

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS AND THE BUILDING UP OF THE  
CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

Thesis

Submitted to

The College of Arts and Sciences of the  
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of

Master of Arts in Theological Studies

By

Michael Anthony Romero

Dayton, Ohio

August 2016



THE LAYING ON OF HANDS AND THE BUILDING UP OF THE  
CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

Name: Romero, Michael Anthony

APPROVED BY:

---

Sandra Yocum, Ph.D.  
Faculty Advisor

---

Meghan Henning, Ph.D.  
Faculty Reader

---

Dennis Doyle, Ph.D.  
Faculty Reader

---

Daniel Thompson, Ph.D.  
Chair of Department of Religious Studies

© Copyright by  
Michael Anthony Romero  
All rights reserved  
2016

## ABSTRACT

### THE LAYING ON OF HANDS AND THE BUILDING UP OF THE CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

Name: Romero, Michael Anthony  
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Sandra Yocum

The Catholic Charismatic Movement, inheriting the use of the laying on of hands from the Neo-Pentecostal movement, was able to grow and flourish because the laying on of hands was seen as a channel by which one could experience a spiritual renewal. The Catholic Charismatic Movement's own rationale behind the use of the laying on of hands has fallen short in assessing its value during the early growth of the movement. The appraisal of the laying on of hands as a symbolic gesture or a sacramental is challenged in this study, and a new interpretation of the use of the laying on of hands is offered: the laying on of hands is a charism that built up the Catholic Charismatic Movement. The personal spiritual journeys of William Storey and Ralph Keifer are analyzed to understand what led them to their encounter with the Protestant Pentecostal prayer group, where the Catholics first received the baptism in the Spirit by the laying on of hands. The subsequent "Duquesne Weekend" retreat and the growth of the movement on the campus of Notre Dame are also studied in respect to the prevalent use of and the sought-after

nature of the laying on of hands. My interpretation of the laying on of hands as a charism relies on the pneumatology of Heribert Mühlen. Mühlen's description of the Church as the continuation of the anointing of Jesus with the Spirit, and his understanding of the Spirit as the divine self-giving supports the idea that in the laying on of hands the two parties are surrendering to the church and the Spirit. Ultimately, the laying on of hands in this context is a charism for the community where the public witness of the act edifies and strengthens.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: THE ROLE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE “BIRTH” OF THE CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT.....	8
CHAPTER 2: CONTINUITY WITH THE ANCIENT CHURCH: THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR LUKE IN ACTS 8.17.....	61
CHAPTER 3: THE MOVEMENT AND THE LAYING ON OF HANDS: PRAYER IN ACTION.....	96
CHAPTER 4: RENEWAL AND THE SPIRIT: THE CHARISM OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.....	127
CONCLUSION.....	174
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	177

## INTRODUCTION

The “birth” of the movement known as the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church can be directly traced to the use of the laying on of hands. Not only was its use attested to at the student retreat known as the Duquesne Weekend, but the faculty leaders on that retreat had received the laying on of hands at a Pentecostal prayer meeting just a month prior. From the onset of the Catholic movement the laying on of hands was so ubiquitous that it could be asked: What would the movement look like without the laying on of hands? In a movement known for its intense prayer and focus on the power of the Holy Spirit in the daily lives of its followers, the laying on of hands (hereafter LH) stands out as a distinctly human and physical act. It was constantly associated with the renewal experience that impacted personally the lives of believers from the first prayer meetings. At the same time, the LH was regarded as a sacramental, a symbol, or prayer in action. It was not ascribed any power, rightly so, but it also goes largely unexamined and taken for granted by charismatics. The question of why it is necessary is never asked, because it is not deemed necessary to lay hands on someone for them to be healed or to receive the baptism in the Spirit. The practices and testimonies as revealed in the literature of the movement, however, would likely make the uninitiated ascribe special status or even power to the LH. The focus of this study is to use the personal testimonies of those involved at the beginning to understand how the LH was used to build the community of charismatic believers. The ultimate conclusion is that the LH acts as a charism which

builds up and edifies the community. This renewal or building up is experienced both personally for those being prayed over, and communally for all who witness and participate in it.

I begin in chapter one with the history of the birth of the movement. The period focused on is roughly 1963-1973. The years prior to the birth of the movement are important for understanding the movement itself. The charismatic renewal sees its birth as Providential and as part of the Spirit's response to the prayer invoked at the beginning of the Vatican II by John XXIII: "Renew your wonders in this our day as by a new Pentecost." Protestant Pentecostalism was also influencing how Catholics thought about their own church and practices. The Catholic view of the Pentecostal movement in the world at that time will be used to situate the four Catholics who crossed the denominational lines to receive the LH at a Protestant prayer meeting. Ralph Keifer's and William Storey's personal journeys will be analyzed closely to understand the renewal experience they sought and why they crossed denominational lines. Particular attention will be given to the prayer meetings they attended with the Chapel Hill prayer group and the experience of the laying on of hands as described by Keifer and Patrick Bourgeois, the first Catholics to receive the LH by the pentecostal group. This will lead to a close description of the events of the Duquesne Weekend, the student retreat led by Keifer and Storey that is known as the "birth" of the Charismatic Movement. The historical review concludes with emergence of the movement in South Bend, IN and the boom it experienced on the campus of Notre Dame.

Chapter two is an interlude to the Acts of the Apostles. The purpose of this interlude is based on the claims of the movement that they share in a fundamental



Christian experience as seen in the apostolic church of the New Testament. Their claim refers largely to the baptism in the Spirit and the extraordinary charisms—such as glossolalia, healing, and prophecy—that they practice, and of which the New Testament speaks. The claim to sharing in a common experience with the ancient church is not limited to the practice of the extraordinary charisms or the baptism in the Spirit, and in fact, these may not be the best way for the Catholic Charismatic Movement to link themselves to the first Christians. These first Christians still bore the weight of the historically violent and bitter divisions between the Samaritans and the Jews. Before the Spirit would allow for the spread of the Word past Judea and Samaria “and to the ends of the earth,” there had to be a reunification of these divided people. Through a historical-critical and literary exegesis of Acts 8.1-25, it will be shown that the LH as used in the conversion of the Samaritans is a biblical example of the LH as charism, which allowed for the building up of the church physically and spiritually.

Chapter three then looks at how the Catholic Charismatic Movement has explained the meaning of the LH. It will be shown that their appraisal of the LH is incomplete and does not match up to the great social and spiritual significance they ascribe to the LH in the practices of the movement up to the early 1970s. Other historical examples from the early days of the movement will be given to show that the LH had significantly more weight in the context of the movement’s growth than they directly admit. In fact, in some cases, the fact that a person had not received the LH would keep them from admittance to certain prayer meetings. While there are criticisms of the movement to be given in this respect, that is not the goal of this chapter. The examples

given are to show that the movement's theological and historical appraisal of the LH falls short when held up to examples of its use.

In chapter four the pneumatology of Heribert Mühlen is employed to provide a theological explanation of the LH as a charism. Because of the prominence of the LH in prayer practices of charismatics and its use in building up the charismatic communities, this chapter is aimed at providing a theological framework to account for the LH in this role of building up the church, the body of Christ. Close attention is given to certain events of Mühlen's life because they influence his notion of a Spirit-experience. Also, his relationship with the Catholic Charismatic Movement is scrutinized because much of his work during the historical period reviewed in this study was influenced by the movement.

#### *Guidelines for Key Terms and Ideas*

The movement known today as the Catholic Charismatic Renewal was originally referred to as Catholic Pentecostalism because of the Pentecostal movement and the practices associated with it. In the historical breakdown, the Catholic Charismatic Renewal falls under the heading of neo-pentecostalism. Neo-pentecostalism is the appropriation of pentecostal practices beginning in the 1950s by mainline Protestant churches, which were generally considered more traditional and orthodox. Eventually, the term "charismatic" won over the term "pentecostal," but both were present from the beginning. For the purposes of this study, the more general term Catholic Charismatic Movement (hereafter CCM) will be used to refer to the social movement within the Catholic Church that moved en masse to seek the renewal experience through the LH, thus leading to the need in the charismatic communities for large-scale organization and leadership. Catholic Charismatic Renewal carries with it the spiritual and ecclesial focus

of the movement for the renewal of the entire Catholic Church. Throughout this study the terms “pentecostal” and “charismatic” will be used interchangeably to refer to the people involved in the CCM depending on the context. Typically today, both Catholic Charismatic Renewal and CCM are synonymous with the group of Catholics around the world who practice the biblical charisms and pray for the baptism in the Spirit with the LH.

The experience known as the baptism in the Spirit that has come to typify what separates the charismatics from the “non-charismatic” Catholics has varying definitions and explanations. All Protestant understandings of the term will be avoided because the focus here is on the Catholic Pentecostal experience. The CCM is known for its respect for and defense of the magisterium of the Catholic Church. Therefore, the Catholic view always avoids any accounting of or comparison of the baptism in the Spirit with the seven sacraments. Though it has been called by critics of the CCM a pseudo-sacrament, and no matter how closely some of the Catholic language used to describe it sounds sacramental, the CCM does not sway from this position. For the Catholics, the baptism in the Spirit does not confer grace and it is not a sacrament. The most basic description is that the baptism in the Spirit stirs up in the person or actualizes the graces already received in confirmation and baptism.

The baptism in the Spirit in the CCM is almost always prayed for with the LH. At times the phrase “imposition of hands” is used. Though it is possible for a person to try and impose the experience on someone, this is not inferred by use of the alternate phrase. In fact, as will be seen, the person seeking baptism in the Spirit usually requests the LH. Still, there are recorded cases, including at the Duquesne Weekend, of people receiving a

baptism in the Spirit without the LH. In the literature of the CCM, the making of the sign of the Cross with one's hand is likened to the LH. In this study these two are mutually exclusive.

The LH in this study is a dynamic of persons and intentions. The LH is not merely a physical gesture that can be likened to the sign of the Cross or the extension of one's hands in prayer. For that reason, the parts of the dynamic must be named. The person desiring renewal and receiving the LH is referred to as the aspirant. The person(s) who desires for the aspirant what he or she seeks and prays for it while also physically laying their hands on the aspirant is referred to as the suppliant. The witnesses are anyone in the community who witness this act, and may also be joining in the prayer. Chapter four will break this down in detail, but the notion of the LH as a charism that builds up the church entails that an aspirant receives the LH by a suppliant(s) in the presence of the Christian community. The LH as a charism is also distinguished from the baptism in the Spirit, which Heribert Mühlen would also call a charism.

Mühlen's ideas of what constitutes the experience of a charismatic renewal are expressed differently throughout his career. Ultimately, what he understands as a baptism in the Spirit is praising God for its own sake. A personal experience of charismatic renewal or a Spirit-experience means that a person has gone through a process of preparation that may involve instruction and meditation. This process culminates in an act of prayer and committing to Christ usually in a public setting. Because of the public aspect, it is sometimes referred to as a "socially transmitted faith-experience" or "social God-experience." In these types of experiences he does hold that it is the Holy Spirit at work.

Mühlen's understanding of socially transmitted God-experiences also includes that they are corporealized movements of the Spirit in the person. Corporeal refers to the body, but also the mind, will, one's character and emotion. As such, the corporeal nature of the social God-experience refers to internal and external steps one has taken toward spiritual renewal that is experienced physically and emotionally as much as it is spiritually.

Lastly, the word charism is used the way Mühlen, and Christian tradition for the most part, understand it. Charisms are gifts given by the Spirit to individuals to be used for others, which build up the body of Christ. This is the ultimate objective of this thesis, to show that the CCM's appraisal of the LH as a sacramental severely underplays the role it played in building up the charismatic community. The extraordinary charisms listed in 1 Cor 12.8-11 are not of interest this study. They are not refuted or confirmed. Christian tradition holds that the lists of charisms given in the New Testament are not meant to be exhaustive. Even the CCM reminds its own that there are many gifts given for the service of others, including practical gifts of organization or leadership. It is also pointed out frequently, to their credit, that tongues is listed as the lowest or least of the charismata. While tongues, or glossolalia, tends to be one of the most frequently discussed aspects of pentecostal groups in general, most would likely agree that this is misplaced attention. Charisms, fundamentally, have to do with service or edification of others, and this is how the LH is being looked at throughout this study.

# CHAPTER 1

## THE ROLE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE “BIRTH” OF THE CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

*“Awakening never occurs in a vacuum, but always in a specific historical situation.”<sup>1</sup>*

### *Introduction*

The laying on of hands is a charismatic-movement. The personal movement toward a spiritual renewal is a personal desire, but also a communal experience. The LH can be called a charismatic-movement because the individual desires a spiritual renewal, and this desire is shared by the prayer community with whom the individual participates. Because of this individual-communal dynamic, the LH in the context of the “birth” of the CCM is ultimately a gift for the community that results in more than the renewal experience of the individual. The LH by the community accompanied with a common good will and prayer toward that renewal. When the aspirant and the supplicants<sup>2</sup> can both contribute will, prayer, and physical and spiritual surrender, when all of these are present, there is action or step toward a more charismatic ethos by both parties. The community of witnesses is strengthened by virtue of witnessing this dynamic of the LH where the individual desires of persons seeking support from the group are met. The large scale phenomena of pentecostalism within the Catholic Church began with these small-

---

<sup>1</sup> Heribert Mühlen, “Charismatic Renewal: An Ecumenical Hope,” *Theology Digest* 30, no.3 (1982): 249.

<sup>2</sup> For this thesis, “aspirant” will be used to refer to the person on whom hands are being laid and “supplicant” will be used to refer to the person who is performing the LH with prayer on the aspirant. These are my terms.

scale steps: individuals seeking spiritual renewal or charismatic-movements within their own lives.

The larger social movement of pentecostal practices being adopted among Catholics and the subsequent formation of charismatic communities and prayer groups is the Catholic Charismatic Movement.<sup>3</sup> The well-known Duquesne Weekend is generally known as marking the “birth” of the movement. On the night of February 18, 1967, in the chapel of the Ark and the Dove retreat house in North Hills, PA about 25 college students reported that they experienced the baptism in the Spirit, some with the laying of hands and some without. After this retreat, little time passed before word of what had happened spread, and many of the retreatants began sharing their experience on the campus of Duquesne University. Rumors spread to Notre Dame University, but eventually one of the faculty leaders of the Duquesne Weekend retreat shared the experience of the LH with students in South Bend. The spread of the movement at Notre Dame marks the period of rapid growth at the beginning of the summer of 1967 because of the influx of students, priests, monks, nuns, and others from across the country for summer courses. The pentecostal-type prayer meetings at Notre Dame grew to be so big, and so many people came to be involved that organization was undertaken, and leadership emerged among a number of Catholics who had been baptized in the Spirit early in 1967. The

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this thesis, the movement in the Catholic Church will be referred to simply as the Catholic Charismatic Movement. However, it should be noted that the following terms are synonymous with the same movement: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, and Catholic Pentecostalism. A somewhat controversial point at the beginning of the movement was the association of the term “pentecostal” with a Catholic lay movement. René Laurentin remarks on the confusion of naming the movement even as late as 1977 when the English translation of his book on the movement was published. He also cheekily remarked that the Greek form of the word, “pneumatics,” had been monopolized by the automobile tire industry agitating the situation. *Catholic Pentecostalism*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1977), 16-17; Institutionally, the US Catholic Bishops, in their report from November of 1969, warned of associating Pentecostalism with Catholic prayer groups and were already leaning towards the term “charismatic renewal.” Report of the American Bishops, “The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church in the U.S.A.,” in O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 291-93; Cf. *Ibid.*, 31-35.

organized social movement that included rapidly growing numbers, a body of literature, a leadership body, and a network of communities in different states is where the notion of large scale renewal of the Catholic Church emerged as a goal of the movement.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, there are no founders of the CCM in the sense that the first Catholic Pentecostals did not set out to enact change or reform in the Church through a “pentecostal experience.” Organization through leadership emerged from the universities and notions of renewal of the Catholic Church came from this later organized effort.

This chapter will focus on three periods that comprise the historical events that envelope the birth of the movement: 1) the ecclesial context in which the CCM emerged from just prior to and after the second Vatican Council, 2) the accounts of what led the first few Catholic Pentecostals to seek out a Protestant Pentecostal prayer group, and 3) the events of the Duquesne Weekend followed by the early days of the movement at Notre Dame. Within each of these brief time frames, the LH will be focused on to highlight the circumstances that characterized its use.

From the early 1960s, when examining Pentecostalism, the Catholic Church’s view of itself as expressed through Catholic writers in religious print media includes comparisons of Pentecostal churches to their own church. The ecclesial context of the Catholic Church will show that some in the Catholic Church viewed the Protestant Pentecostals as having the benefit of a more personal and fuller experience of God and community. This view will inform the personal stories of William Storey and Ralph Keifer who were the first Catholics to seek out a Protestant Pentecostal prayer group in

---

<sup>4</sup> “The goal is a charismatically renewed Church, not a separate ‘pentecostal’ organization ‘for people who go for that sort of thing.’ Having some identity as a movement may be necessary for a time in order to accomplish the larger goal. But the larger goal is the significant one: a charismatically renewed Catholic Church.” George Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and the Church of Tomorrow,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 244.



1966 and receive the LH. Storey and Keifer were later the faculty members leading the Duquesne University students at the famed weekend retreat. The Duquesne Weekend is the climactic point of this historical review. It will be shown to be mostly an isolated event from the larger social movement that would follow.

The charismata, or spiritual gifts, which Pentecostals claim are manifestations of the Spirit are not taken into account for a number of reasons. Primarily, the phenomenon or the extraordinary charismata are not to be denied or affirmed in this study; the significance of the LH in the development of a religious movement is being examined. But also, the occurrence of these gifts is not consistent at the birth of the movement or across testimonies of baptism in the Spirit for many Pentecostals and Catholics. The notion of a renewal experience does not deny the existence of the charismata nor does it affirm. The LH as a renewal experience, and ultimately a charism in itself, has a distinctly social dimension.

The word “social” is important in this study because it is pointing to what can be analyzed in reference to human actions within specific cultural contexts. In short, the extraordinary or supernatural charisms play no role, or are not necessitated, by what will be defined as a social God-experience. Social God-experience is Mühlen’s term and refers to a renewal experience of an individual in the company of one’s congregation or community. The LH in the Catholic charismatic context with its personal and communal dimensions is a social God-experience where the community is edified by virtue of the act of LH in its own right. The subsequent baptism of the Spirit or the manifestation of extraordinary charisms are different gifts altogether. The perceivable and communal LH is the charism to be examined.

The historical review of the beginnings of the CCM will show that the LH was not simply a “gesture,” the generic definition given consistently in explanations of its use by those who studied and participated in the movement. The other most common description of the LH is that it is a sacramental, in the sense of the “little sacraments” that Catholics use to describe things like rosaries and holy water. The historical review will also show that the LH was much more than a mere sacramental for those Catholics who came to share in this Pentecostal experience. On a basic level of understanding, the LH cannot be a sacramental because most Catholics would not associate a deeper spiritual experience that is life-changing with the traditional sacramentals, like genuflecting, as the first Catholic Pentecostals did with the LH. On a theological level, it becomes cumbersome trying to explain the LH as a sacramental because its relation to grace has to be explained.

Ultimately, analysis of the use of the LH prior to, on, and after the Duquesne Weekend will lead to a theological understanding of its role in building up, growing, or propagating members of the Church in this particular act. Chapter four will apply the pneumatology of Mühlen to the actions which are being depicted below to seek an understanding of the LH that is Trinitarian and which describes the full sense in which the LH is a charism that characterizes a social God-experience.

#### *Pre-Catholic Pentecostalism*

On an evening in 1958, a sixteen year old heroin addict grabbed the hands of a preacher and placed them on his own head. He did this in the chapel of Teen Challenge, a start-up ministry of street preacher Reverend David Wilkerson’s, in Brooklyn, New York. It was a teen named Roberto who had been listening to the preaching of former drug

addict Nicky about the work and power of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Nicky preached passionately about how a drug addict who wanted to be clean needed the Holy Spirit. Then Nicky told Roberto that he would lay his hands on Roberto's head, just like St. Paul, and the same thing would happen to him that happened to the first Christians—he would receive the Holy Spirit. It was at this point that Roberto looked across to Reverend Wilkerson and then leapt to his feet and exclaimed that he wanted everything God had for him. Then he ran to the front of the chapel and imposed Nicky's hands on his own head. According to Wilkerson's account, Roberto began to tremble and then fell to his knees while other boys in the chapel gathered around him praying.<sup>5</sup>

This type of prayer that uses the laying on of hands is a conventional practice in Pentecostal churches and Catholic Charismatic prayer meetings. Liberating drug addicts aside, both Pentecostals and Catholic Pentecostals draw inspiration from the New Testament to invoke the Spirit through prayer and use of this ancient gesture. This episode above is recorded in chapter 21 of David Wilkerson's landmark work, *The Cross and the Switchblade*, which is the personal account of his call to preach the gospel to gang members and drug addicts on the streets of New York City. The book itself, and chapter 21 specifically, is cited as one of the inspirations for the first Pentecostal Catholics in seeking a deeper and more concrete experience with the Holy Spirit, which included the LH, eventually leading to the birth of the Catholic Charismatic Movement.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> David Wilkerson, *The Cross and the Switchblade* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1962), 160-62.

<sup>6</sup> What became a common practice for his team of volunteers was to effectively cure addicts from addiction by praying over them with the laying on of hands for the baptism in the Spirit. To be fair to Wilkerson, he did not proclaim the laying on of hands or the baptism in the Spirit as a cure-all. In fact, the following chapter immediately goes on to explain that addicts had to learn what "living in the Spirit" meant and how that differed from receiving the Spirit. Also, while Wilkerson admits that this method did meet with some mixed results, he also testified strongly to its power in transforming the lives of addicts.

Since many in the Catholic Church, lay and clergy alike, were suspicious of Pentecostalism well before the Catholic movement broke out, a review of some perceptions on the Protestant Pentecostal movement from the Catholic perspective will help properly gauge the significance of events that led to the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church with special emphasis on the LH.

Catholic Charismatics tend to view the words of Pope John XXIII in a prayer to the Holy Spirit he gave just before the start of the Second Vatican Council as providential to the CCM: “Renew Your wonders in this our day, as by a new Pentecost. Grant to Your Church that, being of one mind and steadfast in prayer with Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and following the lead of blessed Peter, it may advance the reign of our Divine Savior, the reign of truth and justice, the reign of love and peace. Amen.”<sup>7</sup> Indeed, the key phrase “as by a new Pentecost” is cited frequently in the literature. Even prior to the movement, Catholic literature was already mentioning this prayer of Pope John’s invocation of the Spirit for an outpouring on the Church and the Council. Daniel J. O’Hanlon’s “The Pentecostals and Pope John’s ‘New Pentecost,’” published in a May 1963 issue of *America*, begins and ends by calling attention to Pope John’s wish to restore the Church to the “simplicity” of her birth, i.e. the church of the Acts of the Apostles, and challenges Catholics to consider the implications of taking these words seriously.<sup>8</sup> O’Hanlon points out to the reader that John XXIII was hoping for a new Pentecost. The conclusion drawn is that the Catholic Church, in being open to the “Spirit of renewal,” should take

---

<sup>7</sup> Walter M. Abbot and Joseph Gallagher, eds. *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 793.

<sup>8</sup> Daniel J. O’Hanlon, “The Pentecostals and Pope John’s ‘New Pentecost,’” *America* 108, 18 (1963): 634-36.

important lessons from the Pentecostal churches who take their name from what Catholics consider the birth of the Church itself.

O'Hanlon goes on to inform his readers of the boom of Pentecostal churches in Latin America and the US. He emphasizes that those who join are usually the poor and outcast in their social environments. These *déracinés* are repelled and turned off by the cold and formal Catholic churches, comparable to a supermarket. The Pentecostal churches welcome the newcomers warmly, embrace them, and call them sister or brother. O'Hanlon admonishes Catholics and other Protestants for neglecting these authentic Christian values. He then explains that it is harder for Catholics to learn from Pentecostals than from other Protestants, touching on one of the fundamental divisions between the mainline Christian churches and their Pentecostal strains.

O'Hanlon argues that the “formidable social and cultural barriers” separating Catholics from Pentecostals are greater than the religious and theological barriers separating Catholics from Lutherans or other mainline Protestants. This cultural division that O'Hanlon sees is reasoned on a socio-economic basis. The Catholic priest can more easily “play golf” with the Protestant pastor than make contact with these poor and minority-status Pentecostal ministers who likely have no formal education, no theological training, and work blue collar jobs: “The Spanish-speaking minister of a small storefront church in a New York slum is not likely to join the alumni of Union Theological Seminary and the Pontifical Gregorian University for theological discussion in the pastor’s study over a glass of sherry.”<sup>9</sup> O'Hanlon’s candid assessment of the state of relations between what he is essentially calling rich Catholic priests and poor Pentecostals preaching in the streets is striking. The socio-economic disparity to which he

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 635.

calls attention he attempts to balance with continuing to tell his reader what he can learn from the Pentecostal movement.<sup>10</sup>

For O'Hanlon, a Jesuit author writing in a Catholic magazine, the lessons for Catholicism from the Pentecostal movement as it stood in 1963 were manifold. Where the Catholic Church appeared cold and distant, the Pentecostals openly expressed affection for their community and those who come to it from without. Pentecostals were living the virtues of poverty of spirit and O'Hanlon reminds his reader that the Council's first session called for a return to "evangelical poverty."<sup>11</sup> The lesson of the normalness and natural expression of emotion in worship and prayer, the quality of Pentecostalism that would come to stereotype them and Catholic Pentecostals, is one that Catholics must learn to do in the presence of each other. Perhaps the most pertinent for the aims of this discussion is that Pentecostals teach by their example that being Christian means serious consideration of how one is required to live in the world; Christians are not "conformed to the spirit of the world." O'Hanlon calls attention to the observation of Frank Sheed, Catholic apologist of the day, "the greatest obstacle preventing people from becoming Catholics is not the scandalous lives of the few, but the frightfully mediocre lives of the many."<sup>12</sup> While much of O'Hanlon's criticisms may be interpreted as a harsh indictment of the Catholic Church, it is apt and uncannily foreshadows the "new Pentecost" the Catholic Church would experience where one could look at the CCM as early as 1969 and conclude: lesson learned.

---

<sup>10</sup> The use of the masculine pronoun for the reader in this sentence is intentional for obvious reasons. His audience would be the group he criticizes, Catholic priests, and not likely Catholic lay women or women religious, especially since this article dates just seven months after the beginning of Vatican II.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 636.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 636.

On all these lessons—on making individual commitments of faith, on the poverty and simplicity of the gospel message, on personal fellowship in Christian community, on spontaneous public prayer, on emotion as a natural expression of religious conviction, on being a people set apart from the world, and not least that the notion of salvation should deeply impact and transform lives—O’Hanlon is prescient.<sup>13</sup> All of these points are easily identifiable in the motivations and actions of those involved at the beginning of the movement. But what would make crossing this gulf between “supermarket” Catholicism and dynamic Pentecostalism possible? The cold and rigid image of the Catholic Church is short-sighted to be sure, and the Pentecostal churches are already noted at this time for their lack of structure and absence of the sacramental element. But to have what O’Hanlon calls the courage to be “grafted onto Christ’s Mystical Body,” O’Hanlon implies that many Catholics of his day did not possess this courage. Some Catholics had been left wanting and were leaving the Church. Denominational movement in respect to Pentecostalism was one-way and in the poorer classes among Catholics.

Noted Pentecostal scholar, and later scholar of the CCM, Kilian McDonnell also claimed to be “impressed” by the life and growth of the Pentecostal movement.<sup>14</sup> In 1966 he was addressing common criticisms of the movement in an ecumenical journal, criticisms that other Catholic scholars, only a year later, would be attempting to explain as a result of the same phenomena being experienced in the CCM. Such phenomena were glossolalia, emotionalism, and an enthusiasm and focus on the role of the Holy Spirit in Christian daily life. If glossolalia was demonic or disturbed, McDonnell asserts that St. Paul would also have to be dismissed as such and that, after an examination of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Kilian McDonnell, “The Ecumenical Significance of the Pentecostal Movement,” *Worship* 40, no. 10 (1966), 608-29.

scientific and theological literature on the topic, it was his opinion that “many of the cases of speaking in tongues are genuine.”<sup>15</sup> McDonnell reminds his reader that applying strict norms or criteria to the Pentecostal movement can distract from any good that it can offer. They are criticized for being overly emotional in their approach, but this should not invalidate their churches.<sup>16</sup> McDonnell’s key point is that Pentecostals were not obsessed with the Spirit; they had a positive view of the role of the Spirit in the lives of Christians, and it did not overshadow the Lordship of Jesus. The so-called established churches should take note and ask if they have taken the Spirit seriously or the Spirit’s role in composing the church: “This is the major point of Pentecostalism’s ecumenical significance.”<sup>17</sup>

Cutting across denominational lines, much less class lines, had come to typify much of the Pentecostal experience. The emergence of neo-Pentecostalism, the movement of Pentecostalism within the mainline Protestant churches beginning in the 1950s, also showed that the Pentecostal wind had reached further up the social ladder. The Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship, what McDonnell explains as an attempt to “adapt Pentecostalism to the ethos of the middle class business man,” also points to the “social respectability” of the movement—no longer poor and uneducated.<sup>18</sup> So what O’Hanlon perceived in 1963 as the biggest barrier to ecumenical relations between Pentecostals and Catholics, barriers of class, was now all but gone by 1966. The religious barrier also appeared less impassable as David Du Plessis sat as the only Pentecostal

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 614.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 613.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 628.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 627-28. Cf. David J. du Plessis, “Golden Jubilees of the Twentieth Century Pentecostal Movements,” *International Review of Missions* 47, no. 186 (1958): 196.



observer during the third session of the Second Vatican Council in 1964.<sup>19</sup> It was Du Plessis who was invoked in Catholic discussions of Pentecostalism after the council and noted as saying, almost sagely, that to receive the blessings of the baptism in the Spirit one did not have to join a Pentecostal church.<sup>20</sup>

Forsaking allegiance to the Catholic Church was certainly not on the minds of those Catholics who engaged Pentecostals or expressed curiosity at their methods and passion. In a 1966 article in *Catholic World*, Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, future proponent of the CCM in Rome, is noted to have inquired several times on what the “secret” was to Pentecostal zeal.<sup>21</sup> Pentecostalism scholar Prudencio Damboriena’s response: “I do not know.” Suenens’ question might be better answered with another question—brother, are you saved?—the stereotypical Pentecostal question, to which Catholics had begun to approach theologically.

Damboriena also reveals that some Catholics were aware of the roots of Pentecostalism in the US at the turn of the century. He relates that young Agnes Ozman in Topeka, Kansas asked her pastor to place his hands on her and pray for her.<sup>22</sup> Soon

---

<sup>19</sup> Jerry L. Sandidge, “Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue: A Contribution to Christian Unity,” *Pneuma* 7, no. 1 (1985), 41-61.

<sup>20</sup> Prudencio Damboriena, “The Pentecostal Fury,” *Catholic World* 202 (1966): 222.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 18-21. The event of the baptism in the Spirit of Agnes Ozman is generally regarded as the birth of the classic Pentecostal movement that eventually led to the breaking off of Pentecostals to form their own churches. Charles Fox Parham was the Methodist Pastor who laid hands on Agnes. The event took place in Bethel College and Bible School, which he established in October of 1900. Laurentin relates that the students of Parham’s school were also dispirited with the gloomy life of the church in their day compared to that vibrant church depicted in the book of Acts where the Spirit moved in the church and the charisms were a common experience; Cf. Patti Gallagher Mansfield, *As By a New Pentecost: The Dramatic Beginning of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1992), 7-9. Gallagher Mansfield’s historical account includes the compelling story of one Sister Elena Guerra, foundress of the Oblate Sisters of the Holy Spirit in Lucca, Italy. Sr. Elena was “inspired” to write to Pope Leo XIII to renew the Church via a return to the Holy Spirit, eventually resulting in the apostolic letter *Provida Matris Caritate* (1895) where he asks the Church to do a novena to the Holy Spirit ending on the feast of Pentecost, and the encyclical on the Holy Spirit *Divinum Illud Munus* (1897). Leo later, at Sr. Elena’s urging, invoked the Holy Spirit on January 1, 1901, the first day of the new century by singing “*Veni Creator Spiritus*.” Mansfield Gallagher cites this as coinciding with the

after, she began speaking in tongues.<sup>23</sup> For all the confusion Pentecostal doctrine caused Catholics on what receiving the Spirit meant, Damboriena was certain: “we shall never comprehend Pentecostal beliefs and practices until we understand the centrality of the third Person of the Blessed Trinity in their theology.”<sup>24</sup> This echoed McDonnell’s conclusion that the ultimate question is of holiness: the Spirit calling and who will listen.<sup>25</sup> For the time being it seemed that no Catholic knew how to engage Pentecostalism further. While Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* declared at the onset that the restoring of Christian unity was a principal concern of the Council, this declaration of the Council did not inspire two Catholic laymen, both of whom were theology instructors at the same Catholic university, to seek out the laying on of hands from an interdenominational, Protestant prayer group.

### *Three Cursillistas*

“What would happen if I spent two hours every single night in prayer? It was an exhilarating idea. Substitute prayer for television, and see what happened.”<sup>26</sup>

The crossing of denominational, social, and economic lines between Catholics and Pentecostals in the mid-1960s may lead one to hold that the time was ripe for the Pentecostal wave to land full on Catholic shores. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, a husband and wife involved in the movement from its eruption at Notre Dame and who would become leaders of the CCM, paint a dreary picture of the Christian religious landscape in the US at the time: “God is dead” or “missing in action.” The Christian sees

---

outpouring of the Spirit on Agnes Ozman in Topeka, KS; Cf. Agnes N.O. LaBerge, *What God Hath Wrought* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 28-39; Cf. Also Sarah E. Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1930), 51-56.

<sup>23</sup> Damboriena, “Pentecostal Fury,” 217-218.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>25</sup> McDonnell, “Ecumenical Significance,” 629.

<sup>26</sup> Wilkerson, *The Cross and the Switchblade*, 11.

an “ineffective apostolate” and only hears the “pounding roar of God’s silence.”<sup>27</sup> It is onto this backdrop that they tell of how the stirrings of the Spirit began as a spark in Pittsburgh.

Ralph Keifer was a theology instructor at Duquesne University and also one of the faculty leaders at the famous Duquesne Weekend retreat that is regarded as the birth of CCM. In a February 1973 special issue of *New Covenant*, the Catholic Charismatic magazine that emerged from the beginning of the movement, Ralph affectionately refers to a Bill Storey, “my friend,” in a reproduction of a letter he had written. This letter was sent to the University Of Notre Dame after the weekend retreat where he and Storey had personally laid hands on many students of Duquesne and prayed for the baptism in the Spirit. Keifer alludes briefly to the spiritual journey he and Storey had been on the year prior to the retreat: “Some wonderful things have happened here. During the fall [of 1966], my friend Bill Storey and I began to have some lengthy and serious discussions about our Christian life. These culminated in December with the reading of two books, The Cross and the Switchblade, by David Wilkerson, and They Speak With Other Tongues, by John Sherrill. We also began to have some deep and wonderful experiences of prayer.”<sup>28</sup>

William Storey taught church history at Duquesne when he and Keifer began the journey of enriching their spiritual lives. He would ask the group of about 25 college students at the Ark and the Dove retreat house on Saturday of the Duquesne Weekend, “Are you ready for what the Spirit can do in your life?”<sup>29</sup> But in the fall of the previous year, he and Keifer were trying to figure out if such a question even made sense. Most

---

<sup>27</sup> Kevin Ranaghan and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), 2-5.

<sup>28</sup> Ralph Keifer and Bobbi Keifer, “Letter of Ralph and Bobbi Keifer,” *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973): 1.

<sup>29</sup> Patti Gallagher, “Are you ready?,” *New Covenant* 2, no 8 (1973): 2.

early accounts of the birth of the CCM tend to emphasize that part of the journey for Keifer and Storey was an agreement to pray for each other daily. This prayer included a recitation of the “Come Holy Spirit” hymn from the Mass of Pentecost, which includes the following:

Heal our wounds, our strength renew;  
On our dryness pour thy dew;  
Wash the stains of guilty away;  
Bend the stubborn heart and will;  
Melt the frozen, warm the chill;  
Guide the steps that go astray.<sup>30</sup>

These lines of the hymn are due attention because it might be difficult to grasp exactly why these two theology instructors were praying for a change to their spiritual “dryness,” and to “melt the frozen” and “warm the chill.” In August of 1967, they had attended the Congress of the Cursillo movement together. They were also involved in numerous liturgical, ecumenical, apostolic, and peace movements and “disillusioned with them all.”<sup>31</sup> All external indications were that these two Catholic laymen should have been spiritually satisfied given all the effort put into these ecclesial activities. At this point, they both began to lean nearer to influences outside the Catholic Church.

At the Cursillo Congress they had been introduced to Wilkerson’s book by Steve Clark and Ralph Martin.<sup>32</sup> After this encounter and during the year in which Storey and Keifer were praying for each other, Keifer came across the book *They Speak With Other Tongues*, an investigation of the Pentecostal movement by an Episcopalian who had

---

<sup>30</sup> O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 14-15; Cf. Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 8. The Ranaghans’ account states that they had prayed this way “all year, every day”; Cf. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 12.

<sup>31</sup> Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 10; Cf. Jim Manney, “Before Duquesne: Sources of the Renewal,” *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973): 12-17.

<sup>32</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 9. Clark and Martin were also involved in the Cursillo movement and also worked in a university setting. They worked at St. John’s Student Parish in East Lansing, MI.

come to know of Pentecostalism after having a religious experience in recovery from cancer. This book made real the possibility that they could take their spiritual journey to another level.<sup>33</sup>

In the fall of 1966, the group of men met to pray, recited the “Come Holy Spirit,” and discussed crossing denominational lines to approach Pentecostals about the baptism in the Spirit. They considered that they could continue with their current efforts, but didn’t expect that to get them any further. The thought of just laying hands on and praying for each other, to follow the example of Scripture, seemed too inward-looking. They hesitated on their last option, to approach actual Pentecostals. For one, they didn’t know any, and they were also wary of possible anti-Catholic sentiment. Then they recalled an Episcopalian priest, William Lewis, who had lectured at Duquesne once. When Lewis was contacted, they learned that he did in fact have members of his parish who attended a “prayer group of that kind.” They met with Lewis in his office with a woman from that group on January 6, 1967. They discussed the books and their intentions and impressed her enough that she invited them to a meeting the following Friday. Laurentin’s account and the Ranaghan’s account are plain-spoken about the fact that this first meeting with this Pentecostal woman was the same day as the Feast of the Epiphany. They also mention that the first prayer meeting they attended was on the octave day of the Epiphany, which happened to be the Feast of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River and his anointing with the Holy Spirit.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 11; Cf. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 12.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 12-13; Cf. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 12.

These two dates are also noted by Patti Gallagher Mansfield in her book published on the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of the CCM.<sup>35</sup> Clearly the significance of the dates is underscored by the fact that these devout Catholics were well aware that, on these Catholic feast days, they were crossing denominational lines. Gallagher Mansfield, one of the first students to receive the baptism in the Spirit on the Duquesne Weekend in 1967, was able to fill in the denominational background information of this prayer group in her book. Miss Florence Dodge, in whose house these meetings took place in Chapel Hill, was a Presbyterian baptized in the Spirit in 1962. She felt called to start what would become the Chapel Hill prayer group. It had been meeting for a few years prior to the arrival of these Catholics from Duquesne. The group was interdenominational from the beginning, consisting mostly of women. When she learned of the visitors they would have, the Chapel Hill prayer group fasted and prayed in preparation for their arrival on January 13.<sup>36</sup>

Four Catholics arrived that night: Ralph Keifer and his wife Bobbi,<sup>37</sup> William Storey, and Patrick Bourgeois, a fellow theology faculty member. Flo's welcoming of the Catholics echoes the descriptions of many of the Pentecostals O'Hanlon had mentioned in his 1963 analysis of those Latin Americans leaving the Catholic Church for Pentecostal ones. Flo felt a deep love for them and gave them a warm embrace as "sons." At the end, Flo felt compelled to forgo the usual custom of placing a chair in the center of the group for a person who requested prayer, because she felt it was important that no one could take credit for being the first to lay hands on the Catholics. It was evident even to

---

<sup>35</sup> *New Pentecost*, 14.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-16.

<sup>37</sup> For the sake of simplicity and the fact that no first-hand accounts of Bobbi Keifer's experience are known to the author, "Keifer" in the essay will always refer to Ralph.

the newcomers that the usual business of LH was being waived that night. There would be no LH that night. But the “history professor”<sup>38</sup> did reach out to Flo swiftly and told her he came for the baptism in the Spirit; he had waited a long time for it, and “I’m not leaving until I have it.” It appeared that he stopped short of demanding it. After a man from the group questioned the “history professor” one-on-one away from the group to see if he was ready for the baptism in the Spirit, they returned to the group. The prayer group joined hands with each other in a circle around him, and prayed. There was no LH and no outward signs of the Spirit, like glossolalia, which some Pentecostals say typically do follow the baptism in the Spirit.<sup>39</sup>

Ralph Keifer, the “history professor” mentioned by Flo, described that first meeting as being like a family gathering.<sup>40</sup> Though there was no outpouring of the Spirit, Keifer and Bourgeois returned the following week. Keifer would write that the meeting centered on the Letter to the Romans and that the discussion was not “all clouded up with Reformation issues.”<sup>41</sup> The two men requested prayer at the end of the meeting for the baptism in the Spirit. One group prayed over each man individually. This time the LH did take place.<sup>42</sup> Keifer writes in his own testimony:

They simply asked me to make an act of faith for the power of the Spirit to work in me. I prayed in tongues rather quickly. It was not a particularly soaring or spectacular thing at all. I felt a certain peace—and at least a little prayerful—and truthfully, rather curious as to where all this would lead...I couldn’t understand why this charismatic phenomenon didn’t occur more frequently, as one would expect. This seemed to be more in line with what I had come to expect of New Testament Christianity.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Laurentin, *Catholics Pentecostals*, 17.

<sup>39</sup> Mansfield Gallagher, *New Pentecost*, 16.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>42</sup> Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 12.

<sup>43</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 15-16.

Keifer calls attention to his own giving-up moment or surrendering in the act of faith.

Though Keifer didn't mention the LH, Laurentin's account calls attention to the fact that it was used on Keifer and Bourgeois by this interdenominational Pentecostal group.<sup>44</sup>

Keifer would go on to share this experience with his wife and the other Duquesne theology instructor, Storey, laying hands on both.

Patrick Bourgeois shared a similar background and experience with Keifer and Storey leading up to January 13, 1967.<sup>45</sup> Bourgeois was a graduate student in philosophy, a theology instructor, and had done a Cursillo in 1966.<sup>46</sup> Either Keifer or Storey introduced him to the books by Sherrill and Wilkerson, and then invited him to the Chapel Hill prayer group. Bourgeois states he left the first meeting with awareness that these people had "tasted something unique of the Christian life" and that it reminded him of Wilkerson's book. Bourgeois and Keifer reflected on that first meeting that night and through the next week. Keifer had some kind of "psychological obstacle" he had to overcome before they would return to the prayer group the following week. It had to do with an experience with Protestants from his youth. There are no further details on what this was about, but they were the only two to return on January 20.<sup>47</sup>

Bourgeois offers a description of the meeting as they attended the following week: "[I had] to find out if this deeper faith was real and alive. I found we had to expect

---

<sup>44</sup> See note 37; Cf. Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 19.

<sup>45</sup> I have found no personal account of the experience of Ralph Keifer's wife, Bobbi, one of the four Catholics to attend that first meeting on January 13, 1967. Two letters, both written by Ralph Kiefer, are the closest things that come to a personal account of hers or that give details about her experience at this time. One is the letter that breaks the news about the Duquesne Weekend, written to friends at Notre Dame, which is signed "Ralph and Bobbi." See Ralph and Bobbi, "Letter," 1; The other letter is in Mansfield Gallagher's book and is written to an unnamed friend of Ralph's. *New Pentecost*, 20-22.

<sup>46</sup> Bourgeois went on to become a Philosophy professor and has been at Loyola University in New Orleans since 1968. He is currently the William and Audrey Hutchinson Distinguished Professor of Philosophy. See <http://cas.loyola.edu/philosophy/bios/patrick-l-bourgeois>.

<sup>47</sup> Mansfield Gallagher, *New Pentecost*, 125.



more than our recent abstract theological tradition often allowed for.”<sup>48</sup> On his experience of the LH: “The main thing which stood out in the next meeting, to which only two of the four of us returned, was our request for the Baptism in the Spirit. The members of the group prayed avidly over us. That intense prayer by a strong fellowship community elicited an intense inner response.”<sup>49</sup> Bourgeois also commented on their two efforts to surrender to the group: “we united ourselves to the group not only externally, but also internally. Although the prayer and faith during the praying over us was intense, it was calm enough.”<sup>50</sup> The further details he gives can be appreciated intellectually for their precise language and attentiveness to theological concerns. First, he is quick to point out that his experience was not emotional; it was much more profound and measured: “I noticed a somewhat ‘fixating’ experience which emerged from the depth of my being, gradually over the next few days...It was a good experience of the total unity of the depth of my being, drawn to the Sublime.”<sup>51</sup> He contends that though psychologists would likely have explanations for the experience, they would have great difficulty in “explaining” (quotations are Bourgeois’) its origin. In other words, he claims that there is really no scientific justification as to why he should have felt this way after having the LH and prayer.

After this experience at Chapel Hill, Bourgeois said he found it difficult to stop praying or stop reading Scripture once he began. He makes two further points on the experience:

Two reflections stand out, even after twenty-five years. First, this was an interdenominational prayer group. When something of an anti-intellectual

---

<sup>48</sup> Bourgeois, “Another Step,” *New Covenant* 2, no 8 (1973): 5.

<sup>49</sup> Mansfield Gallagher, *New Pentecost*, 126.

<sup>50</sup> Bourgeois, “Another Step,” 5.

<sup>51</sup> Mansfield Gallagher, *New Pentecost*, 126.

character emerged at one of the two first meetings which we attended, someone gently but firmly squelched it as improper. Further, one of the theological points which has always impressed me from the very beginning is that the intense experience of quickening, or of releasing the Spirit, occurs within lived experience in such a way as not to be limited to one theology. This has always struck me as extremely important since it shows that, within certain limits, this experience allows for a pluralism of theologies on a second level of reflection. To me this indicates that the experience does not unequivocally lead to a fundamentalistic theology. One could say the level of this experience is pretheological, but no one, even on the basic and pretheoretical level, is without theological assumptions, even if they are totally implicit and subliminal. The fact is that *the experience happens within differing theological assumptions* (emphasis Bourgeois'), and on this basic pretheological level.

The second point of note indicated above is the role of this colleague, who at first had so much difficulty overcoming emotional resistance to his background with non-Catholics. He obviously became the anointed leader of the Pittsburgh group of Catholics for half a year until he left for further graduate studies. After the Duquesne Weekend, we attended more prayer meetings in the North Hills. Then, in response to some obvious need, this colleague began holding praying meetings at his house every Friday evening until he left town. His role in my life, in the lives of the Duquesne community, and, in the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic tradition, was of central significance.<sup>52</sup>

Bourgeois' recollections, and Keifer's, recall some of the barriers between Pentecostalism and Catholicism which Catholic scholars had noted prior to the birth of the CCM: the socio-economic barrier, and the theological barrier. The former had not vanished. The Neo-Pentecostal movement meant that these two earnest seekers technically didn't have to cross the socio-economic railroad tracks to experience the "authentic Christian values" that O'Hanlon wrote about being present in Pentecostal churches. Keifer and Bourgeois did experience the lessons that O'Hanlon had said Catholics could take from Pentecostalism: fellowship on the level of family, simplicity, spontaneous prayer. But the Catholic seekers were not after an interdenominational experiment aimed at borrowing lessons that they could share with their parishes. They also were not aimed at erasing theological differences, and yet this presupposed barrier

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 126-27.

proved somewhat of a minor obstacle. Neither Bourgeois nor Keifer gave any further information on what Keifer's previous experience with Protestants was that was giving him room to question attending a second meeting, but it clearly did not impede their reception of the experience that the LH offered.

Keifer and Bourgeois' testimonies, which echo some of the pre-conceptions that other Catholic scholars had called attention to about Pentecostalism does not make for the demolition of interdenominational barriers. Though it was quite easy for them to relate to these middle-class women in North Hills, PA, who were mostly members of mainline Protestant churches, their experience moved them to share it with others of their own faith. Notably, these instances of sharing are marked by the imposition of their hands on those with whom they shared. The LH and baptism in the Spirit they experienced did not lead them to bring other Catholics to this prayer meeting. Though many of the first Catholic Charismatics interacted with, prayed with, worshipped with Protestant Pentecostals, they didn't form a church with them or seek to create their own church. Still, Bourgeois' testimony twice makes it clear that the crossing of denominational lines influenced the entire dynamic of the experience for them. They crossed denominational lines and felt welcomed and a genuine sense of Christian love. Keifer's past experience with Protestants, and Bourgeois' emphasis on the fact that they were the only two Catholics surrounded by Protestant Pentecostals points to their awareness that crossing denomination lines was something they did not take lightly. Bourgeois' comment that anything anti-intellectual was stopped, indicates that they were likely expecting an emotional feel heading into the prayer meeting, at least enough to outweigh the emotion of their Catholic experience.

The spiritual dryness that was expressed about Keifer and Storey's journey—which led them to pray for each other, to read the Wilkerson book, and which led them to Chapel Hill—can be expected to have been also partially indicative of Bourgeois' spiritual dryness prior to Chapel Hill. But Bourgeois, being impressed with the intellectual character of this interdenominational prayer group, didn't expect a less spiritual experience. From the "beginning," meaning either on January 20, 1967 or shortly after, he recalls that their collective experience of the Spirit, or social God-experience, was not limited to any one theology. In other words, as Bourgeois described it above, the "quickening" of the Spirit was indifferent to their particular faith experience or theology because it occurred in this interdenominational context. This social God-experience then can be understood as trans-cultural in the way in which Bourgeois characterizes it as happening "within differing theological assumptions" on a pretheological level. Another way of assessing their experience would be to say that it is above culture or super-cultural. The intent and good will of the Chapel Hill prayer group was for these Catholics to experience a renewal in the Spirit. Keifer and Bourgeois went there for this precise purpose. The collective intent of these two Catholics and the prayer group was then geared toward the act of the LH accompanied with prayer. Following the act, the aspirants describe different personal experience of what they identify as the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Keifer, who described himself at the time as a fledgling theologian, wrote to an unnamed friend about his experience before the Duquesne Weekend took place. This letter, dated February 11, 1967, provides further insight to his experience with Catholicism and his spiritual practices prior to the Chapel Hill prayer group:

[I understand] that you are interested in our impressions of contacts with a Spirit-filled prayer group.

Essentially, I think, it has been simply a discovery of all that we already knew of Christ and Christian life. I hope all this doesn't sound too enigmatic, but the whole experience has been rather like having all our suspicions about the truth of Christianity confirmed; gaining a new depth of awareness of who Christ is and what it means to be a Christian...

A deep sense of need for prayer and sacraments, a joy and confidence in witnessing, a serious confrontation with my own sinfulness, have been what I have noticed most about myself...

My wife began to speak in a tongue when I laid hands on her and prayed over her, just two days after the same thing had happened to me at a prayer meeting...

What I have noticed most about her is a quite remarkable attraction to the Scriptures, to spiritual reading, and to prayer, as well as a spiritual wisdom which I find (by way of understatement) quite helpful to me.

The whole experience has brought much joy and confidence; but I would say that there has been nothing that has been exhilarating (in any frothy emotional sense). It has been, on the whole, calm, quiet, and sometimes painful . . . .<sup>53</sup>

The last four ellipses belong to Keifer. He seems to have been at a loss for words when he attempted to describe the experience further and to elaborate on what he meant by it being "painful." In any case, it is evident that it was difficult for him to convey the full meaning of the event for him.

What is interesting to note at the beginning of this excerpt is that he includes the other Catholics who up to this point had received the LH and the baptism in the Spirit in his description of the experience of Christianity. It was Keifer who would lay hands on the other two who were not present on the January 20 prayer meeting. As this letter was written just a week before the Duquesne Weekend, and there are no stories uncovered thus far that indicate that they went around LH on people prior to the retreat, Keifer can

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 20-21.

only be referring to Storey, Bourgeois, and Bobbi Keifer, his wife.<sup>54</sup> These four are the “we” who, by all accounts, are devout Catholics and have only just discovered Christ and the Christian life. Keifer’s description implies that they knew the “truth of Christianity,” but that this experience made them aware on a new, deeper level. His language does reflect some of the same experience as Bourgeois’ in that they both separate it from an emotional reaction. Keifer’s stands separately from Bourgeois’ in one significant way; Keifer is writing within the first three weeks of his experience, so his theological observations as a “fledgling theologian” bear the weight of being formed at ground-zero of the movement. They have not been influenced by what would be said of the CCM or by what it would become. In the last few paragraphs of the letter he writes:

First of all, the prayer group is super-orthodox. Their understanding of the Trinity, of Christ, of the life of grace, of the relation between nature and grace, of election, of human freedom before God, is a Catholic understanding of those realities.

Secondly, I would relate the Baptism of the Spirit to Confirmation as follows. Our sacrament of confirmation is identical to the New Testament baptism of the spirit. That we notice no effects, or minimal ones, in many cases, is due, not to a failure of the sacrament, but to a failure to seek or respond to the gifts to which the sacrament gives us a claim (the whole scholastic bit about cooperating with the grace of the sacraments.) If a confirmed Catholic is later transformed in a context such as we have experienced, this is simply a revival of the grace of the sacrament (again a traditional scholastic notion). The laying on of hands is no repudiation of Confirmation, any more than the Asperges is a repudiation of Baptism. If we are not mere ritualists, it is obvious that sacramentals can be used by God as means of activating what He has already done through the sacraments.

Thirdly, in an ecumenical perspective, this could be the Spirit’s way of leading us into unity with one another. All of the people we have met in the group are active

---

<sup>54</sup> A description of the experience of being baptized in the Spirit, which belongs to either Storey or Bobbi Keifer, is given in the Ranaghans’ book. It is not likely that this testimony belongs to Bobbi mainly because it is unattributed in the book. It is more likely that Storey’s description would go unattributed because of his fall out with the group by 1969-1970. As the Ranaghans’ book was published in 1969, it is likely that Storey was already experiencing conflict with the CCM. Excluding Bobbi’s name from the testimony seems highly unlikely as there are personal testimonies of many of the first aspirants as possible, women and men. In fact, this is one of the main purposes of both the Ranaghans’ and Gallagher Mansfield’s books: to gather as many personal testimonies as possible. A portion of this testimony will be included later in the chapter. See Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 16; Cf. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 17.

in their own churches; we have found no sectarian spirit, no repudiation of the larger institutional church. We are “learning from one another” in the deepest sense, and in the deepest sense we “need one another.” At the same time I find three hours a week when all the divisions between the churches are gone, and I find myself become more and more committed to the Catholic Church.<sup>55</sup>

Keifer’s letter moves from his impression of the group to how this experience relates to his faith, particularly, the sacrament of Confirmation, and the possibilities for ecumenism. Keifer is the one whom Bourgeois noted as having had “psychological” barriers to Protestants, so it is no surprise that his first comment on them has to do with their orthodoxy and how they adhere to some core doctrines, which also happen to be points of high contention between Protestants and Catholics. Keifer immediately associates the Chapel Hill prayer group with orthodoxy because they agree with Catholicism on the Trinity, grace, and human freedom. So, as is unavoidable, he is evaluating the group and his interaction with them—the LH, the baptism in the Spirit, the prayer, the common learning—from his Catholic seat. He can only see the LH as a Catholic, and therefore this biblically based gesture that was imminently tied to the baptism in the Spirit of the Pentecostal movement became flooded with the tradition and doctrine of his ancient church.

Keifer’s Catholic identity cannot help but to compare his experience to the sacrament of confirmation where the word sacramental is used for the first time to describe the LH. His Catholic assessment of the LH for the baptism in the Spirit affirms

---

<sup>55</sup> “Personal Letter,” *New Pentecost*, 20-22. Gallagher Mansfield cites the letter as simply “personal letter” in her endnotes, however, it is Ralph Keifer’s. Gallagher Mansfield states that the Ranaghans had met with a Chi Rho “theology instructor” in South Bend in mid-February and he shared with them his experience of baptism in the Spirit. The Ranaghans then state it was this “same theology instructor” who wrote this letter to friends at Notre Dame exactly one week before the Duquesne Weekend. The Ranaghans’ book then recounts this same sequence of events, but names Ralph Keifer; Cf. “In mid-February, Ralph Keifer came out to South Bend on business and spent the weekend with us. He and a few others had by this time received the ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’ but the Duquesne Weekend had not yet taken place. The quiet fire burning in Ralph was obvious to both of us.” Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 39.

the sacraments, because the interpretation is that there is an activation of the “grace of the sacrament.” Keifer’s recognition of a hierarchy, sacramentals complementing sacraments, and his affirmation of Catholic theology, the “traditional scholastic notion” of grace, does not alter the “socially transmitted faith experience,”<sup>56</sup> i.e. the LH on Bourgeois and Keifer by the Chapel Hill prayer group. The interdenominational composition of the group underscores the super-cultural nature of the act of the LH: the pretheological nature of the experience, as Bourgeois called it, towered so high above denominational lines that Keifer remarks that this could lead to unity with one another. In other words, that social barriers did not prevent the Catholics and the Protestants from sharing this social God-experience in any way strengthens the notion that the LH, in the context of good will and prayerful focus, can be a point of cultural union. By super-cultural, or above culture, it is meant that the LH could unite these two disparate groups despite the theological and class differences of the time. Even more significant, the spiritual traditions could seemingly be united in this humble act.

The desire for Christian unity that Keifer expresses, as well as many other Catholic Charismatics later on, fails to recognize immediately that they were united precisely at the moment of the LH. The LH, which was preceded by the common will of all parties and accompanied with public prayer, and followed by the internal change that each of the aspirants says took place internally, was a physical step toward renewing ecumenical relations.<sup>57</sup> The spiritual awakening reported by the first four Catholic

---

<sup>56</sup> Heribert Mühlen, “The Charismatic Renewal as Experience,” in *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1975), 109.

<sup>57</sup> Keifer also notes that he did receive charisms as well—“prayer in a tongue, discernment of spirits, and power to cast them out”—but these have been omitted from analysis because the focus is on the act of LH.



Pentecostals<sup>58</sup> seems to point back to an earlier question on why Catholics were not experiencing the sacraments the way the Church said they should. The Chapel Hill Four did not come to advocate for leaving the comfort of the Catholic sanctuary to experience the gifts of the sacraments coming to life; they did however seek to bring this experience to their communities, and the vehicle they used to do this was the LH. Thus, the Duquesne Weekend was more of a crossing of lines than the Chapel Hill prayer group because they removed the ritual from the interdenominational context. In essence, the LH could not mean the same thing precisely because the Ark and the Dove retreat house was not the home of Flo Dodge, and the aspirants had now become the supplicants. This in no way denigrates the personal and community experiences that took place on the Duquesne Weekend, but simply recognizes that the social dynamic around which the LH occurred has changed.

The event that occurred on January 20, 1967 at the Chapel Hill prayer group, which only included Bourgeois and Keifer, can be defined as an experience of the presence of God within the community.<sup>59</sup> This understanding of experience emphasizes the presence of the community in the aspirant's seeking of renewal. But if the event is defined as a social God-experience, emphasis is placed on the social desire for unity through prayer, the social expression of unity through physical contact of surrendering

---

<sup>58</sup> (See note 45.) "It is not a revolutionary experience because it reaffirmed all the things which I'd been trying to hold on to for years and to affirm for so many years: my appreciation of scripture, my appreciation of the eucharist, my appreciation of praying... The difference is that it seems to me that everything is easier and more spontaneous and comes from within. It is not so much that I am trying to pray or that I am trying to work with people or that I am trying to advert to God or to pay attention to him, to make him the center of my life. This seems to be now a much more spontaneous welling up of these aspirations and this power from within." Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 16-17. This is a portion of the unattributed, first person testimony, which most likely belongs to Storey. Though it is possible that it belongs to Bobbi Keifer.

<sup>59</sup> "Experience" for Mühlen means contact with the presence of God in the community. Mühlen, "The Charismatic Renewal as Experience," 115.

and reaching with hands, the individual and communal spiritual experience, and the renewal of the community that is attained as the community seeks to renew the aspirants. The imposition of hands on the aspirant in communal prayer is much more than mere symbolism in this view and it is only one part, the central part, of a larger group dynamic. Further, this understanding of a social God-experience can analyze the social and theological import of the event, without disparaging the significance of the spiritual outcome for the individuals involved.

The birth of the social movement known as the Catholic Charismatic Renewal did not occur at the Ark and the Dove retreat house on February 18, 1967. On the one hand, of the retreatants who attended, about 25 college students claim to have experienced the baptism in the Spirit. They went back to campus not intending to renew the Catholic Church. But they could most definitely not, in their own words, keep quiet about what had happened to them. But on the other hand, it was the procurement of a gesture and an experience that made the CCM possible. The LH was put to use, so to speak, in a purely Catholic context, outside of the sacraments by laymen, in hopes to accomplish the same social God-experience as Bourgeois and Keifer at Chapel Hill. The prime difference is the lack of the desire for Christian unity with Protestant churches after the experience; clearly, the group of all Catholic students and faculty were united religiously. Also, many of the testimonies of those who attended the retreat express that baptism in the Spirit was received without the LH. These two differences indicate that the relationship between the aspirants and the supplicants at Chapel Hill and the Duquesne Weekend varies by only a couple of degrees, but also significantly. Keifer and Bourgeois sought renewal in going to Chapel Hill and all engaged in a charismatic-movement; the Catholic charismatic prayer

meetings which developed shortly after were the Catholic Charismatic Movement. Both can be said to center around the LH and prayer for the baptism in the Spirit.

*The Laying on of Hands at the Ark and the Dove*

The experience of the LH on the Duquesne Weekend resembles some of what Keifer and Bourgeois encountered when they received the LH at the Chapel Hill group. But in more ways than not, the dynamic of interactions of the people enveloping the LH looked nothing like Flo Dodge's quite low-key prayer meeting. The Catholic context is one of the largest differences. All the retreatants were Catholic, and they had virtually zero experience or knowledge of any kind of pentecostal experience. The most significant religious difference was that all of the remarkable events of the weekend, viz. the baptisms in the Spirit and manifestations of charisms, occurred in the chapel before the Blessed Sacrament. The LH did not spark, so to speak, the pentecostal experiences in the chapel. Still, it was used freely and with specific intent before and after that Saturday night. Keifer and Storey's roles, now being the ones who were laying on hands, were not as prominent in the events of the night as compared to those who had laid hands on Keifer and Bourgeois at the Chapel Hill group. The review of testimonies from the Duquesne Weekend will show that the LH was put to use the course of the events by human agency, but this will not lessen its potential as a charism.

After Keifer, Bourgeois, and Storey had received the LH, plans for the retreat in February were already in place at Duquesne. It didn't take long for the buzz the retreat created to reach Notre Dame. Fr. Edward O'Connor at the University of Notre Dame was experiencing one of the first waves that would be felt in the wake of the Duquesne Weekend on the night of March 14, 1967. Graduate student Bert Ghezzi was telling him

that “some people in Pittsburgh have received the gift of tongues.”<sup>60</sup> This student continued telling the story of how that same gift was now in action in South Bend. O’Connor, flustered, would later recall, “it is not easy to take in stride the announcement that a close friend whom you have known for several years, who has been a student in your classes, has received the gift of tongues!”<sup>61</sup> O’Connor’s reaction is notable because it likely mirrors the reaction of many then and now who hear about the things that charismatics do. Bert Ghezzi was a student at Notre Dame who had hands imposed on him, along with nine other students from Notre Dame, by Storey, when Storey had visited South Bend just after the Duquesne Weekend. The date was March 5, 1967. The previous night, at a regularly held prayer meeting at the house of one of the students, Storey had told the group his testimony of the Duquesne Weekend: “I do not have to believe in Pentecost because I have seen it.”<sup>62</sup>

What Storey saw at the Ark and the Dove was prefaced by a period of planning for the retreat. Keifer and Storey were faculty advisors for the student organization called Chi Rho, which was essentially a co-ed Christian fellowship alternative to the fraternities and sororities. The focus of the retreat had been “The Sermon on the Mount,” but after the Chapel Hill experience, the focus was changed to “the Acts of the Apostles: or how to become Christians” by these faculty leaders.<sup>63</sup> The Ranaghans’ account states that Keifer and Storey were not trying to lead the students toward the experience they had had, but in preparation for the retreat, participants had to read *The Cross and the Switchblade* and the

---

<sup>60</sup> O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 13.

<sup>61</sup> Edward D. O’Connor, *Pentecost in the Catholic Church: A Trilogy on the Catholic Pentecostal Movement* (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1971), 1.

<sup>62</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 40, 85.

<sup>63</sup> Mansfield Gallagher, *New Pentecost*, 22-23, 71.

first four chapters of Acts.<sup>64</sup> It seems odd that the Ranaghans would claim that Keifer and Storey were not trying to lead the students toward a Pentecost like experience, when they had changed gears to focus on the book of Acts and threw in reading of Wilkerson's book.<sup>65</sup> It cannot be known what Keifer or Storey's true intentions were for that weekend, but it would be safe to assume that they did not plan for the fire of the CCM to spread throughout the country in the way that it did from this little retreat. Maybe they did intend to LH on students at one point, but it cannot be known with certainty if they were seeking the baptism of the Spirit for those on the retreat. The sequence of events leading to that night suggest that maybe they were, but the testimonies of those there also show that Keifer and Storey, at least on the night of the Spirit-experience in the chapel, were just spectators.

Many details about the nature of the retreat have already been given, but all should be recalled to give a thorough account. There was one priest, a Holy Ghost priest, named Fr. Healy who was present, but he did not lay hands on anyone that night during the outpouring of the Spirit in the chapel. Keifer and Storey were already faculty leaders<sup>66</sup> of the retreat and would go on this retreat about one month after their Chapel Hill experience.<sup>67</sup> In addition to changing the focus and including the reading of

---

<sup>64</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 21; Cf. Gallagher, "Are you ready?," 2.

<sup>65</sup> "On the whole the students knew little if anything of 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' or of the gifts and fruits of the Spirit as they had been recently manifest; nor were the faculty members trying to steer them toward this experience...All then simply gathered together in prayer to seek the will of Jesus Christ for their lives." Ibid. The notion that Providence was at hand is prominent; Cf. "Pat Bourgeois recalls that the other two professors were hoping and praying that the Holy Spirit might do something special on the Weekend, but they had no clear plan in mind." Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 23.

<sup>66</sup> It should be noted that in most of the testimonies, especially the ones from Gallagher Mansfield's book, the professors Storey and Keifer go unnamed and are referred to as the faculty moderators, leaders or the professors. In many cases, it's difficult to figure out exactly which of the two was present during certain of the events being described depending on the testimony of the person. For the most part, the distinction is inconsequential, but when it is clear, the name will be given.

<sup>67</sup> Bourgeois was also a member of Chi Rho, but he did not attend the retreat due to work and school constraints.

Wilkerson's book, everyone who went sang "*Veni Creator Spiritus*" as instructed by their professors in Gregorian chant style before every session of the retreat. On Friday night, there was a talk on Mary given by one of the professors, followed by a communal penance service. On the day of the communal Spirit-experience in the chapel, Saturday February 18, they had a talk on Acts 1, then mass, presentations on women in the bible, then a talk on Acts 2. The talk on Acts 2 was given by the same Episcopalian woman who had put Keifer and Storey in touch with the Chapel Hill group, and she focused heavily on the baptism in the Spirit and a life in the Spirit. After this talk, the small group discussions led a graduate student named David Mangan to suggest that they all renew their Confirmation during the retreat, but his suggestion fell to lackluster response from the group. The night of the 18<sup>th</sup> was preceded by a similar lack of enthusiasm even though they had scheduled a birthday party for some students. Also, many of the testimonies recall an incident when the plumbing had failed and the retreat was in jeopardy of being called off early. Many of the students prayed that water be restored. Mangan reports that after they had prayed he went to the faucet later on to check for water, and water came gushing out. Some of the testimonies confirmed that a plumber did come out and repair the problem, but many were unaware until after that this was the case, including Mangan.<sup>68</sup>

After this incident of the water returning, it was Mangan who first headed to the chapel to pray, to give thanks. In his own testimony for Gallagher Mansfield's book he describes going into the chapel as like walking into a brick wall. In his own words, he ended up on the floor but doesn't know how he got there, except to say that it was the powerful presence of God. It is not clear how long he was on the floor, but he eventually

---

<sup>68</sup> Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 25, 35-39, 111-112.

got up and left the chapel to rejoin the others where the party was supposed to be taking place. He didn't speak to anyone, but simply felt "wobbly" and leaned against a wall questioning what had occurred. Describing himself as a reserved mathematician, he approached this strange occurrence as one, and decided to go back up the stairs to the chapel to verify the experience, and the same thing happened. He repeated this sequence of leaving and going back up to verify the result one more time, to meet with the same end. Eventually, he was sitting upright in the chapel and just let out a yell at the top of his lungs, which was apparently some heard throughout the retreat house.<sup>69</sup> The exact flow of events after this becomes hard to piece together from the multiple testimonies of the event, but there is a general sequence of the evening's events that can be seen.

Others were attracted to the chapel after Mangan but some were already in the chapel praying, including Keifer. The testimony of Paul Gray provides a clear picture. Paul and another student Mary Ann Springel went to the chapel to join the professor in prayer because of the problem with the water. The remarkable thing is that they had both already received the LH from Keifer. Paul Gray had given the talk on Acts 1 the previous evening. After the talk on Acts 2, Paul and Mary Ann went to Keifer to request the LH because they wanted to experience what he had.<sup>70</sup> The three went to Keifer's room where the two knelt, and Keifer laid hands on their heads and prayed in English and then in tongues. This all occurred in the confines of the room, away from the chapel. Both Paul and Mary Ann testify that they received the baptism in the Spirit and tongues when

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 111-113.

<sup>70</sup> Paul and Mary Ann were friends with the Keifers from long before the retreat. The Grays, Paul and Mary Ann would eventually marry, claim that the Keifers were influential in their lives. Paul was pursuing graduate work in theology because of Ralph. The Grays suspected more than a month prior to the Duquesne Weekend that something had happened to Ralph and Bobbi. More details on that are given in chapter 3.

Keifer laid hands on them. When Keifer later went into the chapel to pray for water, a few other students in addition to Paul and Mary Ann went with him. Paul and Mary Ann did not witness Mangan turn on the faucet to see the water return to the retreat house, but they did witness him coming into the chapel and fall prostrate on the ground before the tabernacle. Paul and Mary Ann relate that they felt the “fear of the Lord” well up within them and it kept them from looking up. They knelt in worship, but Mary Ann left after some time to prepare for the talk she was going to give on Acts 3 the next day. After a short time, other students began trickling into the chapel. Some kneeled and some held hands.<sup>71</sup> Paul Gray states:

Bill and Ralph went down the line of kneeling converts, praying for the Baptism for each one. We have never since seen such a spontaneous and universal move of the Spirit. Ralph said he felt as though fire was engulfing him; some of the students were saying ‘it’s getting bright’ as he was saying ‘it’s getting hotter.’ The Holy Spirit who appeared as tongues of fire on the first Pentecost again manifested himself as a consuming fire. Singing and speaking in tongues could be heard as we knelt there loving Jesus and being loved by him until 3 a.m. when the good sense of the chaplain and the nuns sent us to bed.<sup>72</sup>

Other testimonies of students who were there in the chapel confirm that Storey and Keifer were laying hands on students, one by one in the heat of this Pentecostal experience.

Annamarie Cafardi and her future husband Jerry shared the experience in the chapel that evening and make mention of the LH. She wrote: “Later, as a number of us gathered for prayer [in the chapel] one of the leaders laid hands on me. Everyone else in the chapel seemed to be having an intense spiritual experience.”<sup>73</sup> In Gallagher

Mansfield’s book, Annamarie elaborates on the event: “Our two faculty advisors moved

---

<sup>71</sup> Paul and Mary Ann Gray, “God Breaks In,” *New Covenant* 2, no 8 (1973): 6-8; Cf. Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 72-75.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 7. Cf. Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 74. It is noteworthy that in Paul Gray’s testimony in the twenty-fifty anniversary account Bill and Ralph go from this first name basis to generic “the two faculty moderators.” This change of familiarity possibly points to the divisions that arose in the CCM from within a couple of years of the Duquesne Weekend.

<sup>73</sup> Jerry and Annamarie Cafardi, “Jesus is Lord!,” *New Covenant* 2, no 8 (1973): 4.



among us, laying hands on us and praying. Several people were praying in languages that I had never heard before. Others were worshipping and many were in tears.”<sup>74</sup> Jerry Cafardi reported: “As I prayed [in the chapel], Ralph Keifer asked if he could lay hands on me. What happened is difficult to express.”<sup>75</sup> Jerry would also elaborate later, “I know something happened to me on the Duquesne Weekend when one of the leaders laid hands on me and prayed for me in the chapel Saturday night. One concrete immediate manifestation of this was that when the Word of God was preached and Communion was shared, I had an assurance of God’s presence.”<sup>76</sup>

Some of the testimonies from the communal experience in the chapel do not mention the LH, though it seems safe to assume that based on the testimony of those like the Grays and the Cafardis, Keifer and Storey did LH on all the students who were present. It also seems that in some of these testimonies, the person was too deeply involved in the experience perhaps to recall if another person was laying hands on him or her. One student states, “When I got to the chapel, about 8:00p.m., there were already many others praying...After a while, we were holding hands as we knelt around the altar. Paul Gray was on one side of me. Suddenly it felt like an electric current was flowing from his hand into mine and surging through my whole body.”<sup>77</sup>

Many instances of the LH did not occur in the chapel before the tabernacle on that Saturday night. Gina Scanlon, who was pregnant at the time, had retired early that night of February 18, 1967. She recalls that she was confused as the other attempted to explain what had happened overnight in the chapel. “On Sunday, people were praying over one

---

<sup>74</sup> *New Pentecost*, 79.

<sup>75</sup> Jerry and Annamarie, “Jesus is Lord!,” 4.

<sup>76</sup> Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 84.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

another with the laying on of hands. I just felt like I wanted to leave. Then, one of the girls came up and laid her hands on my stomach to pray for my baby.”<sup>78</sup> The girl who laid hands on her stomach was Patti Gallagher.

Gallagher Mansfield is a significant figure from the retreat for a number of reasons, but it is primarily because she was one of the first to experience the baptism in the Spirit with David Mangan without the LH, and she herself used the LH on other students that weekend with a noticeable sense of credulity.<sup>79</sup> In her testimony, she is unambiguous in stating that for several of the students who received the Spirit without the LH. She had gone to what she refers to as the “upper room”, i.e. the chapel, in attempts to get students to come down to the birthday party, according to the testimony in her 1992 book. She decided to go before the Blessed Sacrament to kneel when she saw a few people there on the floor praying. Her testimony of this precise moment in the Ranaghan book states:

I wandered up to the chapel without really knowing why, but as soon as I knelt down I began to tremble... There were three other students with me when all of a sudden I became filled with the Holy Spirit and realized that “God is real.”... I was prostrate before the altar and filled with the peace of Christ... [after the “whole group” came into the chapel] The professors then laid hands on some of the students, but most of us received the “baptism in the Spirit” while kneeling before the blessed sacrament in prayer.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>79</sup> Gallagher Mansfield’s testimony has been reproduced in many well-known histories of the period, including the Ranaghan’s 1969 book. Gallagher Mansfield’s book is an important contribution because she was able to acquire a number of other testimonies, contributions from Flo Dodge foundress of the Chapel Hill prayer group, and another letter of Keifer’s, in addition to personal journal entries she made on the weekend. She did not come to take on an official leadership role in the movement as it grew, but her historical contributions are arguably more valuable. She consistently provides the most colorful testimony on the events from the time period, which also happen to be the most detailed and lengthy. The voice of her writing is valuable because it characterizes that of the pious believer, not that of the “fledgling theologian” or the scholarly cleric; in a sense, it is from the inside out. She is more articulate in her writing than others who are relating the same events. She does not shy from expressing the relationships and events that she sees as Providential.

<sup>80</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 34-35.

Her testimony in the 1992 book adds a few more details. For one, she had a brief conversation with the president of Chi Rho in the chapel before she prayed a “prayer of unconditional surrender” before the Blessed Sacrament, and then found herself “flat” on her face, stretched out without anyone laying hands on her.<sup>81</sup> She eventually did bring a couple of other girls into the chapel and prayed with them. Having mentioned more than once that no hands had been laid on her, she was engaged in LH on several people for different reasons for the duration of the weekend.

In her words, on Sunday she and others had learned of one girl who was not comfortable with what was going on the night before. The girl “felt hatred” and actually left the property. Someone went after her and brought her back. Gallagher Mansfield states that the “theology instructor” told her that they had to go “cast out the evil spirit” from the girl. One testimony reports that the girl had left the property more than once than night and witnessed prayer over her the next morning: “Finally, she was prayed with and hands were laid on her.”<sup>82</sup> Gallagher Mansfield’s experience of LH on others did not begin with this spontaneous casting out of evil spirits. When Gallagher Mansfield awoke on Sunday morning she states that her hands were tingling and burning. When she asked the “theology instructor” about it, he told her she needed to lay hands on people and pray: “Just as I followed his lead the day before, I did whatever he told me.”<sup>83</sup> And even prior to Sunday morning, at the end of the long night in the chapel, she laid hands on Mary

---

<sup>81</sup> Her conversation with Bill Deign, president of Chi Rho, is significant because he was one of the several people on the retreat who did not experience what the others did, and her testimony places him in the chapel at the time of these events. His testimony does not say if he received the LH, and it is likely that he did not or said no if Keifer asked him if he wanted the LH. He wrote: “When I went upstairs to the chapel, I seem to remember one woman praying in tongues and another one prostrate. There was a feeling of an ‘in group’ and an ‘out group.’ Some people were having an intense spiritual experience while others, like myself, seemed more like observers.” Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 41, 85.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 46.

Ann Springel and prayed for her. Springel states in her testimony that, after she left Paul Gray in the chapel, she returned to her room to prepare for the talk on Acts 3 she was supposed to give on Sunday. She worried while trying to outline what she was going to discuss. When students were returning to their rooms, around 3 a.m., hands were laid on her by Gallagher Mansfield, and then she went to bed. One final occurrence of Gallagher Mansfield using the LH was on Sunday. Karen Sefcik states that in a moment of “rebelliousness” in dealing with the events of the previous night, she stood in tears in front of the picture window of the retreat house. It was essentially a moment of final surrender for her. She was being comforted by the chaplain and Bill Deigan. Then, “Patti Gallagher came into the room, and as Patti laid her hands on my head she exclaimed, ‘The Spirit of God is in you!’”<sup>84</sup>

Even based on the words of her own testimony, it is difficult to infer what Gallagher Mansfield thought the LH was adding or accomplishing to her act of prayer. She simply states she was following the lead of the “theology instructor.” In the case of casting out the demon, she doesn’t say that the LH and her prayer forced a spirit from out of the girl. She simply says that the girl was different after—relaxed, “relieved, but bewildered,” and that she was happy to be part of the prayer that restored the girl to peace.<sup>85</sup> When she laid hands on Mary Ann Springel, nothing else is said. Karen Sefcik’s testimony offers the most room for understanding. It seems simply that Gallagher Mansfield’s LH was confirming what Sefcik had already decided to accept. The meaning that can be taken is in plain sight, that the LH was used so freely and often, not just by Gallagher Mansfield, that it was in that sense taken for granted.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 41-42.

Exactly how Keifer and Storey were engaging the students is not clear from Gallagher Mansfield's testimony or the others above. It is possible to infer from her testimony that the two men were LH on students who had not yet displayed any signs that they had been baptized in the Spirit. But Annamarie Cafardi's testimony seems to indicate, that if this is what Storey and Keifer were trying to do they were partly unsuccessful. Cafardi herself wrote that at that moment she "felt nothing."<sup>86</sup> Jerry Cafardi's testimony reveals that, perhaps for all the students present, the two professors were asking if she or he wanted to receive the LH, and the reply was yes. Gallagher Mansfield's testimony supplements the Cafardi's. She claims that many were baptized in the Spirit without the LH, implying that there were at least a few others who had received the Spirit with the LH by the professors. So the overall sense is that the professors walked in on events already in progress, and then proceeded to go around the room with the intention of trying to help students receive a baptism in the Spirit, and then proceeded to LH on students toward this end.

The word "intent" in this context of piecing together various testimonies is used delicately. It would be safe to assume that Keifer and Storey, devout and charismatic Catholics, would say that their own desires or intentions were for God's will. They may have interpreted that will to be for the baptism in the Spirit of all present and that this should be or could be supported through the LH. It is crucial that one witness states that the professors asked before LH on someone, because it shows that they were not interested in imposing the experience. So the intent is of a respectful nature at the least. The fact that Gallagher Mansfield's testimony claims that many received the Spirit without the LH does not diminish any of the meaning the LH held for the prayer

---

<sup>86</sup> "Jesus is Lord!," 4.

communities that developed after the Duquesne Weekend nor even for the role it played that weekend. For the movement, the claim to a Providential existence finds roots in the Duquesne Weekend story. Similarly, the LH as a practice in the CCM found its roots there as well. The mention of its use blends into the passing details of some of the witness accounts. But these accounts simply show that the LH was for them, at this time, a natural and inherited aspect of a type of prayer. They did not stop to interpret its meaning, and their testimonies offer no explanation of why they felt the need or knew they had to lay hands on someone. Even so, its use as a charism can still hold up.

The key in understanding the LH as a charism, while it can be a powerful or moving experience, is that it starts simply with desire for change or renewal. The dynamic of aspirant-suppliant with the community witness is present in all the cases of the use of the LH given. The person who then lays hands desires in good will and prayer that the aspirant attains the desired change. This dynamic being played out in front of the community witness is a gift to the community because from their perspective the church takes care of its own. The outward manifestation of any extraordinary signs, while it may occur, does not make the dynamic of the LH a charism. Similarly, any inward manifestations or perceptions of the Spirit are not required. The emotionally charged or blissful event reported by some who receive the LH is a subjective and interior experience. However authentic it may be for that person, the community does not participate and cannot witness in any sense what the individual is experiencing. Bill Deigan's conversation with Gallagher Mansfield in the chapel was significant because his testimony points to this characteristic of the extraordinary experiences not being ubiquitous. He was not experiencing or perceiving what most everyone else in the chapel

seemed to be experiencing and perceiving. Because of this he felt like an outsider.<sup>87</sup> A deeper discussion of charisms will come in a later chapter, but it can be pointed out here that as they are regarded as gifts that build up and edify the community, the charismatic community that would begin to grow out of the Duquesne Weekend had begun with the LH in a distinct role.

Lastly, Gallagher Mansfield's testimony, along with Mangan's, stands in stark contrast to what can aptly be referred to as the typical experience of baptism in the Spirit through the LH. Their experience of baptism in the Spirit has to be taken at face value. They did not go to the chapel seeking the baptism in the Spirit and they did not request the LH from anyone, so it would seem that their testimonies may contradict the notion of the LH as a charism that this study is establishing. But this study is not interested in the LH and how it relates to the extraordinary experience of the baptism in the Spirit. Based on the testimonies of the scene in the chapel, Keifer and Storey probably interpreted what they saw as people receiving the baptism in the Spirit along with charisms such as tongues, so any LH in such a situation would be merely ritualistic. But their movement to lay hands on the other students shows that they desired this experience for the others present.

The desire to share such a transformative experience resulted in the sharing of the LH in South Bend. The Catholic Charismatic Movement would justify the baptism in the Spirit as not being as a result of the LH; it was Jesus pouring out his Spirit and not the person doing the LH. So what could Ralph Keifer take with him to Notre Dame, but his desire that they experience such a renewal experience, and prayer, hoping that they too would want to share the experience.

---

<sup>87</sup> See note 81.

### *The Laying on of Hands at Notre Dame*

The Ranaghans were friends of Storey and Keifer and were aware of the journey they had been on in seeking the baptism in the Spirit. They eventually heard that Storey and Keifer had gone to a Protestant Pentecostal prayer group for the LH. They regarded the news with suspicion: “Together with our doubts and confusion, we knew very well that if these people found some good in this ‘laying on of hands’ business, there must be something to it.” Ranaghan mentions the baptism in the Spirit but refers to the experience of Storey and Keifer as characterized by the physical LH, not any spiritual awakening they experienced. But when Ralph did visit South Bend in mid-February, just prior to the Duquesne Weekend, the Ranaghans noticed that something was different about him.

When Keifer had visited South Bend prior to the Duquesne Weekend, he spent long hours talking about pentecostalism to the Ranaghans. After the retreat took place, Keifer called the Ranaghans one evening to tell them about the events of the weekend and told them to read the Wilkerson and Sherrill books. He then said that another “professor and good friend of ours who also was now filled with the power of the Spirit” would be visiting them.<sup>88</sup> A pre-planned prayer meeting was to be held in the home of the Ranaghans on a Saturday night. At this meeting, the “professor” showed up while it was in progress, and this is where he told them that he had seen Pentecost. The next night, March 5, 1967, nine people received the LH from Storey: “After a good deal of talk,

---

<sup>88</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 39. This had to be William Storey. The only other “professor” who had also been baptized in the Spirit with the LH was Patrick Bourgeois. Bourgeois never makes mention of this trip and did not attend the Duquesne retreat because he was too busy. Also, Storey also joined the faculty at Notre Dame in 1967, so it is probable that his visit had to do with this transition from Duquesne to South Bend. This also ties into the wiping of names that occurs in much of the historical literature. Storey states he had nothing to do with the CCM from 1970, so conflicts may have been turning up at the time the Ranaghans began referring to him as simply “professor” in their history, which was published in 1969. The Ranaghans’ use of the generic title to refer to this man in their book stands in contrast to their not hesitating to call Keifer and Bourgeois by both names and to place them in specific places; Cf. Edward D. O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 39.



debate, and questioning, the entire group asked to be prayed with and to receive the ‘laying on of hands’ that we might be filled with the gifts and the fruit of the Holy Spirit, that our lives might be more fully Christian.”<sup>89</sup> There was no scene similar to the one seen at the Ark and the Dove. It resembled the Chapel Hill prayer meeting. The resulting change in the spiritual lives and deepening of faith did occur for those who received the LH according to the Ranaghan book.

Edward D. O’Connor’s book tells of how the visitor, i.e. Storey, prefaced his laying hands on them:

He replied that he had no particular indication that he ought to do this, and certainly *he* did not have the power to communicate spiritual gifts to anyone. But since they desired it, he was willing to pray with them, and he was confident that God would hear such a prayer. For a minute or two he prayed aloud with a boldness which again impressed them deeply, calling on God to fulfill his promises and send his Spirit and power. Then he prayed in particular over each person who requested it, laying his hands on their heads as he did so.<sup>90</sup>

O’Connor’s account presents Storey as a man who was not content with any notion that with the LH he could willingly baptize with the Holy Spirit even those who sought it.

O’Connor’s presentation also conveys the message of the movement as it became more organized that the LH was just a sacramental or prayer in action. This notion of the LH here is indirectly stated, but he clearly does report that Storey was not treating it as a charism.

Storey’s influence that night is given a unique perspective from one student who had Storey’s hands laid on him, Jim Cavnar. Cavnar was at the meeting the previous night where everyone met Storey. Cavnar states that Storey had prayed with the group together that first night in a quick prayer that they be free from the power of Satan and be

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>90</sup> *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 42. (Emphasis O’Connor’s.)

filled with the Holy Spirit. The second night, when the nine students requested the LH, Cavnar states:

When he came to me I really didn't look for any outward manifestation...He stood before me for a moment, and then, in Christ's name, cast out Satan. As soon as he said the words I knew that a demon had left...immediately I knew what had happened. God was allowing me a sign...Hands were then laid on me.<sup>91</sup>

Cavnar's testimony is remarkable because, as seen at the Duquesne Weekend, not only was the baptism in the Spirit associated with the LH, but so was the expulsion of evil spirits. To be clear, the LH was not used for the expulsion. In both cases though, the command was made first, and then the LH was done.<sup>92</sup>

The experience that the Ranaghans, and Cavnar shared with Storey led them and a few of the other nine to attend a prayer meeting with members of the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International.<sup>93</sup> It was a positive experience for all. The Ranaghans stated that despite the "radical" differences, "we were united by Christ." By early spring, the group of Pentecostal Catholics felt the need for a retreat to process spiritually what had happened in their lives. Once they learned that their friends Steve Clark and Ralph Martin had received the baptism in the Spirit in Pittsburgh, likely from Storey or Keifer, the retreat became a goal for the group.<sup>94</sup> Clark and Martin were working at Michigan State University, and like Keifer and Storey, had also been heavily

---

<sup>91</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 63-64.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Gallagher Mansfield, 41. "The theology instructor came out and got me. 'Come on, Patti, we have to go cast out the evil spirit.' I was stunned by his words...he seemed to know what he was doing, so I trusted him. As we approached her he said to me, 'Command, in the name of Jesus, that this evil spirit depart.' I did."

<sup>93</sup> The prayer meeting was held at the house of the president of the South Bend chapter of the FGBMF, Ray Bullard. O'Connor states: "He was an unpretentious man who sought simply to let the Lord use him as he wills. In this case, he was used so effectively that he became a kind of spiritual godfather for the charismatic community that was beginning to form at Notre Dame." Ibid., 47.

<sup>94</sup> Clark and Martin were the ones who originally turned Keifer and Storey on to the book by Wilkerson. Also, O'Connor's account states that Clark and Martin went to be prayed over when they heard of the news of the Duquesne weekend retreat. Presumably Keifer, Storey, or both LH on them; Cf. O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 62.

involved in the Cursillo movement. The connection between the group of Catholic Pentecostals and Clark and Martin at MSU is key because the “Michigan State Weekend” retreat came from it. However, a few days after this meeting, O’Connor states that the first “pentecostal prayer meeting” took place at Notre Dame.

About 20 persons attended it in the living room of the Ranaghans, including Fr. O’Connor himself. It was from these types of unplanned and ad lib meetings that O’Connor formed his notion that the baptism in the Spirit was without doubt not the result of emotionalism. He notes that people shared freely, read Scriptures, prayed calmly and openly, and song was sprinkled in that all participated in. He also reports joking and laughing and snacking that would lead an outsider who had just come in to be unaware that a prayer meeting was going on. The practice of taking a “coffee break” during each meeting prior to the LH began here, according to O’Connor. To him, this ensured that there were no emotional or psychological elements affecting the prayer and the LH. He describes an organized period that had no “preparation.” The leader announced that people could receive prayer if they desired to “receive the gifts.” Those who did so desire this were instructed on how to recognize them. Five or six who had received the Spirit already gathered around each person: “They laid their hands on his head, and started to pray, at first in English.” There were no manifest charisms that night.<sup>95</sup>

O’Connor’s account of his first prayer meeting where he received the LH is a description of the use of the LH as a charism. Those present had a clear desire for the Spirit, a renewal experience. The leader asked that they come up at their own will. Then a smaller group prayed for each person individually by laying hands on him or her. Not everyone in the group participated in the LH, but they did witness the prayer and act in

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 49-50.

progress. In this account, he does not say what the others there were doing, but it would be safe to say that many if not all were in quiet prayer. There was no scene of extraordinary happenings that echoes Pentecost for those present. O'Connor reports that some did receive the well-known gifts such as tongues, but much later. But one person's gift O'Connor describes simply as "awareness of the fatherhood of God." And for another person it was simply "pervasive joy." The disassociation of emotionalism and disarming scenes of people falling on the floor was present in the movement from the beginning. Though they were focused on the extraordinary charisms, the LH was uniting and strengthening the small community in the privacy and closeness of their homes.

The "Michigan State Weekend" (hereafter MSU retreat) was held April 7-9 and brought the movement into the public eye. Students from MSU, Notre Dame, and St. Mary's College, about 40 including faculty and some priests, overflowed the Old College building on the campus of Notre Dame. There are no detailed personal testimonies of the events of the weekend. The Ranaghans state:

From Friday night till Sunday noon we lived together in a community of prayer seeking the will of God relating our experiences to each other, discussing this new-found life from the Spirit of Christ. Throughout the weekend a large number of people from Michigan State and Notre Dame sought the "laying on of hands" so that the Holy Spirit would come to the surface in their lives. And ever and ever again did we witness prayer remarkably answered...By the end of that weekend the pentecostal movement among Catholics was flourishing at Duquesne, Notre Dame, Michigan State, and offshoot groups had begun at Iowa State and Holy Cross.<sup>96</sup>

Mass was said, there was singing, lots of prayer, and as the Ranaghans recorded it, people sought the LH. On a Catholic retreat where the Eucharist was shared, and presumably other sacraments such as reconciliation were also shared, the LH was sought.

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 44.

O'Connor's account offers more vivid details of what lead to the LH on the MSU retreat. On the Friday evening, after the meeting had officially ended, "some people were prayed over privately, and a few received the baptism in the Spirit." On Saturday morning there was a mass. During the afternoon session, there was a sense of "uneasiness" in the group that the retreat wasn't going smoothly. O'Connor recalls:

Was the whole retreat going to go like this? Then a nun rose impulsively and declared, "I would like to be prayed over for the baptism in the Spirit." That broke the ice. Others joined in on the same request. They took chairs around the center of the room, and those who wished to pray over them went around from person to person, mostly in groups of two or three, in a loose, unorganized way.<sup>97</sup>

How many people did this "impulsive" nun represent is not stated. But O'Connor also reports that news of the retreat had reached some Pentecostal churches in the area. Some of these Pentecostals went out to the campus to observe, and when it came to this point of praying over people their style apparently disturbed many of the Catholics there. In any case, "despite all the confusion and misgivings, a number of people were powerfully touched by the Spirit that afternoon, and a deep sense of joy and love was communicated to the entire group, melting it into unity."<sup>98</sup> This story of requesting to be prayed over doesn't mention the LH. It is difficult to imagine the scene as described and the LH not being used considering that other Catholics were there like the Ranaghans who had received the LH, and especially since a number of Pentecostals had come to join. The MSU retreat ended on Sunday, by O'Connor's report, notably not with a mass as

---

<sup>97</sup> O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 64.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid. O'Connor reports that one of these Pentecostal visitors declared warmly after the prayer "Brethren, I can't tell you all how happy I am to see Catholics can receive the Holy Ghost, too!"

planned, but with a prayer meeting.<sup>99</sup> The retreat brought the Pentecostal style Catholic prayer meetings into the public's eye.

The outcome from some press coverage that these events and others received was that the prayer meetings on campus that took place after the MSU retreat began to attract curious onlookers, and the sizes of the meetings grew into the hundreds rapidly from mid-April of that same year as the Duquesne Weekend.<sup>100</sup> Many did even mock, joke and scoff at what they witnessed while at the meetings, but dozens were requesting to be prayed over, and were. Again, it is quite reasonable to assume that these instances of praying over were done in a similar fashion described by Ranaghan and O'Connor during the first prayer meetings in South Bend, with the LH. Also, their descriptions of these first large prayer meetings at Notre Dame do not record any frenzied moments as seen at the Duquesne Weekend. In other words, many were attracted, and most were curious about what they would find. Though some went intending to ridicule, there were more who sought the experience of prayer with the LH. The Ranaghans add that by the end of the semester, smaller and more personal prayer meetings were occurring on campus in dorms and in the homes of faculty members.<sup>101</sup>

It was because of these large-scale meetings that practical issues of space and time began to be problems. The need for some kind of organization by "leadership" became apparent. One pressing issue was if those who were seeking prayer should be

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 69. O'Connor notes also that the prayer meeting on Saturday night of the retreat went from about 7:30 in the evening to 3a.m. the next morning.

<sup>100</sup> The students on campus, including the Ranaghans, were engaged in a culture that had already held prayer meetings, though definitely not of the Pentecostal type. Many of the first Pentecostal Catholics were involved heavily in theological studies, and liturgical involvement, and holding prayer meetings and bible studies. The Friday night prayer meetings were already regular occurrences. Cf. Ibid., 44-47; Cf. Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 45; Cf. also Jim Manney, "Before Duquesne: Sources of the Renewal," *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973), 12-17.

<sup>101</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 46.

prayed over in private or in public and what type of instruction, if any, should that person be given. O'Connor remarks that the group learned that the Spirit would not solve these practical issues for them and leadership roles were assumed:

The group seemed to be reliving the experience of the primitive Church, and it occurred to someone that office and institution do not originate as threats to the charisms (as historians often suppose)...The natural and acknowledged leaders were spoken of as "the elders," in a somewhat playful yet earnest imitation of the usage of the early Church.<sup>102</sup>

Interestingly, the desire to live the Christian experience in the way that is depicted in Acts continued as a type of inspiration for the group. Renewal of individuals, those seeking personal renewal and the LH, was still a central focus, but rising up was this kind of group-reliving of the ancient church experience with which they identified. In these early days of growth the idea of renewal of the Catholic Church can be found. One of the first stories in the Catholic press by Mary Papa from May 17, 1967, "People having a good time praying," was just three months after the Duquesne Weekend. In it Dorothy Ranaghan states directly: "This is not a movement. This is not a club. This is just sharing of a Christian experience that should be a beginning rather than an end in itself. We do not know if it is significant for the Church, but it is significant for us."<sup>103</sup> These types of views belie the organization and creating of leadership roles those involved had to take on in the clear beginnings of a social movement, albeit a social movement within the Catholic church that wasn't aware of its own potential. These first Catholic Pentecostals interacted closely with Protestant Pentecostal churches in the area, attending their prayer meetings and vice versa. Eventually, the Notre Dame prayer meetings came to be more

---

<sup>102</sup> O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 78.

<sup>103</sup> Mary Papa, "People Having a Good Time Praying," *National Catholic Reporter* 3, no. 29 (1967): 10.

organized and they attracted more people, Protestants and Catholics alike.<sup>104</sup> But the national growth was a result of the summer school session of 1967.

The Ranaghans report that about 3,000 students who were pursuing advanced theology degrees came to the campus that summer. They were priests, nuns, and brothers mostly from all over the country. The leadership in the group of the time decided that a panel should be set up to discuss the pentecostal movement to explain it to those coming in who had questions. The panel on June 30 boasted 300 attendees, and afterward several dozen expressed desire to attend a prayer meeting. Because of the panel, the prayer meetings grew in size again.<sup>105</sup> Priests, brothers, nuns, seminarians, and others came to “pray with us.” Some sought the baptism in the Spirit, but not all.<sup>106</sup> When school resumed the following fall, the prayer meetings returned to their former sizes of less than 50 and sometimes much less. Over the next two years, the Notre Dame community grew slowly, as did the new communities formed in Grand Rapid and Ann Arbor, MI. Extended ministries developed that served the community, but the centerpiece was always the communal prayer meetings. Week after week the prayer meetings would be doing the same things they had from the beginning: singing, praying, reading Scripture, and laying hands on one another in prayer.<sup>107</sup>

The LH in these early days of the movement is ubiquitous. Nearly all of the personal testimonies recorded in the Ranaghans book and Mansfield Gallagher’s mention

---

<sup>104</sup> O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 80-83. O’Connor also states that Pentecostal churches of the area would also call the University to invite “that priest that has the Holy Ghost” to come and speak and their church.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 14. Laurentin gives some numbers indicating the type of growth that occurs during this time. These are based off of the attendance figures of the national meetings at Notre Dame. He states these represent just 10% of the national whole: 90 in 1967, 100 plus in 1968, 450 in 1969, 1,300 in 1970, 4,500 in 1971, 11,000 in 1973, 25,000 in 1973, and 30,000 in 1974.

<sup>106</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 47-48.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, 91-107.



it explicitly, and in many of these the persons state that they asked for the LH. They did not ask for the baptism in the Spirit and they did not state that they wanted to renew their confirmation. In some of these testimonies, they are at the larger prayer meetings at Notre Dame during that first year, so people were interested in seeking the experience not just in the confines of a friend's living room or on retreat. The request for the LH shows that these first Catholic Pentecostals did not see the baptism in the Spirit as a guaranteed outcome of the action. We only have the testimonies of those who did say they were also baptized in the Holy Spirit. But when these write about what for them is the life-changing reality, the baptism in the Spirit, they consistently mention the LH in close proximity. Or they mention the LH and describe what happened in their lives after, leaving out literal mention of a "baptism in the Spirit." The regularity of the use suggests that the growing community would not have been the same without the LH. People were asking for the Spirit-experience but didn't say to please pray that I receive the Spirit, but don't lay a hand on me. It was intuitive at this early point that the two went together. The specific request for the LH shows that the growing movement recognized that a particular sequence worked: This is where the movement is born. The movement of Catholics to seek the charismatic experience began when large numbers witnessed the LH and its effects, then sought it themselves, whereupon others witnessed their moment of receiving the LH. These small-scale steps of individuals seeking renewal or a charismatic-movement in their own lives began with the LH.

The voices of the CCM would eventually analyze the LH as a sacramental or prayer in action. Their analysis was largely a retrieval of the use of the gesture from biblical sources and tradition. As the prayer meetings and small communities in Michigan

grew into a national movement, the question of the theological significance of the LH did not loom large for them, but their association of their cause of renewal through the Holy Spirit with the apostles in the New Testament did. The next chapter will be an interlude into the question on if the CCM has a claim to a common experience with the ancient church. The charisms that they value and the baptism in the Spirit that they sought are not necessarily the best way to approach this question. But as the biblical basis for the charisms that all Christians acknowledge is found in the New Testament, it is fitting that an answer to the question of historical congruencies with the ancient church be looked for in the New Testament as well, in the book of Acts. The story of the conversion of the Samaritans in Acts 8.1-25 will be analyzed in its historical context with particular attention to the literary devices of the author, both of which unite his story towards his theological purpose: the church is built on acts of drawing people to God with and in the Spirit, but also with physical acts, like the LH.

## CHAPTER 2

### CONTINUITY WITH THE ANCIENT CHURCH: THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR LUKE IN ACTS 8.17

*Now when the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent them Peter and John, who went down and prayed for them, that they might receive the holy Spirit, for it had not yet fallen upon any of them; they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid hands on them and they received the holy Spirit.  
—Acts 8:14-17*

#### *Congruencies with the Past?*

Heribert Mühlen amended the ending of the second edition of *Una Mystica Persona* in 1967 with a pastoral concern: “Of what use are all speculative and systematic initiatives, if in the end the drudgery of the inevitably foundering theological enterprise does not lead to an encounter with the mystery itself?”<sup>108</sup> Indirectly, the CCM would agree with what Mühlen wrote. At its beginning, the CCM was intimately centered on the encounter with the “mystery,” and it was aware of this focus. It interpreted John XXIII’s invocation of the Holy Spirit to “Renew your wonders in this our day as by a new Pentecost” as a direct call for the reawakening of the charisms that graced the early church. In its literature, it would directly identify with the experience of the first Christians:

Christianity did not begin as a set of precisely worded doctrines and as a well-thought-out structure. It began with a Person, Jesus of Nazareth who is the Christ.

---

<sup>108</sup> Heribert Mühlen: *His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile of the Church* (New York: University Press of America, 2004), 1.

It continued through individuals coming to experience and live the life of his Spirit, the Holy Spirit. A renewal of the life of the Church must begin with a renewal of individual lives in his Spirit.<sup>109</sup>

From its birth, the CCM pointed to the first Christian communities of the New Testament as the progenitors of the charisms which they had been experiencing in the twentieth century. The movement's retrieval of a history of the charisms tended to follow a common narrative: the Apostles experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit as read in Acts 2 where the charism of tongues was given so that the newly inspired could proclaim the Word; the charisms—such as tongues, prophecy, and healing—were common in the early church, as read in Paul particularly 1 Cor 12.8-10, 28 and Rom 12.6-8; the Acts of the Apostles is a historical testimony to the charismatic church of the first century; and then for reasons unknown, the church entered an age where the charisms were no longer being witnessed.<sup>110</sup> Now the Church was entering a new age, according to the movement, where people were being drawn increasingly to life in the Body of Christ; the charisms, given for the building up for the body, allow the church to participate with the Spirit in “forming the people of God.”<sup>111</sup> The movement did see itself relating much more directly to the early church because of the examples of charisms it claimed to have in common with those mentioned in the New Testament. But are mere examples of glossolalia and

---

<sup>109</sup> George Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and the Church of Tomorrow,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 237.

<sup>110</sup> Edward D. O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1971), 279-86; Cf. René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 47-56; Cf. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, New York: Paulist Press, 1969), 157-190; Cf. Steve Clark, *Baptized in the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1976), 103-143; Cf. Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* trans. Francis Martin (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 32-41.

<sup>111</sup> Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, “Introduction,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, 2-3.

prophecy witnessed at the prayer meetings enough to make this claim? And how did it account for the apparent lack of manifestation of charisms after the apostolic age?<sup>112</sup>

St. John Chrysostom is cited more than once as a marker of the diminishing of the extraordinary era of the church. Edward O'Connor notes that Chrysostom says of the nascent church, "charisms were given even to the unworthy, because the ancient period needed this help to foster the faith; but now they are not given even to the worthy because the faith is strong and firm enough not to need this support."<sup>113</sup> Leo Joseph Cardinal Suenens responded directly to Chrysostom. He reflects on the charisms in the early church in his book, *A New Pentecost?* Suenens says of Chrysostom's statement on the declining of the charisms: "He thought...that the early Church had need of special treatment so as to sustain its missionary efforts and its exceptional situation. His answer is somewhat unconvincing. In fact, charisms, because the Spirit remains faithful, have never disappeared from the Church."<sup>114</sup> However unsatisfying Chrysostom's explanation is for the disappearance of charisms,<sup>115</sup> O'Connor and Suenens were institutional voices speaking on behalf of and in agreement with the charismatic dimension of the church. Suenens would even say upon his "pilgrimage" to Ann Arbor, MI in 1973 to "come and see" what the CCM was doing, "This is why I am here, to see again the Acts of the Apostles in action."<sup>116</sup> If the CCM's claim to the fundamental Christian experience of the

---

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Kilian McDonnell, "Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in the Spirit: Tertullian and the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 671-93. McDonnell examines Tertullian's *On Baptism*: in the initiation rites that Tertullian describes the newly baptized were instructed to ask God verbally in front of the congregation for the gifts of the Holy Spirit after water baptism. McDonnell suggests that it is possible that, because of Tertullian's Montanist associations later in his life, the Catholic Church steered from this particular rite of initiation to ensure that Montanism would not return.

<sup>113</sup> *The Pentecostal Movement*, 280.

<sup>114</sup> *A New Pentecost?*, 36.

<sup>115</sup> In this case, they are referring to the extraordinary charism.

<sup>116</sup> Ralph Martin, "An Interview with Cardinal Suenens," *New Covenant* 2, no. 12 (1973): 1.

Holy Spirit in the early church is to be evaluated, can the New Testament provide something to which the movement can point for a grounding of its most basic principles?

This question is really composed of two internal questions: what does the CCM say is a fundamental Christian experience, and what is one of the movement's most basic principles? The baptism in the Spirit is not necessarily the best answer to the first question. The experience is interpreted widely depending on which Pentecostal flavor you're reading, Protestant or Catholic, let alone the diversity of Protestant Pentecostal interpretation. But if the question were narrowed to the Catholic Pentecostal context, then the notion that the baptism in the Spirit is a reviviscence of the graces received in baptism or confirmation prevails. And this is likely more difficult to reconcile with the apostolic church as presented in Scripture because, while the Catholic Church grounds the seven sacraments on Scriptural authority, the CCM would be looking for the actualization of graces given (baptism in the Spirit) in sacraments not yet formally ritualized and institutionalized. In other words, the baptism in the Spirit is an experience that may translate across the centuries as a Spirit-experience for the CCM, but not as an experience that is doctrinally or dogmatically equivalent then and now. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is not the fundamental Christian experience that can tie the CCM directly to the early Church.<sup>117</sup>

The second question on what the most basic principle is of the CCM must be approached with equal caution. The Catholic Charismatic Movement is also called the Renewal for good reason: it is not a social movement begun by one or a few people who

---

<sup>117</sup> Reception of the Holy Spirit is clearly something that all Trinitarian Christians identify with and believe in, largely based on Acts 2.38. Christian initiation or reception of the Spirit cannot and will not be debated in this study. Water baptism in the institutional church was never in question by the CCM. In other words, the rite of baptism as a social God-experience is something that the CCM would not deny as an experience which unites all Christians, either in the ancient church or today.

came together in agreement with particular goals in mind for social or institutional change. The charismatic renewal is best understood as a movement because the institution and the laity came together to understand a Christian experience that was spreading through the church quickly, and on a large scale. In asking what basic principles sustain the movement then, undoubtedly the notion of a communal experience of God rises to the top, because the Spirit-experience witnessed in the CCM of which the church, lay and religious alike, was trying to make sense always occurred in the communal context. The answer to this second question is also the answer to the first one. The basic principle that the communal experience of God is fundamental to the church and fundamental to being Christian, also presupposes that the community of Christians is united by the Spirit. Catholic charismatics and Pentecostals alike would agree that Acts 2 is a communal experience of God where all Christians are united by his Spirit.

The CCM pointing to Scriptures to claim a common experience with the early church will claim that the charisms and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit is just as present “today” as it was then. But a communal experience of God is not limited to miraculous events. A communal experience of God or a social God-experience can mean many things. For the purpose of this study, what can be identified as congruencies between the ancient church and the CCM are a belief that all Christians are united by the Spirit of Christ, and this is true outside of any supernatural or extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit. Therefore a social God-experience does not require the witness of extraordinary charisms; if any charism is being used for the benefit of others and to build up the body of Christ, the church, then there is a social God-experience by virtue of the Spirit of Christ within that person.

An exegesis of Acts 8.1-25 will be a brief interlude in this study that will establish whether indeed the CCM's claim to continuity with a fundamental Christian experience found in the early church is tenable. This passage was chosen because in it two historically opposed religious groups were united by the Holy Spirit in conjunction with an act of the laying on of hands. As will be shown in the following chapters, the CCM would be fundamentally different if the LH were not used by the movement. The LH had many uses for the movement, but its use boils down to the desire of a renewal experience on the part of the aspirant, and the love of the community joined in prayer and united in the Spirit of Christ, reaching out through the LH. In Acts 8, the use of the LH as a charism can answer the movement's claim to a common experience with the ancient church.

### *Introduction on Acts 8*

My starting point for analysis of Acts 8.1-25 is two-fold in respect to the question of historicity: 1) the historical context in which Acts was written and 2) literary skill with which Luke unites his sources towards a theological purpose. Whether Acts is more historical or more popular in nature, analysis of Luke, as a writer, and of Acts (interpreted as any number of genres) cannot ignore these two points: the historical context of the events depicted and the literary skill of Luke the story-teller.

In agreement with Daniel Marguerat,<sup>118</sup> Luke is a historian.<sup>119</sup> He is indeed the first Christian historian in the sense that he intended to craft a narrative of the founding

---

<sup>118</sup> Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), xi.

<sup>119</sup> This is also the position of form-critic pioneer Martin Dibelius: "We ascribe this title [historian] to him only because he did more than collect traditions. He tried to combine them in his own way, into a significant, continuous whole..." *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*, ed. K.C. Hanson (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004), 16-19.



and early growth of the Christian movement; he adds profound meaning to the Christian cause through the struggles and successes of the early missionaries. As a story-teller, he gives an identity to historical Christianity. Through the characterization of challenges faced in a specific cultural milieu, his narrative can develop an idea interlaced between dramatic episodes. At the very least, Luke's narrative points the reader to a message revealed through the interweaving of history, as he saw it, with literary devices he chose, to best present his theological agenda. Thus his choice of plot, narrative setting, and re-composing of material are driven by a subjective point of view, which is necessarily the case for all historical writers.<sup>120</sup> Luke's plot, setting, and literary arrangements are best understood as developing his theological objective as described by Jacob Jervell. Jervell makes the case for a reading of Acts where the idea of the church as Israel is the overarching theme throughout the book: "Luke's main interest is to demonstrate the church as the one and only true Israel, the unbroken continuation of the people of God in the time of Messiah-Jesus. The Christian message cannot be separated from the religious, political and cultural fate of Israel."<sup>121</sup> Jervell necessarily ties the church of Luke's narrative to the cultural realities, political and religious, of the people of Israel. Therefore, for the early Jewish-Christians an ecclesiology of this early church has political and religious implications.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>121</sup> Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1996), 4-5.

<sup>122</sup> To call the Christian Church depicted in Acts the church of Israel is not meant as an anachronistic use of the term *ekklesia* to describe the Jewish people prior to the Christian era or at the time of Acts. The modern concept of "church" as a gathering of people of common religious belief and practices did not exist. Jervell's aim is to explain how the Gentile and Jewish Christians of the first century are heirs to promises God made to Israel. Thus, "church of Israel" does point to the Jewish origins of the first Christians, but it also means that the people of God who are the emerging Christian church in Acts are the inheritors of this status from the people of Israel.

There are many questions that need to be answered if one is to make a coherent interpretation of the passage. Why did Peter and John go from Jerusalem to Samaria to lay hands on the Samaritan converts? How do the apostles in Jerusalem know about the conversions in Samaria? Is there any significance to the LH used in 8.17 that distinguishes this event from other uses of the gesture? Does the Samaritan conversion fit in with Jervell's theological objective of Luke? To intensify Luke's problems, it is not explicitly clear why the Samaritans apparently did not receive the Spirit under Philip's baptism. This episode seems to make Luke contradict himself, because in other baptism accounts, the Spirit falls prior to a baptism taking place, such as 10.44-48<sup>123</sup> where the Spirit falls upon Cornelius and his household before they are baptized with water. The final question is, how can Jervell's interpretation of Luke's purpose make sense when many deem Acts 8.1-25 to be contradictory at worst, or exceptional at best?

Jervell's interpretation of Luke's purpose provides striking clarity for the exegesis of a passage traditionally classified as problematic.<sup>124</sup> My exegesis of Acts 8.1-25 will use his notion of the church as the church of Israel to show that Luke has an ecclesiological and pneumatological point to make in his story of the conversion of the Samaritans. Accordingly, Peter and John's movement from Jerusalem, the consequent act of the LH, and the reception of the Spirit are all coherent points of Luke's message of a reconciliatory church and a Spirit of God that appeals to the spiritual and physical natures of humanity to carry out its mission in spreading the Word.

A brief summary of the major positions concerning the use of the laying on of hands in Acts 8.17 must precede an exegesis of the passage as a whole. The next few

---

<sup>123</sup> Note: all Scripture references, quotes, or allusions are to the NAB unless otherwise stated.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 10.

paragraphs are an exposition that shows most attempts to decipher Luke's narrative in this chapter are built on the presupposition that Philip made some kind of evangelizing error, or that the Samaritans did not properly convert, or that Luke himself was careless with sources or his own theology. I will show that no one in the story is in the wrong, least of all the author. By contrast, these areas of discrepancy in Acts 8 will help elucidate my exegesis, as well as review the challenges the passage offers.

*Discrepancies with Luke's use of the Laying on of Hands?*

The episode of the Samaritan conversion is a unique case in biblical stories of conversion and baptism because of Luke's separation of baptism by water and the receiving of the Holy Spirit. The separation of the two is characterized as a time delay where details like the purported conversion of Simon Magus and the arrival of Peter and John tend to muddy the theological waters for anyone trying to reconcile this episode with other parts of Acts. In Acts 2.38 for instance, Peter states that if a person repents and is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, he or she will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Naturally, exegetes ask why the Samaritans didn't receive the Spirit if they were baptized by Philip in 8.12.

John Tipei's study of the use of the LH in the New Testament categorizes the interpretations offered by scholars on this passage into several general areas when specifically addressing the temporal separation of the Spirit from baptism.<sup>125</sup> Tipei's categories generally deal with either Luke's use of sources,<sup>126</sup> or a scholar explains the

---

<sup>125</sup> John Fleter Tipei, *The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009), 194-203.

<sup>126</sup> Source-critical explanations generally contend with the incorporation of a Peter-versus-Simon confrontation or a Philip-versus-Simon story with a source on Philip's missionary activity. Patrick L. Dickerson, "The Sources of the Account of the Mission to Samaria in Acts 8:5-25," *Novum Testamentum* 39, no. 3 (1997): 210-34.

irregularity of Acts 8.1-25 as a kind of “special situation” that required the apostles to handle the Samaritans differently.<sup>127</sup> The “special situation” theories on the separation of baptism and the Spirit in Acts 8 will go in one of these general directions: there is a purposeful change in the usual descending action of the Spirit that is determined either divinely or apostolically,<sup>128</sup> or the change in the use of the LH is due to apostolic privilege or the need for legitimation<sup>129</sup> of the conversion of the schismatic Samaritans.<sup>130</sup> Both of the “special situation” and source-critical theories tend to downplay the significance of the physical touch performed on the Samaritans and the role of Philip.<sup>131</sup> Given the problems seen in this passage, many questions arise: why did the Samaritans need the LH and on what grounds can their conversion be considered more important? Also, if their conversion is so significant, shouldn’t the LH have a deeper meaning and reality than a mere symbol? Luke’s reconciliatory church doesn’t need to assure converts

---

<sup>127</sup> Notable is Ernst Käsemann who explains that Luke separated baptism from reception of the Spirit so that the church would be presented as apostolic; the LH by the apostles was Luke’s invention. Käsemann focuses solely on the primacy of the apostolic church, and says nothing about to whom this apostolic message is being presented, viz. the Samaritans. Tipei, *Hands*, 196.

<sup>128</sup> George R. Beasley-Murray argues that Πνεῦμα Ἁγίων of 8.17 refers to the charismata and not the Spirit itself descending. Ibid., 233n93; J.E.L. Oulton argues that the Spirit was with the Samaritans after baptism by Philip because of the “joy” in 8.8, though this needed justification by the apostles. He makes the LH a simple symbolic confirmation of baptism. “The Holy Spirit, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands in Acts,” *The Expository Times* 66, no. 8 (1955): 237-40.

<sup>129</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson: “The main thing Luke is interested in here is having the new mission certified by the Jerusalem leadership.” *Sacra Pagina Series*. vol. 5, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 148.

<sup>130</sup> Michael Gourgues holds that the situation of 8.17 is similar to 19.6: the origination of a Christian community outside the circle of the Twelve, however, it is Paul doing the LH in Ephesus (19.1-6), and he is not one of the twelve. Tipei, *Hands*, 233n93; Cf. Walter Dietrich and Geoffrey W.H. Lampe claim apostolic prerogative—the apostles had privileged use of a powerful gesture. Lampe argues the Spirit was “providentially withheld” for the assurance of the new converts. James Dunn’s theory claims that the Samaritans cannot be considered Christian after Philip’s baptism because it is the Spirit that makes one a Christian, not baptism. His is the most extravagant but by far the weakest, because it directly contradicts what Luke tells us about the Samaritan’s accepting Philip’s message about the Messiah. His theory also doesn’t explain why the LH is not used all the time, and it makes the apostles use of it amount to control. Ibid., 198-202.

<sup>131</sup> Philip appears a competent missionary in Acts 8, and is placed throughout the book in close association to three major heroes of Acts: Stephen (6.5), Peter (8.1-25), and Paul (21.8). He also plays the role of being the missionary under which expansion of the Word beyond Jewish borders occurs, not to mention the attribution of miracles to his name. Franklin Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 14-16.

by symbolic gestures. Also, the Samaritans' conversion does not need to supersede anyone else's to be special. I hold that all conversions in Acts are important for the mere fact that Luke includes them, which does justice to Luke and the conversions he includes from his sources. Further, the use of the LH by a representative of the Jerusalem church was necessary and did in fact convey the Spirit, as stated in 8.17, in what Luke portrays as a ritual of reconciliation. Luke's ecclesiology makes sense without passing blame on to Philip or anyone else.<sup>132</sup>

Tipei asks an important question on why Luke did not just have Philip perform the LH when the Samaritans converted. His response is that Luke is showing that the LH is not how the Spirit is regularly conveyed and that the reception of the Spirit is important in conversion. He agrees with Max Turner that the verb ἐπιπίπτειν ("to fall upon") in 8.16 indicates that Luke understood the Spirit to descend in dramatic irruptions as a gift from God similar to Acts 2.2-4 and 10.44-48. He concludes that because of this understanding, the LH by Peter and John is an "ad hoc measure" taken because of an uncommon situation; the apostles had to induce the Spirit with the LH to correct the conversion previously facilitated by Philip.<sup>133</sup> Tipei falls prey to the same errors he just spent time reckoning in the scholarly literature, which largely amount to elaborate tautologies: the Samaritan situation is special because it is an unusual case and the apostles had to remedy the Samaritan conversion because a correction was needed.

---

<sup>132</sup> Frederick D. Bruner attempts a historical-critical reading of the passage but it is based on circular logic, that God separated the LH from the reception of the Spirit so that God could show that these two should not be separated. He further does not connect 8.17 to any ecclesiological statement of Luke's about reconciliation and church growth. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience of the New Testament Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1970), 174-76.

<sup>133</sup> Tipei, *Hands*, 203, 213.

This critique of Tipei is meant to point out that all explanations of the passage end up raising more questions than they answer: Questions of who erred in the situation or deconstructing Luke's words to yield a complex web of hidden meaning impose mystery onto a straightforward passage. My account of the special nature of the Samaritan conversion is based on the historical context of Samaritan-Jewish relations in the world in which Acts emerges. I will show how the historically antagonistic and violent relations of the two groups illuminate the perspective of the Jewish Christians as they approached the Samaritans, how Luke's use of literary devices—narrative chains, speeches, motifs, and summary statements—account for any apparent contradiction in the Samaritan conversion narrative, and how both the historical-critical and literary readings contribute to Luke's overall ecclesiological message of how reconciliation is integral to the Church's growth through the Spirit.

Given that the LH is the common denominator in the historical, literary, and theological interpretations, a lexical overview of the usage of the LH by Luke is needed, and it will make presence of the LH in 8.17 ever more poignant. In particular, it is the verb that expresses the action of the hands that helps bring Luke's themes to light.

ἐπετίθημι (epetithemi).

The LH in Acts 8.17 implies power on the part of the two Apostles and special circumstances. The verb ἐπετίθημι (epetithemi) bears importance for Luke for more than just the frequency of usage and the literary context of its use. The *Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece* shows that this verb is found in the New Testament 37 times and is generally meant as “to lay upon” or “to place upon” one thing to something

else.<sup>134</sup> However, the New Testament largely uses it in a context that includes a miraculous event like a healing or divinely oriented event like a blessing: 20 times between the four gospels and Acts. Luke also uses the verb more times than the other synoptic writers where Matthew and Mark use it 20 times combined.<sup>135</sup> Luke makes up over half of the usage of the verb in the New Testament using it 19 times; 14 of these instances are in Acts alone. Ten of its uses in Luke-Acts are for the meaning of “to lay upon” hands and always toward a divine or holy purpose, such as curing, reception of the Spirit, or a blessing.<sup>136</sup>

Instances of the verb that are less common for Luke are when it is used in conjunction with inflicting harm, notable among these is in the parable of the Good Samaritan where the robbers inflict wounds on the traveler going from Jerusalem to Jericho (Luke 10.30). Luke is the only New Testament writer who uses the verb “to place upon” in reference to the LH for both divine and violent moments.<sup>137</sup> There are no neutral uses of the verb with human bodies. Luke is unique because the verb is used to indicate

---

<sup>134</sup> Institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Center of Münster University, eds., Collaboration of H. Bachmann and W. A. Slaby, *Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece of Nestle-Aland, 26<sup>th</sup> Edition, and to the Greek New Testament 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition* (New York: De Gruyter, 1987), 674-75.

<sup>135</sup> The Gospel of John uses it twice. 1 Tim 5.22 is the only instance found in an epistle and it does refer to hands.

<sup>136</sup> Luke’s spectrum of use of the verb is consistent with secular Greek literature which preceded his diptych work. E.g., in the *Odyssey*, Homer uses it to describe the setting on an altar of a sacrifice: “that we may lay thigh pieces on the altar of Apollo.” Plato uses it to describe putting on the crown of wisdom. In his *Antiquities*, Josephus uses it in a context that includes hands: “King Hezekiah went up into the temple, with the rulers and...himself, and the rulers, laid their hands on the heads of the sacrifices...” Gerard Friedrich, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1985), 159.

<sup>137</sup> John 9.15 uses it when the healed man tells the Pharisees of the clay being put on the eyes; it is not a LH. John 19.2 uses it when the crown of thorns is placed upon the head of Jesus; it is not a LH. The first case is a healing, and the second is physically abusive, but neither is conjunction with the use of another person’s physical body to convey the healing or the abuse. Other uses of the verb that can be considered more physically aggressive other than by Luke: Mt 23.4 for the laying on of burdens, Mt 27.37 for the placing of the written charge over Jesus’ head, Luke 23.26 where the cross is laid upon Simon the Cyrenian. But these are clearly not cases where a person is injured by that which is “placed upon” in the verse.

that another person's physical body is responsible for the "placing" on of something holy or the "inflicting" of something violent.<sup>138</sup> To be fair, Luke's use of the verb in regards to violence do not mention hands or any other body part, but the context of these three "violent" passages clearly leave room for the use of fists or hands in the inflicting of the harm. Physical beatings are explicit in two of the three, while the third implies directly physical harm to a person caused by another. His use of the verb shows clear awareness of the harm or comfort physical bodies "place on" each other.

The fruit of this investigation reveals something remarkable: Luke's *every* use of the verb in respect to physical human bodies is either on the extreme holy side incorporating the LH or on the alternate extreme, an abusive or violent end. The only direct mentions of "hands" with this verb are divine or holy incidents such as healings, blessings, or receiving the Spirit (Cf. note 22). The other three uses of the verb in regards to human bodies are incidents of violence. This puts the conversion of the Samaritans into a new dynamic. The Samaritans share a violent past with the Jews, many of whom are not becoming Christian in the context of Acts, and it is through prayer and the LH that the Samaritans undergo a Spirit-experience in union with the two Apostles representing the Jerusalem church. Does the Samaritan's violent past with the Jews echo in Luke's brief 21 verses comprising their conversion story? Luke's focused use of the rite is prefigured by a historical reality to which his mention of Samaritans in both the gospel and Acts speak, and to which our attention now turns.

### *Jews and Samaritans: A Divided People*

---

<sup>138</sup> Luke's other "violent" uses of epitithemi: Acts 16.23, 18.10. Luke's "divine" uses of epitithemi are for curing (Lk 4.40, 13.13; Acts 9.12, 9.17, 28.8), blessing (Acts 6.6, 13.3), and receiving the Holy Spirit (Acts 8.17, 19, 19.6). The remaining six uses by Luke are benign: they refer to the laying on of physical objects or abstracts notions like laying on of burdens.



F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake's monumental study *The Beginnings of Christianity* devotes time to the Jewish-Samaritan background, but ultimately judge that the mutual hostility may have been exaggerated, but that it no doubt did exist.<sup>139</sup> That notwithstanding, three things will be clear in documenting their shared history: 1) that the character of their relationship ranged from tenuous to bloody, 2) that they share a common genetic and religious lineage, which plays into Luke's ecclesiological message of their conversion, 3) and that some of the most volatile incidents would have been fresh in the minds of first century Jewish-Christians, including Luke. The consistent topic through a biblical and historical recounting of the Samaritans split from the Jews centers around worship, which I will refer to as a divided church motif. It is a divided church in the sense that the split was in large part due to worship practices.

The hostility in the relationship had already reached a climactic point by the time of the destruction of the temple in 70CE, but the biblical account, is traced to 2 Kings 17.<sup>140</sup> The story shows that there is a clear association of not just heresy, but idolatry with the people who descended from the Cutheans in Samaria. Jackson and Lake report that the Samaritans were in some respects more "conservative" religiously than the Jews and even, amazingly, that some Samaritans could enter temple grounds in Jerusalem.<sup>141</sup>

Richard J. Coggins adds that the Samaritans self-designate as "Israel" in their own

---

<sup>139</sup> F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), 124.

<sup>140</sup> Jackson, Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, 120. Here the king of Assyria invaded the region of Samaria and deported the Israelites to Assyria. 2 Kings states that this happened to them because of idolatrous religious practices. The Israelites who remained made Jeroboam their king, but he only led them to sin more through idolatrous worship. Then the king of Assyria next sent other foreigners (e.g. Cutheans) to inhabit the cities of Samaria that were left emptied. He also sent a priest to Bethel who instructed them on how to worship properly.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., 121-22; Cf. Ibid, 84: Also like the Jews, Epiphanius tells us, the Samaritans were divided into sects.

records and as “šām<sup>e</sup>rīm”, which means “keeper” (i.e. of the Torah).<sup>142</sup> Though Coggins concludes that the Old Testament simply does not record any reference that is unquestionably a Samaritan reference, he does think that Samaritanism developed as a faction of Judaism based on “disagreements over cult, belief and society” from the third century BCE.<sup>143</sup> In agreement, James Montgomery states: “It was not therefore as heretics, or false Israelites, except in minor points, that the Samaritans were condemned, but rather as schismatics, who held themselves aloof from the institute of God's Kingdom.”<sup>144</sup> Their status as schismatic is brought to a sharp point when considering their particular distinguishing beliefs: the Scripture for them was restricted to the Pentateuch, Mt. Gerizim (not Zion) was the proper place for worship, and there would be a reincarnation of Moses in the end times named Taheb. The “divided church” motif thus far appears largely political and theological—Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews* adds a carnal third dimension.

Josephus records the building of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim during the time of Alexander the Great (*Ant.* 11:322-324). When Antiochus Epiphanes persecuted the Jews in 175 BCE, the Samaritans denied any kinship with the Jew; they wrote to Antiochus to request that their temple on Mt. Gerizim not be destroyed, because they were not Jews. He acquiesced (*Ant.* 12:257-264). In 129 BCE: John Hyrcanus, a Maccabean Jew, marched against Samaria because of their offenses against a Jewish ally, destroying the city and their temple (*Ant.* 13:280). Relations degraded more during Roman

---

<sup>142</sup> *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1975), 11.

<sup>143</sup> Ingrid Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 50-51.

<sup>144</sup> James A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston Co., 1907), 177.

times when Pompey, mid-first century BCE, liberated Samaria from the Jews (*Bel.* 1:156, 299). Herod and Rome came to be looked upon favorably by the Samaritans for this act of liberation. Herod would later take a wife from Samaria, besiege Jerusalem, and heavily fortify Samaria, which would antagonize anti-Herodian Jews even more (*Ant.* 15:296-8).<sup>145</sup> These jagged relations culminate in the following two episodes that carry the enmity into the time of the first century church and Luke.

Between 6-9CE, some Samaritans secretly entered the Temple when pilgrims flocked to Jerusalem during Jewish Passover. These Samaritans defiled the temple by placing human bones and parts of dead bodies in porticoes and the sanctuary causing the priests to kick everyone out, which was unprecedented (*Ant.* 18:29-30). Then during the time of Cumanus (48-52 CE), Josephus reports in *The Jewish War*, Samaritans of a village Gema murdered several Jews on pilgrimage to Jerusalem for Passover. This led to the Jews then massacring the people of Gema and burning the village to the ground. Cumanus imprisoned some Jews and killed others. Eventually, the governor of Syria became involved finding that the Samaritans had bribed Cumanus. This entire affair lasted one whole year, from one Passover to the next, around the year 51 CE.<sup>146</sup>

Considering the events recorded in the previous two paragraphs, a divided church motif may seem to be an understatement. Biblically, while the Old Testament record is considered highly doubtful, it does reflect the polemical characterization of the Samaritans by Jewish society and it reflects a religious rift that centers on proper worship. Religiously, it is held that the rift was formed on vital religious differences, namely, the proper place to worship. The history of the hostilities, as gruesome and

---

<sup>145</sup> Josephine Massyngbaerde Ford, "Reconciliation & Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, eds. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), 89-90.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 90-91.

bellicose as it is described from this Jewish source, punctuates the divided church motif with an exclamation point. The stepping-stone to the subsequent literary analysis of Acts 8.1-25 is this: Luke used Josephus and the Septuagint as a source.<sup>147</sup> Luke, or whoever the anonymous author of Luke-Acts may have been, would have finished his diptych work within about 65 years of the Passover incident mentioned above, according to the dating of Richard Pervo.<sup>148</sup> Oral traditions about the apostles, Josephus' works, and the Synoptic tradition were available to him.<sup>149</sup>

The following portion of the exegesis on Acts 8.1-25 will tie the historical in with Luke's literary toolbox, which constructs a narrative that speaks to an ecclesial nature of reconciliation where the people of Israel had to be reconciled with itself first in order for the Word to spread beyond the borders of Judea. Luke's tale of the growth of the church is built on the unity of the first believers and the outward spread of the Word from Jerusalem. The Samaritan conversion is part of a trestlework that elevates Luke's ecclesiological agenda beginning in his gospel.

### *Samaritan Seeking in Luke-Acts*<sup>150</sup>

The Samaritan conversion is truly unique among all the other conversions recorded in Acts: it is the first and one of the few non-Jewish conversions, it does not

---

<sup>147</sup> Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2009), 6, 12, 16-18.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Richard I. Pervo, "Dating Acts," *Forum* 5, no. 1 (2002): 53-72. Pervo cites F.F. Bruce, Raymond Brown, and William Ramsay who would not agree that Josephus was a probable source for Luke. This disagreement is based in part on Gamaliel's speech in Acts 5 which mentions two uprisings: that of Theudas and of Judas the Galilean. For Pervo it comes down to the principle of economy: the date of 85CE creates the need for other unknown sources for Luke to draw from, and a reliance on coincidence and on what could count as "common knowledge" for first century Christians. Pervo's date of ca. 115CE is actually the mean of the earliest date of 100CE and the latest limit of 130CE.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6.

<sup>150</sup> The explicit assumption is that the books of Luke and Acts in the New Testament are meant to be read as one cohesive work. Daniel Marguerat argues from source criticism and the use of unifying themes, like narrative chains, that the unity of the two books *ad Theophilum* lies uniquely in "the act of reading." E.g. the centurion chain is three separate appearances of a centurion in Luke-Acts representing a theme of the surprising grace given to faith. See Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 47-64.

happen in a synagogue, and the converts are clearly not a high-profile or esteemed group. Recall Luke's main interest: to show the church as the one true Israel. They are the people of God who have an unbroken connection to Abraham to whom God revealed himself.<sup>151</sup> This basic theology is revealed in the connected dramatic episodes of Acts where his style reveals his theological presuppositions, which is unmistakably Jewish in nature. In Acts, Luke assumes the authority of the Old Testament,<sup>152</sup> Jewish terms and customs are placed with no explanation, and overall his readers had to be well-acquainted with Christianity and Judaism to make sense of his presentation and style. His church is Jewish: "they are Jews with a history, that is, their Jewish history is an inherent part of their life as Christians."<sup>153</sup>

One way to begin to understand Luke's church of Israel, or his ecclesiology, begins in Luke 4.16ff where Jesus' messianic status is declared.<sup>154</sup> After the temptation episode, Jesus returns to Nazareth and goes to the synagogue on the Sabbath to read from the scroll "according to custom." In one of nearly a dozen uses of Isaiah by Luke, Jesus reads from Is 61.1-2, which begins "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he has anointed me..."<sup>155</sup> Luke is telling the reader that it is the Spirit that is giving Jesus the role or position of Messiah. This echoes in Acts 2.33 where Peter reminds the Jews, who were just baptized with the Spirit, that Jesus also "received the promise of the Holy Spirit

---

<sup>151</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 4-5.

<sup>152</sup> "Everything in the Old Testament is Scripture, everything is important, everything is binding. Luke is the fundamentalist within the New Testament. There is in Luke-Acts no criticism whatsoever of Scripture, such as we find in Matthew and Mark, not to mention Paul." Ibid., 61

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 10-15.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 49. Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *Sacra Pagina Series*, vol. 3, *The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 79-82.

<sup>155</sup> 1 "The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me; He has sent me to bring good news to the afflicted, to bind up the brokenhearted, To proclaim liberty to the captives, release to the prisoners, 2 To announce a year of favor from the LORD and a day of vindication by our God; To comfort all who mourn"

from the Father and poured it forth [on them]”. Thusly, the apostles are anointed in the same way Jesus is, as they now constitute the church having just received the Spirit. Luke stops at verse 2 of Is 61 in this gospel passage, but we know that he had a clear understanding of the Spirit’s depiction in the Old Testament and carries it through in his diptych.<sup>156</sup> It is appropriate to read one more verse ahead: “to place on those who mourn in Zion a diadem instead of ashes, To give them oil of gladness instead of mourning, a glorious mantle instead of a faint spirit.” This declaration of the messianic status of Jesus in Luke 4 foreshadows the church and the role of the apostles throughout Acts—anointing people with the Spirit.<sup>157</sup>

The Spirit, for Luke, has always been present in Israel’s history. This is expressed and developed in the speech Stephen makes right before his stoning in Acts 7.1-53 and tells a story of Israel’s resistance to God’s Spirit.<sup>158</sup> The Israel of the Old Testament resisted the Spirit by killing the prophets (7.51). The coming of the Messiah signals the restoration of Israel through the promise of the Spirit (1.6-8). “The Spirit is linked with Israel and the prophets, and so to the Messiah of Israel...The church is the true Israel in so far as Christians obey the Spirit.”<sup>159</sup> Luke also directly condemns temple worship of the Jews (7.48): “the Most High does not dwell in houses made by human hands.”<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 44.

<sup>157</sup> Lois Malcom states: “The Spirit’s power is concrete and palpable, and tied to a specific person—Jesus of Nazareth—and a specific set of messianic expectations. The aim of the Spirit’s work...[is] to call people out of themselves into something new and...generates new ways of thinking, feeling, acting, and experiencing.” Qtd. in Russell Warnken, “Preaching Conversion in Acts,” *St Mark’s Review* 223 (2013): 45-46.

<sup>158</sup> Speech in Acts are one of Luke’s literary methods, ways for Luke to communicate the meaningfulness of the situation to the reader. Dibelius, *Acts*, 21, 60.

<sup>159</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 45-47.

<sup>160</sup> Henry J. Cadbury adds that Stephen attacks the Jews for breaking the Law, that their Temple sacrifices were not “divinely intended,” and that the land of Canaan was not really owned by them, but that Abraham did own a burial place at Shechem. As Shechem was a sacred city of the Samaritans, Luke is making the ultimate insult against the Jews: their inheritance is in the land of heresy. *The Book of Acts in History* (London: A. and C. Black Limited, 1955), 105-06.

Stephen's subsequent condemnation of the Jews in 7.51-53 results in his stoning and ignites a persecution against the Christians in Jerusalem. Through Stephen's speech about Israel's rejection of the Spirit, and the scattering of all Christians except the apostles (8.1), Luke sets the narrative stage for the conversion of the Samaritans and their reception of the Spirit.<sup>161</sup> Previously, the Spirit had been given to chosen few in Israel's history, but now is available for all members of the church to receive.<sup>162</sup> This is how the church is built.<sup>163</sup> Accordingly, this is where God now dwells—in humanity through the Spirit.

The reception of the Spirit by the Samaritans is the highpoint of the narrative chain,<sup>164</sup> which I will call the chain of Samaritan-seeking because it begins and culminates with Peter and John seeking them out in Luke 9 and Acts 8 respectively. Acts 8.17 shows the reader how the LH is a human act that is to be taken literally because a reconciliation needed to occur within the people of Israel before the expansion of the Word could be completed. This reconciliation was accomplished with the Spirit through the human hands of Peter and John. The Samaritan-seeking chain is the attempted outreach of the apostles to the other side of the divided Israel as they attempt to carry the Word out to the world. The Samaritan chain begins in Luke 9 and climaxes in Acts 8; Acts 9.31 and 15.3 are denouement.

---

<sup>161</sup> Stephen's speech "paves the way" for the separating of Christians from the Jewish community, it inaugurates the section of Acts where the Word is spread to the Gentiles, and is better understood in the setting of the book as a whole, not as a martyrdom speech. Dibelius, *Acts*, 70-71.

<sup>162</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 47n72.

<sup>163</sup> The Spirit as attributed to Jesus and destined for believers is a marriage of two Jewish scriptural traditions where the Messiah is endowed with the Spirit and another that attributes the Spirit to the regenerated people of God. Odette Mainville notes that this is the "key to the interpretation of the pneumatology of Luke." Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 114-115.

<sup>164</sup> Marguerat defines narrative chains as unifying lines drawn between the two parts of Luke-Acts that enable the reader to grasp the continuity of the diptych and perceive more covert themes that speak to Luke's messages about Christianity. *Ibid.*, 52-53.

Luke 9.51-56 is a major turning point in Luke's story: Jesus' Galilean ministry is complete, "the days of his going up had drawn near," and Jesus is now journeying back to Jerusalem through 19.44.<sup>165</sup> In this episode of "Samaritan inhospitality", Jesus sends "messengers" ahead to prepare for his reception at a Samaritan village. They are not welcomed because the Samaritans know that their destination is Jerusalem. James and John ask Jesus to call down fire from heaven to destroy the village, but they are rebuked by Jesus, and they continue on the journey.<sup>166</sup> Luke has placed a return of the Messiah to Jerusalem as part of the fulfillment of his messianic status. The Samaritan chain begins by their refusal to show hospitality to those preparing the way for Jesus indicating their rejection of Jesus' message. Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem to be crucified (9.22ff), thus their rejection means a rejecting of the vision of a "suffering prophet-messiah."<sup>167</sup> The request to call down fire represents the intense ramifications for rejecting the Word (10.10-12) and also sets up a parallel motif of fire in the Samaritan chain that is echoed in Acts 8.17. Luke's first mention of the Samaritans in the gospel is a strong statement on the acidity of their relations and a lack of compassion on the part of James and John.<sup>168</sup>

The next link of the Samaritan chain is the parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke 10.29-37. This esteemed parable has been known as an example of philanthropy and also expressing an ethic of solidarity with the poor.<sup>169</sup> Significantly the "greatest commandment" passage (10.25-28) comes just prior to this parable in Luke's gospel.

---

<sup>165</sup> Joshua W. Jipp, *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts: An Interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1-10* (Boston: Brill, 2013), 183.

<sup>166</sup> Spencer adds: "While the appended phrase, 'as Elijah did', is not attested in the best manuscripts, it no doubt correctly identifies the source of inspiration for the two disciples' dramatic plea (cf. 2 Kgs 1.9-14; Sir 48.3)." *Philip in Acts*, 55. Cf. Johnson, *Gospel of Luke*, 164.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 184-85.

<sup>168</sup> Johnson validates the notion of the "ancestral antipathy" based on centers of worship, viz. Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion, as presented in Josephus' *Antiquities*. *Gospel of Luke*, 162.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 20, 230.



Luke follows Jesus command to love “your neighbor as yourself” with the story of a member of a rejected class of people exhibiting this precise virtue and putting into action the greatest commandment. Though Luke had just previously showed us one Samaritan village that would not accept Jesus, Jesus’ command to love is exemplified in the person of a Samaritan acting in a manner to which Jesus calls all. Actions of Samaritans are further emphasized in the cleansing of the ten lepers episode (17.11-19), which also takes place on Jesus’ journey back to Jerusalem through Samaria. Luke’s use of a Samaritan in this healing story is provocative at two levels: the Jewish reader and the apostles journeying with him now hear language of salvation in direct relation to the despised Samaritans (Lk 17.19). This episode and the parable of the Good Samaritan both foreshadow the acceptance of the Word by many Samaritan villages in Acts 8 and their reconciliation with the Jews. This last mention of Samaritans in Luke’s gospel is of a “true worshipper” whose leprosy was healed. Presumably the nine other lepers would have gone to the temple in Jerusalem. This Samaritan, however, returns to the new temple, i.e. to Jesus, to give thanks.<sup>170</sup> This motif of true worship is paralleled in Acts 8 where the Samaritans are initiated into the church.

For Luke, the Samaritans are not considered to be Gentiles, but the “lost sheep of the house of Israel.”<sup>171</sup> The reconciliation to which he builds has taken shape in Luke and is now taken for granted in Acts 1.8 when Jesus tells the apostles that they will spread the

---

<sup>170</sup> Massyngbaerde Ford resourcefully ties in the historical context discussed previously. Jesus commands the ten he healed to show themselves to the priests (17.14). If the healings of lepers in Mt 8.1-4 and Mark 1.40-45 are assumed to be from the same source as Luke’s, the removal of Jesus’ command for the healed leper to make a sacrifice, in addition to showing himself to the priest, speaks to Luke’s sympathy for the Samaritans. Because the Samaritan temple had been destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 129BCE, the Samaritan would not have been able to offer sacrifice and would’ve only been able to show himself to the priests. “Reconciliation in Luke’s Gospel,” 93.

<sup>171</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 76.

Word “throughout Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.”<sup>172</sup> The Spirit was promised (1.4-5) and then the apostles asked Jesus directly about the restoration of Israel (1.6). This connects the restoration of Israel with the work of the Spirit.<sup>173</sup> When Jesus includes Samaria in his response to their question, it is known that the Spirit is going there too.

The Spirit is a major component of Stephen’s speech, which marks the end of missionary activity in Jerusalem and sparks the scattering and persecution.<sup>174</sup> Luke links the martyrdom of Stephen to the Samaritan conversion through the ensuing persecution and scattering of the Christians in Jerusalem (8.1): “throughout the countryside of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles.” This last stepping stone in the Samaritan chain, prior to the reception of the Spirit in 8.17, reinforces the words of Jesus from 1.8 to the now persecuted apostles. The scattering of the disciples includes the seven recently chosen by the Jerusalem apostles (6.5). The scattering also invokes an opposing motion to the one which began the Samaritan chain in Luke 9.51: The apostles now anointed with the Spirit and charged with carrying the Word to the ends of the earth have begun to move outside of the boundaries of Jerusalem. Where Luke portrayed the movement of the Word toward Jerusalem in his first episode with the Samaritans (9.51-56), he is moving it away from Jerusalem beginning with the mission of Philip in Samaria.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Luke is unique in his use of the regions “Judea” and “Samaria” together. They appear together only in Acts in the New Testament: Acts 1.8, 8.1. David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 128.

<sup>173</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 44.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., 75.

<sup>175</sup> Jipp states that “the Word” (ὁ λόγος) is the “traveling Word of God” journeying through the region beginning in Jerusalem (2.41, 4.4), then going to Samaria (8.4, 14) and through other Mediterranean cities, never returning to the same city twice. *Hospitality in Luke-Acts*, 236-37; Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 199; Cf. Ian H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Exeter, UK: Paternoster Press, 1988), 151-53.

The call to submit to the name of Jesus is how the movement of the Word outward from Jerusalem is represented in Acts. The first step in the reconstitution of the people of God, Israel, is from Philip's preaching in Samaria (8.5), which "proclaimed the Messiah to them."<sup>176</sup> The movement of the Word outward from Jerusalem cannot allow bloody divisions to stand. Luke's message for how the church will flourish outside of Israel is thus built on reconciliation. Philip's mission in Samaria was successful prior to the arrival of Peter and John because of the "great joy" created in the people as a result of his miracles (8.7-8), and many Samaritans submitted to baptism after hearing the "good news" (8.12). The Samaritan episode up to 8.13 stands in stark contrast to the beginning of the Samaritan chain where the apostles and Jesus were rejected: where there was animosity on both parties, ill will, and inhospitality from the Samaritans, there is now acceptance of "the Word", hospitality, miracles, and joy.<sup>177</sup> The conversion is completed, but the reconciliation is not.

The reconciliation sequence begins with a missionary report (8.14) and an allusion to Luke 9.51-56. The apostles, being treated previously with severe inhospitality, are now presumably received with open arms. The missionary reports were mostly word-of-mouth reports on the work the apostles were doing as the mission from Jerusalem expanded.<sup>178</sup> Luke presents the report as unambiguously declaring that "Samaria had accepted the word of God." There is no indication in the report of error on Philip's part or

---

<sup>176</sup> For Pao, the term "Israel" is not necessarily referring to the entire Jewish people. He argues that the distinction between a "mainline" Jewish community and the early Christians is already present. Certain criteria, such as the call to submit to the name of Jesus, are an implicit claim to the title of "true Israel" within the narrative of Acts. *New Exodus*, 126-27.

<sup>177</sup> Jipp, *Hospitality in Luke-Acts*, 238.

<sup>178</sup> Jerusalem, being the original model that fed reports to other communities, also had special status, and thus received reports: "Missionary reports served as recommendations for the proclamation when new congregations were founded, as confirmation of the gospel for the congregation sending out the missionaries and as legitimation for the missionaries." Other missionary reports in Acts: 9.27; 11.2, 22; 14.26f, 15.3, 7; 21.19, 21. Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 6-7; Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 213.

insincerity on the Samaritans' part.<sup>179</sup> But Luke does not make explicit why the Jerusalem apostles were sent,<sup>180</sup> merely that they left for Samaria when they received this report.<sup>181</sup> The natural inference is generally that they left explicitly so that the Samaritans could receive the Spirit from them, because 8.15 immediately follows the missionary report with this information; and then 8.16 states that the Spirit had "not yet fallen" as the Samaritans had "only been baptized" in the name of Jesus. The appearance of control of the Spirit can be inferred in 8.17 by the reader, because Luke does show Peter and John being commanded in any way by God to lay hands on the Samaritans so that they may receive the Spirit. Or, it would have to be assumed that the apostles knew that the LH could transmit the Spirit, but this is never established as a "standard mode of operations" for the Spirit by Luke anywhere in Luke-Acts.

Control of the Spirit would contradict the course of the Spirit in Luke's narrative to this point: the Spirit has been the guide of the mission from the beginning and it is the Spirit who sends Philip to Samaria. Contrary to the appearance 8.17 gives, it is the apostles who are controlled by the Spirit who is leading the universal mission.<sup>182</sup> Consistent with Luke's theology that the restoration of Israel is seen as the work of the Spirit,<sup>183</sup> it is clear that the Spirit wants, not just leaders of the church in Jerusalem, but

---

<sup>179</sup> Spencer argues that Luke portrays Philip as successfully pulling off a mass conversion in Samaria. *Philip in Acts*, 48-52.

<sup>180</sup> Johnson holds that Peter and John were sent essentially to "confirm" the Samaritan conversion with the LH. *Acts*, 151. This does not resolve the problem of delay of reception of the Spirit.

<sup>181</sup> "14 Now when the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent them Peter and John, 15 who went down and prayed for them, that they might receive the holy Spirit, 16 for it had not yet fallen upon any of them; they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. 17 Then they laid hands on them and they received the holy Spirit." It is not possible to deduce from these four verses that the apostles were sent explicitly and absolutely to give the Spirit to the Samaritans. Luke goes from a missionary report (8.14), to omniscient narrator (8.15-16). Once in Samaria, they clearly prayed for them to receive the Spirit, having learned at some point after 8.14 that the Samaritans had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

<sup>182</sup> Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 121, 124.

<sup>183</sup> Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 44.

the one apostle who wished death on the Samaritans (Luke 9.54) to be present when the Spirit is conferred on them. This is because of Luke's overall emphasis on the physical violence associated with their relationship.

Luke's first mention of the Samaritans establishes and assumes the violent connection between them and the Jews vis-à-vis their inhospitality and John's request to call down fire on them. In the Good Samaritan parable, the traveler is beaten (harm is inflicted, *epitithemi*), but the Samaritan cared for the wounds.<sup>184</sup> At the healing of the ten lepers, the rotting flesh of the leprous Samaritan is healed. In these three episodes in Luke, the Samaritans are associated with the vulnerability of human flesh. Each time, it is the Spirit of Christ that discerns proper action.<sup>185</sup> As the apostles Peter and John approach the Samaritan village, with knowledge of these events and stories, now also anointed with the Spirit, they are guided once again by the Spirit, this time to be instruments of reconciliation.

The reconciliation is the divided church becoming reconstituted. It is expressed in the LH, which brings the motif of fire full-circle. The wounds inflicted and blood shed between these two peoples is salved with the human hands of John and the anointing of the Spirit. John, who represents the animus of the Jews towards the Samaritans in Luke 9.54, now asks the Lord in prayer for the life-giving fire of the Spirit to come down on the new Christians.<sup>186</sup> It is through his hands, and Peter's, that the Spirit comes to the Samaritans. Acts 8.17 does not clarify exactly how they received the Spirit, but the

---

<sup>184</sup> Johnson: "The violence done to the traveling Judean is overt: he is stripped, beaten, left half dead. This is not a sentimental tale." *Gospel of Luke*, 175.

<sup>185</sup> Jesus is anointed with the Spirit in Luke 3.21-22. In 9.55, Jesus rebukes John. In 10.37, Jesus reveals that the Samaritan exemplified the greatest commandment. In 17.19, Jesus declares the great faith of the healed leper.

<sup>186</sup> Acts 2.3-4 indicate that Luke's fire imagery of the Spirit is a clear association he has with its manifestation. Acts 5.1-11 shows that opposition to the Spirit means death; concurrently, openness to the Spirit means life.

literary evidence strongly suggests that the physical hands of the apostles counter-balance with: 1) Luke's association of pain-inflicted flesh in the gospel stories with Samaritans, and 2) the "violent" uses of *epitithemi* by Luke. In other words, the peaceful and prayerful touch was necessary to overcome the vicious and abusive. Luke's "divine" use of the verb "to lay upon" expresses the ecclesial message that the church, which is built by those who have the Spirit, is formed physically and spiritually through reconciliation of divided peoples.

Additionally, the true worship motif is interjected once again; the Jews and Samaritans now worship in the same Spirit as all have now received the same Spirit. Stephen's admonishment that God does not dwell in what humans have made (7.44-50) is punctuated by Luke in 8.17: God dwells in those who follow the greatest commandment. John, Peter, and the Samaritans in this monumental reconciliation are all following the example of the Good Samaritan. Jesus' promise in 1.8 has been fulfilled: the apostles did witness successfully led by the Spirit, "throughout Judea and Samaria." The fulfillment of the promise doesn't end at 8.17. After the Simon-Peter episode (8.18-24), other Samaritan villages are said to have received the good news (8.25). The reconciliation that occurred in 8.17 was only a glimpse at the larger region of Samaria reached by Peter and John as they traveled back to Jerusalem.<sup>187</sup>

Acts 9.31 and 15.3 are the last two links of the Samaritan chain, and are really a falling action to the climax of 8.17. Acts 15.3 quickly reminds the reader that the Samaritans are now fully incorporated into the church before the story of Cornelius takes over. Acts 9.31 tends to bear more significance because it is one of Luke's summary statements and it is placed in close proximity to the Samaritan conversion and the

---

<sup>187</sup> Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 150.

conversion of Saul, which is the beginning of the spread of the Word further from Jerusalem to the Gentiles.<sup>188</sup> First, Samaria is mentioned in a list of regions where the church resides in peace; the Samaritans are now being directly associated with peace as opposed to violence or abuse.<sup>189</sup> Then, Luke reinforces his ecclesial message of church growth: the church grew in numbers with the consolation of the Holy Spirit.<sup>190</sup> This final phrase of 9.31 underscores Luke's message about the growth of the Church, which is given birth through the Spirit and whose growth is encouraged by the Spirit.<sup>191</sup>

God's consent to the missionary expansion of the church in this act of LH by the Jerusalem apostles is not Luke's purpose in telling this story.<sup>192</sup> This is a foregone conclusion: clearly anyplace in Acts where an apostle proclaims the Messiah, as Philip did, can safely be assumed to be missionary activity approved by God.<sup>193</sup> Luke's purpose must be consistent with his theology and literary tools. An ecclesiological message of reconciliation as the driving action of the spread of the Word through members of the church guided by the Spirit is consistent with Luke's pneumatology throughout Acts. Luke reinforces this message with the literary technique of the Samaritan narrative chain.

---

<sup>188</sup> Luke's summary statements are ways of looking at patterns of events which precede the summary and making the individual stories more descriptive of a larger situation. Dibelius, *Acts*, 17-18; E.g., other summary statements are: 4.34-35, 6.7.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 176-79.

<sup>190</sup> Pao, with David Ravens, "*wonders* if the statement in 9:31a...is intended to signify the healing of the divided kingdom in this new era of salvation." (emphasis added) In addition their soft interpretation of 9.31, Pao goes on to critique Ravens' monograph on the restoration of Israel in Luke for ignoring the role of the Spirit. *New Exodus*, 129, 129n68.

<sup>191</sup> This leads Marguerat to conclude that missionary activity belongs to the Spirit, while faith belongs to Christ. *First Christian Historian*, 117-18.

<sup>192</sup> Scholarly explanations consistently hit just this point: God's approval and the primacy of the church leaders. They also, however, consistently fail to answer the questions this passage begs, notably, how the use of LH is different, how to account for the so-called "delay" in Spirit reception, and how these two apparent discrepancies do not contradict Luke's own theology. "...the outpouring of the Holy Spirit that follows further confirms the significance of this passage that witnesses a major step in the New Exodus program in Acts." Pao, *New Exodus*, 129; "God 'testifies' to Philip's mission and leads the Jerusalem church to agree with it as well." Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 126. Cf. Tipei, *Hands*, 194-203; Cf. also Bruner, *Theology Spirit*, 174-81.

<sup>193</sup> A critical eye may perceive Acts 16.6 to be an exception, but here the Spirit prevents Paul from even entering Asia, so preaching there does not occur.

Luke's literary toolbox includes his use of the verb *epitithemi* to associate either physical abuse or spiritual healing with physical touch of hands. The reconciliation between the Jews and Samaritans through reception of the Spirit conferred by human hands is the counterweight to the physical violence associated with the Samaritans in Luke's gospel and the historical realities of violence, found in Josephus, from which Luke and Acts emerge.

*Conclusion: Acts 8.1-25*

The significance of the LH in Acts 8.17 has traditionally been misinterpreted as a either corrective measure, an indication of apostolic privilege, or even to suggest obscure understandings of the purposes of Christian initiation in the first century.<sup>194</sup> My exegesis incorporates significant aspects of Luke's theology in Acts and his use of literary devices to make a coherent reading of the Samaritan episode. My exegesis further keeps Luke consistent in his theology and skillful in his literary ability. The historical relationship of the Samaritans and Jews illuminates Luke's literary devices that pull together multiple themes and motifs: the Spirit as promised by Jesus guides the missionary activity of the members of the church who also have the Spirit within them, violence from the past is overshadowed by the peace of the Spirit for those who accept the Word, and the church's members, as required by the greatest commandment and the Spirit of Christ within them, are required to reconcile with one another. Significantly, it is the combination of Spirit and flesh through which the reconciliation takes place. Thus, Acts 8.17 is a model of the church's nature and mission, which is to draw people back to God. For the Samaritans this drawing back action was the Spirit manifesting reconciliation in the flesh.

---

<sup>194</sup> See notes 125-131 above.



The overarching dilemma of the time delay for the reception of the Spirit is ultimately a moot point given Luke's greater concerns of church, Spirit, and forgiveness. It is conceivable that Luke offers no attempt to resolve the time delay problem because he did not perceive it as such. It is also reasonable that he assumed his reader did not need any background information to understand the significance of the Samaritan conversion. Luke's purpose of showing the Spirit's use of the LH to accomplish the reconciliation does not preclude the Samaritans having already received the Spirit in baptism, nor does it necessitate it. The two don't necessarily have anything to do with each other, except that the baptism was in the missionary report to Jerusalem in Acts 8.14. Lastly, nothing in Acts or the gospel of Luke stops the Spirit from being sent on a group of people, or a person, more than once; neither Luke's literary devices, nor his theological aims prevent this from occurring. In other words, the simplest explanation is truly that the water baptism of the Samaritans by Philip and the later reception of the Spirit through the LH are unrelated events except that in both instances, the communities are united in the Spirit of Christ. This wipes away all convoluted explanations of different kinds of baptism, the criteria for being a Christian, and what precisely is so special about the Samaritans' exceptional situation. Furthermore, justice is given to Philip as a missionary and Luke as a skilled story teller.

Lastly, this episode in Acts can now be seen to offer all readers many lessons, instead of just making a political point about religious authority and missionary virility. It seems to be forgotten that Luke is largely reliable in respect to his story-telling. So when inconsistencies in Luke have to be invented in order to explain his apparent

inconsistencies, we reveal our twenty-first century agenda being retrojected into Luke.

Eldon J. Epp states:

I believe that we now must acknowledge that claims to a single interpretation are increasingly difficult to justify in our multicultural and pluralist world—both secular and religious. I have come to recognize that multiple interpretations by an array of fellow human beings across the globe are, in numerous instances, each defensible and credible when seen within their varying intellectual and socio-cultural frameworks.<sup>195</sup>

However, that being said, I cannot excuse myself from being immune to this reality. As such, Luke's ultimate lesson is about the Spirit and the unity a community shares in and through the Spirit. Ethnic identities, social divisions, and religious conflict are not easily crossed; it literally takes a conversion experience to move past these divisions for the growth and healing of the community.

#### *Implications for the CCM*

Based on this exegesis of Acts 8.1-25 the most basic Christian experience the Catholic charismatics can assert to share with the early church is the act of laying hands on one another and praying for each other. The church was built up and expanded through use of the LH, and in this way the LH is a charism as presented in Acts.<sup>196</sup> The Samaritans receiving the Spirit in community with the Jerusalem church and the corporealization of Spirit reception in Acts 8.17 are aspects of what makes the LH a charism that the CCM shares with the early church. In this particular instance of the Samaritan conversion the Spirit had not yet *fallen on* them, because the Samaritans needed to *receive* the Spirit from them through the LH. The historically violent

---

<sup>195</sup> "Introduction: A Half-Century Adventure with New Testament Textual Criticism," in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962-2004* (Boston: Brill, 2005), xxxv.

<sup>196</sup> It will be/has been established in chapter 4 that the LH is a charism, i.e. a gift given by the Spirit for the service of others aimed at edifying and building up the church. The LH is a group dynamic of communal prayer, not simply a gesture, which includes desires and intentions of the person on whom hands are laid and the person(s) laying on hands, and that this dynamic is witnessed by the community.

relationship shared between the two groups required a corporealization of the reception of the Spirit. In other words, the vertical experience of the Spirit falling upon the apostles in Acts 2 was replaced by the horizontal experience of the Spirit being received through the laying on of hands in Acts 8.17. The Spirit made use of the LH by Peter and John because they were anointed with the Spirit at Pentecost. Now that they carried the Spirit of Christ within them, their physical reaching out in prayer (8.15) to the separated Samaritan church was a fitting predisposition through which the reception of the Spirit would occur. This corporealization of the reception of the Spirit means that the Spirit made use of the physical nature of Peter and John for the Samaritans to receive the Spirit. Nothing in Acts indicates that the Spirit was limited to use of the LH, nor is there anything that suggests that the Spirit was controlled by the apostles—Luke would certainly agree that the Spirit will go where it will. The exegesis shows that Luke is pointing to the LH as the communal and corporealized means through which the Samaritans received the Spirit, where in many of the cases of Spirit reception in Acts the Spirit falls on the recipient in a more intense fashion.

The communal experience of the Spirit does not always necessitate the manifestation of extraordinary charisms, such as tongues or even healings. But that Peter and John were used to impart the Spirit to the Samaritans is in itself extraordinary because it stands as a special case in Luke's narrative. In any case, the CCM did identify and will continue to identify charisms witnessed in its own communities with those mentioned in the New Testament, and they will see this in keeping with Vatican II's teaching on charisms and will of the Holy Spirit. In his 1974 study of the Catholic Pentecostal movement, René Laurentin speaks of the rebirth of the charisms:

The rebirth of the charisms...came about, as in the early Church, because the Spirit was at work and because there was a need: the Spirit being the source of the charisms, and the organic needs of the Church being their determining purpose. At the same time, the rebirth is in keeping with the reality we read of in the New Testament. So true is this that the New Testament texts shed a real light on the actual practices of Catholic Neo-Pentecostals, and vice versa...There is a partial identity between the charisms of the early Church and those of our own day, although the modalities may differ because the needs differ.<sup>197</sup>

Laurentin alludes to the more supernatural charisms such as healings and tongues, but also works of mercy and charity in his discussion of their rebirth. He does use somewhat of a circular logic asserting that modern needs differ from the ancient church, but that the rebirth reflects the reality of the New Testament and the New Testament helps one understand what is happening in the CCM. It is not a criticism of the movement to say that the onus is on them to verify this continuity with the ancient church. In point of fact, to say that what the CCM shares in common with the ancient church is not extraordinary manifestations of the power of the Holy Spirit, but a communal and physical act of love and prayer in the charism of the LH supports Laurentin's assertion.

The goal is not to make the CCM's claim demonstrable that it experiences the charisms in the way they are given in Acts of the Apostles or other New Testament writings. The goal here is to say that the movement shares a deeply profound commonality with the ancient church as given in Acts 8 through the charism of the LH. This thesis will not show that the CCM lives out exactly the LH as presented in Acts 8, but the movement does employ the LH in its communal context in a way that intentionally builds up and edifies the church. The CCM overlooks the deeper significance of the LH because it does not identify it as a charism in its own right. A retrieval by the movement of an ancient practice that the larger modern church does not

---

<sup>197</sup> *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 50-51. (Note: the publication date given in note 3 above is that of the English translation of his book. The original published work was in French from 1974.)

practice is more tenable when the notion of the LH as a charism is realized. Chapter four will undertake this task. Before that task is undertaken, the explanation of the LH given by the movement itself should first be surveyed.

CHAPTER 3  
THE MOVEMENT AND THE LAYING ON OF HANDS:  
PRAYER IN ACTION

Paul and Mary Ann Gray sat puzzled at the kitchen table of Ralph and Bobbi Keifer's home in later December 1966. The Grays noticed that their friends seemed to share some kind of secret, and bubbled with laughter, but only responded to their inquisitive looks with a question: "What if I were to tell you that the New Testament is true?" Some weeks later, the Grays sat with Keifer and Bill Storey, and the Chi Rho Society at Duquesne University, planning the retreat that would take place in February. The Grays relate that Storey and Keifer suggested to change the theme of the retreat from the Beatitudes and "how to act like Christians" to Acts of the Apostles and "how to become Christians." On the retreat, after talks given on Acts 1 and 2, and singing of "Come Holy Ghost" prior to each talk, the Grays approached Ralph Keifer on the evening of February 18, 1967 and told him they wanted whatever he had. The three of them went to his room at the Ark and the Dove retreat house. Paul and Mary Ann knelt on the floor, and Keifer laid hands on each of their heads while praying, first in English, and then in tongues. This is when the Grays say they received the baptism in the Spirit—not in the chapel with the rest of the Duquesne students later that night.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> Paul and Mary Ann Gray, "God Breaks In," *New Covenant* 2, no 8 (1973): 6-7.

The Grays' story bears many similarities to that of Keifer and Storey who had been searching and praying for each other in a mission of spiritual renewal in the year leading up to February 1967. The critical difference is the context in which the Grays requested to have hands imposed on them: It was not interdenominational. Also, it was completely different from what any of the students experienced that night. The testimony of the Grays tell how Keifer and Storey would go down the line of kneeling students, praying for the baptism in the Spirit, later that night in the chapel of the retreat house after the charismatic phenomena had already begun taking place. Patti Gallagher attests to the fact that the LH was almost secondary that night for most of the students. After charismatic phenomenon had already been witnessed in the chapel "The professors then laid hands on some of the students, but most of us received the 'baptism in the Spirit' while kneeling before the blessed sacrament in prayer."<sup>199</sup> Gallagher Mansfield's testimony on this aspect of the night is unambiguous: "When I prayed...I was kneeling before the altar. The next moment I found myself prostrate, flat on my face, stretched out before the tabernacle. No one had laid hands on me."<sup>200</sup>

One question which comes from analysis of the LH in the events that are labeled the birth of the CCM, is how was the LH used and what does its use say about the movement and the church? To answer such a question, an historical review of the LH from the CCM's perceptive of the gesture will help to gain a clearer image of the social significance of its use between Protestant Pentecostals and Catholics. The Catholic understanding of the LH from within the movement was immediately reflected in their

---

<sup>199</sup>Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), 35.

<sup>200</sup> Patricia Gallagher Mansfield, *As By a New Pentecost: The Dramatic Beginning of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Stebenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1992), 39.

literature. The Catholic understanding was biblically based, historically consistent, and theologically undeveloped.

*The Laying on of Hands for Charismatics*

The CCM was just on the verge of erupting by the summer of 1967 when Mary Papa, in the first article published in *National Catholic Reporter* on the charismatic prayer meetings of Notre Dame, went to witness for herself what was going on at the campus.<sup>201</sup> Her mention and comment on the use of the LH is important because it occurs within three months of the Duquesne Weekend, so it was early, and technically a third-party “objective” observer, though by no means was it a theological evaluation or historical perspective. She says of the Friday night prayer meetings, which at the time were held on campus, in dorms and homes, that the baptism in the Spirit is being prayed for through the imposition of hands: “Through the use of a symbolic gesture known as the ‘laying on of hands,’ they pray for the gifts of the Holy Spirit described in St. Paul.” Though her theological training is unknown, it is known that she was Catholic, and her assertion of what she witnessed was likely based on inquiring with those present at the meetings, her own interpretation, or both. For being accounted as only symbolic, though symbols can be powerful, the place and prominence of the LH in the meeting she witnessed appears more concrete. Her valuation of it as only a symbolic gesture is rash.

At one meeting she attended, which took place in the home of a physics professor, she calls attention to the openness of the nature of the event, and its stark contrast to Catholic mass: “No grim Sunday faces isolating their glances by staring into black-bound prayer books. They sat cross-legged on the floor. Ladies in slacks. White-robed monk. Cigarette smokers. Coffee drinkers. Praying in free-form, singing loudly...It occurred to

---

<sup>201</sup> Mary Papa, “People Having a Good Time Praying,” *National Catholic Reporter* 6, no. 29 (1967): 1, 10.



me that these people were having a good time praying! Is this what they meant by the Holy Spirit dwelling among them?”<sup>202</sup> Her humorous outsider’s tone changes quickly when she describes what could be referred to as a ritual. The LH was a regular feature of the typically three to five hour meetings. The group prepared “in earnest” for the LH, but told everyone that no one had to do it.<sup>203</sup> They then discussed the need to be free of “the devil” before a person was able to receive the Spirit. She reports that the LH was commonly used in combination with words like “In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, I command all unclean spirits to depart.” After making these points, people can then go up to receive the LH. In this case, twelve people went up to sit for prayer, three were chosen to do the LH on them, and a priest gathered in one corner of the room with a small group to say the rosary during this time. The LH began as the group of three men imposed hands on each of the twelve, one by one, down the line. The praying began with commanding evil spirits to depart for the reception of the Spirit. Their prayer turned to “garbled” sounds as they entered praying and singing in tongues: “One of them seemed to be singing a sort of orientalized [sic] Gregorian chant.” Other members of the group would go pray with each of the twelve after they had received the LH. Those aspirants continued to pray quietly, but not in tongues. The meeting ended long after midnight where one final prayer was said over the hostess and host.

Papa’s detailed account brings out, not a contradiction, but questions that begs answering. If the LH is symbolic, what was it symbolizing and why was it consistently used? Could the group have not simply raised hands over the aspirants to accomplish the

---

<sup>202</sup> It is interesting to note those present included mostly graduate students, professors and wives, but also four priests—one the VP for business affairs and Notre Dame, another Fr. Edward O’Connor of the theology department—some undergraduates, a few businessmen, and one Trappist monk “white robe and all.” Papa, “People Having a Good Time Praying,” 1, 10.

<sup>203</sup> She states that it was Fr. Edward O’Connor who made this proclamation.

same symbolism or is the physical LH just more powerful? What is the power or significance of such a distinction between praying for and laying or imposing hands on members of the group? It seems that “symbol” does not capture the true nature of the act or its value to the nascent charismatic culture. Papa’s article also illustrates that the unique and specific uses of the gesture from the beginning were noticed by the participants and outside observers of the movement alike. Edward D. O’Connor himself informed the group about their freedom to not receive the LH, and an unknown person from the group voiced independently the importance of casting out demons prior to imposing hands.

O’Connor, a CSC priest who taught at Notre Dame from the beginning of the CCM and mentioned in the Papa article, wrote about the LH in a small twenty page, pamphlet-sized publication in 1969. He said that the consistent use of the gesture is partly based on the fact that it seems to have a certain power or that “God seems to use it in a remarkable way to bestow grace.”<sup>204</sup> His book, as a representation of the movement’s self-awareness and evaluation of the LH, points out the common objections made by Catholics: the associating of spiritual outcomes to the use of the gesture smacks of superstition, and that the LH is seen as a pseudo-sacrament. O’Connor response, speaking on behalf of the movement, consistently shows itself to adhere to a level-headed approach from early on. Namely, he states, the spiritual power the LH seems to give is not of the act itself; but the act can be made efficacious by God. Further, Catholic Charismatics do not claim that the LH confers grace *ex opere operato* as do the sacraments. O’Connor still states that all sacraments essentially “are human gestures which God uses in a privileged

---

<sup>204</sup> Edward D. O’Connor, *The Laying on of Hands*, Special Charism ed. (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1969; Watchung, NJ: Charisma Books, 1971), 3. Citations refer to the Charisma edition.

way as a means to impart His grace.”<sup>205</sup> What meaning then can Catholic Pentecostals possibly ascribe to this particular human gesture?

O’Connor’s explanation echoes the words of Ralph Keifer on the proper place of the LH. Keifer wrote in a letter shortly after the Duquesne Weekend his views on the significance of the LH in their experience to friends at Notre Dame:

If you should get the books I mentioned [Wilkerson’s and Sherrill’s], which you should be able to find in a good protestant bookstore, you will note that the Baptism of the Spirit is often given by the laying on of hands. Where Catholics are concerned, I do not view this as a substitute for Confirmation. I think it is just a sacramental which activates Confirmation...just as any sacramental should be a genuine activation of what is already present. Nor do I view this as a new gimmick; I view the whole experience as something which should be always and everywhere present, and which we have muffled by our lack of faith. Do we really believe that the Spirit of the Lord has filled the world?<sup>206</sup>

To put his notion of the LH into context, he had already had hands imposed on him at the Chapel Hill prayer group, he had already imposed hands on his wife and Bill Storey, and he had just witnessed the events at the Ark and the Dove. After all these extra-ordinary experiences in his life, he places the act of LH in a rather ordinary spot—after all, sacramentals are quite common in Catholic culture. This is even after, as seen in Gallagher Mansfield’s testimony, people were receiving the baptism in the Spirit at the chapel of the retreat center quite memorably without the use of the LH. The CCM, despite outpourings of the Spirit being witnessed without the LH, could have argued with proper cause to place a special significance on its use, but instead they looked to tradition and Scripture to validate its use.

---

<sup>205</sup> He also points out that in contradistinction to the use of the LH in the CCM, the sacraments which use the LH, i.e. confirmation and holy orders, can only be received once, and that the sacraments require an ordained cleric. Catholics themselves would recognize, by these very facts, that in engaging the use of the LH or witnessing its use, the domain of the sacraments is not being accessed. *Ibid.*, 5-6.

<sup>206</sup> Gallagher Mansfield, *New Pentecost*, 26.

Biblically, the CCM did not differ greatly from Pentecostals in evaluation of the LH. O'Connor categorizes four general uses of the gesture in the Old Testament—sacrifice, execution, ordination, and blessing—and recognizes that a universal meaning was not attributable to each of the noted texts.<sup>207</sup> A basic touch, not laying on of hands per se, but physical contact is also identified as similar in meaning. Jesus is known to have physically laid hands on people to impart a blessing in just one case: the blessing of the children (Mk 10.12, 16; Mt. 19.13, 15). Other uses of the LH by Jesus, or just a touch, are for healing.<sup>208</sup> O'Connor also notes that Jesus raised his hands to bless the apostles (Luke 24.50) in an act similar to Aaron's blessing of the Israelites in Leviticus. Lastly from the gospels, O'Connor recalls that Jesus promised his disciples that they would have power to use the LH for healing (Mark 16.18). Thus the Acts of the Apostles, needless to say, holds tremendous meaning for Pentecostals and Catholic Pentecostals alike.

Catholic Pentecostals, just like other Pentecostals, do take the book of Acts seriously. Keifer's letter from just after the Duquesne Weekend makes this explicit directly because of what happened on that weekend, and his experience at Chapel Hill. When Keifer described his Chapel Hill experience, he wrote: "Cf. the Acts of the Apostles and read them literally. Also, cf. I Corinthians 12-14 and read it literally—we have seen all these things in operation." And when he described the retreat, he wrote: "Cf. the New Testament and read it as though it were literally true *now*, every word, every line. (Emphasis Keifer's)"<sup>209</sup> Keifer's experiences clearly influenced his reading of

---

<sup>207</sup> O'Connor, *Laying on of Hands*, 9, 10, 19n7, 20n8, n9; See Exodus 29.10; Leviticus 3.2, 4.4, 16.21 24, 29, 32; Numbers 8.12 on use in sacrifice. See Leviticus 24.14; Deuteronomy 13.9, 10; 17.7; Daniel 13.34 for use in execution. See Numbers 8.10; 27.18-20, Deuteronomy 34.9 for use in what O'Connor labels as ordination. Genesis 48.14-20 is cited as the single text which is a use of LH as a blessing. Leviticus 9.22, Aaron raising his hands over the Jews to bless them is viewed as an "extension" of the LH.

<sup>208</sup> See Matthew 8.2; Mark 1.41, 5.23, 6.2, 5, 7.31, 8.23, 25; Luke 4.40, 13.13.

<sup>209</sup> Letter of Ralph and Bobbi Keifer, *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973): 1.

Scripture, but his approach was consistent with other texts from the CCM. O'Connor cites uses of the LH in Acts and the epistles,<sup>210</sup> and while his prose lacks some of the excitement of Keifer's personal letter, he concludes that the Apostolic Church did indeed use the LH to impart the Spirit and charisms, in addition to other things like ordination.<sup>211</sup>

Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan draw similar conclusions as O'Connor, though they do not tell their readers to read the NT literally, they do offer a Scriptural examination on the roots of the baptism in the Holy Spirit that would likely not disagree with Keifer's imperative. Explaining to their readers how the New Testament came to be: "Themselves filled with the Spirit since the day of Pentecost, the evangelists and later the writers of the epistles proclaimed their beliefs about the work of the Spirit of the Lord among them."<sup>212</sup> Consistent with O'Connor's approach, the Ranaghans cite essentially the same Scripture verses as O'Connor, and assert that the LH is a "ritual gesture" that could have different uses depending on the situation: In Scripture it can be used with or to complete the baptismal process, but it is not necessary for the reception of the Spirit.<sup>213</sup> Still, the presence and use of the gesture in New Testament examples is easily identifiable and significant for the CCM, but they did not limit themselves to Scripture.

With the benefit of a historical tradition, the Catholic Pentecostals could establish continuity of use for the gesture in the rites of initiation, which for them was also an attempt to understand how Spirit-baptism related to Church practice from the Patristic era. The Ranaghans place the LH on the same plane as holy water or the sign of the cross. They state that the LH is present in initiation rites in both the East and West Churches

---

<sup>210</sup> Acts 6.6, 8.17, 9.17, 13.3; 1 Timothy 5.12, 22; 2 Timothy 1.6; Hebrews 6.2.

<sup>211</sup> O'Connor, *Laying on of Hands*, 11.

<sup>212</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 108-109.

<sup>213</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 128.

between the third and fifth centuries, though they also equate the signing of the cross on the forehead with LH, as does O'Connor, so there is a wide range of meaning in respect to what constitutes the act itself. They comment that local variations existed for initiation rites and may have affected how, when, or who did the LH or other parts of the ritual, but that there was one constant: "the rite always and everywhere concluded with the communal celebration of the eucharist, the sacrificial meal of the Mystical Body of Christ. This whole rite in the Church of the first five centuries was the baptism in the Holy Spirit." This is the one place where they diverge from O'Connor. Local practice also had a role in determining belief in when precisely the Spirit was imparted to the neophyte: in the anointing with oil, the bath, or the LH. In any case, the Ranaghans maintain rightfully that Christian initiation was one event, one sacrament in the patristic Church. The church of the middle ages lost the deep meaning of the relationship of the use of water and the LH and confirmation became a misunderstood sacrament, confusing in respect to its purpose, and the sixteenth century did not exactly clear the waters. Confirmation had "the look of a dangling participle."<sup>214</sup>

The Ranaghans' historical retrieval of the use of the LH reveals an astute awareness of its place in Christian practice, and how the present comes from a collective past. Their understanding of the significance of early Christian initiation of others into the community as directly related to belief in the outpouring of the Spirit validated the charismatic community's experience of the baptism in the Spirit. For the CCM, their practice of the LH for the baptism in the Spirit is invariably linked to the early uses of similar signs, gestures, and words. The fact that the Ranaghans ultimately call attention to the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* of Vatican II and the "problem of the meaning and

---

<sup>214</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 131-39.

practice of confirmation,” as they refer to it, speaks loud and clear to charismatic ears. It was this document of the council which declared that confirmation candidates should renew their baptismal promises prior to being confirmed.<sup>215</sup> The movement held to the idea of the power of baptism in the Spirit in the way it stirred up, or renewed, the graces given Catholics in the sacraments of initiation. So in perhaps an extreme assessment, what Catholics discovered was an experience that was immediately accessible to their religious and spiritual natures.

O'Connor and especially the Ranaghans seem to have a superior grasp on the meaning of the LH in the CCM than on the sacrament of confirmation in the Catholic Church. While a final reformulation of confirmation had yet to be seen for the Ranaghans and the CCM, the conclusion of their historical survey leaves the reader with little doubt of how the movement perceives its “rite” of baptism in the Spirit: “What is essentially meant by Jesus baptizing in the Holy Spirit should not be equated with the present rite of confirmation. In fact we can be more sure about what it means to be baptized in the Holy Spirit than about what it means to be confirmed.”<sup>216</sup> Though the CCM leaned toward an orthodox interpretation of the gesture of the LH, statements like this from movement leaders, while truthful, were bold. Because of the use of the LH in the baptism in the Spirit, and the early interpretations on what baptism in the Spirit meant by those in the CCM, that it was an activation of graces given in confirmation,<sup>217</sup> the movement seems

---

<sup>215</sup> “The rite of confirmation is to be revised and the intimate connection which this sacrament has with the whole of Christian initiation is to be more clearly set forth; for this reason it is fitting for candidates to renew their baptismal promises just before they are confirmed.” *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 71.

[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19631204\\_sacrosanctum-concilium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html).

<sup>216</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 140.

<sup>217</sup> René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Garden City, NY: 1977), 37-43.

particularly confident and certain about their experience more so than the Tradition they inherited.

O'Connor's historical survey of that inherited tradition deals with an interesting question on the appropriateness of laymen using the LH, given that it is only seen in the modern Church in two of the sacraments. He claims as biblical precedents where laymen use the gesture Jacob, Jesus, Ananias, and the people of Antioch who laid hands on Paul and Barnabas. Ignoring the fact that calling Jesus a layman seems highly anachronistic, O'Connor points out that ordained ministers aren't the only ones who can use the LH for the Apostolic Church. He cites Hippolytus and his *Apostolic Tradition* from the third century, which speaks of catechists praying over catechumens with the LH. It specifically states that this occurs whether or not the catechist is a cleric or layman. He then recalls, also from the third century, the *Didascalia*, which presupposed a practice of widows laying hands on people and praying for them.<sup>218</sup> O'Connor stops at the *The Apostolic Constitution* of the fourth century, which is based largely on the *Didascalia*. The LH is specifically prohibited to laymen here. Then, stating that the history of use of the LH through the Middle Ages is obscure, he notes, that it survives in modern times in confirmation where a sponsor imposes hands on the confirmand.<sup>219</sup>

So where does this place the use of the LH among laymen and laywomen in the CCM? O'Connor concludes on the side of Augustine and the Pentecostals—it is prayer in action.<sup>220</sup> In a 1967 article, he discusses how the pattern developed within the first

---

<sup>218</sup> “Widows ought then to be modest, and obedient to the bishops and the deacons... And let them not act after their own will,... or to lay hand on and pray over any one without the command of the bishop or the deacon. But if she do aught that is not commanded her, let her be rebuked for having acted without discipline.” R. Hugh Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 138.

<sup>219</sup> O'Connor, *Laying on of Hands*, 13-14; 20n12b, n13, n14.

<sup>220</sup> “The laying on of hands is not something that we can be performed only once, like Baptism. For what else is it, but prayer over a man?” *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas* III, 16.21.



Catholic pentecostal prayer meetings in South Bend to stop for a coffee break after about the first hour or two. Then when they reconvened and gathered people who wanted to receive the LH, he remarks that this was not regarded as a sacred ceremony: it was seen “simply as a natural expression of the intention of invoking God’s blessings on this person,” and that they were simply imitating a biblical gesture.<sup>221</sup> The association with the transmission of grace didn’t appear to come until later for O’Connor. When he did say that it was comparable to a sacramental,<sup>222</sup> similar to Keifer who directly called it a sacramental, O’Connor would compare it to a person who carries the Word to others—human intermediaries can communicate grace.<sup>223</sup> In his 1971 book, he would continue on this notion that the LH was prayer in action, which God doesn’t need to use. The gesture itself produces nothing, and it does not have the instrumental power of the sacraments. Even so, it symbolizes “graphically that God’s grace is often mediated to a person through others, and especially through the community. God seems to bless the faith from which this prayerful gesture proceeds...the baptism in the Spirit is usually received thus.”<sup>224</sup> While it is clear that O’Connor does not want to elevate the gesture to a sacrament, and compares it to genuflection and the sign of the cross, there is a wide gap between a common act of genuflection, which has no outward effects on the person, and the act of LH, which he says usually is associated with receiving the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He does, mention the communal aspect of the prayer associated with the LH, something common to the Ranaghans. But why would God seem to prefer to transmit grace through this purely symbolic gesture? O’Connor doesn’t answer this question, and

---

<sup>221</sup> Edward D. O’Connor, “Baptism of the Spirit: Emotional Therapy?,” *Ave Maria* ?, no. ? (1967): 13.

<sup>222</sup> O’Connor, *Laying on of Hands*, 6-7.

<sup>223</sup> O’Connor, *Laying on of Hands*, 15.

<sup>224</sup> Edward D. O’Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1971), 117.

if he ever considered it, didn't think an answer was necessary because of the biblical and historical precedent.

The Ranaghans leave a similar feeling of chomping at the theological bit, i.e. there can arise a sense of frustration that they step uncommitted onto a theological track. "The gesture of the 'laying on of hands' which often accompanies 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' is not a new sacramental rite. It is a fraternal gesture of love and concern, a visible sign of human corporeality so necessary for any fully human religious experience."<sup>225</sup> Why is a fraternal gesture of love "necessary" for any fully human religious experience? Does not the phrase "visible sign of human corporeality" repeat itself? Human bodies don't signify human bodies; they are. To be fair, the Ranaghans also say that these "corporeal realities," like rites and gestures, are perceptible signs and "actions of the Spirit-filled Body of Christ, they are instruments through which the Spirit approaches man and man responds. On the deep human level of religious celebration they perpetuate and communicate in space and time the paschal mystery of Christ."<sup>226</sup> In addition to being a sign, the LH is what Spirit-filled people do, and the Spirit may approach them when they do. The notion that on a deep human level of religious celebration, which goes undefined, the LH somehow perpetuates and communicates in space and time the paschal mystery of Christ, is quite a bold statement for something that was two sentences prior in their text a "perceptible sign."

Many other questions can be asked of both the Ranaghans and O'Connor. What kinds of signs are not perceptible? Can some one have a religious experience that is not fully human? Are the sacraments, like baptism and confirmation, fully human religious

---

<sup>225</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 20.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

experiences? Do any other corporeal realities usually lead to an activation of the grace one had received in baptism? Why don't they? How is the paschal mystery of Christ perpetuated in this act or any other gesture for that matter? The point is not to deride the Ranaghans, or O'Connor. The point is to call attention to a lack of clarity of language and theological underpinnings in respect to this very specific, and oft-used gesture, which is claimed to not be of central importance, and yet is also testified to have a unique quality.

The last questions to be asked of the Ranaghans are in respect to their list of four reasons as to why the LH is a common practice, summarized: 1) it is a spontaneous religious gesture; 2) it is a sign of mutual solidarity that binds symbolically those praying while indicating the direction of prayer; 3) it is prayer in action, a corporeal manifestation of prayer; 4) experience shows it is helpful in renewing the life of the Spirit.<sup>227</sup> Question of each of their points in order briefly: Are the structured prayer meetings of Catholic charismatics where people were invited to receive the LH and then lined up for prayer to be considered spontaneous? Does a sign of mutual solidarity that binds people together also transmit the grace of the Holy Spirit? Can't a corporeal manifestation of prayer also be a person clasping their hands in prayer? How does it help renew the life of the Spirit and whose life in the Spirit? The Ranaghans do add that "man" needs physical things in encountering the "transcendent" God. This assertion is truly the most Catholic reason given as to the commonality of the practice seen in the Protestant and Catholic movements. It begins to touch, so to speak, on the notion of the LH as a sacramental. These deeper, sacramentally related meanings that the CCM associated with the LH may have been lost just a few years later. René Laurentin would say of the LH, after a brief commentary that fully agrees with the Ranaghans save in one respect, that it "is not

---

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., 149-50.

sacramental but relates to any need of Christian life.”<sup>228</sup> Commentary on the LH ends there for Laurentin.

The first Catholic Pentecostals perhaps could not be expected to spend so much time reflecting on the gesture. Surely, the baptism in the Spirit monopolized much of the discussion and literature, as did discussion on the charisms, both of which seem to distinguish the movement from non-pentecostal Catholics. But if we can ask, what would the CCM be without the laying on of hands, and come up looking for a coherent answer, then the practice is already revealed as a central part of the culture. The Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit are claimed by the movement to already be present in baptized believers, so naturally they spent much energy explaining what this hallmark of the movement, the baptism in the Spirit, was and was not, because they had to explain the relationship to the sacraments. The movement held firmly that the baptism in the Spirit is not a sacrament, but also, at least in the early years, maintained that the LH was a sacramental. The movement also held from early on that it is Christ who gives the Spirit, not the charismatics or the Pentecostals: the baptism in the Spirit merely actualizes in a concrete way what Christians already possess, which was received in baptism and confirmation.<sup>229</sup> Thus the notion of a renewal comes into play. If a sacramental, such as the LH, activates what is already present, as Keifer said in his 1967 letter from just after

---

<sup>228</sup> René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 57.

<sup>229</sup> Kevin and Dorothy, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 141, 150; Cf. “The Spirit who has already been present since baptism now, because of a new openness [in respect to the baptism in the Spirit], becomes operative at a new depth, living within and reigning within.” Kilian McDonnell, “Catholic Charismatics,” *Commonweal*, 96, no. 9 (1972): 208; Cf. also: “release” of the Spirit, “actualization” or “reviviscence” of gifts, “manifestation” or “upsurge of docility to the grace” of baptism. Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 38; Cf. also: “Jesus is the baptizer in the Holy Spirit. He is the one we have to come to if we want to be baptized in the Holy Spirit.” Steve Clark, *Baptized in the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1970), 50.

the Duquesne Weekend, then what is the distinction between the LH and the baptism in the Spirit?

The CCM was making a fine distinction between what a sacramental is, and what a gesture which puts one in touch with grace is. The looming question, why do the graces received in confirmation need to be activated, has an answer that seems only implied: there's something wrong with confirmation. Catholic charismatics would never say this willfully and certainly do not directly. They consistently held up the sacraments, and showed respect for Vatican II's teaching on them. Still, the experience of baptism in the Spirit found within charismatic prayer meetings and it's commonly accompanying sacramental gesture of the LH was sounding theologically like an unofficial sacrament. Catholic Pentecostalism would designate it as an experience which creates a change in one's relationship with God or which causes one's being to be opened to the action of the Spirit.<sup>230</sup> The LH remained unofficially a sacramental for the CCM. A brief discussion on how the Catholic Church defines sacramentals will help inform the movement's formulation of their own practices.

### *Little Sacraments*

The Catholic Church does allow for a seemingly endless variety of sacramentals, from obscure objects like cinctures and the *Agnus Dei*, to well-known sacramentals like sacred vessels, the palladium, and the Christmas Candle.<sup>231</sup> Even blessings, and yes, gestures can be sacramentals. Ironically, the same church document, *Constitution on the*

---

<sup>230</sup> Clark, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 65.

<sup>231</sup> The cincture is the rope which is tied around the alb and is a symbol of sacerdotal purity. In some religious orders it is blessed specially and sometimes endorsed as a sign of allegiance to an institute. The Lamb of God has been lost to the modern church and is one of the oldest sacramentals. It is a disc of wax from four to eight inches in diameters stamped with a lamb. The wax used was taken from Paschal candles and symbolized the virgin flesh of Christ. They were dipped in water with chrism and balsam and blessed by the Pope. Ann Ball, *A Handbook of Catholic Sacramentals* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1991), 25-27, 106, 196-97

*Sacred Liturgy*, from which the CCM cited in trying to understand the sacrament of confirmation, also offers the faithful a clear designation for sacramentals, though they do not quote this section: “Holy Mother Church has, moreover, instituted sacramentals. These are sacred signs which bear a resemblance to the sacraments: they signify effects, particularly of a spiritual kind, which are obtained through the Church's intercession. By them men are disposed to receive the chief effect of the sacraments, and various occasions in life are rendered holy.”<sup>232</sup> The CCM’s adherence to Tradition and respect for institution would have to explain their use of the sacramental of the LH without contradicting *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (hereafter *SC*). Has the Church instituted the LH for the laity? To which sacrament(s) does the LH bear resemblance? What effects does the LH signify and where is the Church interceding in this? How does the LH dispose one to receive the effect of a sacrament? The final line of the paragraph is speaking about the occasions of first communion, baptism, marriage, etc. but is it possible to interpret the “various occasions” of life to include the LH in a charismatic prayer meeting?

Just as paragraph 60 of *SC* seems to limit the scope of what can be considered a sacramental, the following paragraph would seem to allow in the LH:

Thus, for well-disposed members of the faithful, the liturgy of the sacraments and sacramentals sanctifies almost every event in their lives; they are given access to the stream of divine grace which flows from the paschal mystery of the passion, death, the resurrection of Christ, the font from which all sacraments and sacramentals draw their power. There is hardly any proper use of material things which cannot thus be directed toward the sanctification of men and the praise of God.<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>232</sup> *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 60.  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19631204\\_sacrosanctum-concilium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html).

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, 61.

Key ideas applicable to the LH are the notion of a well-disposed member of the faithful, and that the sacramental gives access to divine grace. The CCM, which does emphasize the openness of the aspirant receiving the LH, would completely agree with this passage: the LH on its own accomplishes nothing, which would seem to go without saying. The CCM would also agree that the faithful are given access to the stream of divine grace, except that they had said this about the baptism in the Spirit, not the LH. Since the movement does not describe the baptism in the Spirit as, nor has the movement ever claimed that it is, a sacramental, one quickly finds incongruence.

The baptism in the Spirit has been and will continue to be defended as not a sacrament, though much of the language that is used to describe the experience even echoes language found in *SC*. Just one for instance, Steve Clark's book states that it is Jesus who is the baptizer in the baptism of the Holy Spirit.<sup>234</sup> This is the precise language used to describe the seven sacraments: they confer sanctifying grace because it is Christ who is acting.<sup>235</sup>

In short, the movement states that the LH is a sacramental. But their description of the baptism in the Spirit closely resembles the Church defined notion of sacramental: it does not confer grace, but merely stirs it up in the believer. But if the LH is a sacramental, it goes unexplained how it stirs up the grace in the faithful; the movement is consistent on the point that it is the Spirit stirring in the aspirant and the LH is unneeded. Lastly, the Church institutes sacramentals, and there is no institution of the LH as a sacramental used for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Strictly speaking, the CCM cannot

---

<sup>234</sup> See note 229.

<sup>235</sup> Paragraphs 1127 and 1128 of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, though written after Vatican II, cite a historical understanding of how the sacraments work, citing Aquinas: "'the sacrament is not wrought by the righteousness of either the celebrant or the recipient, but by the power of God.'" [http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc\\_css/archive/catechism/p2s1c1a2.htm](http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p2s1c1a2.htm).

officially call the LH in the Catholic Charismatic context a sacramental. Obviously, as will be seen, the significance of the gesture cannot be removed because of this. It simply must be shown that the movement's designation, albeit somewhat impromptu and without argument, of the LH as a sacramental doesn't stand up by ecclesial definitions.

Similarly, the baptism in the Spirit is aptly criticized as a pseudo-sacrament by critics of the CCM, though charismatics will adamantly deny this charge. This study cannot, and does not wish, to validate the LH as an official sacramental of the Church. Close reading of the personal testimonies written on the events that lead to the Duquesne Weekend, and the retreat itself, with focus on how the LH was actually used by those involved will give us a clearer picture of how the gesture should be regarded as a rite or, to be crass, a super-sacramental, especially as it was used consistently by the first Catholic Pentecostals, and at the interdenominational prayer meeting where the first two Catholics were baptized in the Spirit with the LH by Protestant Pentecostals.

The movement's growth can almost be marked by the use of the LH. The communities that emerged in some areas put the LH to even more particular uses and it is to these communities and the emerging notion of charismatic culture to which this study now turns.

#### *The Laying on of Hands and the Formation of Communities*

In October of 1973, the first international conference of Catholic charismatic leaders was held in Grottaferrata, Italy, which is just outside the diocese of Rome. Over a hundred delegates were there from 34 countries. One outcome of the four day conference was a document, "Statement on the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic



Renewal.”<sup>236</sup> The main point of the Grottaferrata statement, signed by Heribert Mühlen, was to bring understanding to the movement.<sup>237</sup> It takes note of the fidelity of the renewal, i.e. that Catholics are reinvigorated in their religious life. It clarifies that the charisms are not restricted to those listed in 1 Corinthians 12.28 and are meant for ministering to and building up the whole body of the church. The statement calls attention to the observation of the CCM that the contemporary church does not know what the charisms are and has limited expectation on the Spirit’s movement or action in daily life.<sup>238</sup> The statement explains how they retrieve the historical record of initiation in the Spirit from the church history and biblical precedent. It does not mention the LH, but does discuss the practice of the baptism in the Spirit and it validates the description of the experience that charismatics employ: an actualization or release of the Spirit, which can result in a manifestation of the charisms such as glossolalia.<sup>239</sup> It closes on the note of the CCM’s relation to other renewals who have differing theological explanations for the same “spiritual realities”, as well as different understandings of revelation. The charismatic renewal is noted as not self-appointing itself as the purveyor of the Spirit in the Church, but recognizing that all groups have the Spirit who proclaim, to the Father’s glory, the lordship of Jesus: “That presence in all streams of the renewal is the body of

---

<sup>236</sup> Kilian McDonnell, *Worship* 47, no. 10 (1973), 610-20.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., 619-20. Kilian McDonnell was the original writer of the document, at the suggestion of Cardinal Suenens. McDonnell controlled the document and made the final revisions. The document was reviewed at Grottaferrata, and a small group of theologians was selected to suggest revisions. The final version was distributed to all at the conference, but it was not voted on or debated publicly. The theologians who suggested changes to the document were free to sign it. Other cosignatories were: Salvador Carrillo M.SP.S. (Mexico), Albert de Monleon O.P. (France), Francis Martin (Canada), Donatien Mollat S.J. (Italy), and Francis Sullivan S.J. (Italy).

<sup>238</sup> “One of the reasons for the restricted expectations is the tendency to describe the assistance of the Holy Spirit primarily in terms of the hierarchical ministry.” Ibid., 614-615.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid., 616. The statement explains tongues a gift allowing prayer at a deeper level; it is only one of a number of forms of prayer; it is the “lowest of the charisms” and, as such, it is not surprising that it is so common.

their unity.”<sup>240</sup> For the CCM, a Christian group so united on the proclamation of the Lordship of Jesus has the Spirit.

The basic premise that the proclamation of the Jesus’ Lordship indicates the Spirit’s presence is a key to beginning to understand the charismatic culture. Charismatic culture in this case refers to the social relationships between those who engaged in the LH for spiritual reasons at the birth of the movement, in both interdenominational and purely Catholic contexts, i.e. the Duquesne Weekend. Charismatic culture thrives on this understanding of the Spirit as renewing the lives of believers through “direct” contact with God, and thus the Church: “What is happening is a renewal in people’s relationship with God...The charismatic renewal involves a new experience of God...and the central concern of the charismatic renewal is that a deeper, experientially vital relationship with God the Father, in his Son, through his Spirit, should be the norm of Christian life.”<sup>241</sup> The working of the Spirit in the life of believers and of the church is the focus of the movement, and the movement’s claims of ecclesial legitimacy and historical rootedness are carried right up to the Second Vatican Council because of the council’s emphasis on renewal, particularly in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which speaks of the Spirit renewing the Church.<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., 619.

<sup>241</sup> Stephen B. Clark, “Charismatic Renewal in the Church,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 20.

<sup>242</sup> No. 4 is particularly relevant in respect to the CCM’s view of itself: “When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that He might continually sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father. He is the Spirit of Life, a fountain of water springing up to life eternal. To men, dead in sin, the Father gives life through Him, until, in Christ, He brings to life their mortal bodies. The Spirit dwells in the Church and in the hearts of the faithful, as in a temple. In them He prays on their behalf and bears witness to the fact that they are adopted sons. The Church, which the Spirit guides in way of all truth and which He unified in communion and in works of ministry, He both equips and directs with hierarchical and charismatic gifts and adorns with His fruits. By the power of the Gospel He makes the Church keep the freshness of youth. Uninterruptedly He renews it and leads it to perfect union with its Spouse. The Spirit and the Bride both say to Jesus, the Lord, ‘Come!’ Thus, the Church has been seen as ‘a

The answer to a significant question—is the Catholic Pentecostal movement, as it was in the early 1970s, the renewal of which Vatican II speaks—is not responded to with a definite yes by the movement, but there was also unambiguous language, within the first few years from its birth, on a stated goal of the movement to seek church renewal:

I believe that the charismatic renewal can be the vehicle whereby the life of the entire Catholic Church will be renewed. I believe that its potential is not merely to be a movement or a sect within the Church... The goal is a charismatically renewed Church, not a separate “pentecostal” organization “for people who go for that sort of thing.” Having some identity as a movement may be necessary for a time in order to accomplish the larger goal. But the larger goal is the significant one: a charismatically renewed Catholic Church.<sup>243</sup>

A message of identity through purpose is read in their identification of a goal.

Simultaneously, this statement that the movement can be a “vehicle” implies the question on what form this vehicle will take.

The Catholic Pentecostal experience from the beginning was the coming together in a community, even a short-lived one, to pray for the baptism in the Spirit with the LH. The movement that emerged was the formation of small communities united around this pentecostal experience. These communities are the prayer meetings of the Catholic charismatic groups that emerged from the spread of the movement, but there was something more. Ralph Martin refers to the forming of Christian communities in his opening statement in the February 1973 issue of *New Covenant*. This special issue of the magazine of the renewal, on the sixth anniversary of the Duquesne Weekend, spoke of the major changes already witnessed in the Church because of the renewal. The widespread experience of the renewal, namely through the experience of the baptism in

---

people made one with the unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.””  
[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19641121\\_lumen-gentium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html) (accessed March 20, 2016).

<sup>243</sup> George Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and the Church of Tomorrow,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 237.

the Spirit and the charisms, was influencing Christian life in all areas, “eventually blossoming in the development of vital Christian communities.”<sup>244</sup> This was based on an interpretation of the experience of a life in the Spirit as extending to a community life where this new knowledge in the Spirit, especially the charisms, could and should be grown and used for others:

The baptism in the Spirit can no longer be looked upon as an isolated religious experience; rather, it is the releasing of the power of the Spirit to build us into a living community in which the knowledge and experience of God can increase and grow, and in which men and women can be attracted daily to the life of the Lord as manifested in his body, his temple, his Church, his people, his community.<sup>245</sup>

Ralph Martin’s statement adds a different dimension to the notion that the Pentecostal experience has to do with coming into contact with God—now cultivating groups of people toward this end is natural outcome. Building a living community is a natural outcome because, according to Martin, those who have received the SS, thus entering into a union with God in love, should also share this in a community. “Yielding to God must mean yielding to a community form of life.”<sup>246</sup> In other words, literal “bodies of Christians” need other bodies for the charisms and “life in the Spirit” to mean anything other than a onetime experience. Martin uses John 17.20-23 and 1 Corinthians 12.12-27 to help support this idea, but also Acts 2.44-47. A biblical foundation is a key in nearly all aspects of the development of the CCM. But the movement also drew from its collective experience to steer itself based on how the first prayer groups formed.

Martin noted that it was a “common” thing for a prayer group to form after a small group of people had experienced the baptism in the Spirit. New people would

---

<sup>244</sup> “About this issue,” *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973): inside cover.

<sup>245</sup> Ralph Martin, “Life in Community,” in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 148. Note: Ralph Martin bears no relation to George Martin.

<sup>246</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

eventually come to be present at these meetings, who would eventually desire the baptism in the Spirit. But there would also be those who did not intend to ask for this experience. Martin warns that prayer groups, thus Christian communities, had to be unabashedly pentecostal in nature.<sup>247</sup> The greater point to be noted though is that, within a few years, the movement had noted among its own ranks the developments of patterns, and it sought to keep its ranks “pure” so to speak. Furthermore, the movement saw the uniquely pentecostal experience of baptism in the Spirit as fundamental: “The ‘full Gospel’ should be preached and lived in such a way that it would be impossible for a sizable number of people to continue to come without choosing for or against receiving the baptism of the Spirit and the manifestations which follow.”<sup>248</sup> Pentecostals, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, were known for a desire to share their experience, and the movement had now moved into a stage that sought to make it a norm.

An appropriate question at this point would be on the whereabouts of the LH in all of this community building. Martin mentions the experience of the baptism in the Spirit specifically, but not the LH. The LH can be assumed to be attached to almost any mention of the baptism in the Spirit after the Duquesne Weekend, especially in the context of prayer meetings. This is based on the personal testimony of witnesses as the goings on of the first meetings on the Notre Dame campus, such as the article of Mary Papa in the *National Catholic Register*, in addition to the first-hand accounts in the February 1973 issue of *New Covenant*, and the books by Laurentin, O’Connor, and the Ranaghans also attest to the presence of the practice. Given the frequency with which it is mentioned in the early testimonies, and that it is mentioned as a common practice at the

---

<sup>247</sup> Ibid., 153-54.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., 154.

first prayer meetings, it is likely that when prayer for the baptism of the Spirit is mentioned, the LH was used.<sup>249</sup> Martin's insistence on adhering to the pentecostal experience is immediately followed up with a chapter that hits home this point of the charismatic movement as containing cultural norms and practices from which deviation should not or could not occur.

Bert Ghezzi describes the emergence of charismatic communities in Michigan that all began in 1967 or 1968.<sup>250</sup> The details given of community practices make it clear that by this point in the life of the early CCM that the LH was virtually taken for granted. The language of "Spirit-led" communities Ghezzi describes carries forward Martin's thesis of the necessity of charismatic communities for the movement. Ghezzi and Martin strongly imply, if not outright declare, that the notion of an exclusive culture—which is not intent on excluding, quite the opposite—which has developed with a method for entry based on not just belief and shared values, but also invitation and style of worship, is a natural outcome of the movement. Further, they are being lead to this point, they will maintain, by the Holy Spirit.

The community in Grand Rapids, described as "heterogenous", i.e. interdenominational but mostly Catholic, began in someone's living room in November of 1967, less than a year after the Duquesne Weekend. Within three months, they outgrew the living room and had to move to a parish hall. In their first year of existence, Ghezzi describes the group as being "only a prayer group" because they did not have a way or method of leading people to the baptism in the Spirit. By 1968 the group began

---

<sup>249</sup> A notable testimony includes specific mention that the LH was not in play during this one particular instance of the experience of baptism in the Spirit. This is the case with Patti Gallagher at the Ark and the Dove mentioned in chapter 1. See *As By a New Pentecost* (Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1992), 39.

<sup>250</sup> Bertil W. Ghezzi, "Three Charismatic Communities," in Ranaghan, *As the Spirit Leads Us*, 164-86.

creating sub-communities to take care of its needs, as in prayer, music, leadership, and teaching. A whole team was dedicated to leading people to a baptism in the Spirit. The Tuesday night prayer meetings initially would consist of explaining to newcomers what the renewal meant, followed by the prayer meeting, and then an invitation for those who sought the baptism in the spirit: “The newcomers joined the assembly for the second part, and when it was finished we publicly laid hands on those desiring to pray for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. This continued for many months before we discovered this was too hasty and impersonal an approach.”<sup>251</sup> They stopped publicly praying for the baptism in the Spirit with the LH based on discoveries that some didn’t really understand it, and some hadn’t “committed their lives to Jesus.”<sup>252</sup> Their new method is explained as following the lead of charismatic communities in Ann Arbor and Detroit, so it had already been established in the movement. Now they would invite back newcomers who had heard the “introductory” talk in their first time attending. The following week, the newcomer would have a “personal interview” with a leader which included prayer, sharing, and questions. The two would also discuss if they thought the newcomer was ready for the baptism in the Spirit experience. If so: “We pray for him with the laying on of hands the following Tuesday evening. At the same time we began to ask of those on whom we laid hands to commit themselves to six teachings on growth in the life of the Spirit.” Ghezzi does not say that those who had received the Spirit were to come back for further teaching; he says those who had received the LH. The CCM does not place the LH above the baptism in the Spirit; on this they are univocal. The Grand Rapids community, in seeking to share the experience of the Spirit that its members had all

---

<sup>251</sup> Ibid., 176.

<sup>252</sup> Another reason given was that some of those who received the LH simply did not return, or those who did return “never seemed to go very deep in the Spirit.” Ibid. (176)

individually experienced was discriminating between newcomers who had received the LH and those who had not.

Many criticisms or critiques of the movement approach this topic of elitism or exclusionary tendencies.<sup>253</sup> It is true, to be fair, that their best intentions are to “listen” to the Holy Spirit in communal prayer and bring people together and closer to God, through this now ritualistic experience: teaching, discernment, discussion, prayer and the LH, followed by teaching, and continued life in the community. Ghezzi, who was a member of the Grand Rapids community, explains: “We began to see that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was only one part of a process God was using to lead men into union with him. We learned that he intended the baptism in the Holy Spirit to build men into union with each other in a community which would be a local expression of the body of Christ.”<sup>254</sup> In other words, the Spirit-experience was only a first step in a life in the Spirit, but it is never referred to directly as an initiation in any form. Because this was a mostly Catholic group,<sup>255</sup> though an interdenominational community, it may be that the question of interference with the sacraments never had to be broached, and thus their method of

---

<sup>253</sup> Francis A. Sullivan exhorted leadership in the movement to guard against anything that leads to alienation. Language was called out as a likely candidate because of terms like “baptism in the Spirit,” “Spirit-filled,” “life in the Spirit,” etc. The word “charismatic” is called to task because it divides Catholics immediately into two groups. This was in agreement with other critics, such as Yves Congar, who disliked the terms “charismatic” and “baptism in the Spirit” when rightly all Catholics had received the Spirit. So to speak of a “non-charismatic” was to deny this and to suggest that the pentecostal experience was the only way to be “charismatic.” This line of thought leads to the question of what is a charism, and who is charismatic. Sullivan holds that the CCM at the time was narrowing the sense of the word to specific phenomena like glossolalia, or prophecy. Ironically, it was Cardinal Suenens, a proponent of the CCM, who at Vatican II defended the inclusion of the charisms in the council documents based on the Pauline interpretation, which was much broader: any gift of grace that worked for the up building of the Church. Cardinal Ruffini who “lost” the argument, was for the narrower view of the unique phenomena of the charisms, which Sullivan claims the CCM was tending towards. “Ecclesiological Context of the Charismatic Renewal,” in *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1975), 133-36. Cf. “Cardinal Suenens on the Charismatic Renewal,” *New Covenant* 2, no. 1 (1972): 6-7.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 177.

<sup>255</sup> Ghezzi reports that it was about 70% Catholic, though it is unclear if this was at its “current” peak in 1970 or 1971, around when the book was published, or if it was at the onset. Ibid., 172.



induction could safely be removed from discussion of initiation of any sort; they were simply realizing or actualizing graces already received. The mention of building union between people in a community that is the expression of the body of Christ highlights the mention of the practice of LH even more significant. The desire to build Christian communities in this Spirit-led fashion meant that the LH had to become—yes necessarily, even given the claims of the movement that it was not necessary for reception of the SS—an unofficial yet clearly visible and preferred rite labeled as the first step into a transformed life.

A community of bodies for the CCM at this time meant a unity in body. The Ann Arbor community, which Ghezzi also describes, began in November 1967 as well, but grew at a more rapid pace.<sup>256</sup> In many ways, its growth mirrored what occurred in Grand Rapids. It started in a home setting, which it quickly outgrew, once a week on Thursday nights. It had made such a significant impact in the area that it attracted hundreds of people in the eastern region of Michigan, according to Ghezzi. Because of the massive size it took, by 1969 a Monday night prayer meeting was created “for Christians living around the university who were baptized in the Holy Spirit and who were become more strongly knit together. This community has drawn together about 200 students and other young men and women who were already sharing their Christian lives in prayer meetings, liturgies, households, common apostolates and in other ways.”<sup>257</sup> The character of the Ann Arbor community was unique from the beginning because of this fact of its development. The group may be able to be criticized for many things, but wanting to be

---

<sup>256</sup> Many of the original members were leaders at the birth of the CCM including Jim Cavnar, Steve Clark, Ralph Martin, and Gerry Rauch. Ibid., 180.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid., 180-81.

around others who shared a common experience and style of worship is not one of them.

The significance of this decision speaks for itself.

The central event for the core community is the Monday prayer meeting. This meeting is not a public gathering but an assembly to which one is invited after he receives the baptism in the Holy Spirit and commits himself to the community. The Monday meeting has no definite structure; it usually begins with an exhortation from the leader for the evening and commonly includes spontaneous prayer, manifestations of the charismatic gifts, reading from Scripture, and song. Frequently one of the leaders gives a prepared talk which lasts about 15 minutes. At the end of the meeting new members are introduced and everyone prays for them as they receive them into the community.<sup>258</sup>

This group of Pentecostals—mostly young and students, and Catholic, but also Protestant—had quickly developed a closed culture. The private meeting required an invitation and, though the LH is not mentioned explicitly here nor as a requirement, the sharing in the Spirit experience was named, and it implicitly carries with it the act of the LH.

Like the Grand Rapids community, the baptism in the Spirit became viewed and taught as a more than just an initiatory experience. Ghezzi uses the word to explain the development of the Ann Arbor community:

As the community matured, it learned that being baptized in the Holy Spirit meant being initiated into a deep union both with God and with other men. It also began to understand that there was much more to Christian initiation than praying for the baptism in the Holy Spirit... What God has done has been to renew the whole process of Christian initiation, so that when people become members of the Ann Arbor community they effectively put their lives in the hands of the living God.<sup>259</sup>

The sense that this community was becoming something much more than just a group of people who liked to get together to read the bible, pray together in a certain way, and talk about their faith lives was far removed at this point. The notion of being formally accepted into the “core” group was firmly established and standardized. Ghezzi states

---

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 181.

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 182.

that they developed what were called “Living Life in the Spirit Seminars,” and these had come to be a series of six one-hour sessions, in use since 1969. On the fourth meeting of the series, “the team prays with laying on of hands for all those in the group who are ready to seek and receive the fullness of the Spirit.”<sup>260</sup> The LH was now a fully recognized rite in a self-acknowledged initiation process. Furthermore, the group played a major role in determining when and if an aspirant was “ready” to seek and receive the Spirit. The CCM at this point is clear that it does not give or control the Spirit, but the outright declaration, though always expressed in the language of being led by the Spirit, that the “team” was playing a role in growing the body of Christ meant that the LH, now essentially a pathway, had come to mean much more than the traditional Catholic sacramental had meant in other contexts.

There are many other aspects of these first charismatic communities that invite deeper study, but all of this charismatic community life was understood plainly as a renewal, maturing or growing of the body of Christ.<sup>261</sup> The role the LH served in the establishment of a distinctly Catholic charismatic culture was not clearly defined by the movement theologically, but its prominence in initiation in some communities made it appear to be mandatory. Years before Suenens would remark about the Spirit as a current,

---

<sup>260</sup> Ibid., 183.

<sup>261</sup> The Ann Arbor community developed sub-communities, nine by 1970. They consisted of members of the Monday night prayer group who lived near each other. There were even members who committed to living groups; there were four in 1970. All the sub-communities and living groups prayed together, studied Scripture, encouraged each other in the faith, and engaged in many outward social and evangelistic activities. The living groups focused on even more specific purposes: One group of men, for instance, was engaged mostly in evangelism on campus and around town. Some even developed a type of charism: A living group of men agreed to love each other “radically” by forgiving, exhorting, encouraging, and instructing each other. The Ann Arbor community as a whole was exceptionally active in the charismatic renewal. They did much of the teaching at the annual national conferences and travelled around the country to teach. Ghezzi claims there were “hundreds of sister communities” to the three he was describing, from Canada to Florida. Ibid., 183-86. The Word of God Community is the result of these first charismatic communities and exists today in Ann Arbor doing essentially what the first communities did, and lists five pillars to their vision: ecumenical, charismatic, missionary, Christian, community. See <http://thewordofgodcommunity.org/>.

the LH had already been designated as the flood gates. Where the first Catholic Pentecostals were seeking to share their Spirit experience with others through the LH, the charismatic communities mediated access to a Christian community life and a Spirit experience with the same hands. A hasty indictment of the movement as micromanaging a religious experience overlooks the undeniable visible changes witnessed in people's lives, indeed transformation in some cases, because they received the LH in a context of prayer and community, surrender and reaching out. The question of the authenticity of the claims made by those baptized in the Spirit is best judged on a case-by-case basis, person to person. The question of the social status and theological significance of the LH for the community and the movement is what requires deeper introspection.

The status of the LH in community life is inadequately addressed after the first two years, and the treatments given it by O'Connor and the Ranaghans are largely insufficiently answered by the movement given its key role in determining inclusion and standing. The language of initiation is unambiguous. The LH as a social currency meted out demands a justification of its theological resourcefulness. If the LH can be given a theological explanation that maintains its status as a sacramental, but which also carries the heavy weight with which these types of Spirit-led communities came to place on it, the voice of a serious interlocutor must be accessed.

CHAPTER 4  
RENEWAL AND THE SPIRIT:  
THE CHARISM OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

The ritual and communal nature of the LH as used in the beginning of the CCM indicates an elevated status. The movement steadily maintains that the baptism in the Spirit can be achieved without the LH, but their meetings and even the spontaneous manifestations of charismatic spiritual activity in people is almost always finds someone imposing hands in the moment, in some cases when unsolicited. Their account of it as a sacramental or prayer in action subtly downplays its seemingly central role to their earnest sharing of their faith. The LH as they used it can be explained theologically in respect to a Spirit-centered understanding of the Church as detailed by Heribert Mühlen. For Mühlen, the Church is related to Christ in the Spirit, which may help the CCM develop a theological basis for its ritual of the LH accompanied by prayer.

*Heribert Mühlen*

“As I looked into the charismatic renewal I was amazed to see many of my theological observations about the Holy Spirit happening in the daily lives of people. I was overjoyed.”<sup>262</sup> Mühlen first came to hear about the charismatic renewal from an unnamed Taiwanese priest visiting Germany in January of 1971. The priest told Mühlen,

---

<sup>262</sup> “An Interview with Fr. Heribert Mühlen: Theologian of the Holy Spirit,” *New Covenant* 4, no. 1 (1974): 3-6.

that while he had the Holy Spirit in his books, he wanted to talk to Mühlen about what was going on in the world. After their conversation, the priest “flabbergasted” Mühlen with a simple request: “Now, let’s pray.” As it was not a common thing for theologians to pray with people with whom they were having a discussion on theology, according to Mühlen, he explained how this simple act stirred in him a desire he had felt for 15 years to help the entire church be more open to the work of the Spirit. But his first direct contact was with Protestant Pentecostals at a session of the Vatican-Pentecostal dialogues in Zurich.<sup>263</sup> Later that year, he viewed a film on the charismatic community in Ann Arbor, and he started his own prayer meeting the next day at this university.<sup>264</sup>

Mühlen’s relationship with the CCM has been described by Vondey as a “temporary solidarity,” because he saw a hope for a renewal of the Church in the unity he witnessed in the movement. Mühlen never worked explicitly towards theological defenses of what was occurring in the movement. Nevertheless, his own words show that he had much in common with the movement:

Baptism in the Spirit has been a gradual process over a period of six to eight months. I am praying more now and reading Scripture...to personally respond to the Lord who speaks to us in Scripture. I also find myself drawn to the prayer meetings, and a growing joy in being with other Christians simply as a fellow Christian, and not as such an imposing things as a professor of dogmatic theology...I have no doubt that the Holy Spirit himself is acting with power in the

---

<sup>263</sup> The dialogues were set out to be a series of meetings to cover various issues over the course of five years, and occurred in large part due to the efforts of noted Pentecostal leader David du Plessis and Kilian McDonnell, Catholic Pentecostal scholar. The first series was 1972-1976, one meeting being held each year in a different city. The first meeting in June 1972 focused on an exegetical approach “in order to study ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’ in the New Testament, its relation to repentance and the process of sanctification and the relation of the charismata to it.” *Final Report of the Dialogue Between the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity of the Roman Catholic Church and Leaders of some Pentecostal Churches and Participants in the Charismatic Movement within Protestant and Anglican Churches: 1972-1976*, [http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pontifical\\_councils/chrstuni/pentecostals/rc\\_pc\\_chrstuni\\_doc\\_1972-1976\\_final-report-pentecostals\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/pentecostals/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_1972-1976_final-report-pentecostals_en.html) .

<sup>264</sup> “Interview with Mühlen,” 4.

charismatic renewal and that this will have profound implications for the lives of many individuals like myself, and for the church as a whole.<sup>265</sup>

Mühlen's testimony about his Spirit experience is given at a transitional period of his life and career. His recollection of his own baptism in the Spirit mirrors that of so many other recorded testimonies, though he does not indicate whether the LH was used on him or not. He had been known as a theologian of the Spirit many years prior to this interview, and clearly, he was drawn to the movement in part because of his own pneumatology, as well as the movement's emphasis on renewal. Later he would even pen a guide for spiritual renewal, which was meant to be accessible to Protestants and Catholics: *A Charismatic Theology*.<sup>266</sup>

This book was meant for small congregations focusing on renewal; it is split into two parts, which are each split into seven week periods, and each week is split into seven days, each focusing on a different aspect of the faith. It's structure does remind one of the six-week "Living the Life in the Spirit" seminars developed in the Ann Arbor charismatic communities. But to be best understood, *A Charismatic Theology* should be seen in the context of his life up to that point.<sup>267</sup> It is for this reason that a brief biographical sketch of his life will be given, with attention to specific experiences of his own renewal in order to frame his relationship with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal accurately—his relationship with the CCM was during a middle point of his life that is characterized as

---

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>266</sup> Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit*, trans. Edward Quinn and Thomas Linton (New York: Paulist Press, 1978).

<sup>267</sup> Mühlen was not attempting to mirror or improve on the "life in the Spirit" seminars, but any casual observer of the CCM and his work will note the resemblance. His book is divided into two parts: the first geared toward a leader or pastor, and the second toward the seeker of renewal. Each part has a seven week structure in which the faithful are guided in reflection, prayer, and spiritual renewal. It is intended for use in a parish or church setting as a renewal program. His process is regarded as well-grounded systematically and exegetically.

“transitional” by scholars of Mühlen such as Vondey and Gwan-Hee Kim<sup>268</sup>. Then, Mühlen’s understanding of renewal will be distinguished on a key point from the notion of renewal as typically found in the CCM at this time: his approach to renewal was based on the idea that ecumenical diversity could be a starting point for unity and the renewal of all Christian churches. Mühlen’s pneumatology will be explored with particular focus on how the one Spirit is one and the same in many churches. This ecumenical formulation of Mühlen’s pneumatology will provide a theological framework from which to understand the birth and rapid growth of the CCM and its reliance on the LH. A constructive and ecumenical appraisal of the use of the LH during the birth and growth of the early CCM will then be given where the LH as a dynamic act of the congregation can strengthen the Church through the renewal of its members.

### *A Time for Renewal*

Mühlen had studied theology and philosophy at the University of Bonn beginning in 1946, and then earned his doctorate in philosophy at the University of Freiburg in 1951,<sup>269</sup> en route to his ordination in 1955. He was a vicar for a brief period and then continued on an academic path. Notably, he studied under Karl Rahner for a year and completed his doctorate in theology in Münster in 1963. Wolfgang Vondey states that his dissertation *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, and his follow-up *Una Mystica Persona*, brought him quick notice in the theological community; his habilitation work at the University of Munich “was praised as an ‘ecclesiological event’” by Alois Winklhofer in a review of Mühlen’s second publication. Mühlen was, in a sense, at the forefront of a renewed interest in pneumatology and ecclesiology. He garnered praise from

---

<sup>268</sup> Wolfgang Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile of the Church* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), xxxiv-xxxvii.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., xiii. His dissertation: *Sein und Person nach Johannes Duns Scotus*.



contemporary greats Karl Barth and Hans Urs von Balthasar, and was a *peritus* at Vatican II. He became Professor of Dogmatic Theology and History at the Theological Faculty Paderborn in April of 1964.<sup>270</sup>

The so-called transitional phase of Mühlen's career from 1965-1990 is where his theology gets mislabeled as a charismatic theology. He took part in the newly created Roman Catholic-Pentecostal dialogues beginning in 1972, and it was from this encounter and his later contact with the CCM that one critic, Gwan-Hee Kim, states was the impetus for his turning more away from speculative theology towards pneumatopraxis.<sup>271</sup> Kim argues that Mühlen had a "pneumatological conversion," in regards to the role of the Spirit in the Incarnation, when he changed to insisting that the sending of the Spirit could be prior to that of the Son: thus, a personal experience of the Spirit in the Church is an experience with Jesus. This notion of encountering the person of Jesus through the work of the Holy Spirit found strong parallel with the Catholic charismatic communities of the time because of their emphasis on a personal encounter with God through the baptism in the Spirit. But Mühlen had always maintained that there was no such thing as a "distinct charismatic spirituality or theology" and he did not write on behalf of or in promotion of the CCM. Further confusion on how deeply imbedded into the CCM he truly was may have been magnified by his 1976 work *Einübung in die christliche Grunderfahrung, vol. 1, Lehre und Zuspruch*, which had the unfortunate and misleading translation of *A Charismatic Theology*.<sup>272</sup> This book did exhibit Mühlen's movement during this period of his life toward a praxis of Christian renewal based on a

---

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., xiv.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid., 162-63.

<sup>272</sup> Ibid., xix, xlvin20. The German title of this work translates roughly as "initiation into the fundamental Christian experience." Ibid., xix, xlvin20.

“pneumatology from below” approach where the church is the experience of the Spirit of Christ.<sup>273</sup> Mühlen was committed fully to pneumato-praxis, and this transitional time forms the basis of his later focus solely on church and spiritual reform.<sup>274</sup> His understanding of the person of the Holy Spirit as a fundamental doctrine and reality of the church infused his work to the end of his career, but it is in this transitional phase where his association with the CCM takes place and ultimately ended.

Mühlen’s “temporary solidarity” with the CCM takes place during this transitional period of his life.<sup>275</sup> The temporary relationship was built on Mühlen’s fascination with the renewal aspect of the movement; both Mühlen and the movement had a similar focus on the communal context of renewal. As charismatic communities were firmly established in parts of the US like Michigan, Mühlen was telling the CCM that the “charismatic renewal” was the response of God to the call in Vatican II for a more collegial and communal authority in the church, and that the church was in the middle of “epochal change...God dwelt in Jesus, the new temple, and as we become joined to Jesus, God dwells in us...That’s why it’s so important that we know that God is not primarily present in church buildings, but in us, the people of God.”<sup>276</sup> According to Vondey, Mühlen’s orientation towards spiritual renewal at this period of his career finds its beginning at the end of the Council, his last day in fact. Mühlen reflects in a journal entry he made in St. Peter’s Basilica from near the baldachino altar canopy and the window of the gold dove:

---

<sup>273</sup> Ibid., xxxv-xxxviii. Vondey adds: “Mühlen himself describes it as the logical consequence and final result of his life-long endeavor in theology and praxis...This liturgy symbolizes the climax of his theological and practical work and represents in its far-reaching ecumenical significance a challenge to the theology and praxis of all Christian churches.”

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., xiv-xv. His later books focus on pneumato-praxis culminating in the introduction of a reform liturgy in 1992, found in *Kirch wächst von innen*.

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., 162.

<sup>276</sup> “Interview with Mühlen,” 4.

Somewhat melancholy, I listen into the hall...and then there is again this window, jumping at me as it was nine years ago when I came here for the first time; this window far away at the end of the auditorium behind the giant canopy of Bernini, small, but shining brightly in Pentecostal yellow. In the last weeks I had to look again and again at this tiny spot, and I absorbed it, the splendid framework hardly bothers me anymore. I remain standing at the entrance for a while and look once more at the auditorium...And then this window comes towards me, joining together with the confusion of voices. The thought strikes me: Holy Spirit among this assembly of bishops, in this confusion of languages from all over the world! This voice will remain! Increasingly, I believe to hear [*sic*] only one voice, as in a choir carried over from afar. This is the voice of the one Spirit, the one Church, the council! One Spirit in the many, one person in many persons: mystery of unity of the many languages, colors of skin, opinions. The divine we in the human we! Holy Spirit, present throughout the sinful history of the Church and into the last hours of this council, in spite of and contrary to all sin! I want to pray, give thanks. *Veni Sancte Spiritus, veni lumen concordium*...I listen to myself in surprise, as this hymn rises up from inside of me and know suddenly: gifts of the Spirit will arise, renewal will come, renewal out of this one Spirit in the many churches...<sup>277</sup>

His melancholy reflection, ending with a jolt of spiritual perception or hopeful renewal so to speak, anticipates not only his own experience with the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogues he would be commissioned to participate in throughout the 1970s and 1980s, but also his own personal renewal.

Mühlen's first encounter with Pentecostals in 1972 would have implications for his life that would surprise even him. Soon after this first meeting with Pentecostals, he met the Taiwanese missionary, and they shared an uncommon experience, prayer: "After about twenty minutes of prayer of [*sic*] my Christian brother I was therefore completely shocked about my inability to answer. I could not even say, Amen."<sup>278</sup> Then, eight months after he had started his own prayer group in Paderborn when he had viewed the film about the Ann Arbor community, he was participating in spiritual exercises with the Archdiocese and a small group of priests. They were invited to renew their baptismal,

---

<sup>277</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 133-34; Cf. *Ibid.*, 162.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, 163.

confirmation, and ordination promises. Revelation 3.20 was read, which turned out to be profound for Mühlen.<sup>279</sup> He would say about this experience:

For the first time in my life, it became clear to me. Either this is a meaningless poetic phrase or this is really the glorified Christ speaking; and that is what is meant in Revelation...I struggled for three days and said, “Dear God, I am, after all, a professor of theology. You cannot expect me to do this!...I stepped forward after receiving communion, said what I wished to ask from God at that hour, and requested prayer and blessing from those present. I did not “feel” anything by doing this since it was for me a simple step in obedience to a call from God. But to my surprise, a few days later I noticed how prayer started within me and the psalms flowed out of me with an unknown intensity...I have analyzed this event in all the directions of a psychology of religion, but I cannot escape the thought that in it was given to me the original experience of baptism which the New Testament reports.<sup>280</sup>

Mühlen’s self-described Spirit experience led this turn into more practical theology that had ecumenical implications. This experience was the focal point in his life from where he could say there was a proverbial “before” and “after,” where the “after” is clearly centered on a theology centered on renewal which invites others to experience the same.<sup>281</sup> He established seminars, prayer meetings and other renewal services around Europe in schools, universities, and churches. It was within this period of personal renewal and church renewal that he penned *A Charismatic Theology*, a handbook for pastoral renewal at the local level, and had a working relationship with the CCM. In 1977, Mühlen even set up an office for Catholic congregational reform in Paderborn, but this office had nothing to do with the CCM. This office produced a journal where Mühlen wrote out his “Guidelines for Congregational Renewal” in its first issue, which he held were not in the interests of forming or supporting a movement or specific spirituality. He

---

<sup>279</sup> “Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will enter his house and dine with him, and he with me” (NAB).

<sup>280</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 164.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid, 165. E.g., Mühlen invited bishops to renew their promises of ordination at a prayer services with German bishops and cardinals in 1975. He was also took part in forming CREDO, Catholic Agency for the Renewal of Faith and Evangelization, which stressed renewal of sacramental promises, not just those of initiation, but also marriage and ordination.

did advocate “spirit renewal,” which meant repentance, acceptance of baptismal graces, and acceptance of charisms.<sup>282</sup>

Mühlen’s personal renewal experience likely colored his perception of the CCM and intensified any hope he saw in it for the church. But the congruencies that can be made between his theological thought and the development of the movement are hard to find.

#### *Consonance to the CCM*

The CCM and Mühlen shared a belief in the importance of the small community context for encouraging and facilitating personal renewal experiences for its members. Mühlen had in mind, however, a larger universal and ecumenical notion of how a charismatic renewal included all Christian churches. The CCM, as the name implies, was focused from early on and saw as its Spirit-led goal to renew the entire Catholic Church. The movement could not reconcile what it saw as fundamental cultural differences of the Protestant Pentecostal churches with traditional Catholic spirituality. Any consonance found between Mühlen and the CCM boils down to the unity of the churches in the Spirit and the manifestation of charisms as gifts for building up the body of Christ. While both had a different sense of long-term or of large-scale renewal, they both began with the community or the congregation.

The idea of congregational renewal holds a specific meaning for Mühlen because of his sense of the word “congregation,” which for Mühlen meant something more personal than “parish.” While the latter term holds its traditional meaning for Mühlen, the former highlights his concern to “revitalize in small groups the traditions that are already present in the parish in order to make possible a renewal of the entire local Christian

---

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 166.

community and, ultimately, the immediate social world of the Christian.”<sup>283</sup> In one sense, the charismatic communities embodied much of what Mühlen was looking for in real-life, concrete manifestations of congregational renewal while respecting the individual tradition of the church experiencing renewal.

The CCM held closely to the purpose of sharing the spirit experience of its members, and did not call for a separation from the Catholic Church, but in fact maintained the superiority of the sacraments and traditional devotions such as the rosary and Eucharistic adoration. In this, there are easily identifiable congruencies to the CCM and their establishment of “Spirit-led” communities, intent on renewing the Church one person at a time. The most obvious embodiment of local-level congregational renewal in the CCM were the prayer meetings, which were typically small, though the ones that spawned the larger charismatic communities, in places like South Bend and Ann Arbor, grew into the hundreds. The typical prayer meetings, bibles studies, and other apostolic outreaches of the charismatic communities were small and in support of or attached to local Catholic parishes. This type of local-level, small group, congregational renewal also shared some of the understanding Mühlen had about what spirit renewal meant in so far as it viewed baptism in the Spirit as a revitalization of baptismal graces. While this understanding of renewal may sound analogous to the CCM’s understanding of baptism in the Spirit, because of its emphasis on graces already present in the person receiving the LH, Mühlen’s relations with the movement were limited to the purposes of attempting to incorporate its “theological emphases” into his newly formulated focus on ecclesial

---

<sup>283</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, xviii-xix. Vondey is explaining that, as a general rule when reading Mühlen, the word Mühlen used for local Christian community, *Gemeinde*, means more than just the geographic and administering parish.

praxis and pneumato-praxis of the Catholic Church. Vondey notes that Mühlen's attempt to do this ultimately failed.

The Catholic-Pentecostal dialogues showed Mühlen that ecumenical hope was justified and a real possibility. During the 1970s and 1980s, Mühlen's ideas of ecumenical praxis and charismatic renewal were essentially the same—both aimed at church renewal. But Mühlen's particular definition of charismatic renewal meant “ecumenical congregational-renewal, in which the spiritual inheritance of the currently separated churches and spiritual traditions is preserved and renewed with direction toward the future.”<sup>284</sup> This was the key to distinguishing his thought from the “goals and structures” of the CCM. While the first Catholic Pentecostals participated in interdenominational prayer meetings, mostly after the Duquesne Weekend, and some of the first charismatic communities in Michigan were ecumenically diverse, the movement in the Catholic Church drifted slowly towards homogeneity, i.e. inter-denominationalism. Mühlen truly did believe in one Church and the one Spirit, and in that sense formulated renewal from an ecumenical means and towards an ecumenical end based on this Spirit-renewal:

It is impossible *a priori* to question the true and authentic experience of the Spirit granted in these and other awakenings or to deny that the major Churches must face the question as to whether they have culpably closed themselves up against these experiences: whether they are to blame for the fact that new Churches have been formed, thus leading to further division in Christendom...It may be regarded as a special gift that Catholics and Protestants can produce together an initiation into the renewal of their *respective* Churches...Particular emphasis must be laid on the fact that *the inner dynamism of the charismatic renewal is directed, not to a new charismatic Church (Church of the Spirit), but to a charismatically renewed Church*....The awakening of the gifts of the Spirit in *all* the major Christian Churches can lead to the restoration of our lost unity only under the further guidance of the Spirit of God.<sup>285</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., 167, 171.

<sup>285</sup> Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology*, 16-18. (Emphasis Mühlen's).

Mühlen had a truly universal end in mind as he believed that the charisms of the respective churches could be used to the mutual benefit of all the Christian churches.

The CCM focused on a Catholic renewal, which may have stemmed from ecumenical support at its birth, but did not appraise any advantage for growth in the ecclesial differences.<sup>286</sup> The CCM, interested in ecumenism, saw divisions and differences to be approached from a position of respect. There was no plan for universal renewal or for unity. The historical and theological differences between Protestants and Catholics were proclaimed by the CCM as being overcome by the trans-cultural experience in the Spirit, but the movement looked to Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* to maintain a position of respect and understanding, and if anything, to maintain so-called cultural distinctions.

Kevin Ranaghan wrote of the relationship between Protestant Pentecostals and Catholic Pentecostals:

While we must be extremely careful that what takes place under the name of charismatic renewal is to the best of our knowledge the authentic work of the Holy Spirit among us...we must also be extremely careful not to import into the Catholic charismatic movement those purely human elements which properly and rightly belong among classical pentecostals as part of their religious and cultural traditions. These elements frequently have no place in the Catholic theological, spiritual, and cultural tradition, and they have little resonance with contemporary American Catholicism.<sup>287</sup>

Ranaghan understands these differences between Catholic Pentecostals and classical Pentecostals as cultural. Much leadership in the CCM would reflect this growing good-

---

<sup>286</sup> Cf. George Martin: "I believe that the charismatic renewal can be the vehicle whereby the life of the entire Catholic Church will be renewed...its potential is not merely to be a movement or a sect within the Church...but to infuse and renew the entire Church...But the larger goal is the significant one: a charismatically renewed Catholic Church." "Charismatic Renewal and the Church of Tomorrow," in *As the Spirit Leads Us*, eds. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 244.

<sup>287</sup> "Catholics and Pentecostals Meet in the Spirit," in *Ibid.*, 135; Cf. *Ibid.*, 125-29.



willed isolationism toward Protestant churches. And while Ranaghan cited heavily the *Decree on Ecumenism*, particularly numbers two through nine, he was interested in showing how the faithful Catholic should relate to his or her “separated brethren.” Ranaghan further argued that the “cultural envelope” in which the Protestants have received the gifts of the Spirit is “not the essence of the experience itself.” He would say in fact that the renewal in the “Church today” is the “essence of a renewal of life in the Holy Spirit.” He concludes that it is a grave error to think that since Catholics had received the baptism in the Spirit, they were obliged or required to take on aspects of “pentecostal culture.”<sup>288</sup> On the other hand, Mühlen’s reading of the *Decree on Ecumenism*, paragraph four in particular,<sup>289</sup> understood the “fullness of catholicity” to mean that a relationship of all churches, universally, was necessary to realize what he called the convergence of churches toward a common future. For Mühlen, the one Church is made up of the many churches by virtue of the Spirit’s presence in them.<sup>290</sup> The CCM was not trying to express theologically or find ecclesial praxis based on a pneumatology where the one church was constituted by the same Spirit which inhabited all churches—this was Mühlen’s goal. But both the CCM and Mühlen thought that all Christian churches were united by the Spirit and the charisms.

The height of Mühlen’s associations with the CCM was undoubtedly during the 1970s. But even then, though he maintained that the charismatic renewal had great promise in being able to reunite Christians, he would say: “Each church has to build up

---

<sup>288</sup> Ibid., 128-29.

<sup>289</sup> “Nevertheless, the divisions among Christians prevent the Church from attaining the fullness of catholicity proper to her, in those of her sons who, though attached to her by Baptism, are yet separated from full communion with her. Furthermore, the Church herself finds it more difficult to express in actual life her full catholicity in all her bearings.” Paul VI, *Decree on Ecumenism*, 4.

<sup>290</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 167.

the other churches with their [spiritual] gift and receive the gifts of the other churches. No church, including the Catholic Church, has experienced all the gifts fully.”<sup>291</sup> He added that churches need the gifts of the other churches to be complete. This, in stark contrast to what leaders in the CCM were writing, indicates simply that he envisioned a praxis that integrated divergent traditions. He held that Christians had a right to their own tradition and theology, granted they did not claim a right to force it on others.<sup>292</sup> Certainly, the CCM would agree with that statement; the CCM did not claim to desire integration of traditions in their renewal.<sup>293</sup> The birth and rapid growth of Catholic Pentecostalism indicated that there were many Catholics who desired a more deeply personal encounter in their faith and in making decisions about how to publicly confess and profess that faith. One of the ultimate barriers Mühlen perceived in trying to integrate principles of the charismatic renewal into ecclesial praxis was that the churches were overly structured, to the point that such personal, public, and deep experiences of faith were not possible, especially in the interests of ecumenism, which Mühlen held even more highly than the CCM.<sup>294</sup> In other words, the CCM encompassed this challenge by virtue of its own existence; its goal of renewing by forming communities without was incapable of applying pressure to the established church’s social framework. Thus, the type of renewal which Mühlen envisioned could not be arrived at through the vehicle of the CCM.

---

<sup>291</sup> “Interview with Mühlen,” 6.

<sup>292</sup> Heribert Mühlen, “Steps Toward a Universal Council of Christians,” *Theology Digest* 21, no. 3 (1973): 199.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. Ibid. Mühlen argued from tradition. The theological traditions of the Jews and the Greeks were not eliminated by Christianity, but were integrated: “There is preserved within the New Testament a Christology of Aramaic-speaking coinage different from a Christology which developed among those who spoke Greek...Hence Eph 2:14-18 could see the unique primacy of Christ precisely in breaking down the iron curtain and making Jews and Greeks into *one*, without making them *alike*.” (Emphasis Mühlen’s).

<sup>294</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 178-79.

Mühlen distanced himself from the movement from 1985.<sup>295</sup> After that point, his concern for ecumenical unity remained, with the awareness of the Holy Spirit's presence and operation in all churches. Still, much of his vision for ecumenical unity did align with the values of the early CCM: communal engagement between churches, identification and practice of charisms for the benefit of the community, and openness to the action and witness to the concrete manifestations of the Spirit. Mühlen's notion of the Spirit as "one person in many persons" could be transposed ecumenically as "The Holy Spirit is one and the same in the many churches,"<sup>296</sup> which could be argued for strongly as the thesis for the movement itself. The goal of this study, however, is not to take Mühlen's ideas of renewal and lay them upon the movement itself. Rather, the LH can be evaluated in light of how Mühlen understands the Spirit's relation to the Church. Mühlen's pneumatology, in respect to its ecumenical formulation as the one Spirit being one and the same in many churches, provides a theological framework from which to understand the outbreak of the movement, leading to a constructive and ecumenical appraisal of the use of the LH during the birth and growth of the early CCM.

Before proceeding to a study of Mühlen's pneumatology, it should be noted in some more detail what he meant by charismatic renewal, and what became of his work for renewal after dissociating himself from the CCM.

### *Charismatic Renewal and Spirit-Experience*

---

<sup>295</sup> Ibid., 172. From the late 1970s, one point Mühlen had become critical of the CCM on was the operation of the Spirit in the Church, in regards specifically to the gifts of the Spirit: "As the history of the Church shows, human beings start being deeply moved when they open up to the Spirit of God, and at the same time the fundamentally concupiscent state of human existence emerges, [i.e.] dubious motives, begging for recognition, up to the tendency to abuse the gifts of the Spirit in a sublime indulgence of the self. For this reason, the vital question of the contemporary renewal is the discernment of spirits."

<sup>296</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 167.

Simply stated, the separation of the churches was not necessarily a bad thing in Mühlen's thinking. The historical separation of the churches was a starting point for renewal and Christian unity for Mühlen, because the converging of the plurality of churches imaged the plurality of the divine "we," the Trinity. Mühlen envisioned an ecumenical praxis which reestablished Christian unity based on the Spirit's presence in all Christian churches, which required the cooperation of the churches to reestablish a visible unity. Mühlen had a workable plan to make this praxis a reality by means of a universal council of Christians.<sup>297</sup> He identified three steps: self-discovery, in which each church recognizes its particular charisms and those of other churches; openness, in which each church evaluates whether it has used its particular Spirit-gifts or charisms for the enriching of the other churches; assimilation, in which churches critically assimilate that which it can from other churches in respect to its own traditions.<sup>298</sup> With these steps he argued for a call to a universal council of Christians that would allow the churches to live the visible unity to which they are called as bearers of Christ's Spirit.

This goal of visible unity was based on 1 Corinthians 12.7,<sup>299</sup> where he identifies that the "manifestation" or "evidencing" which the Spirit grants is like the Logos in the Incarnation; this *phanerosis*, evidencing or manifestation, is the Spirit's self-showing in a visible reality—there is literally a phenomenon of the Spirit via the charisms. These "phenomenon" given for the benefit of others expresses the idea of *sympheron*, which he translates as "all-around best advantage," where help and collaboration are both implied. Thus, he translates this verse as: "The Spirit is made concretely perceptible in each one in

---

<sup>297</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 168.

<sup>298</sup> Mühlen, "Universal Council of Christians," 197. He further identified three methods for these steps: dialogue, convergence, and consensus.

<sup>299</sup> "To each individual the *manifestation* of the Spirit is given for *some benefit*" (NAB). (Emphasis mine.)

proportion as there is a trend toward togetherness.”<sup>300</sup> As there is a diversity of gifts in multiple individuals, or individualities, the movement toward using them together with and for the whole fulfills their purpose and justifies their concreteness. Unity, and a convergence toward working for the all-around best advantage of others and the group, presupposes a diversity of individualities: “The Church differs from every other society in that it is never really autonomous within itself, but finds its constantly self-renewing unity in that Spirit which is distinct from it.”<sup>301</sup> Mühlen recognized this self-renewing in the Spirit aspect as being established in a newly formulated understanding of the Church in Vatican II’s *Lumen Gentium*.<sup>302</sup> The Spirit, in *Lumen Gentium*, identified as unifying and moving through the “whole body” would ground what would come to be Mühlen’s notion of charismatic renewal.

During his “temporary solidarity” with the CCM, Mühlen proposed a simple question: what do we immediately think of when we hear the word “Holy Spirit”? Moreover, who says that they have the Holy Spirit in them? He contends that many would not state outright that he or she was “filled” with the Holy Spirit, and that those of the primitive Church would assert it “without exception.” Mühlen was not merely locating disconnect between the spiritual and ecclesial aspects of contemporary worship practices within the Catholic Church. He sought to call attention to the fact many have a narrow understanding of God, and that an experience of the Spirit of God, not just

---

<sup>300</sup> Mühlen, “Universal Council,” 198.

<sup>301</sup> Ibid.

<sup>302</sup> Heribert Mühlen, “Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church: Dogmatic Aspects of Charismatic Renewal,” *Sacramental Life* 12, no. 4 (1974): 334. See *Lumen Gentium* 7.7: “In order that we might be unceasingly renewed in Him, He has shared with us His Spirit who, existing as one and the same being in the Head and in the members, gives life to, unifies and moves through the whole body. This He does in such a way that His work could be compared by the holy Fathers with the function which the principle of life, that is, the soul, fulfills in the human body.”

[http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19641121\\_lumen-gentium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html).

understanding, would lead to renewal in the Church. He thought that a person's experience of the Spirit had to do with the social experience of God.<sup>303</sup> Is it proper to frame the CCM as a social experience of God? Mühlen would answer yes, if the Spirit experience was not an end in itself, and if the life of the church as a whole was being enriched.

Vondey asserts that Mühlen was far from being a leader or official voice of the CCM; he was inspired by what he witnessed and this fueled an attempt to integrate the renewal and Spirit experience of the movement into an ecclesial praxis for the Catholic Church.<sup>304</sup> Therefore, his definition of charismatic renewal never lined up with any “textbook” definition produced by the CCM.<sup>305</sup> He did believe that there was ecumenical hope in his understanding of charismatic renewal, which was inspired by his encounters with the movement, but which was also wholly his own formulation where an experience of the Spirit is a trinitarian experience in the community, an experience of the Spirit is an initiating experience that can be profound but cannot replace faith, and experiences of the Spirit can be integrated into church life.<sup>306</sup> “A charismatic experience is defined as the happening whereby our hearts are perceptibly touched and seized by God's Spirit and we thus personally encounter Christ. Emphasis is on ‘perceptible’: [*sic*] experience of the Spirit *is* perceived by the individual and others.”<sup>307</sup> Mühlen's emphasis on the community's perception of one's encounter with the Spirit is precisely the aspect of the charismatic renewal which he called the “ecumenical hope.”

---

<sup>303</sup> “The Person of the Holy Spirit,” *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 11-12.

<sup>304</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 166-67.

<sup>305</sup> Mühlen, for his clarity of thinking and theologically enriched perspective, is ultimately the theologian the charismatic renewal needed.

<sup>306</sup> Heribert Mühlen, “Charismatic Renewal: An Ecumenical Hope,” *Theology Digest* 30, no. 3 (1982): 245-249.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, 245. (Emphasis Mühlen's).

The Spirit experience is not enough to constitute a renewal; the charismatic renewal occurs in a congregational context with the hope of renewing the Christian's immediate social community. Because diverse traditions were coming together for prayer, praise, personal conversion, and acceptance of spiritual gifts meant that a trinitarian community-experience of God was being revealed through the one and the same Spirit active in the spiritual gifts. Therefore, charismatic renewal is inclusive. The social experience of God supplements one's denominational religious experience. The movement of so many people, as Mühlen saw it, in the twentieth century to personally encounter God was evidence of, not one movement, but a historically new essence of the church.<sup>308</sup> A historically new essence of the church did not mean that there was something flawed or replaced in previous conceptions of the church or ecclesiologies. These charismatic experiences reveal a church united and constructed by the Spirit, a thesis Mühlen upheld prior to the movement's spread.

The Spirit experience in a renewal context is an initiating event that is constituted of rational, volitional, and affective moments and should not be confused with faith.<sup>309</sup> The idea of "event" must be qualified. Clearly, Mühlen would agree that there was generally a moment or event that leads to a longer period of gradual conversion and reception of spiritual gifts. But the singular notion of an event, one point in time, which he calls a psychic event, similar to what Paul or Augustine experienced, is not and should not be taken as a universal norm. The Spirit experience is merely a beginning and is better appraised as a spiritual renewal because it does not invalidate water baptism. Mühlen, though he does not accuse the CCM of this, points to this as one danger of the

---

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., 245-46.

<sup>309</sup> Ibid., 247.

charismatic movement during this time, the early 1980s, to turn reception of the Spirit and spiritual gifts into a single and, frankly, manufactured moment. He also offers admonishments to the movement for, in some places, attempting to maintain this Spirit experience when it should be seen correctly as an initiating experience.<sup>310</sup> Mühlen's "charismatic renewal" understands that Western spirituality does not encourage novices to cling to exalted states of enthusiasm or spiritual awakening:

The more we try to preserve specific perceptions, the less ready we are to enter the abyss of faith. A great hindrance to charismatic renewal is identifying "charismatic" with emotionality. Charismatic first means "gracious." In this sense, all Christians are charismatics. "Charismatic" must not be used in an elitist sense to separate a group from other Christians.<sup>311</sup>

Mühlen's warnings, coming towards the end of his affinity for the CCM, emphasize the congregational aspect of charismatic renewal even further. The CCM can be said to have been at the beginning, as this is the focus of this study, to be unavoidably congregational, and this can be seen with the focus on prayer meetings and building Christian communities. Mühlen would counter though, that congregational charismatic renewal does not, nor should it, lead to the forming of new communities. Christians, in the communities to which they already belong, can participate more fully in them because of a charismatic renewal.<sup>312</sup> These competing ideas of charismatic renewal—one in which extra-ecclesial communities emerge as a result of the Spirit experience where the

---

<sup>310</sup> Ibid., 247-48. I would offer that this danger existed from the beginning of the "Life in the Spirit" seminars, particular in Ann Arbor where invitation was required to attend specific prayer meetings, and in any other community that exhibited this same behavior. Voices of the movement, such as Kevin Ranaghan and Stephen Clark, would agree that there was a "life in the Spirit" to be lived in community after the LH had taken place. But this may make Mühlen's point all the more poignant: the Spirit experience should not be sought for its own sake; Cf. Heribert Mühlen, "The Charismatic Renewal as Experience," in *Holy Spirit and Power*, 109.

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., 248; Cf. Edward D. O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame: Ave Maria, 1971), 239-62; Cf. also Francis A. Sullivan, "The Ecclesiological Context of the Charismatic Renewal," in *Holy Spirit and Power*, 133-36; Mühlen made similar admonishments in other writings. Cf. Henry Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of "Spirit-Baptism" in the Charismatic Renewal Movement* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 183.

<sup>312</sup> Mühlen, "Ecumenical Hope," 248.



Christian can live fully in the Spirit, and one where the Spirit experience has a charismatic renewal effect on the congregation to which the Christian belongs—are never reconciled in Mühlen’s time.

While charismatic renewal referred to a congregational development over time, Mühlen had also moved from the idea of Spirit-baptism to that of “renewal in the Spirit” in 1977.<sup>313</sup> This refers to an act of initiating renewal, such as the LH for a prayer of renewal. This is an event, but can take time for the effects to be felt. According to Henry Lederle, who offers sharp clarification of some of the shifts in Mühlen’s thought on precisely what this Spirit experience meant for Mühlen at different points in his career, renewal in the Spirit meant three things—conversion, renewal of baptismal promises and grace, and acceptance of charisms—which fit into his overall scheme of congregational renewal.<sup>314</sup> The idea of renewal in the Spirit as expressed on those three points is the “event” which this study will use to refer to the idea of Spirit-baptism, because it largely agrees with what the CCM said of its baptism in the Spirit. Lastly, this study would be remiss if it did not include the fact that Mühlen would eventually decide, by 1981, that the term Spirit-baptism should be totally avoided because of the confusion it caused in respect to water baptism, and that it creates misconceptions about what renewal in the Spirit really means and what is traditionally believed about baptism in water.<sup>315</sup> Nonetheless, the pastoral work in renewal with which he began to experiment in the 1970s, and his notion of charismatic renewal, ultimately comes to account for the formation of his reform liturgy. It was meant to create an opportunity for all Christians to be able to make a personal expression of faith, and similar to his “charismatic renewal,”

---

<sup>313</sup> Lederle, *Treasures Old and New*, 180-85.

<sup>314</sup> Ibid., 182.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid., 184.

potentially transform the social context of the individual beginning with a renewal of baptism.<sup>316</sup> On Mühlen's contrast to Pentecostals, including the CCM, Lederle says: "The basic difference to the practice of neo-Pentecostals in America is the approach of presenting a spirituality for every Christian rather than grouping together those who have had similar experiences."<sup>317</sup>

### *Why Mühlen*<sup>318</sup>

Mühlen's pneumatology was developed prior to the CCM and it is being used here to provide a description of the Holy Spirit which reflects the phenomena recorded by the CCM, namely the LH. The theology of the movement was sorely lacking at the time, but Mühlen did not intend for his pneumatology to be a pneumatology which justified the charismatic movement. In his own words, though, he did see promise in the CCM, and concrete examples of what he was writing about being lived in the movement. He ended an interview with Ralph Martin—editor of *New Covenant*, the magazine of the Catholic charismatic renewal—with somewhat of a personal testimony of the work of the Holy Spirit in his life:

I would like simply to say that for 15 years I have known the Holy Spirit with my head, but now I also know him with my heart, and wish the same joy for you. For 15 years people have said to me: 'What you are writing is speculation, not real.' But now I am seeing it come to reality all over the world. The Holy Spirit is real, and being sent by the Father and the Son to bring the human race to knowledge of

---

<sup>316</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, xiv-xv, 36-37,

<sup>317</sup> Lederle, *Treasures Old and New*, 183.

<sup>318</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, ix, xiii, 42. Mühlen's trinitarian pneumatology came at a time referred to as "years of famine" by Yves Congar, and "fear of the Spirit" by Karl Rahner. It was developed and written in his two essential works *Der Heilige Geist als Person* (1963) and *Una Mystica Persona* (1967). Neither book has been translated into the English language. Wolfgang Vondey's study of the development of Mühlen's thought is the only English language book that this study has discovered on the life and thought of Heribert Mühlen. Mühlen published largely in German, a handful of articles and chapters are translated into English, including one book, the misnamed *A Charismatic Theology*. Vondey himself indicates that while Mühlen is one of the most significant Roman Catholic theologians of the twentieth century, and while many scholars can comment on one or two aspects of his thought, Mühlen stands as one of the least comprehensively understood theologians. After the 1970s, little was heard of him outside of Germany.

them. I longed for this, but it was in my head, and an unfulfilled ongoing. Now it is in my heart, changing my life. Praise the Lord.<sup>319</sup>

Because Mühlen apparently had his own personal experience or encounter with the Spirit doesn't automatically mean that his theology was made to be a perfect fit for the CCM. As Mühlen notes, he had been studying and writing long theological works about the Holy Spirit for decades before the outbreak of the CCM and his encounter with it. His pneumatological insights can be used to elucidate and explain the deep meaning behind the use of the LH and its theological import for the movement. Further, his pneumatology can be used to add theological backing to the structure and belief of the movement because they both held in common two fundamental values: the church beyond Catholicism was united by the Holy Spirit and the Spirit acts within the body of Christ. This meant that the churches and the faithful should act to bring to people a personal encounter with Jesus. On these two points, the theological implications of the LH in the CCM in the US at its beginnings are able to be investigated with the aid of Mühlen's trinitarian pneumatology.

Mühlen's trinitarian theology of the Holy Spirit can be expressed in many short forms, where the Spirit is: the "we-act" in the "we-thou," the one divine self-giving, one person in many persons, the personified "we" of the Father and Son, the ecclesial "we," the divine "we," the dynamic of grace-filled fascination. These briefs formulations, it goes without saying, disclose a dense process of reasoning that took Mühlen from Augustine and Boethius to Richard of St. Victor and Thomas Aquinas. With biblical warrants and, later, backing of Vatican II documents, he arrived at an explanation of the unique function of the Spirit in the Church and in the Trinity. Simply put the Spirit

---

<sup>319</sup> "Interview with Mühlen," 6.

functions to relate persons. To formulate this as an ecclesiological statement, Mühlen says, the Church is the mystery of the union of the Spirit in Christ and in Christians. To state this with a trinitarian emphasis, the Spirit is “one person in many persons.”<sup>320</sup> These three formulations of Mühlen’s on the Holy Spirit will be reviewed in turn to give an accurate account of who the Spirit is for Mühlen, how the Spirit relates to and functions in the Church and in the Trinity. Particular analysis of each aspect will likely overlap with the others, but will flow in that order given: Spirit, Trinity, Church.

### *Spirit (And Trinity)*

Mühlen had come to accept that theology had to reflect on real experience; purely intellectual theology is out of touch with reality, and can only be life-giving if it begins with an experience of God.<sup>321</sup> In fact, long before his own Spirit experience, he sought to describe the Spirit in more personal terms—how to speak of the Holy Spirit as a person.<sup>322</sup> Vondey states that Mühlen conceived of the Trinity in a more personal way because he could name the persons of the Trinity in a way that distinguished them from the other two, and implied their relationship without relying on a description of the relation that fell on negation.<sup>323</sup> This naming of the relations within the Trinity was heretofore unfulfilled: the Father is the I-relation, and the Son is the Thou-relation, and both are the “we” of the Holy Spirit.<sup>324</sup> He relied on Scripture for the discovery of the

---

<sup>320</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 99.

<sup>321</sup> Martin, “Interview with Mühlen,” 4.

<sup>322</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 62.

<sup>323</sup> E.g. The Father is divine and also is not the Son; Cf. Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*: “Their personhood is a pure *oppositio relationis*, an absolute opposition of relation. One can express their respective personhood only with the help of a double negation: Each divine person is for itself an inconceivably intensive unity, and it is also *not* one of any of the other persons.” Ibid., 66.

<sup>324</sup> David Coffey, *Grace: The Gift of the Holy Spirit* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2011), 55-56. Coffey further notes that this assignation of names to the relations of the Trinity was never done by Augustine or Thomas Aquinas.

personal pronouns “I,” “thou,” “we.”<sup>325</sup> John 14.23 was the key passage from which he derived the personal pronouns.<sup>326</sup> This verse, in the context of the promise of the Paraclete in verses 15-17, showed Mühlen that the “we” includes the Father, Son, and Spirit.<sup>327</sup>

The derivation of “thou” is based on, but not limited to, these key points. The Father knows himself as the “I” and brings the Son forth; the Son is the image that stands over and against the Father as a person, thus thou.<sup>328</sup> Also, Mühlen noted that thou statements from the bible always include the Son’s relationship to the Father. Mühlen did intend that the Son is the person spoken to in dialogue with the I of the Trinity, therefore, the relationship of the Father to the Son, a knowing and loving personal relationship, is properly expressed as I to thou.<sup>329</sup>

Divine self-love was the basis of this inner-trinitarian union. The love of the Father and Son is reciprocal and can be expressed as divine love of self. The Spirit, the co-beloved, is the person to whom the divine love of self is directed. The Father and Son breathe forth the Spirit and express love to it, active spiration; the we is expressed in that

---

<sup>325</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, xvii. Vondey clarifies that the German analogy Ich-Du-Wir is “I-thou-we” not “I-Thou-We.” These are called person-words because they refer to proper persons of the Trinity. Further, “thou” in English is perceived as formal, antiquated and polite. “Du” is informal and more personal in German. “You” is not chosen as the English person-word because all scholars who write in English on Mühlen have chosen “thou,” and “you” can cause grammatical and semantic confusion depending on the text in which it appears. Thus, “thou” should be understood as second person singular familiar. Lastly, these person-words will be set off with quotation marks in their first occurrence. Subsequent appearances of the same person-word will appear without quotation marks unless it causes confusion, depending on the surrounding text.

<sup>326</sup> “Whoever loves me will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our dwelling with him.” (NAB)

<sup>327</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 67-68. Some key verses for the derivation of “I-thou” from the New Testament: John 8.24, 28; 13.19; 17.21; Mark 13.6.

<sup>328</sup> “I” therefore designates the incommunicable mode of existence of the divine self in the Father; ‘thou’ expresses the incommunicable existence of the divine self in the Son.” Ibid., 95n162.

<sup>329</sup> Ibid., 73-74, 95n166. By contrast, the relationship of the Son to the Father is expressed as “thou-thou.” This has been the source of criticism for Mühlen, but the naming of the relation was secondary for him. Mühlen most desired to identify the difference between the Father and the Son with the person-words “I” and “thou.”

the Holy Spirit returns the love expressed to it to both the Father and the Son: passive spiration. Thus, the Spirit is the we-act between the Father and the Son, the we in person between the Father and the Son, the inner-trinitarian we-relation. The Father and Son are united in the Spirit and the Spirit is the bond between them. The pneumatological conclusion, that the Spirit is the we in person between the Father and the Son, was always being formulated by Mühlen with an ecclesial eye.<sup>330</sup>

*The One Holy Spirit in Christ and Christians*

One of Mühlen's ecclesiological aims was to improve upon the formulation of J.A. Möhler's of the church as "the Son of God appearing constantly among men in human form as his permanent incarnation."<sup>331</sup> If the Spirit is the "we" in person, and the Spirit of Christ was sent to the church, then "permanent incarnation" doesn't adequately explain the Spirit's relation to the church. Mühlen rejected the permanent incarnation view and offered a better understanding of the church, that it was a continuation of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit. Mühlen located this principle of union between the Spirit and the Church of Christ from Augustine and Aquinas.<sup>332</sup> *Mystici Corporis*, which upheld the concept of "una mystica persona," indicated that scriptural imagery of the head and body could help explain this concept.<sup>333</sup> Mühlen thought his inner-trinitarian analogies could describe such an ecclesiology where Christ is in Christians.<sup>334</sup> He would argue that the church could not be the continuation of the Incarnation, in part, because the church does not participate in the hypostatic union. Essentially, Mühlen is distinguishing between the

---

<sup>330</sup> Ibid., 74-78.

<sup>331</sup> Heribert Mühlen, "Sacrament and Charism: the Spirit and the Church," *Theology Digest* 25, no. 1 (1977): 45-49.

<sup>332</sup> Vonhey, *Mühlen*, 102.

<sup>333</sup> In particular, Colossians 1.18-24, and 1 Corinthians 11.3.

<sup>334</sup> Vonhey, *Mühlen*, 104.

relationship of Christ to the Church and the relationship of the Spirit to Christians individually.<sup>335</sup> Furthermore, the Spirit continues the historical manifestation of Jesus by leading the Church: the experience of Christ is the experience of the Holy Spirit. Mühlen says, “The Holy Spirit as the ‘we’ in person...is himself the continuity between the historical and glorified Christ and the Church.”<sup>336</sup> The Spirit is the principle of union of Christians, the spiritual gifts, and the body of Christ: the Church is the mystery of the presence of the Spirit in Christ and in Christians—one person in many persons.<sup>337</sup> The Spirit uniting Christians is an aspect of Christ’s self-giving, Christ sending his Spirit. But also, the inner-trinitarian “we-act” is a dynamic of self-giving: the Father gave his Son, and the Son gave himself to the Father, which is why Mühlen also understands the Holy Spirit, the *Pneuma*, as the “one divine self-giving.”<sup>338</sup>

There are important implications of this conclusion for how the body of Christ relates to individual believers, particularly in small communities or congregations. For one, the human is not Spirit, but embodied Spirit. Mühlen claimed that all being is relational being: since the body receives the Spirit and the Spirit is the active principle of the body, and humans receive both corporeality and spirituality from God, a person is engaged in a continual process of giving and receiving by the creative will of God in the person. A person is invited by Christ into a personal relationship with God by virtue of the self-giving of Christ to participate in his anointing through the Spirit—for Mühlen, on this, the entire mystery of the Church is built.

---

<sup>335</sup> “The Church, therefore, cannot be understood as a continuation of the Incarnation. Instead, the relationship between the inner-trinitarian processions and the mission of the divine persons in salvation history [suggest] that the inner-trinitarian distinction between sonship and spiration corresponds in salvation history to the difference of the Incarnation of the Son and the sending of the Holy Spirit into the human nature of Jesus.” *Ibid.*, 120-21.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>337</sup> *Ibid.*, 114-115.

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

Being in communion with the Father and Son only makes sense if the Spirit is in the community. The Holy Spirit relates Christians as one person in many persons.<sup>339</sup> Mühlen states: “The Church is the visible and tangible form of the invisible Holy Spirit and therefore the grace of God and Christ. This, however, is possible only because the Holy Spirit is numerically one and same in the Father, in the Son, and in the whole Church.”<sup>340</sup> Thus, baptism is one principle of unity for the church, even in many churches. Because of these divisions, the unity in the Spirit is mystical and profound in the fullest sense of these words.

Mühlen’s emphasis that church divisions are transcended and unified by the Spirit is an aspect of his ecclesiology which shows that the birth of the CCM was indeed an expression of Christian unity. Also, by virtue of the one Spirit being in many persons, it can be known then that the LH is in and of itself a Spirit-experience, because the community itself experiences renewal when it prays together and lays hands on one of its members for the renewal of a member, a fortiori, in that they are all united in Christ’s Spirit. The LH does signify communal formation, common identity, intention and direction of prayer, but its frequency of use and elevated status as access to community life in some charismatic communities prove that there was a social dynamic that was taken for granted by the early CCM in that they severely downplayed the prominence of the LH in the inner workings of the small communities sharing their Spirit-experience. At the bare minimum, the position of the LH in these communities was such that a sufficient theological accounting of it should have been undertaken by the movement that could justify its substantial status. Does the practice of the LH in these instances say anything

---

<sup>339</sup> Ibid., 116-131.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid., 131.



about the theological values of these groups who used it? If it is presumed that the unity of the small communities employing the LH, as at Chapel Hill and the Ark and the Dove, was based on the self-giving of the Holy Spirit, then Mühlen's notion of the Church as the mystery of the presence of the Spirit in Christ and in Christians can tell us something much greater about the LH. The objective of this study then is to show that the LH is a renewal experience within the congregational context of charismatic or interdenominational pentecostal prayer meetings, a social experience of God, where the Spirit works within the social structure and physical bodies of the congregation to unite or reconcile members of the body of Christ.

In order to make this connection between Mühlen's Trinitarian pneumatology, which has ecclesial implications by design, and the CCM's use of the imposition of hands during its early period, attention should first be given to Mühlen's thought in respect to the nature and role of charisms.

#### *Marked by the Gift of God*

Mühlen's emphasis on the renewal that could happen in local congregations is a "charismatic" renewal in large part because of the presence of *charismata*. This renewal is an encounter with the person of Jesus, but renewal also meant that there was, what Mühlen called, a corporealization and personalization in this encounter. Corporealization refers to the fact that in one's physical human body, not just the mind or soul, one takes steps in faith. This means there are, in acts of renewal or initiation like baptism, concrete manifestations of one's faith journey. The charisms, which themselves are concrete manifestations of the Spirit, play a role in that encounter because they are meant to benefit others, and they are meant to be experienced in the community. Renewal in the

congregational context is a social God-experience. For Mühlen, experiences involving the charisms or pneumatic experience, always has a social dimension. The reality then in the pneumatic experience is that the signs of God's saving and missionary love are made present through the Spirit in persons of the community.<sup>341</sup>

Experiencing signs of God's love in persons of the community is something that Mühlen believed was common in the apostolic church, and which was the key to a contemporary interior renewal of the church. This "ancient fundamental experience which was the foundation of the early Church" was a self-surrendering act of individuals and communities to the Spirit of Christ. To be clear, the basic charismatic experience<sup>342</sup> consisted of a public act of renewal of one's baptismal and confirmation based on a personal decision to surrender to God, almost as if a "second conversion." This was the goal of what he also called the socially transmitted faith experience—social in the sense of being a publicly witnessed act of renewal, and socially transmitted in that the congregation played a physical and spiritual role. The method of this socially transmitted faith experience is important for discerning an authentic charismatic experience, i.e. not seeking the charismatic experience for its own sake.

It is rather a direct, personal, public witness of faith...The acquisition of a level of praising God which can embrace the entire person including the feelings is never an end in itself, but is the *way* by which God and Christ can involve themselves in the world in the power of their Holy Spirit...it is only the person who surrenders himself in service to his fellow man who will discover himself in ways new and unconceived. This will come to him as it were a bonus, for discovery of self is an unmerited gift of God to us.<sup>343</sup>

---

<sup>341</sup> Mühlen, "Sacrament and Charism," 46.

<sup>342</sup> "Pneumatic experience" is interchangeable with "charismatic experience." At different points of his career, "charismatic experience" had slightly different meanings for Mühlen, but those slight differences do not affect this study's use of his thought. Both terms have to do with a personal choice to surrender to God and a public act of renewal of baptismal and confirmation promises. These lead a person to individual renewal and a desire to praise God for his own sake.

<sup>343</sup> Mühlen, "Charismatic Renewal as Experience," 109-110. (Emphasis Mühlen's).

If the Church is the continuation of the anointing of Christ with the Holy Spirit, then the Spirit also anoints again or stirs the anointing of the individual surrendering in a socially transmitted faith experience. The “we” of the Trinity in these charismatic experiences makes use of signs for the purposes of the renewal, exploiting the social dimension of the experience. Signs of the Spirit’s presence are called by Mühlen, charisms.

Charisms are signs and gifts. As the Holy Spirit is the “gift” or the divine self-giving, the Holy Spirit making-present the Father and the Son giving themselves to each other in love, so too the charisms are gifts of the Spirit making present the Spirit for the church. Mühlen states the day of Pentecost is the origin of the church as God’s original sacrament, where the apostles were gifted with the ability to proclaim the Word, and signs were seen as well, such as tongues—this was the action of the Holy Spirit in the historical Church. For Mühlen, the seven sacraments today which convey God’s grace are also signs of the Spirit working in an historical manifestation. Charisms are signs that do not convey grace, but simply work in the church in individuals as an inward capacity for the building up and edification of Christ’s body, the Church.<sup>344</sup> Mühlen is consistent with the idea that God’s revelation is more a vertical phenomenon than it is a horizontal one. In other words, God’s Spirit interacts with the Church historically, horizontally from the day of Pentecost in the church to modern times, more so than in direct ecstatic or emotional experiences occurring external to the community boundary.<sup>345</sup> Pentecost is the origin of the Church as the original sacrament: “the Church is the historical manifestation of the transhistorical Spirit of Christ. Whoever has seen and heard the Church, has seen

---

<sup>344</sup> Mühlen, “Sacrament and Charism,” 47.

<sup>345</sup> Mühlen cites Paul and Augustine as such “vertical” experiences.

and heard something of the Spirit of Christ himself (Acts 2.33).”<sup>346</sup> Direct vertical experiences of God’s Spirit are not meant to circumvent or supersede the corporealization of the faith steps a person makes. Signs or charisms perceived in the community are meant for the believer.

The believer’s spiritual renewal is a perceptible experience within the community of believers. Mühlen points to “sign” in the New Testament, “*semeion*,” identified by Paul as tongues and prophecy for example. Such signs indicated the presence, appearance, or manifestation of the Spirit of Christ.<sup>347</sup> These signs are not purely functional or simply pointing to a reality that is not there. These “*semeia*,” charisms, are “*signs of the presence of the Spirit of Christ*.”<sup>348</sup> He acknowledges that Paul only refers to the gift of tongues and the gift of prophecy as these “*semeia*,” but Mühlen declares that all the charisms are expression signs, signs that contain what they indicate; the charisms express or contain the love of God for humanity and point to his Spirit. Tongues, for example, Mühlen calls an incomprehensible sign because the outsider will not understand it, and so will not be moved. For the believer even, praying in tongues is a sign only if it is interpreted. Prophecy then is an expression sign because it is a gift given for the building up of the community.<sup>349</sup>

Mühlen stresses that the charisms are a “natural aptitude or gift” that comes from inside the believer.<sup>350</sup> The Spirit in the believer precedes the perceivable sign, indicating further that these signs are meant for use for others. A looking out for the salvation of

---

<sup>346</sup> Mühlen, “Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church,” 339.

<sup>347</sup> Ibid., 336.

<sup>348</sup> Ibid., 340. This is Mühlen’s use of 1 Corinthians 12.7, the *phanerosis* of the Spirit are signs. (Emphasis Mühlen’s). See note 299.

<sup>349</sup> Ibid., 340-41. On this commentary on signs, Mühlen is referring primarily to 1 Corinthians 14.22-25, though the entire chapter concerns these two charisms.

<sup>350</sup> Cf. Mühlen, “Jesus, the original charismatic,” in *Charismatic Theology*, 105-109.

others, not primarily for one's own self, is part of the social God-experience. Charisms are perceptible "in order that the Spirit of Christ may become socially effective and manifest within the community or that we may be able to see and hear something of this spirit of Christ."<sup>351</sup> This is why Mühlen's differentiation between the sacramental signs, the seven sacraments, is important. While they are experienced in the community, the sacramental signs are manifest in material things like water, oil, or bread; they come from without the person, and intend to confer grace or are done anteriorly to the presence of the Spirit.<sup>352</sup> Charisms are gifts which result from the self-giving of God through his Spirit.

Mühlen actually refers to the baptism in the Spirit as a charism: "the charisma of praising God for his own sake."<sup>353</sup> The baptism in the Spirit bears testimony to Jesus' resurrection, as well as "our own" resurrection.<sup>354</sup> The Spirit baptism, which Mühlen would later prefer to call the renewal of the Spirit, can also be referred to as declaring God's wonderful deeds,<sup>355</sup> which needs constant renewal in the individual. For Mühlen, ultimately, the sacramental conferring of grace in the heart of the believer, as in confirmation, should become charismatic, meaning that signs of the grace of God are visible for the community through the perceptible gift welling up from the individual.<sup>356</sup>

The conclusion to be drawn from examination of charisms in Mühlen's thought—the charisms as the Spirit making use of the corporeal nature of humanity in the

---

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., 341.

<sup>352</sup> Mühlen, "Sacrament and Charism," 47; Cf. Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church," 342. Mühlen does allow that sacraments of confirmation and ordination, and possibly marriage, can be called "charismatic sacraments" because the ones receiving the sacrament are each given some kind of charismatic capacity for serving others with respect to the salvation of others.

<sup>353</sup> Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church," 341.

<sup>354</sup> Mühlen refers to Acts 1.8, 2.32 on this point.

<sup>355</sup> Mühlen refers to Acts 2.11, and 1 Peter 2.9 on this point.

<sup>356</sup> Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church," 342-43.

community context to inspire desire for God and build up the Church— is that the laying on of hands is actually a charism of the Spirit, in the same way as tongues or prophecy. The justification of the presence of the LH in the CCM by the movement itself is that it is merely a sacramental, however, its assessment as a charism, in the sense that Mühlen describes them, is significantly more accurate.<sup>357</sup> The presence, status, and role of the LH in the early CCM are justified when the LH is accounted for as a corporealization of the Holy Spirit in the congregation as a gift to others that both contains and indicates what it signifies.

As a charism of the Spirit, the LH is a true expression sign because it contains what it indicates; it indicates the self-surrender of the aspirant and the supplicant, but it also contains the reaching out of the Holy Spirit through the bodies of the community in the LH and the collective surrender. The LH signifies surrender, on both the part of the aspirant and the supplicant, but it also witnesses to the presence of Christ's Spirit in both parties. The aspirant desires renewal. The supplicant(s) desire also, in part because of their love for Christ's church and a desire to see the church grow, that the renewal be given. The love motivating the supplicant and the surrender of the aspirant, allowing persons to physically impose hands on one's person, echoes Mühlen's trinitarian pneumatology where the Father and the Son give of themselves to each other or surrender to each other. In this way, the LH in the context of charismatic renewal<sup>358</sup> is a trinitarian approach to God within a community. While the LH can be done with non-believers, as a

---

<sup>357</sup> *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 57. It was Ralph Keifer, one of the first two Catholics to receive the LH and baptism in the Spirit at the Chapel Hill prayer meeting, and later the Ranaghans and Edward O'Connor who would invoke the term "sacramental" in the Catholic sense of the "little sacraments." René Laurentin would simply state that it was "deeply meaningful" and "not sacramental but relates to any need of Christian life."

<sup>358</sup> Here "charismatic renewal" refers to the movement itself, and also the renewal of the Spirit in the congregation as understood by Mühlen outside of any movement.

charism it is a trinitarian approach to God when it is done within the context of the congregation. The LH as a surrendering act expresses the missionary love of God: as the Spirit is present in the person imposing hands, the suppliant reaching out *is* the Spirit reaching out to the aspirant; this is a physical and spiritual reaching out. The suppliant has willfully and prayerfully surrendered with the physical sign of reaching out to the aspirant. The missionary love expressed in Mühlen's trinitarian pneumatology where the Father and the Son send themselves to each other, makes this "we" act of the Trinity present in the community when the congregation reaches out with the LH and the aspirant surrenders to the Spirit of Christ present in the community.

The salvific love of God, also key in Mühlen's pneumatology, is expressed in that the LH also indicates that the congregation is concerned for the salvation of the aspirant. In the CCM particularly, as it held to the assertion that the baptism in the Spirit does not confer grace, the LH is a sign to the community that someone is open to the Spirit of God which is corporealized in the LH of the community and the surrender of the aspirant. The LH then opens up the aspirant to allow the Spirit to be stirred; the LH is a sign to the aspirant that Christ's Spirit is accessible to them. But the LH does not just indicate that Christ's Spirit is accessible to the aspirant, it contains this reality because of the Spirit of Christ present in the suppliant. The LH is a sign of the communal giving of self in body and spirit of both parties, thus it is a sign of God's salvific love; the LH doesn't just tell the aspirant, but it shows the aspirant "I" care for your well-being and ultimately am concerned for your salvation. The "I" is the individual person of the congregation, but it is also the Spirit of Christ. The congregation witnessing this personal and caring act witnesses the Spirit in action in the physical body of the community.

The LH edifies and builds up the church because it can only be done for the service of others. One cannot lay hands on one's self; it also requires a congregation or small community of two people, thus the LH is fundamentally meant for the benefit of the community. The dynamic is constant that one wills the renewal of another, and the other desires renewal. It further builds up and edifies the congregation by virtue of others witnessing the LH. If this dynamic is removed or altered, then the act of the LH ceases to be a charism. Those not participating in the imposition of hands nonetheless benefit from the witness of faith on the part of those involved. This is similar to what Mühlen says of tongues and prophecy. The congregation sees the LH and hears the prayers of the ones imposing hands. The aspirant feels the touch of the congregation and the congregation reaches out to touch, almost in a sense of lifting up or carrying, the person to God.<sup>359</sup> The LH can be said to be a more suitable public witness of Christ's Spirit because it does not require interpretation for the non-believer. In the Western Christian context, the LH will instantly indicate that the Church is caring for its own.

The notion of the Church caring for its own can be one way of understanding the LH as a natural gift or aptitude. Surely in the charismatic context, what Christian carrying the Spirit of Christ would not want to reach out to another in prayer to draw them nearer to God? The LH is an aptitude which wells up from the person because it has to be understood always in the context of prayer. Christians are suited to pray for each other, therefore the LH and praying for a member of the community is a gift given by the Spirit. The LH, it goes without saying, is not a charism outside of the context of a charismatic renewal, in the same way that tongues and prophecy is meaningless when not understood

---

<sup>359</sup> It is common in prayers heard in charismatic prayer meetings that the one who is being prayed for or having hands imposed on is "lifted up" in prayer by the congregation.



as perceptible signs of God's love. In other words, the LH must mean charism in the congregation, gift given by the Spirit for the benefit of the community, or it is useless.

Lastly in the clarification of the LH as a natural gift or aptitude, it is known in the prayer meetings discussed in the early movement that, from those who have received the baptism in the Spirit or had hands imposed on them, not everyone participates in the LH for others. In one sense it is a practical matter: it is not physically possible for all members of the congregation to impose hands on one person, but this alone does not make the LH an aptitude. But also, as seen in the earliest prayer meetings at and around the campus of Notre Dame, a select few would go forward to impose hands on others for the baptism in the Spirit. It is not always stated directly in the accounts of witnesses to these early meetings why those people were the ones to go impose hands. But it is likely, as in the later more developed and structured larger meetings, that experienced or "tenured" members of the community who had received the LH were chosen or volunteered for this role. In this sense then, aptitude is an appropriate description for those who felt the inclination to participate or contribute to the community through the LH. Aptitude can also simply mean "general suitability." Certainly, those who have had LH can be seen as suited to do this for others and build up the community. It is the understanding of aptitude as a natural ability where one could object that any person with hands plainly has a natural ability to lay their hands on anybody. To invoke the priority of context again, that is precisely not the sense in which the CCM or Mühlen mean for the charismatic LH to be understood. The movement and Mühlen would agree that the Spirit could gift a person with the desire and ability to impose hands in the charismatic context.

The LH as a charism then, like all the charisms, is a gift from the Spirit which all can benefit from, but not from which all have the benefit of possessing.

The LH appears rather non-sensational next to tongues or prophecy though it is a physical act. The list of rather remarkable charisms, which Mühlen and the CCM point to (1 Cor 12.8-11), appear to be of a completely different nature than the LH. But Mühlen and the CCM have spoken on the presence and importance of what are inappropriately referred to as less remarkable charisms. Mühlen warns:

A special danger of the charismatic renewal is that the more spectacular charisms are given undue prominence while the less striking ones meet with scant consideration. The person for example who sees that there is somewhere for the prayer meeting to be held, the person who takes on all the burden of organization or acts as treasurer is performing an indispensable ministry...if all respect everyone else, then one charism can evoke another. But if everyone is concerned only with himself or herself, then the [prayer] service will remain without fruit.<sup>360</sup>

Though Mühlen refers to the “ministry” of organization or treasurer, the context of the previous statement indicates that he considers those who take part in organizing or in the role of treasurer to be practicing a charism.

René Laurentin in his study of the CCM and of the Ann Arbor community in particular observed that the movement understood charisms in the same sense of gifts for service to others. The Ann Arbor community, for example, had coordinators, elders, and servants—these were titles the community used to identify members who had certain gifts and thus served in particular roles. Witnessing, when a person testifies to the community about the work of the Spirit in his or her life, is also given as an example of a charism. Laurentin goes on to say that there is no exhaustive list of charisms to be made because it will always vary depending on the community in which one is attempting to identify charisms and the many ways that community serves itself, and the outside

---

<sup>360</sup> Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology*, 292.

community for the building up of the church: “All these services reflect the gifts and aptitudes, natural and supernatural, of the various individuals involved. They can, therefore, be legitimately called ‘charisms.’”<sup>361</sup> Even though he had already essentially defined charisms, he then asks the question of how to define them and, looking to Vatican II, states that the Council employed different understandings of the term.<sup>362</sup> He is consistent with Mühlen in distinguishing that, even though *charis* means “grace,” there is a difference between *charis* and *charismata*, the first being sanctifying grace, and the second referring to the diverse gifts given to different people for the building up of the Church.<sup>363</sup> Laurentin closes with a list of eight characteristics of charisms, to which attention is called to just one: “The charisms *relate to the whole of human reality*—individual and collective, body and psyche—according to needs and commitments.”<sup>364</sup> Interestingly, it is immediately after his discussion of charisms that Laurentin spends one page on the LH. He does not relate the “gesture” to the “whole of human reality,” as he describes charisms, because he does not regard it as a charism. As per usual, he attests to the many uses of the LH in scripture, and the closest he comes to a “charismatic” definition of the LH is “a concrete sensible expression of solidarity.” Unfortunately, this also applies to handshakes and fist pumps in the air. This is not meant to mock Laurentin, for he also does note the prayer that accompanies the LH, but simply to show that he falls

---

<sup>361</sup> *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 50. Laurentin supports his claims on eight lists of charisms from the New Testament. He notes that the first four lists actually use the word “charism” and the other four do not: 1 Cor 12.4-10, 28-31; Rom 12.6-8; 1 Pet 4.10; 1 Cor 14.6, 13; 14.26; Eph 4.11; Mark 16.17-18.

<sup>362</sup> Laurentin specifically calls attention to *Lumen Gentium* nos. 4, 7, 12, 21, 32; *Apostolicam Actuositatem* no. 3; and *Ad Gentes* nos. 4, 23.

<sup>363</sup> Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism*, 51. He cites *Lumen Gentium* as speaking of hierarchic and charismatic gifts, in no. 7; and in no. 12 it calls them “special graces.” It is to 1 Corinthians 12.7 that the Council, Laurentin, and Mühlen continually refer.

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*, 52. (Emphasis Laurentin’s).

in line with many of the voices in the CCM at its infancy; the LH is relegated to a merely concrete, perceptible or sensible, meaningful, multivalent gesture.

Mühlen's declaration that the baptism in the Spirit is a charism, and thus a charismatic experience in that it is a sign for the community of the Spirit's presence, in itself does not contradict or refute the LH as charism. Mühlen and the writers in the movement agree that the baptism in the Spirit is a profound event from which the effects are sometimes immediately perceptible or sometimes gradually perceptible, from days to months. The Catholic pentecostal movement did not require the immediate outward manifestation of a charism to authenticate a baptism in the Spirit, as did some classical Pentecostal churches. The Catholic pentecostal movement tended toward defining the baptism in the Spirit as a personal, internal, and sometimes gradual process. The notion of a singular event was only one possibility; the Spirit-experience over time was just as likely, and arguably more realistic. The second possibility, over time, is not really an event, but a realization or revelation that comes bit-by-bit from person to person. This notion of baptism in the Spirit is highly personal, implies internal revelations, continued individual prayer, and discoveries on the part of that one person. While such a turnaround in a person's life can be a means for building up the community, it cannot be said that these personal and internal revelations and discoveries are in themselves signs meant for the building up of the community. It is rather that in this type of process, there are many signs or one sign that builds up the one person. This notion of a baptism in the Spirit that is gradual seems less and less like the charisms that Mühlen and Laurentin describe. The goal is not to split hairs over when the work of the Spirit is a charism, for the good of the community, and when it is a personal working internally for individuals, which may

result in the good of the community. The point is to say that it is actually more accurate to regard the LH as a charism because the act is always a public witness, even in small groups, which doesn't require interpretation, which does not require immediate outward manifestations because in itself it is a sign, which directly calls the community to their belief in the presence of the Spirit, and which reflects a trinitarian pneumatology.

To summarize, the laying on of hands is an expression sign of the reaching out of the Holy Spirit; a charism, because it is an aptitude in a person which is given and inspired by the Holy Spirit out of love; a dynamic act that is preceded by a surrender on the part of an aspirant, and is done with the accompaniment of prayer and good will on the part of the aspirant and the suppliant. All of these comprise the act of the laying on of hands in the pentecostal context. This is the full and proper context—if one aspect is missing, then there is no charism. The LH as a publicly visible charism works to building up and edifying the congregation by virtue of being publicly witnessed; it is seen and heard in the same way as tongues or prophecy. Even without the theological understanding of the working of the Spirit in the LH expressed through Mühlen's trinitarian pneumatology, the LH does not require interpretation, making its significance as a charism virtually universally accessible for the congregation. The LH edifies the congregation because it is on one hand simply a human act: the simplicity and affection of the human touch tell the witness of the LH that the church reaches out to care for others. On the other hand, the LH edifies the congregation more deeply as it opens the congregation to the missionary and salvific love of God reaching out to members of the congregation on whom hands are laid.

To make it even clearer, the phrase “the laying on of hands” in the charismatic context should raise in one’s mind an image of no less than two people: one submissive in body, mind and spirit, and the other laying their hands on the other’s body, with the desire for the spiritual renewal of the other, engaged in prayer, also in submission in body, mind, and spirit to the Holy Spirit where the power of the Holy Spirit is taken on faith by at least the supplicant, for sometimes the aspirant is desiring renewal for struggles in faith; this full dynamic is the charism of the laying on of hands. The charism of the laying on of hands is not just the gesture. Also, its power to edify varies slightly for the aspirant, the supplicant, or the community of witnesses. The deeper level of understanding the LH as an “expression” sign can only make sense with this full dynamic of the charism in mind.<sup>365</sup> The LH as an expression sign indicates the inner-trinitarian “we” act or divine self-giving, and the LH contains it. This is not to say that the LH is the Trinity. As Mühlen describes in his pneumatology, the Holy Spirit is the divine self-giving. Hence the LH acknowledges that the Spirit of Christ in “me” the supplicant is reaching out to the Spirit in “you” the aspirant, and in this dynamic charism “we” are making ourselves accessible to the Holy Spirit; thus, the charism of the LH contains what it indicates, a visibly unified act of Trinitarian love.

One possible objection would be to ask how this does not differ from the baptism in the Spirit. The quick response would be to reiterate the discussion above. The dynamic of the LH in the charismatic context does not require that there is any renewal experience for the aspirant as a result, though the belief is that almost always there surely will be.

---

<sup>365</sup> Mühlen, “Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church,” 336-37. Mühlen defines expression signs as signs that indicate and contain what they signify, as opposed to indicator signs, which only point to that which they indicate, such as the rainbow which was a sign of the covenant between God and Noah.

The LH, the full dynamic in the community context, is the charism itself—it is for the congregation. Mühlen would say that Spirit-renewal was the internal renewal that could take place over time. Mühlen would also say that the baptism in the Spirit is praising God for his own sake.<sup>366</sup> Both of these are not the charism of the LH. The description of the baptism in the Spirit generally given by the CCM, that it is an actualization of graces already given or a reviviscence of grace, also points to an internal spiritual renewal. Again, the spiritual renewal or baptism in the Spirit of a person may lead to the gift of certain charisms which could be used for the community, building it up. But this is after the internal renewal and after the LH. An expression sign of the missionary and salvific love of God is the best characterization of the charism of the LH.

This study should attend to briefly Mühlen’s mention of and appraisal of the LH. He speaks of it mostly in the context of the ecclesial sacraments. The closest he comes to calling it a charism is when he refers to it as a “physical sign.” He does not carry this phrase out to the meaning of the dynamic of the LH in the congregational charismatic context as given above.

#### *The Laying on of Hands for Mühlen*

When Mühlen speaks of charismatic renewal, he is referring to congregational renewal based around the acts of renewing baptismal vows, prayer, and the LH. Even during his temporary solidarity with the CCM, he would say that the “charismatic renewal,” not the movement per se, would be able to initiate corrective measures in

---

<sup>366</sup> Mühlen’s is actually one of the best definitions of this biblically based idea. Mühlen saw that the apostles were able to proclaim the Word with urgency, love, and fervor because of Pentecost. When Mühlen says Spirit-baptism is to proclaim God for his own sake, this means proclaiming the Word the way the apostles did for bringing others into the church, which does not preclude praising God in the sense of worship. To proclaim God in a type of praise-worship is a way of proclaiming God for his own sake and way to proclaim the Word the way the apostles were in Acts.

regards to the expression of emotions during worship or really in any religious context for men. Because men in Western culture, according to Mühlen, have been conditioned to repress receptivity and surrender, inevitably their religious orientation is affected in respect to worship and expression of religious sentiment. When he encountered the CCM, he saw that the willingness and openness to public displays of prayer in a group allowed for emotion, not in the ecstatic or extreme blissful sense, to be acceptable for men in a religious context.

The charismatic renewal will be able to institute radical corrective measures in this regard. This movement, therefore, not only represents the beginning of a truly *trinitarian* approach to our understanding of God, but also and precisely because of this it will help heal our human culture from the wounds of historically conditioned distortions and exaggerations.<sup>367</sup>

This was one of the biggest attractions he had to the movement: the surrender and receptivity he witnessed and experienced. The corrective measures he envisioned obviously came to be a dead end for his work in renewal, but the trinitarian approach to understanding God is evident in the charism of the LH, though he did not see the LH as a charism. He did see this receptivity that the movement seemed to bring out in people in some part in the act of the LH, and surely some of this view must come from personal experience.

Mühlen recounts an episode he had with a prayer group in his book *A Charismatic Theology*. In a period of his life after the Council, he experienced a slump, restlessness, and unhappiness in his professional and spiritual lives. He went to a prayer group he knew of and was touched by the personal testimony that a “grey-haired” man gave: “When he then began to talk quite spontaneously about Jesus, I immediately noticed that *he really knew the person about whom he was talking*. I had never before heard anyone

---

<sup>367</sup> Mühlen, “Person of the Holy Spirit,” 19. (Emphasis Mühlen’s).



speak of Jesus Christ in such a way, neither during my studies nor later.”<sup>368</sup> He was so touched, that he continued to go back to the prayer meetings, and after a climactic moment alone in prayer and tears, he went back to the meeting to ask for the LH.

One evening it got so far that I began to pray again after a long interval: ‘Come, Holy Spirit.’ I knelt down and felt the tears running down my face. I have no idea now how long I prayed, but I recognized the immense pride which was at the root of my wrong attitudes. I knew only God could liberate me from this pride. At one of the next prayer meetings I asked the others to lay their hands on me. I remembered the words from the second letter to Timothy: ‘Rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands: for God did not give us a spirit of timidity but a spirit of power and love and self-control. Do not be ashamed then of testifying to our Lord (2 Tim 1.4ff)’. In deep gratitude I said a personal prayer of surrender. The others laid hands on me, prayed for me and thanked God. Never in my life have I embraced people so heartily as I did after this service: with their help I had found my way back to God and so to my vocation.<sup>369</sup>

Mühlen’s experience almost perfectly exhibits the LH as charism, though he is using it to make the point of personal experience and renewal through personal encounter. He recounts a story that tells of the building up of the church insofar as he was a priest of the church, and insofar as the people of the community who witnessed the LH and the embraces afterwards would have felt renewed by the experience. His experience of the LH here can also be seen as a historical continuation of the Spirit of Christ, for this is how he describes the LH in the bible and the sacraments.

Mühlen upholds *Lumen Gentium*, 21.2, by saying that the historical continuation of “Jesus’ fullness of the Holy Spirit is seen above all in the laying-on of hands.”<sup>370</sup> The Constitution and Mühlen speak of gifts being handed on, namely authority of office, and this being passed down to “us” in “episcopal consecration.” Neither is a view of the LH

---

<sup>368</sup> Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology*, 52. (Emphasis Mühlen’s).

<sup>369</sup> Ibid.

<sup>370</sup> Mühlen, “Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church,” 334.

by laymen and laywomen in a congregational context. Mühlen, in the same breath, goes on to compare the LH to a sacramental:

The breakthrough to the basic charismatic dimension of love can in any case be accompanied also by other ‘physical’ signs. The Roman Missal, for example, has a prayer for the gifts of tears...Another ‘physical’ and bodily sign is the imposition of hands performed on the occasion of the renewal of confirmation by the members of a prayer group, an occasion when they (as representatives of the whole Church) bring a supplication for this man before God, thanking God and singing his praise. Seen from a dogmatic point of view, indeed, this action has the structure of a sacramental.<sup>371</sup>

Mühlen speaks accurately from a dogmatic point of view. The description of the LH as a charism is not intended to be dogmatic; the point of view is the personal testimonies of the use of the LH in the events that led to the birth of the CCM, and the descriptions of its use as the movement began to spread at Notre Dame and in Michigan. Mühlen speaks for the ecclesial legacy of the LH in the succession of bishops and popes. This does infer a pneumatology where the Spirit is the “principle of unity in the social structure of the Church,” but so does the notion of the LH as charism.

In his book *A Charismatic Theology*, which was published near the beginning of his “temporary solidarity” with the CCM, he speaks of the LH as a “symbol”: The “symbol of the laying on of hands in itself is ambiguous.”<sup>372</sup> He is always confident of its status as maintaining historical contact with the primitive church, particularly in respect to confirmation and ordination.<sup>373</sup> Mühlen would, a few years later, maintain this notion of the LH as a “physical” sign, but he still does not call it a charism or ascribe to it the qualities of a charism: “Another ‘physical’ sign is several members of a prayer-group laying their hands on a member (thus representing the whole church) as a petition for

---

<sup>371</sup> Ibid., 345.

<sup>372</sup> *Charismatic Theology*, 142.

<sup>373</sup> Cf. Ibid., 298.

God's abundant grace."<sup>374</sup> If this can be considered naming of the LH as a charism, i.e. expression sign, he gives no further attention to the gesture, and it is unclear if the sign is the LH itself on the member, or the whole act of LH being witnessed by the prayer group. The most mention he makes of the LH is in his reform liturgy and it is always in respect to the rite of renewal being performed, and the actual LH is akin to the sponsorial LH as in confirmation or an extension of hands by the priest.<sup>375</sup> But the liturgy stands out as a testament to his belief in the corporealization of the steps in faith a person takes and renews. Vondey states:

The sponsorial laying on of hands, moreover, points to the communal attributes of corporeality. The renewed acceptance of God's covenantal offer is not a mere individual and private event. Rather, the laying on of hands symbolizes that the step taken by the individual is also carried by the Church as the body of Christ (i.e. the *Corpus Christi*) and that the individual act literally "incorporates" the person into the community.<sup>376</sup>

The scope of this study is not to give a full detailed account of the significance of the LH for Mühlen's theology or his reform liturgy. But that his trajectory of Mühlen's thought landed at an understanding of the LH as literally making a person a part of the community speaks to the power the gesture has for our human natures. This power of the gesture was unmistakable to the first Catholic Pentecostals at the beginning, and while neither Mühlen nor the CCM rightly regarded the LH as a charism, both the man and the movement came to incorporate the act into their respective communities' inner and intimate rituals.

---

<sup>374</sup> "Sacrament and Charism," 48.

<sup>375</sup> Vondey, *Mühlen*, 26-29; Cf. *Ibid.*, 31. The reform liturgy was a liturgy of renewal and offered Christians the chance to individually engage in a personal act of faith entrusting themselves to God again.

<sup>376</sup> *Ibid.*, 32-33.

## CONCLUSION

The building up of the Catholic Charismatic Movement was done through human hands, and in respect to the perspective of charismatics, as much as it was by the Spirit. There are probably scores of psychological, anthropological, or sociological reasons why the LH became such an integral part of the growth of the CCM, but it is always linked to the personal charismatic-movement in the lives of people like Keifer and Storey. The objective of this thesis was to establish that movement's own accounting of their practice of the LH did not go beyond that of mere gesture. Perhaps it is incidental that the LH "followed" Keifer and Storey to the Chi Rho retreat, but the preponderance of historical and testimonial evidence shows that the LH was used as a symbolic gesture, but also that it meant substantially more for the communities that can all be linked back to the prayers and touch of the hands of William Storey and Ralph Keifer. The communal dynamic that envelopes the LH was present from long before the "birth" of the movement, and it was present from the day Keifer and Bourgeois received the LH at the Chapel Hill prayer meeting. Perhaps the best example of the LH as a charism is that Chapel Hill prayer meeting that ultimately did lead to the Catholic Pentecostal movement.

The mystery of the Spirit-experience that Catholic Pentecostals wanted to share with their Catholic brothers and sisters was difficult to explain. The effects or consequences of it were easier to describe, such as the desire to read Scripture or the joy

of praying or reciting the rosary. But the congruencies that they saw between themselves and the ancient church are possibly more difficult to explain on concrete, rational terms. The exegesis that chapter two offers suggests that if the charismatic movement has something in common with the early church, that the contemporary Catholic church does not, it is this experience of the LH. The extraordinary charisms can be difficult to explain to Christians, much less non-Christians. This is not a reason to avoid them, but merely points to the practical reality to which the LH speaks. The LH was culturally relevant for the Samaritans and Jews. The reunification of divided peoples that came as a result of its use, as well as the expansion of the church through Samaria illustrate that the LH was the charism that was needed at the time. The Spirit chose the LH to facilitate this reconciliation because humans need human touch, and Christians need the Spirit.

Chapter three's review of the movement's own assessment of the significance of the LH shows that, given that the LH is present with nearly all moments of prayer for the baptism in the Spirit or healing, their explanations don't live up to the reality witnessed every day in prayer meetings, spontaneous prayer on the campuses of Notre Dame and Duquesne University, and the Spirit-led communities in places like Ann Arbor.

Chapter four's review of the life of Heribert Mühlen suggests that the need for renewal is universally identifiable. Mühlen's life work boils down to the questions of what renewal means and how Christians can take physical and prayerful steps to attain it. Thus, his pneumatology offers a privileged perspective because in the end it has this question in mind. The link of his pneumatology to his ecclesiology also carries with it the questions of renewal, because for him the social God-experience is communal not by accident. Mühlen's pneumatology does not need to be accepted *in toto*, but it does show

that it is possible to think of the LH as an incarnational charism. The person reaching out in prayer with the Spirit in her is not an incarnation, but she does pray with the Spirit of Christ in her that the person whom she touches is touched with the Spirit of Christ as well.

The Catholic Charismatic Movement in the US will be fifty years old in February of 2017. The half-century that separates Keifer and Storey's personal journey for renewal from the millions-strong movement that spans the globe today in the Catholic Church is nothing short of astonishing. Daniel O'Hanlon's study of Pentecostalism from 1963 reminds us today of how far the movement has come. The historically poorer Pentecostal churches in Latin America share more in common with the Catholic charismatic communities in the US today because of the CCM. The once impassible gulf of class and religion may have finally had the last two hands-full of dirt poured into it when in June of 2009 Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio knelt in front of some 6,000 Evangelicals and Catholics and received a joint blessing—this was done with the laying on of hands.<sup>377</sup>

---

<sup>377</sup> John Vennari, "Pope Francis, Pentecostals and Interreligious Actions," *Catholic Family News* (October 2013). <http://www.cfnews.org/page88/files/a66a02dd472db2aa376bfd82c0b22724-109.html>; Cf. Dale M. Coulter, "Pentecostal Thoughts on Pope Francis," *First Things* (December 2013). <http://www.firstthings.com/blogs/firstthoughts/2013/12/pentecostal-thoughts-on-francis-and-the-gospel-of-joy>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alkier, Stefan, and Annette Weissenrieder, eds., *Miracles Revisited: New Testament Miracle Stories and their Concepts of Reality*. Boston: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Ball, Ann. *A Handbook of Catholic Sacramentals*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1991.
- Barreto, Eric D. *Ethnic Negotiations: The Function of Race and Ethnicity in Acts 16*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Book of Acts in History*. London: A. and C. Black Limited, 1955.
- Cassidy, Richard J. and Philip J. Scharper. eds. *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Clark, Stephen B. *Baptized in the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*. Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1976.
- . *Building Christian Communities: Strategy for Renewing the Church*. Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1972.
- . *Confirmation and the Baptism of the Holy Spirit*. Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1969.

- Coffey, David. "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit." *Theological Studies* 47, no. 2 (1986): 227-50.
- . *Grace: The Gift of the Holy Spirit*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2011.
- Coggins, Richard J. *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Congar, Yves. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Translated by David Smith. New York: Seabury Press 1983.
- Connolly, R. Hugh. *Didascalia Apostolorum* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Damboriena, Prudencio. "The Pentecostal Fury." *Catholic World* 202 (1966): 217-221.
- Dibelius, Martin. *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*. ed. K.C. Hanson. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Dickerson, Patrick L. "The Sources of the Account of the Mission to Samaria in Acts 8:5-25." *Novum Testamentum* 39, no. 3 (1997): 210-34.
- Diekmann, Godfrey. "The Laying on of Hands: The Basic Sacramental Rite." In *Catholic Theological Society of America: Proceedings of the 29th Annual Convention, Chicago, June 10-13, 1974*, edited by Luke Salm, 339-51. NY: Catholic Theological Society of America, 1974.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Chatham, England: W. & J. Mackay, 1970.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. "Luke and the Samaritans." *Harvard Theological Review* 36, no. 4 (1943): 277-97.



- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Introduction: A Half-Century Adventure with New Testament Textual Criticism." In *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962-2004*, xxvii-xl. Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Ford, J. Massyngbaerde. *Which Way for Catholic Pentecostals?* New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Friedrich, Gerard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Gallagher Mansfield, Patti. *As By a New Pentecost: The Dramatic Beginning of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1992.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Center of Münster University, eds. With the Collaboration of H. Bachmann and W. A. Slaby. *Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece of Nestle-Aland, 26<sup>th</sup> Edition, and to the Greek New Testament 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. New York: De Gruyter, 1987.
- Jackson, F.J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 1, *Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Jervell, Jacob. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Jipp, Joshua W. *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts: An Interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1-10*. Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Sacra Pagina Series*. Vol. 5, *The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- . *Sacra Pagina Series*. Vol. 3, *The Gospel of Luke*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- LaBerge, Agnes N. Ozman, *What God Hath Wrought*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.
- Laurentin, René. “The Charismatic Movement: Prophetic Renewal or Neo-Conservatism.” In *Neo-Conservatism: Social and Religious Phenomenon*, edited by Gregory Baum and Marcus Lefébure, 25-32. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- . *Catholic Pentecostalism*. Translated by Matthew J. O’Connell. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.
- Lederle, Henry. *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of “Spirit-Baptism” in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the ‘Acts of the Apostles.’* Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Marshall, Ian H. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971.
- Martin, Francis. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Scriptural Foundation*. Steubenville: Franciscan University Press, 1986.
- Martin, Ralph, “An Interview with Cardinal Suenens,” *New Covenant* 2, no. 12 (1973): 1-5.

- . “An Interview with Fr. Heribert Mühlen: Theologian of the Holy Spirit,” *New Covenant* 4, no. 1 (1974): 3-6.
- . *New Covenant* 2, no. 8 (1973): 1-28.
- McDonnell, Kilian. “Catholic Charismatics.” *Commonweal* 96, no. 9 (1972): 207-211.
- . “Catholic Charismatic Renewal and Classical Pentecostalism: Growth and the Critique of a Systemic Suspicion.” *One In Christ* 23, no. 1-2 (1987): 36-61.
- . “The Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Reassessment and Critique.” *Religion in Life* 44, no. 2 (1975): 138-54.
- . “Catholic Pentecostalism: Problems in Evaluation.” *Theology Digest* 19, no. 1 (1971): 46-51.
- . “The Ecumenical Significance of the Pentecostal Movement,” *Worship* 40, no. 10 (1966), 608-29.
- . “A Sociologist: Looks at the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.” *Worship* 49, no. 7 (1975): 378-92.
- . “Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.” *Worship* 47, no. 10 (1973): 610-20.
- , and George T. Montague, eds. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.
- , ed. *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- . *The Spirit and His Gifts: The Biblical Background of Spirit-Baptism, Tongue-Speaking, and Prophecy*. New York: Paulist Press, 1974.

- Montgomery, James A. *The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1907.
- Mühlen, Heribert. "Charismatic Renewal: An Ecumenical Hope." *Theology Digest* 30, (1982): 245-49.
- . "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church: Dogmatic Aspects of Charismatic Renewal." *One in Christ* 12, no. 4 (1974): 333-47.
- . "Confirmation as the Sacramental Sign of the Salvation-Historical Self-Giving-Over of the Spirit of Christ." *Theology Digest* 17, no. 1 (1969): 9-14.
- . "Sacrament and Charism: The Spirit and the Church." *Theology Digest* 25, no. 1 (1977): 45-49.
- . "Steps Toward a Universal Council of Christians." *Theology Digest* 21, no. 3 (1973): 196-201.
- . *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit*. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- O'Connor, Edward D. "Baptism of the Spirit: Emotional Therapy?" *Ave Maria* ?, no. ? (1967): 11-14.
- . *Pentecost in the Catholic Church: A Trilogy on the Catholic Pentecostal Movement*. Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1971).
- . *The Laying on of Hands*. Watchung, NJ: Charisma Books, 1971.
- . *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1971.
- O'Hanlon, Daniel J. "The Pentecostals and Pope John's 'New Pentecost,'" *America* 108, 18 (1963): 634-36.

- Oulton, J. E. L. "The Holy Spirit, Baptism, and Laying on of Hands in Acts." *Expository Times* 66, no. 8 (1955): 236-40.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Papa, Mary. "People Having a Good Time Praying," *National Catholic Reporter* 3, no. 29 (1967): 1,10.
- Parham, Sarah E. *The Life of Charles F. Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1930.
- Pervo, Richard I. "Dating Acts." *Forum* 5, no. 1 (2002): 53-72.
- . *Acts: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Ranaghan, Kevin, and Dorothy Ranaghan, eds. *As the Spirit Leads Us*. New York: Paulist Press, 1971.
- . *Catholic Pentecostals*. New York: Paulist Press, 1969.
- Reedy, John. "Reform of Suppression: Alternative Seen for Catholic Charismatic Renewal." *A.D. Correspondence* 10, no. 11 (1975): 1-8.
- Spencer, Franklin S. *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Suenens, Léon Joseph, "Cardinal Suenens on the Charismatic Renewal," *New Covenant* 2, no. 1 (1972): 6-7.
- Sullivan, Francis A. "The Pentecostal Movement." *Gregorianum* 53, no. 2 (1972): 237-66.
- . *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1982.

———. *A New Pentecost?* Translated by Francis Martin. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

Tipei, John Fleter. *The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009.

Turner, Max. “Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8: The Waterloo of Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology?” *Pneuma* 23, no. 2 (2001): 265-286.

van Oort, Johannes. “The Holy Spirit and the Early Church: Doctrine & Confession.” *Hervormde Teologische Studies* 67, no. 3 (2011): 1-8.

Vondey, Wolfgang. *Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile of the Church*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004.

Warnken, Russell. “Preaching Conversion in Acts.” *St Mark's Review* 223 (2013): 42-50.

Wilkerson, David. *The Cross and the Switchblade*. New York: Pyramid Books, 1962.