

## **Bérulle's Marian Way to Jesus: The Christocentric Praxis of Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle's Marian États Revealed Through the Lens of Self-Gift**

RICK PERRY, PH.D. CAND.

*Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium*

I make to the Most Holy Virgin a whole, absolute and irrevocable oblation of all that I am by the mercy of God in being and in the order of nature and grace, of all that depends on it, of all natural, indifferent and good actions, which I will operate forever, referring everything, that is to say, everything that is in me and everything I can refer to the homage and honor of the Most Holy Virgin, which I take and now regard as the object to which, after her Son, and under her Son, I relate my soul and my life, both interior and exterior, and generally everything that is mine.<sup>280</sup>

Pierre de Bérulle (*Vow of Servitude to Mary*)

The above excerpt is from Pierre de Bérulle's vow of servitude to Mary that he propagated, along with a vow to Jesus, in France roughly from 1604, to the end of his life in 1629. This work is an examination of the anthropology and spirituality that surrounds these vows. The hope of the following examination is to draw out the Christocentricity of Bérulle's Marian devotion. The vows of servitude that he propagated and guided others through centralize the inseparability of his Christological vision and Marian piety. Bérulle's theology and spirituality were highlighted by emphases on the creaturely existence of humanity, mystically referred to as nothingness (*néant*), the human person's need to recognize their ultimate dependency on God, and human fulfillment found in the interior dispositions or states (*états*) of the Incarnation. The Bérullian vows in turn, following these presuppositions, were to serve in stirring grace in those who have allowed their faith to dissipate or lie dormant.

---

<sup>280</sup> Pierre de Bérulle, and Jacques Paul Migne, *Œuvres complètes de Bérulle* (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1856), 630-31 (my translation).

## 1. Biography and Historical Context

Bérulle is primarily a figure in French church history, known for his founding of the first oratory in France and his political career as a statesman and cardinal, especially his polemic with Cardinal Richelieu.<sup>281</sup> His escort and supervision of the Discalced Carmelite migration to, and reform in, France is also well documented. His role in these crucial movements in France in the spiritual vacuum following Trent<sup>282</sup> allowed Bérulle to propagate his theology, along with the corresponding spirituality, through the appropriate channels respectively. He was able to promote a spirituality with a particular Christocentric and exemplarist fabric through his organizing and supervision of the Oratory and Carmelite communities in France. Thus, Bérulle's lasting impact on the spiritual life of France and beyond is worth investigating. Most of the research conducted on Bérulle and the subsequent Oratorian spirituality ("the French school" as famously named by Henri Bremond), has been primarily carried out in the French speaking areas of academia. There have been some advancements in this area by scholars outside of France,<sup>283</sup> though these scholars appear to have not received much

---

<sup>281</sup> Cardinal Armand Jean du Plessis, Duke of Richelieu (1585-1642), was a French clergyman and statesman. He was consecrated as a bishop in 1607 and became a powerful figure in both Church and French politics. He was made cardinal in 1622 and King Louis XIII made him chief minister in 1624. His chief foreign policy aims were to check the power of the Austro-Spanish Habsburg dynasty and to ensure French dominance in the Thirty Years' War. Although he was a cardinal, he did not hesitate to make alliances with Protestant rulers to achieve his goals. These political aims put Richelieu at odds with Pope Urban VIII (1568-1644).

<sup>282</sup> The Council of Trent (1545-1563) required the creation of diocesan seminaries with the canon *Cum Adolescentium Aetas*. Many dioceses in France did not implement the canon and establish seminaries. This vacuum to a large degree was filled by Bérulle's establishment of the Oratory.

<sup>283</sup> Some notable exceptions are Anne Minton, *The Figure of Christ in the Writings of Pierre De Bérulle, 1575-1629* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983); William M. Thompson, *Bérulle and the French School. Selected Writings*, trans. Lowell M. Glendon (New York: Paulist, 1989); Charles E. Williams, *The French Oratorians and Absolutism, 1611-1641* (New York: P. Lang, 1989); Philip McCosker, "The Christology of Pierre de Bérulle," *The Downside Review*, vol. 124, no. 435, (2006); Edward Howells, "Relationality and Difference in the Mysticism of Pierre De Bérulle," *Harvard Theological Review* 102.02 (2009); Erik Varden, *Redeeming Freedom: The Principle of Servitude in Bérulle* (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 2011); and most recently, Clare McGrath-Merkle, *Bérulle's Spiritual Theology of Priesthood: A Study in Speculative*

recognition, especially on the topic of Bérulle and the French school. These scholars, along with French historical and systematic commentary, will assist here in examining Bérulle's Christology and intrinsically tied Mariology.

Bérulle was born on February 4, 1575 in Cerilly, France. It appears that from an early age Bérulle's spirituality would begin to take shape. His father, Claude de Bérulle, died when he was seven, and he was raised by a single mother, who moved the family to Paris in 1582. Pierre was the oldest of four children. According to historical accounts, Bérulle's mother, Louise Seguier, was an extremely austere woman as "she [while on her deathbed] refused, in the heat of her fever, the approach of her lips with a slice of lemon, calling this relief a sensuality."<sup>284</sup> Bérulle's mother would before her death enter a Carmelite convent and come under her son's spiritual direction. This experience of his could have implanted in Bérulle a deep sense of motherhood, notably from a devout mother who would look to her son for spiritual direction. Possibly due to this upbringing, Bérulle has been depicted by some historians as displaying his piety from a very young age. Henri Bremond<sup>285</sup> depicts the young Bérulle as "convicted and resolute," yet "with no trace of self-sufficiency, for he thought but little of himself."<sup>286</sup>

In 1597 Bérulle published his first work *Bref discours de l'abnégation intérieure* ('A Brief Discourse on Interior Self-Denial'). Notably this early work is characteristically lacking in Christocentricity. Nowhere in the work is mentioned the person of Christ. The work rather emphasizes the abandonment of the human person to God. The main obstacle to radical love of God is self-love, which for Bérulle, at this development of his thought, needs to be utterly negated in order to lose oneself in blissful

---

*Mysticism and Applied Metaphysics*, Ethik Und Philosophie 12, Münster: Studien Zur Systematischen Theologie, Aschendorff Verlag, 2018.

<sup>284</sup> Michel Houssaye, *Le cardinal de Bérulle et le cardinal de Richelieu, 1625-1629* (Paris: Plon, 1874), 278 (my translation).

<sup>285</sup> Henri Bremond (1865–1933) was a French literary scholar and sometime Jesuit (left the Society in 1904). Some have asserted that he was a modernist, considering his friendship with George Tyrrell. Bremond wrote his prolific eleven volume work, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours* (from 1916 to 1936), volume three introducing Bérulle back into academic discussion, depicting the latter as the epitome of devout humanism.

<sup>286</sup> Henri Bremond, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, trans., K. L. Montgomery, Vol. 3 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928), 5.

self-forgetfulness. Bérulle later appears to have had his Christocentric conversion during an Ignatian retreat at Verdun in 1602 when discerning the fulfillment of his own particular calling, and whether to enter the religious life. Rather than entering the religious life, Bérulle intuited a call to something more fundamental: a Christocentric orientation by which all those with Holy Orders should orientate themselves in virtue of the unifying sacrament which constitutes their priestly office:

Here I could not ignore, but trying to persevere in some particular thought on the selection of some means rather than others, and particularly on the plan to enter into some religious order, and the motives that could carry me, I felt my mind hampered and darkened. I wanted to overcome this obstacle, and try a second time to go further, and then I had an inner warning that what God wanted from me for the time being was to offer myself to him and to dispose of whatever he pleased, and not to make a selection. Nevertheless, being applied to it again for the third time, I had another interior movement to resort rather to the Virgin Mary so that she might return me to the end and so to the means that her God and her Son give me, and that with some feeling of piety and devotion to her. Therefore, I begged her to dispose my mind to invoke in this affair the saint to whom she principally desired me to resort. I felt with confidence and devotion a movement and a desire to depend on her. Blessed be the Blessed Virgin in whose care I put myself entirely. Jesus Christ alone is the end and the means in the Cross and in the Eucharist. There we must bind to Him as to our end, to use Him as a means.<sup>287</sup>

Notably above, appearing to ground Bérulle's Christological centering is his orientation to Mary. Fundamentally during this conversion to a more Christocentric spirituality, Bérulle has recourse first to Mary, whom he has confidence with orientating him "to the end and so to the means that her God and her Son give..." In the context of being stripped of a possible religious pretentiousness, Mary simply orientates Bérulle to her Son. Thus, paradoxically in placing Bérulle most

---

<sup>287</sup> Bérulle, *Œuvres*, 1290 (my translation).

fundamentally at the servitude of her Son above anyone else, Bérulle felt “with confidence and devotion a movement and a desire to depend on her...” Simply put, devotion to Mary places Bérulle’s sight on Jesus at its most fundamental level, and in turn, Bérulle recognizes the value of Mary within this Christocentric light. It is probable that this experience at Verdun influenced to some degree his appropriation of the vows of servitude to both Jesus and Mary.

Much of the Catholic reform in France following Trent was influenced by those that frequented the salon of Bérulle’s cousin, Madame Acarie (Barbara Avrillot, later “Marie de l’Incarnation”). Acarie lived for several years in Bérulle’s mansion after her husband had been exiled from France. Much of the abstract mysticism, which stressed the *via negativa* that influenced Bérulle early on was from his encounters at this salon. Those that met at the salon were Pierre de Coton S.J., Dom Beaucousin O. Cart., St. Vincent de Paul, Benoît de Canfeld, and St. Francis de Sales to name a few.<sup>288</sup> Beaucousin and the Carthusians are believed to have been a channel for the translation and propagation of the Rheno-Flemish mystical school.<sup>289</sup> As early as 1595, Beaucousin was influential on Bérulle as his spiritual director. It is highly possible that the more abstract mysticism of the northern mystics was transmitted to Bérulle through this connection.

Madame Acarie also influenced Bérulle’s 1603-04 personal escort of the Discalced Carmelites from Spain into France, after which by papal bull Bérulle became one of three co-superiors, partnered with André Duval, a lecturer at the Sorbonne, and Jacques Gallemant, a priest at Aumale, a commune in northwestern France. Bérulle held this position as superior until his death. Despite the Teresian constitutions not allowing males to be separate from females within the order, Henry IV refused to allow Spanish friars to enter France. Nonetheless Bérulle escorted seven nuns into France, including Anne of St. Bartholomew, Teresa of Avila’s nurse, and the latter’s right-hand, Ann of Jesus, whom John of Cross dedicates his *Spiritual Canticle*.<sup>290</sup> The nuns arrived to find

---

<sup>288</sup> Philip McCosker, “The Christology of Pierre de Bérulle,” *The Downside Review*, vol. 124, no. 435, (2006), 112.

<sup>289</sup> Minton, *The Figure of Christ in the Writings of Pierre De Bérulle*, 469.

<sup>290</sup> Anne of Jesus was the one to pressure John of the Cross into composing a commentary for his work, *Cántico Espiritual*. After coming to France, she would remain under Bérulle’s superiorship for three years before founding a convent in Brussels. Anne

Carmelite postulants awaiting them, trained by Madame Acarie and living their conventual life in her home.<sup>291</sup> In 1604, Carmel of the Incarnation was founded in Paris.<sup>292</sup> Bérulle's time as a visitor and spiritual guide of the Carmelites led to tensions between him and later Carmelite friars that entered France under Denys de la Mère de Dieu in 1609. In 1614, Pope Paul V appointed Bérulle as perpetual visitor over the Carmelites already under his care, despite the protest of the Carmelite friars. Much of the debate surrounded Bérulle's promotion of consecrating oneself to Jesus and Mary, accusing Bérulle of substituting the Carmelite charism with the new Oratorian spirituality. Ironically it appears that Bérulle discovered these vows of servitude on his way to Spain in 1604 to bring Teresian reform to France.<sup>293</sup> He had exhorted both those of the Oratory and Carmelite communities to profess the vow of servitude to Mary in 1614, and to Jesus in 1615.

The ferocity of the polemic surrounding the vows of servitude and Bérulle's role as perpetual visitor to the Carmelite communities is best summed up in the *Morlaix affair* of 1623. Discalced Carmelite friars had established an unauthorized convent in Morlaix<sup>294</sup> in 1612. In 1623, when Pope Urban VIII confirmed the superiorship of Bérulle and his colleagues,<sup>295</sup> the Carmelite friars advised the nuns to disobey the Pope and their bishop, and thus were excommunicated by the dean of Nantes,

---

of Jesus brought the *Cántico* to France, while assisted by Bérulle. Considering that John of the Cross's essential work on nuptial theology was in the personal possession of Anne, and Bérulle spent a good amount of time with her in Spain and on the road (she was carrying the *Cántico* at this time to France), it is not a stretch to believe Bérulle was one of the first French persons to review this work. Also, considering that Bérulle's work, *Discours de l'état et des grandeurs des grandeurs de Jésus*, is composed in response to a polemic with Carmelite Friars, it is highly probable that he utilized the spirituality of the great Carmelite. The *Cántico* was first published in Paris in 1622, and was in French.

<sup>291</sup> Michael J. Buckley, "Seventeenth-Century French Spirituality: Three Figures," in *Christian Spirituality: Post-Reformation and Modern* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 44.

<sup>292</sup> This convent was closed and razed during the French Revolution in 1797.

<sup>293</sup> Thompson, *Bérulle and the French School*, 12.

<sup>294</sup> Morlaix is a commune in the Finistère department of the region Brittany in northwestern France.

<sup>295</sup> Notably, Paul V in 1620 confirmed Bérulle's appointment along with Gregory XV in 1621. See Raymond Deville, *The French School of Spirituality: An Introduction and Reader*, trans. Agnes Cunningham (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1994), 42.

Étienne Louytre, twice in 1623 and 1625.<sup>296</sup> The Bishop of Léon, René de Rieux refused to submit himself and denounced Louytre to the Assembly of Clergy meeting in Paris. The assembly sided with Rieux and passed its declaration on June 16, 1625. Rome was upset with the assembly's decision against Louytre, and Pope Urban VIII then sent a letter to all the French dioceses overturning the assembly's decision. Seeing that the Oratorians were receiving the upper hand with the papacy, which probably was perceived as undermining the prevailing Gallican spirit<sup>297</sup>, Bishop de l'Aubespine sought for "calls of abuse"<sup>298</sup> concerning all bulls in favor of the Oratorians, subjecting them to the power of the local bishops. The Oratorians though had been in the past loyal to the local bishops over them, and continued to be despite allegations. The vows even made their way to the faculties of Leuven and Douay, Leonardus Lessius<sup>299</sup> himself being suspicious of the vows and later advising Bérulle to defend himself.<sup>300</sup> This, and other polemics, led to Bérulle's apologetic defense in *Discours de l'état et des grandeurs de Jésus* ('Discourse on the State and Grandeurs of Jesus') in 1624. Despite this polemic with Carmelite friars, French historian Michel Houssaye presents Bérulle as receiving a favorable reputation with second generation Carmelite nuns, who referred to him as the "good Father" that "we owe, after God, all that we are."<sup>301</sup> During the vows dispute, the Carmelite Madeleine de Saint-Joseph defended Bérulle's propagation of the vows, as they were beneficial for her own spirituality.<sup>302</sup>

A much smoother path for Bérulle to promote his spirituality centered on the vows of servitude was through his establishment of the first French Oratory in 1611, The Oratory of Jesus. The purpose of the

---

<sup>296</sup> Williams, *The French Oratorians and Absolutism*, 215-16.

<sup>297</sup> Gallicanism was a political and theological movement in France advocating for the restriction of papal power.

<sup>298</sup> Williams, *The French Oratorians and Absolutism*, 217.

<sup>299</sup> Leonardus Lessius (1554-1623) was a Flemish Jesuit and moral theologian who taught on the Leuven faculty. He is known for his treatise *De iustitia et iure* ('On Justice and Rights'), published in 1605, which was a commentary on the *Secunda secundae* of Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*.

<sup>300</sup> Houssaye, *Le Père de Bérulle et L'Oratoire de Jésus 1611-1625* (Paris: Plon, 1874), 404-406.

<sup>301</sup> Houssaye, *Le cardinal de Bérulle et le cardinal de Richelieu*, 497 (my translation).

<sup>302</sup> See Lettre 3 in Madeleine de Saint-Joseph, *Lettres spirituelles*, ed. Pierre Serouet (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965), 17.

Oratory was for the reform of the clergy in the wake of Trent, considering the decrees on the new seminary system were not officially enacted in France until 1615. Bremond presents the Bérullian reform not as one of mere moral change, but rather emphasizing the priesthood in its “mystical” dimension.<sup>303</sup> What was sought to be restored by Bérulle was the dignity of the priesthood through a renewed look on the state of such a vocation, which was essential to his theology and spirituality. Here the vows of servitude were not required, though they were heavily encouraged, as Bérulle believed that the dignity of the priesthood was necessarily tied with a sense of unity with Jesus.<sup>304</sup>

Despite Bérulle’s impact, today Adrien Bourdoise<sup>305</sup> is typically attributed with establishing the first seminary infrastructure in France, after the Assembly of the Clergy published the decrees of the Council of Trent in 1615. Bourdoise’s advancements though were not so much in the areas of education (thus theology and spirituality), but rather in practical matters.<sup>306</sup> Bérulle and his successors transmitted the theology and spirituality that contributed to the religious climate of France in the seventeenth century. Charles Williams points out in his work, *The French Oratorians and Absolutism, 1611-1641*, that the Oratorians were deployed all throughout France to meet the growing needs of the faithful: “Typically, a bishop would request that several Oratorians be sent to his diocese to assist in reforming the clergy and to conduct missions and catechism classes for the laity, and to deliver Lenten and Advent sermons.”<sup>307</sup> Despite filling this modest need as pastors, the Oratory was becoming more and more affiliated with education, being tasked with establishing new colleges. The Bull *Sacrosanctae* of 1613 permitted the Oratory to open colleges. Colleges were established in Saumur, Beaune, Condom and elsewhere to meet the demands of the citizens. Under Bérulle’s successor, Charles de Condren, education passed from the Oratory to Jean-Jacques Olier and his Company of St. Sulpice, which was founded in 1647. St. Jean Eudes in 1643 founded the Congregation of Jesus and Mary, today known as the Eudists, which was tasked

---

<sup>303</sup> Bremond, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, 135-36.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>305</sup> Adrien Bourdoise (1584-1655), was a French priest and the founder of the seminary Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet.

<sup>306</sup> Thompson, *Bérulle and the French School*, 10.

<sup>307</sup> Williams, *The French Oratorians and Absolutism*, 214.



primarily with missionary work. Due to his missionary activity, Eudes at times is depicted as more active and practical than Bérulle when it came to his pastoral approach. Though it is evident that Eudes did conduct more missions than any other Oratorian, Bérulle's activity with the Oratory, Carmelites and French monarch depicts a particularly active clerical life. Such responsibilities may have kept him from direct involvement in missionary endeavors. St. Vincent de Paul is comparable to Eudes in terms of missionary activity, and though he was under the spiritual direction of Bérulle, he never was an Oratorian. Bérulle's direction and influence over such a vast number of persons and institutions illustrates not only someone who was able to transmit his knowledge of theological affairs, but also someone with an active role as a superior, cardinal, spiritual director and pastor.

Bérulle collapsed and died on October 2, 1629 while celebrating mass. Pope Innocent X, at the request of one of Bérulle's successors at the Oratory, François Bourgoing, introduced the beatification process for Cardinal Bérulle in 1648. Despite forty five miracles being attributed to him, the process was halted apparently because Bérulle was found to have been put on the Jansenist's calendar, possibly alluding to a suspicion that Bérulle had Jansenist leanings (St. Francis de Sales is also found on the same calendar).<sup>308</sup> Bremond asserted that Bérulle's influence culminates in the missionary activity of St. Louis de Montfort,<sup>309</sup> whose influence later extended far and wide due to the latter's work, *True Devotion to Mary*. This example displays the reach of Bérullian reform.

## 2. Bérulle's Christocentric Balance of État

One of the key features of Bérulle's thought is his notion *état* (state), and the meaning given it. The *états* are 'states of being', for which Christ, in virtue of his divinity, are revealed by the acts of His earthly life, or the Incarnation as a whole. For Bérulle creaturely acts left to themselves are fleeting and signify little. The acts of Christ, on the other hand, are perpetual and extend out to others welcoming participation. Thus, the different acts and corresponding states of the Incarnation signify something of the inner life of God and subsequently are extended to the Christian to participate in according to their state of life. Whether it be the

---

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>309</sup> Bremond, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, 1.

birth of Christ, His public ministry, or Passion, the Christian can participate in these events perpetuated in time, which in turn have an effect on the state of the Christian. At the same time, Bérulle's *états* are Christocentric and exemplarist: the Christian can participate and take on the life of Christ, to be another Christ, while the Christian also has a relation *to* Christ. This Christocentricity, relation to Christ, is preserved in Bérulle by his devotion to Mary, who is the model of one who has a unitive relation to Christ. This Marian unity in turn maintains and presupposes distinction yet Christoforms the disciple.

An important distinction investigated in relation to this notion of *état* is between the psychological and ontological. Are we to reduce the Second Person of the Trinity's identity to acts he takes *ad extra*? Yet, at the same time, God's very reason for the Incarnation, and the prelude to creation, is for revealing and communicating the divine life. In the fifth volume of his work, *The Glory of the Lord*, Hans Urs von Balthasar has acknowledged Bérulle's Christocentricism founded on an interlacing of the psychological and ontological:

In the analogy of being the analogy of the finite and infinite subjects is permanently in force. And in the concrete order of the world, as the supreme miracle of divine grace, the God-Man Jesus Christ is like the bridge between infinite and finite, between absolute glory and absolute adoration, the mediator of the religious act. Ontologically and psychologically, He is the full reality of analogy... This precision is not just ontological, because it is expressed by Christ's own act of adoration; and yet it is not just functional either, for the particular act totally corresponds to the ontological situation of the God-Man. To express the unity of the two aspects Bérulle invents the idea of 'state' (*état*). This denotes the psychological and existential dimension of Jesus' ontological reality; constantly and precisely, His actions reveal His being.<sup>310</sup>

Following the same line of reasoning here from Balthasar, two main anthropological dynamics can be extrapolated from Bérulle's notion of *état*. The first is action: the human person comes to a certain understanding of

---

<sup>310</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar. "The Realm of Metaphysics in the Modern Age." *The Glory of The Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*. vol. 5 (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 120-21.

the good through action and self-fulfillment. The second is self-knowledge or disclosure: the human person comes to a knowledge of self and reveals oneself to others through act. For Bérulle, one may say his notion of *état* enables him to expound on how when someone unites themselves to Christ's *état*, to Christ's life qualitatively, taking on Christ's disposition, then who someone is becomes clear. In other words, their calling is made clear and is made manageable through the dialogical and in relation through the *état* of the Incarnation. Considering Bérulle's first work, *Bref discours de l'abnégation intérieure*, and the dominant theme of self-renunciation, self-knowledge proceeds first from knowledge of God, and not the inverse. Vincent Vasey, in his 1985 article "Mary in the Doctrine of Bérulle on the Mysteries of Christ," depicts Bérulle reversing the prayer of Augustine found in the *Soliloquies*, "Lord that I may know myself and know you" (*Noverim me, noverim te*).<sup>311</sup> Vasey continues, "Convinced that first of all one must look to God, he wanted to know each category of being by reflecting on God and God's perfections."<sup>312</sup>

No better creature ever responded to this call as did Mary due to her relation to Christ as his mother. In virtue of his creation, the human person is always in relation to God. The creature is by virtue of God's sovereignty dependent continually:

Hence, the obligation to remain entirely dependent on God and to follow the penchant of nature by striving to go to God. All of these ideas lead inevitably to the establishment of religion as the duty arising from baptismal consecration. Such is the response to the disposition God has made and implanted in each one; this is the answer to the state or condition of being. It is the substance of the Incarnation which then functions *in actu secundo*; it is the state and condition of the Mother of God which accounts for her psychological response to the reality of her condition.<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> Augustine, *Soliloquia* II, 1: PL 32, 885, qt. Vincent R. Vasey, "Mary in the Doctrine of Berulle on the Mysteries of Christ," *Marian Studies*: vol. 36, no. 11, (1985), 73.

<sup>312</sup> Vasey, "Mary in the Doctrine of Berulle," 73.

<sup>313</sup> Vasey, "Mary in the Doctrine of Berulle," 71.

In light of this Marian response to creaturely dependence, it should be noted that in relating Mary to other creatures, especially human beings, Bérulle appropriated quite heavily the hierarchical schema of Pseudo-Dionysius. Creatures of an inferior order are dependent upon the influence of higher creatures. Here, due to Mary's unique privilege in the life and mysteries of Christ, and cooperation in His redemptive work, Christians are obliged to invoke her in their difficulties. The extension which enlists and enables Mary in serving humanity's good is the Incarnation. Through Christ assuming human nature, an extension is made by which human persons can participate in the divine life. All the events of Christ's life, including his dispositions, become the qualitative center in time. For this reason, all the events of Christ's life are not dead and past, but are perpetuated in time. Christ's unique relation to Mary was fundamental in his life, and subsequently is fundamental in the life of the Christian.

Another way of defining the *état* of the Incarnation, or the various *états* of such, is proper interior orientation, either in actuality or potentiality. This interior-oriented, yet ontologically related, spirituality promoted by Bérulle is evident from *Grandeurs* in his defense of the vows of servitude as a renewal of baptismal vows. He was not inventing another sacrament, but rather was making available an extension and renewing of the promises made at baptism. These *états* are for all time offered to humanity to participate in. Henri de Lubac noticed this perpetuity of the *états* as first requiring a Marian birth of Jesus in the heart of the Christian:

Earlier Bérulle had commented on it with remarkable insight: 'The Son of God wants to be born in our hearts...The mystery of Jesus [must not be treated] as past events that are dull and lifeless, but as events that are alive and present... only by reproducing in ourselves the divine mystery par excellence, that is, by begetting the Son and breathing the Spirit; in this way the Christian is essentially Θεοτόκος and our Lord looks on us as a brother, even more, as a mother, whoever receives and practices his Word.'<sup>314</sup>

---

<sup>314</sup> Henri de Lubac, *Theology in History* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996), 66.

Here de Lubac is alluding to Matthew 12:46-49, whereby Mary is an exemplar for the Christian to imitate. De Lubac is referring to the tradition that attests to three births of Christ: first, Christ is eternally begotten by the Father, second, Christ is born of the Virgin Mary, and third, Christ is born in the heart of the Christian. As found in many devotions and consecrations throughout the Church's history, the emphasis of a particular private devotion or practice that involves a vow or commitment is in actuality an occasion for stirring grace dormant in the person. Notably the consecration propagated by de Montfort was also articulated as the renewing of one's baptismal vows, the very argument made by Bérulle in *Grandeurs*.<sup>315</sup>

As an extension of the Incarnation, Bérulle explicitly expounded upon the *état* of the Virgin Mary, and not just implicitly by his devotion to her. The mediative nature of Mary highlights Bérulle's more participative spirituality. While Bérulle's mystical notion of God as unmediated to the human person is held, he spends a good amount of time on the Virgin Mary in his works:

"This consent thus given, thus reported and thus accepted by the eternal Father, by the power of the Most High, you are the mother of Jesus; you are the paradise of the second Adam; you are the animated temple of God incarnate; you are the ample dwelling of the incomprehensible! Great qualities, admirable powers, rare and singular effects! And yet things so great and so divine are the consequences and effects of something so low as the humble birth of Jesus on earth and in the manger. For if God were not born and born of the Virgin, this great state [*état*] and this rare quality of the Mother of God would not be in the world."<sup>316</sup>

Here Mary is referred to as a "paradis du second Adam," and thus displaying her as an extension in creation to Jesus' humanity. It is highly likely that Bérulle had an image in mind of Eve in constructing this extension. This image of a paradise also equates to a specific Marian

---

<sup>315</sup> St. Louis de Montfort attended Little Saint-Sulpice in 1695. Jean-Jacques Olier was the founder of Saint-Sulpice, and was a disciple of Charles de Condren, Bérulle's successor at the Oratory.

<sup>316</sup> Bérulle, *Œuvres*, (GJ XI, X) 376 (my translation).

*état*, a “great state (*état*) and quality of the Mother of God...” which is a mediated way for the believer to approach Jesus:

And hence, the greatest state which is absolutely within the jurisdiction of the sovereignty and power of the incarnated Son of God, is and remains only through this humble birth; it is to know the state [*état*] and the quality of the Mother of God ... the grace attached and reserved to the quality of Mother of God, would not be existing in the treasures of the power of Jesus and in the accomplished order of his grace and glory, and the incarnate Word would be deprived of the highest point of his state, of the most beautiful jewel of his crown, and of the most eminent dignity which is his power.<sup>317</sup>

As evident from this reflection on the *état* of Mary, within the written vow of servitude above, this vows-based spirituality caused Bérulle to include a vow to Mary, preceding a vow to Jesus.

### 3. Between Néant and Image

An important ontological understanding of Bérulle’s that needs to anchor any examination of his mystical notion of *état* is his understanding of the human person as *néant* (nothingness). God is the one that sustains all being, including the being of humanity, and in this sense the human person is a nothingness. This notion of nothingness in Bérulle is not meant to be demeaning, but rather is a form of realism. This realism is the psychological awareness that the human person, despite his dignity, is not God. Erik Varden<sup>318</sup> has rightly noticed two *néants* in Bérulle, whereby the “original *néant*” is one of contingency, and the second one of sin. This is clear from one of Bérulle’s short devotional writings:

We ourselves have only a right to nothingness, to sin, to hell, that is to nothing in any way. For the first is the nothingness of being, which we have been drawn, and between which and us there is only a wall, and yet it is

---

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., (*Vœu à Marie*) 631 (my translation).

<sup>318</sup> Erik Varden (1974– ) is Abbot of Mount Saint Bernard Abbey in Leicestershire. Norwegian by birth, he was, before entering religious life, a Fellow of St John’s College, Cambridge. He has published several translations and scholarly monographs and is much in demand as a preacher, spiritual director and lecturer.

only mire, that is, that body formed of dust and earth, and that dust, mud and earth, drawn from nothingness. As for the soul, there is no distance between us and nothingness except the hand of the Creator who has drawn us by his power. Sin is a second nothingness worse than the first; nothingness of grace, nothingness opposed to God, nothingness resisting God, and hell is the consummation and establishment in this miserable nothingness, where the damned loses all the use of all the good which is in their natural being, and is irreparably established in the state and servitude of sin.<sup>319</sup>

After the Fall, humanity entered into a double néant, though again the intrinsic value of humanity is not wiped out, but rather that a true existential crisis is at hand whereby the human person, by not recognizing the reality of their contingency, is separated from God in such a way that they are actually turning against themselves, and in that sense, becoming 'non-being'.

As noted above, knowledge of one's self is needed by the human person in order to have a proper disposition toward the Incarnation. Knowledge of who and what someone is made possible in light of who and what they are created to be, the calling from which is found one's true fulfillment. This knowledge necessarily involves the recognition by the person of their creaturely poverty and the supreme dignity of their vocation. One's vocation defines their creation as *imago Dei*: the human person has the capacity to know and love God, and thus have union with Him which transcends their natural powers. Bérulle balances within this mystery the incomprehensibility of God and the extension made by God to humanity through the Incarnation. At one moment God is the source of all wonder, while at the same time this wonder is given proper attention through the Incarnation:

You are in this state and subsistence an abyss of wonders, a world of greatness, an excess of eminences, rarities, singularities; you are the center, the circle and

---

<sup>319</sup> Bérulle, *Œuvres*, (OP 132), 1166 (my translation).

the circumference of all the emanations of God out of yourself.<sup>320</sup>

At certain points Bérulle is lifted up into contemplation of the wonder that transcends his own finitude, as seen above, and at other times is humbled in recognition of his creaturehood. Nonetheless he appears in some texts to oscillate lyrically in recognition of the duality of *néant* and image:

For man is composed of completely different parts. He is a miracle on the one hand, and on the other hand a nothingness. He is celestial on the one hand and earthly on the other. He is spiritual on the one hand and bodily on the other. He is an angel, an animal, a nothingness, a miracle, a center, a world, a god, a nothingness surrounded by God, needing God, capable of God and filled with God if He wills.<sup>321</sup>

The above excerpt is from Bérulle's *Opuscules de piété*, a collection of short devotional texts (opuscules), meditations and outlines for homilies written for the instruction of the Oratorians and others. This opuscule is probably the Bérullian text that receives the most attention of twentieth century scholarship. Within the wider context of his work, *Le mystère du surnaturel*, Henri de Lubac has picked up on this oscillation as depicted in Bérulle, as found in the same passage above:

Hence, in this creature apart, this "unstable ontological constitution" which makes it both larger and smaller than itself. Hence this sort of dislocation, this mysterious claudication, which is not only that of sin, but first and more radically that of a creature made of nothing, which strangely touches God. *Deo mente consimilis*. At the same time, indissolubly, "nothingness" and "image"; radically nil, and nevertheless substantially image. *Esse imaginem non es homini accidens, sed potius substantiale*. By its very creation, man is a "companion of slavery" with all nature; but at the same time, by his character of image - *in quantum is ad imaginem dei* - he

---

<sup>320</sup> Bérulle, *Oeuvres* (GJ II, V), 164 (my translation).

<sup>321</sup> Bérulle, *Oeuvres* (OP 115), 1137 (my translation).



is “capable of blissful knowledge,” and he has received deep down, as Origen said, “the precept of liberty.” We understand the exclamations of Bérulle. His lyricism does not betray, he does not exaggerate the doctrine of the ancient theologians: “It is a nothingness, it is a miracle .... it is a God, it is a nothingness surrounding God, indigent of God, capable of God!”<sup>322</sup>

Bérulle’s depiction of the human person as *imago Dei* is the counterweight within his schema, and the dogma of creation more generally: though created out of nothing, the human person is capable of union with God. Bérulle will follow the humanist definition of humanity by referring to the human person as a “grand miracle.”<sup>323</sup> At times he refers to the human person as a miracle insofar as human nature is an “abridgment of this universe in its structure and its composition,” distinguishable in dignity from the rest of creation due to rationality. The rest of creation is “perfect in its condition, and without expecting any other new degree that they lacked,” whereas with humanity “the nature of man was not created to remain in the bounds of nature.”<sup>324</sup> Thus, human persons are bridges between the material and spiritual. At other times Bérulle tempers this elevation of humanity, rather “it [the human person] is an angel, it is an animal, it is a nothingness, it is a miracle ... it is a nothingness surrounded by God ...”<sup>325</sup> This oscillation never does become a dialectic in Bérulle’s writing (in the Hegelian sense); he holds both in tension without explaining away to a synthesis (the tension holds). Despite the human person being created *ex nihilo*, a miracle takes place wherein which the creature, who is ultimately contingent, is able to be united to God to the extent of having God live in and through them. This deifying vivification is made possible through the extension made by the Incarnation.

---

<sup>322</sup> De Lubac, *Le mystère du surnaturel* (Paris: Aubier, 1965), 149 (my translation).

<sup>323</sup> De Lubac, *Pic de la Mirandole : études et discussions* (Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1974), 130 (my translation).

For this oscillation within the Bérullian definition of the human person, between image and néant (which constitutes the ‘grand miracle’), see Jean Dagens’s *Pic de la Mirandole et Bérulle*, in *Pensée humaniste* (1950), 281-82.

<sup>324</sup> Bérulle, *Œuvres*, (OP 132), 1166 (my translation).

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.* (OP 115), 1137 (my translation).

#### 4. Unitive Dispossession

It is appropriate to conclude that Bérulle encountered John of the Cross's nuptial spirituality due to the former's assistance in bringing Carmelite personalism to France. Bérulle's development of the notion of dispossession takes its particular expression in a "state of dependence"<sup>326</sup>. This state (*état*) manifests most apparently through the vows of servitude. The vow begins with the wish "that there is no more of me in me."<sup>327</sup> Bérulle states, in discourse two of *Grandeurs*, that he is explicitly basing this on Galatians 2:20: "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." At this point in *Grandeurs*, Bérulle is expounding on how one ought to seek a state whereby Jesus has "possession" of them:

And as the Son of God, by the right of subsistence, is in possession of human nature which he has united to his person, so I want that by the special and particular right of power, Jesus deigns to come into possession of my spirit, of my state and my life, and that I am nothing but a bare capacity and a pure emptiness in myself, filled with emptiness, and not of me forever.<sup>328</sup>

Bérulle here is making the remarkable connection between giving "possession" of one's self through becoming "bare capacity." To dispossess of one's self requires a self-emptying, a handing over to the care of another, a dependence on the other, and in relation to Christ, a total handing over. Edward Howells has acknowledged this notion of dispossession in Bérulle as depicting the nuptial dimension:

Mutual dispossession brings the language of servitude and anéantissement together with the erotic language of mystical union from the medieval Song of Songs tradition. Bérulle used both in conversation with Christology, although he barely refers to the Song. Christ's servitude, as the divine Son in relation to humanity, derives from a Trinitarian relational mutuality,

---

<sup>326</sup> Erik Varden, *Redeeming Freedom: The Principle of Servitude in Bérulle* (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 2011), 37.

<sup>327</sup> Bérulle, *Oeuvres* (GJ II, 12), 181 (my translation).

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.* (my translation).

which Bérulle explores according to the logic of the sharing of possessions in a marriage. Instead of each possessing part of their total possessions individually over against what the other possesses, the two partners, transformed by mutual dispossession, possess all of them equally and together. When one applies this to personal identity or self-possession and not just to material possessions, one gets a paradoxical result. The partners give up all that they possess as separate identities and offer each other their nothingness apart from the other. They then possess themselves, as selves, only in the act of dispossession in favor of the other.<sup>329</sup>

The self-giving quality of dispossession paradoxically results in true self-possession, but only within the dynamic of giving one's self to another. It is through the giving of one's self that the true self is possessed and recognized. A similar order of operations takes place between self-giving and self-knowledge: Bérulle gives a theocentric priority, by which knowledge of self and possession of self precipitates principally from knowledge of God and unitive dispossession to Christ.

As stated above, Bérulle appears to have received this notion of dispossession from John of the Cross:

When there is union of love, the image of the Beloved is so sketched in the will, and drawn so intimately and vividly, that it is true to say that the Beloved lives in the lover and the lover in the Beloved. Love produces such likeness in this transformation of lovers that one can say each is the other and both are one. The reason is that in the union and transformation of love each gives possession of self to the other and each leaves and exchanges self for the other. Thus each one lives in the other and is the other and both are one in the transformation of love.<sup>330</sup>

---

<sup>329</sup> Howells, "Relationality and Difference," 233.

<sup>330</sup> John of the Cross, *The Complete Works of Saint John of The Cross: Spiritual Canticle & Poems*, ed. Edgar Allison Peers, vol. 2 (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1947), St. B 27.

Here John of the Cross is drawing a connection between unity-in-love and the dispossession of each person. It could be said that there is a perichoretic union through self-gift, whereby stressing dispossession, thus implying distinction, or unity-through-gift, is the image presented here. From handing over possession of one's self to Christ, paradoxically one might say, the human person then has possession of Christ to some degree. There is a mutual indwelling between the Christian and Jesus that necessitates a distinction. This unity by way of dispossession as seen in the latest Carmelite reform during Bérulle's time was seen as a way of transformation, "This marriage is incomparably greater than the spiritual betrothal, for it is a total transformation in the Beloved, in which each surrenders the entire possession of self to the other with a certain consummation of the union of love."<sup>331</sup>

Bérulle went as far as to speak of mutual dispossession between Jesus and his disciples. This expression is most notably found in his explication of Jesus' relationship with the Virgin Mary. In *Vie de Jésus*, an intended sequel to *Grandeurs* which went unfinished at his death, Bérulle states:

We can say that, whether she has seen or she has not seen the person of the Word incarnated in her, this divine person possesses the Virgin, and the Virgin possesses this divine person incarnated in her, of a possession so rare, and so peculiar to it, that we have neither pen to write it, nor language to say it, nor heart to feel it, nor mind to understand it. It is too graceful for us to dare to think and reverence it. It is a possession so great and so perfect, it is a communication so powerful and so intimate, it is a power so high and so high in the very order of miraculous and peculiar grace... holds a rank so high in the divine operations, and carries a privilege so rare in the favors of the Incarnate Word, that there never was and never will be anything like it.<sup>332</sup>

This possession appears to be a deifying cause of the human person, as seen in the exemplar case of the Virgin Mary, as "a

---

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, St. B 22, par. 3.

<sup>332</sup> Bérulle, *Oeuvres* (*Vie de Jésus* 29, I), 500 (my translation).

possession so grand and perfect, it is a communication so powerful and intimate.” For Bérulle, the Virgin Mary also profoundly represents the one creature in which God handed himself over in the Incarnation.

## **5. Conclusion: Marian Receptivity and the Spirituality of État**

As propogated by Bérulle, the vows of servitude manifest grace-filled dispossession to the fullest. The vows are Marian, and ultimately Christocentric. Following the Marian thread, and the notion of dispossession, Aaron Riches has synthesized and highlighted the core of Bérullian spirituality:

But the deeper question, from a Bérullian point of view, concerns the very concrete question of what practice of life corresponds to unbounded love, to the movement from the *néant* of *creatio ex nihilo* to the *autre néant* of becoming a pure *capax Dei* in Christ. The Bérullian answer is Mary: she is Queen of Heaven precisely because she is *ancilla Domini*, because she claims nothing for herself before the Lord. This central Marian dimension was given practical expression by Bérulle in the famous vows of perpetual servitude to Mary and to Jesus, which he imposed or recommended on all those who either sought or were canonically placed under his spiritual care... Internalizing the vow thus meant learning, like Mary, to desire “to have no self in our self” in order to let “the spirit of Christ be the spirit of our ‘self’”. In the vow, then as in the Marian *fiat*, the human self is actualized in a negation of self-sufficiency to receptivity... We consecrate ourselves to Mary, then, because the Logos dispossessed himself to be utterly dependent on her, taking flesh of her womb and learning the gestures of human love at her breast in order to complete his mission on Calvary. In this way the pattern of the Son’s kenosis, from the frailty of his human infancy to the brutal wounding of his Passion, is the most concrete icon of filial obedience and it reveals, in the most tangible way, *who* Jesus is. And this form of being, of dispossession and being submissive to the initiative of

an Other, Christ, according to Bérulle, gives us to ourselves ('nous-mêmes à nous-mêmes').<sup>333</sup>

Here the paradox of coming to Jesus through Mary, under the Christocentric lens of dispossession and self-gift, leads to an ultimate dynamism of human activity infused with grace, whereby through the giving of one's self they find themselves. This relational constitution of the human person finds its fulfillment in the person of Christ, who reveals Himself through giving of Himself, which becomes a model for humanity to follow. As noted above, the perfect alignment of interiority expressed in Bérullian spirituality can be seen in the Virgin Mary, who is presented as constantly in a state (*état*) of giving herself to Jesus, and thus participating in his Incarnation.

Through the state of gift, humanity enters the nuptial union between Christ and his Church. Thus, there is a unity-through-dispossession. Phillip McCosker<sup>334</sup> has called this unity a "relational cord."<sup>335</sup> Bérulle's relationship with the Carmelites also appears to have kept his reflection on the Trinity less abstract by primarily focusing on the Incarnation. The privation of subsistence, following the formula of the hypostatic union, in the humanity of Christ is an analogous lesson for the Christian to follow in becoming pure capacity for Christ to dwell in them. This capacity is maximal in the person of Mary, whose openness to the divine life bears and brings the person of Christ into this world.

The theological anthropology and Mariology examined in this work not only highlights that of Bérulle, but apparently the whole of Pope St. John Paul II's *New Evangelization*. Bremond considered St. Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort as "the last great Bérullian,"<sup>336</sup> and de Montfort is whom John Paul II explicitly took his papal motto from, "*Totus tuus ego sum, et omnia mea tua sunt. Accipio te in me omnia. Praebe mihi cor tuum, Maria*" ('I belong entirely to you, and all that I have is yours. I take

---

<sup>333</sup> Aaron Riches, "Christology and the Nihil: The Wisdom of Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle and the Catholic Encounter with Modernity," *Christian Wisdom meets Modernity* (New York: T & T Clark, 2016), 170-71.

<sup>334</sup> McCosker is Vice-Master of St Edmund's College, University of Cambridge, and Director of the Von Hügel Institute for Critical Catholic Inquiry. His Ph.D. thesis was on models of paradoxicality in mystical christologies at the Faculty of Divinity in Cambridge.

<sup>335</sup> McCosker, "The Christology of Pierre de Bérulle," 115.

<sup>336</sup> Bremond, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, 1.

you for my all. O Mary, give me your heart')<sup>337</sup>. De Montfort's consecration to Mary was acquired by him during his time at Saint-Sulpice, the school founded by the notable Bérullian Jean-Jaques Olier.

Notably found throughout Henri de Lubac's works, he attributed the influential aphorism found in his work *Catholicisme*, "By revealing the Father and by being revealed by him, Christ completes the revelation of man to himself,"<sup>338</sup> to the thought of Bérulle:

Precisely, if we inspect a little of the spiritual history of humanity, we see one thing: there is reciprocity between man and God; in revealing himself to man, God reveals man to himself. It is by revealing himself as being personal that he has made man understand the depth of what is a personal being. The personality of man has been truly acquired in his consciousness only through the judeo-Christian revelation, prepared by the Old Testament, but assured and deepened by the New. When St. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians says: 'when it has pleased God to reveal his son, in me', this formula 'in me' is very evocative. In revealing himself to man, God digs the interior of man to make him reveal himself to himself. This is a very traditional thought. We find it among the Fathers, among the great spiritual writers. It is a thought that has been magnificently expressed especially by Cardinal de Bérulle, and the entire Oratorian tradition has pondered a great deal on this theme of the revelation of man by the revelation of God.<sup>339</sup>

Notably this work quoted above, *La foi chrétienne: Essai sur la structure du symbole des apôtres* ('The Christian Faith: An Essay on the Structure of the Apostles Creed'), that was originally published by de Lubac in 1969, is almost identical to his earlier work *Catholicisme* in

---

<sup>337</sup> Louis-Marie Grignion Montfort, *True Devotion to Mary* (Rockford: Tan, 1985), 266.

<sup>338</sup> De Lubac, *Catholicism: Christ and the common destiny of man* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 339.

<sup>339</sup> De Lubac, *La foi chrétienne: Essai sur la structure du symbole des apôtres* (Paris: Cerf-Alpha, 2008), 503 (my translation).

1938. The author in both contexts refers to Gal 1:15-16: “to reveal his Son in me.” De Lubac also notably cites Bérulle regarding self-knowledge in *Le mystère du surnaturel*,<sup>340</sup> and he later explicitly details Bérulle’s Christian humanism in his chapter “Jean Pic et Bérulle” of *Pic de la Mirandole : études et discussions*, published in 1974, which to some extent is principally defined by viewing the aphorism *Nosce te ipsum* (‘Know thyself’) as a precursor, though lacking in itself, to divine revelation. According to de Lubac, the opposite of this Christian humanism wherein which “God digs the interior of man to make him reveal himself to himself,” is the atheistic humanism as depicted in *Le drame de l’humanisme athée*, which calls for an emancipation of the human person from God, who is only a psychological projection of the self:

The inference is that, in order not to sacrifice love to ‘God’, we must sacrifice ‘God’ to love. In so doing, moreover we shall be accomplishing the secret purpose of religion. For, rightly understood, religion ‘ceremoniously unveils the hidden treasures of man’s nature; it is the avowal of his inmost thoughts, it is the public revelation of the secrets, the mysteries of his love’... His [Feuerbach’s] atheistic humanism thus took as its banner the old precept that the Fathers of the Church had taken over long before. To reveal to mankind its own essence in order to give it faith in itself—that was his sole aim. But in order to attain it he thought it necessary to overthrow the God of the Christian conscience.<sup>341</sup>

Here the self-revelation of the human person that follows from God’s own self-revelation no longer follows the underlying Augustinian recognition *Deus interior intimo meo et superior summo meo* (‘God is more inward to me than my most inward and higher than my highest’), God being transcendent and immanent. Rather, according to atheistic humanism, God is a projection of the human person’s own self; thus,

---

<sup>340</sup> See de Lubac, *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (New York: Crossroad, 1965), 214.

<sup>341</sup> De Lubac, *The Drama of Atheist Humanism*, trans. Mark Sebanc (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1998), 32.



there is a need, according to this distortion, to emancipate one's self from the illusion that is God in order to take back what they have slavishly given to an illusive other. What follows is the abolition of any spirituality that would emphasize dependence on another, starting with God.

The Bérullian influence also has an uncanny resemblance to *Gaudium et Spes*, paragraph twenty-two, which possibly was directly taken from de Lubac's *Catholicism*.<sup>342</sup> "The truth is that only in the mystery of the incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. For Adam, the first man, was a figure of Him Who was to come, namely Christ the Lord. Christ, the final Adam, by the revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love, fully reveals man to man himself and makes his supreme calling clear." (*Gaudium et Spes* 22:1). De Lubac himself worked closely on Schema 13 of the text with John Paul II (at that time Karol Wojtyła):

Another Frenchman with whom I established a close friendship was the theologian Henri de Lubac S.J., whom I myself, years later, made a cardinal. The Council was a privileged period for becoming acquainted with bishops and theologians, above all in the individual commissions. When Schema 13 was being studied (later to become the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the modern world, *Gaudium et Spes*), and I spoke on personalism, Father de Lubac came to me and said, encouragingly: 'Yes, yes, yes, that's the way forward,' and this meant a great deal to me, as I was still relatively young.<sup>343</sup>

*Gaudium et Spes* twenty-two and twenty-four were the most prominent texts for the entirety of John Paul II's pontificate. The traditional formula which served as the hermeneutical key for the entirety of John Paul II's pontificate, that knowledge of God leads necessarily to knowledge of one's self, also was a guiding principle in de Lubac's theological synthesis. Thus, the reach of Bérulle's influence extends to this very day, though at times subtle and a result of those that followed him. It is fitting that de Montfort's Mariology, influenced by the spiritual wake Bérulle left, probably was the largest impact the latter made on future generations.

---

<sup>342</sup> Riches, "Christology and the Nihil," 179.

<sup>343</sup> John Paul II, *John Paul II: Rise, Let Us Be on Our Way* (New York: Warner, 2004), 165.

Mary's self-knowledge and gift of self in accordance with her Christic motherhood, bought for her by the blood of her Son, becomes then an exemplar for any Christian to emulate. It is the *état* of Mary that enables Christians to bear the Son of God in their hearts.