

Marian Studies

Volume 45 *Mary and Religious Education:
Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting
of the Mariological Society of America, held in
New Orleans, LA*

Article 12

1994

The Virgin Mary as Known by Youth, as Taught in Colleges and Seminaries: Part II. Marian Studies in American Catholic Colleges and Seminaries

Johann G. Roten
University of Dayton

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



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roten, Johann G. (1994) "The Virgin Mary as Known by Youth, as Taught in Colleges and Seminaries: Part II. Marian Studies in American Catholic Colleges and Seminaries," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 45, Article 12. Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol45/iss1/12

This Article 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 mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

THE VIRGIN MARY AS KNOWN BY YOUTH, AS TAUGHT IN COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES: TWO SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES

*Johann G. Roten, S.M.**

PART II: MARIAN STUDIES IN AMERICAN CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES

The Catholic public has perceived that a change in Marian devotion occurred after Vatican II. At first, there was what some have called a crisis or a "great silence" concerning Marian devotion. This period of dislocation was overcome through unforeseen developments such as a reawakening of religiosity, the renewed attraction to the preternatural (e.g., evident interest in apparitions), the rediscovery of the human face in theology, and the quest for role models in various liberation movements. In this new effervescence there is much which touches upon the person and image of Mary, but what has occurred in the area of formal teaching about Mary? In April 1992, the International Marian Research Institute at the University of Dayton sent a questionnaire to those responsible for the course of studies in theologates, seminaries and departments of religious studies throughout the United States. We clearly indicated our purpose in surveying what is being taught about Mary: that we did not wish to pry or needle, to pass judgment on others, or start some new "mariomania."

The matter to be investigated was detailed in a short survey (15 questions for religious studies departments, 16 for theologates) focused on the teaching of Mariology. The survey may have been too intricate, demanding more time and attention than a busy (and possibly irritated) respondent was able or

*Fr. Roten is president of the Marian Library/International Marian Research Institute at the University of Dayton.

willing to give. A portion of the results suffers from either lack of attention on the part of the respondent or the complex formulation of the questions.

The survey was mailed to 80 religious studies departments and to 42 seminaries and theological faculties in the United States. The results were the following:

	<i>Did reply</i>	<i>Did not reply</i>
Religious Studies Departments	54	26
Seminaries, Theological Faculties	26	16

This response represents a return rate of 63.5% for religious studies departments and 62.4% for theological faculties (see Appendices II and III for lists of institutions). A major difficulty encountered in carrying out this survey was related to identifying the nature of each institution, especially in cases of complex structure. A second difficulty involved finding the person responsible for the curriculum. Some of the unreturned surveys may have been lost in the administrative channels of bigger institutions, without ever reaching the teaching personnel. A third difficulty surfaced upon reviewing the answers. Asked whether the teaching of Mary is incorporated in various disciplines, respondents may have found it difficult to describe their situation with precision. We assume that some of the answers given are conjecture.

What follows are reports on each of the questions, together with a summation on the respective responses—first, those from the religious studies departments of Catholic colleges and universities, and, then, those from seminaries and theological faculties. Finally, some concluding general observations are offered.

1. Inquiry Concerning the Teaching of Marian Theology in Religious Studies Departments

(1) *Does your department presently offer teaching on Mary?*

Yes: 42

No: 12

Eight of the twelve "no" responses were actually false positives. Although, they answered no, they continued

with the survey and answered other questions in the affirmative, showing that they did in fact incorporate Marian teaching in some ways.

- (2) *If you have a no answer, please feel free to comment briefly.*
Here eleven responded that, although there were no specific courses on Mary, the Marian material was incorporated into other courses. Only three said there was no teaching at all about Mary in their department.
- (3) *If you have a yes answer, please tell us whether that teaching is:*
- a) *occasional and incorporated into material other than Mariology:*
Yes: 70.6% (36 of 51 replies)
 - b) *regularly incorporated into material other than Mariology:*
Yes: 21.6% (11 of 51 replies)
 - c) *offered as an independent and required course on Mary:*
Yes: 0% (0 of 51 replies)
 - d) *offered as an independent but elective course on Mary:*
Yes: 21.6% (11 of 51 replies)
- (4) *What would be the approximate number of hours foreseen for such teaching?*
- less than 1 hour: 16.1% (5)
 - 1 to 2 hours: 41.9% (13)
 - 2 to 3 hours: 22.6% (7)
 - 3 to 4 hours: 16.1% (5)
 - more than 4 hours: 3.2% (1)
- (5) *If you incorporate the Marian teaching into other material, please indicate within which (one or more) of the following:*
- a) *Scripture*
Yes: 63.5% (33 of 52)
 - b) *Christology*
Yes: 69.2% (36 of 52)
 - c) *Church History*
Yes: 59.6% (31 of 52)
 - d) *Spirituality*
Yes: 48.1% (25 of 52)
 - e) *Liturgy*
Yes: 27.5% (14 of 51)
 - f) *History of Religion*
Yes: 11.5% (6 of 52)
 - g) *Women's Studies*
Yes: 44.2% (23 of 52)
 - h) *Other*
Yes: 23.5% (12 of 51)

Under the category called "Other," the following answers were listed: Basics of the Catholic Faith (5), Christian Marriage, Ecclesiology (5), Teachings of Vatican II (2), and Women of Faith. In addition, there were four responses which said they were unsure of its incorporation within different classes. For this question (and for questions 6, 7, 11, and 12), the number of answers listed will not necessarily add up to the number of general responses checked. This occurred because respondents who checked answers such as "Other" did not necessarily list only one answer, but many times listed several.

- (6) *If your department offers an independent and required Marian course, at what point in the program (level and topic) is it taught?*

a) *No Independent/Required course: 44*
Independent/Required course: 3

b) *Level*

First Year: 2

Second Year: 1

Graduate: 1

c) *Topic*

Listed as the "Topic" with which the Marian material was presented were the following: Scripture, Catholic Tradition, Philosophy of Religion, and Religion and Culture (2).

- (7) *If your department offers an independent and elective Marian course, at what point in the program (level and topic) is it taught?*

a) *No Independent/Elective course: 34*
Independent/Elective course: 12

b) *Level*

First Year: 2

Third Year: 1

Graduate: 9

Undergrad. & Grad.: 2

c) *Topic*

The following were listed as independent/elective courses: Mary and the Saints in Christian Tradition (2), Special Questions in Systematic Theology: The Many

Faces of Mary, Mary in the NT, Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion, Mariology (5), Mary in the Modern World, Theology of Mary, Mary, Theology of Mary in View of Feminist Thought, Mary: Woman of Faith, Feminist Theology, Mary in Catholic Thought.

- (8) *Has the teaching on Mary your department offers undergone changes recently?*

No: 73.0% (27) Yes: 27.0% (10)

- a) *No, the present program has been offered since:*

1969: 1 1985: 3

1974: 1 1986: 2

1975: 2 1988: 1

1977: 1 1989: 1

1980: 1 1990: 2

1981: 3

- b) *Yes, the present program was introduced in:*

1989: 2 1992: 2

1991: 1 2000: 1 [sic]

The overlap in responses suggests that respondents did not know how to answer this question.

- (9) *In 1988, the Congregation of Catholic Education published a letter entitled "The Virgin Mary in Intellectual and Spiritual Formation." Has this letter had any direct or indirect influence on the teaching about Mary in your department?*

Yes: 15.6% (7) No: 84.4% (38)

When asked to comment briefly on their answers, three respondents answered that the letter might have influenced specific faculty, but that it was not an influence on the whole department. Five commented that they had not seen it, did not know about it, or did not really care to implement it since there was no Marian theology being taught in their institution. One "yes" respondent cited the letter's influence in the context of other resources (papal and episcopal documents on Mary).

- (10) *In your department is there an established syllabus for the teaching on Mary of Nazareth?*

Yes: 4.1% (2) No: 95.9% (47)

(11) *Does your department present a particular viewpoint on Mary?*

a) *a definite methodological approach?*

Yes: 34.7% (17) No: 65.3% (32)

b) *a specific concentration or content?*

Yes: 32.6% (15) No: 67.4% (31)

c) *specific teaching methods or techniques?*

Yes: 6.7% (3) No: 93.3% (42)

Of the "yes" answers to question 11.a, the comments were: doctrinal approach (5), historical (14), comparative (2), devotional (prayer) (2), Scripture/Biblical/NT (7), Protestant/Catholic Dialogue, ecclesiological (2), typological, women's studies (2), viewpoint of Vatican II, anthropology, iconography, Eastern versus Western Christian emphasis, literary/narrative analysis of Mary's role as a character, critique of Mary as perfect disciple, and sexuality. Of the "yes" answers to question 11.b, the comments were: biblical (4), history (2), Immaculate Conception/virginal conception of Jesus, and theology. Of the "yes" answers to question 11.c, the comments were: lecture/ discussion (2), and inquiry into how Mary is used in religious tradition (to liberate or to disenfranchise women, to perpetuate exclusive language about God).

(12) *What materials are used in this teaching on Mary?*

a) *course handouts prepared by teacher?*

Yes: 14.9% (7 of 47 replies)

b) *a specific manual or text?*

Yes: 27.1% (13 of 48 replies)

Under "a specific manual or text," the following works were mentioned (listed here alphabetically by author/editor):

- Anderson, H. George, et al. (eds.). *The One Mediator, the Saints and Mary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992. (2)—Brown, Raymond E., et al. (eds.). *Mary in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978. (3)—Buby, Bertrand. *Mary, the Faithful Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.—Corrington, Gail Patterson. *Her Image of Salvation*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1992.—Donnelly, Doris. *Mary*,

Woman of Nazareth. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.—Flannery, Austin (ed.). *Documents of Vatican II (Lumen Gentium, Chap. VIII)*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1984. (2)—Graef, Hilda C. *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.—Horgan, Thaddeus D. (ed.). *Walking Together*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990.—Jelly, Frederick M. *Madonna: Mary in the Catholic Tradition*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1986.—John Paul II, Pope. *The Mother of the Redeemer*. Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1987.—National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Behold Your Mother, Woman of Faith*. Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1973.—Norris, Richard A. (ed.). *The Christological Controversy*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.—O'Donnell, Christopher. *At Worship with Mary*. Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1988.—Paul VI, Pope. *Marialis Cultus* (English). Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1974.—Rahner, Karl. *Theological Investigations* (assorted essays). Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961—. —Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Mary—the Feminine Face of the Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.—Tambasco, Anthony J. *What Are They Saying about Mary?* New York: Paulist Press, 1984.—Tavard, George. *The Forthbringer of God*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989.—Thompson, William M. *Christology and Spirituality*. New York: Crossroad, 1991.—Vollert, Cyril O. *A Theology of Mary*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.—Warner, Marina. *Alone of All Her Sex*. New York: Knopf, 1976. (2)—Yoonprayong, Amnuay. *Who Is My Mother?* Rome: Pontifical University Gregorianum, 1985. In addition, not surprisingly, some mentioned direct use of the Gospels. Also, one respondent mentioned "various works" of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Leonardo Boff.

c) *another manner of teaching?*

Yes: 31.3% (15 of 48 replies)

Under "another manner of teaching," the responses were lectures (6), slide presentations (5), videos (2), individual professor research, texts on Mary in Christology or women's issues, historical writings/readings of the first century in which Mary of Nazareth is mentioned (2), and the Akathistos Hymn.

(13) *In your department have any theses on Mary been written since 1980?*

a) No: 97.8% (44 of 45 replies)

b) *How Many?*

One: "The Concept of Participation in the Post-Conciliar Development of Marian Theology" (S.T.L. Thesis). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America.

- (14) *Names and Addresses of those who teach Marian Theology at your institution* (see Appendix I).

- (15) *Suggestions or Reflections:*

One negative suggestion: stop sublimating women through the study of Mary.—Two positive suggestions: thanks for the survey, God bless your efforts.—Eleven positive reflections: (not reported here).—Two negative reflections: Mary has no role in our department.

2. Inquiry Concerning Marian Studies in Theological Faculties, Seminaries and Theologates

- (1) *Does your institution presently offer teaching on Mary?*

Yes: 100.0% (26 of 26 replies)

- (2) *If you have a no answer, feel free to comment.*

- (3) *If you have a yes answer, please tell us whether that teaching is . . .*

- a) *occasional and incorporated into material other than Mariology?*

Yes: 42.3% (11 of 26 replies)

- b) *regularly incorporated into material other than Mariology?*

Yes: 65.4% (17 of 26 replies)

- c) *an independent and required course on Mary?*

Yes: 15.4% (4 of 26 replies)

- d) *an independent but elective course on Mary?*

Yes: 76.9% (20 of 26 replies)

- (4) *In either case (of independent or incorporated teaching) what is, in the framework of a global theological formation, the approximate number of hours foreseen for Marian teaching (each class approximately 45-50 minutes)?*

1 to 2 hours: 14.3% (3)

2 to 3 hours: 9.5% (2)

3 to 4 hours: 4.8% (1)

more than 4 hours: 71.4% (15)

- (5) *If the Marian teaching is incorporated into other material, please indicate within which (one or more) of the following:*

a) <i>Scripture</i>	e) <i>Liturgy</i>
Yes: 62.5% (15 of 24)	Yes: 45.8% (11 of 24)
b) <i>Christology</i>	f) <i>History of Religion</i>
Yes: 62.5% (15 of 24)	Yes: 4.2% (1 of 24)
c) <i>Ecclesiology</i>	g) <i>Women's Studies</i>
Yes: 75.0% (18 of 24)	Yes: 20.8% (5 of 24)
d) <i>Spirituality</i>	h) <i>Other</i>
Yes: 54.2% (13 of 24)	Yes: 33.3% (8 of 24)

In the "Other" category, the materials listed were as follows: Devotional Practices, Introduction to Theology, Liberation Theology, Church History, Patristics, Systematic Theology, Hispanic Theology, and Intensive Program of Spiritual Formation.

- (6) *If the Marian teaching is incorporated into other material, please comment briefly on the specific context(s) in which it is found (for example, where in ecclesiology . . .).*

The following list represents the answers given: Ecclesiology, Vatican II, Scripture, Spirituality (4), A Christological Understanding of Mary, Mariology, Mariology as a Type of Ecclesiology, Mary and the Saints in Devotional Life, The Marian Sacramentary and Lectionary, Christology (Mary's Role in Redemption) (9), Ecclesiology: Mary's Role in the Church (6), Scripture (6), Mary as the first model of discipleship, Mary as the model believer, Mary's sinlessness (in anthropology), *Lumen Gentium* (Chap. VIII), the history of Marian dogmas, liturgy (Marian feasts), liberation theology and general theological topics (2).

- (7) *If your institution offers an independent and required Marian course, at what point in the program (level and topic) is Marian theology taught?*

- a) *No Independent/Required Course:* 15
Independent/Required Course: 8
 b) *Level*
 Second year: 2

Third year: 1

c) *Topics:*

Marian Spirituality (Theology I), Mariology (4), Theology of Mary in Feminist Thought, Mary as Woman of Faith, Feminist Theology, and a Consortium.

- (8) *If your institution offers an independent but elective Marian course, at what point in the program (level and topic) is this teaching offered?*

a) *No Independent/Elective course:* 3

Independent/Elective course: 17

b) *Level*

First year: 1

Second year: 1

Third year: 9

Fourth year: 1

c) *Topics:*

Marian spirituality (2); Mary, Mother of God (scriptural, patristic, dogmatic, tradition) (3); Mary in Scripture (2); Mary in theology/Theology of Mary (5); Mary in liturgy; Mary in devotional life; Mary in the Church; Mary in doctrine and devotion: a historical examination (2); Mariology—global; and Guadalupe.

- (9) *Has the teaching on Mary that you offer undergone changes recently?*

No: 18

Yes: 4

- a) *No, the present program has been offered since . . .*

1973: 1 1983: 1

1975: 1 1986: 1

1979: 1 1987: 1

1980: 2 1988: 2

1981: 1 1989: 2

1982: 2 1990: 1

- b) *Yes, the present program was introduced in . . .*

1986: 1 2000: 1 [sic]

- (10) *In 1988, the Congregation of Catholic Education published a letter entitled "The Virgin Mary in Intellectual and Spiritual Formation." Has this letter had any direct*

or indirect influence on the teaching of Mariology in your institution?

Yes: 58.3% (14 of 24 replies)

Excerpts from some responses: "The document is not used but there is indirect influence. It tempts us to make Mariology a required course and strengthens our commitment to the current elective course on Mary" — "The document acts as a measure against which to check our courses" — "Because of the letter we added an independent elective course to our curriculum" — "The letter has helped us to design a required course" — "This letter seems useful, but we cannot find it" — "This letter has been integrated in some way" (3) — "The professor teaching Mariology is not familiar with the letter" — "The letter has not entered into our curriculum planning."

- (11) *In your institution is there an established syllabus for the teaching of Mariology?*

Yes: 48.0% (12 of 25 replies)

- (12) *Does the Marian theology offered by your institution present a particular viewpoint?*

a) *a definite methodological approach:*

Yes: 82.6% (19 of 23 replies)

Responses: Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium*, systematic (2); spirituality-based, doctrinal (11), historical (11), liturgical, biblical (2), devotional (2), Christological, ecclesiological (2), and Hispanic culture/piety.

b) *a specific concentration or content:*

Yes: 60.0% (12 of 20 replies)

Responses: Immaculate/virginal conception of Jesus, spirituality and Mary (2), historical (2), ecumenical perspectives, patristics, comprehensive approach, biblical (7), dogmatic (2), doctrinal (3), devotional, liturgical (2), and a concentration on the Byzantine Church.

c) *specific teaching methods or techniques:*

Yes: 25.0% (5 of 20 replies)

Responses: Lecture/discussion (3), and one whose primary concern is to move students from a subjective Marian piety to a Marian devotion firmly grounded in Scripture and Tradition.

(13) *What materials are used in Marian teaching:*

- a)
- course handouts prepared by the professor of this subject?*

Yes: 40.0% (10 of 25 replies)

- b)
- a manual or text that is printed and could be obtained in a library or bookstore?*

Yes: 80.0% (20 of 25 replies)

The following titles were mentioned (listed here alphabetically by author/editor):

Brown, Raymond E. *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.—Brown, Raymond E., et. al. (eds.). *Mary in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978. (4)—Brown, Raymond E. *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.—Buby, Bertrand. *Mary, the Faithful Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.—Donnelly, Doris. *Mary, Woman of Nazareth*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989. (3)—Flannery, Austin (ed.). *Documents of Vatican II (Lumen Gentium, Chap. VIII)*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1984. (8)—Gebara, Ivone and Maria Clara Bingemer. *Mary, Mother of God, Mother of the Poor*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1989.—Graef, Hilda C. *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.—Hines, Mary. "Mary in the Prophetic Mission of the Church." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 28 (Spring 1991): 281–299. (2)—International Committee on English in the Liturgy (eds.). *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary: Sacramentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.—John Paul II, Pope. *Redemptoris Mater* (English). Boston, MA: Daughters of Saint Paul, 1987.—Koehler, Theodore (ed.). *Marian Studies* (vols. 37, 40). Dayton, OH: Mariological Society of America. 1986, 1989.—Laurentin, René. *A Short Treatise on the Virgin Mary*. Washington, NJ: AMI Press, 1991. (3)—Macquarrie, John. *Mary for All Christians*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991.—McHugh, John. *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975.—Moloney, Francis. *Mary: Woman and Mother*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1988.—National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Behold Your Mother, Woman of Faith*. Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1973. (2)—Paul VI, Pope. *Mariæ Cultus* (English). Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1974. (5)—Rahner, Karl. *Mary, Mother of the Lord*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.—Schillebeeckx, Edward. *Mary, Mother of the Redemption*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.—Stacpoole, Alberic (ed.). *Mary's Place in Christian Dialogue*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-

Barlow, 1983.—Tambasco, Anthony J. *What Are They Saying about Mary?* New York: Paulist Press, 1984.—and various encyclicals.

c) *another manner of teaching?*

Yes: 20.0% (5 of 25 replies)

Explanation: An analysis of liturgical texts and offices of the Byzantine Church. Formal presentation by professor with assigned readings (2).

(14) *In your institution have any theses or dissertations on Marian topics been written since 1980?*

No: 64.0% (16 of 25 replies)

a) *Master's degree?*

Yes: 33.3% (8 of 24 replies)

How Many?

One: 3

Three: 2

Four: 1

Five: 1

Masters' Theses (listed alphabetically by author or title [if author not given]):

Coakley, Paul. "A Study of the Mother of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." Emmitsburg, MD: Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, 1983. — "The Development of the Doctrine of the Assumption from the Fifth through the Ninth Centuries." Columbus, OH: Pontifical College Josephinum. — McDonald, William. "The Question of Mary Throughout the Ages." Emmitsburg, MD: Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, 1970. — Rode, John. "The Message of Our Lady of Fatima vs. Modernity." Emmitsburg, MD: Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, 1991. — Tran, Michael Xuan. "Marian Devotion of the Vietnamese in Exile as a Reflection of Both the Successes and the Incompleteness of the Renewal of Marian Devotion in the Universal Church." Camarillo, CA: St. John's Seminary, 1993. — "The Virginal Conception of Jesus and the Historical-Critical Method: Review of Recent Findings." Cincinnati, OH: Athenaeum of Ohio Seminary. 1989. — Also, St. Mary Seminary in Cleveland, OH mentioned, without name, three theses (by Chris Schenk, Ray Hamlin and Daniel Schlegel). Three Research Papers from the Athenaeum were listed as well: "Revelation 12: Who Is the Woman Clothed in the Sun?: An Analysis of the Interpretations"; "Mary Mother of the Poor"; and "The Historical and Liturgical Significance of the Immaculate Conception."

b) *Licentiate?*

Yes: 1

How Many?

1

c) *Doctoral?*

No: 24

d) *Another degree or diploma?*

Yes: 1

How many?

1

The lone "Other" was an S.T.B. granted for a thesis on the History of the Rosary from Mundelein Seminary in Mundelein, Illinois.

(15) *Names and Addresses of those who teach Mariology at your institution:*

See Appendix I.

(16) *Suggestions/Reflections:*

Positive Suggestions: 1; Positive Reflections: 10;

Negative Reflections: 1.

3. Some General Conclusions

The survey appears to have been received and responded to in a positive manner. In spite of some logistical problems (and maybe in part thanks to our repeated requests) close to two-thirds (59.6%) of all institutions returned questionnaires.

1. Some Marian coursework is present in 42 (77.8%) of the religious studies departments which answered the inquiry, as well as in all the theological faculties which responded (26).

2. There are three possibilities for teaching about Mary.

- a) The first possibility offers a *required* and independent course on Mary: none of the religious studies departments and only 15.4% of the theological faculties offer this possibility.
- b) The second possibility offers an independent but *elective* course on Mary. Elective courses are of-

ferred in 21.6% of religious studies departments and 76.9% of the theological faculties.

- c) A more fluid and pervasive way of teaching consists in incorporating Marian content regularly or occasionally into material other than Mariology (for example, into Scripture). This seems to be the preferred form of teaching about Mary for religious studies departments (81.2%) as well as for theological faculties (85.6%).

3. The approximate time allotted for Marian studies in the overall framework of religious and/or theological formation was expressed in number of hours. For religious studies departments 64.5% of the respondents indicate between one to three hours of teaching. Only 16% indicate less than one hour, and a similar percentage thinks that the allotted time is more than three hours.

Theological faculties have allotted more time. For 71.4% of the respondents the allowed time is four hours or more; 28.6% indicate from one to four hours.

4. We discover similar patterns in religious studies departments (*RSD*) and theological faculties (*ThFac*) when it comes to indicating where the Marian material is incorporated:

<i>Material</i>	<i>RSD</i>	<i>ThFac</i>
Scripture	63.5	62.5
Christology	69.2	62.5
Church History/Ecclesiology	59.6	75.0
Spirituality	48.1	54.2
Liturgy	27.5	45.8
History of Religion	11.5	4.2
Women's Studies	44.2	20.8
Other	23.5	33.3.

Significant differences seem to appear for ecclesiology (*n.b.*, religious studies departments were asked about history of the Church and not ecclesiology), liturgy, and women's studies.

5. When asked whether there were any recent changes, overwhelming majorities for both religious studies departments (73%) and theological faculties (81.8%) replied in the affirmative. The 1988 letter from the Congregation of Catholic Educa-

tion, "The Virgin Mary in Intellectual and Spiritual Formation," seems to have had a very modest influence on religious studies departments (15.6%), but a greater influence on theological faculties (58.3%).

6. Only 4.1% of the religious studies departments, but 48% of the theological schools, have an officially established syllabus for teaching about Mary. Concerning specific pedagogical methods related to teaching on Mary, the following information appeared:

	<i>RSD</i>	<i>ThFac</i>
Presentation of a particular viewpoint on Mary	34.7%	82.6%
Specific concentration or content	32.6%	60.0%
Specific teaching methods	6.7%	25.0%
Use of handouts prepared by the teacher	14.9%	40.0%
Use of specific manuals or texts	27.1%	80.0%.

Theological schools present a more *focused* approach to Marian teaching.

7) Since 1980, only one Marian master's thesis was reported by college and university religious studies departments, while nine Marian dissertations (seven master's theses, one licentiate thesis, and one S.T.B. thesis) have been presented on the topic of Mary in theological schools (seminaries).

AFTERWORD

Two Surveys: Harmonizing the Results

The two surveys conducted by the International Marian Research Institute were quite different. One was directed to high-school and college-age youth concerning their attitudes toward and acquaintance with Mary, the mother of Christ; the other survey dealt with the teaching of Mariology in colleges and seminaries. The contrasts are readily apparent. The first survey targeted young people, with limited religious training, and focused on their personal experiences related to Mary. The second was directed toward older, well-educated people, with a

specific academic background in theology at an advanced level. Their questions examined institutional facets related to Marian teaching within the context of higher education.

However, though the audiences differed greatly, the subject matter dealt with knowledge of Mary and how it is communicated. Further, the methods of gathering and of appraising the data were quite similar. This being the case, we conclude with a brief attempt to relate these two disparate surveys.

There are some areas of convergence. The majority of the youth surveyed had both some knowledge of and appreciation for Mary. Analogously, the vast majority of institutes (including all the theological faculties) presented some Marian teaching. Also, the write-in replies indicated mostly positive views of the Mary being presented, with only a few strongly-worded negative replies. Finally, detailed knowledge about Mary was lacking among the young people. A few concrete suggestions were offered to improve this situation: the median figure of about two hours of teaching on Mary (for religious studies departments) would permit only a superficial acquaintance, even for those receiving the advanced training in religion.

To religious educators, both surveys provide some encouragement while offering no easy assurance. There is no "vast Marian desert," but rather a steady, "shallow transmission of religious sentiment and doctrine."

Appendix I—Survey II

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF THOSE WHO TEACH MARIAN THEOLOGY

—From Responding Colleges and Seminaries—

(Listed alphabetically by state, city, institution)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Kenan B. Osbourne | Franciscan School of Theology (Berkeley, CA) |
| 2. Paul F. Ford, PhD | St. John's Seminary (Camarillo, CA) |
| 3. Rev. Frederick Cwiekowski | St. Patrick's Seminary (Menlo Park, CA) |
| 4. Hugh F. O'Donnell, CM | St. Thomas Theological Seminary (Denver, CO) |
| 5. Dr. Mary Collins | Catholic University of America (Washington, DC) |
| 6. Dr. M. Margaret Kellehen | Catholic University of America (Washington, DC) |
| 7. Dr. B.L. Manthalen | Catholic University of America (Washington, DC) |
| 8. Dr. J. Wiseman | Catholic University of America (Washington, DC) |
| 9. Monika Hellwig | Georgetown University (Washington, DC) |
| 10. Julia Lamm | Georgetown University (Washington, DC) |
| 11. Chester Gillis | Georgetown University (Washington, DC) |
| 12. Fr. George Kirwin, OMI | Oblate College (Washington, DC) |
| 13. Rev. Walter Brennan, OSM | Catholic Theological Union (Chicago, IL) |
| 14. Sr. Ann Maria Pindo, RSM | Catholic Theological Union (Chicago, IL) |
| 15. Rev. Louis J. Cameli | Mundelein Seminary (Mundelein, IL) |
| 16. Sr. Sara Butler | Mundelein Seminary (Mundelein, IL) |
| 17. Edward D. O'Connor | University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame, IN) |
| 18. Dr. Philip Kaminski | Saint Mary's College (Notre Dame, IN) |
| 19. Keith J. Egan | Saint Mary's College (Notre Dame, IN) |
| 20. Bro. Doug Edmonds, SVD | Divine Word College (Epworth, IA) |
| 21. Bro. Rodney Bowers, SVD | Divine Word College (Epworth, IA) |
| 22. Sr. Anne Sedgwick, OSF | Divine Word College (Epworth, IA) |
| 23. Sr. Susan Wood | Saint Mary College (Leavenworth, KS) |
| 24. Sr. Kathleen Wood | Saint Mary College (Leavenworth, KS) |
| 25. Fr. Stephen Lee | Saint Mary College (Leavenworth, KS) |
| 26. Rev. E. Pfister | Notre Dame Seminary (New Orleans, LA) |
| 27. Fr. Frederick M. Jelly, OP | Mount Saint Mary's Seminary (Emmitsburg, MD) |
| 28. Dr. Mary Hines, SND | Washington Theological Union (Silver Spring, MD) |
| 29. Brian E. Daley, SJ | Weston School of Theology (Cambridge, MA) |
| 30. Sr. Elaine Huber | Merrimack College (North Andover, MA) |
| 31. Rev. Kevin Surryer, OSO | Merrimack College (North Andover, MA) |
| 32. Sr. Padraic O'Hane | Merrimack College (North Andover, MA) |
| 33. Dr. Mary Ellen McClanaghan | Marygrove College (Detroit, MI) |
| 34. George P. Alcsér | Marygrove College (Detroit, MI) |
| 35. Rev. James Jorgenson | Sacred Heart Major Seminary (Detroit, MI) |
| 36. Dr. William Riordan | Sacred Heart Major Seminary (Detroit, MI) |

37. Rev. Joseph Szewczyk Ss. Cyril and Methodius Seminary (Orchard Lake, MI)
38. Rev. Gregory Banazak Ss. Cyril and Methodius Seminary (Orchard Lake, MI)
39. Sr. Veronica Koperski Ss. Cyril and Methodius Seminary (Orchard Lake, MI)
40. Sr. Irene Doman Ss. Cyril and Methodius Seminary (Orchard Lake, MI)
41. Gregory Polan, OSB Conception Seminary College (Conception, MO)
42. Benedict Nennan, OSB Conception Seminary College (Conception, MO)
43. Donald Grabner, OSB Conception Seminary College (Conception, MO)
44. Rev. Thomas Gneisen Conception Seminary College (Conception, MO)
45. Dr. Mary Catherine Hillkert Aquinas Institute of Theology (St. Louis, MO)
46. Dr. Joan Delaplane, OP Aquinas Institute of Theology (St. Louis, MO)
47. Carla Mae Streeter, OP Aquinas Institute of Theology (St. Louis, MO)
48. Michael Deinkovich, OP Aquinas Institute of Theology (St. Louis, MO)
49. Rev. James Swift, CM Kenrick-Glennon Seminary (St. Louis, MO)
50. Richard Valantasis St. Louis University (St. Louis, MO)
51. Elizabeth Johnson Fordham University (Bronx, NY)
52. Rev. Gabriel Scarfia Christ the King Seminary (East Aurora, NY)
53. Rev. Peter Vaccari Seminary of the Immaculate Conception
Huntington, NY)
54. Dr. Winifred Whelan, OSF St. Bonaventure University (Saint Bonaventure, NY)
55. Kathleen Nash Le Moyne College (Syracuse, NY)
56. Rev. James T. O'Connor St. Joseph's Seminary (Yonkers, NY)
57. Rev. Richard Walling Athenaeum of Ohio (Cincinnati, OH)
58. Rev. Richard Marzheuser Athenaeum of Ohio (Cincinnati, OH)
59. Fr. Edward Clark, STD Athenaeum of Ohio (Cincinnati, OH)
60. Fr. Austin Doran, STD Athenaeum of Ohio (Cincinnati, OH)
61. Fr. Charles Miller, CM Athenaeum of Ohio (Cincinnati, OH)
62. Dr. Joan Nuth John Carroll University (Cleveland, OH)
63. Dr. Joseph Kelly John Carroll University (Cleveland, OH)
64. Rev. Gerald Bedmar Saint Mary Seminary (Cleveland, OH)
65. Rev. Allan Laubenthal Saint Mary Seminary (Cleveland, OH)
66. Rev. Thomas Weber Saint Mary Seminary (Cleveland, OH)
67. Thomas E. Esselman, CM Saint Mary Seminary (Cleveland, OH)
68. Rev. Leonard Glavin, OFM Pontifical College Josephinum (Columbus, OH)
69. Fr. Bertrand Buby, SM University of Dayton (Dayton, OH)
70. Dr. Mark Miravalle Franciscan University (Steubenville, OH)
71. Rosalind Smith, PhD Allentown College (Center Valley, PA)
72. Rev. Demetrius Dumm, STD St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
73. Rev. Bede S. Peay, PhD St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
74. Rev. Warren Murrman, OSB St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
75. Rev. Thomas Acklin, OSB St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
76. Rev. Kurt Belsole, OSB St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
77. Bro. Elliot Maloney, OSB St. Vincent Seminary (Latrobe, PA)
78. Rev. James J. Collins Holy Family College (Philadelphia, PA)
79. Mr. Joseph Stoutzenberger Holy Family College (Philadelphia, PA)
80. Rev. Edward Biggane Holy Family College (Philadelphia, PA)
81. Dr. William M. Thompson Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA)
82. Dr. Anne Clifford Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 83. Dr. Michael Cahill, CSSp | Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 84. Jennifer Glancy | Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 85. Nancy Ring | Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 86. Msgr. Russell A. Duker | Ss. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Seminary
(Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 87. Msgr. Alexis E. Mihalik | Ss. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Seminary
(Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 88. Fr. Frank A. Firko | Ss. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Seminary
(Pittsburgh, PA) |
| 89. Rev. Matthew F. Morry | Providence College (Providence, RI) |
| 90. Sr. Mary Ann Fellmar | Providence College (Providence, RI) |
| 91. Sr. Helen O'Neill, OP | Providence College (Providence, RI) |
| 92. Rev. Charles Neumann, SM | St. Mary's University (San Antonio, TX) |
| 93. Dr. Geri Telepak | St. Mary's University (San Antonio, TX) |
| 94. Rev. J. Willis Langlinais | St. Mary's University (San Antonio, TX) |
| 95. Rev. Mattias P. Cremer | St. Mary's University (San Antonio, TX) |
| 96. Rev. Richard Schlenken | Sacred Heart School of Theology (Hales Corners, WI) |
| 97. Daniel Di Domizio | Cardinal Stritch College (Milwaukee, WI) |
| 98. Rev. George Tavad | Marquette University (Milwaukee, WI) |

Appendix II—Survey II

**RELIGIOUS STUDIES DEPARTMENTS
WHICH RESPONDED**

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Allentown College | 28. Mount Saint Mary's College |
| 2. Alverno College | 29. University of Notre Dame |
| 3. Barry University | 30. Pepperdine University |
| 4. Benedictine College | 31. University of Portland |
| 5. Boston College | 32. Providence College |
| 6. Cardinal Stritch College | 33. Rosemont College |
| 7. Catholic University of America | 34. St. Bonaventure University |
| 8. Conception Seminary College | 35. College of St. Elizabeth |
| 9. University of Dayton | 36. Saint Hyacinth College |
| 10. Divine Word College | 37. St. John Fisher College |
| 11. Duquesne University | 38. School of Theology of St. John's University |
| 12. Fordham University (Bronx) | 39. St. John's University |
| 13. Fordham University (NY) | 40. St. Louis University |
| 14. Franciscan University of
Steubenville | 41. St. Mary College |
| 15. Georgetown University | 42. St. Mary's College |
| 16. Gonzaga University | 43. St. Mary's University |
| 17. Holy Family College | 44. St. Meinrad College |
| 18. John Carroll University | 45. University of St. Thomas |
| 19. King's College | 46. St. Vincent College |
| 20. Le Moyne College | 47. University of San Francisco |
| 21. Loyola College | 48. Santa Clara University |
| 22. Loyola Marymount University | 49. University of Scranton |
| 23. Loyola University of Chicago | 50. Seton Hall University |
| 24. Manhattan College | 51. Spring Hill College |
| 25. Marquette University | 52. Stonehill College |
| 26. Marygrove College | 53. Villanova University |
| 27. Merrimack College | 54. Unknown School |

Appendix III—Survey II

**ACADEMIC SEMINARIES, THEOLOGATES, and
FACULTIES WHICH RESPONDED**

1. Aquinas Institute of Theology (Theologate)
2. Athenaeum of Ohio (Theologate)
3. Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Ss. Cyril and Methodius (Theologate)
4. Catholic Theological Union (Graduate School of Theology)
5. Christ the King Seminary
6. Dominican House of Studies Pontifical Faculty of the Immaculate Conception
(Theologate/Theological Faculty/Pontifical Faculty)
7. Franciscan School of Theology (Theologate)
8. Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley (Pontifical Faculty)
9. Kenrick Seminary (Theologate)
10. Mount Saint Mary's Seminary
11. Mundelein Seminary at the University of St. Mary of the Lake (Theologate)
12. Notre Dame Seminary (Theologate)
13. Oblate College Graduate School of Theology (Theologate)
14. Pontifical College Josephinum (Theologate/Pontifical Faculty)
15. Pope John XXIII National Seminary (Theologate)
16. Sacred Heart Major Seminary (Theologate)
17. Sacred Heart School of Theology (Theologate)
18. St. John's Seminary (Theologate)
19. St. Joseph's Seminary (Theologate)
20. St. Mary Seminary (Theologate)
21. St. Patrick Seminary (Theologate)
22. St. Thomas Theological Seminary (Theologate)
23. Ss. Cyril and Methodius Seminary (Theologate)
24. Seminary of the Immaculate Conception (Theologate)
25. Washington Theological Union (Theologate)
26. Weston School of Theology (Theologate)