

## Roman Catholics and Non-Denominational Christians

*Talk given in Rome: April 30, 2003*

Peter Hocken

The sub-title of this talk could be **Why We Must Meet?**; or **Why We Must Work Together?** But maybe it is better expressed: **Why We Need Each Other?**

A first reason for our coming together could be the sheer size and scope of the non-denominational charismatic phenomenon in the world today. The *New International Dictionary of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* that Stan Burgess has edited gives a statistic of 295 million<sup>1</sup>. At the very least, there is need for those in the historic Churches, and not least in the Catholic Church, to pay attention to this phenomenon, to seek to find out what is happening, and then to understand it. Such understanding needs to take place at various levels and within various disciplines.

It seems that with new revivalistic currents the first scholars to show interest are most often sociologists and anthropologists. There are works by Irving Hexham and Karla Poewe on non-denominational charismatic churches in South Africa<sup>2</sup> and a

---

<sup>1</sup> See p. 284. The authors, David Barrett and Todd Johnson, use the terminology of “Neo-Charismatics” and “Third Wavers”. Actually the term “third wave”, unfortunate in my view, when first coined by C. Peter Wagner, did not refer to “non-denominational charismatics” but to Evangelicals being impacted by aspects of Pentecostal-charismatic practice without accepting a second-blessing theology or the “charismatic” label.

<sup>2</sup> I. Hexham and K. Poewe, “Charismatic Churches in South Africa: A Critique of Criticisms and Problems of Bias” in K. Poewe (ed.) *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), pp. 50 – 69. See also the article of the same authors on South Africa in S. Burgess (ed.) *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002) pp. 227 – 238.

book by a British anthropologist, Simon Coleman, on the Faith Church in Uppsala, Sweden<sup>3</sup>. Theologians have not shown themselves to be very quick off the mark in this respect. There is more literature on the non-denominational in Britain than in any other country, largely due to the pioneering work of Andrew Walker, the Russian Orthodox son of an Elim Pentecostal pastor, a sociologist well-informed in theology and a lecturer at Kings College, London<sup>4</sup>. The new charismatic grouping that has attracted the most study would appear to be the Vineyard movement led by John Wimber until his death in 1998<sup>5</sup>.

The need for non-denominational and Roman Catholics to come together can be argued from both the size of the non-denominational movement as a charismatic phenomenon and the size and influence of the Catholic Church in worldwide Christianity. This argument is enhanced by the renewal currents encouraged and let loose in the Catholic Church by the Second Vatican Council together with the extent and the impact of the new ecclesial movements.

---

<sup>3</sup> S. Coleman, *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

<sup>4</sup> A. Walker *Restoring the Kingdom: The Radical Christianity of the House Church Movement* (Guildford: Eagle, 1998). Walker has written numerous articles on the same subject. There are also some other studies of lesser weight and thoroughness.

<sup>5</sup> The bibliography on the Vineyard movement given in the entry in NIDPCM (p. 1177) does not mention any of the more detailed studies: M. Percy *Words, Wonders and Power* (London: SPCK, 1996); D. E. Miller *Reinventing American Protestantism* (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 1997); D. Albrecht *Rites in the Spirit* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Another sociologist who has written on Wimber and the Vineyard movement is Stephen Hunt.

However, there is a grave danger of the dynamic currents of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity and the Catholic Church simply perceiving each other as deadly enemies, with the Catholic Church denouncing these dynamic new groupings as “sects” and they in turn denouncing the Catholic Church as dead, apostate, semi-pagan, the embodiment of “religion” in thrall to the bondage of “religious spirits”. This danger is real, both because of the dynamism of the new charismatics and because our mentalities are so different.

### A Framework for Understanding

For us here, who have mostly – maybe all – built friendships over the years across this divide, we may be able to move directly into more constructive relationships. But for our constituencies, I think a wider framework of understanding is needed to show how the Holy Spirit is at work on both sides and how the present situation fits into a bigger historical context.

I see the Charismatic Movement of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as the latest in a series of what I call “revival streams”<sup>6</sup>. I prefer the term “streams” to “movements”, because “streams” captures far more accurately the initial life-giving flow from the Lord that comes before all forms of organisation<sup>7</sup>. The first of these, the

<sup>6</sup> This framework is presented in more detail in my book *The Strategy of the Spirit?* (Guildford: Eagle Publications, 1996).

<sup>7</sup> The revival stream character of the Pentecostal movement was constantly emphasised by Donald Gee. One typical statement of Gee was: “Before we became so Movement-conscious we thought more often of the Pentecostal Revival as a means of grace to quicken whomsoever the Lord our God should call. Denominational loyalties were a secondary consideration. Let them remain such. The vital necessity of the Movement is that it shall continue and grow as a Revival. Nothing less deserves to be called ‘Pentecostal.’” (“Are we too ‘Movement’ conscious?” *Pentecost* 2, December 1947).

Evangelical stream arose around the 1730s<sup>8</sup>; the second, the Holiness stream in the middle decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; the third, the Pentecostal stream at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the fourth, the Charismatic stream between 1950 and 1970. This schema has the merit of seeing that something truly new and creative happened around 1730: the beginning of outdoor preaching and mass evangelism<sup>9</sup>, the emergence of a strong missionary thrust in Protestant Christianity<sup>10</sup>, the first signs of a movement that was wider than particular Protestant denominations and groupings. It also indicates the historical sources influencing the Pentecostal and charismatic streams, while recognising that they also represent something distinctively new in reference to what had preceded them for many centuries.

The Evangelical stream began within the existing Protestant denominations, though it contained a strong element of protest against outward lifeless formalism within those churches. Soon it began to have a few expressions outside those denominations<sup>11</sup>. The Holiness stream began within some Protestant denominations, particularly the Methodist and the Presbyterian – and then in England the Anglican, but within fifty years it was giving rise to new Holiness denominations. The Pentecostal stream followed rapidly on the Holiness stream, winning over some new Holiness groupings and posing a major challenge to Holiness circles. Unlike the other streams, the Pentecostals found no lasting place within the older denominations, and within ten to twenty years had become totally a

<sup>8</sup> Here I follow in particular the conclusions of David Bebbington in his major study, *Evangelicalism in Britain: 1730 – 1980* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1989).

<sup>9</sup> First by George Whitfield, and then by John Wesley.

<sup>10</sup> This came particularly from the Pentecost experience among the Moravians at Herrnhut, Germany, in 1727.

<sup>11</sup> E. g. in Britain the Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion.

movement of new Pentecostal denominations. In this respect, the Charismatic stream first appears as “Pentecost outside Pentecost”, to use Donald Gee’s phrase, that is, the Pentecostal blessing and experience appearing – unexpectedly – within the historic Protestant Churches, and then – even more unexpectedly – within the Catholic Church. The spread of the Charismatic stream to the Catholic Church, made possible by the Second Vatican Council, has to be of major spiritual significance, precisely because it represents the first time that a worldwide revival stream of Protestant provenance had entered and been welcomed within the Roman Catholic Church.

But the Charismatic stream soon manifested a presence outside the existing Churches and denominations in groupings that by the early 1970s were being called “non-denominational”. The “non-denominational” charismatics did not identify with “renewal” in the historic Churches<sup>12</sup> and they did not identify with the Pentecostals. In fact, they generally thought that the Pentecostal movement had taken a major wrong turning when it became a cluster of new denominations. Perhaps for the first time<sup>13</sup> – or certainly in a new way – the first generation of “non-denominational” charismatics were determined not to become new denominations. Seeing the “non-denominational” in this larger historical context makes it easier for other Christians

<sup>12</sup> A similar determination was found among many of the early Plymouth Brethren. Some non-denominational leaders, such as Arthur Wallis, deliberately contrasted Renewal, seen as insufficient, with Restoration, seen as the full purpose of the Lord.

<sup>13</sup> There was an element of “anti-denominationalism” in the Plymouth Brethren, that certainly flowed into the “house church movement” in Britain; see P. Hocken *Streams of Renewal* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997), Appendix III “The Ecclesiology of the Plymouth Brethren as background to the stream of the Charismatic movement associated with D. G. Lillie and A. Wallis”, pp. 201 – 206.

to take this phenomenon seriously and not to dismiss it as an ephemeral fad.

This history suggests that the tension and polarity between “inside” and “outside”, between renewal of the existing Churches and new expressions outside, reflects a “strategy” of the Holy Spirit, however difficult that may be for our received theologies – on both sides. With this interaction between “outside” and “inside” we come to a deeper reason why dialogue, cooperation and relationships are necessary between the historic Churches and the revival streams. This interaction is especially necessary between the biggest and the ancient Church, the Catholic, and the most deliberately “outside” grouping, the “non-denominational” desirous of avoiding the fate of “denominationalism”.

#### The Distinctiveness of the New Charismatics - with a Few Questions

Before outlining some possible principles to guide a Catholic – non-denominational encounter, I want to reflect on the distinctiveness of the new charismatics. I am speaking primarily here of the phenomenon as it manifests itself in North America, Europe and Australasia, but many of these characteristics are found in all continents. I am also speaking more about the apparent mainstream of the “new churches” and not so much about the “Faith Churches”, which in some ways form a distinct bracket of their own<sup>14</sup>.

Since the Charismatic stream basically, I believe, represents the spiritual blessing of the Pentecostal stream but in a different context, we may ask how the new charismatics are different from the Pentecostals. In their determination not to

<sup>14</sup> The original Faith (prosperity) groupings in the USA grew up more out of a Pentecostal background, encountered the opposition of the Pentecostal denominations, and opted for the label “charismatic” for motives that were as much political-promotional as theological.

become new denominations, the new charismatic networks and assemblies are more flexible and less doctrinaire than the Pentecostals. Denominations require declarations of doctrine in a way that movements do not. While fundamental convictions are important to them, the “non-denominational” charismatics are most concerned about “life”: that faith is a living faith, that congregations are living bodies that grow and multiply. They are more contemporary in style and organisation, owing more to modern patterns of business management than to inherited theology and church tradition. The formation of new networks and new assemblies is characteristic of the entrepreneurial spirit in a capitalist economy. This fact suggests that to treat this phenomenon as simply another instance of schism in the classical sense of divisions within an existing body would be a mistake. There is a strong factor of acculturation or they might say here of *aggiornamento*.

An aspect of their pragmatism is that they are generally less anti-Catholic than their Evangelical and Pentecostal forebears. This would seem to make possible new forms of ecumenical relationship and collaboration. I have met non-denominational leaders who do not see themselves as either Protestant or Catholic, and who feel free to relate to both - and beyond. Their pragmatism often makes them more open than Pentecostals to symbols and prophetic gestures in their worship<sup>15</sup>. This greater openness is partly a consequence of being better educated than the first generations of Pentecostals, though often their education has been secular – often in business-related and technological studies – rather than ecclesiastical-theological. The combination of intelligence and entrepreneurial spirit has produced a remarkable creativity, so that many initiatives have originated in these milieux.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. the attraction of candles within the Cornerstone network in U. K. and the openness of some Vineyard assemblies to more liturgical forms.

This means that they have an edge on the historic Churches in leadership formation, in systems management, etc., as well as producing a disproportionate amount of new Christian music.

In terms of theological-spiritual content, the new Charismatics are more interested in the issue of Church than classical Pentecostals have been. Related to this is their general belief in the restoration of the Ephesians 4: 11 ministries<sup>16</sup>, particularly the restoration of apostolic ministry. Much of the recent charismatic focus on the prophetic has been spearheaded by the new Charismatics<sup>17</sup>. Initially, one of the major differences between the Charismatics “inside” and those “outside” was the emphasis of the latter on the Ephesians 4: 11 ministries, which led to a contrasting of “Renewal” with spiritual gifts, seen at best as a half-way house, with “Restoration” emphasising both spiritual gifts and Ephesians 4: 11 ministries.

Because the new Charismatics represent a revival stream that resists denominationalisation, it does not yet have the apparatus of denominations. This enables Catholics to see the “non-denominational” more as new movements parallel to the new ecclesial movements in the Catholic Church, which make no claim to be church. The determination not to become new denominations is often regarded as sociologically naïve, but might it not be that this determination represents a prophetic element that is part of the Lord recalling us all to be more in movement towards the Kingdom, just as the Church

<sup>16</sup> “And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ” (Eph. 4: 11 – 12).

<sup>17</sup> It is within new Charismatic circles that particular people have been widely recognised as having the ministry of a prophet: e.g. Rick Joyner and Bobby Conner (U. S. A.) and Graham Cooke (U. K.).

was called “The Way”<sup>18</sup> in the Acts of the Apostles? Might not these features make it easier for the Catholic Church to relate to the new charismatics?

### Some Putative Principles

To approach such a dialogue of “outside” and “inside” I want to propose a few principles for discussion and possible agreement. With each principle I will give a short explanation.

#### **1. The new revival streams arise as correctives to weaknesses, neglects and failures of the historic Churches.**

This point is more of an historical observation than a theological principle<sup>19</sup>. It is not as broad as saying that all movements arising outside the Churches represent elements of the Christian heritage neglected in the mainline Churches – which may well also be true. It is a statement only about the four **revival streams**, which possess a particular character as outpourings from “on high” that do not arise from the genius or the insight of any one founder figure. In consequence, they do - I suggest – manifest a higher element of divine purpose in their origins than other new movements in which the human component in their origins is stronger.

#### **2. The God-given element in the revival streams is a force for new life, linked to certain core convictions concerning the Christian gospel.**

The revival streams combine a focus on a living relationship to God with core convictions concerning the gospel. They can only be understood rightly when both these elements are taken into account. The core convictions ground the objectivity of

<sup>18</sup> Acts 9: 2; 19: 9, 23. See also Acts 18: 26; 22: 4.

<sup>19</sup> Theologically, the action of God can never be adequately understood simply in terms of a response to a human situation.

revival-renewal, but without the directness of relationship to the Lord the revival streams lose their dynamism and can degenerate into mere fundamentalism.

The revival streams in their genesis and character do not mediate the whole of Christian life or the whole of divine revelation. The core convictions are normally part of the official belief of the Churches in which they arise, but in the revival streams these core convictions have been raised up as the energising centre that carries forward the Lord’s work of revival. They do not represent or constitute Church simply as streams.

In the Evangelical stream, the core convictions are that Jesus Christ is Saviour from sin and Lord of all, his substitutionary atonement on the cross<sup>20</sup>, the unique authority of a totally-trustworthy Bible<sup>21</sup>, the primacy of evangelism and the need for each believer to repent and to experience conversion. The Holiness stream adds the necessity of personal experience of sanctification, the Pentecostal the gift of the empowering Spirit in Spirit-baptism and the spiritual gifts.

#### **3. At the heart of the revival streams is a lifting up of the absolute Lordship of Jesus Christ, accentuated in the Pentecostal and Charismatic streams by the life-giving mission of the Holy Spirit that is totally directed towards the Omega point of the Coming of the Lord.**

<sup>20</sup> Although Catholics do not usually use this term, it is in accordance with Catholic faith insofar as it is expressing the fundamental truth that Jesus died for our sins, and in so doing did what we were incapable of doing for ourselves. See the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 615 under the heading “Jesus substitutes his obedience for our disobedience”.

<sup>21</sup> I have used the word “trustworthy” to express what all Evangelicals believe about the total reliability of the Bible, and that many but not all would express in terms of inerrancy.

The role of the revival streams is not primarily an insistence on certain doctrines, but the dissemination of an experienced dependence on the saving power and unique Lordship of Jesus Christ. The core convictions are the necessary doctrinal underpinning for this existential dependence. The Pentecostal and Charismatic streams emphasise that this dependence on the Lordship of Jesus can only be realised in and through the Holy Spirit. The spiritual gifts that characterise these streams can in fact only be received through a trusting faith-dependence upon the Divine giver. The exercise of these charisms thus symbolises for the whole Christian life the dependence on the Holy Spirit that is being received afresh at each moment. The dependence on the risen Lord and the outpouring of his Spirit orients the Christian community afresh to the coming of the Lord and his Kingdom. For the cry that the Spirit gives to the Bride is “Come”. This subordination to the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the ever-continuing gift of the Holy Spirit oriented to the coming fulness constitutes the deepest challenge of the revival streams to the Church.

#### **4. New revival streams are given for the benefit of the whole body of Christ.**

In God’s purposes, all gifts are given for the sake of the whole. This is ultimately because in God’s creation everything is connected, and in the redemption this connectedness that was disrupted by sin is being restored. This principle is expressed by Paul in relation to the giftings of the Holy Spirit: “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.” (1 Cor. 12: 7). This is further explained later in the same chapter, when Paul writes, “For the body does not consist of one member but of many” (1 Cor. 12: 14) and then makes the comparison with the human body in which the “The eye cannot say to the hand, ‘I have no need of you,’ nor again the head to the feet, ‘I have no need of you.’” (1 Cor. 12: 21).

The revival streams focus on the spiritual and the inward, as a corrective to formalism and lack of life. As currents of new life given to benefit the whole body, the streams have a servant role. They are not the whole of Christianity, and never bear witness to the fulness of divine revelation. A servant vision recognises the God-given character of much in the Church heritage that needs to be preserved and revived through renewal. If revival streams claim to be the whole, they lose this servant character and their exaggerated claims distort their original gifting. This may happen in the process of a revival stream becoming a new denomination or cluster of denominations.

#### **5. The revival streams are needed by the historic Churches.**

To benefit the whole body of Christ, the core-convictions of the revival streams have to interact with the total life of the Church in all its multi-faceted dimensions. This is the profound meaning of **renewal**. This interaction means encounter with a corporate way of life, with a church culture, with a heritage, with a structured institution. The Church so addressed from within and from without by the revival stream has its non-negotiable convictions and traditions. With the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches, the non-negotiable element is greater, and is not just spiritual or theological. The non-negotiable includes an element of embodiment. Here the encounter occurs within a Church that understands itself as an embodiment of the one Church of Jesus Christ.

This encounter between revival/renewal stream and Church inevitably creates tensions. The tensions come first from the challenge of the Holy Spirit to embodied and entrenched forms of church behaviour. They can be exacerbated by immature behaviour by revival-renewal enthusiasts, but the call and the dynamism of revival/renewal necessarily contains a prophetic challenge to the status quo in the Church. The deepest challenge is the total

orientation of the Holy Spirit to the coming kingdom, that cannot be accommodated to any form of settled establishment in this world.

Profound renewal in the historic Churches comes through the faithful suffering of the prophetic pioneers. Most of the great pioneer figures who prepared the way for the Second Vatican Council in the Catholic Church suffered a great deal, but the Church later accepted their vision and not that of their opponents<sup>22</sup>. It is this perseverance through acute suffering and trial that produces a humility and a depth in the prophetic figures.

**6. However, in God's Providence some streams may develop outside the existing expressions of the Church. In this case, they are still for the sake of the whole Body, but their contribution may require a period of separate development.**

The first statement is a fact. Streams of revival do form and/or develop outside the existing Churches, whether often or only occasionally. The key questions then are: (a) how do the existing Churches regard them? And (b) how do they understand themselves?

Two gospel texts that can speak into this situation: (a) a word of John the Baptist: "do not presume to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham." (Matt. 3: 9). (b) a word of Jesus: "John said to him, 'Teacher, we saw a man casting out demons in your name, and we forbade him, because he was not following us.' But Jesus said, 'Do not forbid him; for no one who does a mighty work in my name will be able soon after to speak evil of me.'"

---

<sup>22</sup> One could mention men like Dom Lambert Beauduin, the Abbé Paul Couturier, Père Yves Congar, OP, Père Henri de Lubac, SJ.

(Mark 9: 38 – 39)<sup>23</sup>. These are interesting passages, because they seem to be speaking more into a situation of independence than of schism.

Catholics are more accustomed to think of schism than of independence. But even with schism, there is an important biblical episode that mentions a schism with prophetic sanction. In 1 Kings 11 – 12, we read of the schism between the northern and the southern kingdoms. In this narrative: (a) the prophetic promises to David concerning the kingdom are not revoked (1 Kings 11: 34); (b) the schism is the consequence of Solomon's sin (1 Kings 11: 33); (c) the schism has prophetic sanction through the prophet Ahijah (1 Kings 11: 29 – 39); (d) this punishment for the Davidic kingdom will not last for ever (1 Kings 11: 39).

This story should not be used to justify any kind of schism. But it does question an automatic conclusion that schism can never be justified. But in this episode, the prophetic sanction for the schism states that it is because of the sin of the king, it is only for a time, and it does not represent a withdrawal of the divine promises to the lineage of David. Thus, if there is a divinely-sanctioned separateness, it can only be for a time<sup>24</sup>. Hence, this sixth principle is not an exception to the fourth. Thus, for example, the work of the Holy Spirit among the Mennonites is ultimately for the good of the whole Church, even if it takes over 450 years for those who rejected their witness to realise it.

---

<sup>23</sup> I have chosen the Markan version of this saying, as it includes the mention of doing "a mighty work" in the name of Jesus, which is not present in Luke's version in Luke 9: 49 – 50.

<sup>24</sup> It is significant that after the schism, when Rehoboam plans to regain his lost territories by force, the prophet Shemaiah proclaims: "Thus says the Lord, You shall not go up or fight against your kinsmen the people of Israel. Return every man to his home, for this thing is from me." (1 Kings 12: 24).

**7. Revival-Renewal within the existing Churches and Revival-Restoration outside the existing Churches play different but complementary roles in the preparation of the Church for the coming Kingdom.**

The irreplaceable witness of the historic Churches is to the fulness of divine revelation and the fulness of the means of grace, together with the witness to God's total faithfulness. The contribution of revival/renewal is a re-centring on the core reality and revelation, that throws light on the whole, and thus the purification, the revivification and the "re-dynamisation" of the full Christian heritage. Renewal combines the **intensive** life and focus of the stream with the **extensive** range of the whole body.

The process of renewal is messy. There is tension, there is opposition, there are times when the witness is obscured. This is a process of the spiritual impacting the structured life of believers in the Church, an interaction of the spiritual with the bodily, the intellectual and the psychic. It is this interaction in all its messiness and pain that incarnates the life-impulses in the structured body and purifies the reforming soul.

When new groupings develop outside the existing Churches, they have a freedom to base their whole corporate life on the core convictions that drive them. They have a freedom to follow the Holy Spirit: in worship, in ministry, in evangelism, in formation. They can develop their own models, and determine their own priorities. With the Pentecostal movement and again in the new Charismatic streams, this has meant a freedom to make the gifts and ministries of the Spirit central to their corporate worship and to their government in a way that is not possible for renewal movements within historic Churches. In this way, the new groupings pose a challenge to the Churches to live more fully in dependence on the Lordship of Jesus and in the gifting of the

Holy Spirit. They confront the churches with eschatological urgency.

The contribution of the new groupings and networks outside the Churches is to show forth what living by these central convictions can achieve. Their calling is, we might say, to make the Churches jealous, to take an idea from Paul's teaching about the Gentiles and the Jews. But the challenge of the revival streams tends to be "one-generational". For outside the historic structures, they cannot avoid taking on new structures<sup>25</sup>. And their structures tend to be less flexible and their heritage more limited than that of the ancient Churches that were never constituted by way of "reaction". Thus the return challenges from the historic Churches to the independent groupings are the challenges of incarnation, of fulness and of long-term fidelity.

**8. We need each other for the recovery of a wholeness in which the spiritual, the intellectual and the bodily-structural elements find their right ordering from God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. This recovery is essentially related to the recovery of the Jewish roots, in which these elements were fashioned together.**

The more I grapple with these issues the more I believe the deepest issues are the relationship between spirit, mind and body, and the Messianic hope. It is to do with incarnation. But not just with incarnation understood as the Son of God becoming man, but with the incarnate God-man through his passion and death becoming a

---

<sup>25</sup> When new denominations then arise, they are forced to become more total systems in a way that revival streams are not. They have to clothe themselves, so to speak, with a comprehensive doctrine, with a form of church government, with patterns of education, particularly for pastors. Later revival streams then in their turn impact these new denominations, as the Holiness and Charismatic streams have interacted with the Methodist churches.

“spiritual body” (1 Cor. 15: 44) that is a “life-giving spirit” (1 Cor. 15: 45) so as to bring “many sons [and daughters] to glory” (Heb. 2: 10).

In recent years, I have had an increasing contact with the Messianic Jews. I believe that this is highly relevant to our encounter. One major reason is that the Messianic Jews are in several ways another form of independent church with many bonds to the Evangelical-charismatic “non-denominational” world. But from another angle, the Messianic Jews are very unlike the “non-denominational” groupings, for they claim to be a resurrection of a Jewish expression of the Church that existed in the first centuries of the Christian era. The Messianic Jews are living a huge tension: as believers with an Evangelical theology and a revivalist spirituality and as believers connecting with the most ancient biblical heritage for whom physical descent from Abraham through a historical heritage is a constituent dimension. By their double belonging, we might say, they are caught up in this meeting of new life and ancient heritage. Ultimately, they cannot separate the spirit from the body. And the Jews still carry the Messianic hope – more strongly than the Gentilised Church has done. It is so interesting that the Catholic Catechism in its section on the second coming has this extraordinary sub-title: “The glorious advent of Christ, the hope of Israel”<sup>26</sup>.

---

This document has been published on web site StuCom, <http://home.hetnet.nl/~stucum> as document 0100uk  
Other articles of P. Hocken on StuCom: 0101uk, 0102uk and 0103uk. (More article can be published after June 16th, 2003.)  
Who is Peter Hocken? See StuCom 0104uk.  
Some English documents on the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue: 0002uk, 0004uk, 0023uk, 0093uk, 0096uk.  
Dutch documents on this dialogue: see overview StuCom document 9003

---

<sup>26</sup> *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, heading above para. 673 - 4.