

5-23-2014

### Editor's Preface

Thomas A. Thompson  
*University of Dayton*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies)

 Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Thompson, Thomas A. (2014) "Editor's Preface," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 65, Article 2.  
Available at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies/vol65/iss1/2](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol65/iss1/2)

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

## EDITOR'S PREFACE

---

The 65th annual meeting of the Mariological Society of America took place May 20–23, 2014, at Viterbo University (La Crosse, Wisconsin). The program, entitled “Forty Years after *Marialis Cultus*: Retrieval or Renewal,” was devoted to this significant document on Marian devotion issued by Paul VI in 1974. We were welcomed to the Diocese of La Crosse by Bishop Patrick Callahan: “For forty years,” he noted, “Pope Paul VI’s Apostolic Exhortation *Marialis Cultus* has led us deeper in the worship and love of God through the Blessed Virgin Mary, His chosen Vessel of Honor. . . . My prayer is that your time here will be filled with grace and joy, and, in union with Pope Francis’ prayer for the Church, lead you, filled with hope, to a life of service following Mary’s Son!”

La Crosse is the location of the Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, begun in 2004 and dedicated in 2008 by Raymond Leo Cardinal Burke. The shrine is a large Baroque structure nestled in the Wisconsin hills, with outdoor devotional areas, Stations of the Cross, and rosary walks. Pastoral care for the pilgrims who come to the shrine is provided by the Franciscans of the Immaculate.

Preceding *Marialis Cultus* (1974) was the document of the American bishops on Marian devotion, *Behold Your Mother* (1973). The Mariological Society did not devote a meeting to *Behold Your Mother*, although several of its members contributed to the document. At this meeting, with

help of notes from Fr. Eamon R. Carroll, OCarm, **Msgr. John T. Myler** spoke of the origin and development of this American document in his address entitled “At the Moment of *Marialis Cultus*: What the U.S. Bishops and Theologians Were Thinking.” During the “decade of the Marian silence” (1964-1974), it was John Cardinal Carberry of St. Louis who introduced the proposal for a pastoral letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary at the American bishops’ meeting at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in November 1970. In 1971, Fr. Eamon R. Carroll, OCarm (longtime member of the Mariological Society), became the principal writer. Members of the drafting committee (who were also MSA members) were Fr. Frederick Jelly, OP; Fr. Edward O’Connor, CSC; and Fr. Richard Kugelman, CP. Cardinal Carberry also engaged the support of a young priest of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Fr. Timothy Dolan (now Archbishop-Cardinal of New York).

Msgr. Myler was fortunate to have access to Fr. Eamon Carroll’s personal notes from the years the document was written and revised.<sup>1</sup> In the two years of preparation, over sixty suggestions (*modi*) were submitted by the American bishops for the document; a review of these suggestions indicated a difference among the bishops over whether the document should outline and develop the Virgin Mary’s relation to Christ or to the Church. The American document

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Guide to the Father John T. Myler ‘Behold Your Mother’ Research Collection, 1968–2005,” in the Archival and Special Collections of the Marian Library (ML.038), available at [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/finding\\_aid/75/](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/finding_aid/75/).

was written independently of Paul VI's *Marialis Cultus*. Among the differences between the two documents was the section on the rosary: *Behold Your Mother*, in addition to the traditional form of the rosary, encouraged experimentation with the form (e.g., formulation of new mysteries of the rosary; insertion of readings, hymns), whereas Paul VI, to avoid further confusion, decided not to change the traditional manner of praying the rosary.

The American document underwent four revisions, and was promulgated on November 21, 1973, at a Mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. Interestingly, Bishop Fulton Sheen voted against the document, saying that it was not sufficiently engaging: that it “lacked blood.” However, it was also the time when the attention of the National Conference of American Bishops was focused on a response to the Supreme Court decision on *Roe vs. Wade* (January 22, 1973).

The presentations at this year's program reflected the “broadening” of Marian devotion that resulted from directives given in *Marialis Cultus*. **Dr. Mary McCaughey** spoke of Marian spirituality—to be distinguished from Marian devotion—which is developing in new ecclesial groups such as Focolare, the Emmanuel Community, Youth 2000, and the Marian charismatic movement. This spirituality stems from *Lumen Gentium* and the guidelines for the renewal of Marian devotion in *Marialis Cultus*. All Marian devotion must in some way be related to Christ, the Holy Spirit, Scripture, the Church. This spirituality begins focused on the person of Mary as a member of the Church and then leads to a contextual spirituality of communion. More than a simple act of devotion, it promotes living

Mary's receptivity to the Triune God at every stage of the journey of life through faith, hope, and love. Through this devotion, lived as a Marian spirituality, the nature of the Church is made manifest as the sacrament of the communion of God and humanity.

**Dr. Patricia A. Sullivan** developed the relation between Marian spirituality and Marian devotion. *Marialis Cultus* (MC 16–20) speaks of the “attitudes of devotion” which bind the Church to the Virgin Mary: “profound veneration ... burning love ... trusting ... invocation ... loving service ... profound wonder ... attentive study.” The question arises of the difference between Marian spirituality and Marian devotion/Marian devotions. Some today would speak of a Marian devotion that transcends states, styles, and formulas and is centered on Christ and the Church. But, within the larger framework of spirituality, will that which is distinctive about the person of Mary—her singular dignity and mission—be absorbed into a larger context? In a spirituality centered on the Trinity, how does one express that which is specific to Mary? These specific traits of devotion can assist in the development of a Marian spirituality (MC 22). An interplay between devotion and spirituality is suggested: they nourish each other.

Relying on previously unpublished correspondence, **Dr. Laetitia Rhatigan** spoke of the letters which Fr. Patrick Peyton, CSC, addressed to participants of Vatican II. During the time of the Council, Fr. Peyton wrote to Cardinals Cicognani and Suenens and to Archbishop Edward Louis Heston, CSC, urging that the Council encourage family prayer and the Family Rosary. Vatican II did refer to the family as the “domestic Church” in *Gaudium et Spes* (48),

and in the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (*Apostolicam Actuositatem*). After Vatican II, along with many others, Peyton was puzzled by the apparent “victory” of liturgy over devotion, and, in 1969, he wrote an impassioned letter to Paul VI, asking the pope to “enhance, enrich and raise to a higher level of efficacy ... the Family Rosary, by proclaiming it a liturgical prayer.” Peyton’s letter led to Paul VI’s *Marialis Cultus*, with its section on the evangelical nature of the rosary and encouragement of the Family Rosary (MC 52).

**Fr. Emery de Gaál** spoke of the contribution that Cardinal Scheffczyk made to Mariology after Vatican II. Not well known to English readers, Cardinal Scheffczyk was responsible for over 1,200 scholarly articles (about 200 on Marian topics). He contributed much to reference works for German readers; he collaborated with Remigius Bäumer on the multi-volume *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, and he edited the “indispensable” *Marienlexikon* (1991–94) and was the co-founder of *Forum Katholische Theologie*. In many places in Europe, courses on Mariology, spirituality, and pneumatology have disappeared; Christianity is presented merely as an historical account grounded in cultural association, to be verified by the individual. Thus, Christianity is not seen as grounded in divine revelation, “but in positive, tangible cultural achievements.” Scheffczyk presents a joyful positive Christian anthropology based on sound theological exegesis. Mary has an indispensable role in the drama of salvation: she is the guarantee of the “incarnational principle of the Catholic faith,” to counter a call to an undefined freedom. “By virtue of her objective position in the saving works of Christ Jesus—unlike any

other saint—Mary has entered a unique and lasting relationship with all humankind” (*Maria in der Verehrung der Kirche*, 6:4). Together with Avery Dulles, Scheffczyk was named a Cardinal in 2002, and both of them were influenced by John Henry Cardinal Newman.

**Dr. Danielle Peters** pointed out how an observation in *Marialis Cultus* was developed in Pope St. John Paul II’s *Mulieris Dignitatem*. *Marialis Cultus* (MC 34–36) indicated that “devotion to the Blessed Virgin must also pay close attention to certain findings of the human sciences” in order to bridge the gap “between some aspects of this devotion and modern anthropological discoveries and the profound changes which have occurred in the psycho-sociological field in which modern man lives and works.” Twenty-five years later, John Paul II’s *Mulieris Dignitatem* (MD) drew upon the anthropological dimension of Marian devotion to explain the feminine genius (MD 9, 10, 11). There are four aspects inherent in the mission of women: they are created in God’s image and likeness; they are to reflect divine love, cooperate in salvation history, and participate in the New Covenant. In addition, there is the unique feminine genius that is present in salvation history. Insights from “the psycho-sociological field” (MC 34) reveal both obstacles and opportunities for the feminine genius to freely develop and bear fruit. Other educational pointers are given to assist women to embrace this gift as “other Marys in our time” and, in so doing, contribute to a “culture of encounter” (Pope Francis). The Virgin Mary is the highest expression of the feminine genius.

**Fr. Thomas A. Thompson’s** contribution deals with Pope Paul VI’s principal consultant for composing *Marialis*

*Cultus*—Ignacio M. Calabuig, OSM. Fr. Calabuig was rector of the Pontifical Faculty Marianum and also Consultant to the Congregation of Divine Worship. Relying on previous writings of both Paul VI and Calabuig, my article analyzes sections of *Marialis Cultus*, suggesting that some sections show the influence of Paul VI and others of Calabuig. *Marialis Cultus* spoke of a “more organic and closely knit” commemoration of Mary in the “whole mystery” of Christ, commemorated in the annual cycle of the mysteries of her Son (MC 2). It was Fr. Calabuig who was responsible for *The Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (1986) that provided texts illustrating Mary’s relation to the mysteries of Christ celebrated throughout the liturgical year, implementing Vatican II’s directive on Mary in the liturgy: “In celebrating the annual cycle of Christ’s mysteries, the Church honors with a special love the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who is joined by an inseparable bond to the saving work of Christ” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 103).<sup>2</sup>

**Fr. Frederick Miller** began his presentation by recalling the deep impression that St. Louis Grignion de Montfort’s *True Devotion to the Virgin Mary* had on him thirty years ago. That work brought to him an awareness of Mary’s motherhood of grace in his life. Recently, Fr. Miller visited the places in France that were part of the saint’s life: the

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Marian Studies* 40 (1989): “Mary and the Holy Trinity, as Reflected in the Liturgical Year,” by Kenan B. Osborne, OFM; “The Virgin Mary in the Liturgy: 1963–1988,” by Thomas A. Thompson, SM; “Mary in the Liturgy of the Hours,” by Sr. Martha Garcia, OP; and “Marian Devotions: In and beyond *Marialis Cultus*,” by Stanley A. Parmisano.

village of Montfort, the humble home of the Grignion family, the chapel where he was baptized, the seminary of St. Sulpice, and the towns where he preached missions.

St. Louis de Montfort was an itinerant preacher who traveled on foot to Rome to present his method of conducting parish missions to Pope Clement XI. He returned to France as Missionary Apostolic, allowing him to conduct parish missions in many areas. In six years as priest, he preached over two hundred missions. Two weeks before each mission began, missionaries arrived to prepare the people. The mission included evangelical preaching of the Word of God and the renewal of baptismal promises. This renewal took place at the beginning of the mission and, if possible, at the baptismal font. A general confession of sins was encouraged. Montfort's special gift was his intuition of the unique role of Mary in the formation of Christian disciples. The Neo-Catechumenal Way, so powerful in the current period of the Church's history, has much in common with the methods and content of Montfort's approach. His teaching on Mary is a blessing for the whole Church—a blessing pointed out repeatedly by St. John Paul II, a spiritual son of Montfort.

**Msgr. Arthur Calkins** spoke of Mary's cooperation in the mystery of Christ as presented in recent ecclesial documents. The word *coredemptrix* has appeared in papal documents, but, because of ecumenical considerations ("sensitivity"), it did not appear in Vatican II documents (although reference was made to it in some of the documents cited in the text). In the commentary of *Marialis Cultus* on Marian feasts, reference is made to the Blessed Virgin's "free consent and cooperation in the work of redemption (MC 6), and, in the commentary on the Presentation of Christ

(Feb. 2) and the feast of Our Lady of Sorrows (Sept. 15), reference is made to Mary's "co-suffering with Christ" (MC 7). *Marialis Cultus* also presents Mary as *Virgo offerans*: the cooperation of Mother and Son in the work of redemption reaches its climax on Calvary (MC 20). In the *Collection of Masses of the B.V.M.*, Mary is presented as the New Eve standing by the Cross of Christ (*Collection* 11, 12 [35, 43, 46]). Pope St. John Paul II spoke often of Mary's co-redemption, her active cooperation in the sacrifice of her Son, and of her work of redemption and her maternal intercession. Her active participation with the sacrifice of her Son is prominent in John Paul II's writings: she is joined "most closely in sharing the redeeming work of her Son" (*Redemptoris Mater*, 25). This notion of Mary's participation is a most powerful element in Marian devotion.

**Dr. Gloria Dodd** addressed "Feminist Perspectives on Mary: Retrieval or Renewal?" using criteria from *Marialis Cultus* to analyze recent works by three representative feminists (Prof. Marina Warner, Sr. Elizabeth A. Johnson, and Dr. Rosemary Radford Ruether) and three New Feminists (Dr. Ronda Chervin, Mrs. Juli Loesch Wiley, and Dr. Michele Marie Schumacher). Seeking equality for women against patriarchy, sexism, and androcentrism, the feminists' notable strengths included an emphasis on Mary's humanity and solidarity in the Communion of Saints. Their outstanding flaws included a feminist critique of public revelation followed by a rejection not only of a literal interpretation of Mary's virginal conception and her perpetual virginity, but also of an all-male clergy. The New Feminists' perspective, influenced by St. John Paul II's *Evangelium Vitae* (99), was noted for innovative reflections

on Old Testament typology (“First Eve,” Coredeptrix, Mediatrix, nursing mother, and exalted widow), but their experiential method remained flawed with unapproved private revelation. Dr. Dodd concluded that the feminist approach overstressed some truths in a way that renewed some Marian doctrines but also denied others, while the New Feminist perspective followed Paul VI’s criteria, but needed a more careful method and further development.

Once again, this annual volume closes with the “International Academic Marian Bibliography, 2013–2014,” prepared to include references not only as found in research resources, but also from European Mariological societies and from journals whose articles frequently are not included in larger databases. A perusal of the entries will show the various approaches in Marian studies found in different cultures; it will also demonstrate the abundance of materials available from Marian and Mariological societies.

*Fr. Thomas A. Thompson, SM*  
*Secretary: Mariological Society of America*