EXCERPTA E DISSERTATIONIBUS IN SACRA THEOLOGIA

CUADERNOS DOCTORALES

DE LA FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA

Universidad de Navarra

MARCIN STANISŁAW LECH

Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ
Intercession and Mediation of Mary according to the Seattle Statement

SEPARATA

DIRECTOR/ *EDITOR*
J. José Alviar
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA

VOCALES
Juan Luis Caballero
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA

Carmen José Alejos
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA

SECRETARIA
Isabel León
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA

Marcin Stanisław Lech

Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ. Intercession and Mediation of Mary according
to the Seattle Statement 407-495

[*María, gracia y esperanza en Cristo*. La intercesión y mediación de María según
el Seattle Statement]

Tesis doctoral dirigida por el Prof. Dr. Pablo Blanco

Charles Kayiira Kabanda

Prayer and charity in St. Teresa of Calcutta 497-571

[Oración y caridad en Santa Teresa de Calcuta]

Tesis doctoral dirigida por el Prof. Dr. Pablo Marti

Universidad de Navarra
Facultad de Teología

Marcin Stanisław LECH

Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ
Intercession and Mediation of Mary
according to the Seattle Statement

Extracto de la Tesis Doctoral presentada en la
Facultad de Teología de la Universidad de Navarra

Pamplona
2022

Ad normam Statutorum Facultatis Theologiae Universitatis Navarrensis,
perlegimus et adprobavimus

Pampilonae, die 12 mensis ianuarii anni 2022

Dr. Paulus Blanco   Dr. Romanus Sol

Coram tribunali, die 7 mensis iunii anni 2021, hanc
dissertationem ad Lauream Candidatus palam defendit

Secretarius Facultatis
D. nus Eduardus Flandes

Presentation

Abstract: The doctoral thesis presents research on the issue of the Catholic concept of the mediation and intercession of Mary and the discussion about it in the Catholic-Anglican dialogue. The thesis opens with the preliminary section, which explains both the relationship between mediation and intercession and the dependence of Mary's role on the unique mediation of Christ.

Due to the fact that the principle of ecumenical dialogue is the agreement of two Christian churches or communities on theology and morality, the author elaborates two early chapters presenting the positions of the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion regarding the mediation and intercession of Mary. Firstly, the history of the development of the theory of the intercession and mediation of Mary in Catholic theology and its understanding are presented (chapter I). Afterwards, studies of Anglican sources are made, analysing and describing the position of Anglican theology on this role of Mary (Chapter II). Knowing the positions of both ecclesial communities, the author then focuses on the dialogue between them on the issue of Mary's mediation and intercession – a dialogue whose fruits were included in the document *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ*, also known as the Seattle Statement (2005). The third chapter of the thesis, which is here published partially, presents both the editorial history of the said document, the statements published in the declaration, and the theological reaction to the published results of the dialogue.

Keywords: mediation, intercession, ecumenism.

Resumen: Este trabajo doctoral presenta la investigación sobre el tema del concepto católico de la mediación e intercesión de María y su discusión en el diálogo católico-anglicano. La tesis se abre con la sección preliminar, que explica tanto la relación entre mediación e intercesión, como la mediación única de Cristo, y la dependencia del papel de María del de Cristo.

Debido al hecho de que el principio del diálogo ecuménico es el acuerdo entre dos iglesias o comunidades cristianas sobre cuestiones de teología y moralidad, el autor inicialmente proporciona dos capítulos que presentan la posición de la Iglesia Católica Romana y la Comunión Anglicana acerca de la mediación e intercesión de María. En primer lugar, se presenta la historia del desarrollo de la teoría de la intercesión y mediación de María en la teología católica así como su comprensión (capítulo I). Posteriormente se realizan estudios de fuentes anglicanas para analizar y describir la posición de la teología anglicana sobre este papel de María (capítulo II). Conociendo la posición de ambas comunidades eclesiales, el autor se centra luego en el diálogo entre ellas sobre el tema de la mediación e intercesión de María: un diálogo cuyos frutos fueron recogidos en el documento *María, gracia y esperanza en Cristo*, también conocido como Declaración de Seattle (2005). El tercer capítulo de la tesis, que publicamos aquí parcialmente, presenta tanto la historia editorial de dicho documento, las declaraciones publicadas en la declaración, como la reacción teológica a los resultados publicados del diálogo.

Palabras clave: mediación, intercesión, ecumenismo.

Two years ago the author presented his licentiate thesis on the presence of the Mother of God in the ecumenical dialogues between the Roman Catholic Church and other Churches and Christian communities. As a result of this research, it became evident that Mary had been mentioned a significant num-

ber of times in the Anglican-Catholic dialogue. This was reflected especially in the statement *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ*. This document, presented in 2005 in Seattle, addressed many Mariological issues, among them the question of the intercession and mediation of Mary.

This topic seemed very interesting for several reasons. Firstly, Anglicans and Catholics had spoken openly and calmly on this matter, which tended to arouse great emotions in Protestants, who do not recognise any mediation other than that of Christ. Secondly, no dialogue with other churches and Christian communities had addressed this issue as broadly as the Seattle Statement. Thirdly, the discussion on the proposed new Catholic dogma provided a stimulus for exploring how Anglicans perceive the intercession and mediation of Mary.

These reasons showed the importance and timeliness of the subject and prompted this work, entitled *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ: Intercession and Mediation of Mary according to the Seattle Declaration*.

This study required a clear structure: at the beginning, a preliminary section to introduce the meaning of the terms *mediation* and *intercession*. Later (the first chapter), it was necessary to investigate the origins and the meaning of this concept in Catholic theology, as well as to become familiar with the arguments of the Anglicans (the second chapter). The third chapter focused on the efforts of the Anglican-Catholic dialogue to better understand and adequately express the role of Mary as mediatrix. The main research findings were collated in the concluding chapter of the thesis.

In this extract, an excerpt from the third chapter of the investigation will be presented. It is the culmination and climax of the doctoral thesis, analysing the document *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* and the information which it contains about Mary's intercession and mediation. Due to the considerable size of the third chapter, the author has here omitted the introductory issues (III.1 *Marian issues in ecumenical dialogue with Anglicans*) and the description of the first reaction to the publication of the statement (III.*4 Mediation and intercession of Mary presented in the Seattle Statement and the posterior theological reflection*), found in the last part of the thesis' third chapter.

The topic and scope of the investigation are worth clarifying. Firstly, although the theory of the mediation of Mary is based on the truth of the unique mediation of Jesus Christ, this Christological issue was not the key question of our study. Secondly, the fruits of other official ecumenical relationships with many Protestant denominations were omitted, so as to concentrate on Anglican-Catholic relationships. Thirdly, it was necessary to present both the development of the theory of the mediation of Mary in Catholic theology

as well as the critique of this concept in Anglican theology. This discussion, however, was of a preliminary nature, since the author intended to focus on the contemporary ecumenical dialogue between the two ecclesial groups and examine the degree of compatibility between Anglican and Catholic positions on the mediation of Mary.

The Seattle Declaration on Mary gave rise to many comments and articles, but none of them directly and fully addressed Mary's mediation. That is why this thesis has tried to address the issue of Mary's mediation in dialogue with Anglicans in a broader way, and is an attempt to answer questions that have not yet been developed. Therefore, the thesis constitutes a certain scientific contribution for three reasons. Firstly, it covers all Anglican sources which were available and which addressed the subject of Mary Mediatrix. The author has done research on the publications of Anglican authors, to elaborate what may be the first anthology of its kind. Secondly, the author has analysed the Anglican-Catholic dialogue on the question of Mary's mediation, with special emphasis on the findings of the Seattle Statement. Thirdly, the early reception of the Seattle document in terms of Mary's mediation was studied, reviewing the official and local responses posted by Anglicans and Catholics, in order to provide a perspective of the Catholic-Anglican ecumenical dialogue.

During the investigation three methods were used. The philological method was useful in the analysis of terms and the contexts of their use. The theological method made it possible to distinguish the official teaching of the Catholic Magisterium from the theological conception of individual authors, and to better understand the theological assumptions of the two ecclesial communities in dialogue. The diachronic method served to see clearly the historical development of our theme.

The analysis of the Anglican-Catholic dialogue on the issue studied gives a clearer idea of the stage at which the dialogue is in, and of the progress represented by the Seattle Declaration. The conclusions can be grouped into two categories: 1) as regards Anglican theology: an assessment of its treatment of the question of the intercession and mediation of Mary; 2) as regards the Anglican-Catholic dialogue on the role of Mary: a portrayal of the status quaestionis on this matter.

Let us start with the results of research on Anglican theology. The thesis has probably provided the first results of research on Anglican theologians and their attitude to the question of the mediation of Mary. After examining hundreds of Anglican sources from the 16th to the 20th century, I have finally found 126 of them that addressed the subject of Mary's mediation.

1) The two fundamental attitudes of Anglican theologians to the question of Mary's mediation were either to ignore the matter silently or to criticise it.

2) Anglican theology was not closely familiar with the development of the understanding of the question of the mediation of Mary in Catholic theology. The analysis has shown that the Anglicans did not at first know the richness of the patristic and medieval testimonies in favour of the mediation of Mary.

3) Over time, Anglican theologians slowly began to understand mediation in an analogous way. But mediation began to be especially associated with advocacy.

4) Analysis has also shown that not all Anglican theologians rejected the title of Mediatrix, although they did not always understand it in a way similar to the Catholic understanding.

5) Research on various Anglican theologians allows us to affirm that it is impossible to clearly define the Anglican position on the mediation of Mary.

Now we can present the conclusions of the Anglican-Catholic dialogue:

1) The Anglican-Catholic ecumenical dialogue on the subject of Mary's mediation and intercession had an interesting background in Anglican theology. Of the 31 Anglican writers who discussed Mary's mediation in 20th century, only seven of them expressed a positive opinion. Surprisingly, those seven authors were not mentioned in the proceedings of the Seattle Statement.

2) Despite the discussion about Mary's intercession, the Seattle Statement did not make a clear statement on the subject of Mary's mediation and there was also no significant progress in agreeing on her participation in the distribution of graces.

3) The Seattle Statement did not advance much in the dialogue about Mary's mediation. However, this does not mean that zero progress was made. On the contrary, one must appreciate each step towards mutual understanding. And concrete steps were noticeable in the case of the document – the understanding of Mary's intercession; the distinction between official Church teaching and religious practices; the perception of the overly drastic reaction of the Anglican reformers to distortions in popular piety; and the agreement on the irreplaceable role of Christ the Mediator.

4) Remembering the two-dimensionality of Mary's mediation, it can be said that the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion coincide on the question of Mary's intercession (ascending dimension); but there is no consensus on the descending dimension. Anglicans find it difficult to accept the special role of Mary in the distribution of graces. But the descending dimension is not entirely clear in Catholic theology either: some Mariologists do not recognise as indispensable the role of Mary in distributing God's graces. Pope

Francis himself has affirmed that some Marian titles of Christological origin are highly debatable, since they express love but are sometimes exaggerated. Therefore, it is difficult to demand that Anglicans fully agree with the Catholic concept, which itself is under discussion.

It is obvious that despite the great effort invested in this research, this work has not exhausted the subject. Many works by Anglican theologians from the 16th and 17th centuries remain to be accessed in manuscripts, or are considered lost. It is also to be hoped that further progress in the dialogue will bring new contributions to Anglican theology and to the ecumenical discussion of the mediation of Mary understood as intercession.

Other perspectives may also be indicated for future research. Firstly, there seems to be a need for further research on those Anglican authors who were favourable to the question of Mary's mediation. Secondly, a better analysis of the works of those Protestant authors who were critical of the question of Mary's intercession and mediation would allow for a better understanding of Anglican reservations. Thirdly, it would be very useful to carry out a similar study on the question of Mary's mediation in other ecumenical dialogues. Finally, the document *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* encourages the exploration of many other aspects of Mariology in the ecumenical dialogue with Anglicans, such as the role of Mary as Mother of the Church or her distinctive ministry in the Church.

Index of the Thesis

II
THE ISSUE OF MARY'S MEDIATION AND INTERCESSION IN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

III
MARIAN MEDIATION AND INTERCESSION IN MARY, GRACE AND HOPE IN CHRIST

INDEX OF THE THESIS

Bibliography of the Thesis<superscript>*</superscript>

1. Primary source

Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission II, «'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'. Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission», *Information Service* 118 (2005) 42-60.

— «The Seattle Statement. 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London: Continuum, 2006, 7-87.

2. Church documents and Magisterial documents

2.1. *Sacred Scripture*

The Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version. Catholic Edition, Oxford: University Press, 1999.

2.2. *Documents of the councils*

Council of Nicaea II, «Actio sexta. Refutationis tomus sextus», in Academia Scientiarum Bavaricae (ed.), *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum. Series secunda*, vol. III, Lamberz, E. (ed.), *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016, 748-793.

<superscript>*</superscript> Due to the established limit of words, in this extract of the doctoral thesis only the primary bibliographic sources are presented (in chronological order in subsections 1, 2, and 5.1; in alphabetical order in the remaining subsections). The complete bibliography may be consulted in the official text of the doctoral thesis.

Council of Trent, «Decree on the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of the Saints and on Sacred Images», in Denzinger, H., Hünermann, P., et al. (eds.), *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012, 429.

Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando. Series I, *Antepraeparatoria*, Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1961.

Gil Hellín, F. (ed.), *Concilii Vaticani II synopsis in ordinem redigens schemata cum relationibus necnon Patrum orationes atque animadversiones*, vol. II, *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Lumen gentium*, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995.

Vatican Council II, «Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. Vatican II, 'Lumen gentium'», in Flannery A. (ed.), *Vatican Council II. The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Northport: Costello, 1981, 350-426.

2.3. *Papal documents and teaching*

Sixtus IV, «Cum praeexcelsa», in Denzinger, H. et al. (eds.), *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012, 354-355.

Benedict XIV, «Gloriosa Dominae», in *Our Lady: Papal Teaching*, Boston: St. Paul, 1961, 25-29.

Pius IX, «Ubi primum», in *Pii IX Pontificis maximi acta*, vol. I, Romae: Typographia Bonarum Artium, 1854, 162-166.

— «Ineffabilis Deus», in *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi acta*, vol. I, Romae: Typographia Bonarum Artium, 1854, 597-619.

Leo XIII, «Supremi Apostolatus officio», *ASS* 16 (1883-1984) 113-118.

— «Octobri mense», *ASS* 24 (1891-1892) 193-203.

— «Magnae Dei Matris», *ASS* 25 (1892-1893) 139-148.

— «Iucunda semper expectatione», *ASS* 27 (1894-1895) 177-184.

— «Adiutricem populi», *ASS* 28 (1895-1896) 129-136.

— «Fidentem piumque animum», *ASS* 29 (1896-1897) 204-209.

— «Augustissimae Virginis Mariae», *ASS* 30 (1897-1898) 129-135.

Pius X, «Ad diem illum laetissimum», *ASS* 36 (1903-1904) 449-462.

Benedict XV, «Ad Petrum S. R. E. Card. Gasparri», *AAS* 9 (1917) 265-267.

— «Sodalitatem nostrae Dominae», *AAS* 13 (1921) 342-345.

Pius XI, «Exstat in civitate Verdelais», *AAS* 16 (1924) 152-153.

— «Miserentissimum Redemptor», *AAS* 20 (1928) 165-178.

— «Caritate Christi compulsi», *AAS* 24 (1932) 177-194;.

— «Ingravescentibus malis», *AAS* 29 (1937) 373-380.

Pius XII, «Bendito seja o Senhor», *AAS* 38 (1946) 264-287.

— «Auspicia quaedam», *AAS* 40 (1948) 169-172.

— «Menti nostrae», *AAS* 42 (1950) 657-701.

— «Sociis sodalitatum italicarum ab Actione Catholica», *AAS 45* (1953) 848-855.

— «Ad Caeli Reginam», *AAS* 46 (1954) 625-640.

JOHN XXIII, «Ad Emum. P. D. Gregorium Petrum Tit. Sancti Bartholomaei in Insula, S. R. E. Presb. Card. Agagianian», *AAS* 51 (1959) 88-89.

— «Marialium Congregationum sodalibus», *AAS* 51 (1959) 639-641.

PAUL VI, «Allocutio XII. In Vaticana Basilica ad Conciliares Patres habita», *AAS* 56 (1964) 1007-1018.

— «Mense Maio», *AAS* 57 (1965) 353-358.

— «Christi Matri», *AAS* 58 (1966) 745-749.

— «Signum magnum», *AAS* 59 (1967) 465-475.

— «Marialis cultus», *AAS* 66 (1974) 113-168.

JOHN PAUL II, «Redemptoris Mater», *AAS* 79 (1987) 361-433.

— «Wednesday Audience of November 5, 1997», *L'Osservatore Romano* (8 October 1997) 11.

— «Rosarium Virginis Mariae», *AAS* 95 (2003) 5-36.

2.4 *Documents of the Roman Congregations*

CONGREGATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, «Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC», *AAS* 74 (1982) 1062-1074.

— «Catholic Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I», *Information Service* 82 (1993) 47-51.

— *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London: G. Chapman, 1994.

CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, «Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy. Principles and Guidelines» (2002), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20020513_vers-direttorio_en.html (access: 10.02.2021).

3. ANGLICAN SOURCES ABOUT MARY'S MEDIATION AND INTERCESSION**

«A Goodly Prymer», in *Three Primers Put Forth in the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1848, 1-303.

«A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man», in LLOYD, C. (ed.), *Formularies of Faith Put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1856, 213-377.

————

** Many early English works, and especially old prints (from the 16th and 17th centuries, but only these), have long titles which are basically a description of the work or an abstract of the content. Therefore, the author gives here only incipits of the titles according to bibliographic practice. The original spelling has been preserved.

«Articles About Religion», in Lloyd, C. (ed.), *Formularies of Faith Put Forward by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1856, 3-20.

«King Henry's Primer», in *Three Primers Put Forth in the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1848, 437-527.

«The Institution of a Christian Man», in Lloyd, C. (ed.), *Formularies of Faith Put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1856, 21-212.

«The Irish Articles», in Bray, G. L. (ed.), *Documents of the English Reformation 1526-1701*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Company, 2004, 437-452.

«The Manual of Prayers or the Prymer in English», in *Three Primers Put Forth in the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxford: University Press, 1848, 305-436.

«The Thirty-nine Articles», in Bray, G. L. (ed.), *Documents of the English Reformation 1526-1701*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Company, 2004, 284-311.

A Gagge for the Pope, and the Iesuits..., London 1624.

Abbot, R., *The Third Part of the Defence of the Reformed...*, London 1609.

Allchin, A. M., «Marie et les saints dans l'oeuvre de Thomas Ken», in Triacca, A. M., Pistoia, A. (ed.), *La Mère de Jésus-Christ et la communion des saints dans la liturgie*, Roma: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1986, 17-28.

— «Our Lady in Seventeenth-century Anglican Devotion and Theology», in Mascall, E. L., Box, H. S., *The Blessed Virgin Mary. Essays by Anglican Writers*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963, 53-76.

— «Mary: An Anglican Approach» *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 54 (1988), 120-130.

Andrewes, L., «An Answer to the XVIII. Chapter of Cardinal Perron's Reply», in *Reverendi in Christo Patris, Lanceloti...*, London 1629, 1-25.

Attersoll, W., *A Commentarie Vpon the Forth Booke...*, London 1618.

Baxter, R., *The Safe Religion, or, Three Disputations...*, London 1657.

Baycroft, J., «The Place of Mary in the Anglican Communion», in Pedico, M. M., Carbonaro, D. (eds.), *La Madre di Dio, un Portico sull'avvenire del mondo*, Roma: Edizioni Monfortane, 2001, 243-249.

Beard, T., *A Retractiue From the Romish Religion...*, London 1616.

Bickersteth, R., *The Blessed Virgin and Anglican Divines*, Stockport: Hurst Bros., 1907.

Birckbek, S., *The Protestant Evidence Taken Out...*, London 1635.

Boys, J., *An Exposition of the Dominical Epistles...*, London 1610.

— *An Exposition of Al the Principal Scriptures...*, London 1610.

Brett, T., *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies...*, London 1720.

Bull, G., *The Vindication of the Church of England...*, London 1719.

Burgess, A., *A Treatise of Original Sin...*, London 1658.

Byrchensha, R., *A Discourse Occasioned Vpon the Late...*, London 1602.

Cade, A., *A Iustification of the Church of England...*, London 1630.

Care, H., *A Word in Season Being a Parallel...*, London 1679.

CLAGETT, W., *A Discourse Concerning the Worship...*, London 1686.

CLEMENT, F., *A Briefe Discourse of Mans...*, London 1593.

COLES, G., *Theophilus and Philodoxus...*, Oxford 1674.

COOKE, A., *Worke, More Worke, And a Little More...*, London 1628.

COOPER, H., «Mary, the Obedient Woman», *Mother of Jesus* 10 (1970) 1-8.

COVERDALE, M., *A Confutacion of That Treatise...*, Zürich 1541.

COXE, A., C., *The Novelty and Nullity of the Papal Dogma...*, Baltimore: James S. Walters, 1855.

CRAKANTHORPE, R., *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae...*, London 1625.

CRANMER, T., «The Forty-Two Articles», in BRAY, G. L. (ed.), *Documents of the English Reformation 1526-1701*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Company, 2004, 284-311.

— «Thirteen Articles», in BRAY, G. L. (ed.), *Documents of the English Reformation 1526-1701*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Company, 2004, 184-222.

DERING, E., *XXVII. Lectures, or Readings...*, London 1577.

DORRINGTON, T., *Observations Concerning the Present State...*, London 1699.

DOWNAME, G., *A Treatise Concerning Antichrist...*, London 1603.

DUNPHY, W. H., «The Faith of the Body of Christ», in *The Body of Christ*, Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1930, 84-102.

ELTON, E., *An Exposition of the Epistle of St Paule...*, London 1615.

ELTON, E., *The Triumph of a True Christian...*, London 1623.

EUBANK, R. A. B., «The King's Daughter is All Glorious Within», *Studies and Commentaries* 3 (1987) 16-18.

FABER, G. S., *Letters on Tractarian Secession...*, London: Dalton, 1846.

FORBES, W., «Consideratio controversiæ hodiernæ...», in ID., *Considerationes Modestae...*, London 1658, 268-341.

FOWNS, R., *Trisagion or, The Three Holy Offices...*, London 1618.

FYLER, S., *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral...*, London 1682.

GAREY, S., *A Newe Yeares Gift for the Soule...*, London 1615.

GIBBONS, N., *Questions and Disputations Concerning the Holy Scripture...*, London 1601.

GODOLPHIN, J., *The Holy Arbor, Containing a Body of Divinity...*, London 1651.

GOODWIN, G., *Babels Balm: or The Honey-combe...*, London 1624.

GOUDGE, H. L., *The Invocation of Saints and the Cult of the Blessed Mary*, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1917.

GRAFTON, C. C., *Christian and Catholic*, New York: Longmans, 1905.

GREENACRE, R., «Mother of All Christians (1998)», in PODMORE, C., *Maiden, Mother, Queen. Mary in Anglican Tradition*, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2013, 189-192.

— «Two Grounds of Blessedness», in PODMORE, C., *Maiden, Mother, Queen. Mary in Anglican Tradition*, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2013, 62-65.

HALL, A. C., *The Virgin Mother, Retreat Address...*, New York: Longmans, 1894.

HALL, J., *Epistles, the First Volume...*, London 1608.

— *The Old Religion a Treatise...*, London 1628.

HARVEY, W., *Divine Meditations...*, London 1661.

— *The Marriners Card and Compass...*, London 1659.

HICKES, G., *Speculum Beatae Virginis...*, London 1685.

HOBY, E., *A Curry-Combe for a Coxe-Combe...*, London 1615.

HUGHES, T. R., «The Society of Mary», *Immaculata* 31 (1980) 15-18.

HUGHES, W., *The Man of Sin, or A Discourse of Popery...*, London 1677.

HULBERT, C. A., *Theotokos, or, The Mother of Our Lord...*, London: Washbourne, 1842.

JACKSON, T., A *Treatise Containing the Originall...*, London 1625.

JEFFRAY, W., *The Picture of Patience...*, London 1629.

JEWEL, J., *An Apologie, or Aunswer in Defence...*, London 1562.

— *An Expositio[n] Vpon the Two Espistles...*, London 1584.

JURIEU, P., *A Continuation of the Accomplishment...*, London 1688.

— *The Pastoral Letter of the Incomparable Jurieu*, London 1689.

KIPLING, R., «Hymn Before Action», in ID., *The Seven Seas*, London: Methuen, 1896, 103-105.

L'ESTRANGE, H., *The Alliance of Divine Offices...*, London 1659.

LANCASHIRE, A., *Born of the Virgin Mary*, London: Faith Press, 1962.

LAYFIELD, E., *The Soules Solace...*, London 1632.

LEIGH, E., *Annotations Upon All the New Testament...*, London 1650.

LINDSAY, D., *The Tragical Death of Dauid Beato[n]...*, London 1548.

LONGFELLOW, H. W., «This Is Indeed the Blessed Mary's Land», in MARCHANT, J. (ed.), *The Madonna*, London: Longmans, Green, 1928, 196-197.

LOUTH, A., *Mary and the Mystery of the Incarnation*, Oxford: SLG Press, 1976.

MACQUARRIE, J., «Mary Co-redemptrix and Disputes over Justification and Grace», in MIRAVALLE, M. I. (ed.), *Mary Coredemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate, Theological Foundations* vol. II, Santa Barbara: Queenship Publ., 1996, 245-256.

— *Mary for All Christians*, London: T&T Clark, 2002.

MASCALL, E. L., «The Place of Mariology in Christian Theology: An Anglican Approach», in *De cultu mariano saeculis VI-XI*, vol. II, Roma: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internacional, 1972, 125-136.

MASON, A. J., *Purgatory; The State of the Faithful Departed; Invocation of Saints*, London: Longmans, Green, 1901.

MAYER, J., *An Antidote Against Popery...*, London 1625.

— *Ecclesiastica Interpretatio...*, London 1627,

MAYHEW, R. R., *Sichah: or, A Continued Tract...*, London 1683.

MILBURN, J., «A Sermon Preached in Washington Cathedral», *Studies and Commentaries* 1 (1982) 1-4.

— «Mary in Tudor Anglican Writings», in *De culto mariano saeculo XVI*, vol. III, Roma: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internacional, 1985, 101-116.

MILL, J., *A Sermon Preached on the Feast of the Annunciation...*, Savoy 1676.

Montagu, R., *Antidiatribae ad priorem partem*..., Cambridge 1625.

— *Immediate Addresse unto God*..., London 1624.

More, H., *A Modest Enquiry into the Mystery*..., London 1664.

Mornay, P., *Fovvre Bookes, of the Institution*..., London 1600.

Murray, J., *The History of Religion*..., London: Henderson, Nicoll & Johnson, 1764.

Mortimer, R. C., «The Doctrine of the Assumption», in Mortimer, R. C., Mascall, E. L., *The Assumption of Our Lady*, London: Church Union, 1952, 3-7.

Muddiman, J., «Mary in the Communion of Saints: Eschatology and Invocation», in Sagovsky, N., Denaux A. (eds.), *Studying Mary: Reflections on the Virgin Mary in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology and Devotion*, London: T&T Clark, 2017, 12-20.

Oates, T., A *Discourse of the Unlawfulness of Praying*..., London 1689.

Olivier, J., *A Present for Teeming Women*..., London 1663.

Palmer, W., *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine*..., Aberdeen: A. Brown, 1846.

Patrick, J., *The Virgin Mary Misrepresented by the Roman Church*..., London 1688.

Pearson, J., *An Exposition of the Creed*, London 1659.

Percival, H. R., *The Invocation of Saints Treated Theologically and Historically*, London: Longmans, 1896.

Perkins, W., *A Golden Chaine*..., Cambridge 1600.

— *A Goodly and Learned Exposition of Christ*..., Cambridge 1608.

— *A Reformed Catholike*..., Cambridge 1598.

— *A Treatise Tending Vnto a Declaration*..., London 1590.

Pittenger, N. W., «The Devotion to the Mother of Christ in Catholic Spirituality», *Anglican Theological Review* 33 (1951) 71-81.

Pressick, G., *An Answer to Grifith Williams*..., Dublin 1660.

Prynne, W., *Aurum Reginae*..., London 1668.

— *Historiarchos, or, The Exact Recorder*..., London 1659.

— *The First and the Second Part of Signal*..., London 1660.

— *The First-[Third] Tome of an Exact Chronological Vindication*..., London 1665.

— *The Third Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historical Vindication*..., London 1657.

Pusey, E. B., «E. B. P. to the Bishop-elect of Oxford», in Liddon, H. P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. III, London: Longmans, 1894, 43-45.

— «Letter to Miss Baker», in Liddon, H. P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. I, London: Longmans, 1893, 132.

— *An Eirenikon in a Letter to the Author of «The Christian Year»*, Oxford: James Parker, 1856.

— *First Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman*..., London: Rivingtons, 1869.

Rainolds, J., *The Summe of the Conference Betweene Iohn Rainoldes*..., London 1584.

Sampson, T., *A Warning to Take Heede*..., London 1578.

Sarson, L., *An Analysis of the I. Timoth. I. 15*..., Cambridge 1645.

Satgé, J. C. de, «Mary in the Church. Some Matters for Ecumenical Study», *One in Christ* 4 (1968) 143-155.

— «Towards an Evangelical Reappraisal», in MASCALL, E. L., BOX, H. S. (eds.), *The Blessed Virgin Mary. Essays by Anglican Writers*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963, 103-114.

— *Mary and the Christian Gospel*, London: SPCK, 1976.

SENHOUSE, R., *Foure Sermons Preached at the Court...*, London 1627.

SHELDON, R., *A Suruey of the Miracles...*, London 1616.

SHERLOCK, W., *A Short Summary of the Principal...*, London 1687.

SIMSON, P., *A Short Compend of the Historie...*, Edinburgh 1613.

SMITH, H., *Gods Arrovve Against Athesisi*, London 1593.

SMITH, J., *Christian Religion's Appeal...*, London 1675.

SPARKE, T., *An Ansvvere to Master Iohn De Albines...*, Oxford 1591.

SPENCER, B., *Chrysomeson, A Golden Meane...*, London 1659.

STAFFORD, A., *The Femall Glory...*, London 1635.

STEPHENSON, J. C., «Devotion to Our Lady Among Anglicans», *Marian Era* 1 (1960), 18-20 and 126-127.

STILLINGFLEET, E., *Several Conferences...*, London 1679.

— *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome...*, London 1686.

STRODE, W., *A Sermon Preached at the Visitation...*, London 1660.

SUTCLIFFE, M., *A Briefe Replie to a Certaine Odious...*, London 1600,

— *A Challenge Concerning the Romish Church...*, London 1602.

— *A Ful And Round Ansvver to N.D...*, London 1604.

— *A True Relation of Englands Happines...*, London 1629.

— *The Blessings on Mount Gerizzim...*, London 1625.

— *The Unmasking of A Masse-Monger...*, London 1625.

SWEEPER, W., *Israels Redemption by Christ...*, London 1622.

SYMONDS, H. E., «The Blessed Virgin Mary», in MASCALL, E. L., BOX, H. S. (eds.), *The Blessed Virgin Mary. Essays by Anglican Writers*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963, 1-11.

TAYLOR, J., *Dissuasive form Popery*, London 1664.

— *The Life and Death of the Most Blessed Among Women...*, London 1620.

TAYLOR, T., *The Progresse of Saints...*, London 1630.

THORNDIKE, H., *An Epilogue to the Tragedy...*, London 1659.

THORNDIKE, H., *Just Weights and Measures...*, London 1662

THORNTON, L. S., «The Mother of God in Holy Scripture», in MASCALL, E. L. (ed.), *The Mother of God. A Symposium by members of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius*, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949, 9-23.

TRIGGE, F., *A Touchstone, Whereby May Be Easily...*, London 1599.

TYLER, J. E., *Primitive Christian Worship...*, London 1840.

— *The Image-Worship of the Church of Rome...*, London: SPCK, 1847.

— *The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary...*, London: SPCK, 1846.

USSHER, J., *An Ansvver to a Challenge Made...*, Dublin 1624.

VÉRON, J., *A Stronge Battery Against the Idolatrous...*, London 1562.

WAKE, W., *A Collection of Several Discourses Against Popery...*, London 1688.

WELCH, J., *A Reply Against M. Gilbert Brovvne...*, Edinburgh 1602.

WENHAM, J. W., *Modern Evangelical Views of the Virgin Mary*, Wallington: Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1988.

WESTON, K., «Mary: An Evangelical Viewpoint», in STACPOOLE, A. (ed.), *Mary's Place in Christian Dialogue*, Middlegreen: St. Paul Publications, 1982, 158-166.

WHITBY, D., *A Discourse Concerning the Idolatry...*, London 1674.

WHITE, F., *The Orthodox Faith and VVay to the Church...*, London 1617.

WHITE, J., *The Restoration of All Things...*, London: Cliff & Jackson, 1712.

WILBERFORCE, S., *Rome – Her New Dogma...*, Oxford: John Parker, 1855.

WILLIAMS, J., *A Catechism Truly Representing the Doctrines...*, London 1687.

WOTTON, A., *A Defence of M. Parkins Booke...*, London 1606.

4. ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC ECUMENICAL DOCUMENTS

4.1 *Documents and reports up to the Seattle Statement*

ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE COMMISSION (CANADA), «Canadian ARC: Remarks on the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's 'Observations on the final report of ARCIC'», *One in Christ* 20 (1984) 257-286.

ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC JOINT PREPARATORY COMMISSION, «The Malta Report», in CLARK, A., DAVEY, C., *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue. The Work of the Preparatory Commission*, London: Oxford University Press, 1974, 107-115.

ARCUSA, «Agreed Statement on the Purpose of the Church», *Origins* 5 (1975) 328-334.

— «Where We Are: A Challenge for the Future», in WITMER, W., WRIGHT, J. (eds.), *Called to Full Unity: Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations 1966-1983*, Washington: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1986, 160-174.

— «Images of God: Reflections on Christian Anthropology», *Origins* 13 (1984) 505-512.

ARCIC I, «Authority in the Church II. The Statement (1981)», *Information Service* 49 (1982) 98-105.

IARCCUM, «Action Plan to Implement: Communion in Mission», *Information Service* 104 (2000) 139-140.

4.2 *Documentation of ARCIC II's work on the Seattle Statement*

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 2, 1999» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=93 (access: 02.12.2019).

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 4, 2000» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=94 (access: 02.12.2019).

IARCCUM, «Action Plan to Implement: Communion in Mission» *Information Service* 104 (2000) 139-140.

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 4, 2001» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=88 (access: 02.12.2019).

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: July 18, 2002» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=89 (access: 02.12.2019).

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Feb 3, 2003» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=91 (access: 02.12.2019).

ARCIC II, «Communiqué: July 18, 2003» https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=90 (access: 02.12.2019).

AustARC, «The Saints and Christian Prayer» https://iarccum.org/archive/Australia/1997_austarc_The-Saints-and-Christian-Prayer.pdf, access: 02.12.2019).

Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, «Anglican – Roman Catholic International Commission: January 28 – February 3, 2004», *Information Service* 115 (2004) 81-82.

Sagovsky, N., Denaux A. (eds.), *Studying Mary: Reflections on the Virgin Mary in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology and Devotion*, London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Sherlock, C., «The Journey. An Anglican Perspective», in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ. The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London 2006: Continuum, 218-219.

4.3 *Ecclesial responses to the Seattle Statement*

Anglican Diocese of Sydney Doctrine Commission, Response to the Anglican and Roman Catholic International Commission Report «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», www.sds.asn.au/Site/103715.asp?a=a&ph=cl (access: 07.11.2019).

Anglican Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, «A Response to 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», *One in Christ* 43 (2009) 167-182.

Church of Ireland, «Response to Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», https://www.ireland.anglican.org/cmsfiles/pdf/Information/Resources/CCU/arcic_mary.pdf (access: 07.11.2019).

Faith and Order Advisory Group of the Church of England, «Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission Report: Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ, General Synod Briefing Paper GS 1818», https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/gs%201818_Feb11.pdf (access: 07.11.2019).

— «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ (ARCIC II): Essays, GS Misc 872», Westminster: The Archbishops' Council, 2008.

Hill, C., «Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission Report: 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», in *General Synod: February Group of Sessions 2011 at Church House*, Westminster 2011, 7: https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/gs%201812_Feb11.pdf (access: 28.11.2020).

Kings, G., «Fulcrum Response to the Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission Agreed Statement, Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», https://www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/-articles/mary-grace-and-hope-in-christ-fulcrum-response-to-the-anglican-roman-catholic-international-commission-agreed-statement/ (access: 07.11.2019).

4.4 *Official commentaries on the Seattle Statement*

Bradshaw, T., «The Anglican Commentary», in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London: Continuum, 2006, 133-166.

Wicks, J., «A Commentary on 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ' of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission», *Information Service* 118 (2005) 61-69.

— «The Roman Catholic Commentary», in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London: Continuum, 2006, 167-203.

4.5 *Sources on the ARCIC Document on* MGH

Aranda, A., «La 'mediación materna' de María en el diálogo ecuménico», *Estudios Marianos* 84 (2018) 191-214.

Aubé-Élie, C., «Seattle: un important document sur Marie», *Unité des chrétiens* 140 (2005) 33.

Beckwith, R. T., «A.R.C.I.C. on the Mother of our Lord», *Churchman* 120 (2006) 353-362.

Bhaldraithe, E. de, «The Challenge of the ARCIC Agreement on Mary», *Doctrine and Life* 60 (2010) 21-36.

Blanco-Sarto, P., Lech, M. S., «Mother of Hope. Mary of Nazareth in the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue», *Studia Oecumenica* 20 (2020) 265-282.

Borsch, F., «Mary and Scripture: A Response to 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», *Anglican Theological Review* 89 (2007) 375-399.

Boulding, R., «Anglicans and Roman Catholics Reach Agreement about the Virgin Mary», *Church Times* 20 May 2005, 3.

Bruni, G. M., «Genesi, approndo e metodo della Dichiarazione Anglicana-Cattolica su Maria», *Marianum* 69 (2007) 423-453.

Butler, S., «The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreed Statement: Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ», *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 55 (2005) 469-482.

— «The Mary Statement: A Roman Catholic Perspective', in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London: Continuum, 2006, 232-256.

CÁCERES ZALAZAR, H. A., «Católicos y anglicanos: 'María: gracia y esperanza en Cristo'», *Miriam* 57 (2005) 146-149.

CERETI, G., «'Maria: grazia e speranza in Cristo'. Il recente documento della Commissione internazionale anglicano-cattolica», *Studi ecumenici* 24 (2006) 187-196.

COLZANI, G., «Dichiarazione di Seattle su 'Maria: grazia e speranza in Cristo'. Chiarimenti e problemi», *Marianum* 69 (2007) 454-480.

DAVIE, M., «Mary – Grace and Hope in Christ: An Evangelical Anglican Response», *ANVIL* 23 (2006) 17-32.

DENAUX, A., *Maria, genade en hoop in Christus: Een oecumenische overeenkomst tussen Anglicanen en Katholieken over de plaats von Maria in het heilsplan van God*, Antwerpen: Halewjin, 2012.

— «Maria, Gnade und Hoffnung in Christus: Eine neue gemeinsame Erklärung der ARCIC», in HOFRICHTER, P. L. (ed.), *Auf der Suche nach der Seele Europas*, Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 2007, 315-323.

DENAUX, A., SAGOVSKY, N., SHERLOCK, C. (eds.), *Looking Towards a Church Fully Reconciled*, London: Paulist Press, 2016.

DESIDERI, F., «Maria: grazia e speranza in Cristo: un passo in avanti nel dialogo ecumenico», *Ecclesia Mater* 44 (2006) 107-112.

FARRELL, M., «'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'. Some Observations and Comments», *The Australasian Catholic Recorder* 84 (2007) 259-266.

FLACK, J. R., «Roman Catholic/Anglican Dialogue: 'Mary – Grace and Hope in Christ'», in TONIOLO, E. M. (ed.), *Maria nel dialogo ecumenico in Occidente*, Roma: Marianum, 2008, 187-192.

FLANAGAN, D., «An Ecumenical Breakthrough – Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», *Doctrine and Life* 55 (2005) 20–27.

FLORIO, M., «L'unità dei cristiani e la Vergine Maria: un testo del dialogo anglicano-cattolico», *La Nuova Alleanza* 111 (2006) 4-11.

FULLER, R., «'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ' – An Anglican Response to the Seattle Statement», *Sewanee Theological Review* 50 (2006) 93-101.

GABRIELLI, D., «Maria e la «ri-rececezione» ecumenica: un accordo tra cattolici e anglicani», *La Civiltà Cattolica* 156 (2005) 113-127.

GARCÍA PAREDES, J. C. R, «El «Amen» de Maria al «si» de Dios: reflexiones en torno al Documento de ARCIC 'María: gracia y esperanza en Cristo'», *Pastoral ecumenica* 23 (2006) 89–107.

GONZÁLEZ MUÑANA, M., «'María: gracia y esperanza en Cristo': Comentario a la Declaración conjunta anglicano-católica sobre el papel el María en la vida y doctrina de la Iglesia», *Pastoral ecuménica* 23 (2006) 49–62.

GREENACRE, R., «Marie: grâce et espérance dans le Christ», in *Je suis l'Immaculée*, Paris: Parole et Silence, 2006, 173-189.

— «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ. Homily», in PODMORE, C., *Maiden, Mother, Queen. Mary in Anglican Tradition*, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2013, 84-87.

— «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», in PODMORE, C., *Maiden, Mother, Queen. Mary in Anglican Tradition*, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2013, 205-218.

HARRIS, A., «A Marian Pilgrimage. Reflections and Questions about ARCIC's 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», *Ecclesiology* 2 (2006) 339-356.

HINTZEN, G., «Das anglikanisch-katholische Dialogdokument 'Maria: Gnade und Hoffnung in Christus», *Catholica* 59 (2005) 167-188.

LARGO DOMÍNGUEZ, P., «María y la esperanza en la declaración ecuménica de Seattle», *Ephemerides mariologicae* 62 (2012) 309-328.

LEAHY, B., «Achievements and Challenges of «Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ'», *Louvain Studies* 33 (2008) 117-135.

— «What are They Saying about 'Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ'?», *Irish Theological Quarterly* 75 (2010) 45-55.

MAGENNINS, F., «The Use of Scripture in the ARCIC Statement. Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», *Milltown Studies* 56 (2005) 114-124.

MALTHY, J., «Anglicanism, the Reformation and the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's Agreed Statement 'Mary Grace and Hope in Christ'», *Theology* 110 (2007) 171-179.

MARSDEN, J., «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ – An Anglican View», *Milltown Studies* 56 (2005) 105-113.

MARTINEAU, S., «Marie: grâce et espérance dans le Christ», *Unité des chrétiens* 139 (2005) 6.

MACVANE, S., «Il documento di Seattle: 'Maria, grazia e speranza in Cristo», in ERBETTA, A., DE FIORES, S., VIDAU, E. (eds.), *Maria di Nazareth. Ecumenismo – spiritualità – chiesa locale*, Roma: AMI, 2010, 151-155.

METHUEN, C., «Mary in Context: a Historical Methodological Reflection», in *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ (ARCIC II). Essays by the Faith and Order Advisory Group of the Church of England*, Westminster: The Archbishops' Council, 2007, 15-23.

MILLER, D., «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ. The ARCIC Statement», in MCLOUGHLIN, W., PINNOCK, J. (eds.), *Mary for Time and Eternity*, Leominster: Gracewing, 2007, 15-21.

— *On the ARCIC Statement; Mary – Grace and Hope in Christ*, Wallington: Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 2007.

O'DONNELL, C., «Ecumenical Progress on the Blessed Virgin: ARCIC 2005», *Milltown Studies* 56 (2005) 87-104.

PAINTER, J., «ARCIC on Mary: An Historical Consideration of the Use of Early Church Evidence in the Seattle Statement», *Journal of Anglican Studies* 4 (2006) 59-80.

PERRELLA, S., «Dialogo cattolico-anglicano. 'Maria: grazia e speranza in Cristo': quale recezione nella chiesa cattolica?», in TONIOLO, E. M. (ed.), *Maria nel dialogo ecumenico in Occidente*, Roma: Marianum, 2008, 193-397.

— «Dimensione mariana della spiritualità secondo il documento cattolico-anglicano di Seattle», in ERBETTA, A., DE FIORES, S., VIDAU, E. (eds.), *Maria di Nazareth*, Roma: AMI, 2010, 157-179.

Philips, D., «ARCIC on Mary, or Things Vainly Invented», *CrossWay* 97 (2005) 1-3.

Pulford, C., «Anglican-Catholic Report Reaches Accord on Role of the Virgin Mary», *Ecumenical News International* 6 (2005) 4.

Ruddock, B., «Ecumenical Reflections on 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'», *The Pastoral Review* 3 (2007) 42-46.

Sagovsky, N., «Maria e il 'metodo ARCIC'», *Il Regno documenti* 50 (2005) 271-273.

— «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ – How Those Involved See it», *The Tablet* 259 (21 May 2005) 8.

— «Mary and Christian Hope: Background to the ARCIC Statement», in McLoughlin, W., Pinnock, J. (eds.), *Mary for Time and Eternity*, Leominster: Gracewing, 2007, 3-14.

Sánchez Pérez, A., «La Virgen María en el diálogo ecuménico según el Documento de Les Dombes y la Declaración de Seattle», *Almogaren* 39 (2006) 139-171.

Seville, T., «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ», *New Directions* 1 (2008) 6–7.

Soosai Rethinam, R., *Ecumenical Reflections on the ARCIC Agreed Statement «Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ» against the Background of Recent Mariological Research*, Leuven: KU University, 2010.

Thompson, T., «The Immaculate Conception in the Catholic-Protestant Ecumenical Dialogue», *Marian Studies* 55 (2004) 245-268.

Villar, J. R., «La figura de Santa María en el documento «María: Gracia y esperanza en Cristo'», *Scripta de Maria* 5 (2008) 187-214.

Warner, M., «'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ'. A New Understanding of Scripture and Tradition?», *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 5 (2005) 265-271.

5. Subject bibliography

5.1. *Church Fathers and medieval theologians (critical editions)*

Irenaeus of Lyon, «Démonstration de la prédication apostolique», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 406, introduction, traduction, and notes: Rousseau., A., Paris: du Cerf, 1995, 88-142.

Irenaeus of Lyon, «Contre les hérésies. Livre III», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 211, critical edition: Rousseau., A., Doutreleau, L., Paris: du Cerf, 1995, 16-491.

Origèn, «Comentarie sur saint Jean», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 157, introduction, traduction, and notes: Blanc, C., Paris: du Cerf, 1970, 128-367.

Ephrem the Syrian, «Ad Dei Matrem. Praecatio secunda», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 524-526.

— «Oratio ad Deiparam», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 528-532.

— «Oratio ad Dei Matrem», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 532-536.

— «Oratio ad Sanctissimam Dei Genetricem», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 536-539.

— «Oratio ad Dei Genetricem», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 539-543.

— «Oratio exomologetica ad Sanctissimam Dei Genetricem», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 548-550.

— «Sermo de Sanctissimae Dei genetricis Virginis Mariae laudibus», in Assemani, G. S. (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, vol. III, Romae: Typographia Vaticana, 1746, 575-577.

Augustine of Hippo, «Sermo 47», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. XXIX, Pellegrino, M., Bellini, P. et all. (eds.), *Discorsi I*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1979, 862-915.

— «Sermo 197», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. XXXII/1, Bellini, P. et all. (eds.), *Discorsi IV/1*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1984, 84-91.

— «Sermo 293», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. XXXIII, Quacquarelli, A. et all. (eds.), *Discorsi V*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1986, 222-243.

— «Sermo 361», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. XXXIV, Paronetto, V., Quartiroli, A. M. (eds.), *Discorsi VI*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1989, 345-373. *PL* 39, 1599-1611.

— «De sancta virginitate», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. VII/1, Trape', A., Palmieri, M. et all. (eds.), *Matrimonio e verginità*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1978, 74-159.

— «Contra Epistulam Parmeniani. Liber secundus», in *Opere di sant'Agostino*, vol. XV/1, Markus., R. A., Lombardi, A. (eds.), *Matrimonio e verginità*, Roma: Città Nuova, 1978, 100-179.

Apponius, «Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 421, text, traduction, and notes: Rousseau., A., Paris: du Cerf, 1995, 10-335.

Pseudo-Origen, «Homilia in Mattheum 12, 38», *PLS* 4, 887-896.

Théoteknos of livias, «L'Encomion», in Wenger, A., *L'Assomption de la Très Sainte Vierge dans la Tradition Byzantine du VI au X siècle*, Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1955, 280 and 291.

Proclus of Constantinople, «Homily I», in Constas, N., *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 2003, 136-147.

Antipater of Bosta, «Discorso di Antitpatro», in Vona, C., *L'orazione di Antipatro sulla nascità del Battista e l'orazione dell'Annunziazione*, Roma: Lateran University Press, 1974, 26-67.

Romanos the Mélodist, «2ᵉ Hymne de la Nativité», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 110, introduction, traduction, and notes: Grosdidier de Matons., J., Paris: du Cerf, 1965, 88-111.

— «On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary», in Maas, P. (ed.), *Sancti Romani Melodi cantica*, Oxford 1997, 276-280.

Eusebius of Alexandria, «Sermo de eleemosyna et in divitem atque Lazarum», *Patrologia Graeca* 86, 424-452.

John of Thessalonica, «Dormitio Dominae nostrae Deiparae ac semper Virginis Mariae», in Jugie, M., «Homélies mariales byzantines», *Patrologia Orientalis* 19 (1925) 375-438.

Modestus of Jerusalem, «Encomium in Dormitionem Sanctissimae Dominae Nostrae Deiparae Semperque Virginis Mariae», *Patrologia Graeca* 86, 3301.

Germanus I of Constantinople, «In Praesentationem Sanctissimae Deiparae Sermo I», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 291-310.

— «In Praesentationem Sanctissimae Deiparae Sermo II», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 309-320.

— «Homilia in Annuntiationem SS. Deiparae», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 319-340.

— «Homilia in Dormitionem B. Mariae II», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 347-353.

— «Homilia in Dormitionem B. Mariae III», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 359-372.

— «Homilia in S. Mariae Zonam», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 371-381.

Andrew of Crete, «Encomium in Nativitatem sanctissimae Deiparae», *Patrologia Graeca* 97, 805-820.

Andrew of Crete, «In Nativitatem Beatae Mariae Virginis», *Patrologia Graeca* 97, 861-882.

John Damascene, «Sermo in Annuntiationem sanctissimae Dominae nostrae Dei Genetricis», *Patrologia Graeca* 96, 647-662.

— «Première homélie sur la Dormition», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 80, introduction, traduction, and notes: Voultet., P., *Homélies sur la Nativité et la Dormition*, Paris: du Cerf, 1961, 80-120.

Paul the Deacon, «Miraculum S. Mariae», in Petsch, R. (ed.) *Theophilus, mittelniederdeutsches Drama in drei Fassungen*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1908, 1-10.

Tarasios of Constantinople, «Oratio in SS. Dei Matrem in templum Deductam», *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 1481-1500.

Theodore the Studite, «Sermo LXIV. In Annuntiationem prior», *Patrologia Graeca* 99, 593

— «Oratio in dormitionem dominae nostrae Deiparae», *Patrologia Graeca* 99, 719-730.

Radulphus Ardens, «Homilia XXX. In Assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 155, 1421-1425.

Guibert of Nogent, «De laude Sanctae Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 156, 537-578.

Anselm of Canterbury, «Oratio LIV Ad Sanctam Virginem Mariam», *Patrologia Latina* 158, 960-961.

Eadmer of Canterbury, «Liber de Excellentia Virginis Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 159, 557-580.

Gottfried of Admont, «Homilia LXV. In festum Assumptionis B. Mariae Virginis secunda», *Patrologia Latina* 174, 964-971.

— «Homilia LXXV. In festum Nativitatis S. Mariae Virginis prima», *Patrologia Latina* 174, 1003-1006.

— «Homilia LXXVII. In festum Nativitatis S. Mariae Virginis quarta», *Patrologia Latina* 174, 1022-1028.

— «Homilia LXXVIII. In festum Nativitatis S. Mariae Virginis quinta», *Patrologia Latina* 174, 1028-1030.

Peter Abelard, «Sermo XXVI. In Assumptione Beatae Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 178, 539-547.

Bernard of Clairvaux, «De Adventu Domini Sermo II», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. IV, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1966, 170-174.

— «In Vigilia Nativitatis Domini Sermo III», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. IV, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1966, 211-219.

— «In Assumptione B. Virginis Mariae Sermo I», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. V, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1968, 228-231.

— «In Assumptione B. Virginis Mariae Sermo II», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. V, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1968, 231-238.

— «Dominica infra octavam Assumptionis B. V. Mariae», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. V, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1968, 262-274.

— «In Nativitate B. Virginis Mariae Sermo. De aqueductu», in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. V, Romae: Editiones Cictercienses, 1968, 275-288.

Guerric of Igny, «Ier Sermon pour l'Assomption», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 202, traduction and notes: Morson, J. et all., *Sermons. Tome II*, Paris: du Cerf, 1973, 414-427.

— «IIe Sermon pour la Purification», in *Sources Chrétiennes* 166, traduction and notes: Morson, J. et all., *Sermons. Tome I*, Paris: du Cerf, 1970, 322-339.

Arnaldus of Bonneval, «De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 189, 1725-1734.

Adam of Saint Victor, «Sequentia XXV. In Assumptione Beatae Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 196, 1501-1504.

John Halgren of Abbeville, «Commentaria in Cantica Canticorum», *Patrologia Latina* 206, 201-862.

Peter of Blois, «Sermo XII. In eadem Purificacione», *Patrologia Latina* 207, 596-599.

— «Sermo XXXIII. In Assumptione Beatae Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 207, 660-663.

— «Sermo XXXIV. In eadem Assumptione», *Patrologia Latina* 207, 663-665.

— «Sermo XXXVIII. In Nativitate Beatae Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 207, 672-677.

ADAM OF PERSEIGNE, «Mariale. Sermo I. In Annuntiatione B. Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 211, 699-711.

— «Mariale. Sermo II. De partu B. Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 211, 711-719.

— «Mariale. Sermo V. In Assumptione B. Mariae», *Patrologia Latina* 211, 733-743.

— «Fragmentum Marianum III», *Patrologia Latina* 211, 746-752.

— «Fragmentum Marianum IV», *Patrologia Latina* 211, 752.

PSEUDO-HILDEFONSUS, «Libellus de Corona Virginis», *Patrologia Latina* 96, 285-318.

NIGEL DE LONGCHAMPS, «Miracula sancta Dei genitricis virginis Marie», in ZI-OLKOWSKI, J. (ed.), *Nigel of Canterbury. Miracles of the Virgin Mary*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1986, 15-98.

WALTER OF WIMBORNE, «Ave, Virgo Mater Christi», in RIGG, A. G. (ed.), *The Poems of Walter of Wimborne*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978, 144-183.

JOHN OF GARLAND, *Epithalamium beatae virginis Mariae*, Firenze: Olschki, 1995.

RICHARD OF SAINT-LAURENT, *De laudibus B. Mariae Virginis libri XII*, Antverpiae 1625.

BONAVENTURE, «Corona beatae Mariae Virginis», in in *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae S. R. E. Episcopalis Cardinalis Opera omnia*, vol. VIII, Quaracchi: Colegii S. Bonaventurae, 1898, 677-678.

— «De Purificatione B. Virginis Mariae. Sermo II», in *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae S. R. E. Episcopalis Cardinalis Opera omnia*, vol. IX, Quaracchi: Colegii S. Bonaventurae, 1901, 640-644.

— «De Annuntiatione B. Virginis Mariae. Sermo V», in *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae S. R. E. Episcopalis Cardinalis Opera omnia*, vol. IX, Quaracchi: Colegii S. Bonaventurae, 1901, 677-682.

THOMAS AQUINAS, *Marian Sermons. Complete Works*, Augsburg 1757.

— «Question 26 – Christ as Called the Mediator of God and Man», in *Latin/English Edition of the Works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, vol. XIX, *Summa Theologiae. Tertia pars, 1-59*, Lander: Aquinas Inst. for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012, 277-278.

— *Commentary on the Gospel of John. Chapters 1-5*, Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

— «Sermon 17. 'Lux orta'», in ID., *The Academic Sermons*, Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2010, 246, 242-258.

BARTHOLOMEW OF BOLOGNA, «Alia expositio Salutationis Angelicae», in ROSSI, I. F. (ed.), *S. Thomae Aquinatis Expositio salutationis angelicae*, Piacenza: Collegio Alberoni, 1931, 36-39.

CONRAD OF SAXONY, *Speculum beatae Mariae virginis*, Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1904.

JACOBUS DE VORAGINE, «The Assumption of the Virgin», in ID., *The Golden Legend. Reading on the Saints*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012, 471 and 475-476.

JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, *Four Questions on Mary*, Ashland: Franciscan Institute Pub., 2012.

HOCCLEVE, T., «Address to Sir John Oldcastle», in FURNIVALL, F. J. (ed.), *Hoccleve's Work: The Minor Poems*, vol. I, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, 8-24.

— «Prayer to the Blessed Virgin (1)», in FURNIVALL, F. J. (ed.), *Hoccleve's Works*, vol I, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, 43-47.

— «V. De beata Virgine», in FURNIVALL, F. J. (ed.), *Hoccleve's Works*, vol. II, London: Oxford University Press, 1924, 11-15.

— «VI. De beata Virgine», in FURNIVALL, F. J. (ed.), *Hoccleve's Works*, vol. II, London: Oxford University Press, 1924, 15-16.

JEAN GERSON, «Sermo factus in loco Sessionis Concilii generalis Constantensis», in DE HASSIA, H., DE ALLIACO, P. ET AL. (eds.), *Joannis Gersoni Doctoris Theologi et Cancelarii Parisiensis Opera Omnia...*, vol. II, Antverpiae 1706, 202.

— «Sermo Valde notabilis. Factus in Cena Domini de humilitate», in DE HASSIA, H., DE ALLIACO, P. ET AL. (eds.), *Joannis Gersoni Doctoris Theologi et Cancelarii Parisiensis Opera Omnia...*, vol. III, Antverpiae 1728, 1123-1134.

BERNARDINO OF SIENNA, «Sermo V. De Virginis matris Dei Nativitate», in DE LA HAYE, I. (ed.), *Sancti Bernardini Senensis ordinis Seraphici Minorum Opera omnia*, vol. IV, Lugduni 1650, 93-98.

— «Sermo LII. Feria tertia post Dominicam olivarum. De salutation angelica, quae per ordinem declaratur», in PERANTONI, P. M. (ed.), *Sancti Bernardini Senensis OFM Opera omnia*, vol. II, Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1950, 153-162.

NICOLAUS POLONUS, «De Visitatione B. Mariae», in *Nicolai Poloni... sermones de praecipuis sanctorum festis totius anni*, Coloniae 1613, 109-115.

— «De Assumptione», in *Nicolai Poloni... sermones de praecipuis sanctorum festis totius anni*, Coloniae 1613, 151-156.

LAWRENCE JUSTINIAN, «In Annunciatione Beatae Mariae Virginis», in *Divi Laurentii Iustiniani protopatriarchae Veneti, opera omnia*, Coloniae 1616, 627-630.

DIONYSIUS THE CARTHUSIAN, «De praeconio et dignitate Mariae», in *Doctoris ecstatici D. Dionysii Cartusiani Opera omnia*, vol. XXXV, Tornaci: Typis Cartusiae S. M. de Pratis, 1908, 477-574.

— «De dignitate et laudibus B. Virg. Mariae», in *Doctoris ecstatici D. Dionysii Cartusiani Opera omnia*, vol. XXXVI, Tornaci: Typis Cartusiae S. M. de Pratis, 1908, 17-174.

SAVONAROLA, GIROLAMO, «Esposizione sopra l'orazione della Vergine Text», *Marian Library Studies* 10 (1978) 81-105.

BERNARDINO DE BUSTIS, «Mariale, pars XII, ser. 2», in COLOMBOTTI, L. F., DE PRA CAVALLIERI, L. (eds.), *Bernardino de Bustis e il Mariale*, Busto Arsizo: Convento dei Fratri Minori, 1982, 44-45.

TRYON, R. W., «Miracles of Our Lady, in Middle English Verse», *Publications of the Modern Language Asociation* 38 (1923) 320-322.

5.2. *Other books, articles and papers*

«Heyl Gloryous Virgyne», in Brown, C. (ed.), *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century*, Oxford: University Press, 1939, 53-54.

«Propositiones circa schema De Beata Maria Virgine Matre Ecclesiae a partibus conciliaribus linguae germanicae et Conferentiae Episcoporum Scandinaviae exaratae», in Niño Picado, A., «La intervención española en la elaboración del capítulo VIII de la constitución 'Lumen gentium'», *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 18 (1968) 163-179.

«The Lang Rosair», in Bennett, J. A. W. (ed.), *Devotional Pieces in verse and Prose from MS Arundel 285 and MS Harleian 6919*, Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1955, 322-334.

Algermissen, K., *Iglesia católica y confesiones cristianas. Confesionología*, Madrid: Rialp, 1964.

Allchin, A. M., «Mary, Virgin and Mother: An Anglican Approach», *Marian Library Studies* 1 (1969) 96-112.

Alonso J. M., «Erasmo, hombre-puente en la historia de la devoción mariana», *Estudios Marianos* 36 (1972) 233-264.

— «IIª Parte: Mariología», *Marian Library Studies* 12 (1980) 435-508.

Anderson, H. G., Stafford, J. F., Burgess, J. A. (eds.), *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. VII, *The One Mediator, the Saints, and Mary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub., 1992.

Ángel Luis, «Cristología y mariología de un anglicano 'casi católico'. John de Satgé y su 'Mary and the Christian Gospel'», *Estudios Marianos* 47 (1982) 191-233.

— «John de Satgé. Un promotor del ecumenismo mariano», *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 34 (1984) 357-360.

Apollonio, A. M., «Maria Santissima Mediatrixe di tutte le grazie», *Immaculata Mediatrix* 7 (2007) 157-181.

— «Mary Mediatrix of All Graces», in Miravalle, M. I. (ed.), *Mariology. A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians and Consecrated Persons*, Goleta: Queenship Pub., 2008, 411-465.

Balić, C., «La doctrine sur la bienheureuse Vierge Marie Mère de l'Eglise et la Constitution 'Lumen gentium' du Concil Vatican II», *Divinitas* 9 (1965) 464-482.

Barnes, J. E., «A Caroline Devotion to the Virgin Mary», *Theology* 73 (1970) 535-541.

— «Bishop Bull's Mariological Sermon. A Study in Seventeenth-century Anglican Thought», *Marianum* 32 (1970) 77-94.

— *All Generations Shall Call me Blessed. XV Devotions of Our Lady from Anglican Writers of the XVII Century*, London: Society of S. Peter & S. Paul, 1973.

Bastero de Eleizalde, J. L., «La mediación materna de María», *Scripta Theologica* 32 (2000) 135-159.

— *María, Madre del Redentor*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 1995.

Bauman, L., *The Anglican Rosary*, Telephone: PRAXIS, 2003.

Bittremieux, J., *De mediatione universali Beatae Mariae Virginis quod gratias*, Bruges: Beyaert, 1926.

Blanco, P., Ferrer, J., *Lutero 500 años después. Breve historia y teología del protestantismo*, Madrid: Rialp, 2017.

Blancy, A., Jourion, M., the Dombes Group, *Mary in the Plan of God and in the Communion of Saints. Toward a Common Christian Understanding*, New York: Paulist Press, 1999.

Bover, J. M., *Catecismo popular sobre la mediación universal de María*, Lérida: Gráficos Academia Mariana, 1927.

— *Deiparae Virginis consensus: corredemptionis ac mediationis fundamentum*, Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1942.

— *La mediación universal de la Santísima Virgen*, Barcelona: Vilamala, 1933.

— *La mediación universal de la Virgen en Santo Tomás de Aquino*, Bilbao: El Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1924.

— *María mediadora universal o Soteriología mariana: estudiada a la luz de los principios mariológicos*, Madrid: C.S.I.C, 1946.

Brandreth, H. R. T., «La santa Madre de Dios en la teología y en la devoción de la Iglesia Anglicana», *Estudios Marianos* 32 (1969) 289-300.

Casanovas Cortés, R., «La mediación materna de María en los documentos, textos y actas del Concilio Vaticano II», *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 40 (1989) 255-285.

Cwiertniak, S., *La Vierge Maria dans la tradition anglicane*, Paris: Fleurus, 1958.

Desmarais, M.-M., *S. Albert le Grand docteur de la médiation mariale*, Paris: J, Vrin, 1935.

Dickson, C., «Mary in Anglican Tradition», *The Priest* 65 (2009) 46-48.

Dodd, G. F., *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces: History and Theology of the Movement for a Dogmatic Definition from 1896 – 1964*, New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2012.

Elliott, K., Seibt, B., *Holding Your Prayers in Your Hands: Praying the Anglican Rosary*, Denton: Open Hands, 2001.

English, L., «Roman Catholic Solutions to the Marian Question in Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue», *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 37 (2000) 142-150.

Erasmus of Rotterodam, «Paean Virgini Matri dicendus compositus in gratiam Dominae Veriensis», *Marian Library Studies* 11 (1979) 83-98.

— «Responsio Erasmi ad exhortationem Alberti Pii. Veneratio Virginis Deiparae», *Marian Library Studies* 12 (1980) 412-420.

Ferroni, L., «La Vergine, nuova Eva, cooperatrice alla divina Economia e Mediatrice secondo il Damasceno», *Marianum* 17 (1955) 1-36.

— *La Vergine Madre, regina della gloria e mediatrice di grazia nel poema di Dante*, Macerata: Tipografia S. Giuseppe, 1960.

Folgardo Flórez, S., «La Virgen María en el esquema agustiniano de la mediación», *Scripta de Maria* 2 (1979) 59-96.

Freeman, T. S., «Offending God: John Foxe and English Protestant Reaction to the Cult of the Virgin Mary», in Swanson, R. N. (ed.), *The Church and Mary*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004, 228-238.

Freitas Silveira, V., «Maria, mãe de Jesus, na Igreja Anglicana», *Último Andar* 31 (2018) 45-59.

Frost, B., *The Mystery of Mary*, London: Mowbary, 1938.

Fuller, R., «The Role of Mary in Anglicanism», *Worship* 51 (1977) 214-224.

Gambero, L., «Patristic Intuitions of Mary's Role as Mediatrix and Advocate: The Invocation of the Faithful for Her Help», *Marian Studies* 52 (2001) 78-101.

Gilski, M., *Mariologia kontekstualna św. Augustyna*, Lublin: KUL, 2006.

Goossens, W., *De cooperatione immediata Matris redemptoris ad redemptionem obiecti-vam*, Paris: Declée, 1939.

Greenacre, R., «The Virgin Mary in the Liturgical Texts of the Anglican Communion», in *De Cultu Mariano Saeculo XX*, vol. I, Città del Vaticano: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis, 1999, 213-230.

— *Mother Out of Sight: Anglican Devotion to Mary*, Wallington: Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1990.

Grignion de Montfort, L.-M., *True Devotion to Mary*, Rockford: Tan Books, 1985.

Haffner, P., *The Mystery of Mary*, Leominster: Gracewing, 2004.

Hauke, M. (ed.), «Maria, 'Mediatrice di tutte le grazie' nell'Archivo Segreto Vaticano del Pontificato di Pio XI», *Immaculata Mediatrix* 7 (2007) 118-129.

— *Maria «Mediatrice di tutte la grazie». La mediazione universale di Maria nell'opera teologica e pastprale del cardenal Mercier*, Lugano: Eupress FTL, 2005.

Holeton, D. R., «Marie dans la tradition liturgique anglicane», in Triacca, A. M., Pistoia, A. (ed.), *La Mère de Jésus-Christ et la communion des saints dans la liturgie*, Roma: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1986, 117-134.

Ilzo Daniel, L., *La mediazione materna di Maria in Cristo negli insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, Pregassona: Eupress FTL, 2011.

Izquierdo, C., «Jesucristo, el redentor», *Revista española de teología* 71 (2011) 445-466.

— *El Mediador, Cristo Jesús*, Madrid: BAC, 2017.

Josemaria, A., *The Blessed Virgin Mary in England*, New York: iUniverse, 2008 & 2009.

Jupp, R., «'Awfully Gifted of the Children of Men'. Some aspects of Newman's devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary as an Anglican», in *Newman on Mary. Two Studies in Development*, Wallington: Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1996, 2-16.

Kolfhaus, F., «La Mediazione mariana di tutte le grazie nel Magisterio di Giovanni Paolo II», *Immaculata Mediatrix* 14 (2014) 19-33.

Lahey, W. L., «The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Theology and Devotion of the Seventeenth-Century Anglican Divines», *Marian Studies* 38 (1987) 137-170.

Lennerz, H., «Considerationes de doctrina B. Virginis Mediatricis», *Gregorianum* 19 (1938) 419-444.

LIGUORI, A. DE, «Discourses on the Principal Feasts of Mary», in GRIMM, E. (ed.), *The Complete Works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, vol. VII-VIII, Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931, 287-461.

— «Explanation of the Salve Regina», in GRIMM, E. (ed.), *The Complete Works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, vol. VII-VIII, Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931, 35-285.

— «Meditation for the Seven Principal Feasts of the Blessed Virgin», in GRIMM, E. (ed.), *The Complete Works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, vol. VII-VIII, Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931, 639-652.

— «Meditation on the Litany of Loretto», 153, cf. also: LIGUORI A. DE, «Explanation of the Salve Regina», in GRIMM, E. (ed.), *The Complete Works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, vol. VII-VIII, Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931, 618-638.

LLAMAS MARTÍNEZ, E., *El Anglicanismo*, Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 2003.

— «Doctrina y piedad Mariana en el Anglicanismo», *Revista de espiritualidad* 36 (1977) 291-319.

MACCULLOCH, D., *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, London: Penguin Books, 2003.

MANELLI, S. M., «La Corredentrice assunta al cielo in Apocalipse 12», in AA.VV., *Assunta al cielo perché corredentrice sulla tierra*, Frigento 2013, 85-106.

— *All Generations Shall Call Me Blessed. Biblical Mariology*, New Bedford: Academy of Immaculate, 2012.

MERKELBACH, B. E., *Mariología: tratado de la Santísima Virgen María, Madre de Dios y Mediadora entre Dios y los hombres*, Bilbao: Descléede Brouwer, 1954.

MILLER, C., *Mary and the Eucharist. A Seventeenth-century Anglican View*, Wallington: Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1992.

MIRAVALLE, M. I., «*With Jesus*»: The Story of Mary Co-redemptrix, Galeta: Queenship Pub., 2003.

— *María. Corredentora. Mediadora. Abogada*, Santa Barbara: Queenship Pub., 1993.

MONTFORT, L. DE, *True Devotion to Mary. With Preparation for Total Consecration*, London: Catholic Way Pub., 2013.

MORE, T., «Letter to a Monk» in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. XV, KINNEY, D. (ed.), «*In Defense of Humanism*». «*Letter to Martin Dorp*». «*Letter to a Monk*», New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986, 198-311.

NEWMAN, J. H., *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.S., on His Recent Eirenicon*, London: Lawrence Kehoe, 1866.

NICHOLSON, D., «The Caroline Divines and the Blessed Virgin Mary», *Mother of Jesus* 4 (1969) 1-14.

PATERSON, J., «Anglicans and Mary: a Church of Ireland», in HYLAND, J., *Mary in the Church*, Dublin: Veritas, 1989, 79-94.

PATTERSON, W. B., «William Perkins versus William Bishop on the Role of Mary as Mediator», in SWANSON, R. N. (ed.), *The Church and Mary*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004, 249-258.

Romaniuk, K., «La Sainte Vierge Marie, médiatrice de toutes les graces d'après Adam de Perseigne», *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 25 (1963) 139-146.

Rovira Belloso, J. M., *Introducción a la teología*, Madrid: BAC, 1996.

Satgé, J. C. de, «The Cult of Mary in the Church of England», in *De cultu mariano saeculo XVI*, vol. III, Roma: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internacional, 1985, 83-100.

— «The Virgin Mary in an Anglican Classic: John Pearson's «Exposition in the Creed» (1659)», in *De cultu mariano saeculis XVII–XVIII*, vol. IV, Roma: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internacional, 1987, 519-523.

Sesboüé, B., *Jesucristo, el único Mediador. Ensayo sobre la redención y la salvación*, vol. I, Salamanca: Secretario Trinitario, 1990.

Shuel, J., A., «The Blessed Virgin Mary in Classical Anglicanism», *Canadian Journal of Theology* 4 (1958) 187-194.

Sri, E., «Advocate and Queen», in Miravalle, M. I. (ed.), *Mariology. A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians and Consecrated Persons*, Goleta: Queenship Pub., 2008, 467-505.

Stephenson, J. V., «Devotion to Our Lady Among Anglicans», *Marian Era* 1 (1960) 18-21.

Steward, J., «An Anglican Woman's Perspective on Mariology», *Grace & Truth* 15 (1998) 24-28.

Wicks, J., *Introduzione al metodo teologico*, Casale Monferrato: Edizioni Piemme, 1994.

Wirgman, A. T., *The Blessed Virgin and the Company of Heaven*, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1913.

Yarnold, E., «Anglicans, Roman Catholics and the Blessed Virgin Mary», *One in Christ* 19 (1983) 274-281.

5.3. *Dictionaries and encyclopedias*

«Mediate», in Fowler, H. W., Fowler, F. G., Allen, R. E. (eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Claredon Press, 1990, 737.

«Mediation and Conciliation Service», in Black, H. C. (ed.), *A Law Dictionary: Definitions of the Terms and Phrases of American and English Jurispudence, Ancient and Modern*, Union: Lawbook Exchange, 2004, 799.

«Mediation», in Jowitt, E., Walsh, C. (ed.), *The Dictionary of English Law*, London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1959, 1159.

«Mediation», in Whitney, W. D., *The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia: A Work of Universal Reference in All Departments of Knowledge, with A New Atlas of the World*, New York: Century, 1904, 3682.

«Mediation», in *A Modern Dictionary of the English Language*, London: Casell, 1911, 419.

«Mediator», in, *A Modern Dictionary of the English Language*, London: Casell, 1911, 419.

«Mediation», in Goodrich, C. A., Porter, N. et al. (eds.), *Webster's Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, London: George Bell & Sons, 1886, 824.

«Mediator», in Attwater, D. (ed.), *The Catholic Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, London: Casell, 1951, 316.

«Mediator», in Urdang, L. (ed.), *The Oxford Thesaurus*, Oxford: University Press, 1997, 280.

«Mediator», in Webster, N., *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, New York: Dodd Mead, 1887, 824.

Abbagnano, N., «Mediación», in Id., *Diccionario de filosofía*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982, 786-787.

Bastero de Eleizalde, J. L., «María», in Villar, J. R. (dir.), *Diccionario teológico del Concilio Vaticano II*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2015, 671-697.

De Fiores, S., «Mediatrice», in Id., *Maria. Nuovissimo dzizionario*, vol. II, Bolonia: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, 2006, 1081-1141.

— «Microstoria della salveza», in Id., *Maria. Nuovissimo dzizionario*, vol. II, Bolonia 2006, 1143-1169.

Hebblethwaite, B., «Mediator», in Richardson, A., Bowden, J. (eds.), *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, London: SCM Press, 1983, 354-355.

Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Claredon Press, 1968.

Latham, R. E., Ashdowe, R. K. et all. (eds.), *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, Oxford: University Press, 2018.

Lewis, C. T. (ed.), *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Claredon Press, 2002.

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. et all. (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Claredon Press, 1996.

Lodi, E., «Oración mariana», in De Fiores, S., Meo, S. (dirs.), *Nuevo diccionario de mariología*, Madrid: Ediciones Paulinas, 1988, 1487-1498.

Meo, S., «Mediadora», in De Fiores, S., Meo, S. (dirs.), *Nuevo diccionario de mariología*, Madrid: Ediciones Paulinas, 1988, 1304-1320.

O'Carroll, M., «Advocate», in Id., *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, Wilmington: Glazier, 1982, 5-6.

Parente, P., «Mediación», in Parente, P., Piolanti, A., Garofalo, S. (eds.), *Diccionario de teología dogmática*, Barcelona: Editorial Litúrgica Española, 1963, 254-255.

Reese, W. L., «Mediation», in Id., *Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion. Eastern and Western Thought*, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press Hassocks, 1980, 346.

Rodríguez-Garrapucho, F., «Historia del movimiento ecuménico», in Izquierdo, C., et al. (eds.), *Diccionario de Teología*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2014, 291-293.

Villar, J. R., «Introducción. III. La hermenéutica conciliar», in Id. (dir.), *Diccionario teológico del Concilio Vaticano II*, Pamplona: EUNSA, 2015, 78-96.

Vorgrimler, H., «Mediatore», in Id., *Nuovo dizionario teologico*, Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, 2004, 410-411.

Marian Mediation and Intercession in Mary, *Grace and Hope in Christ*

T he previous chapters have surveyed, firstly, the theological develop-
ment of the concept of Mary's mediation in the Catholic Church (cf.
chapter I) both prior to the protestant Reformation (cf. I §1) and after
the Reformation (cf. I §2). Afterwards, the Anglicans' position on the theory
of Mary's mediation was studied, as found in their publications since the An-
glican schism until the 1980s (cf. chapter II). In this manner, the concept of
Mary's mediation was analysed, both in the theology of the unified Church
prior to the Reformation and in the subsequent divergent paths of Catholic
and Anglican theologies.

The next stage of research is to verify how the topic of Mary's media-
tion was discussed in the last half-century of ecumenical dialogue between the
Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion. The purpose of this
analysis is to check whether ecumenical efforts in the field of Mariology have
contributed – if not to the resolution of contradictions – at least to a partial
agreement on the mediation of Mary. The author wants to achieve this goal in
three steps, representing the next phases of the research.

Firstly, a general overview of the Mariological topics emerging in the
Anglican-Catholic dialogue (cf. III §1) will be presented. In this way, the
reader will be able to learn about the historical background of the ecumeni-
cal dialogue and see which Mariological issues were discussed by the Angli-
can-Catholic commission.

Later, the author will analyse the statement entitled *Mary, Grace and Hope
in Christ* (cf. III §§2-3). He will examine in a special way how this most impor-
tant ecumenical document on Mariology raised the question of the mediation
of Mary. This stage will help to verify whether the official Anglican-Catholic
dialogue has reached an agreement on the subject matter.

Finally, having analysed the statement of the above document on the
mediation of Mary, the first reception of findings on this issue in the Catholic
Church and in the Anglican Communion (cf. III §4) be remains to discussed.

It is known that the findings of the theological commission are not tantamount to authoritative teaching, but must be approved both by the Holy See and by the Anglican side. Getting to know these reactions, especially the official ones, will allow us to verify whether the arrangements of the ecumenical commission resulted in an agreement on the intercession of Mary between the two ecclesial communities, or whether it opened the next stage of discussion on this topic.

1. Marian issues in ecumenical dialogue with Anglicans

From the ecumenical point of view, the Church of England is one of the most active members of the dialogue compared to other Christian denominations. Actually, it can be said that the origins of the modern ecumenical movement are, in a sense, related to Anglicanism. Already in the middle of 19th century, the *Oxford Movement* began the dialogue with the Catholics. Later this dialogue would be mentioned in the Conferences in Lambeth, Malinas Conversations, the YMCA and YWCA movements, Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland, *Faith and Order* and many others. The Anglican Church is a member of many international ecumenical organisations, and also conducts bilateral dialogues with many Christian denominations[1].

Due to this particular openness to ecumenism, as well as to the quite strong Anglo-Catholic tendency, the ecumenical dialogue between the Catholic Church with the Church of England is quite cordial, and gives rise to numerous meetings, conferences, joint pilgrimages, and visits of the hierarchs. A very important topic in the ecumenical dialogue between Anglican and Catholics is the issue of Mariology. There are many aspects and forms of this dialogue.

Two important elements in the ecumenical relationship between both Churches are worth mentioning particularly (from the Mariological point of view). The first is the Sanctuary of Our Lady of Walsingham. This Anglo-Saxon chapel was the most important Marian shrine in England until the Reformation and a pilgrimage destination for many kings. The church, destroyed during the abolition of monasteries, was abandoned for four hundred years. However, at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, there was a revival of the religious services. Both Catholics (in 1896) and Anglicans (in 1938) rebuilt their churches in the village, which gave the renewed cult an ecumenical character[2].

The second important element in Anglican-Catholic relations is the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, founded in 1967 by the Catholic

layman Martin Gillett. Since then, the association has been developing theological dialogue between the two Churches, paying particular attention to Mariological issues[3].

However, the most eminent form of dialogue are official theological meetings, which are one of the basic vehicles of official ecumenical relations between the two churches[4]. Analysing the declarations and other documents from conversations with the Anglican Communion (both on the international level and on the local level), it may be noted that Mary appears continuously. Moreover, in 2005 one of the recent documents of the ecumenical Catholic-Anglican dialogue was dedicated in full measure to the person of Mary and theological topics related to her: *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*.

2. Mediation and intercession of Mary in the Seattle Statement

This subsection is the most important part of the thesis. According to the assumptions formulated in the introduction, the author would now like to examine how the issue of Mary's mediation was presented in the Seattle Statement.

Firstly, it seems proper to present those elements of the editorial history of the text that relate to the debate on the subject of Mary's mediation (§ 2.1). Later, the final text of the document should be carefully examined step by step, finding in it the fragments that relate to the mediation of Mary (§ 2.2). Finally, the key task must be confronted, of evaluating the concept of Mary's mediation presented in the statement in the light of the theology of mediation existing in the Catholic Church (§ 3).

2.1. *History of the editorial work of the Seattle Statement*

In this section, the author would like to present the history of the editorial work on *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ*. However, this will not be an exhaustive study on the overall editorial history or an attempt to comprehensively present the contribution of all the interlocutors or the personal influence of particular committee members on the shape of the Seattle Statement. Above all, the author wishes to extract and present those facts that are related to the issues of Mary's mediation and intercession. Work on the Seattle Statement was done in a total of six meetings, lasting from 2000 (30th meeting of ARCIC) to 2004 (35th meeting of ARCIC).

2.1.1. Mississauga (1999)

The 30th meeting of the ARCIC[5] was held on 26 August-2 September 1999 at the Queen of Apostles renewal Centre in Mississauga, Ontario (Canada)[6]. During this meeting, the bilateral commission took the first steps to enter into discussions on the Mariological topic. Several preliminary papers were listened to and two sub-committees were created: one for editing the scheme of the future document; and the second one for identifying the resources needed for the discussion of the commission. In the introductory structure of the document, it was foreseen that consideration would have to be given to the theme of Mary's intercession[7].

2.1.2. Paris (2000)

The 31st meeting of the ARCIC was held on 26 August – 4 September 2000 at the Prieuré St. Benoît et Ste Scholastique, Montmartre, Paris[8]. While the meeting of 1999 was rather of a preparatory nature, the meeting of 2000 undertook intensive work on the issue of Mary in the life and doctrine of the Church. During the discussion, members of the commission also presented the background papers, which facilitated a deeper understanding of the problems discussed.

Sara Butler MSBT presented her paper *Second Vatican Council, and Subsequent Papal Documents: Annotated Quotations* (ARCIC II [Mary] 458/00)[9]. Among the many Mariological themes that have appeared in the teaching of the Church since the Second Vatican Council, Butler included the issue of Mary's mediation. In this line, she cited three important sources that touched on Mary Mediatrix: *Lumen gentium*, *Redemptoris Mater*, and the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (No. 970). Thanks to Butler's paper, the commission had the opportunity to learn the official position of the Catholic Church on the subject of Mary's mediation.

Regarding Mary's intercession, Butler referred to LG 62 which teaches that «[Mary's] manifold intercession continues to obtain for us gifts of eternal salvation». Commenting on these words, Butler explained that Mary «assumed into heaven continues to intercede for *the brethren of her Son*»[10]. Butler found another explanation for Mary's intercession in the text of *Redemptoris Mater*. On this basis, she explained that Mary's «motherly care for us, expressed by her intercession, is portrayed as an extension of her motherhood of Christ» and that «she will continue to intercede for her children until the end of time»[11]. The last Catholic document to which Butler referred was the *Cat-*

echism. Citing No. 969, Butler presented the doctrine of the Church, which believes in «motherly intercession,» which «continues» also after her[12].

Anglican Prof. John Muddiman of Oxford also made a brief reference to the question of Mary's mediation and intercession. Focusing on the interpretation of the biblical foundations of Mariology, Muddiman cited Pius XII's document declaring the dogma of the Assumption of Mary. At one point, he assessed it positively, appreciating that Pius XII did not comment on the controversial topic of Mary's mediation and her alleged role as Co-Redemptrix[13]. This shows that Muddiman was not a supporter of the title *Mediatrix*, and he was glad that it did not appear in the *ex cathedra* solemn teaching of the Church. Rozane E. Elder in her paper «Overview of the Development of Marian Doctrine» also mentioned testimonies about faith in the intercession and mediation of Mary[14].

Another important paper in which the topic of Mary's mediation appeared was the work of C. Sherlock and P. Cross: *Mary in the Communion of Saints: Some Issues*[15]. As Sherlock said, «[the paper] noted the relative absence of eschatology in ARCIC's work thus far, took up the language of the saints in Christ as 'truly alive', and advocated doing theology from the 'future backwards'. Combined with discussion of Romans 8,27-30, this was to become a major 'engine' for the work on Mary»[16].

In their paper, the authors started by presenting the facts regarding the matter of invoking Mary's intercession. Firstly, they recognised that in Catholicism and Anglicanism the practice of invocation is not present in the same way. They emphasised that this practice, common in Catholicism, although not prescribed or required, constantly required control and correction by the official Magisterium. In Anglicanism, however, reluctance could be noticed with respect to this practice, as expressed by the critical words recorded in the *Articles of Religion*.

However, the authors acknowledged that criticism by Elizabethan theologians was directed not so much at the prayer for the intercession of the saints (which was perceived not so much as erroneous, but «spiritually dangerous»), as towards the apparently misunderstood «Romish Doctrine» which seemed to encourage, as fitting and appropriate, practices not fully understood[17].

After this recognition of the situation, Sherlock and Cross firstly dealt with the issue of eschatology, which is the basis for the proper understanding of the heavenly Church, and then the issue of communication in prayer with the dead, particularly the saints. The authors relied on the Australian statement *The Saints and Christian Prayer*, of which they quoted significant fragments in their paper. Appreciating the deep reflection contained in this

statement, Cross and Sherlock stated that «these insights may be valuable to ARCIC in considering the issue of Mary and invocation – which raises the question of the distinctive place of Mary in the communion of saints»[18].

In connection with the above, both theologians attempted to take the next step in reflection, asking «what is distinctive about Mary in the communion of saints». At the beginning they stated that «Mary's distinctive role» and «her historic significance... do not have a sense that these are *present* realities»[19]. Furthermore, «few Anglicans would think in terms of her being Theotokos now», and «few Anglicans would have the sense that they sing the Magnificat with Mary now»[20]. Finally, «Anglicans generally do not regard Mary as having a *present* ministry different in kind to that of other saints». For many Catholics, however, «Mary is near at hand, and may be approached in a familiar way in prayer, both in *conversation* and as *invocation*»[21].

It should be noted that all of the above statements are in fact reflections of opinions among Anglicans or ordinary teaching by Anglican pastors. They are not equivalent to an official teaching formulated in contemporary documents of the Anglican Community or the Anglican Bishops' conference. It is difficult to argue with human feelings or habits. Still, the statements help to understand the fears or prejudices present in the Anglican mentality, which are in fact the fruit of the influence of the Calvinist doctrine on Anglican teaching, and – in more recent times – the evangelical influence on the so-called *Low Church*.

After making the above, both authors went on to deal with the practical question about the impact of this theological incongruence on the possible doctrinal communion between Catholics and Anglicans. For Sherlock and Cross it would seem that the liturgical sources show the «growing closeness in reflecting on the present glorified state of Mary and the saints, as well as her intercession»[22]. It can therefore be said that for both authors Mary's intercession did not appear to be a major problem for building unity between the two Churches.

In the light of the discussions about mediation and intercession during the meeting, the commission decided to reorganise the cluster 2. In terms of the subject of Mary's mediation, the most important was the change of the section C – from «Sin, Eschatology and Mary» to «Mary, Church, Communion of Saints and Eschatology». Additionally, the issue of Mary's intercession was included for discussion in the cluster 4 (*Mary in the liturgical life of contemporary Anglicans and Catholics*) of section C: «Mary in the Communion of Saints: prayer and *koinonia*»[23].

2.1.3. Dublin (2001)

The 32nd meeting of the ARCIC was held on 27 August – 4 September 2001 at the Church of Ireland College of Education in Dublin[24]. During this meeting, committee members continued to consider the place of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the doctrine and life of the Church.

An important contribution was the paper of M. Nazir-Ali and N. Sagovsky, *The English Reformers and the Blessed Virgin Mary* (ARCIC II [Mary] 490/01). It raised the issue of criticism of medieval Marian piety by the English reformers[25]. As the authors showed, this criticism was centred on a perceived threat to the mediation of Christ[26].

In the light of the exchanges and delivered papers, the commission decided to recast the draft of the prepared document again. This task was entrusted to the team of the four drafters, who formulated it during the January meeting in the Monastery of Chevetogne (Belgium) and entitled it: *Mary, Christ and the Church* (ARCIC II [Mary] 506/02). For the issue of the mediation of Mary, the most important change was the creation of the section F: *Mary in the life of the Church* (No. 61-67), which would have two parts: «The Invocation of Mary» (64-65) and «Devotion to Mary and the struggle for justice» (66-67)[27].

2.1.4. Vienna (2002)

The 33rd meeting of the ARCIC was held on 10-18 July 2002 at the Focolare centre *Am Spiegeln* in Vienna[28]. During this meeting, in order to discuss and re-elaborate the details of particular fragments of the prepared scheme, the committee split into smaller working groups. Among others, there was a group tasked with drafting Section D, about mediation and invocation. This group quoted again the paper of AustARC in 1996-99 on *The Saints and Christian Prayer*[29]. As Sherlock reminisced, «the overall outcome was a tighter draft in the scriptural area, a reshaping of the historical/theological section (including discussion of *Sub tuum praesidium* based on the Greek text), and general approval of the work on invocation/mediation»[30].

Unfortunately, the details of the proceedings and the joint work of the commission have not been published. However, it may be concluded that the subject of Mary's mediation was considered so important that some paragraphs were devoted to this issue in the prepared scheme, the so-called Vienna draft[31].

In order to continue the committee's work smoothly, members were asked to submit their comments and remarks to the working group dealing

with the preparation of the document scheme. In accordance with suggestions and requests, the drafters prepared on 27-29 November 2002 a new working scheme, divided into four sections. We are most interested in section *D. Mary in the life of the Church* (65-71):

> The tradition of invocation and mediation in the Communion of Saints (68.64-66);
> The distinctive place of Mary (67-70);
> Differences reconciled in the freedom of grace (70)[32].

Therefore, this scheme of the document already has an architecture like that of the final document which would appear in 2005.

2.1.5. Delray Beach (2003)

The 34th meeting of the ARCIC was held on 10 – 18 July 2003 at the Duncan Centre, Delray Beach, Florida[33]. During this session the devotion to Mary in both the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion was considered along with the issue of the theology of invocation of the saints.

In this way, the working text of the ecumenical document (ARCIC II [Mary] 553/03) was finally edited, initially entitled *Mary, Pattern of Grace and Hope for the Church*[34]. The structure of chapter D (*Mary in the life of the Church*) was slightly changed. It contained two subsections:

> The tradition of invocation and mediation in the communion of saints (69-72);
> The distinctive place of Mary (73-77)[35].

2.1.6. Seattle and final document (2004)

The 35th meeting of the ARCIC was held on 28 January – 3 February 2004 at the Palisades Retreat Center, Seattle (USA)[36].

During this meeting, commission members officially approved the document, thereby concluding the second phase of the deliberations of ARCIC. Regarding the question of the mediation of Jesus and Mary, and her intercession, «The Agreed Statement affirms that Mary has a continuing ministry which serves the ministry of Christ, our unique mediator; that Mary and the saints pray for the whole church and that the practice of asking Mary and the saints to pray for us is not communion-dividing»[37].

Thanks to the work of the commission, individual points were re-edited, that is, while maintaining the accepted project of the scheme, the order of individual points included in specific chapters was changed slightly:

> D. Mary in the life of the Church (64-75).
>   Intercession and Mediation in the Communion of Saints (67-70).
>   The Distinctive Ministry of Mary (71-75)[38].

Now having an overview of the editorial process of the text of the Seattle Declaration, it is possible to proceed to examine the text of the document referring to Mary's mediation.

2.2. *Mediation and intercession of Mary in Mary*, Grace and Hope in Christ

As was mentioned in the beginning, one subsection in section *D. Mary in the Life of the Church* was directly devoted to the issue of intercession and mediation of Mary[39]; but it is possible to encounter other individual mentions in the remaining parts of the document as well[40].

2.2.1. Introduction

The introduction to the ecumenical document contains only one important reference to the subject of Mary's mediation. It is found in No. 2, where the authors of the statement refer to previous documents from Catholic-Anglican relations, in which Mariological issues were raised. For members of the commission, the contribution of the statement from 1981, *Authority in the Church II* (discussed in this paper: cf. § 2.1.1 c and § 2.2.1), was particularly important. This is expressed in No. 2 as follows:

> 2. ARCIC has addressed this topic once before. *Authority in the Church II* (1981) already records a significant degree of agreement:
> «We agree that there can be but one mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ, and reject any interpretation of the role of Mary which obscures this affirmation. We agree in recognizing that Christian understanding of Mary is inseparably linked with the doctrines of Christ and the Church... (para. 30)».

It is clear that – according to the nature of the introduction – the authors of the document consider the previous fruit of dialogue as a starting point, and

also as the still-valid locus of current conversations in the history of Anglican-Catholic relations. Therefore, the above quote gives basic premises about Mariological issues.

Examining the above text in terms of the issue of Mary's mediation, it must be stated that the absolutely fundamental and undeniable truth is the fact of the one and universal mediation of Jesus Christ. However, continuing the above premise, the authors of *Authority in the Church II* in a negative way had rejected any interpretations of Mariological theories which could distort or menace the truth about Christ as the only Mediator. In the editing of theological and ecumenical documents, the way of formulating of statements is very significant. Therefore, it is possible to draw the following conclusions from linguistic and stylistic analysis.

Firstly, two realities are clearly interrelated through contrast: the fundamental truth about Christ-Mediator and the erroneous theories about the role of Mary. This way of expressing thoughts brings to mind somewhat the Protestant principle of *aut-aut*[41]. The authors of *Authority in the Church II* did not wish to formulate a theory or teaching that would mistakenly attribute the role of Mediator to Mary.

Secondly, following the first deduction, *Authority in the Church II* had approached Mary's role in a very cautious, if not negative, way. The authors of the document did not allude to the fact that in the teaching of the Catholic Church, and especially from 1964 (*Lumen gentium*) up to 1981 (*Authority in the Church II*), official documents had presented in a very balanced and careful manner the truth about the maternal role of Mary, whose ministry was closely connected with her maternal and intercessory function. In light of this, one might have expected at least a mention of Mariological theories that did not deny the basic truth about the unique mediation of Christ.

Thirdly, the authors of *Authority in the Church II* had not used the title *Mediatrix* in relation to Mary, preferring to call her presumptive function «a role of Mary» instead of *mediation*. It is logical to ask why this wording was used. Was this done in reference to the terms used in the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and of pope Paul VI? Perhaps it was all about continuing the Council's teaching line. Indeed, as indicated above in § 2.3, The Council in *Lumen gentium* (No. 60-62) did not use the term *mediation* of Mary but rather the terms «subordinate role», «duty», «function», «office», «salutary influence» or «motherhood/maternity in the order of grace». Similarly, Paul VI did not use the term «mediation of Mary» in official teaching.

Or perhaps it was about precluding both obvious theological errors and even moderate and careful conciliar teaching? We must remember that, with

all its caution, the constitution *Lumen gentium* did affirm that Mary «is our mother in the order of grace» (LG 61) and that she «is invoked in the Church under the titles of Advocate, Helper, Benefactress and Mediatrix» (LG 62). Also Paul VI, though not calling Mary directly *Mediatrix*, taught that she is the «generous steward of His merciful gifts» (*Mense Maio*), «mediatress for peace» (*Christi Matri*) or «path and rallying point» (*Marialis cultus*). If this was indeed the reason for a clearly negative detachment from the measured teaching of the Catholic Church, we could speak, at least, of cautious, if not suspicious, Anglicans.

However, to soften this critical interpretation of the analysed passage, it should be added that by saying «any interpretation of the role of Mary which obscures...» one can indirectly surmise that there may be other theories acceptable to both parties. The fact is, however, that at that time the authors were not decided on elaborating on this issue or even mentioning those acceptable theories.

It seems, therefore, that the overall tone of the quoted passage from *Authority in the Church II* is quite critical and somewhat incontrovertible. It must therefore be concluded that in 1981 the ecumenical dialogue with the Anglicans about the mediation of Mary was in a rather incipient phase.

Somebody may now ask why the authors of *MGH* decided to put this quote at the beginning of the statement. The authors themselves explain it in Nos. 2 and 3. Thanks to these explanations, it can be understood that the words from *Authority in the Church II* cited in No. 2 were on the one hand a starting point for a debate on Mariological issues. On the other hand, they served to show that since their publication in 1981 the participants of the ecumenical dialogue had changed the mutual evaluation of the approach to Mariological tradition (principle of the «re-reception», cf. No. 3).

2.2.2. Section A: «Mary according to the Scriptures»

This chapter does not mention directly any of the points that concern us – neither the title *Mediatrix* nor the issue of Mary's mediation. There is also no reference to Jesus Christ's unique mediation. The only place where the verb *mediate* appears is No. 16, and there it concerns the person of the Holy Spirit. The Incarnation of the Son of God, states this number, was mediated by the Holy Spirit.

Although this quote is not directly related to the issue of Mary's mediation, it is worth remembering. Sometimes the accusation has been leveled against Catholics, that by exaggerating the attribution to Mary of the role of

Mediatrix they seem to endanger the mediation of Christ, and also to forget the sanctifying role of the Holy Spirit, who works in us as the Divine Person sent by God the Father and God's Son.

2.2.3. Section B: «Mary in the Christian Tradition»

Chapter B is historical. In it the authors of the Seattle Statement analyse the tradition of the undivided Church and its history after the Reformation.

Chapter B consists of four subsections devoted to the different historical periods of the Ancient epoch (comprised of two subsections, Christological and liturgical), the Middle Ages and the post-Reformation era. Mary's mediation is mentioned in third and fourth subsections.

a) *The Growth of Marian Doctrine and Devotion in the Middle Ages*

The subsection devoted to the medieval epoch consists of three points (No. 41-43). In No. 41 the growth of Marian devotion at the period of the early Middle Ages is discussed, assessing it rather as something good and useful (St Bernard and the practice of the Rosary are alluded to). No. 42 focuses on Mariological doctrine in theology. The thematic richness of this medieval theology is highlighted, and «the measured theology of Mary's sanctification» of Thomas de Aquinas as well as «the subtle reasoning of Duns Scotus about Mary», are treated positively. However, it is also mentioned that «the centre of attention of believers shifted from Mary as representing the faithful Church, and so also redeemed humanity, to Mary as dispensing Christ's graces to the faithful» (No. 42).

No. 43 centres on the late medieval period, paying special attention to popular religion and piety. Mary Mediatrix is mentioned:

> 43. In the Late Middle Ages, scholastic theology grew increasingly apart from spirituality. Less and less rooted in scriptural exegesis, theologians relied on logical probability to establish their positions, and Nominalists speculated on what could be done by the absolute power and will of God. Spirituality, no longer in creative tension with theology, emphasized affectivity and personal experience. In popular religion, Mary came widely to be viewed as an intermediary between God and humanity, and even as a worker of miracles with powers that verged on the divine. This popular piety in due course influenced the theological opinions of those who had grown up with it, and who subsequently elaborated a theological rationale for the florid Marian devotion of the Late Middle Ages.

It cannot be denied that, after the rather positive assessment of early medieval piety (No. 41) and the development of theological doctrine (No. 42), No. 43 is characterised by a rather negative attitude to the topic discussed. Nominalists, affective spirituality and popular religion are criticised in particular. Regarding the latter issue, the authors of *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* emphasise that «Mary came widely to be viewed as an intermediary between God and humanity». This mention seems to be quite critical. Analysing the above words, several conclusions may be drawn.

Firstly, usage of the terms «popular religion» and «popular piety» is quite puzzling[42]. At the time of the writing of the Seattle Statement, the *Directory on Popular Piety. Principles and Guidelines* (2002) had already been in circulation for two years. The *Directory* employs the technical terms «popular piety» or «popular religiosity»[43] and argues that these names are more appropriate than «popular religion»[44].

The Seattle document first refers to Mary's mediating role as an element of «popular religion», but later talks about the theory of mediation as «this *popular piety*... [which] influenced the theological opinions of those who had grown up with it» (No. 43). So, it is not entirely clear what the statement is referring to. Is this about the «expression» of a collectivity's «totalizing view of the transcendent» (i.e. religiosity) or about «cultic expressions» (i.e. piety)? Which is it to be?

Secondly, the document states that those misconceptions were «widely» accepted in the popular religion (or maybe piety...?). From the researcher's point of view, unfortunately, the commission did not specify what it meant by «widely». To justify the use of this adverb, at least two or three examples should be given to illustrate that which is claimed (like in No. 41 and No. 42). However, if there are no examples and if that term is understood as «as a rule», «by all» or «generally», then it seems that this quantifier is a bit unfair.

It is true that it is easier to distort popular piety, as it is largely a product of a personal way of experiencing faith by people with possibly low religious education (but not only by them). Because of this, their creations were neither widely written down nor published. Hence, the references and their descriptions are known only from the accounts of people who at that time possessed literacy and had a reason to talk about popular piety. Of course, there are edifying descriptions of popular piety; but usually it was referred to when somebody wanted to correct it, to criticise or to pay attention to changes going in the wrong direction. But how and why can it be asserted that «Mary came *widely* to be viewed as an intermediary between God and humanity»?

Thirdly, in No 43 one thing is perceived as a mistake or problem. According to the authors of the document, the error consists in the perception of Mary «as an intermediary between God and humanity». This approach seems to be surprising again. After all, according to the secular teaching of theologians (cf. § 1.3) – and therefore not uneducated people – Mary can rightly be called *Mediatrix*. It is worth recalling at least St John Damascene (who in the Middle Ages was read often and considered an authority),[45] and, above all, Thomas of Aquinas[46], both earlier mentioned by the authors of the statement.

And even if the teaching of that epoch (despite having been propounded by universally recognised authorities) could be called by somebody as private theories, from the perspective of 2004 it seems at least surprising that this truth should be considered problematic or erroneous. In the moment of approving the final version of *Mary*, *Grace and Hope in Christ*, the authors of the document must have been familiar with the in-depth explanation of Mary's mediation during the pontificate of John Paul II[47]. So, what are the authors of the statement referring to? What is the ground for their wariness? Is it reflected in their use of the term «intermediary»? Is there an idea of an intermediate instance «between God and humanity»? Unfortunately, this has not been explained. It may be assumed that the members of ARCIC were referring rather to a lack of religious equilibrium in experiencing and understanding the faith of contemporary people. From the point of view of modern theology, perhaps the objection was simply to a lack of a basic hierarchy of truths, in which basic truths, though still present, seemed to have been pushed into the background by overly emphasised and over-experienced matters of less importance.

Fourthly, it is worth paying attention to the expression that Mary was *widely* seen as «even as a worker of miracles with powers that verged on the divine». The wording «verged on the divine» is quite disturbing, because it seems to suggest that some people (it could be asked: who exactly?) considered Mary's «power» to be different from the divine one. However, this serious allegation is not supported by any specific example or argument. So it is difficult to guess who could say that. Therefore again, one can feel a bit disappointed with the lack of precision in dealing with important issues.

In what follows, it must be acknowledged that there is some point to the negative assessment a situation where theology is more affected by «affectivity and personal experience» or by «culture of the people» than by Revelation or the solemn teaching of councils. However – entering into a healthy argument with the above formulation – it is possible to call to mind the appreciation by the Second Vatican Council of the *sensus fidei* of the people of God[48], as well as its appreciation of human reason, history, signs of the times, the lives of saints

or the experience of local or regional Churches as *loci theologici*[49]. Therefore, it must be concluded that on the one hand, it is not entirely true that late-medieval theologians relied solely on popular piety in developing their theology (although it was undoubtedly often a starting point or element of inspiration for them), because – as Chapter I proves – they abundantly utilised scriptural sources and employed biblical symbols, comparisons or similarities. On the other hand, according to Catholic doctrine, valuable insights are to be found in the Apostolic Tradition, and there is nothing wrong with using other *loci theologici* as well.

Trying to sum up our analysis of No. 43, it is possible to conclude that the members of ARCIC present the issue of Mary's mediation in a rather negative way: as an untheological expression of popular religiosity. Secondly, one can notice a certain terminological imprecision («intermediary», «popular religion/piety»), which leaves the more inquisitive researcher with an ambiguous understanding of the words of the document. There is a lack of necessary examples and, finally, a rather surprising reluctant attitude towards the truth which was finally approved by the Catholic Church (cf. RM, CCC or RVM).

b) *From the Reformation to the Present Day*

The historical description of the development of Marian doctrine and piety contained in the subsection dedicated to the Middle Ages is followed by a subsection that deals with the period starting from the Reformation. No. 44 states:

44. One powerful impulse for Reformation in the early sixteenth century was a widespread reaction against devotional practices which approached Mary as a mediatrix alongside Christ, or sometimes even in his place. Such exaggerated devotions, in part inspired by presentations of Christ as inaccessible Judge as well as Redeemer, were sharply criticized by Erasmus and Thomas More and decisively rejected by the Reformers. Together with a radical re-reception of Scripture as the fundamental touchstone of divine revelation, there was a re-reception by the Reformers of the belief that Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and humanity. This entailed a rejection of real and perceived abuses surrounding devotion to Mary. It led also to the loss of some positive aspects of devotion and the diminution of her place in the life of the Church.

Already the first reading of the above point allows for the observation that it has been a little bit more accurately edited than No. 43, but still leaves a lot to be desired. Entering the analysis of No. 44, it is necessary to bring out the particular elements important for the issue of Mary's mediation.

Firstly, the ARCIC members explain that one of the reasons for the criticism of Mariology by the Reformers was the existence of «devotional practices which approached Mary as a mediatrix alongside Christ, or sometimes even in his place». Every Catholic must agree that the above quoted concept of Mary's mediation is incompatible with Revelation and the Church's official teaching. The teaching of St Paul is clear: «for there is but one God and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all» (1 Tim 2,5-6). As has been shown before (chapter II), the official teaching of the Church has repeatedly reminded that Jesus Christ is the only mediator, due to the hypostatic union realized in him. Any Catholic would agree that there is no mediator «alongside Christ», let alone «in his place». A doctrine that would say the opposite is simply contrary to Revelation and the teaching of the Catholic Church.

Commenting on the above wording contained in No. 44, the precision on the part of the document's authors should be noticed. Using the terms «alongside» and «in place» (described by Pope John Paul II as «*parallel* mediation» and «*autonomous* or *rival* mediation») they very accurately present errors in understanding Mary's mediation. But, at the same time, they ignore different forms of mediation that are part of and result from the unique mediation of Jesus Christ[50], and omits any mentioned of them[51].

However, it seems that again there is a lack of even one illustrative example here. For example, there is a mention of Erasmus and Thomas More in the next sentence, but unfortunately it is impossible to know which «devotional practices» the statement is referring to. This is quite important because the devotions (or devotional practice) are not synonymous with «popular piety», «popular religiosity» or even «pious exercise». Each of these four terms has its own specific meaning[52].

So what are the authors of the document referring to? Which «devotional practices» or «exaggerated devotions» are they criticising? It is hard to say because there are no footnotes with examples or explications. Perhaps there is an implicit reference to one of the works mentioned in chapter I (§ 1.3.6). In the case of Erasmus, it has been shown that his attitude towards the idea of Mary's mediation was quite ambiguous. But it is hard to say that his broad critique of Marian piety is coherent and correct: in addition to stigmatising obvious deviations in piety, Erasmus also seemed to condemn that which was not a mistake (such as seeking Mary's intercession)[53]. In the case of Thomas More, he rightly warned against any erroneous teaching, fraught with consequences, which, under the guise of piety and love for Mary, distorted understanding both of Mary's role in our lives and the doctrine of salvation. However, this

did not mean a wholesale rejection of Marian piety, but rather a concern for experiencing it properly[54].

Still, due to the lack of explicit references in the MGH, the above remarks are only conjectural. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the arguments of the statement, beyond stating the limited opinion that the lack of specificity makes it difficult to clearly understand the allusions of the authors of the document.

Further on in *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ*, the authors of the document, after citing distortions and errors of «exaggerated devotions», present the answer of the Reformers to the whole situation. On the one hand, this answer consists in «a re-reception... of the belief that Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and humanity.» There is no doubt about the above truth of faith: coming from Revelation, it has ever been at the heart of the Church's faith and was always part of the Church's official teaching. However, let us pay attention to the stated consequences of the «re-reception» of that belief: «This entailed a rejection of real and perceived abuses surrounding devotion to Mary». The authors of the statement themselves here admit that the zealous criticism of Marian devotion has resulted in dangerous generalisation. Negative attitudes towards deviations in piety caused the Reformers, on the one hand, to rightly criticise real errors and deformities. However, by succumbing to generalising or harmful stereotypes, they accused Marian piety of false distortions and judged too harshly some practices that did not actually constitute a deformation.

It cannot be denied, as in the example given by Thomas More, that among many simple Catholics there were wrong theories that the Reformers rightly criticised. But it is also evident that – as we can see in the case of Erasmus – in the heat of criticism it was easy to deliberately or unknowingly find bad intentions and accuse of menacing the orthodox faith.

Right and truthful criticism has done good to the Church. Catholics, in response to the Reformation, embarked on the path of renewal, which was reflected above all in the decisions of the Council of Trent. For their part, Protestants radically stopped practicing warped Marian piety. However, negative attitudes and harmful generalisations led to sad consequences. As expressed in the end of No. 44, «it led also to the loss of some positive aspects of devotion and the diminution of her place in the life of the Church». The too-sudden rejection in Marian piety of what was suspicious or vague led to the disappearance of positive forms of piety in Protestantism.

In this way, starting from the warped forms of Marian piety, which misunderstood the mediating role of Mary, No. 44 cites two Catholic humanists

contemporaneous with the outbreak of the Reformation who criticised errors in Marian piety. There were indeed instances of precarious understanding of the legitimate doctrine of «subordinated mediation» of Mary. But it also happened that devotions which were not essentially wrong were subjected to excessive criticism. Unfortunately, as ARCIC members write, this stereotypical attitude and prejudices led, in the Protestant sphere, to too-easy rejection of many types of Marian piety, with the result that Mary, despite her presence in official liturgical worship, actually disappeared from the social and non-liturgical experience of faith.

It is important for the subject of the thesis to note that a point has been reached on which both Catholics and Anglicans agree: there exists only the sole mediation of Jesus Christ, but there are also forms of Marian piety, correct and coherent with orthodox Christian doctrine that, unfortunately, ended up being rejected by the Reformers in their extreme reaction.

2.2.4. Section C: «Mary within the Pattern of Grace and Hope»

In chapter C of *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* there is no mention of Mary's mediation. The only fragment that is in some way related to this topic comes from No. 52. Members of the ecumenical commission, devoting the chapter C to the topics of eschatology and theology of grace, begin with a simple expression of Trinitarian faith: «Participation in the glory of God, through the mediation of the Son, in the power of the Spirit is the Gospel hope». They confess that Christians hope to participate in the glory of God the Father. However, this is done through the mediation of the Son of God and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

This simple expression once again evokes the sole and irreplaceable mediation of Jesus Christ, who himself stated that no one can come to the Father except through him (cf. John 14,6). Although Mary's mediation is not mentioned here, it is a reminder that no other mediation can compare with Christ's unique mediation.

2.2.5. Section D: «Mary in the Life of the Church»

After analysing the (direct and indirect) references to the theme of mediation in Chapters A-C, now is time to study *D. Mary in the Life of the Church*. This chapter opens with the introductory points Nos. 64-66, in which the authors of the document explain that Mary, even after leaving this world, still plays an important role in the community of believers in Christ.

Then, the members of ARCIC proceed to deal with the subject of Mary's mediation, in the section *Intercession and Mediation in the Communion of Saints*, and also mention it in the last point of the section *The Distinctive Ministry of Mary* (No. 75).

c) *No. 67*

The first point of the section *Intercession and Mediation in the Communion of Saints* (No. 67) is actually devoted to Mary's intercession. The authors of *MGH* start by describing Catholic forms of expressing faith in the intercession of the Mother of God, and then describe the criticism of these practices by the English Reformers. The text of No. 67 begins with a brief reminder of the gradual development of the veneration of Mary. It pays special attention to the formation of the prayer *Hail Mary*, which involved the addition, in the Middle Ages, to the angelic salutation from the New Testament, of a request addressed to Mary to pray for sinners «now and at the hour of our death»[55]:

> 67. The practice of believers asking Mary to intercede for them with her son grew rapidly following her being declared Theotókos at the Council of Ephesus. The most common form today of such intercession is the 'Hail Mary'. This form conflates the greetings of Gabriel and Elizabeth to her (Luke 1,28,42). It was widely used from the fifth century, without the closing phrase, «pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death», which was first added in the 15th century, and included in the Roman Breviary by Pius V in 1568. The English Reformers criticized this invocation and similar forms of prayer, because they believed that it threatened the unique mediation of Jesus Christ. Confronted with exaggerated devotion, stemming from excessive exaltation of Mary's role and powers alongside Christ's, they rejected the «Romish doctrine of... the Invocation of Saints» as «grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God» (Article XXII). The Council of Trent affirmed that seeking the saints' assistance to obtain favours from God is «good and useful»: such requests are made «through his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our sole Redeemer and Saviour» (DH 1821). The Second Vatican Council endorsed the continued practice of believers asking Mary to pray for them, emphasizing that «Mary's maternal role towards the human race in no way obscures or diminishes the unique mediation of Christ, but rather shows its power... in no way does it hinder the direct union of believers with Christ, but rather fosters it» (*Lumen gentium* 60). Therefore the Roman Catholic Church continues to promote devotion to Mary, while reproving those who either exaggerate or minimize Mary's role (*Marialis Cultus* 31). With this background in mind, we seek a theologically grounded way to draw more closely together in the life of prayer in communion with Christ and his saints.

ARCIC members here explain that English Reformers criticised prayers asking for Mary's mediation, «because they believed that it threatened the unique mediation of Jesus Christ». It must be acknowledged that the commission, in describing the motives of the Reformers, expresses them in a very insightful way. Through the formulation «they believed», the authors attempt to express that such criticism was due to subjective judgment or suspicion rather than a thorough examination of the criticised expressions and the intentions of those who had formulated the invocations.

From a linguistic point of view, the verb *believe* means «to accept that (something) is true, especially without proof» or «to hold (something) as an opinion». Thus, words implying certainty (e.g. prove, evidence, indicate, demonstrate, show, manifest or exhibit) are not used at this point, but rather one connoting presumptions, feelings, theories, opinions, ideas or suspicions.

In this way, the members of ARCIC precisely express that the condemnatory criticism of the part of the English Reformers was largely influenced by the prejudices and negative generalisations of all aspects of Mary's mediation resulting from the confrontation «with exaggerated devotion, stemming from excessive exaltation of Mary's role and powers alongside Christ's».

There are two issues to be appreciated in the attitude of the English Reformers. Firstly, that they acted rightly to defend the basic truth about the unique mediation of Jesus Christ, which the Catholic Church for its part, based on Scripture and the Doctrine of the Fathers, had never doubted in its official teaching. Secondly, they rightly objected to exaggerated devotion, which conceived Mary's mediation «alongside Christ's». The Catholic Church too rejects in its doctrine any interpretations of Mary's mediation that would have the character of «autonomous or rival mediation», as Pope John Paul II has called it[56].

However, as the authors of the statement admit, it should be noted on the other hand that the Reformers did not make an effort to thoroughly examine the doctrine of the Church, but rather, by employing harmful generalisations and prejudices caused by negative examples of distorted Marian piety, rejected too quickly and too radically the practice of invoking the intercession of saints, including the Mother of God.

Later in No. 67 there is a Catholic response to the categorical criticism of the saints' intercession. It is significant, firstly, that MGH does not try to deny the deviations of Marian piety that existed in the 15th and 16th centuries, as well as the false theories about Mary's mediation that they presented. The fact is that such distortions did take place. It should be remembered, however, that the practice of the lay faithful or popular preaching is not determinant of

what the Church believes – the Church's official doctrine is presented in the documents of the councils and the official teaching of popes, based upon and derived from Revelation: Holy Scripture and the Apostolic Tradition.

Secondly, attention must be drawn to the fact that the document cites the teaching of the Council of Trent, which in *Decree on the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of the Saints and on Sacred Images* (3 December 1563) taught that the Catholic Church had always professed the faith that the only Mediator is Jesus Christ. At the same time, the Council taught that it is wrong to think that asking for the intercession of saints (including Mary) would threaten Christ's mediation[57]. Later, also the Second Vatican Council emphasised that Mary's maternal service in no way threatens Christ's unique mediation, because it comes from, and does not obscure, Christ's mediation (cf. LG 60). Finally, reference is made to the words of Pope Paul VI from *Marialis cultus* No. 31, looking for the basis for pursuing orthodox teaching about Mary's role[58].

However, when one compares the complete text of MC 31 with the succinct reference made to it in MGH 67, it becomes clear that further attention is required. In *Marialis cultus* No. 31 the Pope does not refer in any concrete way to the question of Mary's mediation or seeking her intercession. The proper topic of this point is the issue of proper subordination to the devotion of Mary to the Sacred Liturgy. Neither does MC 31 talk about minimising or exaggerating of the role of Mary, as MGH reports. The Pope does make reference to «certain persons» who «leave [devotions of Marian piety] aside and in this way create a vacuum which they do not fill», on the one hand, and to those who «mix practices of piety and liturgical acts in hybrid celebrations» (MC 31), on the other. So it seems that the main message of MC 31 is not the critique of those who «exaggerate or minimize Mary's role», but rather those who do not understand the proper distribution of emphasis in worshiping God and the saints.

a) *No. 68*

In *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* for the issue of Mary's mediation, the most important point is No. 68:

68. The Scriptures teach that «there is one mediator between God and humankind, Christ Jesus, himself human, who gave himself as a ransom for all» (1 Tim 2,5-6). As noted earlier, on the basis of this teaching «we reject any interpretation of the role of Mary which obscures this affirmation» (*Authority II*, 30). It is also true, however, that all ministries of the Church, especially those of Word and sacrament, mediate the grace of God through human beings. These

ministries do not compete with the unique mediation of Christ, but rather serve it and have their source within it. In particular, the prayer of the Church does not stand alongside or in place of the intercession of Christ, but is made through him, our Advocate and Mediator (cf. Rom 8,34, Heb 7,25, 12,24, 1 Jn 2,1). It finds both its possibility and practice in and through the Holy Spirit, the other Advocate sent according to Christ's promise (cf. Jn 14,16-17). Hence asking our brothers and sisters, on earth and in heaven, to pray for us, does not contest the unique mediatory work of Christ, but is rather a means by which, in and through the Spirit, its power may be displayed.

Already after the initial reading it can be seen that No. 68 is very rich in content and raises many issues related to the doctrine of the mediation of Christ and Mary. As expected, No. 68's opening words are taken from the letter of St Paul the Apostle (1 Tim 2,5-6). It is obvious that these words are absolutely basic for a proper understanding of the doctrine of mediation between God and humans: in virtue of the hypostatic union, Jesus Christ, the true man and the true Son of God, is the only mediator.

It is worth highlighting that the authors of the statement quote a longer passage of 1 Timothy than is commonly done: whereas usually only 1 Tim 2,5 is cited in papal teaching and ecumenical documents, No. 68 is also cites v. 6 («who gave himself as a ransom for all»). This is an important detail for two reasons. Firstly, it extends and deepens the understanding of the argument about the uniqueness of Christ's mediation. It not only affirms that He is the true God («Christ») and man («himself human»), but also gives a soteriological argument: only Jesus Christ redeemed us, giving Himself as a ransom for all. Nobody else did it; no one else died on the cross for humanity and shed his Blood for us. Secondly, there might be an implicit reference here to LG 60, where verses 5-6 are clearly quoted. It can be assumed that the authors of the statement wished to recall that the council clearly pointed to this broader paragraph from 1 Timothy[59].

After citing the teaching of St Paul, the commission ARCIC II in the second sentence of No. 68 quotes a statement expressed by ARCIC I in the document *Authority in the Church II* (1981), which has already been cited in *MGH* (in the *Introduction*, cf. § 3.2.1). These words, rejecting erroneous interpretations of Mary's role, were formulated in 1981 in a rather categorical way. The authors of *MGH* must have been mindful of the quite negative attitude of *Authority in the Church II*, and so they immediately added: «it is also true, however, that all ministries of the Church, especially those of Word and sacrament, mediate the grace of God through human beings».

Therefore it could be understood that – compared to 1981 – in the Catholic-Anglican dialogue there has been some development in the understanding of *mediation* of God's graces. In view of the rather categorical wording of *Authority in the Church II*, it is clear that both sides of the dialogue now agree that God can also grant his grace through the Word and through the Sacraments. Indeed, when somebody listens to the words of the Holy Scripture, he listens to God Himself; and the sacraments, for their part, are carriers of the grace of God. For example, Holy Baptism (considered as a sacrament by all Churches and Christian communities) is a sign of the invisible grace of God, that turns the human subject into an adopted child of God and cleanses that person from original sin.

ARCIC members then provide a theological explanation for this truth: the ministry of the Word of God and the administration of the sacraments do not convey God's graces to us «outside Christ» or «excluding Him». They are not a separate or alternative mediation, but they are at the service of Christ's mediation, which is also their source. It is Christ who is «the Word [which] was God» and «all things came into being through him» (Jn 1,1-2). It was Christ who instituted the sacraments and they have power only through his saving work.

In addition to the Holy Scripture and the sacraments, the authors of the statement recall the truth about the prayer of the Church. Also in this case the authors of *MGH* highlight that the Church's prayer does not bypass or replace Christ's intercession (cf. Rom 8,34). On the contrary, the prayers of the Church are always «made through him», because, as the Scriptures teach, Christ is our mediator (cf. Heb 12,24) and Advocate (cf. 1 Jn 2,1).

The commission later extends the truth about mediation by talking about the role of the Holy Spirit. In this way, remembering the uniqueness of the mediation of Jesus Christ, the ARCIC also recalls that before his death and resurrection Christ himself promised to send us the Holy Spirit (cf. Jn 14,16-17). The Holy Spirit is therefore said to be the «other Advocate»; and according to the common doctrine of the Church, we can pray «in» him and «through» him. The word «through» therefore also expresses the mediating role of the Holy Spirit.

At the end of No. 68 the commission concludes: «Hence asking our brothers and sisters, on earth and in heaven, to pray for us, does not contest the unique mediatory work of Christ, but is rather a means by which, in and through the Spirit, its power may be displayed».

The above words express a common belief of Catholics and Anglicans that, based on the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, it can be shown that asking for intercession (both from living brothers and sisters and from those who al-

ready enjoy the glory of heaven) is not an exclusion of Christ's only mediation, but «is rather a means» – i.e. a method, system or action – «by which, in and through» the Holy Spirit, the power of this Christ's mediation can be shown.

Taking a step-by-step look at the text of No. 68, it is worth asking now how its teaching affects the understanding of the doctrine of Mary's mediation. Firstly, when talking about Mary's mediation in any way, it should be always remembered that it is part of and depends entirely on the unique mediation of Jesus Christ, true God and true man who died for us and shed his blood on the cross for our redemption.

Secondly, the committee members clearly state that despite the exclusive statement of St Paul about the only mediation of Christ, God also uses the mediation of the Word and of sacramental signs. However, these do not constitute other *channels* of grace; rather, these two examples clearly show that all other ways of conveying grace are closely connected with Christ and established by him. The reader of this work may rightly find a certain analogy to the teaching contained in LG 62, where the Council reminds us that other, analogous forms of mediation are also known, that draw their power from Christ and convey His graces (cf. LG 62). *Lumen gentium* refers to the priesthood (which after all is a sacrament – as mentioned in MGH 68) as a sharing in Christ's own priesthood, in a manner analogous to how «the one goodness of God» is communicated to creatures in different ways.

One might ask why ARCIC did not directly refer to the above words of LG. Two factors may have influenced in this decision. The first one could be the controversy regarding the sacramental nature of the priesthood in the Anglican Community (the issue of the Catholic Church's refusal to recognise apostolic succession in the Church of England because of arbitrary changes in the formula of episcopal and presbyteral ordinations). For this reason, the general term «sacrament» (MGH 68) may have been deemed more acceptable by both parties rather than «the priesthood» (LG 62). A second factor could be the fact that the mediation of the Word of God is a clearer example of mediation than the transmission of the goodness of God. Of course, the non-inclusion of this example in MGH does not signify its rejection. In any case, the example of scriptural mediation is an important and valuable insight of the ARCIC: although the Catholic Church believes that Christ «is present in his word since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the Church» (SC 5), until the publication of MGH, this truth was nowhere called upon to analogously explain or theologically legitimise Mary's mediation.

Thirdly, in harmony with Catholic teaching in LG 60-62, all agree that everything that is analogously a form of mediation of grace (part of the unique

mediation of Christ in every case) is never a new «different» form of mediation «alongside or in place» of that of Christ. The truth that Mary's mediation is never any «other parallel mediation» has been repeatedly affirmed in the teachings of Paul VI, John Paul II and the CCC.

Fourthly, apart from the Christological dimension of mediation, ARCIC also draws attention to the pneumatological aspect. Therefore, one cannot read the categorical words of St Paul to Timothy in an exclusive manner and in isolation from the rest of Holy Scripture. The Bible speaks of the Holy Spirit using words suggestive of His mediating role. This is an important point, as Catholics have sometimes been accused of attributing to Mary the role proper to the Holy Spirit.

Fifthly, if the prayer of believing brothers and sisters – though sinners – is pleasing to God and takes place in Christ – Mediator and Advocate –, the prayer of those who already in heaven with God is even more pleasing to Him. It is Mary who heads this company, occupying a special place among the saved because of her Divine Motherhood[60]. Thus, although no nominal mention is made of Mary, it is clear to ARCIC that her mediation role is closely related to Christ's mediation and reveals its power. This had been said too by John Paul II, in teaching that «her mediation is thus in the nature of intercession» (MC 21) and that «Mary's motherhood continues unceasingly in the Church as the mediation which intercedes» (MC 40). It follows that Mary's mediation is closely linked to the service of intercession.

It can therefore be concluded that the ARCIC members show a deepened understanding of Mary's mediation. They acknowledge, based on Holy Scripture, that Christ's unique mediation does not exclude other forms of mediation (MGH mentions four forms: sacramental, scripturistic, intercessory, and above all pneumatological), which allows the creation of space for Mary's mediation, which is actually part of intercessory mediation of the blessed in heaven.

b) *No. 69*

Continuing with the analysis of the subsection devoted to Marian intercession and mediation, we come to No. 69. It refers entirely to the issue of intercession and begins by clearly emphasising its dimensions: Christological and pneumatological.

> 69. In our praying as Christians we address our petitions to God our heavenly Father, in and through Jesus Christ, as the Holy Spirit moves and enables us. All such invocation takes place within the communion which is God's being and gift.

In the life of prayer we invoke the name of Christ in solidarity with the whole Church, assisted by the prayers of brothers and sisters of every time and place. As ARCIC has expressed it previously, «The believer's pilgrimage of faith is lived out with the mutual support of all the people of God. In Christ all the faithful, both living and departed, are bound together in a communion of prayer» (*Salvation and the Church*, 22). In the experience of this communion of prayer believers are aware of their continued fellowship with their sisters and brothers who have 'fallen asleep,' the 'great cloud of witnesses' who surround us as we run the race of faith. For some, this intuition means sensing their friends' presence; for some it may mean pondering the issues of life with those who have gone before them in faith. Such intuitive experience affirms our solidarity in Christ with Christians of every time and place, not least with the woman through whom he became «like us in all things except sin» (Hebrews 4,15).

Meditation on the action of the Holy Spirit, who acts in every Christian community, naturally stimulates reflection on the ecclesiological dimension of prayer. Everyone – departed and living – «are bound together in a communion of prayer». Hence, it is possible to be aware of everyone's closeness to, and unity of prayer with, everyone else, including the saints, who in No. 69 are called – according to the biblical term – «cloud of witnesses». In No. 69 there are clear references to the results of the Anglican-Catholic dialogue that took place in Australia[61]. MGH, however, does not limit itself to a general reference to the unity of those who are on earth with those in heaven: it explicitly mentions the Virgin Mary, the woman through whom Christ became «like us in all things except sin» (Heb 4,15).

It can be stated that No. 69 is an important step forward in understanding and accepting the practice of asking for Mary's intercession. This fruit of dialogue can propitiate important progress in ecumenical relations and seems to be helpful in understanding Mary's mediation in the context of intercession.

c) *No. 70*

The reflection begun in No. 69 is continued and developed in No. 70. This number begins with a description of the common practice among Christians, consisting not only of prayer *with* the saints (No. 69), but also *through* the intercession of the saints:

70. The Scriptures invite Christians to ask their brothers and sisters to pray for them, in and through Christ (cf. James 5:13-15). Those who are now 'with Christ', untrammelled by sin, share the unceasing prayer and praise which cha-

racterizes the life of heaven (e.g. Revelation 5:9-14, 7:9-12, 8:3-4). In the light of these testimonies, many Christians have found that requests for assistance in prayer can rightly and effectively be made to those members of the communion of saints distinguished by their holy living (cf. James 5:16-18). It is in this sense that we affirm that asking the saints to pray for us is not to be excluded as unscriptural, though it is not directly taught by the Scriptures to be a required element of life in Christ. Further, we agree that the way such assistance is sought must not obscure believers' direct access to God our heavenly Father, who delights to give good gifts to his children (Matthew 7:11). When, in the Spirit and through Christ, believers address their prayers to God, they are assisted by the prayers of other believers, especially of those who are truly alive in Christ and freed from sin. We note that liturgical forms of prayer are addressed to God: they do not address prayer 'to' the saints, but rather ask them to 'pray for us'. However, in this and other instances, any concept of invocation which blurs the trinitarian economy of grace and hope is to be rejected, as not consonant with Scripture or the ancient common traditions.

The above passage abounds in many important statements that should be noted and discussed in more detail. Firstly, the commission members make the important statement that the practice of seeking the intercession of saints must not be perceived as opposed to Scripture. In this way, the principle contrary to the motto of *sola Scriptura* is applied: according to the words of ARCIC, the fact that some practice was not stipulated *expressis verbis* in the Holy Scriptures as «a required element of life in Christ» does not necessarily mean that it is contradictory to God's will. Admitting the validity of this principle universally recognised in the Catholic Church is a big step in the Anglicans' interpretation of the teaching of the Roman Church. It will be later seen how the members of the Low Church or the more evangelical communities of the Anglican Communion responded to this affirmation.

However, returning to the subject, it must be stated that the members of the commission agree that, on the one hand, invoking the intercession of saints is not contrary to the doctrine of the Bible; and on the other hand, it is not a necessary element of Christian life.

The above conclusion leads to the second conclusion. The members of commission emphasise that «the way such assistance is sought must not obscure believers' direct access to God our heavenly Father». This means that ARCIC emphasises that Mary's intercession (or mediation) never interferes with direct contact with God. This means that Mary's mediation is not an «intermediate» or «additional degree» between humanity and Christ, or hu-

manity and God the Father. In addition, it is worth noticing the concern expressed for the correct understanding and practice of seeking the intercession of saints (including Mary). An indirect suggestion may also be perceived, that – as with any truth not formally expressed or minutely described in the Bible – the question of intercession must be overseen and explained by shepherds guarding faithfulness to Christian faith and Gospel practice.

Thirdly, by teaching that when «believers address their prayers to God, they are assisted by the prayers of other believers, especially of those who are truly alive in Christ and freed from sin,» the members of ARCIC acknowledge that intercession is a form of help (and thus mediation), and obviously that Mary may be called upon first of all to render such «assistance», as she is after all the one «freed from sin» *par excellence*.

Finally, in the reference to liturgical practice it is emphasised that, in the final analysis, every prayer, even the invocation of saints, is done through Christ in the Holy Spirit. In this statement, a concern is expressed for the compatibility of Christian practice with the trinitarian doctrine of grace.

All in all, it may be affirmed that, firstly, the commission's conclusions presented in No. 70 constitute a breakthrough in the view of the doctrine of the intercession of saints, and secondly, they help to understand Mary's role of intercession in particular.

d) *No. 71*

Nos. 71-75 fall under the title *The Distinctive Ministry of Mary*. They contain no more statements formally speaking of Mary's mediation, but they do include two allusions. In No. 71 it is stated that Mary «is believed to exercise a distinctive ministry of assisting others through her active prayer». Although the term *mediation* is not used here – only «distinctive ministry» –, a clear allusion to the matter can be seen, once again in relation to Mary's intercession.

e) *No. 75*

In the subsequent points of the subsection *The Distinctive Ministry of Mary*, the authors of MGH write about Mary's spiritual motherhood towards Christians (No. 72); about the issues of Marian piety and apparitions (No. 73); and about the impact of Mariology on social issues (No. 74). The question of Mary's mediation is alluded to again in No. 75.

75. Affirming together unambiguously Christ's unique mediation, which bears fruit in the life of the Church, we do not consider the practice of asking Mary and the saints to pray for us as communion dividing. Since obstacles of

the past have been removed by clarification of doctrine, by liturgical reform and practical norms in keeping with it, we believe that there is no continuing theological reason for ecclesial division on these matters.

Again, although there is no direct reference to Mary's mediation, this text is important for two reasons. Firstly, after all the arguments in chapter *D. Mary in the Life of the Church*, the authors emphasise once more that the only mediation between God and human beings is the mediation of Christ. Therefore, any understanding of Mary's mediation as «autonomous or rival mediation» – as John Paul II warned – is excluded. Secondly, knowing that Mary's mediation is intercessory, it is clearly stated that once the obstacle – in the form of a misunderstanding of invocation of Mary – is removed, Anglicans see no problem in asking for the help of the Mother of God.

However, the most optimistic statement is the conclusion that – in view of the above consensus between the two denominations – the question of seeking Mary's intercession is not «communion dividing». It seems, therefore, that it is possible to talk about a big step taken by the Anglicans towards a proper understanding of this Mariological issue and its new «re-reception».

2.2.6. Conclusion

The last part of the Seattle Statement (*Conclusion*) contains points No. 76-80. There are two passages in them that are relevant to the theme of Mary's mediation. The first is a passage in No. 76. In beginning their attempt to summarise the fruits of dialogue, the authors of the document emphasise that the basic statements expressed almost 25 years earlier in the statement from 1981 are still valid:

> 76. Our study, which opens with a careful ecclesial and ecumenical reading of the Scriptures, in the light of the ancient common traditions, has illuminated in a new way the place of Mary in the economy of hope and grace. We together re-affirm the agreements reached previously by ARCIC, in *Authority in the Church II* 30:
> – that any interpretation of the role of Mary must not obscure the unique mediation of Christ;
> We believe that the present statement significantly deepens and extends these agreements, setting them within a comprehensive study of doctrine and devotion associated with Mary.

It can therefore be concluded that No. 76 highlights what had constituted the starting point in ARCIC II proceedings. Hence the categorical statement from *Authority in the Church II* No. 30 is repeated, rejecting any misinterpretation of Mary's role in the Church, which would undermine the truth about the unique mediation of Jesus Christ.

While No. 77 explains how the commission had carried out its task, in No. 78 – in accordance with the title of the section: *Advances in Agreement* – an effort is made to sum up what had achieved through dialogue and a joint study of Scripture. In No. 78 we find this statement:

> 78. As a result of our study, the Commission offers the following agreements, which we believe significantly advance our consensus regarding Mary. We affirm together
>
> (...)
>
> that Mary has a continuing ministry which serves the ministry of Christ, our unique mediator, that Mary and the saints pray for the whole Church and that the practice of asking Mary and the saints to pray for us is not communion-dividing (paragraphs 64-75).

Of the five statements given in No. 78, the last refers to the doctrine of Mary's mediation. It follows from the above words that the only mediator between God and people is Jesus Christ, whose mediation is expressed by the term «the ministry of Christ». Mary «serves» this mediation. The authors of MGH also use the word «ministry» to describe her role. Since «ministry of Christ» actually means being «our unique mediator», it can be supposed that «a continuing ministry» of Mary refers to her mediating function (although the words *mediation* or *Mediatrix* are not used), and that this «continuing ministry» of the Mother of God consists primarily in her intercession on behalf of the entire Church.

2.3. *Evaluation*

After analysing the text of *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* and examining all the passages which directly and indirectly relate to the issue of Mary's mediation, it is appropriate to attempt a summation of our analysis of the document. The results may be synthesised in seven points.

First of all, significant space in the document was devoted to dealing with the subject of Mary's mediation. In relation to *Authority in Church II* (1981)

and *Images of God: Reflection on Christian Anthropology* (1983), where this topic was but briefly mentioned, *MGH* discussed many aspects related to Mary's mediation, noting the disproportionate growth of piety emphasising this role of Mary; offering a criticism of distortions of Marian piety that overshadowed the person of Christ as the unique Mediator; noting too the exaggeration of Reformers' criticism; reviewing the doctrine of the Councils of Trent and Vatican II, as well the teaching of Paul VI; appraising attempts to explain how the uniqueness of Christ's mediation does not exclude other forms of subordinated mediation. All in all, the document has touched on many points related to this question.

Secondly, despite the somewhat insufficient provision of examples in support of certain affirmations, the document attempts to objectively present the historical background to the Protestant-Catholic conflict over Mary's mediation. It discusses the issue of Marian piety, which at times embodied a wrong approach to Mary's mediation (No. 43 and 44). But at the same time it recognizes that the criticism from the Protestant side was, if not exaggerated, at least based on opinions and quite generalised (cf. No. 67).

Thirdly, the Anglicans admitted that too categorical rejection of Marian piety resulted in some kind of impoverishment among the Anglicans, as Mariology was limited in a certain sense only to the liturgical dimension (cf. No. 44).

Fourthly, the review of the doctrine of the Council of Trent and of the Second Vatican Council (cf. No. 67), shows that, on the one hand, the Catholic Church in its official teaching has never denied the uniqueness of Christ's mediation, emphasising that Mary's role is subject to the unique mediation of her Son.

Fifthly, thanks to *ressourcement* in Scripture and reliance especially on the New Testament for clarification as regards various forms of mediation, both Catholics and Anglicans undeniably see that Christ's unique mediation does not exclude others that flow from it and are subordinate to it (cf. No. 68).

Sixthly, the shortcomings of the document are worth mentioning. It is important to note that there is no reference to the teaching of John Paul II and the CCC[62] – loci in which there is a deepening of the understanding of the doctrine of Mary's mediation. Furthermore, apart from making general assertions, the document provides no examples illustrating distortions in Marian piety and criticism on the part of humanists (i.e. of More and Erasmus, cf. § 3.4.3.2).

Seventhly, there is a conclusion regarding a linguistic matter. Although the title *Mediatrix* is used once in relation to Mary, it is employed when refer-

ring to a wrong doctrine («a mediatrix alongside Christ, or sometimes even in his place», No. 44). Also the term *mediation* is used only in relation to the ministry of Jesus Christ[63]. In relation to Mary, only terms such as *role* of Mary[64], *intermediary* between mankind and God (No. 43), or – in quite a number of instances – *intercession*. On the one hand, it must be admitted that the explanations contained in Nos. 67 and 68 show that it is not unfounded to see a kind of mediation in other persons (Holy Spirit, saints, community of Christians) or signs (Holy Scriptures, sacraments). On the other hand, however, nowhere is Mary called *Mediatrix* in a positive way; and her role is not referred to as *mediation*.

Finally, an important historical and theological issue is worth noting. According to the conclusions presented at the end of chapter II, in the 20th century there were several important Anglican theologians who agreed with Catholics on the intercession of saints and more or less accepted the title of *Mediatrix* (Anglo-Catholics: L. S. Thornton, H. E. Symonds, B. Frost, G. D. Carleton; as well as evangelical Anglicans: J. C. de Satgé, J. Macquarrie). It seems quite strange that neither the Catholic members of ARCIC nor the *MGH* document referenced their explanations and arguments, the more so as the testimony of these authors constituted an important voice in the Mariological discussion and the explanation of the conclusions presented in the Seattle Statement.

Thus, we have been able to appraise the ARCIC commission's attitude towards Mary's mediation. Of course, one might feel dissatisfied. However, one cannot fail to see clear progress in the dialogue on controversial topics. Finally, the effort to reach the truth by getting rid of prejudices and returning together to the sources, i.e. the Holy Bible and Tradition, should be appreciated.

3. Evaluation: Mediation and intercession of Mary in the Seattle Statement compared with the Catholic doctrine

In this subsection, the author will evaluate from a Catholic perspective how the issue of Mary's mediation is presented in the document *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ*. The goal is to evaluate the conclusions presented in the Seattle Statement in the light of the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Later, this evaluation will make it possible to evaluate comments that constitute theological responses following the publication of MGH in 2005.

The review of the development of the Catholic doctrine on the mediation of Mary, in chapter I of the thesis, helped to understand how theologians

deepened their understanding of this Mariological truth and how the Magisterium of the Church enunciated it. It became clear that the understanding of Mary's mediation underwent development: not in the sense of a radical change in the attitude of the Church, but in the sense of unceasing theological exploration. Not every theologian thought and wrote in the same way, and in different epochs the issue was approached variously. Therefore, it would be a mistake to try to compare the concept of Mary's mediation in MGH with that in any one of older theological works. Firstly, not every theological proposal has be proved correct. Secondly, even interesting theological suggestions were not always accepted in Mariology. Thirdly, the use of certain words gradually evolved and terms took on slightly different shades of meaning. Finally, the Magisterium of the Church, whose task is to ultimately discern theological issues and safeguard Christian doctrine, did not always consider it appropriate to teach or publicly promote certain ideas.

Therefore, the official doctrinal statements of the Roman Catholic Church are crucial, as they proffer the current Christian teaching. Due to the fact that the work on the Seattle Statement and its signing took place during the pontificate of John Paul II, it is right to compare the doctrine contained therein with the Mariology officially taught during John Paul II's pontificate. Of all the magisterial documents of this period, the most important and most representative is the Catechism of the Catholic Church; for this reason, the Mariology presented in the Catechism will be our main and basic evaluation criterion. This methodological decision is also supported by the fact that the CCC is not so much the work of a pope, but a synthesis of Catholic teaching according to the principles of Vatican Council II; in mariological matters the CCC basically follows the guidelines outlined by the constitution *Lumen gentium*.

It is also necessary to answer the possible doubt as to whether the choice of the CCC as a criterion for evaluation does not mean a relegation of the rich theology expounded by John Paul II. Indeed, it may be said that for the most part the teaching of this Pope on Mary's mediation is not explicitly cited in the text of the CCC. However, as stated earlier, this does not signify the rejection of the teachings of the Polish pope: the very nature and purpose of the *Catechism*, as a succinct exposition of Catholic fundamental belief, left no room for detailed discussion of certain issues. Choosing the CCC as the criterion for assessing the Mariology of MGH allows the evaluation to distinguish between what necessarily should appear – truths that must be upheld by believers even to the point of martyrdom – and other elements of Catholic theological reflection, which though valid are not essential for living a true Christian life. The

ordinary magisterium of John Paul II can be helpful as a background for our theological evaluation. In particular, the following papal documents will be important: the letter *Rosarium Virginis Mariae* (which generously draws on the CCC's teaching and may be taken as a kind of commentary on the Mariology contained in the CCC) and the encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*.

Before proceeding to the evaluation of the Seattle Statement, it should be recalled that, according to the conclusions presented at the end of the first chapter (cf. § 2.5.2 e), five basic dimensions of the theology of marian mediation can be distinguished, derived from the CCC. They are: the Christological and pneumatological dimensions; the theology of grace; the intercessory dimension; and the semantic aspect (cf. §§ 4.1-4.5). In addition, some aspects indirectly expressed in both the CCC and the Seattle document will be mentioned later, as secondary evaluation criteria that allow for a more complete assessment (cf. § 4.6). The evaluation will be synthesised in the concluding section (cf. § 4.7).

3.1. *Christology and mediation of Mary*

The evaluation of *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* should begin by considering the relationship between the theology of Mary's mediation and Christology. The rejection of Mary's mediation by Protestants arose above all from the difficulties involved in reconciling this mariological thesis with the revealed principle of the uniqueness of the mediation of Jesus Christ, based on the hypostatic union. Because of the indisputable character of this principle, on which Catholics and Anglicans agree, the truth about Christ as unique Mediator appears in both CCC (No. 480, 618, 667, 771, 846, 956, 1369, 1544, 1546, 2574, 2593, 2674) as well as in MGH (No. 2, 44, three times in 68, 78).

In addition, there is a statement in MGH referring to the critical attitude of the Reformers «against devotional practices which approached Mary as a mediatrix alongside Christ, or sometimes even in his place» (No. 44). No similar formulation is found in the CCC, perhaps because, on the one hand, the *Catechism* is primarily a positive exposition of the truths of faith rather than an apology against doctrinal errors; and because, on the other hand, the explicit confirmation that the Catholic side fully agrees with the above caution was spoken by John Paul II during the general audience of 1 October 1997[65].

At the same time, the CCC mentions other forms of mediation – that of Moses (2574-2577 and 2593) and that of priests (1456)[66]. Both this term and

the idea contained therein are consistent with the fact that God implemented his plan for the Chosen People using Moses – a proceeding that involves elements of mediation, as emphasised by the CCC. As for the allusions to the ministry of priests (CCC 1456), we find a similar wording in MGH 68: «all ministries of the Church, especially those of Word and sacrament, mediate the grace of God through human beings». Although there is no explicit mention of the priesthood here, it may be reasoned that priests are both proclaimers of the Word of God and ministers of the sacraments.

Thus, it can be seen that the ecumenical document coincides with the teaching of the Catholic Church in the Christological aspect, as both documents underline the uniqueness of the mediation of Jesus Christ. However, the CCC creates more space for an analogical understanding of the role of other persons (or groups of persons) that can be interpreted as forms of mediation (above all, the role of Moses, to whom Scripture also applies the word *mesites*, i.e. mediator – cf. 1 Cor 9,9). But MGH passes over this issue. Thus, it seems that despite clear progress in ecumenical dialogue, it remains difficult for Anglicans to accept the use of analogies.

3.2. *Pneumatology and Mary's mediation*

Noticing the Holy Spirit's work in the context of Mary's mediation has not always been easy in the history of the development of this doctrine. Hence, it is worth appreciating how the pneumatological dimension appears both in the CCC (688, 741, 2630, 2634, 2644, 2765, 2843) and MGH (No. 16, 54, 68, 69). It is clear that, in both documents, the pneumatological dimension is related to the aspect of intercession. Interestingly, something similar (on the plane of intercession) occurs in Christology. Both the CCC and MGH emphasise that Jesus Christ is *par excellence* the one who intercedes for humans (CCC: No. 519 – with title of Advocate, and later 662, 739, 1341, 1361, 1368-1370, 2593, 2606, 2634; MGH 68).

Hence, an opinion could be formulated that while both documents carefully avoid any confusion between Christ's mediation and Mary's, they have no problem with analogically applying the concept of intercession to both Divine Persons and to Mary (and other saints). It would seem, therefore, that the action of the Holy Spirit, which neither competes with Christ's mission nor contradicts His unique mediation, could help to better understand the role of Mary (and the saints). Obviously, it would be wrong to put the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary on an equal level, but the unity of the Holy Trinity

is the magnet that attracts human creatures to unity in Christ. So it seems that pneumatology can serve as a key to a better understanding of the cooperation of human instruments in Christ's unique ministry.

3.3. *Theology of grace and Mary's mediation*

The pneumatological dimension facilitates the shift of the theological gaze from intratrinitary relations to the relationship between the Triune God and humans. It is in this context that the subject of grace and its transmission appears.

CCC 308 teaches that God, who is the first cause of grace, «operates in and through secondary causes». Salvation and holiness radically depend on God, who is the source of grace and wants to share it with creatures. Moreover, no merits exist that are not radically Christ's (cf. MGH 491-492, 956, 970, 1163, 1476, 1478, 1820, 2009, 2011). This is why the Catholic Church recognises that God can validly use people as instrumental causes (cf. Pius XII, *Ad Caeli Reginam* 38, 42; LG 62).

Something similar (though not using the terms *instrument* or *instrumental cause*) is affirmed in MGH 68: «all ministries of the Church, especially those of Word and sacrament, mediate the grace of God through human beings». Therefore, there is agreement on the specific role performed by persons who participate in «mediating the grace of God». It should be noted, however, that after the above statement, MGH specifies that to «mediate» means that «our brothers and sisters, on earth and in heaven (...) pray for us», thereby understanding mediation primarily as intercession.

3.4. *Semantics of Mary's mediation and intercession*

If it is possible to affirm that Mary plays a special role in mediating God's grace, attention should be paid to the terminology and, more generally, the semantics regarding the question of Mary's mediation.

The *Catechism* nowhere calls Mary's role as *mediation*. However, it does employ synonymous terms. For example, CCC 494 refers to Mary as the «cause of salvation», quoting St Irenaeus[67]. In CCC 2674 the *Catechism* makes an interesting comparison: since Jesus is the way, then Mary on this path is she who «shows the way» (*hodigitria*) and she «is herself 'the Sign' of the way». It should be noted, additionally, that the CCC nowhere calls Mary directly *Me-*

diatrix, except for the quote from LG 62, which speaks of the practice in the Church (*in Ecclesiae*) of designating Mary with this title (CCC 969).

MGH, however, seems to prefer the term *intercession* in describing Mary's role. No. 67 additionally employs another term, likewise used in LG 60: «Mary's *maternal role* towards the human race». A similar expression is found in the quote from *Gift of Authority II* (No. 30). In addition, *intercession* was rendered in No. 70 as *assistance*. There is also a mention of the «continuing ministry» of Mary (No. 78). However, as regards the expressions *mediatrix* or *intermediary*, MGH uses them twice (No. 43 and 44) and only negatively, when giving examples of equivocal medieval practice («Mary came widely to be viewed as an intermediary between God and humanity» – No. 43) or distortions in 15th-century piety («Mary as a mediatrix alongside Christ» – No. 44).

It may be concluded that CCC and MGH coincide in not naming Mary's role as *mediation*. However, they diverge when it comes to the use of the title *mediatrix* (or *intermediary*). On the one hand, the two documents do not literally state that Mary is mediatrix. On the other hand, the CCC (in the context of the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and of John Paul II) considers the use of the title *mediatrix* as a practice that is not misleading, when understood properly. In turn, MGH shows an attitude to this title that is marked, if not by criticism, then at least by reluctance. This shows that although there is a good will to understand Mary's role in ecumenical relations, the title *mediatrix* is still associated by Anglicans with distortions of popular piety or problematic theological theories.

One could ask whether the use of the title mediatrix and intermediary titles is acceptable to the Catholic side. Before the author expresses his opinion on this subject, some details are worth considering. Firstly, MGH does not make a balanced presentation of this title, as it does not take into consideration the proper understanding of *mediatrix* as formulated in *Redemptoris Mater* or in the general audience in 1997. Secondly, it does not take into account that in certain localities the feast or memorial of Mary Mediatrix, with its proper Mass, is allowed by the Holy See, following orthodox doctrine. Thirdly, the fact of the lack of dogmatisation of the truth about the mediation of Mary through an act of solemn Catholic Magisterium does not mean affirmation of this theory's fallacy.

It would seem that the Catholic side –for ecumenical reasons– did not push for a final explanation of the subject of Mary's mediation. Significant progress had already been achieved in the explanation of the intercession of the saints (including Mary) and some consensus attained regarding the partic-

ipation by human beings in the transmission of divine graces. Despite these advances, the lack of clarification (even after quoting four marian titles from LG 62 as used «in Church»), gives the impression of a silent acceptance of Anglican prejudices.

3.5. *Intercession and Mary's mediation*

The evaluation made in the above points suggests that attention must be paid to the way in which MGH and the CCC present Mary's intercession. This is necessary because, in accordance with the teachings of Paul VI and John Paul II, the category of intercession helps to properly understand the truth of Mary's mediation.

The CCC teaches in its four references to Mary's intercession that it is «manifold» (969). The CCC also expresses the quite specific conviction that Mary intercedes for us «at the hour of our death» (1014). In addition, the Catechism recalls the scene from Cana of Galilee, where «Mary prays and intercedes in faith» (2618) and teaches that her intercession is united with the prayer of the Church (2827).

How does the text of MGH refer to the above practice? Regarding the prayer *Hail Mary* the Seattle Statement mentions the second part of the prayer, which is a plea for intercession at the time of death, but adding that this practice had been criticised by the Reformers. Going further, the members of the commission argued that Mary's intercession, properly understood, did not contradict Christ's unique mediation (No. 67).

Regarding Mary's actuation in Cana of Galilee, MGH does not speak so much about intercession, as about instructions (No. 71); and further notes Mary belonged to the «company of Jesus» (No. 25). Furthermore, it cites the theological opinion of St. Irenaeus that Mary's request in Cana had been made in excessive haste (footnote 8). Thus, it can be seen that among the members of ARCIC there was no agreement on the interpretation of this biblical passage as an example of Mary's intercession.

However, as regards the aspect of Mary's unity with the prayer of the whole Church, a greater agreement between MGH and the CCC may be noted. This is reflected in the references to the common prayer of Mary and the apostles in anticipation of the Holy Spirit (No. 26) and to the community of prayer with the saints (and Mary) in heaven. It is worth recalling too that MGH 43 mentions quite critically the perception of Mary as a «worker from miracles with powers that verged on the divine». This approach would seem

to imply a rejection of the belief that Mary's role consists exclusively of performing miracles.

In view of the above, it can be said that although CCC and MGH agree on the issue of Mary's intercession, they do not say it in the same way. In MGH, the term «manifold» (*multiplici*) intercession does not appear; some reticence towards the final part of the *Hail Mary* can be sensed; and an ambiguous understanding of the pericope of the wedding in Cana of Galilee may be noted. Although at the end of the document it is stated that «the practice of asking Mary and the saints to pray for us is not communion-dividing» (MGH 78), it is difficult to agree with the statement that there has been sufficient removal of the «obstacles of the past... by clarification of doctrine» about Mary's intercession (MGH 75). It seems, therefore, that either: 1) that the consensus and compliance declared in MGH 75 and 78 were not sufficiently well expressed in the final redaction of the statement; 2) or the final statements are simply too optimistic.

3.6. *Other aspects*

After comparing the doctrine on the mediation of Mary presented in CCC and MGH, other aspects merit attention that have so far not been considered as categories of evaluation. However, it should be borne in mind that here we shall talk above all of the *intercession* of Mary, because neither of the two documents formally call the role of Mary *mediation*.

3.6.1. Causal issue

Both documents agree that the crucial reason for Mary's unique role is her Divine Motherhood. Due to the Anglicans' difficulty in adopting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to the same extent as Catholics do, MGH does not mention this dimension as important for an ideal function of intercession. However, it does mention the testament from the cross (Jn 19,25-27) and Mary's vigil with the disciples (Acts 1,12-14).

3.6.2. Parties of the mediation and intercession

Nowhere is it formally stated that Mary is a mediatress between Christ and human beings; MGH 43 even criticises any theology that places Mary as «an intermediary between God and humanity». Mary does, however, pray to

God for people, and her entire role is at the service of «the ministry of Christ» (MGH 78).

Mary's prayer is a plea on behalf of others, referred to by MGH in different ways (*men*, *people*, *believers*, *Christians*). There is therefore no single specific or preferred term to refer to the «human» pole of the mystery of intercession (mediation).

3.6.3. Spatiotemporal aspect

Both the CCC and MGH affirm that it is not incorrect to look to Mary's intercession: the Seattle Statement focuses on this practice of faith in the present day, without a detailed discussion of Mary's earthly life. However, speaking of this second aspect, it seems that the authors of the commission found it easier to see and understand the scene of joint prayer in the Cenacle (Acts 1,12-14) than to read the scene of Cana as an example of Mary's intercession.

3.7. *Conclusions*

To sum up, starting from the definition of mediation, it must be stated that the document *Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ* does not make a clear decision on the issue of Mary's mediation. It appears to view the ascending aspect (intercession) as more comprehensible and acceptable than the descending aspect (as it prefers to talk about Mary's motherhood rather than her role in the distribution of graces). Despite the freedom implied in the re-reception of certain theological truths, it seems nonetheless difficult for Anglicans to accept Mary's mediation in the version generally accepted by Catholics and taught by John Paul II.

Despite this, it can be said that the acceptance of the question of Mary's role based on her intercession, as presented in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, is a great ecumenical achievement.

It should also be remembered that in the elaboration of the entire document the Anglican members of ARCIC showed a great openness to dialogue, a readiness to understand the Catholic arguments, and a desire for unity. Such attitudes, which became especially evident in the openness to dialogue over the truths of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of Mary, have resulted in an undeniable ecumenical success. Anglican ARCIC members' ac-

ceptance of many aspects of Catholic teaching regarding these issues was even received by some Anglican radical circles as a betrayal of Protestant doctrine. It seems, therefore, that thanks to the intensive progress in the dialogue on crucial Mariological truths, the lack of a spectacular breakthrough on the subject of Mary's mediation should not be taken as a sign of diffidence or discord: on the contrary, the commission has shown that Catholics and Anglicans increasingly agree on the fundamental Mariological truths, leaving less important issues to be discussed later in the dialogue.

Therefore, it is reasonable to say that achieving agreement on the role of Mary, in the form in which it is presented by the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, is a great ecumenical advance.

Notes

1. Cf. RODRÍGUEZ-GARRAPUCHO, F., «Historia del movimiento ecuménico», in IZQUIERDO, C. *et al.*, *Diccionario de Teología*, Pamplona 2014, 291-293; DENAUX, A. (ed.), *From Malines to ARCIC. The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, Leuven 1997.

2. A similar situation, albeit to a lesser extent, took place in Ipswich, where Marian devotion became the motivation for praying for Christian unity (1987).

3. Cf. Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary: http://www.esbvm.com/ (access: 18.11.2020).

4. Cf. BLANCO-SARTO, P. & LECH M. S., «Mother of Hope. Mary of Nazareth in the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue», *Studia Oecumenica* 20 (2020) 265-282.

5. The dates and titles of the meetings are provided according to the website of the Centro Pro Unione: http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/arcic/e_arcic-info.html (access: 02.12.2019).

6. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 2, 1999», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=93 (access: 02.12.2019).

7. The planned § 3/D was entitled: «Mary and the Communion of Saints: praying with/to Mary» (ARCIC II [Mary] 437/99) – cf. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary: Reflections on the Virgin Mary in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology and Devotion*, London 2007, 245.

8. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 4, 2000», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=94 (access: 02.12.2019).

9. Cf. BUTLER, S., «Second Vatican Council and Subsequent Documents of the Magisterium with Annotated Quotations», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary*, 193-201.

10. BUTLER, S., «Second Vatican Council and Subsequent Documents», 197.

11. *Ibid*., 199.

12. *Ibid*., 200.

13. Cf. MUDDIMAN, J., «Mary in the Communion of Saints: Eschatology and Invocation», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary*, 17.

14. The paper was published later as: ELDER, R., «Mary in the Common Latin Tradition: Agreement, Disagreements and Divergence», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary*, 73-109.

15. ARCIC II [Mary] 454/00, later published as: SHERLOCK, C. & CROSS, P., «Mary in the Communion of Saints: Eschatology and Invocation», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary*, 217-221. Work on the subject of Mary's intercession between both members of ARCIC II had to be quite difficult. Sherlock himself confessed: «As regards Mary, that was about it – as a good Protestant I knew praying to anyone but God was pointless if not idolatrous. That Roman Catholics seemed to invoke Mary was another reason that they were only marginally Christian at best. (...) My spiritual journey had little place for Mary, and none for invocation, not only from lack of experience but also for positive reasons» (SHERLOCK, C., «The Journey. An Anglican Perspective», in BOLEN, D. & CAMERON, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ. The Seattle Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, London 2006, 205 and 209).

16. SHERLOCK, C., «The Journey. An Anglican Perspective», 214.
17. SHERLOCK, C. & CROSS, P., «Mary in the Communion of Saints», 217.
18. *Ibid*., 219.
19. *Ibid*., 217.
20. *Ibid*., 219.
21. *Ibid*., 220.
22. *Ibid*., 221.
23. Cf. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 246.
24. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Sept 4, 2001», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=88 (access: 02.12.2019).
25. Cf. NAZIR-ALI, M. & SAGOVSKY, N., «The Virgin Mary in the Anglican Tradition of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries», in SAGOVSKY, N. & DENAUX, A. (eds.), *Studying Mary: Reflections on the Virgin Mary in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology and Devotion*, London 2007, 131-146, especially 134-139.
26. Cf. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 249.
27. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 250.
28. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: July 18, 2002», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=89 (access: 02.12.2019).
29. Cf. AustARC, «The Saints and Christian Prayer», https://iarccum.org/archive/Australia/1997_austarc_The-Saints-and-Christian-Prayer.pdf (access: 02.12.2019) – presented in § 2.1.2 e.
30. SHERLOCK, C., «The Journey. An Anglican Perspective», in BOLEN, D. & CAMERON, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*, 218-219.
31. ARCIC II [Mary] 524/02. Planned sections of chapter F: «Invocation and mediation in the communion of saints» (64-67), «The distinctive place of Mary» (68-70), and «Differences reconciled in the freedom of grace» (71) – cf. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 251.
32. So-called the second Chevetogne draft, ARCIC II [Mary] 527/02. Cf. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 256, note 5.
33. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: July 18, 2003», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=90 (access: 02.12.2019).
34. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 252.
35. *Ibid.*, 253.
36. ARCIC II, «Communiqué: Feb 3, 2003», https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=91 (access: 02.12.2019).
37. DENAUX, A., «Appendix. The Redactional History of the ARCIC Document on Mary», 253.
38. *Ibid.*, 254.
39. All quotations and numbers of the particular points of the documents are taken from: ARCIC II, «The Seattle Statement: Mary, Grace and Hope in Christ», in Bolen, D., Cameron, G. (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*, 7-87.
40. For a short presentation of all the document, cf. Blanco-Sarto, P., Lech, M. S., «Mother of Hope», 273-274.
41. Cf. BLANCO, P. & FERRER, J., *Lutero 500 añosdespués. Breve historia y teología del protestantismo*, Madrid 2017, 45-50.
42. «9. The term 'popular piety' designates those diverse cultic expressions of a private or community nature which, in the context of the Christian faith, are inspired predominantly not by the Sacred Liturgy but by forms deriving from a particular nation or people or from their culture. Popular piety has rightly been regarded as 'a treasure of the people of God' and 'manifests a thirst for God known only to the poor and to the humble, rendering them capable of a generosity and of sacrifice to the point of heroism in testifying to the faith while displaying an acute sense of the profound attributes of God: paternity, providence, His constant and loving presence. It also generates interior attitudes otherwise rarely seen to the same degree: patience, an awareness of the Cross in every-day life, detachment, openness to others and devotion'.»

– Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, «Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy. Principles and Guidelines», http://www.vatican. va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20020513_vers-diret-torio_en.html (access: 10.02.2021).

43.	«10. 'Popular religiosity' refers to a universal experience: there is always a religious dimension in the hearts of people, nations, and their collective expressions. All peoples tend to give expression to their totalizing view of the transcendent, their concept of nature, society, and history through cultic means. Such characteristic syntheses are of major spiritual and human importance.

.	Popular religiosity does not always necessarily refer to Christian revelation. But in many regions, expressed in a society impregnated with various forms of Christian elements, it gives rise to a kind of 'popular Catholicism', in which coexist., more or less harmoniously, elements originating from the religious sense of life, from the own culture of the people, and from Christian revelation.» –Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, «Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy», No. 10.

44.	Cf. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, «Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy», No. 6, footnote 9. It also teaches that popular religiosity (as the Seattle Statement says, «popular religion») should be understood with «a certain precision of language» (*Directory*, No. 6).

45.	Cf. John Damascene, «Homily 1 On the Dormition of the B. V. Mary», cited in «Appendix IV: English Translation of Chapter VIII of «Lumen gentium»», *Marian Studies* 37 (1986) 248, note 15.

46.	Cf. Thomas Aquinas, «Question 26 – Christ as Called the Mediator of God and Man», in *Latin/English Edition of the Works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, vol. XIX, *Summa Theologiae. Tertia pars, 1-59*, Lander 2012, 277-278.

47.	Especially in *Redemptoris Mater* and CCC, but also in the general audience of 1997 and in *Rosarium Virginis Mariae*; cf. § 2.5.

48.	Cf. LG 4, 12, 15, 35 and 37; DV 23, DV 8, 10, 23; AA 2, 3, 25 and 30; AG 19, GS 43, 52 and 62; PC 12; also later ME 2; FC 5; CL 14; DVer 35; CCC 1804.

49.	Cf. Rovira Belloso, J. M., *Introducción a la teología*, Madrid 1996, 137-141; Wicks, J., *Introduzione al metodo teologico*, Casale Monferrato 1994, 19-22.

50.	It is necessary to recall, in particular, the clarifications in *Redemptoris Mater*, where the pope explains that Mary's mediation is «mediatio in Christo» and that «Mary's mediation is intimately linked with her motherhood. It possesses a specifically maternal character, which distinguishes it from the mediation of the other creatures who in various and always subordinate ways share in the one mediation of Christ, although her own mediation is also a shared mediation. (...) And such cooperation is precisely this mediation subordinated to the mediation of Christ (RM 38)» – John Paul II, «Redemptoris Mater», http://w2.vatican.va/ content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031987_redemptoris-mater. html (access: 03.05.2020).

51.	Mediation «in Christo», «a shared mediation», «subordinated mediation» (RM 38), «subordinate to that of the Redeemer» (RM 41), «other dependent, ministerial forms of mediation» or «other forms compatible with the infinite value of the Saviour's work» (general audience, 01.10.1997).

52.	The *Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy* clarifies the meaning of the word «devotions»: «8. In the present context, this term is used to describe various external practices (e.g. prayers, hymns, observances attached to particular times or places, insignia, medals, habits or customs). Animated by an attitude of faith, such external practices manifest the particular relationship of the faithful with the Divine Persons, or the Blessed Virgin Mary in her privileges of grace and those of her titles which express them, or with the Saints in their configuration with Christ or in their role in the Church's life» (Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, «Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy», No. 8).

53. The only help in understanding what the authors of MGH might be referring to is an article by Nicholas Sagovsky, a member of ARCIC (SAGOVSKY, N., «Mary and Christian Hope: Background to the ARCIC Statement», in MCLOUGHLIN, W. & PINNOCK, J. (eds.), *Mary for Time and Eternity. Essays on Mary and Ecuemenism*, Leominster 2007, 3-14). This is a record of a speech given at the ESBVM Chester Congress (September 2002) and edited after the publication of the Seattle Statement. In footnote no. 3 the author refers to the commentary of D. MacCulloch on Erasmus's *Colloquies* (cf. MACCULLOCH, D., *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, London 2003, 101-102). Perhaps the authors of *MGH* were concerned with the Erasmus critique of the Marian title of *Star of Sea* and the ancient prayer *Salve Regina*. As regards this prayer, it is difficult to agree with the criticism of Erasmus.

54. In the case of Thomas More there is no suggestion in any article or commentary which could help discover the intentions of the commission. It remains for us to suppose that they had in mind his *Letter to a Monk* (cf. MORE, T., «Letter to a Monk», in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. XV, 285-291).

55. It should be noted that a version «pray for us sinners, amen» was already known from the 14th century.

56. Cf. JOHN PAUL II, «Wednesday Audience of October 1, 1997», *L'Osservatore Romano* (8 October 1997) 11.

57. Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT, «Decree on the Invocation, Veneration, and Relicts of the Saints and on Sacred Images», in DENZINGER, H. & HÜNERMANN, P. *et al.* (eds.), *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012, 429.

58. However, in *Marialis cultus* No. 31 Paul VI does not refer in any concrete way to the question of Mary's mediation or seeking her intercession. The proper topic of this point is the issue of proper subordination to the devotion of Mary to the Sacred Liturgy.

59. Cf. also the general audience of John Paul II form 01.10.1997, where the Pope referred to an even wider context: 1 Tim 2,1.5-6 (cf. II chapter § 2.6.3.3).

60. The conclusions of ARCIC could be enriched with an important biblical text written by St Paul, to which John Paul II has already drawn attention (general audience, 01.10.1997), explaining the meaning of Mary's mediation – cf.: John Paul II, «Wednesday Audience of October 1, 1997», 11).

61. Cf. AustARC, «The Saints and Christian Prayer», https://iarccum.org/archive/Australia/1997_austarc_The-Saints-and-Christian-Prayer.pdf (access: 29.04.2020).

62. The only reference to the doctrine given in CCC could be the mentions of the intercessory role of the Holy Spirit (cf. MGH 16, 68, 69; CCC 688, 741, 2630, etc.).

63. Cf. No. 52; three times in No. 67; No. 68; No. 75 and No. 76.

64. No. 2, 68 and 76 citing *Authority in the Church II*; No. 47 citing *Lumen gentium*; and three times in No. 67 – citing *Lumen gentium* and *Marialis cultus*.

65. Cf. JOHN PAUL II, «Wednesday Audience of October 1, 1997», 11.

66. In reference to Moses, in MGH 8 is written that «through Moses [the Lord] made a covenant with Israel that, obedient to his word, they might be a holy nation and a priestly people». Interestingly, the word «through» was translated in Spanish as «por medio de Moises». – cf. ARCIC II, «María: gracia y esperanza en Cristo. Declaración de Seattle. Relación de la Comisión Internacional Anglicano-Católica Romana (ARCIC II) 2004», *Diálogo Ecuménico* 40 (2005) 162.

67. Cf. IRÉNAEUS OF LYON, «Contre les hérésies. Livre III», *SC* 211 (critical edition), 440; English translation: Irenaeus, «Against Heresies», in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translation of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, vol. I, ROBERTS, A. & DONALDSON, J. (eds.), *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, Grand Rapids 1975, 455.

Index of Excerptum