

TALK GIVEN BY FATHER JOSEPH KENTENICH IN ROME

on 8 December 1965

Translated from the German and issued by:

Secular Institute of the
Schoenstatt Sisters of Mary
7800 CONSTANTIA/SOUTH AFRICA

December 1994

Talk given by Father Joseph Kentenich in preparation for the symbolic laying of the foundation stone of the Shrine in Rome on 8 December 1965 at 2-30 p.m.

My dear Schoenstatt Family,

If I have accepted the suggestion to give a talk now and not at the celebration itself, it is because I am expecting a visitor who cannot be put off. No obstacle could have prevented me from taking part in this great and solemn act.

While we are together in this way, just at this time, at this solemn moment, I think I may say that I do not see you now as individual persons, but as symbolically representing the whole family: not only the whole family here on earth, but - if I may express it this way - the members of the heavenly Schoenstatt, as well as those whom we may suppose to be suffering in purgatory. Thus a large community is gathered here. In spirit, therefore, we may all without exception feel that we are present here, and when I repeat: my dear Schoenstatt Family, all without exception should feel addressed.

The act we are preparing for, as I have already said, is very important. Outwardly it is insignificant, but if we try to grasp the deeper meaning we shall see that it is extremely significant. If I may say more exactly why it is so significant and important, I think I may suggest: We are concerned with bringing ourselves into line with and uniting ourselves with the solemn closing act of the Second Vatican Council.

What does this final act mean to us? It is the solemn laying of the foundation stone (for the church 'Matri Ecclesiae') in the form of the blessing of the foundation stone. That there is an exterior similarity is quite obvious at the first glance - we also want, at least symbolically, to bless the foundation stone, to lay the foundation stone (for our shrine).

If the inscription on the foundation stone which the Pope wants to bless and lay, and which he has blessed, is: Matri Ecclesiae, if the new Church is to be dedicated to Our Lady as Mother, we feel that it is quite natural for us to give the new shrine, our M.T.A. shrine in Rome, the title: Matri Ecclesiae.

There is, therefore, a certain similarity between the two acts. The difference, seen purely from without, to a large extent consists in this, that we have only our little sanctuary in comparison with what will apparently be a magnificent cathedral.

Yet we are not satisfied with talking only of bringing ourselves into line, we also say that the act unites us with the Church.

With this I have given you the points I wish to discuss with you. There are two thoughts.

First of all we want to consider: How do we see the Church which is to be dedicated to Our Lady?

Secondly: How do we see the function of a mother which Our Lady is to exercise in regard to this Church? This concerns the act itself which some of you attended at St Peter's.

The New Image of the Church.

I. What answer shall I give to the first question?

How do we see the Church? It has quite different features from the Church of yesterday or the day before. How do we see the Church?

When you later get an opportunity to meditate on all that the Council has achieved in decisions and declarations, you will soon find that the Constitution on the Church stands out as the focal point of it all. Everything else that was discussed, advised or decided, is included, at least in germ, in the Constitution on the Church. Why is there a new attitude to the Church, a new self-concept of the Church, which to a great extent differs from that of yesterday or the day before?

That is the great question: How does the Church see herself today? This does not only mean: what are the absolute and unchangeable fundamentals of the Church? The question does not touch upon the metaphysical concept of the Church, but on how the present-day Church sees herself.

We know how hotly and at what great length the new features of the Church were discussed at the Council. And now we ask: How does this Church appear to us in comparison with the image of yesterday and the day before?

The answer: It is a strange Church; it is a Church which on the one hand is strongly bound to tradition, but on the other is extremely free and detached from rigid traditional forms. It is a Church which is united by a very deep spirit of brotherliness but which is at the same time hierarchic and is directed in a fatherly way. It is a Church which has the mission of becoming the soul of the present and future culture and world.

Would it now be worth while to go into details? I do not know what I should stress particularly. Should I remind you that the old images of the Church

withdraw before the new features of the Church? It is of special importance for us that the Council in describing the Church liked to use the expression:

i. The Church at the moment sees herself as the pil-grim Church: not as the Church which is complete in herself, not as the Church which is self-contained, but as the pilgrim Church. What does this mean? She must take into herself the most varied elements she encounters on her pilgrim way, in her pilgrim existence, on the pilgrimage of her historical existence, and she has to see to it that these elements essentially form her features, her time-bound features. It is a pilgrim Church.

Further, what are its features? How does the Church see herself today? If I may use images: We are used to regarding the Church as an immovable rock. The Church has been founded upon a rock. "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam." The Church today is also a rock, but we want to and we may (for the Church herself does so) explain the image of the rock very differently. Formerly the nations were invited to seek and to find their way to this rock. Today this rock is in constant motion. If I may use an image which can seldom be used, I would like to say that this rock is a pilgrim rock; it is on pilgrimage through the nations, it is on pilgrimage through the times, it seeks people, souls, even invites them to come, and does not wait until they come of themselves.

Therefore let us rather use another image: the Church, a ship. The concept of a ship includes this ability to move, this dynamic life. The Church is a ship riding the swells and waves of the sea - the waves may climb to heaven, and may even endanger the ship to such an extent that it appears as if it will be swallowed up in the abyss. The image of the Church: this is how the Church sees herself. Do we now grasp the great difference between yesterday and the day before, between today and tomorrow?

Seen in this light it should be much easier for you to understand the discussion that surrounded and even raged around the image of the Church.

Search for some other images. This is the first characteristic of the Church as we see her today - she is a pilgrim Church, a pilgrim rock, a ship sent out into the high seas. In comparison with the earlier concept it is an extremely dynamic Church. Therefore, do away with, or at least shift the emphasis. Let us not stress so much the static but rather the dynamic power and strength, the dynamic character of the Church.

This is what the Church looks like. There is a new image of the Church.

ii. A second characteristic is this: the Church is united in an extremely tender, deep and close brotherliness, although in such a way that at the same time there is an hierarchical government and leadership.

If we again compare this second characteristic with the image of the Church of yesterday or the day before, we know how the Church regarded herself, and how we to a great extent have known her. It was not brotherliness that

united the people among themselves and to the leaders of the Church. Instead there was on the one hand rigid over-lordship, a hierarchy which had all the responsibility, all the power; and on the other a people, which I might almost say, was consumptive, which had too little responsibility, shared the responsibility too little. Thus there was a sharp contrast. This character was imprinted upon the Church by early Christianity, by the patriarchal society of those times, and later, since the time of Constantine the Great, by the laws of the state. Since that time there has been the sharp distinction in the Church between superior and subject.

And now in contrast, the Church sees herself from a single standpoint: she sees herself simply as the people of God. This people of God has a single point of contact. All without exception, whether the hierarchy or the people, meet at this one point. What is it? A mutual brotherliness which enables souls to grow together. Therefore, I repeat, the new self-concept of the Church, the feature which she recognises as her own, is this outstanding brotherliness, from the point of view of what is common to all, to the people of God. This people of God is internally united, also with the hierarchy, by an all-comprising and penetrating responsibility. There is no longer a lack of responsibility; each member in his proper place bears responsibility for the total image of the Church. This is the new image of the Church.

And the hierarchy? Of what importance is leadership in the Church today? First of all we must see the community. What unites us all is the idea that the hierarchy, too, is the people of God. From this follows the responsibility of the hierarchy. It is responsibility not for "unworthy subjects", but for the people of God. What does that mean? Once again a much closer rapprochement between superior and subject. What does that mean? A hierarchic orientation, a hierarchic government, is a government which proceeds, as we have said so often in these days, from an outstanding fatherliness which is anchored in supernature. All in all, then, this is the second characteristic of the new image of the Church.

iii. And the third characteristic? Later you should try to see that I am not discussing something I might perhaps have cooked up on my own, but something which has been stressed again and again in all the pronouncements of the Council, now in this way, now in that.

This Church should be, as she was in early Christian times, and as she should always have been, the soul of the present-day world culture. Thus, there should be no separation between the Church and culture, nor between the Church and the world. No, the Church should be the soul of the entire culture, the confused culture, the extremely worldly culture, and of nature which is influenced by the devil. This is how the Church sees herself.

I stress once more! When you later meditate on the discussion about the features of the Church, you will realise how bitter was the battle about this self-portrait of the Church. If there had only been a question of the metaphysics of the Church, it would naturally have been simple to find the answer.

Yet what is of special importance is a word, a process, which we should consider most carefully. Since on the whole the world today is affected by the idea of evolution, we should also see the Church under the aspect of a sound evolution. The Church is not a finished product, she will never be complete here on earth. The Church changes, so do her different life processes. Of course we must remember - I already took this into account when I started - that the Church should be and will be bound to her tradition.

If you now meditate on this short description of the new Church, the new self-portrait of the Church, and then look at life in the world, whether this concerns the clergy, the episcopate or the individual believer, you will be able to discover fairly rapidly which opinion the individual person upholds. The one leaves tradition behind altogether, so that he sees only progress, evolution, while another sees only tradition and refuses to acknowledge any development. This results in the great confusion of our times.

I think we will have to wait a very long time before the detrimental side-effects of the Council have been overcome in the Church at large. Experts tell us that it will take centuries to reap the fruits of the first Vatican Council. Today we must first overcome the detrimental symptoms, the unnoticed and unexpected uncertainty about the new image of the Church in the widest circles, whether we think of the hierarchy, the clergy or the laity. Once this is overcome, at least to a certain extent, the Council will begin to bear fruit.

With this, I think, I have shown you the new image of the Church. Now the Church for which the Pope is laying the foundation stone is to be dedicated to the Mother of the Church. Of which Church? Of this Church - you may not overlook this point - She is the Mother of the new Church, the Church with these new features.

From this follows the second question:

MARY'S MOTHER-FUNCTION

2. What is her function as a mother for this Church? Here, too, let me remind you how sharp was the battle about the function of Our Lady in this Church. Sometimes it seemed as if they did not want to recognise the function of mother; sometimes it seemed as if the idea of equalisation and unity - that is, the idea of the people of God - was seen in such a one-sided way that Our Lady was at most considered and acknowledged as the most perfect member of the people of God. It seemed as if there was no longer any antenna, any thought for motherhood. From this you may be sure that the discussion did not concern the formal metaphysical penetration of phenomena, but rather the living image which the Church has of herself - in this instance the Marian aspect. How does the Church see the function of a mother, that is, how does the present-day Church, how do the faithful, the Council Fathers as representatives of the present people of the Church - how do these representatives see the Church's mother-function? In the same way

as before we ask: How do the representatives of the people of the Church see the essence of the Church, the image, the features of the Church?

The answer: There was great uncertainty, great and heated discussion. Many were of the opinion that we were on the way to seeing Marian devotion from a Protestant standpoint. We were on the way to distorting the image of Our Lady to such an extent that the new Church could recognise no motherly principle. Yet clarity was reached to an ever-increasing extent. And for this, I think, we may thank the Holy Father very specially.

Increasing clarity of thinking was reached in regard to the relationship of Our Lady to the Church in general, and her position in the Church of today. Our Lady is doubtlessly the most perfect member of the Church. This has been recognised on all sides as a tradition, a heritage, which the Church has always upheld, and which Protestantism has also partly adopted.

Yet is she the Mother of the Church? That is to say: Is she a mother in the full sense of the word, and is she also the exemplar of the Church? The Church has increasingly realised that the old concepts are still very much alive within the Church. Our Lady is the prototype of the church. What does that mean? Our Lady is indeed Mother of the Church, but the Church is also a mother. Thus she is Mother of the Church, in the same way as the Church is a mother. If she is Mother of the Church, she is not only the prototype of this Church, but also a mother who has power to conceive and give birth to this Church.

If you remember these three points, these three expressions, you will understand many things more clearly.

a. Let us now ask: In what does her function as mother actually consist? What do dogmatics tell us?

This is not the main question. The main question is rather: How does this idea of the mother's function find expression in the modern Church?

From the dogmatic point of view we could well recall all that we have formerly said on these matters; that is, we could recall that as Our Lady is truly Mother of the individual believer, so she is also the Mother of the Church as a whole. We may here distinguish between the conception of the Church, the birth of the Church, and a certain completion and perfection of the Church. These are truths which should be explored and examined anew today. It must also be seen whether they are really alive in the consciousness of the children of the Church, and in the Church herself.

When was the Church conceived? Dogmatics expresses the truth which is alive in the Catholic people: she was conceived at the same moment as Christ was conceived. Seen in this light, we may no longer see Christ only as an historical person, but also as a mystical person. Thus Our Lady is not only the Mother of the historical Christ, but also of the mystical Christ. I do not intend to repeat all that dogmatics has taught us through the centuries, yet it

will do us no harm to be better in the picture in every respect about these matters.

When, according to the feeling of the people, and where and when, according to dogmatics, did the birth of the Church take place? At the moment of Christ's death. There is a well-known saying: The Church issued forth from the heart of the God-Man, and under the cross stood Our Lady. *Stabat Mater Jesu juxta crucem*. She repeated her 'yes'; it is here, then, that she proved herself a mother, when she co-operated in making the birth of the Church a reality.

And the completion of the Church, so that it could put out to sea, took place at Pentecost: *et erant omnes unanimiter eum Maria Matre Jesu perseverantem in oratione*. Our Lady, therefore, as the Church has felt from the earliest times, is in the truest sense the Mother of the Church.

b. And now: What is the function of Our Lady in regard to the Church of today? It is the same mother's function which she has always exercised in the Church. The most important thing we can say is that the new image of the Church must always be seen in the light of faith, but also in the light of evolution, as well as in the light of dogmatics, in the light of God's plan. It is and will always remain God's plan that the Church cannot exist, that also the Church today cannot be born, cannot be conceived anew, cannot be completed, without Our Lady. Recall here, please, a thought which we have often used in our family. How was Christ born, how conceived? We have before us the great thought: Our Lady the Christ-bearer. For this reason she also bears all Christians, and finally, she bears the *Corpus Christi Mysticum*. The Creed tells us the same truth: the only-begotten Son took flesh of the Holy Spirit and was born of the Virgin Mary.

We know how the mystic, Grignon, explained this thought. We do not want to stay with this point for long. We only want to find the connections. Let us listen to this thought once again, because it so exactly shows what we in our family have repeatedly stressed and lived. It is this: How was Christ born? Christ not only in the Christian, for what applies to the individual Christian applies also to Christianity and to the Church. He was conceived of the Holy Spirit and was born of the Virgin Mary.

The consequence. If Christ is to be born again in the Christian, if the Church, if even the present-day Church is to be born again, it can only happen through the Holy Spirit, but in union with the Virgin Mary. That is to say, and this is the pronouncement and depth of the thought of Grignon: where the Holy Spirit finds Our Lady in a soul, the great dogma, the great truth can be realised in an outstanding way - Was conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary.

When Grignon pondered further and considered why the Church at certain periods brought forth so few saints, why Christ was so seldom born again in a perfect way, he answered, and we can well understand him: because the Holy Spirit too seldom found the Virgin Mary in souls. Wherever he finds her,

however, he cannot help descending and becoming active. Et verbum caro factum est. Then Christ is born again. This is the great law that is valid both for the Church of today and the Church of the future.

We can see and cast light on this thought from another angle. We say, and ancient dogmatics confirm this, that if we want to be sufficiently prepared to give a home in our souls to the Eternal Father, to the Triune God, the so-called 'potentia obedientialis' must be fully developed in our souls. Potentia obedientialis - that is the readiness to receive the Divine. Was Our Lady not open for God? If she lives and works in us, it is the most natural thing in the world that she lets us share in her 'fiat' attitude. As often and as long as we say a 'fiat', we may suppose that the Holy Spirit, that the Triune God, takes possession of our soul, so that these words may come true in an outstanding way: "Et verbum caro factum est."

All that Teilhard has to say about evolution is in its intention doubtlessly very valuable. The whole world should finally be nothing but a Corpus Christi Mysticum. This teaching only begins to err when, if what some maintain is true, evolution is applied to grace as within the framework of nature, so that nature of its own power becomes capable of containing grace as something natural to it. If the 'potentia oboedientialis' is always kept in mind, we cannot imagine a greater or more beautiful aim for the world than that of the whole of creation, not only men but also inanimate nature, forming one great Corpus Christi Mysticum.

What have I explained to you? Nothing but the thought: How do we see the Mater Ecclesiae, or rather, how do we see the Church which is newly consecrated, newly built, as a symbol of the Church at the new shore? How do we see her mother-function? The general answer has been given.

Our Co-ordination.

At the beginning we said: the act which we are about to undertake has a deep meaning. By it we want to be brought into line with and united with the great act which has been solemnly carried out at St Peter's. Would you like to consider with me: How can we describe this co-ordination: What is its significance? Actually we should ask ourselves two questions: how do we see this co-ordination in regard to the image of the Church? How do we see this co-ordination in regard to her mother-function?

If we think of the image of the Church, those of us who know Schoenstatt, who have studied and lived Schoenstatt's teaching, may perhaps object: the image of the Church which we have just studied in the light of the Council, has always been the image of the Church as we have known it. Indeed we have seen the Church in no other way. Therefore, they may object, or at least feel: we may not say that we have brought ourselves into line with the Council's image of the Church. Must we not rather say that the Council's image of the Church has been brought into line with ours? In essentials we were the first. This is doubtlessly true. It is even a question that must be studied again, if only because outside our circle the charge is made and

constantly repeated: You have absolutely no idea what the Church wants today, what the Church says of herself, nor do you co-operate. We need not co-operate, we have already gone before. We need only know how we have remained loyal to this image of the Church, and how we have tried to exemplify this image in our own ranks.

May I remain with this thought for a moment? I think I must say that the battle of the past years was at bottom a battle for the image of the Church. The Church of yesterday even tried to bring our image of the Church onto the same level as the exaggeratedly traditional image of the Church. How did we arrive at our image of the Church? If I may give the answer in a concentrated form, it is only to inspire deeper study. Our image of the Church has arisen from deeper than usual levels of the Corpus Christi Mysticum, that is, the Church. It has always received its inspiration from deeper levels, it has always been orientated towards the new shore, that is, the shore that is so hotly disputed today, and it has constantly been penetrated by a powerful fullness of grace.

With this I have made three essential statements which cannot be understood very easily or quickly. Yet we must see these things more clearly, even if we only think of our task in the near future. If we like to distinguish between a fore-conciliar and a post-conciliar image of the Church, we have to admit that the post-conciliar image has been our fore-conciliar image. It is important to see these things clearly. If we do not do so we are unable to defend ourselves, nor are we in a position to understand the importance of the act we are about to undertake.

Let us now question more closely the meaning of the statement: we have arisen from deeper than usual levels of the Church, the Corpus Christi Mysticum. How can we describe this deeper level?

Let me just remind you of one or the other expression we used in the past. From the beginning we have found the meaning of Christianity in this thought: the victorious bringing home of the elect in Christ and Mary in the Holy Spirit to the Father. This was the deep, original well-spring of life. We were not concerned with keeping this or that spiritual practice; there was always only one great thought, everything was dynamic and in movement, everything was seen in its final perspective, in so far as one can do so today. Therefore we answer: The victorious return home - in keeping with the victorious bringing home - the victorious home-coming of the elect through Christ Jesus in the Holy Spirit to the Father. This is the deepest and final source. We have also always kept in mind: Not only through Christ Jesus, but also et Maria. There were always clear concepts, we always searched for the deepest level of truth.

This is only a very small contribution. Later, when you study this yourselves, you must spend more time on this thought, so that the whole family may again be elevated to the level we have now reached. You may never overlook, that seen purely from the historical angle (the representatives of) the trends which set the note today had from the first constantly to take us

into account, and we had constantly to take them into account. Whoever thinks a bit rationally will, therefore, have to say a priori: that which is taught today, that which comes to the surface as a function, as a vital power, must in some way be present in our family. This is true of the liturgical movement, the mystical trend, the youth movement, or any other movement which has given of its best in order to renew the image of the Church in an existential way.

They have all flowed towards us, and we have constantly taken them into account.

I would like to suggest that you try to find out, either from Jungmann or any of the modern liturgists, whether there is anything essential in their teaching which we have not already taught. Of course, and this is the great difference, we have not stuck slavishly to forms. It is one of the characteristics of my way of thinking to maintain that forms change, but not the essence of the liturgy, the function of the liturgy. I would like to remind you that in his encyclical "Mystici Corporis", Pius XII used practically the same definition - I would not like to suggest in any way that he took it from us - but forms, as we formerly said, change. Others may lay down forms. You will see that the forms of today which are idolised, will tomorrow be replaced by other forms. This by no means implies that we should have no forms. I would only like you to realise that we are not out of date as some might think, and as we may think tomorrow or the next day. We are not old-fashioned. Even today we are in advance of the modern Church. For example, we go significantly further in our teaching on the Church as the soul of modern culture. In this the Council showed its helplessness; it declared that the problems were too new, and so they were never discussed. For this reason the Council remained with giving only a few suggestions.

Let us ask again: How did we come into existence? How did our image of the Church come into existence? The Holy Spirit guided us to allow spring-clear waters from deeper levels of the Corpus Christi Mysticum to flow towards us. I would like to repeat: This is the reason for the misunderstanding between the old Church and ourselves; and vice versa.

Now that the Church has increasingly accepted our image as her own, now that the public consciousness of the Church has recognised this image, even if only experimentally, we can understand that according to God's plans all the decrees have been lifted.

And now we talk of bringing ourselves into line. There we have the expression again! It is true, the Church has brought herself into line with us and has taken on our features. This does not prevent us from saying that at the new shore we must bring ourselves into line with and take on the features of the image of the Church given to us by the Council. In essentials it is our own image of the Church.

Then I said - once again it is completely in keeping with the spirit of the Church and of the Council - we have constantly orientated ourselves towards the new shore. This, at least so it seems, so it is proclaimed and proved, is

the new thing given us by John XXIII. He opened the doors and the windows. He did not ask what trends existed in the Church, but what trends existed in the whole world. Call to mind, please, how much this law of the open door inspired our thinking from the beginning. We always proceeded from the thought: if we want to get to know the spirit, the modern spirit, the spirit of the times, the worldly spirit, we can best do so by getting to know the spirit of our opponents. Think, for example, of national socialism or bolshevism. This has always been our strength, to be told and shown by them what God wants of us in detail. This is exactly the criterion applied by the Church today. The doors are open, ours were always open, our windows were always open.

In this way, we can understand how it came about, and how we are to understand, that our image of the Church has by far and for a long time anticipated the image of the Church laid down by the Council.

And that we were permeated by a stream of grace may be attributed to this - we need only recall the past - that we always told Our Lady and remembered that it is her task to form and educate the new man in the new society. For this I may now say, the genuine Christian and Catholic in the new Church.

Actually I should remain with this thought much longer, but what has been said must suffice. It is only meant as an inspiration and incentive to explore further in every direction.

What have I said? How can we describe this act of co-ordination which we want to carry out by laying the foundation stone of our new M.T.A. Chapel? We want to bring ourselves into line with the image of the Church visualised by the Pope as he lays the foundation stone for his sanctuary.

Secondly: How can we describe Our Lady's mother-function? When we think of ourselves, of bringing ourselves into line with the Church, I think we must also say that in regard to our conscious dependence and attachment to Our Lady, we can repeat that the Council is on the way to getting into line with us. We could remain with this thought for a long time, and so we should. It is the great task to which we have been loyal from the first. Our image of Mary, as we have proclaimed it from the beginning, is far ahead of the times. Later the popes have described it feature by feature as we have done from the beginning. Our Lady is the official and permanent helpmate and associate of the Saviour in his entire work of redemption. Our Lady is the great educator. Whom does she want to educate? The new Catholics, leading them to the new image of the Church. We have always expected and looked for everything from her.

With this I have roughly indicated a few themes. Let us look at the thesis once more: What does the simple act we are undertaking mean? It brings us into line with and unites us with the solemn closing of the Council. This is co-ordination.

Union.

And if we now mention the act of union, how is it to be seen? I think that since after the Council the Church has in essentials taken up a similar stand as we have - whether this includes the image of the Church or the mother-function of Our Lady, her educative activity - we may not overlook that this concept of union is of special importance to us. It is not as though it is something new. What do I mean by union in this instance? It means inclusion in the mission of the hierarchy. It implies inclusion in the mission of the Church and the hierarchy.

Once again this would require careful study, but I shall not go into it. You should consider how long we have striven to achieve this union. First of all, when I told you that the Church had come into line with our image of the Church and our teaching on Our Lady's mother-function, you should not overlook that this has been possible. We were never outside the Church, we were a member of the Church. This is quite normal, especially if we apply a sound doctrine of evolution to the development of the Church. It becomes possible, even evident, that on numberless occasions the Church as a whole has brought herself into line with a part that had been nourished from deeper sources, and remained true to the great trends of the future. Therefore we may not be surprised. Yet we have also always tried to adapt ourselves to the image of the Church we had before us.

This is the reason why we constantly tried to get to the Pope, to the hierarchy. Think only of a few common expressions: All for Schoenstatt, Schoenstatt for the Church, the Church for the Triune God. What do we mean when we say: Schoenstatt for the Church? As a member of the Church we always want to penetrate, impregnate and be a leaven for the whole Church. All for the Church, means and must mean: a member of the Church we always want to penetrate, impregnate and be a leaven for the whole Church. All for the Church, means and must mean: dependence on the hierarchy, in particular the Pope.

Let us proceed. We have used and followed well-known expressions: In the shadow of the sanctuary the destiny of the Church will be essentially influenced for centuries. What does that mean? In the transformation of the Church from within - or if you like, although it sounds rather strange - in bringing the Church into line with us. Yet basically this means: In the shadow of the sanctuary the destiny of the Church will be essentially influenced for centuries. An essential part of the Church is the hierarchy. Repeated efforts were therefore made to contact the hierarchy.

And when we now begin to call ourselves the heart of the Church, what do we want to be? The Church must always be seen not only from its inner, but also from its outer essential structure.

Now that is most beautiful, indeed, I may not overlook the other truth: The meaning of the two visions, as I saw it, as we saw it, was finally nothing but the union of ourselves, our thinking and willing, and our new vision of the Church, with the (traditional) image of the Church, in so far as its essential

features were concerned. And for this reason we wanted to be dependent on the hierarchy and the Popes.

When you now see the latest trends, you must admit, indeed it has given me personally the greatest joy, that especially the leaders of our priests' branch have a strong and instinctive urge to go to Rome, to the Pope, to the hierarchy. By the way, when we recall what we always wanted, we must answer: We always wanted to be the order of the bishop. We have never overlooked the hierarchy, we have always seen it clearly. The order of the bishop. Pars motrix et centralis - the order of the Pope.

Union. The deepest meaning of the act we are about to undertake must be seen not only as bringing ourselves into line with, but also in uniting ourselves with the Church as we have just explained it. Therefore our little chapel is built close to St Peter's basilica. What is the significance of bringing the little shrine near to and into the shadow of St Peter's? We wanted to come to Rome and help in carrying out the mission of the Church, the post-conciliar mission of the Church from here. Let us not forget, however, that the post-conciliar mission of the Church has been our fore-conciliar mission. We can, therefore, readily explain what we are now doing in this regard. Now we are on the same ground, we have the same way of thought, the same feeling as the Church, as the public opinion in the Church. Therefore it will be very much easier for us today to penetrate the Church and fulfil our task. But we shall be better able to do so, because in all probability the hierarchy will be more open for us in the near future.

For the great questions that remain to be answered - think only of all we have said of the uniting function of brotherliness within the Church, and the hierarchic-pastoral function - these are things that are practically unknown to us even today. It may be that much will be written on these topics, but until the episcopate understands the meaning of the words: my people are also my brothers, they share the responsibility, each one bears responsibility for the whole Church in his own sphere, until this has one day become a reality! These are things which we have until now tried to realise in every respect. Thus, when I think of the post-conciliar Church, we have one great advantage because we are ahead in our thinking, acting and feeling, but we also have a great task.

You have all probably heard that I recently promised the Bishop of Muenster that we would try to make his diocese a true family. What does that mean? When we use the expression 'people of God', the unifying bond between the episcopate, the Church and the people is seen. Thus the great question for the future remains open: How will each diocese, each parish, become a family of God? And how do we see the father in this family of God, how the child?

Please do not forget that the simple act we are about to undertake includes a world of truths and realities. We cannot even guess what it implies, otherwise our priests would have prepared for it in an entirely different way. As seen

now it is only of secondary importance, a little act has been performed, but the full weight of enthusiasm is not behind it.

Union. What does it mean? The shrine is to be consecrated. What task do we undertake by the consecration of this shrine? Union with, co-ordination with the great act carried out by the Pope this morning.

What shall I say to close? I received a number of cards from Milwaukee. They should have been printed, but the people who were meant to do it were unreliable, so it was not done. Maria, please read what is on them:

"In remembrance of the symbolic laying of the foundation stone of our M.T.A. Chapel in the shadow of St Peter's, as a symbol of our co-ordination and union with the solemn closing act of the Second Vatican Council, the laying of the foundation stone for a great new Church which the Mater Ecclesia gives to the Mater Ecclesiae. (Rome) - Schoenstatt, Feast of the Immaculate Conception 1965."

This summarises the full message of this talk doesn't it? Of course you will need to work it through until it becomes a living possession, not merely in the head but also in the heart.

On the other page are the words:

"Christmas 1965 - the Feast on which the Miracle of the Holy Night for which we have been longing since 1941/42 has become a perfect joyful reality. J.K."

Now I would like to say a final word. It is not by chance that this simple and yet so meaningful act, which brings our family history to a certain close and tangibly ends the whole history of the visitation, has taken place on the 8 December.

It was one of Scheeben's favourite thoughts: There is a connection between the Immaculate Conception and papal infallibility. I do not want to enter into what this thought includes in detail. What is the connection between these two - infallibility and the Immaculate Conception? The Immaculate Conception includes intactness of the entire personality; infallibility, intactness of the head. Intactness, what does that mean? Infallibility.

May Our Lady therefore help us who, as we heard this morning, have striven so hard and continue to strive for the spirit of the Immaculata. The Immaculata spirit is the mother soil of our family. It should also help us to submit to the Pope. We know, we also guess, as St Augustine once said, what great good fortune is ours that we belong to the Catholic Church, because in so many questions the Church guides us with her authority. We experience today more than ever, even through the Council, that many questions would have remained unsolved had not a final authority existed, had not the Pope finally spoken infallibly ex cathedra.

Therefore let us ask Our Lady to impress this day upon us deeply, so that we see it not only as a great gift but also as a great task; a task that inspires us to look back and see the great connections, and to look forward and offer our entire lives to the family, and in the family through the hands of Our Lady to the Church and the Triune God. So at the close, let us sing once more: "With thy sceptre in thy hand ..."