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A DOMINICAN graduate student at Catholic University called to my notice the special issue of the quarterly review, Sacra Doctrina, published by the Dominicans of Bologna (anno xviii, quaderno 69-70) as a double-number for the period January-June, 1973, and bearing the title, Maria di Nazareth nella Chiesa. When I got hold of the issue, 368 standard book pages, I felt for the moment as if the calendar had suddenly turned back twenty years to the Marian Year of 1954, when so many Catholic magazines devoted extended special numbers to our Lady. But this new Marian number of Sacra Doctrina is no exercise in nostalgia. If it is in some respects a bit rueful about changes that have occurred since the Marian Year (of 1954), and occasionally indulges in over-defensiveness, the majority of its excellent articles provide evidence of the continuing progress of the theology of the Marian mystery.

The 'presentation' is by Dominican provincial P. E. M. Rossetti. The idea for the special issue took root in a suggested year of prayer for the fourth centenary of the institution of the liturgical feast of the Rosary. It was thought that a good theological base was required along with pastoral and devotional manifestations, and Msgr. Gherardini of the Lateran theology faculty was put in charge. When he brought it up at a theological gathering, writes P. Rossetti: "the proposal fell on an embarrassed and embarrassing silence, and hence nothing happened. Mariological interest among theologians today is in a crisis stage. Either they prefer to keep silent, turning their attention to more lively interests or areas of easier success, or

they write of Mary in a social and historical key that deforms the true face of the Mother of Jesus and our Mother” (he refers to the recent book by G. Gualemí, Maria espressione della società et della Chiesa, Bologna, 1972). This is the situation to which Sacra Doctrina addressed itself, drawing up this special number on ‘Mary of Nazareth in the Church,’ following another recent special number of Gesù di Nazareth, il Cristo.

The biblical concern is dominant, which I would suggest is characteristic of most post-conciliar writing on our Lady, with four papers, on Old Testament and especially New. Gherardini writes of ‘Mater Ecclesiae,’ in explanation of Pope Paul’s title; Bellarmino Bagatti, O.F.M. reports his researches on traditions of the Virgin’s death, tracing the Transitus and Dormitio writings back to a single original text of the second century (itself long lost but influencing surviving later ones), a task not attempted by two recent investigators in Italy, Marcello Craveri (1969) and Luigi Moraldi (1971). Bagatti builds his case on early Jewish-Christian writings, with archaic doctrinal overtones typical of the second/third century period. A second school of Transitus accounts is Greco-Roman, with the Judaeo-Christian traces eliminated. He brings out also the use of the word ‘sister’ for Mary in early Christian literature which went out of fashion as an anti-agapete measure. Further, he describes the archeological evidence for a tomb of Mary venerated in the valley of Cedron in the early centuries, according to Jewish-Christian literature, a source left aside by such later authors as Cyril, Jerome, and Epiphanius.

G. Ferrari of the University of Bari contributes an article Marian doctrine and Marian Heortology in Eastern Tradition, with special reference to Eastern Orthodox Churches. William Purdy, expert on Anglicanism for the Secretariat for Christian Unity, writes briefly of the place of Mary in Anglican thought, paying just tribute to the English Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Father George C. Anawati, Dominican, writes from Cairo of Mary in Islam, a subject also of this survey.
Anawati's is practically the same as his article *Islam and the Immaculate Conception*, in the book edited by Fr. E. O'Connor, *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance*, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1958. A set of *note e discussioni* closes the volume: G. M. Besutti, on cult; G. Velocci, on Mary in the life and thought of Cardinal Newman; R. Biagi, on Mary in the 'new theology,' reacting sharply to the Dutch Catechism. And B. Gherardini reports on Mary's place in K. Barth's Christology. Surveys from different countries were projected; only two were provided: Manteau-Bonamy with a post-conciliar Marian assessment in France, and P. Bollandi, on devotion to the Virgin in French Canada, a rather discouraging record of recent fall-off.

Rossetti's preface concludes on a hopeful note, bolstered by the positive papers in *Sacra Doctina*:

> Seen and discovered in the mystery of the Church, Mary—we are sure of it—will again loom large in the eyes of believers and theologians; the appreciation of Mary will grow with the awareness that she is not just a chapter of the Church, but a deep and vital dimension of it.... Cromazio d'Aquileia (d. 408) wrote: The Church does not exist without Mary, the Mother of the Lord. Her great and discrete presence will bring to the new theology the authentic taste of Christ and the faith (il sapore reale di Cristo e della fede).

Then Rossetti winds up with a quotation from a 1963 conference by Raymond Panikkar only printed in 1972, on the Marian dimensions of life: "All is important: theology, science, culture, progress; all is very important; but without Mary our Christian life is mutilated, and no matter how we try, without Mary we give a false impression of Christianity."²

After that lengthy introduction, I continue this survey with the following sections:

A Survey of Recent Mariology

A. Some recent publications on Our Lady and Islam.


C. Recent studies in the sources, scriptural, patristic, medieval, magisterial.

D. A fourth category of life and devotion: spirituality, liturgy, hagiography.

A. Our Lady and Islam.


500,000,000 of the world’s people are Muslims. Recent events in the Middle East and the connected energy crisis have made us aware of this often-overlooked world which includes the Arabs as well as the Turks and followers of Mohammed in surprisingly many countries, as Yugoslavia and France.

On Mary in Islam, there appeared in 1973, *Maria nel Messaggio Coranico*, by the Discalced Carmelite, Nilo Geagea, now stationed in Lebanon. His study on the divine maternity of a good many years ago is often referred to still; it bore his name as Nilus a Sancto Brocardo. This new book, published by the Teresianum in Rome, previously appeared in the 1972 volume of *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* (v. 23). The major texts Fr. Geagea considers in the Koran can be conveniently consulted in the pamphlet, *Mary in Islam*, no. 13 in the series, *Mother of Jesus*, published by the English Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a lecture given by Fr. R. J. McCarthy, S.J., June 1971, in London. The principal references are two, Sura (or chapter) XIX, which is titled: Maryam; and Sura III,
The House of Imran, who is Mary's father, the Joachim of Christian apocrypha. There are a few lesser references as well.

Fr. Geagea takes his cue from the Second Vatican Council's declaration on the relationship of the Church to non-Christian religions, which says of the Moslems: "Though they do not acknowledge Jesus as God, they revere him as a prophet. They also honor Mary, his virgin mother; at times they call on her too, with devotion" (n. 3). Restricting himself to the text of the Koran, hence with a minimal use of the classic commentaries that amplified, sometimes fantastically, references to Mary's life, Geagea sets himself a three-fold task: 1) an analysis of the Koranic texts; 2) a synthesis showing Mary's singular and eminent position; 3) a conclusion concerning the historical origins of Mohammed's references to Mary in the Koran, concerning the dogmatic elements, mainly the differences between Muslim and Christian faith with respect to Mary, and finally concerning ecumenical hopes.

In terms of composition of the Koran the two main periods are the Mecca period, 612-622 and the Medina period, 622-632, when the prophet died, with the Hegira or emigration the point of division between the two periods. In Muslim understanding it was in 612 that Mohammed, then 40, began to receive the revelations of Allah from the angel Gabriel. The order of the Koran is not chronological, and there are many difficulties about dating the parts, but the 19th chapter, titled, Maryam (or our Mary) belongs to the Mecca period about 615, and the third chapter, titled, the Family of Imran, belongs to the Medina period, about 631. There is a continuity to Mohammed's great respect for Mary. The 114 chapters are arranged roughly in descending order of length and ascending order of interest.

Chapter XIX belongs to the time Mohammed sent a band of his disciples to Abyssinia; one tradition says it was read to the Negus, the Christian ruler there, and seems to have convinced him the faith of his visitors was similar to his, because
of the respectful remarks on Jesus and Mary in the story of the virginal conception and the birth of Jesus who defends his virgin mother against the charge of having him out of wedlock by speaking even though only an infant. Geagea's own view is that the biblical material is related to the visit to Abyssinia indeed, but was recorded after the return of the disciples, hence after 615. Chapter 3, *The Family of Imran*, treats of the birth of Mary and her upbringing in the temple, concluding with the annunciation. Combined, both chapters tell the following events about Mary: her nativity, her seclusion in the temple from childhood, the annunciation, the birth of Jesus, the trial of calumny, and Mary's deliverance.

Does the Koran speak of Mary's final fate; has it hints of her Assumption? There are a few lesser references that have sometimes been construed that way, but Geagea does not see them as at all clear; one is in c. 23 (*The Believers*): "And we made Mary's Son and his mother to be a sign and gave them refuge upon a height where was a hollow and a spring."

The author's synthesis is that Mohammed presents Mary as both a *sign* (ayat) along with Jesus, a sign for all mankind; and an example for all. The Koran gives Mary a singular place among all women, she is the only woman whose name is given; no wife of Mohammed is expressly named, nor is his beloved daughter Fatima named. Mary's name occurs 34 times, after Moses and Abraham and Noah, but more than Adam and Lot or even Jesus. (Allah's name however is there 2,697 times!)

In two chapters (XXI, *The Prophets* and XXIII, *The Believers*) Mary is called 'a sign,' (XXIII), 'a sign unto all beings' (XXI). That Mary is sign flows from the place Allah in his omnipotence and providence has accorded her: predestination, purification, singular maternity, though not of course a divine maternity for Islam, union with Christ, and high dignity. To speak of an Immaculate Conception might seem indicated on verbal similarities, but there is no matching doctrine of original sin or redemption either. As for motherhood, much
though Mary be praised in her virginal maternity, a good part of Mohammed's insistence on this is polemic, to show that Jesus is not only truly man, but merely man. On Mary's dignity the words of the Koran sound like St. Luke: "Mary, God has chosen thee, and purified thee: He has chosen thee above all women" (III).

Mary is an example (mathal) in the Koran. It is not explicitly said that she belonged to Islam ante litteram, but when it is said that all who adhered to Allah before Mohammed were true Muslims, the same was said implicitly of Mary, as explicitly of Abraham and many other great figures of Old Testament and New, Jesus Himself and His apostles among them.

Mohammed sought to lift up the condition of women, regarding them as also believers. In Mary virgin, believer, devout, that is, one of the obedient, the Muslim woman sees an ideal model, and it is still the custom in some places, as Iran, for mothers to say to their small daughters: "Do not do this because Lady (Hazret) Mary (Maryam) would not have done it," and also here and there (Bagdad, Teheran, Mexico, too!) adolescent girls still keep in silence the fast of the Virgin, to receive as did Mary the word of God, recalling chapter XIX: Mary's words: "I have vowed to the All-merciful, a fast, and today I will not speak to any man," as also her being in the sanctuary under the care of her uncle Zachariah in III.

The study of sources does not suit Muslim mentality, which regards the Koran as dictated pure and simple by Allah to Mohammed by means of an angel. Hence, source criticism is antecedently irreverent, and the seeking of 'fontes' contrary to the faith of Islam. All the same, it was already noted centuries ago there was a correspondence between facts given about Mary in the Koran and in early Christian documents. Various theories have been suggested: a totally Jewish origin which Geagea dismisses as wild indeed; or, a Christian or Jewish/Christian origin. Geagea favors the recently proposed view of P. Yusuf Haddan that official Christianity did not influence
Islam directly, but a Christian sect did, some of whose members lived in Arabia, in Higaz where Mohammed was born and in Mecca. Mohammed came in contact with this sect and their movement, which explains the Jewish/Christian content of the Koran. After Mohammed consolidated his religion, the sect was absorbed and disappeared. From the north across Persia there was a Nestorian Christian influence; from the south, towards Ethiopia, a monophysite one. More particularly, a dependence can be shown on Christian literature, mainly the apocrypha, which Mohammed likely knew from oral tradition rather than from written documents.

To the 'historical facts' about Mary and Jesus which came from a Christian source, Mohammed added his own personal prophetic reflections. Borrowing from the great monotheistic religions of Judaism and Christianity, Mohammed forged his own rigid monotheism. What has been called the ‘‘irruzione creatrice’ of Mohammed fused the many elements. In Islam, Geagea writes, understood in its triple meaning of religion, community, state (civiltà), everything must begin with the Koran and keep the Koran in first place. The Koran is not considered by Muslims a work of genius on Mohammed’s part, but the word of God, infallible truth. The Marian elements are an integral part of the Koran, and share in that infallibility and light from God himself.

Geagea concludes with some ecumenical reflections. In the Marian sector Islam may seem to hold much in common with Catholic Christianity; in fact, there are basically enormous differences, as a glance at the Christian creed shows. Yet hopeful signs obtain: there is a Mohammedan veneration for Mary, Mother of Jesus the Prophet, the Muslim pilgrims frequent such famous shrines as her house in Ephesus, modern Turkey, near Izmir (ancient Smyrna). Geagea suggests dialogue might begin with the divine maternity, rooted in the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Mohammedans have a religious horror of the title, Mother of God. In their fierce loyalty to the one God
Muslims reject a Trinity which is in fact usually a tritheistic travesty of true Christian belief. Muslims react to a concept of the Trinity that consists of three divine beings: a father, a son and Mary the mother. Geagea repeats the warning of the 1970 guidelines from the Secretariat for non-Christians, a caution against entering ecumenical dialogue in a proselytizing spirit.

A recent number of Cahiers Marial from the Montfort Fathers of France, no. 89, Sept. 1, 1973, is mainly on the theme, 'with the Muslims,' taking cognizance of the 1,124,115 Mohammedans now living and working in France: from Turkey, Pakistan, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and Africa. As J. Ghys puts it in his introduction to this number, "more than an abstract study of Islam, it is meeting persons with trust and mutual respect that will help us receive and understand the many Muslims in our midst." I am not aware of any similar Muslim presence in the United States, though the phenomenon of the Black Muslims should perhaps not be overlooked.

There is a simple and illuminating interview Father Laurenceau, O.P. had with Muslim students, three girls in their early twenties. They discuss the place of women, the meaning of wife and mother, women's religious life as they see it, young people and religion, and finally Mary, mother of the prophet Jesus, and their view of Catholic devotion to her. The Little Sisters of Jesus working in the Middle East write of Christian and Muslim attitudes towards Mary in their experience, and the magazine prints here also the Marian texts of the Koran. The Sisters state strongly one must not discuss religious differences between Christian and Muslim, not even on points where we are closest, "for we have, on each side, a different way of conceiving the same things, and that which unites us in the simplicity of everyday life could separate us in intellectual discussion." With respect to Mary this means speaking of her with joy and respect, "sharing, in all freedom (gratuite) the profound joy of loving together the one who is for us a mother,
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and who is for our brothers a sweet and mysterious force, on which they count in times of distress and anguish, in all fidelity to the Koran which speaks of her as a sign."

The famous J. M. Abd-El-Jalil, O.F.M. contributes a significant article on the Marian Theology of Islam, filled with insights. Abd-El Jalil places the Marian theology in the context of Muslim faith in the cult due the one God, and their views on Christology, in profound disaccord with Christian doctrinal outlook. He calls attention to two Marian texts from the Koran that are especially meaningful to Muslims: One is often written in calligraphy in the mihrag, the niche in the mosque that points towards Mecca. It is from Sura III, v. 37:

Whenever Zachariah went in to her in the Sanctuary, he found her provisioned, "Mary," he said, "how comes this to thee?" "From God," she said. "Truly God provisions whomsoever he will without reckoning."

In consequence Zachariah prayed for an heir, who has given him.

The other text is from XIX, the story of Mary giving birth to Jesus by the trunk of a palm tree, which God commands her shake, "and there shall come tumbling upon thee dates fresh and ripe. Eat therefore and drink, and be comforted. . . ." Muslims often say: "shake also to thee the palm-trunk. . . .", to stir up their courage in difficulty.

Father Abd-El-Jalil's new article concludes much as in his Marian Era one of 1961, in fact, some of the sentences are the same; he writes: "Polemics will not bring peace to the hearts of Christians and Moslems, nor will it foster beneficial studies and humble meditation. We absolutely need as Christians to make a sincere effort toward an accurate understanding of Muslims. This effort cannot be separated from the living witness; 'expressing the truth in charity' is more than ever necessary today, when we are inescapably on show to all our brother human beings, whatever their religion or their unbelief. The
mystery of Mary which especially needs to be put into living practise among the Molelms is that of the Visitation; humble bearers of the presence and of the 'sentiments' of Jesus, we will go to meet those who do not know him and misunderstand him. His Spirit will do the rest.”

B. Ecumenical Events:

The second main category in this survey is “our Lady and Christian ecumenism,” and I refer in particular to two events of the past year, the first was the international ecumenical conference held at Birmingham, England, Easter week, April 23-27, on the theme, *Mary in the Bible*, under the English Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the second was the Catholic University seminar, *The Virgin Mary in Ecumenical Perspective*, held June 11-15, under 'Continuing Education.'

Organizer of the English gathering was Mr. H. Martin Gillett, founder and secretary of the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who had planned also the London meeting of 1971 on the theme, *The Blessed Virgin in the Church Today*. Another meeting for Easter time 1975 is already in planning, on the theme *Mary in the Divine Scheme for the Redemption*. Co-Presidents at Birmingham were Anglican Bishop Cyril K. Sansbury, general secretary of the British Council of Churches, and Catholic Bishop Alan Clark, of the Roman Catholic Ecumenical Commission, and theologian in his own right as you may have noticed in his piece on *virginitas in partu* in the current (December 1973) issue of *Theological Studies*. The opening session was Easter Monday evening, April 23, with about 150 in attendance from many Christian Churches. Both presidents spoke: Bishop Sansbury outlined the hope of the week, not hiding the difficulties. From deeper down in Protestant soil even than grass roots, he said, there is the conviction Roman Catholics worship the Virgin Mary, but don’t believe in God, while Protestants say, “We worship God, but don’t believe in the Virgin Mary.” The conference was a response to
the clarifications of the Second Vatican Council, and especially to the greater use of Scripture; fruitful dialogue will come through common study of the Bible. The Conference has been set in the framework of the Eucharist, said Bishop Sansbury, even though we share the pain of not receiving together the body and blood of Christ. It was a striking feature of the week, along with many common prayer services, to see the members attending each other’s eucharistic celebrations.

Bishop Clark said in his opener that wherever Mary is to be found today, and whatever importance she may have in our respective traditions, one thing is certain: she is there in the Bible. The problem is how to reconcile the freedom of her biblical simplicity with the undoubted theological depth she inspires; hence the need to reflect on our faith if we take seriously our ecumenical commitment. “We are united in our acceptance of the good news of the Gospel and in that good news we find Mary.”

There were eight major papers through the week; I had the lead spot, speaking of systematic theology of the Blessed Virgin in relation to exegesis, developing a paper given in 1965 in Santo Domingo. Other speakers and subjects were as follows: Sebastian Brock of Cambridge spoke of Mary in the Syriac tradition, both the Golden Age, illustrated by Ephrem (4th C.) and Jacob of Sarug (5/6th C.), and liturgical texts still in use in the Jacobite-Monophysite and also the Nestorian Churches. Critical editions of writings of both Ephrem and Jacob of Sarug have recently appeared.3

Professor Duncan Derrett (the University of London) read the paper, Mary in Midrash and Mary in Fact, appealing to the law and customs of the time of Jesus for a better understanding especially of the Virgin Birth, which he himself regarded as

non-miraculous. Two Catholic Scripture scholars who were present, R. Laurentin of France and J. McHugh of England, took strong exception to Dr. Derrett's views. Without sharing either his premises or his conclusions, I feel Derrett made a good point in saying: "we cannot understand the New Testament, unless we are tolerant of the flow of ideas from the Old Testament, and not from the Old Testament alone, for they had a commentary which we do not have unless we study the same materials."

Donal Flanagan of Ireland gave a prayer on Luther's Commentary on the Magnificat, a subject to which he has also devoted one of his seminars at Maynooth. He won the praise of German Lutheran pastor W. Borowsky, whose own paper was, The Role of Mary in the Bible; the Viewpoint of a Lutheran. Father John McHugh, Professor of Scripture at Ushaw, spoke on The Woman Clothed with the Sun (Apoc. 12), as one of a series of papers he has given in recent years on Mary in St. John's writings, which are to appear finally in book form. Father Fidelis Buck, Jesuit from Canada, gave an illustrated lecture one evening, The Marian Shrines in Bible Lands—a good cut above a Sunday School magic lantern show!

René Laurentin was present throughout the conference and spoke on Mary in the Communion of Saints, the only paper that has so far been printed. Published last fall by the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it runs 44 pages, with the notes and bibliography, and is difficult to summarize briefly and yet fairly. The development was historical, as the titles of the three parts show: part one: The Communion of Saints: Basis of Theological Consideration of the Mother of Jesus; part two: The Spirit of Fellowship Lost in a Mist of Hierarchy; and part three: Reconversion During the Second Vatican Council. Laurentin opened by noting the strange neglect of his topic, considering the ecumenical importance of 'Mary in the communion of saints.' "This silence is really astonishing," he said, "for the communion of saints is one of the soundest ground-
bases for all theological reflection about the Mother of Jesus." Beginning with the Bible, especially Mary's place in fellowship with the apostles and the brethren before Pentecost, Laurentin went on to the so-called 'anti-mariological' texts from the public life: the true kinsmen in all three synoptics (Mt. 12, 50; Mk. 3, 35; Lk. 8, 21); the enthusiastic woman (Luke only, 11, 27); and Jesus' words at the wedding feast of Cana (John 2). To hold such texts as anti-familial, argued Laurentin, destroys the gospel balance and contradicts His advice to honor father and mother. The gospels show Jesus withdrawing from His family only to draw closer to them later on, as when He was twelve and lost and found in the temple, and again after the Cana wedding.

For both St. Luke and St. John, Mary is figure of the believing community; she is the representative type of the Church. St. Luke sounds the communitarian note repeated: the whole congregation was outside praying as Zechariah entered the Lord's sanctuary; all the neighbors in the hill country rejoice in John the Baptist's birth; at the presentation, Anna the prophetess spoke 'of the child to all who looked forward to the deliverance of Jerusalem.' In St. John, Mary gives birth to a new race, as the daughter of Zion, joining John 16 (Last Supper) to John 19 (Calvary).

Beyond the Scriptures Laurentin gave a brief exposé of the liturgy, concentrating, as he said, on one supremely important and incontestable fact, namely, the mention of Mary in the canon of the Mass. The Roman communicantes (now eucharistic prayer No. One), "communicantes et memoriam venerantes, in primis gloriosae semper Virginis Mariae Genitricis Dei et Domini nostri Jesus Christi," occurs in Rome from the mid-5th century, while Eastern anaphoras show it from the beginning of the 300's. Laurentin's words: "This liturgical text is an extension from the Acts of the Apostles, where Mary is placed in the koinonia of the first Christian community. But in the eucharistic anaphora Mary occupies the foreground; she is not behind the
apostles but *in front* of them. The strong form of expression used to convey this forefront position (*in primis*) is meant to imply a real priority of honor."

Laurentin, in part two, traced a gradual obscuring of the sense of fellowship in favor of installing the Virgin Mary above the Church, most of all in the stratification of the medieval society. The reaction of the Reformers to abuses associated with an extreme separation of Mary from the rest of the Church led to the forbidding of all invocation of St. Mary. In turn, the Counter-Reformation extolled the Virgin Mary even more, sometimes with embarrassing extravagance.

The Second Vatican Council, maintains Laurentin, achieved a re-conversion, with the Mother of Jesus seen again in the fellowship which is the Church. In the dogmatic constitution on the Church, the second chapter is on the people of God. Chapter One is on the Church as 'mystery.' 'The people of God' was made the second chapter, ahead of the chapter on the hierarchy, to show that the Church is primarily a communion, a fellowship, a community sharing the life of God. In this perspective, the hierarchy including the *servus servorum*, the Holy Father, is seen as a humble ministry within the Church. Chapter eight on the Virgin Mary is in the same perspective; by her own self-identification she is 'the handmaid of the Lord.' Significantly, chapter eight follows chapter seven, on the communion of saints.

What brought about this change at the Council? In part, it was the democratic process, but this was "a somewhat superficial factor," says Laurentin. The true cause was a return to the Gospel. The Church is fellowship; Mary is member and image of the Church. A shift has taken place from the ontological (or hierarchical) to the existential, from *privilege* to *sharing*. Mary is neither understudy for Christ, nor substitute for the Holy Spirit. Rather she remains the primordial witness before the other members of Christ's Body, for she is especially joined to Him. Our Lady is not a cult object separate from
Christ; rather, her human presence in and through the Holy Spirit shows us the way to Christ. Her motherly presence, as in John 19, is first of all a sisterly presence, as in the Acts of the Apostles.

At the very end, R. Laurentin put this question: "Why does Protestantism tend to reduce the Communion of Saints to the fellowship of the living, and seem almost allergic to fellowship with the witnesses who lived before us—the Twelve and the Blessed Virgin included? Is it simply a reaction against the cult of the saints? Or are there deeper reasons for it? Has there already been a change in this key-attitude? Can it still change in the Reformed Tradition? This question demands deeper consideration." Anglican Bishop Sansbury started the discussion by saying that evangelicals put great value on the Pauline statement that to die is gain, yet were scandalized by the abuses of chantry Masses. He commented further that prayer for the dead and infant baptism are both second generation questions, and suggested that if the abuses had been attached to infant baptism rather than to prayer for the dead in the pre-Reformation period, then such prayer might have come over into Protestantism. With the current scepticism about life after death, prayer for the dead is also rejected. Mr. Penn, officially representing the Free Churches at the Conference, said that if R. Laurentin's views were gaining ground among Catholics, Protestants would regard this as hopeful, though he reported also the lasting fear of Free Church people that Roman Catholics put another Mediator in the structure of salvation. Views on the communion of saints vary greatly from denomination to denomination, he said. Out of his own personal Presbyterian background he holds the communion of the departed, though without special reference to the saints; there is no reason, he added, why this should be so.

Mary and the Communion of saints was a topic of recurring interest also in the June week's Seminar on the Virgin Mary in Ecumenical Perspective, held at the Catholic University of
America. The first day I devoted the morning to an introduction and recommended readings; in the afternoon Fr. Peter Kearney, my colleague in the department of theology at Catholic University, joined me in presenting the complementary views on Mary of biblical and systematic theology. On Friday morning I summarized and offered suggestions for further study. On Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, representatives of other Christian Churches addressed us, and took part in discussions: Dr. Lawrence Folkemer, Lutheran of Gettysburg; British-born Anglican Reginald H. Fuller, well-known writer on New Testament topics, now teaching at Alexandria Episcopal Seminary, Virginia; Father John Meyendorff of the Orthodox Church; and Dr. Ross Mackenzie, Scottish-born, now teaching at the Richmond, Virginia, Union Theological Seminary, who presented the Presbyterian position. Fr. Fred. M. Jelly, O.P., of our Society, was on the program, both as discussion partner, and as the Catholic speaker on a panel with Dr. Mackenzie at an evening ecumenical forum opened to the public.

As samples of the week's lectures, none of which has yet appeared in print, I offer brief comment on Fr. P. Kearney's paper, and Dr. Fuller's and Dr. Mackenzie's lectures. Fr. Kearney emphasized that the Gospels regard Mary as an Old Testament figure. Mary's words, "all nations shall call me blessed," echo the prophet Malachi (3, 12). Mary speaks for all Israel, as 'daughter of Zion," a note found also in the Annunciation narrative. The Johannine writings, both Gospel and Apocalypse, show us Israel in transition, moving from the woman figure of the Old Testament people of God to the new woman figure, the emerging Christian Church. The story of the 'enthusiastic woman' of Luke, Chapter 11, with her cry, "blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts that nursed you," recalls Proverbs (10, 1 and 23, 25) on the wise son who brings joy to his father and mother. The Savior's reply turns the compliment from His own person to the new people He
is forming, as Jesus uses the Deuteronomistic phrase, "Rather blessed are the who hear the word of God and keep it."

Dr. Fuller reported Anglican views of past and present. His opinions on our differences, as well as his veneration for the Mother of Jesus, are known to a wide audience through his regular comments on the Sunday and holyday liturgy in *Worship* magazine; in the November, 1973 number he commented on the Immaculate Conception readings (and prayers), with a gentle but clear Anglican disclaimer as to the doctrine itself; and he has done similarly for the Assumption. Dr. Fuller's commentaries, completing the three years of the New Lectionary in the January 1974, *Worship*, are to appear in book form from the Liturgical Press during 1974. He spoke also of the late 19th century debate on the Virgin birth, and Bishop Charles Gore's classic defense of the literal understanding, again under attack in Bishop John Robinson's recent book, *The Human Face of God*. For his own part, Dr. Fuller holds the Christological value of the infancy chapters takes precedence over their literal character; hence he regards the virginal conception of Jesus more as kerygmatic affirmation than as report of historical fact—the view he set forth in an article of some years ago, *The Virgin Birth: Historical Fact or Kerygmatic Truth?*—which summarized the present century's Anglican thought (*Biblical Research*, 1 [1956] 1-8).

Anglican attitude towards the saints expresses itself in a double manner: the first way is open praise of them, more apostrophe than invocation; the second form is commonly called 'comprecation,' meaning 'we pray to God that strengthened by the saints' prayers we attain unto him.' My comment was that our Roman Catholic practice admits 'comprecation' but we are also accustomed to 'talk directly to the saints.' About 'calling upon our Lady,' Anglican outlook might be summed up thus, Dr. Fuller said: "We don't say we shouldn't do it; and some of us may do it; but we don't know that we can do it." Wide though the Anglican umbrella may be, in some
sectors at least there is a growing strength to what Dr. Fuller classified as 'some of us may do it,' for example Bishop William Chadwick, Anglican Bishop of Barking, said in July, 1972, at an ecumenical conference held at Ampleforth Abbey, England (his paper has appeared in the *Ampleforth Journal*, Autumn, 1972, *Mary and Ecumenism*, cf. there also, 1973, an extensive, perceptive report on the Birmingham meeting on *Mary in the Bible*): "She is no longer the prerogative of Catholics. The Churches are saying: give us a share in the Virgin’s prayers, she who is caught up into the power of the Resurrection."

Dr. Mackenzie spoke of *The Mother of God is Reformed Piety*. He began with John Calvin's reasons for rejecting Marian cult: 1) such cult is not founded on the Scriptures, which stress rather the glory of God; 2) Marian cult is religiously dangerous, for it imperils the understanding of Christ as our one Savior; 3) it is a dogmatic distortion to hold that Mary cooperated even in the redemptive work of Christ on the cross. Along with such criticism, the Reformers sought to bring out the biblical portrait of Mary, and the meaning of the phrase in the creed, "born of the Virgin Mary." They held she remained also a virgin, and regarded her with the Bible as the 'highly favored one.' But they forbade all invocation of Mary. After considering some recent developments, especially the diversity of Calvinist/Presbyterian views in the virgin birth, Dr. Mackenzie put this question: "What does it mean in our day to proclaim Mary blessed and to find her place in the liturgy and prayer of the Church?" He said that Protestants must examine their consciences to see if their attitudes on Mary are simply reactions to Catholic excesses. Finally he said: "God calls mankind to the fulness of which Jesus Christ is the revelation and means and goal. Mary was the first to respond to this call, and she remains the sign and stimulus of our praise.

---

of God. And as Luther said, ‘To praise the Lord with gladness is not a human work.’”

B. de Margerie, S.J. in Esprit et Vie, 26 July 1973, L’Immaculée Conception et l’Assomption dans l’unité de l’Église, puts this double question: “Is Church union possible without the common recognition of Mary as Immaculate and assumed into heaven? Are we facing true development or dogmatic reduction?”

C. Scriptures and Other Resources:

In his address in England Laurentin could only find one comparatively recent study on the scene from the Acts of the Apostles, by Cardinal Bea at the Roman congress of 1950, printed in Alma Socia Christi, v. 6, fasc. 1, 1952: “Erant perseverantes . . . cum Maria matre Jesus in communicatione fractionis panis (Atti 1:14; 2:42).” To illustrate the third main section of this survey, np., scripture and other ‘sources,’ the first notice is of Benedetto Prete’s article in the special Marian number of Sacra Doctrina: “Il sommario di Atti 1, 13-14 e suo apporto per la conoscenza della Chiesa delle origini,” 65-124, a study that reads delightfully well. He takes the pericope in context, thought for thought, word for word, relating it to the rest of the Bible, particularly other similar summary statements in Acts. The bond (so also in Bea, 1950) between Acts 1:14 and 2:42 is the best known: 2, 42 reads: “they remained faithful to the teaching of the apostles, to the brotherhood, to the breaking of bread and to the prayers.”

With a caution against both extremes, one that says too much of our Lady in Acts Ch. One, giving her royal powers in the young Church (da Spinatoli), the other that will say no more than simply that this is the last mention of Mary in the New Testament (G. Stählin), Prete makes the following points, among others. Mary is called ‘mother of Jesus,’ that Jesus of whom the previous verses in the same chapter of Acts have been speaking—who after his suffering appeared alive to his
disciples, "appearing to them over the course of 40 days and speaking to them about the reign of God," commanding them finally to wait in Jerusalem for the "fulfillment of my Father's promise," the baptism with the Holy Spirit. There is a continuity between Jesus who suffered and was raised up, and the Church which is His Body. The Second Vatican Council, restrained though it was on interpreting New Testament allusions to Mary, saw a parallel between the conception and birth of Jesus under the power of the Spirit in the Nativity chapters and the infancy of the Church in the Acts. "All these with one accord devoted themselves to prayer, together with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers." (New Oxford Annotated, 1973). Prete appraises the adverb homothumadón, for which 'with one accord' seems a good translation, specially since 'accord,' etymologically, comes from the word, cor, heart. Prete suggests Acts 4, 32, as capturing this sense of homothumadón: unione dei cuori. "The whole group of believers was united heart and soul..." "One only heart" is an echo of the unanimity at Sinai in Exodus 19, "Everything the Lord has said we will do," taken as the attitude typical of the community gathered in prayer. The note 'with one accord' goes well with the koinonia of the early Christians of the Acts, as 2:42, 'the brotherhood' or the 'fellowship.'

The same issue of Sacra Doctrina has a short article by C. Spicq, O.P. on Jn. 2:1-11, entitled, Il primo miracolo de Gesù dovuto a sua Madre; he counsels keeping in check the symbolic interpretation. His conclusion concerning Mary's role in this primarily Christological sign is: "That prayer to Mary is efficacious and that it can affect the moment fixed by Providence for the entrance on the scene of the Incarnate Son of God... Prayer to Mary is inserted into the Divine plan, and the Father takes account of it in determining the opportune times in the economy of salvation."

The Appendix to this Survey mentions other biblical studies. For the moment a quick salute to the Father E. Maly's The
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On the virginal conception of Jesus Father R. E. Brown's attention-attracting lecture of the fall of 1971 came out in somewhat revised form in the spring of 1973 as a paperback, along with another essay, The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus. In this printing he takes a clear stand on behalf of a literal virginal conception, something not done by Father Joseph Fitzmyer, S.J., in the conference just printed in the December, 1973, Theological Studies, entitled Virginal Conception in the New Testament, originally given at the fifth annual theological seminar for Bishops held July, 1973. I was on the same program with Fr. Fitzmyer, and presented a status quaestionis on the virginal conception from the systematic theologians's standpoint, and said that I regard a literal virginal conception as taught by the ordinary teaching of the Church, and so, binding teaching. Father Fitzmyer does not; we did not debate it in July, nor shall I here.

I note only three points: First, I do not see on what grounds Father Fitzmyer declares that dogmatic theologians are not agreed on the normative character or binding force of the constant and ordinary magisterium in this matter. Admittedly this is not the main concern of Father Fitzmyer's biblical study, but it is a vital point all the same, and it would facilitate consideration and discussion of his legitimate questions to know what measures he has used to reach the position that "it does not seem to be the case at the moment" that dogmatic theologians are in agreement about the normative character or binding force of the constant and ordinary magisterium.

My second point of disagreement concerns Fr. Fitzmyer's remark that the Council's wish not to decide questions under

---

discussion by theologians, as stated in Chapter 8 of *Lumen gentium*, extends to this issue, no more than I can agree that conciliar references to Virgin Mary can all be called 'stock phrases.' Consider for example the statement on religious life in *Lumen gentium*, no. 46:

Religious should carefully consider that through them, to believers and non-believers alike, the Church truly wishes to give an increasingly clearer revelation of Christ... as the example of so many saintly founders shows, the counsels are especially able to pattern the Christian man after that manner of virginal and humble life which Christ the Lord elected for Himself, and which his virgin mother also chose (emphasis added).

My third point is that, though I leave to exegetes the thorny problems of the New Testament witness to the virginal conception, I note in this respect that some other Catholic experts, also cognizant of the biblical difficulty, do accept the literal virginal conception as the binding teaching of the Church today, for example, R. Brown, W. Dalton, S.J., of Australia, and A. Feuillet. Bruce Vawter's recent book, *This Man Jesus*, shows that there is no convincing biblical argument against the literal virginal conception of Jesus, nor against the life-long virginity of Mary, His mother, for silence is not the final word in the Church's understanding.

Harvey McArthur wrote January, 1973, in *Novum Testamentum* a study of the 'Son of Mary' title from St. Mark, concluding to a basically neutral narrative use, not a possible insult on the part of the neighbors, nor an oblique reference to the virgin birth. The title enters to a slight degree in the April, 1973, *Novum Testamentum* in J. D. Crossan's extended article on *Mark and the Relatives of Jesus*, which makes no judgment on their precise identity, but considers their place in Mark's gospel in form-critical assessment.

---

D. Life and Devotion:

Under this section many titles might fall. Here the communion of saints enters again, in special interest liturgical publications and in journals of the Orthodox Church. *Questions liturgiques*, from Mont César, Louvain, has much on the communion of saints in its double number ending the year 1972, including a report on the 19th study week of St. Sergius, Paris, July, 1972, which was on *communio sanctorum*, described as ‘a reality too much overlooked in the actual liturgy.’ The paper by Alexis Kniazef was then printed in full in the first 1973 number of *Questions liturgiques*, jan-mars (54 yr): *La Presence liturgique de la Mère de Dieu*. The intercession of the Theoktokos is one of Kniazef’s topics; her role in the eucharistic anaphora(s) is another. Kniazef chose not to include the Mariology of the ikons in his paper. But that is a whole rich world on which there is a huge literature, a neglected *locus theologicus* we may hope will be one day investigated, with great ecumenical profit. Its ramifications comprise West as well as East. The events of the 8th century and their resolution at the 7th Ecumenical Council, the second of Nicea, 787 A.D., speak still to the traditional understanding of Mary’s place not simply in Christian iconography, but in her role as intercessor in the communion of saints. *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 3rd number of 1973, had an article on the theology of the defenders of icons during the controversy. The same number had an interesting, if somewhat acerbic article, on Charles Péguy who died in World War I, William Rush’s *The Spirit of Truth and the Mystery of Charles Péguy*. Mr. Rush finds Péguy very close to the spirit of the Orthodox Church and writes of his love for Our Lady of Chartres who never disappointed him, even in death. Finally, Father Alexander Schmemann contributes a piece titled, *Concerning Women’s Ordination: A Letter to an Episcopal Friend*, which is a strong rejection of priesthood for

---

women as completely contrary to the living tradition of the Orthodox Church, and its deep sense of the Church as mystery, not simply as institution or power structure, and a serious peril to ecumenical dialogue between East and West. At the end of the letter, Father Schmemann offers a word or two on our Lady:

Creation itself, the Church herself, man and the world themselves, when contemplated in their ultimate truth and destiny, are revealed to us as a Bride, as a Woman clothed in the sun; why in the very depth of her love and knowledge, of her joy and communion, the Church identifies herself with one Woman whom she exalts as "more honorable than the Cherubim, and beyond compare more glorious than the Seraphim."


---


9 Available from L.A.S., Piazza dell'Ateneo Salesiano 1, 00139, Rome; no. 8 in the *Academi Mariana Salesiana* series.
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Lourdes in recent years, sends "both theologians and sociologists away with some good hard facts to mull over." Laurentin's article was in a 1973 volume (no. 81) of Concilium, titled The Persistence of Religion. Teresa Braun writes in the July-August, 1972, La Vie Spirituelle of The Mother of God in Polish Catholicism, an inspiring insight into a rich world of piety non-Polish people know little about.

Mention was made above of the September 1973 number of Cahiers Marials (n. 89). Here are highlights from other issues.\(^{10}\) The final 1972 number (85, 15 Nov.) was on "spiritual childhood as an adult spirituality," illustrated particularly in St. Therese of the Child Jesus, born in 1873. H. Holstein and A.M. Carré were among the authors. During the centenary year other pieces appeared on St. Therese's devotion to Mary, as by R. Laurentin.\(^{11}\)

January, 1973, (n. 86), took up consecration, with understandable emphasis on St. Louis Grignion de Montfort's 'total gift to Christ by Mary.' H. Cazelles of Catholic University, Washington, D.C., wrote a biblical study of 'sacred,' of 'God consecrating himself,' and of 'Christ, the holy one of God, consecrated in his humanity,' and how this affects us all, especially through Mary.

The April issue (n. 87) reported on the AOM meeting of February, 1973 (The association of Marian Works, Association des oeuvres mariales); the subject was Mary in the Prayer and Concerns of Christians. Principal speaker was Père Manaranche, S.J., four of whose conferences are given here. They are reprinted from Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse et sociale, as noted in the Review for Religious bibliography.\(^{12}\) One lecture was on 'praying to Mary,' a point the speaker developed even more at

---

\(^{10}\) Cahiers Marials, 5 times a year, $5.00, from 80 rue de la Tombe-Issoire, Paris 14.


the request of his hearers. He writes well of the often misunderstood term, intercession, and Mary's place in union with Christ. St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises* is cited as a good example. Manaranche's final paper from the Marian Associations days of February, 1973, on the 'virginity of Mary,' appeared in the next number (88, June 15, 1973). He brings in current questions on the virgin birth and answers them clearly and strongly. Through these numbers B. Billet, O.S.B., continues his *Essai de bilan marial (1965-1972)*, which began with n. 82, ran through nn. 83, 84, 85, to conclude here in n. 87.

Number 88, June, is the size of many a paperback; seventy-plus pages present the papers read at the May, 1972, 25th anniversary meeting of the reactivated French-speaking Canadian Mariological Society. The founder was Marcel Bélanger, O.M.I., who died September 1972, and whose life and writings are briefly surveyed. Père T. Koehler, here with us for our own 25th anniversary, was at the May, 1972, Ottawa meeting, and read a paper on *The Present State of Research in Mariology*, printed in *Cahiers Marials*. Fr. Koehler devotes the second part of his paper to 'Mary, blessed from generation to generation,' in five pictures: a) the biblical portrait; b) Mary, the Church and the liturgy; c) our Lady and modern times, that is, Reformation and afterwards; d) the appearances of Mary; and a brilliant final section e) 'une icône modelée par l'Esprit,' ranging over psychology, iconography and theology.

Paul Hitz, C.SS.R., spoke of *Mary in Present-day Pastoral Practice*. He wrote at greater length on the same theme in *Studia moralia* of the *Alphonsianum*.¹³ N. Provencher, O.M.I., of Ottawa, and G. Langevin, S.J., of Laval, Quebec, spoke briefly of methods of approach to Mary in teaching theology. The Canadian Mariological Society met again this past October, in Quebec, under the presidency of H.-M. Guindon, O.M.I., but

I have not seen their program or heard of publication plans.

The final 1973 Cahiers Marials (n. 90, 15 Novembre) expands the theme, *Do You Believe in the Holy Spirit*, with studies by H. Cazelles (St. Paul on Charisms, and relationship of the apostolate to the Eucharist), A.-M. de Monléon (surprising points of resemblance between pentecostal phenomena and the Lourdes experience), H.-M. Manteau-Bonamy (Mary’s place in the charismatic movement), and H. Holstein (discernment of spirits and allied reflections). In the chronique A. Bossard reports on the meeting of the French Society of Marian Studies, September, 1973, on the theme, *Une femme, Marie, signe d’espérance*. Summaries are given of the papers by R. Laurentin, Madame Piveteau-Laurenceau, Dom B. Billet, O.S.B. (Jung’s views of Mary as archetypal woman), Père Laurenceau, H. Cazelles, P.S.S., and a Mr. Lash, Anglican deacon from England, Fr. Théodore Koehler, S.M., spoke on *Marian Studies and Psychological Research*. (At the St. Petersburg meeting, Fr. Koehler, whose activities span his native France and the U.S., where he serves as curator of the Dayton Marian Library, served as discussion leader for this Survey, and also reported briefly on the recent French gathering).

When in Australia last summer I spoke at a late vocation seminary in Sydney, and referred to Carlo Carretto’s book, *Letters from the Desert* (Orbis, Maryknoll, N.Y., 1972; also Darton, Longman and Todd, London, pb., 1972). One of the seminarians knew Carretto, prominent in Italian Catholic Action before he joined the Little Brothers of de Foucauld in the African desert; he told me he had tried in vain right after the Council to find an American publisher for the translation from the Italian 1964 original. Chapter 17, *The Friendly Night*, has some incisive comment on the faith of Mary and Joseph; and in chapter 7, *The Stages of Prayer*, the author reflects about animated arguments on the pros and cons on the rosary during his ‘life as a European.’ Then he adds: ‘It was in the desert that I came to realise that those who discuss the rosary—as I
discussed it in that way—have not yet understood the soul of this prayer. The rosary belongs to that type of prayer which precedes or accompanies the contemplative prayer of the spirit. Whether you meditate it or not, whether or not you get distracted, if you love the rosary deeply and can't let a day go by without saying it, you are already a person of prayer. The rosary is like the echo of a wave breaking on the shore, God's shore: 'Hail Mary... Hail Mary... Hail Mary...' It is like your mother's hand on your childhood cradle. The rosary is a point of arrival not of departure. ... The rosary is an incomprehensible prayer for the 'commonsense' man, just as it is incomprehensible to repeat 'I love you' a thousand times a day to a God one cannot see. But for the pure of heart it is understandable; the person rooted in the Kingdom and living the beatitudes understands the rosary.'

APPENDIX

Further Selection of Recent Writings in Mariology:


A. POPES AND BISHOPS:

1. Pope Paul VI, Voi sapete, to general audience, May 30, 1973, English in weekly L'Osservatore Romano, June 7, 1973, Need to renew our devotion to the Blessed Virgin
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Mary to obtain the grace of the Holy Spirit; also Our Lady's Digest, Sept.-Oct. 1973.


4. The Dimensions of the Priesthood (Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, 1973) also pb.: 'Marian Dimension' is one section, from Pius XII and Paul VI.


B. SCRIPTURES:

1. B. Billet, ed., Ton Dieu marche avec toi, Paroles de Dieu sur le pèlerinage de la vie (Cahiers du Livre, Chambray-lès-Tours, 1973): biblical texts under many headings, section on B.V.M.

ing issue of the previous volume 2, for Advent and Christmas tide, 1971/1972, had articles by McNamara on the Immaculate Conception, Wansbrough on the Infancy narratives.


C. FATHERS:

1. S. Alvarez Campos, *Corpus Marianum Patristicum* (Burgos), five volumes have been announced, 1970 onwards, two have appeared; extended note by E. Toniolo, *Un nuovo 'corpus marianum,'* in *Marianum* 34 (1972) 475-8.


tus patiens' y la doctrina mariana en la Capadocia del siglo IV (Beauchesne, Paris, 1972).


D. GENERAL STUDIES; PARTICULAR DOCTRINES:

1. Ephemerides Mariologicae, under J. Alonso, C.M.F., is appearing regularly, with good multilingual coverage; vol. 23 (1973) fasc. 3, latest to come, has articles by G. Giambardini, O.F.M., V. Figuera (on Francis de Sales), and others; Buen Suceso, 22, Madrid-8, $10.00 a year.

2. Marianum continues to appear in spite of printing and posting troubles; no. 108, annus XXXV, fasc. I-II, 1973, is the latest; the volume will be completed by Bibliografía Mariana 1967-1971, again by G. M. Besutti, O.S.M. (Viale Trenta Aprile, 6, 00153 Rome; $11.00 a year).


4. H. J. Brosch and H. M. Köster, eds., Mythos und Glaube, v. 5 of Mariologische Studien (Driewer, Essen, 1973), from the German Mariological Society.

5. Estudios Marianos of the Spanish Mariological Society continues its steady output, v. 36, María en la Espiritualidad de la Iglesia, from the 1970 meeting, printed 1972; v. 37,

6. La Madre di Cristo nel dinamismo rinnovante dello Spirito Santo, in La Madonna, rivista di cultura mariana 20 (Set.-Dec., 1972): from the 12th 'national week of Marian studies,' held in Turin, Aug. 28-Sep. 1, 1972, papers by E. Toniolo, Card. Pellegrino, J. Galot. Next year's Survey will take notice of these Italian 'weeks' and their proceedings from 1961, as La Madonna nella catechesi (Naples, 1971, 11th week), with the rosary the theme of the 1970 week. Th, 1973 week, the 13th, was at Loreto on Mary's presence in the mission of evangelization.


11. Thomas Heath, O.P., Our Lady as Friend, in The Sign, June, 1973: by a theologian who is also a poet, a lyrical page of prose.


E. ECUMENISM:


2. Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., *The Virgin Mary in Ecumeni-
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3. John Coventry, S.J., Mary’s Place in our Redemption, in Mother of Jesus, series 2, no. 1, English Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1973: membership in the Society and its publications can be had through the Secretary, Mr. H. Martin Gillett, 237 Fulham Palace Road, London SW6, 6UB, England, annual fee one pound fifty pence.


F. LITURGY AND DEVOTIONS:


2. Dominican Sisters of North Guilford, Conn., Song of the New Sion (Montfort Publications, Bay Shore, N.Y., 1972) a record of shared prayer, psalms, meditations, prayers, 75¢ pamphlet.


29-43: on ancient Marian antiphon: 'Suscipe verbum, virgo Maria, quod tibi a Domino per angelum transmissum est, etc.'


**G. SAINTS AND HOLY PEOPLE:**


2. *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, fasc. LII-LIII (1972), fasc. LIV-LV (1973) has much relevant material, e.g., Jean Damascene, Jean Lydgate (Life of our Lady), Jacques de Sarouq, Jean Jenstejn of Prague (d. 1400, his vicar general was John Nepomucene), Jean Eudes, John the Evangelist and the Mother of Jesus (by D. Mollat).

3. Joseph Kentenich (1885-1968), founder of the Schönstatt Movement, is the subject of *Marianische Erziehung*. Päda
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gogische Tagung (Vallendar-Schönstatt, 1971). The article on the Schönstatt Sisters of Mary in the New Catholic Encyclopedia states: "The means employed by the movement are: 1st, a covenant of love with the Blessed Mother, as being the best way to Christ, and through him and in the Holy Spirit, to the Father."

4. Louis Pérouas, S.M.M., Ce que croyait Grignion de Montfort et comment il a vécu sa foi (Mame, Paris, 1973), for 300th anniversary of his birth.

5. E. Piacentini, Dottrina mariologica del P. Massimiliano Kolbe (Herder, Rome, 1972) one of many writings by Fr. Piacentini on his martyred conventual Franciscan confrere.

H. ARTS, BELLES LETTRES, CASSETTES, POTPOURRI:


2. Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., Blessed are You who Have Believed, November, 1973, release of the Conference-a-Month Club, 55 Demarest Ave., Englewood, N.J. 07631: both in cassette and record form; the other side has Herbert F. Smith, S.J. Teaching Others to Pray.

3. Frank E. Fortkamp, St. Mary and Her Problem Child, in U.S. Catholic, 38 (December, 1973): "since Mary trusted in the guiding hand of God even though she did not fully understand his vocation, she is the perfect model for today's parents."


5. Robert Kress, Mariology and the Christian's Self-Concept,
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in Review for Religious 31 (May, 1972) 414-419; I missed this in last year's Survey, by priest professor of the St. Louis School of Divinity.

6. Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie, founded by E. Kirschbaum, Vol. 3: Allgemeine Ikonographie, Laban-Ruth (Herder, 1971), as reviewed by Thomas Finan in Irish Theological Quarterly, April, 1973, has an outstanding article on Maria und Marienbild: Finan comments: "Irrespective of orthodoxy and whatever dialectical puritanism may suggest, the names of Rouault, Moore, Dali and others in this century indicate how deep goes the image of the divine Mother and Child as a shaping form of human desires."


8. Emilio Piovesan, Franciscus Mothensis Poeta, in Latinitas (Vatican, 1972): Francis of Motta, b. 1463, d. ab. 1537, wrote the poem here edited In Divae Mariae Laudem.


10. Colin Stephenson, Merrily on High (Morehouse-Barlow, N.Y., 1973), described in a fall, 1973, advertisement as 'a delightful, nostalgic backward glance,' from the Anglican author's 'first discovery of 'baroque' Anglo-Catholicism as a small boy in Brighton to the culmination of a notable priesthood as Warden of the Shrine of our Lady of Walsingham.'


12. Geoffrey Turner, Mythology and Marian Dogma, in New Blackfriars 54 (July, 1973) 303-313: our Lady's Virginity, Immaculate Conception, Assumption. See also the passing remarks by B. R. Brinkman, S.J., in On Sacramental Man:

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol25/iss1/14
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