

EDITED BY

*John C. Cavadini*

AND

*Danielle M. Peters*

*Mary* ON THE EVE OF  
THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME PRESS

NOTRE DAME, INDIANA

© University of Notre Dame Press

University of Notre Dame Press  
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556  
www.undpress.nd.edu  
Copyright © 2017 by the University of Notre Dame

All Rights Reserved

The Press gratefully acknowledges the support of the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts, University of Notre Dame, in the publication of this book.

Published in the United States of America

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Cavadini, John C., editor.

Title: Mary on the eve of the Second Vatican Council /  
edited by John C. Cavadini and Danielle M. Peters.

Description: Notre Dame : University of Notre Dame Press, 2017. |  
Includes index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017001229 (print) | LCCN 2017010059 (ebook) |  
ISBN 9780268101589 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 0268101582  
(hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780268101596 (pbk. : alk. paper) |  
ISBN 0268101590 (pbk. : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780268101602 (pdf) |  
ISBN 9780268101619 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Mary, Blessed Virgin, Saint. | Vatican Council  
(2nd : 1962–1965 : Basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano). De Beata Maria  
Virgine Deipara in mysterio Christi et ecclesiae.

Classification: LCC BT613 .M37 2017 (print) | LCC BT613 (ebook) |  
DDC 232.9109/04—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017001229>

∞ *This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992  
(Permanence of Paper).*

© University of Notre Dame Press

## Introduction

JOHN C. CAVADINI

This book has the aim of an invitation. I wonder if there is any person more uniquely associated with Catholicism than Mary, the Mother of Jesus. I do not mean to imply that Mary is the most important person in Catholic teaching, belief, or practice. The person of Jesus Christ would take that place. But Jesus is not uniquely associated with Catholicism: all Christians believe in Jesus in some central way, and even some non-Christian religions find a place for him. But if one wants to use the image of a person to call to mind on a poster, on the cover of a book, in a film, something Catholic without using the word “Catholic,” Mary is the most likely candidate. In polemics against the Church, in the Church’s own imagination as expressed in art and theology, the Catholic Church is uniquely associated with Mary. Mary remains the person whose name or image will bring to mind Catholicism most readily.

It is ironic that this should be the case since, after the Second Vatican Council, the level of devotion to Mary, at least in the Catholicism of much of Europe and North America, plummeted and remains very low, so low that the eminent theologian Karl Rahner bemoaned the state of Marian devotion in a famous essay that one of our contributors, Peter Joseph Fritz, brings to our attention. Of course she holds her place in the

liturgy, and yet, to judge by the comments of another contributor, Fr. James Phelan, homilies on Mary are rarely heard, sometimes not even on Marian feast days. And “Mariology,” if by that is meant the theological study of Mary, has all but vanished from the theological mainstream and from theological curricula. It is an irony, then, that Mary persists in the cultural imagination as the person most uniquely associated with Catholicism. It is an even further irony that Mariology was one of the most flourishing of theological disciplines in the decades on the “eve” of the Second Vatican Council, and indeed had been flourishing for about one hundred years before. Both theology and devotion had so prospered in the “long” century between the declaration of the Immaculate Conception as dogma by Pius IX (1854) and the declaration of the Assumption as dogma by Pius XII (1950) and the subsequent opening of the Council (1962).

The invitation extended by this book is to study the Marian theology of this long century and to begin to find ways to take up some of its strands and cultivate them anew. There are so many, as it were, beautifully colored threads of reflection on Mary that have been simply left behind. Some of them were woven into the tapestry of chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium* (LG), the Council’s Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. Some of them were not. All of them were dropped, seemingly, after the Council. Perhaps it is time to pick some of them up and weave them anew. Perhaps after a distance of nearly sixty years we can look at the various theologies without feeling quite so keenly the controversies out of which they arose and to which they contributed, and that may allow us to see golden threads of continuity that we had not seen before. It may allow us to refuse some of the dichotomies that seemed so urgent in some of those decades, for example, between the so-called Marian maximalism and the so-called minimalism; refuse them, at least, as defining features of the story of Marian theology in the long Marian century preceding the Council. From the perspective of the present dearth, even the “minimalism” of the 1950s can look fairly maximalist!

The volume begins with a section on historical highlights of the period we consider. The first chapter is a retrospect of the development of Marian theology by Fr. Brian E. Daley, who looks back from the perspective of *Lumen Gentium* to the earliest beginnings. Fifty years after

the Council, we are, he says, “still trying to discern what features of preconiliar Catholic life were of permanent importance, in need now of refreshment or even reconstruction, and what were just part of a world that has properly evolved away.” This applies to the theology of the “Marian Age,” as the whole modern era of Catholicism could be called because of its increasing focus on Mary, culminating in the two Marian dogmatic definitions of 1854 and 1950. Perhaps the most crucial development in the ancient Church was the affirmation of Mary as “Mother of God” at Ephesus in 431, with the efflorescence of Marian devotion everywhere in the Church. Ironically this devotion flourished regardless of whether the Chalcedonian definition of the person of Christ, with its reaffirmation of the title “Mother of God,” was accepted or not. Liturgical devotion to Mary was a constant throughout a church that was divided on other (related) issues, and even the non-Chalcedonian churches accepted the Dormition, or, as it became known in the West, the Assumption, of Mary. In the West, two developments in Marian theology were to have a long history of development themselves, all the way into the twentieth century. These were Bernard of Clairvaux’s idea that Mary is “the ‘aqueduct,’ the channel through whom all God’s grace flows to a parched humanity”—a precursor of the idea that Mary is “*Mediatrix*” of all graces—and the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which achieved its most precise and persuasive early form under John Duns Scotus. The theology of the Marian Age focused on the development of these and other “privileges” of Mary, sometimes veering into enthusiasms that seem “to have shifted the emphasis of Christian belief and piety from Jesus to Mary,” as with de Montfort, who, Daley writes, “draws on the tradition of her channeling God’s grace to the world . . . and alters it into an image of her complete control of that grace,” to the extent that “Christianity seems to have been transformed into ‘*Marianity*.’”

In reaction to such enthusiasm, to be sure, but also to Catholic theology even in less enthusiastic versions, we find, for example, Karl Barth’s 1938 rejection of Catholic Mariology as “the critical, central dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, . . . the one heresy . . . which explains all the rest . . . the principle, type, and essence of the human creature cooperating . . . in its own redemption,” and thus “the principle, type and essence of the Church.” Meanwhile, Catholic theology in the 1930s had begun to

experience the new movement that came to be called *ressourcement*: a “return to the sources of theology,” which “attempted to move away from the deductive, apologetic rationalism” and “looked for historical development, continuities, and influences within a changing but organically growing tradition, inspired by a new encounter with the Church Fathers” and, through them, the Bible. Taking Barth at his word, in a way, these theologians began to focus on what de Lubac (1937) called “a single Mystery: the Mystery of Christ and the Church.” Otto Semmelroth in 1950 explicitly and systematically inserts Mary into this “single mystery” as “both the personal center and the symbol of what God has brought to fulfillment in the Church: as Bride.” In a sense, he accepts Barth’s critique and attempts to draw out the biblical and patristic dimensions of Mary’s place in this “single mystery,” precisely so that the mystery is not divided, as Barth feared. Yves Congar follows suit in 1952 with *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, both attempting to reconnect, as de Lubac had done, the theology of Mary with the theology of Christ and the Church—agreeing with Barth, in a sense, that something had gone awry—and yet defending Catholic teaching on Mary and the Church by insisting on the crucial role of the humanity of Christ in redemption, and thus on the roles of Mary and the Church, who are both intimately associated with it. Barth’s critique, from Congar’s point of view, represents a rejection, implicitly, of the “mediating role of Christ’s humanity,” an irony, since Barth’s objection was precisely to the way in which he believed Catholic theology to have displaced this mediating role in favor of Mary and the Church. Hugo Rahner’s book *Our Lady and the Church*, published the year before, follows the same idea of Mary as a “type” of the Church. In 1956 his brother Karl Rahner argued along distinct, although related, lines for the integration of Mary into the economy of biblical faith. For Karl Rahner, the “fundamental principle of Mariology” is realized in the Assumption of Mary, that is, the acknowledgment of Mary as the most perfectly redeemed of all human beings.

Thus, on the eve of the Second Vatican Council we had, in the theology developed by the *ressourcement* theologians, a Mariology that was tied integrally to the history of salvation, made possible by “a renewed, historically grounded, liturgically centered, scripturally expressed, understanding of the *Church*” (emphasis in original). When the Council was an-

nounced in 1959, the older themes of the Marian Age, concentrating especially on the relationship of Mary and Jesus and the privileges flowing from this relationship—for example, her status as Mediatrix—which glorify her “as singular, as different from the rest of us,” were understood by a number of more traditional theologians as a way of glorifying, not of detracting from, Christ the Lord. From this perspective, it was argued that the Council should have a separate document on Mary. The perspective developed by the *ressourcement* theologians, however, was behind an alternative proposal presented to the Council, namely, that Mary be included as part of the Council’s statement on ecclesiology. By a narrow vote, the Council fathers approved the latter proposal. “The resulting final section of *Lumen Gentium*,” as Daley writes, “is in many ways one of the most complete summations we have of modern Catholic Marian doctrine,” one that folds Marian theology formally into the theology of the Church and yet manages to integrate into this theology, and thereby contextualize within it, the privileges strand of the Marian Age, including her role as Mediatrix, which appears as “an expression of her continuing motherhood.” Daley’s essay concludes with a brief look at the development of Marian theology in the writings of Popes Paul VI, John Paul II, and Francis as commentary on and development of the synthesis of *Lumen Gentium*.

The second chapter in the volume, by Fr. Thomas A. Thompson, offers the reader a second retrospect of Catholic Marian theology from the perspective of *Lumen Gentium*, this time paying special attention to the theme of Mary’s *faith* as the golden thread that helps us to narrate the history of this theology. In figures as early as Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Mary’s faith is contrasted to the unbelief and disobedience of Eve. In Ambrose the theme of Mary’s faith becomes a link to the faith of all believers, all of whom, like Mary, can conceive and give birth to the Word of God. For Ambrose, Mary serves as a *type* of the Church, both of whom give birth to believers. As such, Mary is also the mother of believers. Augustine develops the idea more fully: “For Augustine, Mary’s maternity was an encompassing mystery transcending temporal succession; it was an illustration of the *Totus Christus*, that is, the inseparability of the physical body of the Christ from the body of the members.” Mary’s faith preceded her conception of Christ physically, as the conception of Christ in her heart and, presumably, all of his members.

This Augustinian tradition continues in Bede and other monastic teachers in the West, but in the “Marian revival” featuring Bernard of Clairvaux and the development of the “Hail Mary” in the twelfth century and moving on to Albert the Great and Thomas, there are no references to the faith of Mary. Apart from Albert the Great, the Mary–Church relation is hardly present, and after him it “appears to have fallen into oblivion.” Marian theology picks up after the Council of Trent, and the word “Mariology” appears for the first time in a treatise from 1602, but it is in the nineteenth century that we find an acceleration of Marian teaching and, though itself critiqued for an overly rationalistic methodology, “the Scholastic revival in Italy was a response to rationalism and modern philosophy.” But the renewal of liturgical, biblical, and patristic theology beginning in the nineteenth century and the early twentieth eventually reached Mariology through the *ressourcement* theologians, and the deductive method of the Neo-Scholastic handbooks was left behind, even though the search for a “fundamental principle” for Mariology persisted in this new style of theology. “Yet to be written,” Thompson notes, “is the history of the Marian *ressourcement*, which at Vatican II was responsible for an image of the Virgin Mary different from the one that was found in the early twentieth-century manuals.” He writes, “First recovered” from the early centuries was “the Mary–Church relationship” and “then the Virgin Mary’s integration into Scripture and salvation history.” Thompson summarizes the contributions of Hugo Rahner, Alois Müller, Heinrich Köster, René Laurentin, and Otto Semmelroth as well as the contributions of the Mariological societies that evolved in the first half of the twentieth century.

*Lumen Gentium* chapter 8 presents Mary within the *one* mystery of Christ and the Church, reconciling and integrating a Christocentric or Christotypical view of Mary and an ecclesiotypical view. Thompson writes that that document proclaims that “within the Church, Mary’s relation to Christ is fully intact” in all its various dimensions, and within this one mystery, Mary’s place in salvation history is elaborated under four Old Testament types: the promised Woman (cf. Gen. 3.15, where the Latin text has a feminine subject); the virgin who shall conceive (Isa. 7:14; Mic. 5:2–3; Matt. 1:22–23); the humble and poor of the Lord; and Daughter of Sion. Mary’s faith, mentioned in the second of the blessings



that Elizabeth directs to her: “Blessed are you among women, and blest is the fruit of your womb; Blest is she who believed that there would be a fulfillment of what was spoken to her by the Lord” (Luke 1:38, 1:45), bridges the two testaments. Perhaps, Thompson suggests, this second blessing, highlighted by John Paul II in his encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*, could also be added to the Hail Mary, along with the first.

The next chapter in the collection also offers an overview of the period, in this case a kind of parallel overview tracing developments in Marian representation against developments in theology. Without trying to claim too close a correspondence that would seem forced on the art, the chapter of Fr. Johann G. Roten demonstrates certain resonances between Marian theology and Marian art, even as it keeps our eyes on some of the larger cultural developments that affected both art and theology at the same time. Devotional art associated with the village of Epinal in northeast France had a popular character and was most closely associated with the “Christotypical” or “Marian privilege” theology that emphasized Mary’s role as Mediatrix or Co-redemptrix. Devotional art was also closely influenced by the nineteenth- and twentieth-century apparition tradition. Insofar as the “Marian century” was a century of upheaval, with two horrific world wars in its latter half, to which corresponded both the art and the privilege theology, “There was a terrible need for redemption from the tragedies and consequences of two world wars, and thus an urgent call for trustworthy mediation between heaven and earth.” Accordingly, the Epinal representations often depict Mary with a unique combination of compassion and strength: “The overall message is one of mercy and power.” The popular images did undergo development, partly in response to the so-called realism of Hollywood and partly in reaction against what came to be perceived as their own previous sentimentality. Yet these somewhat iconoclastic trends did not succeed in displacing the popular images but were rather taken up into a still recognizably iconic style. The more “artistic” or high-culture representation of Mary evinced trends that in some ways broke sharply with the sentiments of religion in general, not just popular religion, as can be seen in the developments leading up to Max Ernst’s *The Virgin Spanks the Son of Man before Three Witnesses* of 1926. A transition had taken place from religion triumphing in the arts to art triumphing over religion,

which art observed without celebrating. In terms of more religious, high-culture art, we find a transition from Romanticism to expressionism associated with Plateau d'Assy. Despite all of the changes in the representation of Mary in the Marian Age, up to the eve of the Second Vatican Council the fundamental image remained that of Mother and Child: "Whether sacred or secular, kitsch and popular or of genuine artistic quality but seemingly non-Christian, whether of pious inspiration or for aesthetic enjoyment only—there remains the abiding and irreversible reality of Mother and Child," the "foundational expression" of Marian art that serves as a kind of summary of the Gospel and of all of revelation, which renders it irreplaceable. It should be noted that Fr. Roten's endnotes provide the reader with a wonderful annotated bibliography, in effect, for anyone wishing to pursue this topic further.

The chapters in the second section of the book take up individual theologians, beginning with Yves Congar. Christopher Ruddy's chapter analyzes the contribution of Congar by tracking his opposition to two opposed tendencies, namely, the "maximalist Mariology" of certain Catholic theologians and the extreme minimalism of neoorthodox Protestantism. For Congar, the maximalist strain of Mariology was, as we have already seen from our overview essays, dialectical or deductive in character, separated from the rest of theology and so an "isolated maximalism" that tended to "work by deduction from atemporal principles." Congar's approach was that of the *ressourcement*, recovering the way in which the Fathers placed the mystery of Mary within the mystery of the Church and the latter within the mystery of the divine economy of salvation. Ruddy writes: "This tethering or integration of Mary to ecclesiology and soteriology is the foundation of Congar's Mariology." At the same time, for Congar, Protestant minimalism with regard to Mary was simply a function of Protestant minimalism with regard to the salvific role of Christ's humanity and thus to the role of human cooperation in God's gracious saving work. Ruddy explains Congar's view: "Jesus's conception and birth, in this view, are not something that Mary does but something that she receives; she has no active role, save that of her *fiat*, which 'receives and recognizes that God is at work in her.'" Congar, on the other hand, would want to recognize an active role of cooperation in both Mary and the Church. As he writes: "In setting up this union of

heaven and earth accomplished in person by Jesus Christ, a share is also to be attributed to our Lady through her cooperation in the mystery of the Incarnation, and to the Church because it communicates to us the effects that flow from the Incarnation.” As Ruddy writes, for Congar “Mary and the Church are . . . ‘one and the same mystery in two moments,’” with Mary’s virginal motherhood being a type of the Church’s virginal motherhood. Ruddy’s assessment of Congar’s contribution to Mariology recognizes his positive contributions, including his role in reconnecting Mary to the Church and to salvation history, but also notes the drawbacks that Congar’s Mariology had, as its aim was “less to open up or to explore a theology of Mary than to correct theological and devotional excesses” and as such was “more reactive than constructive, more concerned with corralling than cultivating,” and less willing to emphasize Mary’s unique dignity among all creatures. There is “a decided coolness in Congar’s Marian thought” as a result, and Ruddy wonders whether one of Congar’s “unintended” legacies was “postconciliar Catholic ecclesiology’s relative neglect of Mary”—whether, in other words, once the mystery of Mary was subsumed by the mystery of the Church, it became an optional afterthought in ecclesiology, following the minimizing “trajectory” and energy of Congar’s Mariology rather than the positive claims it makes. Ruddy concludes with an observation that could almost be the motto of this whole collection: “It is no slight . . . to suggest that a new work of integration, *ressourcement*, and discernment is needed today if Mary is to reclaim her rightful place in the mysteries of Christ and the Church.”

Ruddy’s chapter raises this question: as Mariology moved away from the trope of “Mary’s privileges” to contextualizing Mary in another theological framework such as that of the Church, how do we avoid rendering Mary just another example of that framework, even if the preeminent example, such that there is no longer a point to Mariology, except as the preeminent illustration of a category? This seems to be what happened with Congar’s trajectory, if Ruddy is correct.

Next is Matthew Levering’s chapter, which examines three theologians’ writing in the 1950s, exactly on the “eve” of the Second Vatican Council. By studying writings of René Laurentin, Otto Semmelroth, and Karl Rahner, all written in close proximity to each other (1953, 1954,

and 1956, respectively), Levering examines whether and to what extent each theologian attended to the relationship between Mary and the Holy Spirit as it is stated explicitly or implicitly in Scripture. He takes as a cue for his analysis comments by Congar that, on the one hand, “it is very important to remain conscious of the deep bond that exists between the Virgin Mary and the Spirit” and, on the other hand, to guard against a tendency to “functionally replace the Holy Spirit with Mary.” Levering shows that of the three theologians he studies, only Laurentin attended to the relationship between Mary and the Spirit, and, further, he did so by following the “biblical portraiture,” which shows, among other things, that “the Holy Spirit did not simply make the infant Christ present in [Mary’s] womb; rather the Holy Spirit also consecrated her and assimilated her to her Son so that she could fulfill her unique vocation as mother of her Son.” Again, Levering writes, “Laurentin’s approach takes us through Mary’s life and shows how deeply her unique relationship with the Holy Spirit marks her vocation.” This approach, Levering suggests, preserves a sense of Mary’s uniqueness, her “privileges,” without detaching her from the biblical story of redemption. The approaches of Semmelroth and Rahner, by contrast, begin to bleach out Mary’s distinctiveness in favor of Mary as a type of the Church (Semmelroth) or as an exemplar of God’s grace (Rahner). Semmelroth preserved more of a connection between Mary and the Holy Spirit than did Rahner; nevertheless, “he [Semmelroth] generally studied the mysteries of Mary in order to show something about the Church.” In the sermons of Rahner that Levering studies, “the particular details of Mary’s life and the specific person of the Holy Spirit do not have much of a role.” More important is that “she exemplifies what grace is and what humans are,” and Mary seems almost collapsed into theological anthropology as the most important exemplar of God’s grace, extended to all human beings. It was Laurentin, “even more than Semmelroth or Rahner,” who “anticipated the achievements of *Lumen Gentium*, which clearly states that Mary is “the beloved daughter of the Father and the temple of the Holy Spirit,” as befits her reception of “the high office and dignity of Mother of the Son of God” (citing LG 53).

The following chapter, by Peter Joseph Fritz, focuses on Karl Rahner alone. Rahner appears in Fritz’s lucid essay as the self-described

“minimalist” that he is, and yet we find that his minimalism has a “maximalist” twist. In fact, the very words “maximalist” and “minimalist” seem somewhat problematic since they do not exhaust the debates in Mariology that arose in the Marian Age and to some extent may continue in the present. Fritz shows that Rahner attacks the maximalism of certain mid-century Mariologies precisely because they seem to be “centrifugal,” that is, they seem to be ways of refusing to deal with attacks on the central claims of the Christian message, such as those of atheism, and so are “escape hatches” that actually end up evacuating Mary of the very significance they so hoped to attach to her. Rahner’s minimalism was for him a way to reintegrate Mary into the very story of salvation that makes her meaningful to us. What Fritz calls his “fundamental principle” for Marian theology was not her motherhood, therefore, which for Rahner “connotes privatization,” Fritz says, but rather “the fact that Mary is one human person among many, . . . blessed *among* women” (emphasis in original), because—and this is Rahner’s fundamental principle—she is the person who is, in his words, “redeemed in the most perfect way.” As Rahner saw it, this minimalist position actually maximizes Mary’s significance to us. Fritz explains: “Rahner’s stress on Mary’s belonging to the human race ends up underscoring her constitutive place in the salvific economy. Minimizing her personal privilege maximizes her salvation-historical significance.” Combining his fundamental principle with his brother Hugo’s ecclesiotypical view of Mary, Rahner argues that it is precisely as the most perfectly redeemed person that Mary *is* the “type of the Church”: as Fritz writes, Mary’s “giving of the Spirit through the enfleshed Word” shows that the true apostolic life is not what Rahner calls a “spirit of anarchy” but one that results in a “bounded ecclesiology,” to use Fritz’s term, that has, in Rahner’s words, “the courage to submit to flesh, to concrete precisions.” Near the end of Rahner’s life, this courage appears in a new form in the title of an essay from 1983, “Courage for Devotion to Mary.” This essay laments the loss of Marian devotion in many countries of the Western world in favor of New Age spiritualities or meditative practices associated with Eastern religions. Rahner’s attack on a certain kind of Marian maximalism was not intended to distance the Church from traditional Marian devotions such as the rosary; it was intended to draw out their full significance rather than

to risk the centrifugal theological moves that would ultimately seem to cut them off as peripheral spiritual phenomena. Fritz regards this essay as ranking “among the most significant Rahner ever wrote.” It exhibits Rahner’s minimalism as giving very little court to the minimalistic “progressives” who have given up Marian devotions “in the name of progress.” In closing, Fritz notes that “Rahner teaches us that if we ever feel inclined to minimize our words about Mary, the resulting minimalism should manifest itself as the simplicity of traditional Marian prayer.”

The study by Troy A. Stefano takes up the task of describing the Mariology of someone who never wrote a particular work on Mary but whose work is nevertheless suffused with mariological reflection, namely, Henri de Lubac, perhaps the *ressourcement* theologian par excellence. De Lubac’s success in Mariology, in fact, may be due to the dispersed character of his reflections. He was out not to combat the maximalism or the minimalism of other Mariologists or indeed to engage in a separate subject called Mariology but to present a compelling account of the Catholic faith steeped in the biblical tradition as it had been inherited from the Fathers of the Church. This requires (as for Congar) a profound appreciation of the Incarnation. De Lubac seems to be able to hold together the Christotypical emphasis in Mariology—associated with the uniqueness of Mary and her “privileges”—with the ecclesiotypical emphasis in Mariology, which was increasingly associated with Marian minimalism as the Council approached. De Lubac’s use of the Marian titles “Immaculate Spouse,” “Virgin Mother,” and “Mother of the Church” is key to his unique approach. All three, taken together, preserve the integrity of an “incarnational logic” that honors Mary’s uniqueness (perhaps more than the approaches of Congar and Rahner?) even as it integrates Mary fully into the economy of salvation history. The key here is to realize that the economy is constituted by God’s self-emptying love, fully accomplished in the Incarnation, and that this self-emptying moment is never taken back; “God, thus bodily mediated, is never consequently received unmediated apart from Christ’s body,” as Stefano writes. God’s self-emptying love is the ultimate mystery. Mary’s role in mediating that love to us through her motherhood of Christ is unique and irreplaceable. To try to minimize it is, in effect, to turn the Incarnation into an abstraction instead of remembering that Jesus is a person and, we could add,

following Origen (in *On First Principles* 2.6.2), that he came into the world as a baby who cried just like any other baby. To minimize Mary's role is to defeat the purpose of confessing the Incarnation and to vitiate the fullness of one's confession of the economy of salvation. Under each of the three titles, Mary at once advances and recapitulates, in Christ, the economy of salvation. As Immaculate Spouse, Mary's unique relationship to the Word fully discloses the spousal love of God for Israel and brings it to fulfillment in her role as Virgin Mother. Here the spousal dimension, "following Scheeben," is prioritized because it emphasizes the perfection of Mary in grace as a perfection for a true cooperation *as* beloved spouse "to ensure that Mary as Virgin Mother cannot be turned into an abstraction by seeing her as solely an instrument for the Incarnation," in Stefano's words. This seems to be an important difference from the views of all of the theologians studied so far except, perhaps, for Laurentin. As Virgin Mother, according to de Lubac, Mary thus becomes the "sacrament" of Christ. As Stefano writes: "The structure of Christ's own historicity is the 'form' of his mediation; if Christ's condescension to adapt to our weakness came through Mary, Christ's 'form' remains as the Incarnate One through Mary. Christ is *forever* from Mary's womb" (emphasis in original). Mary is a "type of the Church" not simply as a representative, or even as *the* representative member, but because she is the Mother of the Church. Her "hour" comes when Christ's hour comes and she is given as mother to the Beloved Disciple. The moment when her spousal and maternal identity passes over into the Church, who is Spouse and Virgin Mother, is the moment when the fullness of the significance of her status as Mother of the Incarnate Word is revealed. Only by calling Mary "Mother" do we fully realize our identity as members of the Church, members of Christ's body, and fully confess the mystery of the Incarnation, universalizing it without abstracting it. Therefore, as Stefano writes: "To invoke Mary as our mother . . . is to say that the spousal and maternal mediations of the Church are themselves derivative of the concrete relation between Christ and Mary." If calling Mary the "type" of the Church deemphasizes the priority of Mary, the result will be an abstraction of the body of Christ, the Church, into an impersonal structure, no longer "wholly personal," no longer "she," no longer the "continuation" of the Incarnation but a displacement of it into the past.

The next chapter, by Msgr. Michael Heintz, presents another *ressourcement* theologian writing on Mary in the decade before Vatican II, Louis Bouyer, whose theology, as Heintz analyzes it, presents the same concern as that of de Lubac for exhibiting Mary's integration into the economy of salvation precisely by preserving her irreducible uniqueness. In other words, the "ecclesiotypical" theology depends on the "Christotypical," and the Christotypical is prevented from becoming isolated (as Rahner feared) from the rest of theology because it is oriented precisely toward the ecclesiotypical. In agreement with Rahner's approach, Bouyer writes: "Our Lady shows forth what is, *par excellence*, the Gospel teaching, namely, how our human nature is raised by grace to a degree corresponding to the closeness of the bond that unites us to Christ. . . . In her we are able to discern, realized in time, all that the divine Wisdom held in store for us." In a striking phrase that reminds us even more of Rahner, Heintz notes that, in a way, "Mariology is theological anthropology." And yet Bouyer has many safeguards in place that keep Mariology from collapsing into theological anthropology, such that Mary is distinguished from us only by degree, not by an irreducibly unique role. Mary is not only a member, the most redeemed member, of the Church but also the "link" between Christ and the Church. More particularly, it is Mary's faith that is the link, as the perfect coming together of predestination and human freedom. As Bouyer states: "From the standpoint of God's initiative, of predestination, we may say that it was because the moment had come when the Word had decided to take flesh that faith flowered in Mary. But from the standpoint of saving human freedom, it is equally true to say that the Word became incarnate at that moment rather than at any other because he had at last found a soul of entire faith, wholly disposed to receive him." Christ is "above faith" because, though his human nature is fully human, it is taken up by a divine person and established in the beatific vision, yet "Christ's humanity, though possessed by a divine person, yet remains ours, because it first belonged to the person of Mary," and thus our humanity is united to Christ's humanity "through" the humanity of Mary. She thus serves as the link between Christ and the Church. Her utter uniqueness does not isolate her but in fact makes her "the masterpiece of grace," and her fiat is "arguably the freest choice ever made by a human person." Though she is a member of



the Church, she can never be collapsed fully into it because that would destroy the link that connects the Church to Christ. Mary's "privileges"—her maternity and her holiness, for example—in one sense will be fully extended to the Church eschatologically, and yet, in another sense, the conditions for the extension of these privileges would be destroyed if they did not persist in Mary uniquely. Thus, if Mary is a "type" of the Church, it is not because she foreshadows the Church by containing already the perfection that the Church eventually will have; rather, it is the other way around. Heintz writes that "ecclesial maternity," for example, "is first and foremost Marian, and the Church, Bouyer asserts, can be called 'Mother' only by being a 'continuation' of Mary's own maternity." Mary's virginal motherhood is, in Bouyer's words, "the condition of possibility for the Church's motherhood." If Mary is the Seat of Wisdom, it is the Wisdom of the "mystery" of God's self-emptying love made manifest in Christ. She is, Heintz says, the "Seat of *this* Wisdom" (my emphasis) and cannot be dissolved fully into the Church without undoing the Wisdom that made the Church.

The third section of the book gives us a glimpse of Mary on the eve of the Second Vatican Council as she entered into preaching and into the spirituality of monastic and secular institutes and movements. The first chapter in this section, by Fr. Kevin Grove, takes up the earliest example in the book, one close to the heart of the University of Notre Dame, namely, the Marian preaching of Basil Moreau, founder of the Congregation of Holy Cross, which founded the university. As he introduces us to the pastoral concerns of Moreau's preaching, Grove demonstrates conclusively that the characterization of the Mary of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception on offer in such scholarly works as the essay "Immaculate and Powerful," by Barbara Corrado Pope, is a caricature. According to this and similar views, the doctrine portrays a Mary who is not scriptural, in Pope's words a "pure and passive vessel" who is anything but a disciple. The Mary of Scripture disappears into this doctrine, which seems to be little more than a papal ideology in support of what Grove calls "conservative government ideals against postrevolution secular, or modern, values." The Mary of the doctrine becomes isolated even from other doctrinal contexts—Trinitarian, Christological, and ecclesiological—becoming, "both in popular preaching and in theological

discussion . . . a more and more autonomous figure.” Grove comments that such scholarly claims “are often leveraged without any support” and that “at least in the singular example of Moreau”—who, as an Ultramontanist, could be expected to exhibit the worst of the ideological tendencies alleged here—“we see the paradigmatic opposite.” Preaching on the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Moreau draws a picture fully determined by the portraiture of Scripture (to use the expression of Levering in a different context), of someone who is anything but passive in her “daily and mutual” sharing in the life of Jesus. The Incarnation is central, revealing the influence of the earlier “French School” of theology, but precisely as self-emptied into the realities of daily life. “What appears here is a Mary who—at the level of experience and perhaps without full comprehension—must have been working through the human aspect of raising a Son who was the Word having assumed her flesh.” She is as such not only a disciple but “the model of discipleship, more so than the twelve,” more than Thomas and Peter, and more even than the Beloved Disciple. She is not a passive instrument, disconnected from the Trinity, but the “minister” of the Father’s designs and as such a “cooperator” in the sufferings of her Son and in the plan of salvation. One difference: the Father, who gave up His Only Begotten Son, is impassible by nature, but Mary, as a human mother, is able to suffer and, insofar as she gives up her innocent Son, she suffers with him and in a sense is martyred herself on Calvary. In the suffering of Mary, Grove states, Moreau is “exploring the depths of sorrow as complete configuration to the redemption wrought in Jesus Christ” and therefore to the depths of human compassion. The Immaculate Heart of Mary, far from the distant “powerful” Mary of the caricature, “bears forth the mystery of the Incarnation” in her willingness to accept sorrow on our behalf and in “pondering in her heart” her own sorrows, which are the sorrows of her Son, which in turn are the sorrows of all human hearts. Here is again a characteristic of the French School spirituality initiated by Pierre de Bérulle in the early seventeenth century and eclipsed by the French Revolution, which attempted to replace Mary with the Goddess of Reason. If Moreau is attempting to recover a tradition, it is this one in which the “privileges” of Mary are hers only in service of her larger mission of compassion in the economy of redemption. Grove sums up his chapter with a brief reflection on the

famous “Golden Dome” of the University of Notre Dame, on top of which is an image of Mary of the Immaculate Conception: “Such a gilded icon of doctrine might seem the ultimate evacuation of the historical Mary in favor of what has become ‘immaculate and powerful.’ But there might be a more charitable and indeed more probable reading possible. For a thinker like Moreau it would have been impossible to enshrine a doctrine *qua* doctrine in gold, but so decorating a mother who teaches how to relate to Christ—and opens up the imagination to all points of Jesus’s life—would be a worthwhile pondering.”

The following chapter is also on the Immaculate Conception, but this time as the focus of a collection of scholarly essays for a conference held at the University of Notre Dame in 1954, edited by Fr. Ed O’Connor and published in 1958, just four years before the opening of the Council. Some of the participants were present at the Council or otherwise actively involved. Ann W. Astell’s chapter pays tribute to the volume, published by the University of Notre Dame Press nearly fifty years ago and still “the most cited, most comprehensive collection on the development of the doctrine in the English language.” Peter Fritz’s essay reminded us that Karl Rahner had called for a pluralist Catholic conversation regarding Mariology in which so-called maximalists and minimalists could receive each other’s perspectives and perhaps realize that the conversation was more cohesive than it first might seem. The volume edited by O’Connor bears out that insight, as noticed by no less an ecclesiologist than Cardinal Avery Dulles, who called the volume “a skillful and prudent compromise between two tendencies in modern Catholic theology, one of which would emphasize Mary’s unique connection with Christ the Redeemer; the other, her close connection with the Church and all the redeemed.” That is, “if,” as Astell adds parenthetically, compromise “is indeed the appropriate word,” suggesting that it is not. Astell’s chapter suggests instead that the volume is a particular spiritual penetration into the mystery from which the essays arise, one that is performed in the essays themselves, as well as in their editorial integration, which allows and in fact even insists that these perspectives be integrated. “Indeed,” she writes, “O’Connor’s ‘Preface’ to [the] volume consistently conjoins them, admitting no contradiction between them,” and more, integrating the mystery of the Immaculate Conception with the other mysteries of the

faith, ameliorating the isolation with which Mariology, especially of the maximalist sort, had so often been charged. What is interesting is that the integration it achieves is achieved not from the minimalist perspective of Rahner, which could sponsor a pluralist conversation but not envision the integration of the perspectives (as he himself admitted) but from a more Christotypical perspective. As Astell writes: “It begins with Mary and extends into ecclesiology a historical narrative of a mysterious, personal, Marian redemption effected in, with, and through Christ.” From the point of view of proximate history, Astell observes, this “‘particular outlook’ that holds together the Christotypical and ecclesiotypical features in a single, specifically soteriological ‘point of balance’” is on the losing trajectory. O’Connor clearly thought, and hoped, that the Church was on the way “towards a definition of Mary’s co-redemption and mediation of graces.” This is the opposite trajectory from the one that the Church has actually taken, but it is also the opposite trajectory from the one that Chris Ruddy invited us to consider as Congar’s. Perhaps there is a reason, beyond the solidity of the scholarship in this collection, that it has endured as a live resource for so many years, even given some of the shortcomings that Astell also notes.

It is as though the collection has a spiritual heart at its center, as though the collection transcends its character as a collection and communicates this spiritual heart, proceeding from a spiritual transformation proceeding directly from the mystery of the Immaculate Conception herself. “We are enveloped in mystery,” the patrologist Jouassard writes at the end of his chapter, “a mystery that God allows our dull minds to penetrate slowly.” The *ressourcement* style of historical study, fully allowing for and documenting in a rigorous scholarly way the development of doctrine in the Church, arises from a spiritual conviction. Astell writes: “What gives coherence to the book as a whole—apart from the contributors’ shared devotion to Mary Immaculate—is the constantly reiterated witness to, and expectation of, doctrinal development, as a proof of the Holy Spirit’s presence in, and guidance of, the Church in its understanding of Mary and thus of itself as Christ’s bride.” O’Connor’s own chapter on the “spirituality of the Blessed Virgin” is in a way the soul of the collection, taking up this spirituality with reference both to Mary’s “personal life and to the lives of others insofar as they are influenced by her,” including the witness of such saints as John Eudes, C.J.M., and

Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, from the French School of spirituality introduced by Kevin Grove's chapter. The collection presents us with a historical approach that is not historicizing because of this "soul" living in the book, balancing "the *nouvelle théologie* of the historians with the Neo-Thomism of dogmatic theologians, joining history with significance" instead of playing them off against each other.

Astell's chapter also gives us a clue as to the origin of this "soul" animating the book, itself a life that was influenced by and penetrated with the mystery of Mary, in the many-layered way that such influence often comes about. It turns out that there is a connection between O'Connor's chapter and L'Arche, founded in 1964 by Jean Vanier, who had given his project to aid the mentally handicapped this Marian title ("Ark"). Père Thomas Philippe, O.P., who was the chaplain of L'Arche from its foundation, was master of studies at the Dominican House of Studies outside of Paris, the Saulchoir, when O'Connor studied there. Philippe had succeeded Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., whom Philippe had been charged by the Holy Office to remove in 1942. Philippe was himself removed in 1952, criticized for his unorthodoxy and exaggerated Marian mysticism, which was based on an experience he had in prayer in 1937. He spent ten years under ecclesiastical censure but emerged from that to take his place in the L'Arche movement. Astell notes: "Neo-Thomist in his Mariology, Marian in his mysticism, Père Thomas had a heart that was drawn into the crucible of all the vital intellectual movements of his day, into the deep mysteries of human beauty and affliction, and the charitable practices demanded by them." O'Connor repeatedly cites Philippe, even though at the time he was still under censure. Astell writes that we have in this collection an enactment of what Philippe called true Marian spirituality, namely, "a close union of doctrine and practice, . . . objective, because based directly on the dogmas of the Church . . . at the same time a spirituality of littleness . . . of personal intimacy with Jesus and Mary [and of service to the poor]." For anyone "who has the patience to discover it," there is perhaps a pedagogy in this collection for the trajectory of Marian theology that may show a path forward.

The next two chapters, each in its own way, continue the demonstration that at the heart of major ecclesial movements in the twentieth-century Church there is a Marian spirituality whose trajectory has yet to be fully realized. Both chapters suggest that a key to the success of the

movements described is the creative interpretation of Marian doctrine achieved in an enterprise in which there is a close union between doctrine and practice. Danielle M. Peters explores the contribution of the founder of the international Schoenstatt Movement, Fr. Joseph Kentenich. Fr. Kentenich, who was apprehended by the Gestapo in 1941 and imprisoned at Dachau until 1945, knew firsthand what he called the “anthropological heresy” of his day, a heresy that he said “refers directly to human nature.” He thought the symptoms of this heresy include “a rapidly increasing secularization accompanied by an equally accelerated dehumanization”; at once a “flight from God” and “an alarming inability to build community and to love”; and “individualism and nihilism.” Fr. Kentenich commented, “Personhood is combated. Human freedom, the whole structure of human nature as it is created by God, is increasingly ruined” in favor of mass manipulation of the human psyche and even, he predicted in 1948, human cloning. As a response to the anthropological heresy, Fr. Kentenich worked toward a vision of “the new person in the new community,” as Peters writes, and he placed it under the protection of Mary, who, as Mother of God, Fr. Kentenich wrote, “is, as it were the point of intersection between nature and supernature.” He very self-consciously focused on the Church’s teaching on Mary in order to discover what Peters refers to as its “anthropological and pedagogical corollary for the Christian life.” Working theologically off of insights found in the writings of M. Scheeben, Fr. Kentenich’s Mariology was always “Christ-centered . . . even when Vatican II and post-Vatican II theology stressed an ecclesiotypical and anthropocentric” Mariology that seemed to be following another trajectory. Thus Fr. Kentenich would be placed on the “higher” end of Mariology, if one were comparing overall, and yet he was critical of the dominant, “privilege”-centered Mariology of the theology and piety on the eve of the Council, not because it had centered on Mary’s privileges but because it seemed, in retrospect, to have had so little effect. It seemed isolated from the rest of Catholic faith and life: “See how little depth it had!” Fr. Kentenich exclaimed. “What is left of it today? . . . How little it had taken root in the subconscious life of the soul!”

The solution lay not in deemphasizing Mary’s “Christotypical” profile but in using it, exploiting its potential to connect to the rest of Christian teaching and to Christian life. Thus, for example, Peters writes that

for Fr. Kentenich, “Psychologically and pedagogically the dogma of the Immaculate Conception is the most significant of all Marian dogmas for our time because it draws attention to the dignity and value of the human person.” The solemn proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption was a “pedagogical event,” Fr. Kentenich thought, and, in a way that recalls both Rahner and Bouyer, a “synthesis of anthropology.” In particular, like the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, it responds to the anthropological heresies of the day by reminding us of the heavenly glory to which each human body is called, the very body that, today, he wrote, is both “maltreated and on the other hand . . . adored.” No doubt the “maltreated” reflected his time in the concentration camp. Again, Peters writes, Mary’s fiat is not simply a private act but is a “representative act and the expression of humanity’s self-surrender to the Son of God.” It is crucial to keep the proper balance, though: Mary’s fiat as a private act does not dissolve into an abstract representation. As Peters writes: “The ‘Yes’ of the individual to Christ simultaneously is therefore, though not always consciously, the individual’s alignment with Mary’s ‘Yes,’” which remains unique not just as a model but as a unique participation in the mystery of Christ into which we are invited. Just as Christ entrusted himself to Mary in a unique way, as his Mother, and as Mother was his first and primary Educator, so Mary is, Peters writes, “Mother and Educator of the whole Body of Christ,” and Christian devotion to Mary is an incorporation into her pedagogy, into the “school of Mary,” as John Paul II later characterized it. Mary’s unique cooperation in redemption through her wholly graced and wholly free “Yes” is the pedagogy that can respond to the anthropological heresies of the age because the dignity of the creature is recovered, not in competition with divine initiative but at that initiative itself. Mary is the most perfectly redeemed creature, as Rahner suggested, but in order to preserve her significance as such, her unique relation to Christ must be maintained as a starting and ending point; otherwise, the implication seems to be, one has no answer to the dehumanizing and depersonalizing “heresies” against human nature in our time. Peters closes by suggesting that a trajectory from Vatican II that picks up on the trajectory laid out by Schoenstatt, as Fr. Kentenich inspired it, has been laid out by Popes Paul VI, John Paul II, and, incipiently, Francis.

The theme of the integration of doctrine and practice is continued in Peter Casarella's examination of the "Marian profiles" of two prominent twentieth-century Catholic women, both of whom initiated lay movements in the Church, Adrienne von Speyr and her younger contemporary Chiara Lubich. Yves Congar's notion of analogy provides the key here to an understanding of how Mary, with her irreducibly unique relationship to Christ, has become ecclesiotypical without being collapsed into the doctrine of the Church or of theological anthropology. The notion of a Marian "profile" for the Church and for movements within the Church is intended to carry this insight of the primacy of analogy. For Adrienne von Speyr, the image of Mary, Virgin Mother of Mercy, predominates, along with the image used to express it, that is, the image of the poor and all the needy (all of us!) gathered under Mary's protective mantle. Casarella points out that Mary's own contemplation of the mysteries in which she was so uniquely involved changed from a more "abstract" mode to one that, "after pregnancy and giving birth, after standing at the foot of the Cross . . . becomes a model of contemplative prayer that is in touch with the anguish of the human heart." Christ alone suffers "actively," but Mary, in communion with John, "goes into labor" as a passive recipient of that suffering. It forms her, and she becomes the Mother of the Church, the Virgin Mother of Mercy, and the Church, by analogy and by participation in her unique "labor," acquires a Marian profile of active lay works of mercy. As von Balthasar put it, based on the insights of von Speyr, Mary "is seen as spreading her protective cloak over the whole of Christendom, and making some part of her stainlessness flow out over the bride, the Church." As Casarella writes, she becomes in this way (and echoing what we have learned from Fr. Kentenich), "the teacher of the fecundity of contemplative prayer that is in solidarity with the suffering of the world."

Chiara Lubich, the founder of Focolare, "exemplifies a woman entrusted with the gift of the Holy Spirit to go forth like Mary from the foot of the Cross without forgetting the total significance of the event she has witnessed," Casarella notes and credits her with unique and profound Marian insights that created the spirituality associated with Focolare. "One idea closely tied to [Chiara's] Marian origins is that Jesus Forsaken is a key to a Christian understanding of unity," and associated with the



concrete specificity of Jesus forsaken on the cross is “*Maria desolata*,” Mary, desolate from having witnessed the death of her Son. Her desolation in solidarity with her Son, however, is not simply desolation at his death but a unique solidarity with his forsakenness. Lubich understands Jesus’s delivery of Mary to be the Mother of the Church in the person of the Beloved Disciple as a desolation because accepting this act, consummated with Jesus’s death, means renouncing her unique Motherhood of Jesus, in her words, “faced with the passage from one Maternity to another which Jesus indicated to her. . . . In that moment Jesus had neither Mother nor Father. He was nothingness born of nothingness. And Mary was also suspended in nothingness. Her greatness had been her divine Maternity. Now it had been taken away from her.” Commenting on this passage from Lubich, Casarella notes: “In sum, through Mary’s renunciation of maternity she became mother of us all.” Paradoxically, one can think of this renunciation as one of Mary’s unique privileges. No one else can make it. The Marian profile that it creates is one of a “radical openness to the Spirit,” a participation in the forsakenness of Jesus that is uniquely hers but is itself available to participate in. Do we hear an echo of the way in which Fr. Kentenich believed a Marian spirituality to be the answer to the anthropological heresies of our day? If Mary in the Spirit is, one could almost say, co-forsaken, exhibiting a kind of cooperation in the desolation of Jesus, this free and loving renunciation is also a free and loving cooperation in love, a radical stance of welcome. Casarella writes: “The same Spirit has given life to the movement to proclaim the notion of ‘mutual interdependence’ to a multicultural, multiethnic world threatened by the atomizing, deracinating effects of unrestrained globalization.” The analogy between Jesus and Mary’s interdependence, God and the creatures’ interdependence—in both cases wholly dependent on the first term in the pair—is obvious. Lubich even extended the spirituality to an ideal practice of the means of communication in the media.

Finally in this section of the book we have the chapter of Lawrence S. Cunningham, whose contribution ensures that our collection at least touches on the issue of Mary in monasticism on the eve of the Council. Thomas Merton, “himself predisposed to a deep devotion to Our Lady,” applied the image of the Visitation to the contemplative.

Like John, who waited in darkness and could not physically see anything, the true contemplative is, in Cunningham's words, an "eschatological watcher standing in hope for the coming of the Word." He comes to the contemplative, equally in darkness, equally hidden, and, as was Christ to John, equally "mediated to him by Mary." There is also a corresponding hiddenness of Mary herself: "All that has been written about the Virgin Mother of God proves to me that hers is the most hidden of sanctities," Merton writes. It is hidden in her humility and her poverty, and the one who can "see" this humility and poverty is the one who can see the God bearer, and thus the Christ she bears. Merton adds: "No one has ever more perfectly contained the light of God than Mary who by the perfection of her purity and humility is, as it were, completely identified with truth like the clean window pane which vanishes entirely into the light which it transmits." We receive the contemplative illumination of Christ through Mary.

In the epilogue we have a brief pastoral reflection by Fr. James H. Phalan, who invites us to think about the place of Mary in the new evangelization. In a way, this returns us to the opening theme of our introduction. We find our expectations for a standard narrative of Marian theology and devotion unsettled even if we turn to countries and regions where Marian devotion is still vigorous. Fr. Phalan's observations are that even in such places, preaching about Mary is rare: "I learned that very rarely priests and religious preach about her" and that "they do not do so because they have never studied her." Here we find a different kind of gap between theology and devotion, perhaps not the gap between a theology of Mary and its application but a devotion that seems to leave no trace in theology. "It would seem fairly obvious," Phalan comments, that such intense popular devotion as he had witnessed in Mexico and Brazil "would be a powerful source of energy for the New Evangelization; yet I have come to understand," he goes on to observe, "that this energy is relatively untapped." Phalan also observes that there are "no formal and extensive studies . . . of Marian devotion" in contemporary America and that such an undertaking might reveal that the decline in Marian devotion in this country is "correlative with a general decline in daily devotion and prayer on the part of Catholics over the past fifty years." It would be interesting to know if Marian devotion would be a

key element in the New Evangelization in Western countries, too, where, even at Marian pilgrimage places, homilies on the Blessed Mother seem noticeable by their absence. “What are we to make of this great Marian silence?” Phalan asks.

Again the question of trajectory surfaces. The decision of the Council to include Mary in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church rather than to treat her in her own separate document, just because it was a change, seemed to many to be a change that was consistent with the trajectory that Chris Ruddy associated with Congar. Phalan observes that “the apparent change in emphasis given to the Blessed Virgin contributed to some extent to what became the full-scale collapse of Mariology.” Ironically, this includes *Lumen Gentium* chapter 8 itself! Phalan writes: “This text has, by and large, been insufficiently studied and deserves much more attention in order to orient Marian devotion today,” as well as, he adds, Marian theological reflection.

So we return to the invitation we hope to issue with the publication of this collection, an invitation to begin to study more deeply the Mariology that was so vibrant in the Marian Age before the Council and then collapsed to the point where, seemingly, Catholic preachers feel ill at ease in speaking of Mary. Perhaps the place to begin is indeed *Lumen Gentium* itself. Perhaps it is time to see what it looks like when it is released from seeming to be the *terminus ad quem* of a trajectory of minimization. Phalan notes: “Although Mary does not have ‘her own text’ [in the Council documents], she does occupy the final chapter of the fundamental dogmatic text on the Church. As in the case of other topics in other magisterial documents, this final turn to Our Lady was meant to stress her fundamental importance.” Perhaps this chapter of *Lumen Gentium* was actually part of a larger trajectory that we have not as yet discerned very well. If there can be a minimalism that is actually a maximalism, as Peter Fritz suggests of Rahner’s theology, perhaps there is also a maximalism that can be a minimalism, that is, a theology that, precisely by retaining the unique and irreducible role of Mary, is able to preserve and enrich our understanding of the whole economy of salvation in which she plays a part—a crucial part. Perhaps that was the trajectory of which *Lumen Gentium* was itself a part. But we will never know unless we begin ourselves to enter that trajectory and to play our parts in forming it. The

editors are aware that a chapter on Hugo Rahner (1900–1968) under the rubric “Ressourcement Theologians and Response,” and a contribution on some major representatives of a Christotypical Mariology—like Carlo Balić, O.F.M. (1899–1977), and Gabriele M. Roschini, O.S.M. (1900–1977)—could have further enhanced this volume. Hence the invitation to study and to explore tendered by this collection.

Results and paradoxes arising from the chapters of this book include the following:

1. One could imagine that ecumenical interests, certainly a feature of some preconciliar Mariology, might have prompted a more biblically based Mariology as well as one that was more minimalist. But the renewed emphasis on the study of Scripture in the twentieth century did not necessarily result in a richer Mariology, even where there seems to have been warrant for it and even where it might have dovetailed with a more minimalist theology. Fr. Thompson’s chapter shows how the biblical theme of the faith of Mary was never taken up into devotion or into theology. Matthew Levering’s chapter shows how the theme of the Holy Spirit’s relationship to Mary, a prominent scriptural theme, was only unevenly developed on the eve of Vatican II, even by the self-avowed minimalist Karl Rahner, at least in the sermons that Levering has presented for study here. Was the Marian movement ever entirely “in sync” with the biblical and liturgical movements, as Phalan wonders? Or did the biblical and liturgical movements eventually become so “historicizing” that they left theology behind, even as Marian theology could not assimilate these pervasively historicizing tendencies?
2. The “direction,” “spirit,” or “vector” of a particular Mariology may be just as important as what it actually says. As rich as Congar’s Mariology could be, it seemed, in the words of Chris Ruddy, to be somewhat “cold,” not really minimalist but with a governing interest of minimizing. Could it be that one future tack for Mariology might be to take up Congar’s Mariology and infuse it with a different trajectory: one of development rather than of keeping in check?

3. Perhaps instead of the categories “maximalist” and “minimalist,” which Peter Fritz’s chapter shows have serious and perhaps fatal limitations, new categories are needed: mystery versus rationalism or reductionism, as Troy Stefano’s chapter might suggest, or even mystery versus positivist historicism. The search for a Marian “principle” may have been misguided in the first place, as it turned a person, in herself irreducibly a mystery *as a person*, inadvertently into a principle.
4. Areas for further study might include contemporary Marian homiletics, to the extent that this can be determined. Also, devotion to Mary did not decrease (seemingly) in the global South, or so it seems. This should be studied. Phalan’s chapter brings up the issue for contemporary preaching, and Kevin Grove’s chapter shows conclusively, in a historical mode, that a study of Marian sermons can bear rich fruit theologically and can serve to undercut caricatures of Marian cult and culture. If it can work for the nineteenth century, perhaps it can work for today.
5. Fr. Roten’s chapter shows us the need to engage in a theologically sophisticated study of Marian art and to begin to notice what questions—perhaps questions coming on the one hand from devotion and prayer or, on the other, from the surrounding culture—it raises.
6. Finally, all of the chapters show that the most creative Mariology of this period, whatever its supposed “maximalist” or “minimalist” stripe, tried to emphasize connections: in particular, the three-way connections between theology, devotion, and Christian life and discipleship. It seems that the surest result of these chapters is that the kind of “maximalism” that is to be avoided is the one that results in the isolation of Mariology to its own independent “science” in effect; and the kind of “minimalism” to be avoided is the one that so collapses Mary into a theological category that Mariology makes no sense anymore and devotion either collapses, or, if it continues, has no theological reception.