

Marian Studies

Volume 37 *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh National Convention of the Mariological Society of America held in Tampa, FLA.*

Article 10

1986

The Theological Context of and Introduction to Chapter 8 of Lumen Gentium

Frederick M. Jelly

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jelly, Frederick M. (1986) "The Theological Context of and Introduction to Chapter 8 of Lumen Gentium," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 37, Article 10.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol37/iss1/10

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlengen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

THE THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF AND INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTER 8 OF *Lumen Gentium*

Although this paper presents both history and theology, it is intended to be primarily theological. Its principal purpose is to provide a theological interpretation of the main events that led to the text of chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium* (LG), the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which was issued November 21, 1964, as well as a commentary upon the introduction or preface to that chapter on Mary (LG 52-54).¹ The teaching of Vatican Council II on marian doctrine and devotion is more extensive than what is contained in chapter 8 of LG since there are many references to Mary in other conciliar documents.² Our chief concern, however, is to concentrate upon the text of the marian *schema* in the broader context of the real life situations that historically influenced its composition as a part of the *schema* on the Church.³

¹ The translation of the text of chapter 8 of LG used in this paper is that which appears in this volume of *Marian Studies* and was done by F. M. Jelly, O.P. (Arts. 52-54), James T. O'Connor (Arts. 55-59), and Charles W. Neumann, S.M. (Arts. 60-69).

² Instances of references to Mary in other documents of Vatican II are: *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (no. 103); *Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches* (no. 30); *Decree on Ecumenism* (nos. 15 and 20); *Decree on the Training of Priests* (no. 8); *Decree on the Up-To-Date Renewal of the Religious Life* (no. 25); *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* (no. 18); *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions* (no. 3); and, *Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People* (no. 4).

³ The principal source for this paper is the series of volumes that contain the *Acts of Vatican II* and are available only in Latin: *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II* (*Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis*). Specific references to this voluminous work will be *Acta* along with the precise volume, page(s), and year of publication. Other sources that have been useful are: Michael O'Carroll, C.S.Sp., *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, Inc., Revised Edition

The first part of this paper, therefore, outlines a number of facts about the decade preceding the opening of Vatican II, October 11, 1962, which seem to have had at least some remote influence upon the final text. Then we shall carefully consider the important aspects of the debate that led to the momentous decision on October 29, 1963, to make Vatican II's teaching about Mary a part of the *schema* on the Church. The following section will examine the key events surrounding the process that resulted in voting upon the emended text on the very same day of the next year, October 29, 1964. The presentation concludes with a commentary upon the introduction or preface that was issued as a part of the final text. On the whole, this paper is meant to provide a general introduction to my three colleagues in MSA, Frs. O'Connor, Neumann, and Kirwin, who comment upon the remainder of chapter 8 of LG.

Influential Factors Before the Opening of Vatican II

During the 1950's the Marian Movement associated with the pontificate of Pope Pius XII reached its peak. He had solemnly defined the dogma of Mary's glorious Assumption body and soul into heaven in 1950. 1954 was the Marian Year, the centenary of Pope Pius IX's solemn definition of the dogma of her Immaculate Conception. In his Encyclical Letter, *Fulgens Corona*, dated September 8, 1953, Pius XII had not only given directives concerning the proper way to celebrate the Marian Year, but had also reflected upon the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and its relationship to the Assumption.⁴ During these

with Supplement, 1983) to which the author of this paper is particularly indebted for its help in connecting many of the details contained in the *Acta*; P. Salvatore M. Meo, O.S.M., *Maria Nel Capito VIII della "Lumen Gentium"—Elementi per Un'Analisi Dottrinale*, Pontificia Facoltà Teologica "Marianum," Pro manuscripto Restampa (Roma: Typografica "Leberit," 1974-1975); and, Otto Semmelroth, "Chapter VIII—The Role of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, ed. by Herbert Vorgrimler, Volume I (New York: Herder & Herder, 1967), pp. 285-296.

⁴ O'Carroll, *Theotokos* ("Fulgens Corona"), p. 151.

years marian associations of various kinds were founded and attracted the attention of many bishops. Among such organizations was our own Mariological Society of America, actually founded in 1949. Also a number of theological and devotional congresses on Mary were being conducted on the international level, and for a time marian writings were about a thousand publications each year. It is noteworthy that very many of the future Fathers at Vatican II had been involved in this great Marian Movement. About one-third of them were members of religious orders or congregations, most of which had strong marian traditions.

In narrating the story of Mary and the Council, we must keep in mind this historical background. The ante-preparatory commission of Vatican II circulated among bishops and faculties of Catholic universities an inquiry regarding the content of the conciliar agenda. Cardinal Tardini was the president of this commission. When the replies to this inquiry were analyzed, there were 570 of the future Fathers at the Council who wished to see marian topics included on the agenda, and three of the university faculties in Rome—namely, the Antonianum, St. Bonaventura, and the Marianum—submitted a similar request. 382 of the Fathers asked for a statement about Mary's meditation, and 266 wanted a dogmatic definition of the doctrine. These requests came before the preparatory theological commission which Pope John XXIII had set up on Pentecost Sunday, 1960. Although this commission planned to include the Council's teaching about Mary in one of the four *schemata*, i.e., the one on the *depositum fidei* (deposit of faith), at a meeting during October, 1960, its members decided to include it in the *schema* on the Church. We should take note of the fact that this decision by no means settled the matter. The final decision was not to come till three years later on October 29, 1963.

The task of composing the initial text of the marian *schema* was entrusted mainly to Fr. Charles Balic, O.F.M., and by July of 1961, he and his associates at the Pontifical Marian Academy had a third draft ready for discussion. The title of the *schema* at this early stage of development was: "Mary, Mother of Jesus and Mother of the Church." The members of the theological commission received the draft text and some of them submitted

comments upon it. This led to a fourth and somewhat emended text with a new title: "Mary, Mother of the Mystical Body." And then a fifth text emerged with a lengthier title: "Mary, Mother of the Head and Mother of the Members of the Mystical Body." It was examined and discussed in two sessions held at the Antonianum, September 21-22, 1961. Among those meeting there were: Archbishop Dubois, who had written a substantial work on Mariology, Bishop Griffiths, Monsignors Philips, Colombo, Fenton, and Lattanzi, and Fathers Laurentin, Gagnebet, Congar, Tromp, Garcia Garces, Bertetto, Philip of the Holy Trinity, and Salaverri. Most of these men had published important mariological treatises. On November 23, 1961, another meeting was held at the *Domus Mariae* in Rome. Because of uncertainty about the status of the marian *schema*—whether or not it was to be an independent document or a part of the Council's teaching on the Church—and also on account of conflicting opinions among the experts, the composition of the text was becoming more difficult. By January 20, 1962, however, they were able to send a completed text to the theological commission.

When this commission met, the decision was made that the marian *schema* would be an independent document. Some clarification was being sought about Mary's mediation and so it had to be lengthened. This called for much consultation between the sub-commission and the other members of the theological commission. The result was the addition of a long passage on the titles given to Mary which express her special association with Christ in the economy of salvation. Then, at the meeting of the Central Commission with 90 members present, the hastily revised draft was accepted under another title: "Mary Mother of God and Mother of Men." Although 16 of the members expressed reservations regarding the use of "Mediatrice" in this text, no one objected against using "Mother of the Church" as a title for Mary nor to its being proposed as an independent *schema* and not a section of that on the Church.

Opening of Vatican II and Its First Session in Reference to Mary

The Council officially commenced on October 11, 1962, the feast of Mary's Divine Motherhood which was then celebrated

on that date. Pope John XXIII, who lived to open and close the first session of Vatican II, concluded his famous address on the occasion with the following prayer that began with the words: "O Mary Help of Christians, Help of Bishops, of whose love we have recently had particular proof in your temple of Loreto, where we venerated the mystery of the Incarnation, dispose all things for a happy and propitious outcome . . ." Surely the Holy Father's personal participation in the preparations for Vatican II was deeply influenced by his own devotion to Mary, and this inspired his exhortations of others to unite with him in praying for the spiritual success of the Council through her special intercession. He approved the marian *schema* on November 10, 1962, and it was distributed among the conciliar Fathers that November 23rd.

In keeping with the principal purpose of this paper, it would be helpful to draw some comparisons between this initial *schema* and the text that was finally approved about two years later.⁵ From many points of view, it was quite different from what Vatican II decided to give us as the Council's special teaching on Mary in chapter 8 of LG. As already indicated, the title of the marian *schema* which was then intended to be a separate conciliar document was: "Mary Mother of God and Mother of Men." This certainly contrasts with: "The Blessed Virgin Mary, God-Bearer, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church," the finally approved title which clearly communicates its integration into the *schema* on the Church. There were six sections in the initial *schema* on Mary: 1) her close necessary connection (*de arcta necessitudine*) with Christ in accord with God's gracious purpose (*beneplacitum*); 2) her role in the economy of our salvation; 3) the titles that customarily express her intimate association with Christ in the economy of our salvation; 4) her singular privileges as the Mother of God and of men; 5) devotion to her; and, 6) her place as patroness or protectress (*Fautrix*) of Christian unity. Despite the fact that this first *schema* would make some contributions towards the composition of the final text, still one can readily perceive from looking at the above out-

⁵ Cf. *Acta*, Vol. I, Periodus I, Pars IV (1971), pp. 92-97.

line how very different it was in structure, sequence of thought, and emphasis. At this stage of its development, the text seemed to emphasize a Christotypical mariology as well as one that is "privilege-centered," namely, an approach to the mystery of Mary which viewed her as endowed with unique privileges and prerogatives because of her close connection with Christ. What eventuated in the finally approved *schema* was more of an ecclesiotypical and "sharing-oriented" mariology which emphasizes the significance of Mary as Archetype or Exemplar *par excellence* of us redeemed members of the Church and of her singular graces for the sake of our salvation and sanctification. In the proper contexts of this paper, more comments will be made about the apparent conflict between these two different emphases in marian doctrine and devotion as well as about the ways in which the conflict has been resolved in chapter 8 of LG.

This first marian *schema* contained 29 scriptural references in the text itself, and 22 in the footnotes. There was a brief portrayal of Mary in the Gospel from the Annunciation to Pentecost (Acts 1:14), but no orderly summary of Old Testament and New Testament texts as has appeared in LG 55-59 of chapter 8. The footnotes made 22 references to the Fathers of the Church, both Eastern and Western, whereas the text that was finally approved makes much more abundant use of the patristic witness to Mary's place in the mystery of our redemption. Among the *Praenotanda* (what is to be noted beforehand) to the initial *schema*, it is indicated that special appeal was made to the authority of the Magisterium of the Church, particularly of the Popes as the footnotes verify, in order to avoid the controversy concerning the "origin, authority, and meaning" of the "sources of Christian Tradition" that was taking place between Catholic theologians.⁶ Another significant prenote pointed out that the *schema* contained no opinion not proposed by the Supreme Pontiffs.⁷ It singled out three current erroneous opinions that the text corrected: 1) that Mary's *virginitas in partu* (virginity in giving birth or virginal parturition) is really identical with her *virginitas ante*

⁶ *Ibid.*, Praenotanda III, pp. 98-99.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Praenotanda IV, p. 99.

partum (virginal conception or virgin birth as it is often called) with no added significance; 2) that she was entirely unaware at the time of the Annunciation that the Son, whom she was about to conceive, is God; and, 3) that both the error of the "maximalists," who speak as though Mary redeemed us in virtually the same way as Christ, and who claim that she did not die, and that she has not been redeemed, as well as the error of the "minimalists," who write as though the Mother of God were a member of the Church in the same sense as the other children of Adam, were also corrected. The same set of prenotes also calls attention to the sensitivity of the text to the "separated brethren" (*fratres separati*) and their "way of thinking" (*modus cogitandi*). And so, although they are correct in themselves, the *schema* avoided using such expressions as the following ones found in papal teaching because they are so difficult for other Christians, particularly the Protestants, to understand: "Coredemptrix of the human race"; "Reparatrix of the whole world"; etc. Likewise, it emphasizes the importance of showing that Mary's mediation only enhances that of Christ and that devotion to her in no way detracts from the worship due to God or Christ. The arguments in favor of the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption should be so presented as to appear reasonable to the mind of each Christian. And all faithful Christians are invited to unite their prayers to the Patroness of Christian unity to fulfill Christ's mandate that "there be but one flock and one Shepherd." The final prenote warns against the use of too many proofs besides Scripture lest what is meant to be a dogmatic *schema* assume the appearance of a doctoral thesis.⁸

Even though Cardinal Ottaviani made a strong plea to the contrary, the initial marian *schema* was not discussed during the first session of Vatican II. In fact, other than brief references to Mary by Cardinals Montini (the future Pope Paul VI) and Suenens, both of whom called her "Mother of the Church," as well as some inspiring phrases from Pope John XXIII in his address concluding the session, the Council was silent about her. But from the date of its first distribution, November 23, 1962, and

⁸ *Ibid.*, Praenotanda V, p. 100.

its reissue the month of May 1963 under a new title, "The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church," more than 130 Fathers and 150 who were signers of group statements sent comments to Rome about the contents of the first marian *schema*. Fr. Balic made a digest of these replies and circulated it among the conciliar Fathers. The initial conciliar *schema* on Our Lady was over 1700 words, roughly half the length of the text that would be finally approved as chapter 8 of LG. It did turn out that 300 of these words would pass over directly into the final document, and more than 70 words indirectly.

The Discussion Leading to the Decision of October 29, 1963

During September 1963 and the early part of October, seven of the Council Fathers requested that the marian *schema* be integrated into that on the Church. They were Cardinal Frings, Bishops Ferrero di Cavallerleone, Gargitter, Elchinger, and Mendez Arceo, Cardinal Silva Hendriquez in the name of the Chilean Bishops, and Bishop (later Cardinal) Garrone in the name of the French Bishops. Opposed to this proposal was Cardinal Arriba y Castro. Consequent upon some discussion between the conciliar commission and the Moderators, it was announced on October 23, 1963, that there would be arguments presented the following day both for and against the proposal to make the *schema* on Our Blessed Mother a part of that on the Church. Then the Council fathers would be asked to make a final decision by voting on the matter the 29th of October.

For the purposes of this paper, it seems most practical to consider the reasons pro and con through a detailed report of the speeches delivered during the debate by the principal proponents of each side of the question: Cardinal Santos, favoring the position that the marian *schema* remain an independent document, and Cardinal König, who wished to see it become a part of the *schema* on the Church. Cardinal Santos began his address on the Council floor by carefully calling attention to the fact that there was no real disagreement among the conciliar Fathers about Mary's role in the Church, about her very special involvement in its beginning and its continuous nourishment, as well

as about the honor that is due to Mary, the most blessed mother of Christ the Redeemer, from all of her children in the Church.⁹ No one at Vatican II was lacking in devotion to Our Lady. The question under discussion, he continued, concerned solely "the place and the manner of more suitably treating the doctrine about Mary" (*de loco et modo quo aptius tractari debeat doctrina de ipsa Beata Virgine*). She is the Mother of God and of the Church, and the Council acknowledges her to be the "Daughter of the Father," the "Mother of the Son," the "Spouse of the Holy Spirit," the "salvation of the People of God," the "Queen and Teacher of Apostles," the "exemplar of perfection," and, the "help of Christians called to holiness."

Because of her great dignity and unique role in the Church, he was of the opinion that the Council should award her a separate *schema* so that her singular preeminence and dignity might be more apparent. At the same time, Cardinal Santos did believe that this ought to be done in very close connection with the *schema* on the Church. He did not think that the marian *schema* could possibly be inserted into that on the Church without seeming to lessen Mary's dignity or giving the occasion of misinforming those who are not well instructed about her. At the time of his speech on the Council floor, the *schema* on the Church had five chapters: The Mystery of the Church, The People of God, The Hierarchical Constitution, The Laity, and, The Call of All to Holiness. Although the Blessed Virgin Mary belongs to the People of God and is truly a member of the Church, still she is a "preeminent and entirely singular member" (*supereminens . . . et prorsus singulare . . . membrum*) who received fully the fruits of the mystery of the Church before all other members by a preservative redemption (*praeventiva redemptione*). Of course, the Cardinal was here referring to the unique privilege of Mary's Immaculate Conception.

There were many other marian prerogatives identified by Cardinal Santos to argue his case that the Council's teaching on Mary could not gracefully fit into the *schema* on the Church, especially as it stood at the time. Our Blessed Virgin was the will-

⁹ Cf. *Acta*, Vol. II, Periodus II, Pars III (1972), pp. 338-342.

ing instrument and so a cause of the Mystical Body, which is the Church, and hence the Mother of God's People. Before all ages she had been predestined to be preserved from sin by reason of the foreseen merits of Christ in order to become a worthy Mother of God. Having been prefigured in many ways in the Old Testament, she was made the Mother of Christ, our Head, by giving her consent to that mystery. During his hidden life she truly was at his side, and had a role in his introduction to the public ministry by requesting that he work his first sign at Cana in the presence of his disciples. For our sake she suffered with him as he was dying on the cross and merited redemption with him. And, finally, Mary was in the midst of the Apostles praying for the promised Holy Spirit to come for the completion of the Church.

Cardinal Santos continued his speech in favor of retaining the marian *schema* as a distinct document by arguing that there was no fitting place in the *schema* on the Church (*De Ecclesia*) where these various functions of Mary might be suitably treated. She does not fit into the distinction between the hierarchy and the laity. Such classifications do not do justice to her unique place in the Church. Her own call to holiness is unique, having been filled with grace from the very first instant of her existence. She is the exemplar of all who are called to sanctity, and, with her Son, enjoys a singular role in the acquisition of the graces of our redemption as well as in their application to all who are to be sanctified.

Although Mary is found in the one body of the Church gathered together with all the elect, it is in order that she might be the first and preeminent member of the Church and so in a certain sense "above the Church" (*quodammodo est supra ecclesiam*). St. Bernard asserted that Mary "stands between Christ and the Church." Even though a member of the Church, she is vastly different from the other members. The passive redemption of Mary which was "preservative" is different from the "liberative" redemption of the rest of us in a manner that is more than merely one of degree. Since she is the Mother of the Head, Mary is related to the Mystical Body, not like any other member, but as one who cooperated in bringing about the very existence

of that Body. Mary's soteriological function, flowing from her intimate association with the Redeemer and his grace, is in the order of objective redemption and so differs essentially (not merely by degree) from the role that others have in the work of salvation. This could hardly receive adequate treatment in *De Ecclesia* as it had then been distributed to the Council Fathers. Vatican II, in the Cardinal's opinion, ought to treat the whole of marian doctrine which the Church teaches and the faithful believe. And this would be for the good not only of the faithful but also for the "separated brethren" who should know clearly just what the Catholic Church believes and teaches about Mary.

Cardinal Santos was not of the opinion that the very close connection between the Church and Mary was a sufficient reason to insert the marian *schema* in that on the Church. Even though this relationship is truly of the greatest degree, still it does not seem fitting for a mariological treatise, albeit incomplete and synthetic, to be reduced to the *schema De Ecclesia*. After all, this is principally about the Pilgrim Church upon earth, its nature and mission, its members and hierarchical constitution, and its relationships with the "separated brethren." It was not apparent to the Cardinal how all the teachings about Mary, which he considered that the Council should include, could in any logical fashion fit into the chapters on the Church.

In addition, he did not think that mariology ought to be reduced to ecclesiology, when it also has such close connections with Christology and soteriology. If Mary is recognized in her true light, the mystery of the Incarnation, whereby Christ is acknowledged to be the Son of God and the brother of humankind, shines forth more clearly. The affirmation of the true doctrine about Mary has contributed not a little towards the safeguarding of the Catholic teaching about Christ, which was denied by the Nestorians and the Monophysites in the ancient Church, and their heresies have not been completely overcome even in our own time. The dignity of the Mother of God, therefore, as well as her role in the divine plan of salvation, merit a distinct document and not merely an insertion into an already sufficiently full *schema* on the Church nor simply an appendix to it, as though it were a matter of secondary importance. He

feared that it would lead to some perplexity among the faithful since the commission had already approved a separate document for the Council's marian teaching, and so it might seem to them that Our Lady is being less honored. It was also his belief that a distinct document would help avoid getting Vatican II involved in the controversy among Catholic theologians regarding the preference for a Christotypical or ecclesiotypical mariology. The latter would seem to be favored by placing the marian *schema* in that on the Church.

And so Cardinal Santos proposed that there be a separate *schema* on Mary to be considered by the conciliar Fathers immediately after the discussion on the Church with which it is so closely connected. He also recommended the composition of a new introduction to the marian *schema*, so that this connection be made more apparent. Finally, he indicated a very practical reason for not integrating the two *schemata*, namely, that *De Ecclesia* was already complicated enough and to add the Council's marian teaching to it would only require the reworking of material and consume much more precious time. He further requested that the Moderators give the conciliar Fathers sufficient time to weigh the arguments on both sides of the question before submitting it to their vote.

I have gone into some detail on the address by Cardinal Santos, and shall do the same with that of Cardinal König because both represented the main reasons *pro* and *con* on the issue. And, although many of us have come to appreciate the providential wisdom of the decision to make the marian teaching of the Council chapter 8 of LG, it is still important for us to assess the opposing point of view, especially after more than twenty years have elapsed since that decision was made. The reasons advanced by Cardinal Santos in favor of a separate marian *schema* were weighty, on the whole, and did have their salutary influence upon the excellence of chapter 8 of LG. And, as our historical perspective manifests to us, his fears about the probable misunderstanding of the decision not to have a distinct document on Mary, were far from being groundless. We shall discuss this point further after hearing the arguments that carried the day by an extremely close vote.

Cardinal König began his address by clearly asserting that in no way was he about to contradict the statements made by Cardinal Santos, either doctrinally or devotionally.¹⁰ After all, he pointed out, no one who is at all familiar with the Marian and Mariological Movement of the past century, could fail to recognize the abundant supernatural fruits that it has produced under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, despite some deviations. He also reminded the conciliar Fathers that there had been petitions from 600 of them for an explanation of marian doctrine at Vatican II, and that these had been recommended for both theological and pastoral reasons.

Although he thought that such petitions could be satisfied both as a separate *schema* or as an integral part of that on the Church, if one looks at the question "intrinsically and generically" (*per se et in genere*), still there was a very significant fact to be taken into consideration. That fact was the meeting of the theological commission on October 9, 1963, when the majority of them expressed their wish that the Council's teaching about Mary be integrated into the *schema* on the Church. The purpose of his address was to give the reasons behind this majority opinion. These reasons were theological, historical, pastoral, and ecumenical, and all would conspire to prove that the dignity and importance of Mary would be more suitably conveyed by placing the Council's teaching about her within the setting of its teaching on the Church.

First among the theological reasons was the fact that the Church is the central theme of the second session of the Council as well as of Vatican II as a whole. It was therefore fitting that Mary, because of her intimate relationship with the Church, be a part of that central theme. Cardinal König even perceived in the argumentation of those who favored a separate document an implicit agreement with this reason. As Cardinal Santos clearly proposed, they wanted the separate *schema* on Mary to follow immediately that on the Church and to be given a new introduction so that its close connection with *De Ecclesia* could be clearly indicated. In this separation of the Council's teaching,

¹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 342-345.

however, he saw a comparison with the way mariology had so often been divided from the rest of theology in the past. And this isolation has led to some unfounded and false theological excesses. Including the Council's marian doctrine in its ecclesiology should help to avoid the difficulties caused by such extreme positions in mariology.

Secondly, a separate marian *schema* would create the erroneous impression that Vatican II intended to define a new marian dogma. But, he argued, it had been repeatedly denied that this was the mind of the Council.

His third theological reason was a direct response to the argument of Cardinal Santos that it would be incongruous to treat of Mary in the context of the Pilgrim Church. Because the Church is more than an *institution* of salvation (*institutum salutis*) but is also the People of God and the Communion of Saints, the Blessed Virgin ought to be placed within the *schema* on the Church as the preeminent member of the People of God. The ecclesiology of the Church upon earth is incomplete without the eschatological teaching about its relationship with the heavenly Church: ". . . and vice versa the life and soteriological function of the Virgin upon earth cannot be passed over in silence."¹¹ Both an integral ecclesiology and an integral mariology are interdependent and mutually complete each other. And such a reintegration is beneficial to mariology because it shows its true significance in perspective, i.e., the importance of marian doctrine is perceived more clearly in relation to Christ, the sole Mediator, and the Church.

Fourthly, the place and the role of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the economy of salvation is based upon the fact that she is related to the unique Mediator Jesus Christ as the Mother of God who conceived him not only *corpore* but also *corde*, i.e., not only bodily but also in her heart through loving faith and obedience to the word of God. In this way she is the type of the Church which, as the fruit of redemption, is also the means of redemption. And all of God's People have an appropriate part

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 344: ". . . atque vice versa vita et functio soteriologica *terrestris* Virginis silentio praeteriri nequit."

in this mediation of salvation in the Church. And so, as the first fruits of redemption, Mary, the preeminent member of the Church as well as her Archetype, is also a way of salvation by sharing with others the redeeming love that she fully received from Christ. Consequently, the doctrines on the Church and on Mary would be better explained within the same conciliar *schema*.

Finally, the fifth theological reason proposed by Cardinal König responded to the difficulty of Cardinal Santos that, if the Council Fathers decided to put Vatican II's marian doctrine in the same document as its teaching on the Church, they would seem to be favoring an ecclesiotypical mariology over one that is Christotypical. Countering this objection, Cardinal König argued that the proper balanced understanding of the mystery of the Church as both the recipient of the fruits of redemption and a sign as well as instrument of mediating that redemption to the world, would preclude the misinterpretation that the Council was choosing one theological school over another. The so-called ecclesiotypical emphasis would not overshadow the Christotypical since Mary would be portrayed in a single *schema* with the Church as the most sublime cooperatrix with Christ through his grace of both the accomplishment and the application of the fruits of redemption, which indeed enhances the dignity of the Mother of God.

In addition to his five theological reasons, Cardinal König also gave three historical reasons why the Council's marian teaching ought to be integrated into the *schema* on the Church. First, devotion to Mary, as expressed in the litanies of Our Lady, has arisen out of a contemplation of the Church as mother. All the titles attributed to the Blessed Mother in these litanies were originally predicated of the Church. Mary's privileges were portrayed within an ecclesiological perspective. Chapter 12 of the book of Revelation or Apocalypse, for instance, which treats of the virgin Church, gradually came to be interpreted as also symbolically referring to Mary through the medium of the Church. In the Church's Tradition, marian privileges have become clear only in the setting of ecclesial characteristics. From this it follows that, even though her privileges are truly personal, they all bear

an ecclesiological meaning, i.e., they are *in* and *for* the Church. In this way Mary is the type of the Church which is better explained within the one document on Mary and the Church.

Secondly, Pope Paul VI, in the homily that he preached on October 11, 1963, insinuated this close relationship between the Church and the Mother of God. The Holy Father prayed that Mary would bring it about that the Church would come to recognize the Blessed Virgin as ". . . her own mother and daughter and most elite sister, her incomparable model, her glory, her joy, and her hope."¹²

Cardinal König's third historical argument recalled that the international Mariological-Marian Congress held at Lourdes in 1958 had for its theme, "Mary and the Church." This was a manifestation of the fact that the intimate relationship between Mary and the Church was in accord with the spirit of the time and the devotion of the faithful. His pastoral reason for the single document on Mary and the Church followed immediately upon this third historical reason. The devotional life of the faith must be nourished on essentials, and so Catholics should be instructed in the right faith about the mystery of the Incarnation and Mary's role in it. As Cardinal Silva, speaking in the name of 44 bishops, had pointed out, marian devotion in some places has too often been severed in its expression from the mystery of Christ and his Church. The integration of both mariology and ecclesiology in the single document would enrich both doctrines.

The ecumenical reason with which Cardinal König concluded his presentation argued that such an approach would help make Mary as the venerable Theotokos more recognizable to the Eastern Church, and also assist non-catholic Christians in acknowledging the basis of marian devotion in the testimony of Sacred Scripture and of ancient Tradition. Besides, the theme "Mary—the People of Israel—the Church" is being diligently developed in our time not only by Catholic theologians but also by non-Catholics, particularly in light of Sacred Scripture. Not a few Protestants today believe that Mary is foreshadowed as figure of

¹² *Ibid.*: ". . . sua madre e figlia e sorella eletissima ed incomparabile modello, sua gloria, sua gioia e sua speranza."

the Church in John 19:25 and Apocalypse 12. And so, he concluded, for very persuasive theological, historical, pastoral, and ecumenical reasons, the marian teaching of Vatican II should be a suitable chapter in the *schema De Ecclesia*.

Let us now listen to a summary of the arguments advanced by both sides of the question. Cardinal Santos represented those favoring an independent marian *schema* because of Mary's preeminence over all under Christ, her instrumental role in bringing the Church into being, the need for a complete doctrine of faith about her for the good of the Catholic faithful and out of charity for the separated brethren, the fact that mariology also has close bonds with Christology and soteriology as well as with ecclesiology, the teaching of the *schema* on the Church has to do with the Pilgrim Church on earth, the problem of time in revising the *De Ecclesia* to make room for the marian teaching, the difficulty of the Council's appearing to favor an ecclesiotypical mariology over a Christotypical, and the danger of misleading the faithful by seeming to refuse Mary the dignity of a distinct document. On the other hand, Cardinal König thought that a separate document would create the false impression that Vatican II intended to define a new marian dogma, that integrating the Council's marian teaching into that on the Church would not mean that Vatican II was endorsing an ecclesiotypical mariology exclusively, but would place Mary in the context of the central theme of the Council, that it was a distinct advantage for both mariology and ecclesiology to treat of Mary as a preeminent member of the Church and her Archetype, that the integration of both doctrines in the one document would help overcome the theological and devotional excesses and deviations which resulted from unduly isolating Mary from the mystery of Christ and the Church, and, that, in accord with the spirit of the times, it would have the ecumenical value of making Mary more recognizable to other Christians.

The long week-end between the speeches and the actual voting on October 29, 1963, was filled with much tension and feverish activity. Some of the Observers and most of the other Christian churches in the West were in favor of an integrated *schema* on Mary and the Church. On the day of the actual vot-

ing, Cardinal Agagianian, the Moderator, assured the conciliar Fathers that the issue before them was certainly not marian doctrine and devotion as such, and, that the writing of a new text, if necessary, would take place under the direction of the doctrinal commission. The rest is history with which we are all generally familiar, but the precise details may not be well known to us.

The result of the voting was 2193 votes cast: in favor of integrating the marian *schema* into that on the Church, 1114; in favor of a separate *schema* on Mary, 1074; spoiled votes, 5. This means that the difference was less than 2%, and that the required majority was reached with but 17 votes to spare! It was by far the narrowest majority in the history of Vatican II. In almost every instance, the majority of votes favoring a decision was well over 90%. One truly wonders how the hand of the Holy Spirit may have been working in this very close vote. Was it perhaps a warning that in this and in similar matters there had to be very careful implementation of the real meaning and intent of the Council's decision and teaching? I do firmly believe so. The news media exploited the confrontative situation and seems to have played no small part in the apparent misinterpretation by many Catholics that Vatican II was somehow reducing Mary's role in the Church. But life is a risk, especially our life of faith in which we grope together in mystery. This is no reason, however, to tolerate the false impressions that were created after this extremely close decision to integrate the *schema* into that on the Church. More than twenty years later, we are still trying to dispel them and put it all into true and proper perspective!

In order to provide the new text that would become chapter 8 of LG, a committee composed of four members was appointed. Appropriately enough, it included both Cardinals Santos and König along with Bishops Doumith (Maronite) and Theas of Lourdes. And also it was fitting that both Fr. Balic and Msgr. Philips were the *periti* or experts appointed to assist this committee since they represented the different trends in mariology among Catholic scholars. Now let us examine some of the important events that surrounded the difficult task of coming up with the new text that would lead eventually to the draft finally approved to be chapter 8 of LG. Again, we are obviously con-

cerned primarily with the theological significance of these events, especially for marian doctrine and devotion today.

Highlights of the Process Prior to the Final Vote of October 29, 1964

The burden of the work fell upon the shoulders of the *periti*. Their mandate was to come up with a text that would "satisfy all or nearly all." Considering so close a vote on the Council floor, this was to be no easy task! They had to take into account the texts already on hand, one submitted by the Chilean hierarchy, another from Dom Butler sponsored by the English Bishops, as well as the first schema and drafts that had been submitted by Fr. Laurentin and others. On November 25, 1963, theologians representing the different mariological trends met in Rome with Fr. Balic and Msgr. Philips in order to seek a common ground. In attendance at this meeting were Frs. Ciappi, Master of the Sacred Palace, Belanger, DiFonzo, Garcia Garces, Grillmeier, Laurentin, Llamera, Moeller, Larrain and Schmaus. The composition of this group manifested the biblical, pastoral, and ecumenical thrusts of Vatican II's thinking. They were able to agree upon the *possibility* of a future text. Then, at the closing ceremony of the Council's second session, Pope Paul VI used a phrase that would find its way into the final text of chapter 8 of LG (no. 54): "a place (Mary's) highest after Christ and nearest to us."¹³

The two *periti*, Fr. Balic and Msgr. Philips, aided by friends, exchanged draft texts and considered mutual objections until Fr. Balic accepted the fifth draft as an agreed statement to be submitted to the Doctrinal Commission. It received general approval on March 14, 1964, and was examined in detail at a landmark meeting on the 6th of June. For some reason there had been a policy of silence about Mary in the other conciliar documents such as the *schemata* on the Missions, the Lay Apostolate, the Priesthood, on Priestly Training and the Religious Life. Even where there had been mention of Mary in these *schemata* before, they were omitted. Of course, these omissions would later

¹³ Paul VI, *Address to the Council* (Dec. 4, 1963) in AAS 56 (1964): 37.

be reinserted in a proper form. It seems that the drafters of other documents at the Council were waiting to see what would be decided about the marian chapter in the *schema* on the Church.

A new title appeared over the latest text: "The Blessed Virgin Mary, God-Bearer, in the Mystery of Christ and of the Church" (*De Beata Maria Virgine Deipara in Mystério Christi et Ecclesiae*). This title, as you know, remained. But during the year or so prior to the June 6th meeting, many other titles had been proposed, even before the vote of October 29, 1963, to make the marian *schema* a chapter of that on the Church. Among these were: "The Blessed Virgin Mary . . . 1) Figure and Mother of the Church"; 2) Mother of God and of Mankind"; 3) Mother of God and of Christ's Faithful"; 4) Mother of the Faithful"; and 5) Mother of God and of the Church."¹⁴ When the Bishops of Western France proposed that the title be merely, "The Blessed Virgin Mary," "one Father rightly asked 'laconically': what about the title?" (*Iure igitur unus Pater laconice rogat: "quid de titulo"?*)¹⁵

On September 16, 1964, now in the third session of Vatican II, the Council Fathers began their debate on the new marian text. Archbishop (now Cardinal) Roy introduced the debate by reminding the conciliar Fathers about the reason behind the integration of the marian *schema* into *De Ecclesia*, namely, that the Constitution on the Church is the principal theme of Vatican II, "and at the same time the Blessed Virgin is intrinsically connected with the mystery of the Church" (. . . *et simul quod B. Virgo intrinsecus cum mysterio Ecclesiae connectitur*).¹⁶ On the other hand, he continued, in order to explain this connection with the Church it is necessary to consider the role of the God-Bearer in the mystery of the Word Incarnate which is an aspect of mariology that goes beyond ecclesiology. And so it was more suitable, in his opinion, that the Council's teaching on Mary be inserted at the end of the *De Ecclesia* to indicate this truth, which was also expressed in the new title: "The Blessed

¹⁴ Cf. *Acta*, Vol. II, Periodus II, Pars III (1972), p. 312.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

¹⁶ *Acta*, Vol. III, Periodus III, Pars I (1973), p. 435.

Virgin Mary, God-Bearer, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church."

In this context, Archbishop Roy observed that in no way was the Council seeking to settle the controversy over the so-called Christotypical and ecclesiotypical tendencies concerning the image of Mary. After all, absolutely speaking, the type of every perfection is Christ to whom Mary is conformed in a singular way, and so, according to an ancient tradition, she may be called "Type of the Church" (*Typus Ecclesiae*). The Christotypical and ecclesiotypical interpretations, therefore, are in no wise mutually exclusive, but rather complementary. And so Vatican II was not interfering with a theological debate, but providing the fundamentals of Catholic teaching about Mary, on which all the conciliar Fathers agreed, so that both pastoral preaching of her may be solidly supported and the devotion of Christians might be zealously nurtured. This twofold purpose is more effectively pursued by a deeper penetration of the highest mystery of our faith rather than by merely a superficial multiplication of many titles. The Preface of chapter 8 of LG expresses the intention of the Council very clearly when it states, using the words of the Holy Father, Paul VI, that "she holds a place in holy Church that is the highest after Christ and the closest to us" (LG, no. 54).

Archbishop Roy went on to explain the chapter in three sections. The first treats of the role of the Blessed Virgin in the economy of salvation according to Sacred Scripture and Tradition. The sacred page, however, is read, as indeed it ought to be among Catholics, in light of the fullness of revelation and of the explanation of the Fathers and the Magisterium of the Church. After the preparation of the Old Testament, he pointed out that the Annunciation holds a special place in the text of the marian chapter. Without a doubt, in his estimation, this mystery is the principal foundation of all mariology, as is held by all, even the Orientals who venerate the "Theotokos" (God-Bearer) with the greatest of devotion. At the Annunciation, Mary, inspired by a loving faith, freely accepted the role of divine motherhood which has benefitted all of humanity. In this section, the Blessed Virgin also appears as the "New Eve," "cause of salvation," and "mother of the living," as the early Fathers called her. And,

in the course of teaching about Mary's role in the economy of salvation, the two dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are inserted. They were solemnly defined by Roman Pontiffs. The salutary significance of both privileges is shown for the sake of all Christians. Her Immaculate Conception reveals the meaning of an unimpeded response to God's will when one is free from all sin. Likewise, her glorious Assumption body and soul into heaven is a sure sign of hope for all Christians who believe that they are called to share in the glory of our risen Lord. In this section, deeply rooted in Sacred Scripture and the ancient Tradition, merely human arguments and useless difficulties are avoided. It should be understandable to all.

Then Archbishop Roy briefly addresses the second section of the new text for Vatican II's marian teaching, which treats explicitly of the relationship between Mary and the Church. This embraces her cooperation in the salvation of all by her free consent at the Annunciation, the incarnation of the Redeemer, by her share in the offering of the sacrifice of the cross, and by her continuous intercession in heaven. He indicated that the title "Mediatrice" does appear in this context, which many members of the Commission opposed using. It is explained, however, in a way that in no wise detracts from the excellence of the unique Mediator. Next comes the explanation of the sense in which Mary, Virgin and Mother, is rightly acknowledged as "Type of the Church," who herself works for the salvation of all in a virginal and maternal manner. This fits very nicely into the Council's main concern of proposing the mystery of the Church in its various dimensions as the way to salvation and genuine joy to the contemporary world. Hence, the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of us all, is rightly perceived as the exemplar of every virtue, and she is not only to be admired but also to be imitated.

The third section directly deals with the practical application of doctrine to devotion and to preaching. In this way, Archbishop Roy asserted, the Council manifests its own priority with the pastoral implications of its teaching. Regarding marian devotion, both a pusillanimous hesitancy and a false exaggeration must be avoided. Rather it is to be zealously supported, purified

where necessary, and always and everywhere deepened. Here he voiced his hopes for great cooperation. The text concludes with a description of Mary as the "sign of sure hope" and comfort for the People of God who are still on pilgrimage amidst severe hardships. Archbishop Roy draws his own comments to a close with the hope that all Christians, including non-Catholics, will reach that longed-for peace in Christ through the help of the Blessed Virgin. He hopes that a unity of mind and heart concerning the best way to sing the praises of Mary will soon be attained among all the conciliar Fathers and theologians so that the entire Catholic people and all Christians will be blessed by a single intention of faith and devotion. He offered Mary as the example of humble, generous and total acceptance of the mystery of Christ, who came down upon us in the Church through the Virgin. Finally, he exhorted: "Agreeing in doctrine and steadfast in charity, with one voice let us call her blessed with all generations, because He who is mighty has done great things for her."¹⁷

The debate over the proposed marian text, that had been introduced by Archbishop Roy's speech on September 16, 1964, lasted for a number of days. "The swaying opinion from one day to the next in the debate had an element of subdued drama."¹⁸ Two points kept coming up, namely, Mary's mediation and her motherhood of the Church. Some thought that the Council should be silent about both, while others maintained that they ought to be kept in the text. Some additional topics of discussion were: the chapter should be revised for greater accuracy; biblical scholars ought to be engaged to assist in composing the text; Mary must not be relegated to history, but her salutary influence upon souls should be treated; a more complete account of her special relationship with the Holy Spirit should be given; there ought to be a reference to St. Joseph; the scriptural section should consider the marian significance of Revelation (Apocalypse) 12; Mary's role in the life of priests deserves special treatment; the Council ought to make a formal act of consecration to

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 438.

¹⁸ O'Carroll, *Theotokos* ("Vatican II. The Second Vatican Council"), p. 355.

Mary, Mother of the Church; the chapter of Vatican II's marian doctrine should follow immediately upon the first chapter of *De Ecclesia*, "The Mystery of the Church," and be chapter 2 instead of 8.

Twenty-two of the conciliar Fathers requested that chapter 8 of LG be inserted as chapter 2 in the Constitution on the Church. Among them was Bishop Wojtyla (now Pope John Paul II) who made an interesting intervention in the matter during the days of debate on September 18, 1964. In his opinion, making the Council's teaching on Mary the last chapter in the *schema* on the Church seems to be giving the impression that it is more a corollary than a composite part of the total doctrine of the document. Since the salvific will of God has bestowed upon her the most intimate participation in the redemptive work of Christ, it appeared to him more fitting to integrate marian doctrine into that on the Church after the first and before the second chapter. And, if it is not completely developed there, at least mention of Mary must be made there. Bishop Wojtyla thought that the saving function of the Church had not been adequately expressed in the *schema* on the Church. Its ecclesiology did not seem to be sufficiently soteriological. The salvation of the world is always the purpose of the Church, and the Blessed Virgin's role is the closest to that of the Church in this service to the world. He concluded his intervention with the assertion: "The chapter on the Virgin Mary should be integrated into the *schema* in such a way that it not only best suits the dignity of the God-Bearer, but also shows us the Church herself in her more soteriological aspect."¹⁹ This is a point that we might wish to pursue further during our discussion period following my presentation. Although, as we well know, the proposal was not adopted, the principal reason for it is worthy of our careful consideration and probably had a salutary influence upon the doctrine of LG as a whole. Even in its final position as chapter 8 of LG, Vatican II's teaching on Mary seems to emphasize the soteriological aspect of the Council's ecclesiology. Following upon chapter 7 of LG, "The Eschatological Character of the Pilgrim

¹⁹ *Acta*, Vol. III, Periodus III, Pars II (1974), p. 179.

Church and Her Union with the Heavenly Church," chapter 8 can clearly convey not only Mary's unique role in Christ's redemptive work, but also her heavenly role in dispensing the fruits of redemption as a facet of her typology of the Church's saving mission upon earth.

The debate on the differing opinions continued beyond the days fixed, which, with the requisite number of signatures, allowed three participants to address the assembly. One of these speakers was Cardinal Frings, who, at the request of Fr. Balic, appealed to both sides to sacrifice some of their ideas, as good as they might be, for the sake of a consensus on the best possible text. In his intervention, he exhorted all to unite "that this decree may be achieved to the glory of God and of him whom he sent and in honour of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God whom we all—Fathers, Observers, Auditors—love most tenderly."²⁰

After the required revisions were made, the text with its modifications was again brought to the assembly. In his speech on the occasion, Archbishop Roy called the attention of the conciliar Fathers to the principal changes. He began by offering thanks to God for the basic agreement that they were able to reach on the doctrine of the marian *schema*. He pointed out that the corrections proposed by many of the Fathers were particularly concerned with the "presentation and manner of speaking" (. . . *de praesentatione et modo dicendi* . . .) as well as with "the most accurate fidelity to be preserved in citing texts of Sacred Scripture and the documents of Tradition" (. . . *de accuratissima fidelitate servanda in citandis textibus Sacrae Scripturae et documentis Traditionis* . . .).²¹ The Commission, Archbishop Roy continued, had sedulously safeguarded the intention behind all the emendations proposed by the Fathers, and were most grateful to everyone who contributed in any way towards the composition of a better text.

First among the main emendations incorporated into the text concerned what would become article or number 53 in the finally approved *schema*. The words "as most loving mother" (*tan-*

²⁰ O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, p. 355.

²¹ *Acta*, Vol. III, Periodus III, Pars VI (1975), pp. 35-36.

quam matrem amantissimam) were added at the end of the paragraph so that the text read: "Instructed by the Holy Spirit, the Catholic Church with the affection of filial piety honors her as most loving mother" (LG, no. 63). The theological significance of this change was to introduce into the text an equivalent statement about Mary's motherly role in relation to the Church, i.e., all her pastors and faithful (*Ita aequivalenter exprimitur munus maternum Mariae erga Ecclesiam, id est erga omnes eius Pastores atque fideles*).²² The other four emendations identified in the revised text by Archbishop Roy all pertain to sections of chapter 8 of LG which my colleagues will comment upon in detail when treating them in their papers. In general they were: 1) a clearer explanation of "Mary's motherhood in the order of grace"; 2) the addition of the titles of Advocate, Helper, and Aid-giver to Mediatrix who is "invoked" instead of "honored," and a theological explanation of Mary's mediation given through analogies with God's goodness and Christ's priesthood (cf. no. 62); 3) an addition of Mary as the perfect exemplar of the Church's entire apostolic activity (cf. no. 65); and, 4) an abbreviation of a passage in the form of a prayer towards the conclusion of the *schema* so that the document might preserve and show its profoundly doctrinal character throughout.

In the closing comments of his brief address to the assembly, Archbishop Roy further exhorted the Council Fathers to unity about their teaching on Mary. He particularly pointed out that each part of the *schema* must be read in the context of the whole document if they were to grasp its true theological meaning.

On October 29, 1964, just one year to the day after the momentous close vote to make the marian *schema* an integrated part of that on the Church, the emended text was put to a vote. The result of this vote was 2091 voting; 1559 *Placet* (Yes); 521 *Placet juxta modum* (Yes with further emendations); 10 *Non Placet* (No); and 1 spoiled vote. In marked contrast to the previous year's voting, the conciliar Fathers had achieved unanimity!

The final stage of the long and laborious process of arriving at the definitive text to be promulgated as chapter 8 of LG was the

²² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

completion of the textual refinements on the basis of the proposed emendations; 26 of the 95 presented were actually accepted.²³ Two of those concerned the Preface upon which the concluding section of this paper will be commenting. "In view of the merits of her Son" replaced "by her Son" so that the text now reads: "Redeemed in a loftier way in view of the merits of her Son . . ." (LG, no. 53). And the other emendation worth calling to your attention here is ". . . mother of mankind, especially of the faithful . . ." where there had been just ". . . mother of the faithful . . ." in the previous text, so that the emended text now reads: ". . . the duties of the redeemed human race towards the God-Bearer, mother of Christ and mother of mankind, especially of the faithful" (LG, no. 54).

On November 18, 1964, the revised text was approved by 2096 to 23 with one spoiled vote. The next day, LG in its entirety received 2134 in favor and 10 votes against. At the formal vote taken before the promulgation of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (LG) on November 21, 1964, it was approved by 2151 Council Fathers with 5 opposed. Pope Paul VI invited 24 Bishops of dioceses where important marian shrines are located to concelebrate with him on the same day the concluding Mass of the third session of Vatican Council II. More than one-third of his closing address was devoted to Our Lady. Although the conciliar Fathers had not approved putting the title into the text of chapter 8 of LG, for reasons that we shall soon be considering, the Holy Father proclaimed her "Mother of the Church."²⁴

Theological Comments upon the Preface of Chapter 8 of LG

The detailed account of the historical background to Vatican II's teaching about Mary, which has been provided by this pa-

²³ Cf. O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, pp. 355-356.

²⁴ *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II—Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes* (Roma: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1966), p. 985: "Igitur ad Beatae Virginis gloriam ad nostrumque solacium, Mariam Sacratissimam declaramus Matrem Ecclesiae, hoc est totius populi christiani, tam fidelium quam Pastorum, qui eam Matrem amantissimam appellant; ac statuimus ut suavissimo hoc nomine iam nunc universus christianus populus magis adhuc honorem Deiparae tribuat eique supplicationes adhibeat."

per, should both help make clearer the careful and prayerful work that went into it and also supply the context for a better understanding of this teaching. As indicated at the outset of the paper, my presentation has been using historical narrative primarily in the interests of theology and of deepening our faith-understanding of Mary within the total mystery of her Son's Incarnation, Redemption, and Church. The very title of chapter 8 of LG, "The Blessed Virgin Mary, God-Bearer, in the Mystery of Christ and of the Church," is significant in this regard. Fr. Congar, the famous French Dominican who was a *peritus* at Vatican II and one of the chief contributors to LG, has pointed out that the preposition "in" of this title has a most important meaning since it portrays Mary in proper perspective, i.e., as always to be contemplated in close relationship to her Son and his redeemed-redeeming Body, the Church. The phrase "redeemed-redeeming Body" seems to sum up nicely Vatican II's ecclesiology or theological teaching about the Church. Apparently the Council wished to emphasize the mystery of the Church as primarily a redeemed Body since she is first of all a gift of God's redeeming love in Christ and the Pentecostal Spirit without which the Church could not even exist. Only in light of this fundamental truth is she properly understood as a redeeming Body of Christ, i.e., a structure with a hierarchy or sacred order of diverse offices, ministries, and charisms which are all together oriented towards her mission of efficaciously signifying salvation for the whole world. Mary has been given by God a role of exercising a salutary influence upon both of these essential aspects of the mystery of the Church. As Archetype of the Church, however, it seems that she is to be contemplated primarily as the greatest recipient of God's redeeming love in Christ and the Holy Spirit, which began with her Immaculate Conception and reached complete perfection in her glorious Assumption.²⁵

The first paragraph of the Preface in chapter 8 of LG, article 52, teaches about Mary's place within the mystery of Christ.²⁶

²⁵ Cf. Frederick M. Jelly, O.P., *Madonna—Mary in the Catholic Tradition* (Huntington, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 1986), pp. 100-130.

²⁶ Cf. Semmelroth, "Chapter VIII," pp. 287-288.

The Council begins with references to the weighty text of St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians (4:4), and to ancient creeds and councils of the Church which clearly indicate that Mary, as portrayed in Scripture and Tradition, is and has been for centuries intimately related to the Incarnation of the Word and his work of redemption. During Christian antiquity the dogma about Christ was formulated in marian terms such as *Theotokos* (God-Bearer) defined about Mary at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431) in order to overcome the Christological heresy of Nestorianism. Mary can be called *Theotokos* only because her Son was truly divine as well as human from the first instant of his conception in her virginal womb. The redemptive work of Christ must also be expressed in marian terms, since he entered human history through Mary for the sake of our liberation and thus engrafted his Body the Church onto that history of salvation. And so the Church herself must be marian as well as the mystery of Christ and our redemption. Here Vatican II invokes the *Communicantes* of the Roman Canon, i.e., the "In union with the whole Church we honor Mary . . ." of the First Eucharistic Prayer, to express its teaching that all the faithful should reverence Mary in the first place within the Communion of Saints.

This initial article 52 of the Preface introduces the Christocentric approach of the Council's marian doctrine which overcomes the apparent conflict between a Christotypical and ecclesiotypical mariology. Instead of viewing the two emphases as mutually opposed, Vatican II, without explicitly entering into the theological controversy, nicely portrays them as mutually complementary. As Otto Semmelroth says in his introductory remarks to the commentary upon chapter 8 of LG:

There can be no conflict between seeing Mary as the archetype of the Church and seeing her in relation to Christ. She is the archetype of the Church only because her connection with Christ as his mother forms the basis for the share which the Church as Christ's bride has in his work. Conversely, a Christocentric view of Mary is incompatible with any individualist conception of Christ and his work; it necessarily considers Christ together with that mysterious body which he has acquired through his redemption and which is the Church.²⁷

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

Mary's special relationship with the Church is introduced in the next paragraph, article 53. The fact that she is a preeminent, indeed unique, member of the Church makes her no less a member. Likewise, the truth that she was uniquely redeemed at her Immaculate Conception through the foreseen merits of her Son does not make her any the less redeemed than the rest of us. What it does make her to be is the Exemplar or Archetype of the Church, principally as the fruits of Christ's perfect redemption. As the mother of God's own Son, she also enjoys special relationships with the Father as his most highly favored daughter, and with the Holy Spirit as the most holy temple of the Spirit. In the paradox of divine mystery, this intimate closeness to Christ and the triune God not only does not separate her from us, but even deepens her solidarity with all of the People of God. The nearer one comes to the creating and redeeming God, the closer one comes to his/her fellow creatures and adopted children of the Father.

As was previously pointed out in this paper, the addition of "as most loving mother" to the text was intended to be an equivalent to calling Mary "Mother of the Church," the title solemnly proclaimed by Pope Paul VI in his address concluding the third session of the Council on November 21, 1964. One of the main reasons, apparently, why the Council Fathers could not see their way clear to place this marian title within the text itself of chapter 8 is that its history in the Tradition is ambiguous. There is no problem with calling her "Mother of the Faithful," but, if the title means no more than that, then there is the problem of interpreting the mystery of the Church in an individualistic way instead of the traditionally Catholic manner as a corporate Body of members in solidarity with their Head, Jesus Christ, and with one another. Also, the Fathers at Vatican II wished to avoid any possible confusion between the motherhood of Mary in relation to us and the motherhood of the Church herself.²⁸ Although the marian title "Mother of the Church" can be interpreted properly as proclaimed by Pope Paul VI, it seems that it would have been misleading in the context of chapter 8 of LG, which the conciliar Fathers wisely did not want to risk.

²⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 292-293.

Finally, the third and last paragraph of the Preface, article 54, designates the precise intention of Vatican Council II regarding its teaching on Mary. This was to leave open a number of questions to theological discussion and not attempt to treat every single doctrine about her. The faithful are free to hold those mariological opinions which are propounded in Catholic schools of theology. The Council did intend to deal with Mary's relationship to the Word Incarnate and his redemptive work which continues in the Mystical Body and also with our duties of marian devotion. Teaching that Mary "... holds a place in holy Church that is the highest after Christ and the closest to us," in this article of the Constitution on the Church, we are well aware that the Council was using the very phrase that Pope Paul VI had uttered in his address at the end of the second session. It is indeed a very apt way of expressing what has come to be called a "sharing-oriented" mariology instead of one that is "privilege-centered." This means that the special graces and prerogatives divinely bestowed upon Mary through her unique redemption in Christ are not to be contemplated in isolation from the rest of us redeemed members of the Church. As "the highest after Christ" in the Church, Mary is most abundantly blessed. At the same time, however, as "the closest to us" in the Church, Mary's very privileges make her a Model of discipleship for us all.

There is one concluding comment about chapter 8 of LG, as a whole, which is useful to bear in mind before reading the remaining commentaries in this volume of *Marian Studies*. Unlike the other seven chapters of Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, the final chapter on Mary is divided into five sections of which the Preface is the first, and each of which has its own special subtitle. This is the case "... doubtless because it turned out to be twice as long as had been planned."²⁹ And it is an aid in grasping the rich content of the chapter.

VERY REV. FREDERICK M. JELLY, O.P.
Priory of St. Albert the Great
University of Dallas
Irving, Texas

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 287.