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Third International
MARIOLOGICAL CONGRESS

Lourdes, 1958

Address: Pope Pius XII
Summary: Rev. Charles Balic, O.F.M.
Foreword

Mary and the Church — this was the theme chosen for the Mariological Congress commemorating the centenary of the apparitions at Lourdes in 1858. This theme was particularly appropriate for two reasons: 1) Lourdes itself, which during the past century has been an outstanding example of the solicitude of the Blessed Virgin Mary for the Church and which has demonstrated clearly the role reserved for the Mother of God in the Church, especially in modern times, and 2) the great interest which the various Mariological societies throughout the world and the Church herself (especially during the pontificate of the great Marian Pope, Pius XII) have shown in the mutual relationships existing between Mary and the Church.

Marian Library Study 5 attempts a summary of the Third International Marian Congress by presenting the address of Pope Pius XII (perhaps his last formal Marian message) and the closing sermon of Father Charles Balic, O.F.M., President of the Congress. We are indebted to The Pope Speaks (Vol. V, 174ff.) for permission to reproduce Martin F. Connor’s translation of the Pope’s message, to Father Louis Wiesner, S.M., chaplain of Chaminade High School, Dayton, Ohio, for his translation of Fr. Balic’s Latin sermon (Nuntia Periodica, Num. 6, Rome, 1959, p. 20 sq.), and to Father Charles Balic, O.F.M., for permission to reproduce his magnificent summary of the Congress.

An outline of the Congress follows:

1. The Sources of the Doctrine: Mary and the Church
   a. In Holy Scripture
   b. In the Writings of the Fathers
   c. In the Teachings of the Magisterium (Germany)

2. The Relationships Between Mary and the Church
   a. Mary’s Action in Favor of the Church
      1) In general: towards the Mystical Body (Spain)
      2) In particular
         a) Ordinary action
            aa. On the hierarchy: Mary and the Priesthood (Latin-America)
            bb. On the sacraments: Mary and the Eucharist (Permanent Committee of Eucharistic Congresses)
cc. On the life of the Church
   aa) Internal: Mary and the apostolate (United States)
   bb. On the sacraments: Mary and the Eucharist (Per­
      faith (Committee of the Church of Silence)
      aaa. Mary and the Unity of the Church
      bbb. The Orientals
      ccc. The Protestants (Unitas Society)
   b) Extraordinary action
      aa. Apparitions (Portugal)
      bb. Miracles (Committee of Doctors)

b. The Action of the Church in Favor of Mary
   1) The Marian Cult (Holland and Belgium
   2) Marian Art (Pontifical Academy of the Immaculate Con­
      ception)

(published with ecclesiastical approval)
THOUGHTS ON LOURDES

A Message of Pope Pius XII to the International Marian Congress at Lourdes

September 17, 1958

Venerable Brothers and dearly beloved children, pilgrims to Lourdes who are taking part in the great International Marian Congress in Mary's city! May the mysterious and invisible waves which bring you Our voice and this token of Our affection rebound from the great rocks of Massabielle and return to Us as messengers of the enthusiasm and devotion which fill the hymns and prayers you are raising in honor of the Queen of heaven and earth, whom you acclaim at this very moment with the repeated cry "Ave Maria!"

Ave Maria

These are the words of the angel's greeting. Over the centuries all mankind has offered them incessantly, as a garland, at the altar of their Queen. It is a simple prayer, but a profound one, which has echoed without interruption for a century on the banks of the blessed river Gave. It is a quiet, gentle prayer when whispered by a fervent soul. It is a tragic, entreaty prayer on the burning lips of the sick and infirm. It is a strong prayer when it rises as a profession of faith in the virile accents of a man. It is solemn and splendid amid the acclamations of a crowd. But it is always, everywhere full of that love for the Immaculate and that profound filial affection which could scarcely find more perfect expression.

Through this year We have followed the celebration of this centenary from Rome, a city with so many ties to Lourdes, which date from the time that city's name first echoed through the world. With Our words, when such were appropriate, with Our thoughts at every moment, in the granting of special favors, We have shown Our fatherly affection in every possible way. From the Eternal City We have witnessed something of the joy and spiritual consolation which have come to so many of Our children. Their radiant eyes have seemed to keep the heavenly reflection of the miraculous grotto they went to visit.

But of all the events of this centenary, the International Marian Congress is certainly the most important. Lengthy preparations for it were made by renowned theologians. An impressive number of Princes of the Church, Bishops, and Archbishops are present with Our Legate. To represent Us, We have chosen the Cardinal Dean of the Sacred College, for whom We have a deep esteem and lively affection. We also greet with warmth the bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes and his Co-
adjutor, and all the other distinguished religious and civil dignitaries who are present at the Congress.

We must also express Our gratitude to the French government for the grand and courteous welcome that was given Our Legate and for all the attention that was paid to the thousands of pilgrims who came this year from distant places. But is it not one of France’s glories that she has on her soil a world-renowned sanctuary of Mary?

Lessons Taught by Mary

Have no doubts about it, dear delegates to this Congress! It was Mary who at a critical point in man’s history decided to remind her misled children of the real meaning of life by pointing out life’s basic importance and its oneness with that other life which alone will give us true and perfect happiness.

It was Mary who deigned to teach men, with the tenderness and skill of a mother, the two great and essential means for arriving at so lofty a goal: constant, confident prayer, and the indispensable Christian mortification which sustains such prayer. Her supernatural wisdom points out to man the sure road: that road that passes through the representatives of her Son on earth, that road which passes through the Church.

It was Mary who in her concern for the welfare of all men pleaded with the multitude that they might come and drink of those miraculous waters that cure souls and bodies.

It was Mary who with indescribable tenderness decided to abide in a certain manner among us, to be our perpetual help and our refuge, strengthening our faith with new and numberless wonders, sustaining our hope with her unfailing and generous mercy, and fanning the ardor of our love by her heavenly beauty, her limitless goodness and her endless favors.

The Restoration of Christ’s Kingdom

Since today is no different from the last century, since we are sure that we shall never lack Mary’s care and her help, since that blessed grotto—O generous Mother!—will no more stop pouring its flood of maternal favors over the earth than the water will stop running through these valleys or the sun stop spreading warmth and light, We wish to proclaim publicly at the close of this Congress which crowns in a sense this incomparable centenary that We are certain that the restoration of the Kingdom of Christ through Mary cannot fail to be realized, for it is impossible that such a planting, with seed sown in such abundance, should not bring forth a sound crop.

We are well aware that the powers of hell are working to destroy
Mary's heritage by robbing youth of its innocence and sense of shame, by attacking the holiness and permanence of marriage, by setting one class of society against another as if all men were not brothers, by persecuting the Church wherever they can, by spreading the most radical form of materialism.

But We also know that deep in every heart is a thirst for light and truth, that in every soul there lives a sincere desire to find God—even among those who cannot reveal this desire without risking their goods and their lives. We know well the vigor of the spiritual forces which are appearing everywhere as heralds of a splendid springtime!

**Pilgrims to Lourdes**

You yourselves have seen men hasten this year to the feet of the Virgin with peace and serenity, as though they were men who live in a problemless world, a world not menaced by a catastrophe that has no parallel. You have seen them stretch out their hands to one another, smiling like brothers, as if they were not the same people who yesterday were looking from trench to trench at one another with eyes full of hate. You have seen them packing the confessionals, waiting in endless lines to receive the Manna that comes down from heaven, praying tirelessly with arms outstretched before the grotto, singing Mary's praises at sunset in lighted processions.

You have seen them depart, the faithful full of fervor, the sinners reborn, all blessed with Mary's favors, or the sick going home with their illness—haven't you seen them return home with faces aglow with the light of God, afire with a more fervent desire to lead a better life, a new life beneath the mantle of her whose smile they will never forget?

At Lourdes, men say, there is an open window into heaven. We would add that this window not only affords us a glimpse of heaven's glory, but also provides an entrance for a continual stream of light and grace that restores confidence in the future in a mankind that is anxious—to be sure—for growth and progress, but even more for peace and quiet.

**The Peace of Christ**

Brothers and dear children! In this solemn hour beg for the world those gifts which you know to be necessary and appropriate, each in accord with the needs of which he is aware.

But pray, above all, that hatred and discord might cease, that the violent voices of greed and pride might be silenced, and that there might shine at last upon the earth that joyous and blessed sun of the peace that is so desired: the peace of Christ, which transcends every
other sentiment in the hearts of individuals and in their social and international relations, the natural result of unqualified application of the Gospel!

Summon in your prayers the Kingdom of Christ. Your most loving mother invites you to this Kingdom by her example, and her maternal intercession obtains for you all the means you need in order to achieve it. For does not Mary hold a privileged place in this Kingdom because of the role which Providence has chosen to give her in the life of the Church and of each of its members?

The Shrine at Lourdes

This, then, is why, O sweet Mother and powerful advocate, you have deigned to stand on the rocks of the Pyrenees and make that unknown valley a great shrine roofed only by the clouds of heaven; a shrine where your loving Son is honored ceaselessly in the Sacrament of His love, is received with fervor in thousands of hearts which may even still be wrapt in the joy of reconciliation, and is constantly invoked by the trembling lips of those who come to confide in Him a sorrow that no power on earth can cure!

May this be your work, O Queen of Angels, Queen of Peace! And do not permit such triumphs to be restricted to the narrow confines of your shrine. Like an irresistible torrent let them pour through the open valleys, rising to the summits and passing them, to fill and flood all at last with the joy and fertility of their waters. May these waters spread over the earth, cleansing souls, healing wounds, removing difficulties, giving vigor to all things, so that, through your powerful intercession and constant help, the Kingdom of Christ might finally be achieved: “Regnum veritatis et vitae; regnum sanctitatis et gratiae; regnum justitiae, amoris, et pacis!” (“The kingdom of truth and life; the kingdom of holiness and grace; the kingdom of justice, love, and peace!”—Ed.)

Saint Bernadette

And may our fervent prayers be one with those of that little flower whom you deigned to pick from this humble meadow that she might blossom in the garden of heaven, Saint Marie Bernadette Soubirous, whose lovable and hidden virtues, so deep yet so scarcely apparent, were able to teach such great lessons to our confused and troubled age.

May the blessing of the Vicar of Christ—who wishes his blessing to be a pledge of heaven’s choicest blessings—descend upon this city of Mary, which We too once had the pleasure of visiting; upon the countless pilgrims who are at Lourdes now or have been through the year; upon those who are participating in the Congress, especially those who
have cooperated directly in its splendid program; upon Our Brothers in the Episcopacy, and particularly upon Our dear Cardinal Legate!

MARY IN THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST, WHICH IS THE CHURCH

Conclusions and deliberations of the individual sections and of the general sessions of the Third International Mariological Congress

(Sermon given by the Reverend Father Charles Balic, O.F.M., President of the Congress, in the closing session of the Mariological Congress, on September 14, 1958).

Your Eminences, the Prince of the Church, Your Excellencies, the Civil Authorities, Distinguished Gentlemen and Professors—

What she who is ever blessed among all women has done for the Church’s life, and what the Church has done to honor her, whom all generations rightly call most blessed, has been the subject proposed for investigation by this immense and august assembly of masters of theology, gathered together in the Third Mariological Congress. His Eminence, Eugene Tisserant, Lord Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, will soon crown our deliberations with a fitting close. He comes to us in the name of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, to whom we beg God to grant, through the intercession of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, abundant health.

There was question really of only one theme, namely, that of Mary and the Church. But this proposed theme has so many facets and sub-distinctions that it almost seems to touch the whole body of sacred learning. Hence, a selection was made of those aspects of the problem which would more clearly show the role reserved to the Virgin Mary in the Church.

The program reveals the hard work which the thirteen special sessions and the general session have done in weighing reasons, in proposing conclusions, and in publishing the deliberations. One may perhaps recall that difficult situation in which the masters of the Middle Ages found themselves. After having listened to questions on all kinds of topics and from all sorts of sources, these masters attempted to reduce the mass of learning to a unified whole. The statement of the Subtle Doctor, Duns Scotus, might come to mind, for he began his Quodlibet with this quotation of Holy Writ: “All things are difficult,” (Solomon) and then immediately added: “Man cannot explain difficult things by a mere word. We, too, can also make a distinction among questions that are difficult. In the first place, things can be divided into created and uncreated beings, or into things having being in them-
selves and things having being from another, or into necessary or possible things, and, finally, into things finite and infinite. Now the uncreated being, existing of itself, infinite and necessary, is God; but a being created by another, being possible and finite, is commonly termed “creature”. And thus he reduced all matters proposed for discussion to questions about the Creator and the creature.

Almost the same thing can be said of the discussions held here in our Congress of Lourdes, where some things were said about Mary and some about the Church; some were general, others particular; some dealt rather with history or with positive theology, as it is called, others dealt with speculative theology; some questions dealt with worship, others with the power exercised in the Church through the Blessed Virgin; and finally still others with art.

After the President of the Congress briefly outlined the whole program, the distinguished Secretary of the Mariological Society of Germany, the Reverend Father Henry Koester, in the first plenary session, traced the “Christological” and the “ecclesiological” points of view, and then eloquently summarized the investigations made up to this point, dwelling on what ought to be the minimum tribute paid to Mary in the work of the Redemption with which she was associated.

The distinguished Senator and learned professor, Gerard Philips, of the University of Louvain, skillfully proposed the doctrine of the intimate union between Christ and the Church.

It then became necessary that the attention of all listeners be drawn to the transcendence of the Blessed Virgin, or, more clearly, her relations with the Most Holy Trinity and with Christ, as well as with each member of the faithful, and what was most important,—her transcendence according to the teaching of the Church’s magisterium. (Fathers Nicholas, De Aldama). After these points were dealt with, the individual sections could proceed more successfully with their work.

I. The Conclusions and Resolutions of the Thirteen Sections of the Mariological Congress

1. In three special scientific meetings twenty-two distinguished members of the German Mariological Society handled the investigations concerning the teachings of Holy Scripture, the Fathers and theologians, as well as that of the Church’s magisterium about the general parallelism existing between Mary and the Church.

The exegetical meeting examined what the Apostle John wrote of Mary and the Church, discussed the special manner in which John wrote, and explained particularly Chapter XII of the Apocalypse, where there seems to be a certain conflict between the mere Mariological
interpretation and the fundamental ecclesiological explanation.

The historical meeting collected the teachings of Ambrose, Augustine, the Post-Cyrillian Western Doctors, the unpublished commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles, like that of Rupert of Deutz, on the subject of *Mary and the Church*, as well as what theological tradition has taught about Mary's faith in the Passion of Christ. Then the same theme was taken up relative to the teachings of the German theologians immediately preceding the Mariologist Scheeben, the most eminent being Bishop Laurent, author of the first synopsis of Mary and the Church. Last of all the members heard the propositions of the speculative theologian, Scheeben.

Finally, through systematic procedure in the plenary sessions, there was presented a clear view of opinions on Co-Redemption, which recommends a solution from the ecclesiological point of view; in the same session there was a discussion on the systematic value of the parallelism of the *Church and Mary* in the structure of Mariology.

The German Mariological Society recommended that speculative considerations, under the direction of the Church's magisterium, should always be based upon positive foundations.

2. After these considerations of the relationship between Mary and the Church, Mary's special role in the economy of salvation, and the place she holds in the Church, progress moved from general considerations to particular ones so that these three items might be studied more profoundly.

In the first place there was a consideration of what Mary has done and what the Church has done so far as the work of redemption is concerned. On this difficult topic the Canadian Section undertook special investigations. With one voice the fifteen members agreed in acknowledging before all else that the doctrine which reduces the Blessed Virgin's cooperation in the work of redemption to a merely subjective redemption was entirely inadequate. Likewise they agreed that the opinion holding that the Blessed Virgin's cooperation in the objective redemption was only a "mediate" cooperation is far from satisfactory. All agreed in admitting that she cooperated in a manner called "immediate" in the objective redemption as the faithful Associate of Christ (Alma Christi Socia). After carefully examining the nature of her immediate cooperation, the Canadian theologians held that this cooperation was weakened by the theory of "pure acceptance" on the part of the Mother of God, although it is certainly true, in another sense, that the Blessed Virgin accepted God's plan and gifts.

With these things in mind they proceeded to the conclusion of her immediate cooperation, namely, that "this cooperation consisted in
Mary’s genuine and even positive activity or causality in order to reconcile the whole world with God.” But admitting this causality, it can in no wise be said that some price was offered by the faithful Associate of Christ distinct from the price of Christ, so that the work of redemption is really a composite of two prices; rather we must admit that only one price was paid for our salvation and reconciliation, the Blessed Virgin Mary (in a manner proper to herself) together with Christ paying the price and He at the same time associating Mary with Himself when paying the price.

Finally, as to the relationship between Mary and the Church, it can be seen from the foregoing conclusions, that the Church has a part also in the Blessed Virgin Mary, who thus actively cooperated in the economy of our salvation; first of all in so far as the Church has received the fruit from Mary for all its other members, in a social manner, as was fitting for her to do in the objective redemption;—then, in so far as the Church, together with Mary her supreme and intrinsic member, and with Mary’s mediation, has concurred mystically in her own restoration.

We must not, however, think that the Canadian theologians were unanimous on each and every single question. For example, when the question was raised as to whether the Blessed Virgin by thus cooperating, merited only “summa congruitate” or also by “relativa condignitate”, while one honorable member said she merited “de congruo”, many others held out for her meriting “de condignitate relativa.”

Again, in the question whether the Blessed Virgin has a physical as well as a moral influence in the distribution of graces, two of the members firmly held out for the physical influence she exercised, first, because of reasons based on authority (like the Encyclical Letter Ad Caeli Reginam), then on account of the internal logic of the mystery of Mary herself; others, again, had different opinions.

3. Next, if Mary was from all eternity predestined to be the faithful Associate of Christ the Redeemer, both in the acquisition of graces and in their distribution, so that she became not only the Mother of God, but also the spiritual mother of all mankind and the dispensatress of all graces,—her royal power over the Church and her influence over the Mystical Body of Christ, her role in the apostolate, in missionary work, in the spread and establishment of the Church assume, a priori, a rank of the highest importance.

The French Mariological Society, in its fifteen sessions, eruditely explained the royal dominion of Mary over the Church.

The Encyclical Ad Caeli Reginam presents a document on the subject which should lead to a deeper penetration on the part of both
positive and speculative theology. According to Holy Scripture Mary is the Mother of the King of Kings; it is, therefore, fitting to ascertain the mentality of the peoples of Palestine and of the neighboring countries in regard to dignity and duties of a king's mother.

Furthermore, since historical research has delved deeply into the first nine centuries of our era, and a like inquiry about the succeeding centuries is missing, investigation covered the doctrine of Mary's royal dominion in the liturgies of the East and of the West, the foundations of her royal power according to the writers of the twelfth century (her divine maternity and her role of co-sufferer with Jesus), the nature of her royal power (her sublimity and her power), and the manner in which it was manifested (by her intercession and by her direct influence on souls). All of this had been taught, particularly in the seventeenth century, not only by popular preachers, but also by the greatest French theologians and mystical writers, who defended this title of Our Lady against their adversaries, and provided solid bases for the devotion which flowed from it.

Encouraged by these teachings, the theologians of our age were better able to investigate and to understand how unique is the royal power of Mary, and how it is related to Christ's royal dominion. At the same time they were enabled to perceive that the use of analogy on this subject presented the greatest difficulties. Granted that the royal power of Mary can be said to be joined to her glorious assumption into heaven, in the same way that Christ's royal power calls to mind His Ascension, yet this very comparison also points up the differences by which the royal power of one is different from the royal power of the other.

Because Mary is the faithful Associate of Christ the Redeemer, not as His Spouse, but as His Mother (Queen of Mercy), together with Christ she founds the kingdom of the faithful and she joins her actions to the actions of Christ for the salvation of all believers. Furthermore, the manner of exercising royal power, proper to Mary, is that of intercession, not excluding, however, a certain union of love,—whence our Queen together with Christ can exercise a true instrumental causality in regard to graces (according to the teaching of Father Gagnebet). Hence the teaching of Mary's "compassion" with respect to the Church militant and to the Church suffering can be more easily defined. Finally, it will be easier to determine the role of the Virgin Mary in the Church, in her capacity as Queen of the Mystical Body of Christ.

4. The Spanish Mariological Society in its more than twenty reports treated the theme: Mary, Mother of the Church and her influence on the Mystical Body of Christ. Considering that the more recent in-
vesigations were frequently about motherhood, they deemed it opportune to set down the thinking of the Spanish theologians on the subject. The Maternity was seen to flow from Mary's personal union and association with Christ, which must be regarded as active and effective, from the first moment of the Incarnation to the last hour of Calvary. A consequence is Mary's universal mediatorship, with its threefold offices of intercession, acquisition, and distribution of graces. Next came the teachings of the Orientals about the association of Mary with Christ in the dispensing of graces; further on, inquiry was made into the concept of the intrinsic union between the divine and spiritual maternity in its relation to mankind. Moreover, Mary's efficacy in the production of graces was fully approved, not excepting sacramental grace, as well as the efficacy of Mary in the whole spiritual life, from which also a certain mystical experience might be derived.

The final conclusion of the Spanish section is to be based on the principle of her objective co-redemption, which provides, as it were, a foundation for Mary's intervention in the distribution of all graces.

5. Almost thirty theologians gathered together in the Latin American Section to discuss the topic of the “Blessed Virgin’s priestly character”.

Already in the first report, there was a discussion of the term “priesthood” as used in general, and only a certain general sacerdotal character was ascribed to the Blessed Virgin. Although it elevated her in an entirely special way for supernatural works, nevertheless it was completely distinct from a ministering priesthood and from the priesthood of the faithful.

This thesis aroused considerable controversy for the simple reason that not all the theologians could see how the personal character and essential difference between the various kinds of priesthood which theologians usually keep distinct could be maintained. Some were for holding that in Mary could be found nothing which argued even for a basis of specific Marian priesthood (just as really happened in regard to her royal power); for this reason her active participation in the work of redemption was attributed to Mary in view of her role as Mother of the Redeemer and Associate of Christ, not, however, to her priesthood. Others, on the contrary, because of her participation in the redemptive act of Christ, held that Mary had a part in the fundamental priesthood of Christ, so that she is not only a type of the priesthood of the Church, but also its fountain-head, just as the priesthood of Christ is. Others again, making a further distinction, argued for Mary's part in Christ's priesthood not in a univocal but in an analogical sense, and, insisting on a correct application of analogy, they concluded it
was necessary to look into the true concept of priesthood attributed to the Blessed Virgin. To avoid confusion, others proposed that rather than speak in a simple manner of Mary’s priesthood, mention should be made of the spiritual priesthood of the Blessed Virgin, the formal basic element of which would be, ontologically, the fullness of grace she received at the moment of the Incarnation and, under the operative aspect, her maternal charity in so far as it orders and informs the act of religion.

Finally, passing over very many positive theses whose conclusions do not differ essentially from those most recently proposed by the outstanding Father Laurentin in his well-known work: “Mere, L’Eglise, et le Sacerdoce,” we recall certain theologians, who considering the subject speculatively were of the opinion that Mary had a real influence over the hierarchical priesthood, whether as an established institution or as exercised institution.

The discussions of these and other matters convinced the Latin American Section that the matter was considerably involved and that great prudence had to be exercised because the expression “Mary’s priesthood” could very easily lead to lamentable conclusions. Aware of the decrees of the ecclesiastical authority and especially of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office, they arrived at the following conclusions:

First of all, we do have to recognize a certain real relationship of the Blessed Virgin Mary with Christ inasmuch as He is a Priest;

Secondly, this relationship differs from that which exists between Christ and His ministering priests; yet it should not be reduced to that form of priesthood in which the faithful partake;

Finally, this relationship besides being superior to that of ministering priests and of the faithful’s priesthood, is entirely special to her.

6. The question about Mary’s priesthood leads logically to an inquiry into the relations existing between Mary and the Eucharist. This investigation was taken up in the Section of the Committee for International Eucharistic Congresses. Among the eight distinguished members of this committee, the eminent theologian, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Peter Parente, Archbishop of Perugia, spoke most eloquently. In the first place all approved the proposition that the Blessed Virgin Mary really cooperated with her Divine Son in His redemptive work, whether considered subjectively or objectively. Since the Holy Eucharist is a continuation and a certain extension of the Incarnation, the apex and the center of the sacramental system, by which grace, the fruit of the Redemption is communicated to mankind, it follows that Mary cooperated in the institution and efficacy of the
Holy Eucharist. As to the manner in which Mary cooperated and still cooperates in the total economy of the Redemption, the section inclined to the opinion which reduces that manner to that of instrumental causality, whether moral or physical. To prove this the following reasons were adduced:

1) It is God's ordinary way to save creatures by other creatures. The Incarnation is a point in proof, for the assumed humanity became the instrument of the Word.

2) The economy of Redemption is exercised chiefly through the sacraments, or through certain instruments.

3) Mary, who under the title of her Maternity, is ordered to the Incarnation, and by her title of Associate of Christ is ordered to the Redemption, was worthily and fittingly (digne et congrue) assumed by God as an eminent instrument, who, by her special condition mediates between the humanity of Christ and the sacraments.

By this instrumental action a true cooperation is maintained, even in the physical order; this takes nothing away from the unity of the Redemption nor from the dignity of the one and only Redeemer, for the instrumental action is properly and exclusively the action of God, which, however, passes through instruments (the humanity of Christ, Mary, and the sacraments) in order to attain its redemptive effect. The effect belongs to God, but is stamped by the instrument with a particular note; in case of Mary it is stamped by her maternal sweetness. This reasoning makes it easy to extend Marian cooperation to all the fruits of the redemption.

4) Finally, besides this instrumental action, in Mary we must admit proper activity both in the physical order (for example, the proper duties of the Mother towards Christ her Son), and in the moral order (congruous merit, intercession, etc.). For Mary's dignity, nevertheless, instrumental action is of greater value than her own proper action.

Since these elements, which were explained in detail by His Excellency, are real and solid foundations of Mary's mediation, co-redemption and spiritual maternity, (they could also be explained by the ecclesiological method of Corporis Mystici), Bishop Parente proposed the following resolutions, which the section looked upon as its own proper contribution to the Congress:

1) It is to be earnestly desired that the universal mediation of Mary in the whole economy of redemption, even regarded objectively (which can also be called co-redemption), be defined as an article of faith, leaving aside particular controversial questions (such as manner, physical or moral nature of cooperation, etc.), since the truth of media-
tion can be said to be formally revealed in an implicit manner, inasmuch as it is founded on Holy Scripture, continuously referred to among the Fathers and Doctors, vividly represented in the liturgy, spoken of openly in the Church’s magisterium, and rooted deeply and ardently in the conscience of the faithful;

2) that the devotion to Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament, approved for the religious family of Blessed Eymard, be seriously studied so that it might soon be extended to the Universal Church. In this manner the salutary truth of the intimate connection between Mary the Mother of God and the Most Holy Eucharist will be brought to the attention of the laity, and especially the clergy.

3) to promote this kind of theological study in the next Mariological Congresses, where the intimate connection between the Mother of God and the Most Holy Eucharist should be brought up for discussion.

7. As appears quite clearly from the foregoing conclusions, Mary has an active part in the objective redemption, because she is the Associate of Christ the Redeemer, the dispensatress of all graces, and our spiritual Mother. To her then must be attributed a special function in propagating and consolidating the Church. This theme was discussed by twenty-three theologians belonging to the section of the "Church Suffering", from the dogmatic, historical, and apologetic point of view.

Under the dogmatic-speculative aspect the manner of consolidating and propagating on the part of Mary, and on the part of the Church was clearly shown. The Virgin Mary concurs with the Church in consolidating and propagating in a twofold manner: as true spiritual Mother, she has conceived, given birth to, and nourished the whole Church,—and as a member of the Church, she was redeemed in the most perfect manner possible. On the part of the Church, however, consolidation and progress is gained by the road of scientific investigation, refined by the Fathers, Doctors, and theologians, and by the sense of faith in the faithful, which, in the case of universal consent, is a sure criterion of revealed truth, although second in importance to the Church’s magisterium.

Under the historical aspect, it was proved that Mary has most abundantly concurred in the consolidation of the Church during the period of Medieval Manichaeism, and during the great Western Schism. In particular, the influence of the Blessed Virgin on the national literature of Lithuania and Bulgaria received special mention.

From the aspect of apologetics, Mary consolidates the Church as a warrior in battle array, set against the errors of today, namely,
dialectic materialism, atheistic existentialism, and naturalism.

8. Next the section of the International Association called "Unitas", composed of seven theologians, dealt with the subject of Mary and the Unity of the Church. Leaving aside the very difficult question of restoring Christian unity, serious attention was given to the question of Mary, the Mother of Christ, Head of the Mystical Body, and, hence, also of all its members. Now the principal task of a mother, as can be easily seen, is this: to give love, to foster union among all the individual members of the Christian family. For this reason both the consciousness of the faithful, and, what is most important, the utterances of he Sovereign Pontiffs, have repeatedly proclaimed Mary the Mother of Christian unity.

Amid a variety of opinions, never were there lacking those voices which eloquently extolled the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin. First, of all, among the separated Oriental brethren, from the earliest days of a still undivided Christianity, the word "Theotokos" gently captured all hearts, as the meetings of this section vividly demonstrated.

The comparison of Mary with the Church occurs frequently among the "sophianic" Russian theologians of recent times (such as Soloviev, Florensky, and Bulgakov), wherein Mary is termed "Sophia" or Wisdom, and thus raised to a supereminent glory, so that in her the whole of creation appears suffused by an almost divine light so much so, that in praising her, these writers may sometimes appear to go beyond the limits of prudent esteem.

Likewise among the Orientals the most fruitful source both of devotion and even of the science of theology is found in the Sacred Liturgy, from which some very beautiful passages are taken, wherein Mary's maternity and virginity are extolled, and to some extent also her cooperation in the work of Redemption.

Among the followers of Protestantism, Marian doctrine and devotion are absurdly misunderstood, because of a fear that an undue exaltation of Mary might perhaps derogate in some way from the glory due to Christ and to God. However, even among these separated brethren there are some who seek to resolve this difficulty and who, to some extent, accept and promote Marian devotion. They consider Mary immediately in relation with the Church herself. So many and such great differences in Marian doctrine arise from one single but deep cause: namely, from a false concept of the Church and her authentic magisterium. Marian dogmas necessarily imply ecclesiological principles, especially the one true norm of revelation, by which both Holy Scripture and Tradition must be interpreted.

On the other hand, the Virgin Mary as the "handmaid of the
"Lord" is a most fitting image of the spouse of the Church, obedient to the will of her Spouse, who eagerly desires the visible unity of all the faithful and enjoins it upon everyone. Such is the unity of the Church that it includes its own unicity.

After these considerations were studied by the members of this section, and the lofty image of the Virgin emerged for their contemplation, it became evident to everyone that the hope of restoring unity must not be regarded as idle thinking.

9. The North American Section, made up of the Catholic University of Washington, D. C., the Mariological Society, and the Franciscan Marian Commission for the United States of America, proposed in its twenty sessions to study the theme: "Mary and the Apostolate of the Church." From their learned investigations it became clear that the Blessed Virgin Mary had her proper place in every form of the Church's apostolate.

As a matter of fact, the history of the Church especially on this matter approves and confirms the judgment of theological reasoning. The influence of Mary over the centuries and in the various forms of the apostolate was neither always the same, nor always equally explicit and evident. In the course of centuries Mary's task in the work of the total redemption was clearly revealed. The same is true of the consciousness of Mary's influence on the propagation of the Church, over missionary endeavors, over a multitude of apostolic labors. Even today the influence of Mary is frequently hidden, as in the conversion of Protestants. Notwithstanding, Marian devotion constitutes an element which belongs to the fullness of Christianity. Among many modern testimonials of Mary's importance and place in the Church apostolate the Legion of Mary (so violently attacked by atheistic communists) is outstanding.

The United States of America glories in the distinction that already in 1847, before the solemn proclamation of the dogma, Mary Immaculate was designated its patroness by the Apostolic See. Furthermore, from the very beginnings of this nation, devotion to Mary Immaculate flourished, especially in the zeal and faith of its first apostles and missionaries. Today this devotion is still on the increase, and Marian theology undergoes continuous critical study by many theologians, and is presented in an ever-increasing number of books and periodicals.

10. In the tenth section, the Mariological Society of Portugal, composed of twenty theologians, treated Marian apparitions, under three phases: historical, pastoral, and speculative.

These theologians looked into three elements dealing with apparitions, from a speculative point of view: genuineness of the criterion
of discernibility as to the supernatural origin of the apparitions, the intervention of authority and its importance, and, finally, a psychological explanation for the apparitions.

The criteria of discernibility of private revelations constitute an object of major importance among spiritual directors. Traditional rules retain their value even today. Although the ancients recognized two causes in this matter, namely, a good and a bad spirit, modern writers also speak of a third cause, namely, human nature, which at times is so easily deceived. After everything has been scrutinized by theological consideration, it may be concluded that a private revelation from being a merely human fact, can be raised to the status of divine revelation, when this private revelation is acknowledged by the Church as intimately and necessarily connected with infallibly proposed revelation.

The intervention of the Magisterium in judging a private revelation is then the ultimate decisive criterion, and its importance must be examined. As an example, we might consider its relationship to the apparitions at Lourdes and at Beauraing. With regard to Lourdes, according to the Pontifical documents we may conclude that ecclesiastical approval is not merely "negative" but "positive", and, even "for the welfare of the faithful," as Benedict XIV said. Another practical example, the episcopal approbation, given for the apparitions at Beauraing, must be understood under a twofold aspect: negatively, in so far as the approbation does not extend to every individual report; positively, wherein the Ordinary proposes as worthy of belief or admits with moral certitude a statement which before was perhaps wholly or somewhat uncertain.

The principal reason for admitting the heavenly origin of the apparitions is found in their contents, especially in the manifest veracity of the testimony of the witnesses. At least those members who treated this question specifically, were in accord in rejecting the assumption that "there can be no valid demonstration of a heavenly apparition unless it be by means of a distinct miracle which has been announced beforehand." On the contrary, an effective discussion, based on authority and reason, seems to refute this position.

Psychology, on its part, provides theology a powerful auxiliary in solving questions of, or in defining, natural conditions, i.e., the phenomena of apparitions. Under this aspect the question arose: "What is the value and what are the limits of the help which a psychologist can furnish a theologian in interpreting facts?"

The usual notions show clearly the weakness, and even the lack of seriousness at times of some objections, which often are made
against the authenticity of miraculous happenings, as in the apparitions at Lourdes. As a matter of fact, a valid objection is not made up of those dissimilarities which might arise in the reports of the principal parties of aforesaid facts, because their aptitudes differ, one from another in individual details, and this can be due either to their observation of a fact or their manner of relating it. Neither do individual descriptions of details, termed by scoffer’s “imaginary,” constitute a serious difficulty against the authenticity of the facts. Nor, finally, can the “subjectivity” angle which is found in apparitions be properly made an objection, for it is nothing more than an indication of human nature accommodating itself to conditions.

St. Pius X in his encyclical letter *Ad diem illum*, and Pius XII in his encyclical letter *Fulgens corona* speak of prodigies and miracles, which took place through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the city of Lourdes, and which, as Pius X points out, “are clear arguments for banishing the unbelief of mankind today.”

11. But since even among Catholics there exist false notions of the nature of miracles, and especially about the prodigies at Lourdes, where some continue to hold one opinion, others other opinions, it seemed timely, on the occasion of the first centenary of Lourdes, to constitute a special section, made up of men skilled in the medical arts, as well as of theologians and philosophers, so that they might unite their strength both in the public presentation and in open discussion of this important subject. No less a person than His Eminence, Cajetan Cardinal Cicognani, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, graciously provided the impetus for the work of this section, by giving an eloquent sermon on miracles in general, and those of Lourdes in particular, and considering them under the aspect of a confirmation of revelation.

The eleven members of this commission pointed out various difficulties and undertook to solve them. The distinguished doctors (Pellissier, Van der Schueren, Bariety, Salmon, Theibaud, Olivieri, Mauriac) indicated practical difficulties which often turn up in the diagnosis of a sickness, and in making the judgment of the inability to explain miraculous happenings by merely natural laws; but at the same time they showed that these difficulties can at times be overcome with genuine certitude. On this matter they were in full accord with the theologians, and particularly with Father Silvio Romani, Promoter of the Faith in processes of beatification and canonization.

What follows was unanimously approved, namely, that doctors, as doctors, are not competent to judge whether a fact be miraculous or not, but only to establish that such and such a fact cannot be explained
by the known laws of nature. Even if doctors always form such a judgment according to scientific teaching currently in force, nevertheless there is nothing to prevent them from sometimes prudently and with certainty asserting that a certain fact, as it actually took place, will never be accounted for by natural laws, either today or in the future, inasmuch as these happenings have been really withdrawn from the application of natural laws.

It is within the competence of the philosopher and theologian to proceed farther, as is done, for example, in apologetics. And, finally, it is up to the Church to pronounce authoritative and definitive judgment on these matters.

12. From what has been said, it is clear that up to now the eleven aforementioned sections were occupied with discussing the theme: "What has the Blessed Virgin Mary done for the Church?", whereas the twelfth and thirteenth sections took up the theme: "What has the Church done for Mary?"

And so nine outstanding members of the Mariological Society of Flanders and Holland, grouped together into the so-called "Mariale Dagen" undertook to examine questions dealing with the genuine meaning of liturgical devotion and Marian piety, about Mary in the life of the liturgy, about the importance of Marian devotion in Russian countries, about the perpetual and universal cult to Mary, and, lastly, about the value of pilgrimages and sanctuaries. Unanimously this section arrived at the following conclusions:

1) Since in the course of the liturgical year a number of feasts of the Blessed Virgin occur, which had their origin in some definite historical or psychological occasion, which has now completely passed into oblivion or been deprived of any meaning, the section "Mariale Dagen" fervently hopes that the study of the present-day usefulness (timeliness) of many such feasts of the Blessed Virgin be confided to experts.

2) This section greatly laments the abolition of the Feast of Mary, Mediatrix of all Graces, formerly celebrated in many dioceses, and expresses the desire that on the Feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin on September 15, appropriate means be taken to emphasize clearly the Blessed Virgin’s cooperation in our objective redemption, as it is called, through the one offering of her Son and of herself on Calvary, such as it is taught in the pontifical documents.

3) This section earnestly hopes, too, that the older feasts of the Blessed Virgin regain their full dogmatic meaning, as can be seen from the most recent pontifical documents. Thus, for example, it is proposed, by use of pastoral and liturgical instruction, that the Feast of the An-
nunciation become again the true feast of our Redemption, as it is understood in the Oriental Church, from which perhaps much could be taken for other feasts. For in the Feast of the Annunciation we recall the consent which the Blessed Virgin really gave to the conception of the Son of God as our Redeemer, and thus to our divine filiation in Christ.

13. Finally, because the love of the faithful for the Blessed Virgin has ever been manifested and continues perennially to be shown in almost countless ways, it was necessary to speak not only of Marian cult properly so-called, which is amply demonstrated by invocations, feasts, and prayers, but also of sacred art. This question was ably treated by thirteen members of the Pontifical Academy of the Immaculate Conception. And though this particular theme included discussions that were hardly strictly theological, nevertheless certain Mariological theses about the Virgin Mother of God's relationship with the Church were given added strength under an artistic and literary aspect, as can be seen from the following conclusions which this section reached:

First of all Marian art, especially that dealing with pictures, from its earliest beginnings down to our time is in keeping with the dignity of the Church, since it expresses by appropriate means the position of the Church and her various conditions, namely the humble, sorrowful, glorious, apologetic—all of which are based on Mary's protection. Examples of this kind are found in pictorial representations of the mysteries in the life of the Blessed Virgin, under the wide influence, even of the apocryphal gospels. In Marian epochs, there were the magnificent temples in Sicily (Martorana, Monreale, Cefalu, etc.), the apologetical representations of the Immaculate Virgin as Mediatress according to Apoc. 12:1 ff., as patroness of the Roman Church against the heresies of the reformers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the illustrious art of the Flemish School. Likewise pictorial art strengthens historical or literary tradition about the "Passing" or death of the Mother of God, which depends in great part on the older pseudo-witness Denis the Areopagite (at the beginning of the sixth century); hence conclusions can be drawn on a specific question.

Furthermore, the Blessed Virgin as Mediatress and Mother of the Church holds the first and most honored place, whether it be in the greatest Christian poem, written by Dante Alighieri, wherein the Blessed Virgin is constantly invoked and frequently and actively intervenes, or in the universal poetry and literature of Italy, from the thirteenth to the twentieth centuries. This can likewise be affirmed of other literatures over the Christian world.

Finally, the Blessed Mother of God holds a similar place in the
noble art of Marian music, whether it be liturgical (from the seventh century on), or whether it be in praise of her in the native tongues (especially during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries).

Now since it is sufficiently clear from these investigations that arguments both confirming and illustrating Mariological questions, can be drawn from a study of the sacred arts, this section also proposed the establishment of Institutes, especially Marian Institutes, through which learned men and their collaborators might promote more intense and wider scientific studies in the whole field of sacred Marian art. This would serve as a public testimonial and frequently a popular testimonial of sacred doctrine. It was also proposed that similar investigations be conducted in the field of universal literature so that the Virgin Mary be everywhere proclaimed and honored in academic circles as the special "Queen of Poets."

Up to now I have detailed only the names of the thirteen sections and the principal results of the science and learning of so many outstanding men who came together at Lourdes from almost thirty universities, from fifty religious orders, from all peoples and countries. But whoever ponders with a calm and undisturbed mind the points selected for praise and the conclusions which deal with the fundamental dogmas of our religion, will comprehend the serious import of this Third Mariological Congress, which will come to fuller light when the "Acts" of these thirteen sections will be published in separate volumes.

II. The More Important Conclusions Which Were Reached in the General Assemblies

Important also were the problems which were read and discussed in the five general assemblies by twenty of the most eminent theologians. The first thing that strikes us is the common tendency of attributing to the Blessed Virgin as many privileges as can be arrived at by a humble search for the truth, whether it be her official public task in the economy of salvation or the eminent position she holds in the Church.

Already in the opening session of the Congress, in his exposition of the twofold kind of Marian cooperation (the Christological concept and the ecclesiological concept) Father Koester called attention to the so-called "Christo-types" and to the "Ecclesio-types". While disagreeing in many respects (as they did when discussing the exact nature of Mary's task of establishing the Church and her place in the Church), these theologians, nevertheless, were of one mind in their defense of Mary's excellence and transcendence with respect to the other re-
deemed, attributing to her a real social task, a task that is universal, public, redemptive, as well as cooperative with Christ the Redeemer in the objective order. Mary was taken by God as His very own, so that in a singular manner she actively intervened in bringing about the work of the redemption. This intervention was not only "preparative" in that she hastened the Incarnation by her ardent desire and prayer; it was also "inchoative" inasmuch as she gave the Word her faith, her consent, and her own flesh; finally it was "complementary" since she suffered most acutely with Christ at the foot of the Cross for our salvation by consenting to His death, and by co-offering the sacrifice in a manner completely special to herself.

This cooperation which the Blessed Virgin gave both in the Incarnation and in the Passion accompanied as it was by a consciousness of the mystery taking place, was most salutary for the objective redemption, and pertained intrinsically to this redemption. This earthly cooperation being completed, its application efficaciously continues even now, since by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin every kind of grace, including every single, individual grace is granted to men, so that there is no grace that is not obtained through her.

This thesis, laden with so many implications, was discussed in subsequent meetings, first from the viewpoint of Mary's relationship to Christ the Redeemer, then from the viewpoint of her being a type of the Church, which in its most excellent member, cooperated in her own subjective redemption. First of all, the teaching on the transcendence of the Blessed Virgin was discussed. "It pertains intrinsically to the order of things constituted by the hypostatic union," because "the maternity of the Blessed Virgin is ordained to the hypostatic union," and "the very person of the Mother of God pertains to the hypostatic order" (Nicolas). Thus Mary transcends not only the whole order of nature, but even that of grace. To be the Mother of God perfectly and completely is the vocation of the Blessed Virgin, just as much as being worthily and perfectly the assumed nature of the Son of God is the vocation of His assumed humanity.

But Mary is not only the Mother of Christ; she is also His faithful Associate, the new Eve. A careful scrutiny of the documents of the Church's magisterium, leads us to maintain that "the salvation of the human race, or the redemption, proceeding as it does above all else from the divine will, must be attributed de facto not only to the Passion of Christ, but to the compassion of Mary, not as if these two existed independently but inasmuch as they form a oneness through intimate association and strict union." (De Aldama). This Marian cooperation is so meritorious, that it becomes necessary to say "the
treasury of graces, which makes up the redemption of the human race, must be attributed both to the merits of Christ and to the merits of the Blessed Virgin, His Associate."

This Marian cooperation in the objective redemption, moreover, began at the Annunciation the very instant that the Word became man, when Mary, having full cognizance of the Divine Will and of His eternal counsels concerning the manner of redeeming the human race, became the "Mother of Jesus, Co-Redemptrix of the human race, and spiritual Mother of all men" (Malo).

Thus having established the fact of Mary's cooperation in the objective redemption, were we to proceed further in studying the more intimate nature of this cooperation, and especially by looking into the parallelism between Mary and the Church, we would discover among various authors different modes of expression (which has its foundation in the nature of the subject). For instance, there were some who tried to prove that Mary cooperated with Christ the Redeemer in the work of our salvation "formally, inasmuch as she was the representative of the other members of the Mystical Body," so that "in the objective Redemption, while Christ the Redeemer acted as head of all humanity, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Associate of Christ and subordinate to Him, exercised a truly active concurrence, in her role as maternal representative of the whole human race" (Belanger).

Furthermore, by comparing Mary and the sacraments, especially with the Holy Eucharist, the conclusion was drawn that at least that activity and that causality which the sacraments have must be granted to Mary. Thus was defended the teaching that Mary's causal influence exercised on the real Body as well as on the Mystical Body of Christ, is not only a moral but also a physical instrumental cause (Parente), so that Mary "virtually or by contact of power, may be found in the Church, operating instrumentally in her, pouring out light, warmth, and the supernatural life" (Roschini).

If these things are true, namely, if the Blessed Virgin in se is loved more than the whole Church by Christ; if her fullness of grace contains in se all perfections of the grace of the Church; and if she was redeemed before the Church, and had a task entirely proper to her before the establishment of the Church, participating in the Resurrection of Christ and in His Ascension to the right hand of the Father before the whole Church did (Nicolas), is not this privileged, most singular creature, who touches on the boundaries of the Most Holy Trinity, entitled to a position outside and above the Church?

While some replied negatively to this question, even though they admitted that Mary is the first and the principal member of the Church
closest to Christ and dependent upon Him (Nicolas), others (like Philips) did not scruple to declare that Mary is in and above the Church: "She is in the Church because of her incorporation in one body; but she is above the Church, because by the power of Christ she introduces into it the yet unborn economy of salvation."

But when it comes to terminology (whether Mary is the Spouse of the Father, the Mother or the Daughter of Christ, and so on), some (Nicolas) merely in passing asserted that the maternity of the Blessed Virgin had a sort of wonderful intimate connection with the Father "from Whom all paternity in heaven and on earth receives its name", adding further that for this intimate connection to be perfect, it included "the highest spiritualization of this maternity, even to the participation of the Spirit of love, whereby the Father and the Son love one another: The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee" (Nicolas).

Others again, (like Garcia Garces) treating ex professo the relation of Mary with the Head of the Mystical Body of Christ, of which she is the Mother, have come to the conclusion that she is both Mother and Daughter. For, "Christ our Lord belongs to the Church, but as Head, because He Himself forms and unites the Mystical Body in Himself; Mary also belongs to the Church, but as Mother, who, as Associate of Christ and absolutely dependent upon Him, had a role in founding the Mystical Body. Mary, therefore, in her relation to the Head of the Mystical Body is a true spiritual daughter ('figlia del tuo Figlio'); but in relation to the Body itself, that is, to the Church, in so far as the Church is distinct from Christ, Mary is not to be presented as daughter, but as mother."

Finally, in the city of Lourdes the relation of Mary to the Church is manifested in a manner almost visible: when the message of Lourdes is reduced to its historic origin and close attention is given to the words and actions of the Virgin Mary and of the innocent girl Bernadette, there seems to be a certain genuine repercussion of the Gospel of Christ (Laurentin). Continuous manifestations of grace and spiritual life and illustration of the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Holy Eucharist point up the shrine of Lourdes as a triumph of miracles, a triumph of the supernatural order, and an aid of the highest order offered to Holy Church in her continual struggle against atheistic materialism (Munoz Vega, Laffon).

And so because by God's good pleasure Mary holds such a sublime office and such an important place in the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, it is absolutely clear that Marian devotion touches upon the very foundations of our religion; nor is it therefore astonishing
that the Supreme Pontiffs, especially in the last decades, have impressed upon all the Christian faithful that Marian devotion is not merely something optional (Ciappi).

Expressions of this kind, though at times they may appear to be slightly exaggerated, remind us of what St. Alphonsus wrote: "The praise of Mary is a fountain so full that the more it extends the fuller it becomes and the fuller it becomes the more it extends." 3 Hence it is not surprising that if in the city of Lourdes, while countless multitudes of the faithful shouted: "Laudate, laudate Mariam!" even theologians in union with a certain ancient devotee of devotion asserted of their common Mother: "We are compelled to praise (her), lest by our silence we show ourselves ungrateful," 4 and then offered such high words in praise of the Virgin, with what might be termed an almost holy audacity.

Rejecting what is fictitious and false, we must be content with true and solid expressions of praise, according to the caution given by the Seraphic Doctor: "We must not invent bizarre honors in praise of Mary, who does not need our lies, who herself is so full of truth." 5 In the evening of the thirteenth and on the morning of the fourteenth, very learned men held meetings and tried to pass in review divers opinions expressed in the meetings, and bring some balance into their discussions. They discussed the true notion of the objective redemption, and sought a solution to the question of whether Mary is to be likened to Christ or to the Church. 6 Even though these discussions were sometimes waged around terminology rather than the marrow of the subject, they were useful not only for avoiding various ambiguities and for showing the richness inherent in the theme "Mary and the Church", but also to show in their own persons that here in the city of Lourdes they were united in the one and same Heart of their common Mother for the purpose of throwing light on her prerogatives and that there were in their ranks no enemies, no "Minimists", no "Maximists."

In the very beginning it was the intention of the Congress to propose conclusions as to the role entrusted to Mary and to offer some resolutions. But such was the wealth of material that appeared in individual meetings and in the general assemblies, so great the harmony as to substance of this material, but so varied the modes of expression, that it became difficult in such circumstances to propose conclusions for approval couched in strictly scientific formulas. Some members thought that the conclusions about Mary's task in the economy of salvation could be given in the following propositions concerning the special intervention of the Blessed Virgin in the work of redemption:

1) her intervention is different from her office of heavenly inter-
cession and distribution of graces;

2) it is founded on the association of the Blessed Virgin with the Redeemer in the work of our redemption, by which she participates in the objective redemption;

3) this intervention of the Blessed Virgin was made by her meritorious and sanctifying acts, during her life on earth, but especially by the oblation of her Son on Calvary;

4) those acts were performed by the Blessed Virgin and accepted by God as the official acts of the faithful Associate of Christ;

5) without these acts of the Blessed Virgin, there is no Redemption, inasmuch as this (redemption) in reality was ordained by God from all eternity;

6) the power of these acts of the Blessed Virgin to aid in our redemption stems entirely from the merits of Jesus Christ, Who is the unique Victim, the only price of our salvation, and can in no wise be thought of as independent of Christ's merits.

After a careful consideration of the above conclusions, it was not judged opportune that they be proposed for general approval, since they certainly did not present adequately those things which had been said and discussed in so many meetings.

As to the resolutions, certainly what was brought to light by the various sections and by His Excellency Archbishop Parente of Perugia, carried great weight, namely, the dogmatic definition of the truth of Mary's universal mediation, so that the four dogmas which adorn the crown of the Mother of God and those which especially relate to her personal privileges, would be augmented by a fifth dogma, which would cause her social mission to shine forth in a new light. But such a resolution had already been proposed by the International Mariological Congress held in the Eternal City on the occasion of the Jubilee Year of 1950, and formally presented to the Holy Father. The Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII gave sufficient evidence to indicate that he would not define another Marian dogma, wishing to imitate in this matter his Predecessor, Pius IX, who after the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, left to his successors the care and solicitude of defining the dogmatic truth of the Assumption. Since the mind of the Vicar of Christ was known, it did not seem opportune to propose again the same resolution in the very same terms.

What about the other resolutions? There is hardly anyone who does not see the force and importance of those which were proposed by the "Mariale Dagen" section. These resolutions touching on the cult of the Blessed Virgin and her liturgical feasts would certainly obtain general approbation, if there were time to examine them leisurely and
to prepare them for discussion. But what it is impossible to discuss here, may be done at another time and in another place. Up to now there have been held three International Mariological Congresses, and three really magnificent ones.

The Acts of the First International Mariological Congress were published in thirteen volumes by the International Marian Academy; the Acts of the second Congress were published in eighteen volumes; the Acts of this Lourdes Congress will certainly cover just as many volumes.

Although the first Congress was dedicated to Mary’s mission in general; the second, to a study of the privilege of her Immaculate Conception; and the third, to a study of the relationship between Mary and the Church, nevertheless the central point in all these Congresses was the fundamental doctrine of our Redemption; whether the Blessed Virgin had a special role in the Redemption, i.e., whether the Blessed Virgin, herself the beneficiary of redemption, cooperated actively in the Redemption of the human race with Christ not only as His Mother but also as an Associate in carrying out the work of the Redemption.

Now that this universal and well-nigh encyclopedic insight into the essential argument has been achieved, later Congresses can select certain other points for discussion, as, for example, the discussion proposed by “Mariale Dagen”, dealing with the cult of the Blessed Virgin; or the discussion proposed by the International Committee for Eucharistic Congresses, treating the topic of the intimate connection between Mary and the Eucharist. It will be possible to investigate individual limited topics from every point of view, and to arrive at particular conclusions more easily.

Besides, there exists in the Eternal City a Central Council, in which there are representatives of all Mariological Societies, as well as of the thirteen sections into which the Lourdes Congress was divided. To this Central Council all recommendations and whatever has been proposed here or will be brought up in the future will be referred for examination. Thus the Third International Mariological Congress will in a real sense continue its labors. Meantime addresses of all the members of this Congress will be published so that each one may seek solutions and counsel, and send them to the Marian Academy.

If even in the Central Council not everything can be concluded with perfect agreement, let us recall to mind in our own conclusions “veritatem facientes in caritate”—“pursuing truth in charity”; let us work with zeal for the truth, desiring above all to obtain the solution to problems still open to free discussion.

In our Congresses we must uphold as sacred that traditional rule: “Unity in necessary matters, liberty in doubtful ones, but charity in
everything!" History, reason, and experience prove that a just liberty is necessary not only for progress in science, but also, that mere opinion may not be taken for faith; the uncertain, for what is probable; and what is false, for truth. Unity of opinion is desirable, but not to be too much insisted on, according to this felicitous counsel of Father Ledochowski: "Whatever the dispositions of men, whatever be the limits of their talents, maybe it is impossible that even among men known for their great knowledge and piety there should not exist differences of opinions in practical or theoretical matters as the whole history of the Church from the Apostles on, abundantly shows. Whoever, therefore, tries to bring about unanimity through an absolute uniformity of opinions, labors in vain, and even achieves the opposite effect," for such uniformity and unity "is neither necessary nor useful and indeed cannot be obtained; zeal in achieving this vain and false shadow of unanimity would risk exposing charity, learning, and faith to no slight danger."8

If a perfect unity of opinion neither was nor could be the end which our Mariological Congress pursued, where must we look for the real significance of the Congress? Even though an adequate reply to this question can be given only when the Acts of this Congress are published, nothing prevents us from perceiving the broad lines of that answer from what has been already said.

Keeping always in mind that so-called "originality" does not consist in drawing up a new alphabet, but in the spark of genius manifested in the composition of each word, and admitting moreover that in the field of dogma, although it is licit to speak of new approaches, it would be dangerous to propose new things, that is, to bring up a teaching which proceeds from the desire of novelty, contrary to the rules of the Church. From this we see that theologians united in the city of the Church, even though they did not even dream of fighting in defense of "new teachings" which run counter to the teachings of the Church, nevertheless humbly and modestly and likewise sharply and often daringly have said quite a few things in a new way, by working over expressions of various kinds, so that the mystery of Mary and the Church could be more easily explained, and thus those teachings which are not perfectly exact might be corrected.

If these things are true in the field of speculative theology, they are far more true in the exegetical-historical field, where so many and such important facts are often hidden in volumes of libraries, which contain the various monuments of Christian antiquity or of medieval and modern times, and are now brought to light for the first time and studied assiduously.
Furthermore, from the mass of readings and discussions of this Congress it has appeared that the question of Mary’s co-redemption is neither as clear nor as simple as it might appear to some. Some aspects of the very important question remain perennially obscure and call for further investigation. Hence arises the challenge for making other attempts to obtain the desired clarity, according to this saying: “Ceaseless labors conquer everything,” and according to still another, “There is nothing so difficult that it cannot be investigated by further research.”

Someone, for instance, might raise the question (indeed more artificial than real), “Whether Mary should be compared with Christ rather than with the Church.” Such a theoretical question would afford a good opportunity of finding similarities as well as dissimilarities between Christ and the Church, between the Church and Mary (who in a sense entirely different from the Church is the Mother of Christ), and yet these would hardly suffice to uncover the integral and adequate idea of the office and position of Mary in the Church. It is necessary for both “Christo-types” and for “Ecclesio-types” to depart for some length from their proper field, and, separating essential elements from accidental ones, bring about with their united efforts a common synthesis. While it is true that this is not the work of one day of one Congress only, nevertheless, it has been treated in our Congress in such a way and with such dispatch that Ovid’s dictum comes, spontaneously to mind: “Well begun is half done.”—“Dimidium facti, qui bene coepit habet.” While the followers of the Christological method or of the ecclesiological method profess one and the same faith in one and the same mystery of the economy of our salvation, the mystery of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, and in Mary, the advocates of the “Christological” method think that they have discovered certain aspects in this common mystery which the followers of the “ecclesiological” method have overlooked, and vice versa. Seldom can the proponents of either one theory or the other actually demonstrate that those aspects of the Marian mystery which they show to each other exist in reality. Nevertheless their attempt to know each other better, in order to understand each other better, is the golden means of seeking truth in charity,—the way, which little by little, but certainly and fruitfully, leads to progress in the sacred science.

Your Eminences, Your Excellencies, the Heads of State, Distinguished and Learned Teachers,—

His Excellency, the Bishop Peter M. Theas, at the inauguration of this Congress five days ago in the Rock of Massabielle, sharply con-
trasted the ignorance of the innocent young maid Bernadette with the knowledge of the masters of theology: “A hundred years ago ignorance was called before this rock to see. Today science has come here to study.” However the same Spirit of Truth, the same Seat of Wisdom, which illumined the rock of Massabielle during the days of the apparitions, have been humbly invoked by these learned men to come to their aid; piety and speculative thinking, the mystic and the scholastic, have been frequently seen to be united here since the theologians desired nothing more earnestly than to be the instruments of the Holy Spirit in praising this most outstanding creature, who borders on the boundaries of the Most Holy Trinity.

Having thoroughly considered the problems presented, our Congress, I would venture to say, will go down in the history of this Marian city as one of the more outstanding occasions of its whole existence. As a matter of fact, during these days this little city has not only shone forth as Catholic, that is, universal, but has also achieved another distinction, which I would term “theological,” even “conciliar.” For to this city flocked the most learned masters of theology from all over the world, but the greatest number came from Rome, from the See of the Sovereign Pontiff, whose spirit was imbibed and lived by all present. And not only theologians, but also such a great number of the Venerable College of Cardinals and Bishop assembled here, that this little city seemed to be turned into another Rome,—a Roma Marialis.

Everything has been carried out in Mary’s Name; in Mary’s name we came together, our assemblies were conducted in her Name, we discussed Mary, we strove to praise Mary not only by our prayers but also by our speculative consideration. And now before I close the sessions of the Third Mariological Congress, allow me to repeat from a full heart: “Thanks and deepest appreciation to all who in any way whatever worked so that our convention could happily reach its objective.”

Last of all may this Congress end with the same word with which we began it: for just as Mary was the beginning of our work, so may she, the Most Holy Mother of God and our most powerful Mother, be our very last word, too, as a seal set upon all our labors. AVE MARIA!

1. DUNS SCOTUS L. Quodlibet. praefatio (ed. Vives, XV, 3a).
2. The names of all participating members are here omitted for the sake of brevity and clarity. They can be found in Congressus Mariologicus-Marianus Internationalis. Programma. Romae. 1958.
4. This sentence is attributed to St. Bonaventure by A. Roskovany, The Blessed Virgin Mary in her Immaculate Conception . . . I. Budapest. 1873. p.VIII.
5. Bonaventure, Sent. III, d. 3, p. 1, q. 2 ad 3 (Opera omnia, Quaracchi, III, 68b).
6. As Father Koester pointed out in the opening session, and later Father Miller in his masterly discourse, the authors of the Christological and ecclesiological methods disagree among themselves as to the manner of interpreting and judging facts of this kind (especially the facts of the Passion), rather than about the individual historical factors to which the Blessed Virgin gave her concurrence. An indirect foundation of the ecclesiological method is found in the weakness of the opposed theory; a direct foundation relies upon the doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Fathers and upon the mutuality (communication—reception) which seems to be essential in divine human relationships.
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5. Third International Mariological Congress—Lourdes, 1958 Address of Pope Pius XII; summary by Charles Balic, O.F.M., 32p., $0.25.