

instances. The unknown writer who coined the latter title must not have measured the boldness involved in it; in line with a customary figure of speech he intended the title as a short way of saying "Mother of the Redeemer." The title will be abused later on and theology will rectify it; at the time it served as a pointer to further reflection. Finally, to a very notable degree prayer to Mary becomes more fervent, more filial, and more profound in these troubled times.<sup>61</sup>

In short, once again the alternating rhythm of advances and halts is discernible here, the rhythm of spring and winter that has characterized this doctrinal development. But for all that it is important not to overdo the contrast. The quiet reserve of the tenth century is not the silence of death. It is the still and hidden life of things in winter, when strength is gathering for the rebirth.

*redemptrix* or *co-redemptrix*. Christ is not spoken of as *coredeemer* but Redeemer; Mary is not called *Redemptrix* but *co-redemptrix*. This latter title will thus gradually replace the older one. However the extreme reserve of the papal magisterium in this regard should be noted. Only Pius X and Pius XI used the term *coredemptrix*, and in altogether minor contexts which did not commit their magisterium. On the whole history cf. R. Laurentin, *Le titre de Coredemptrice. Etude historique*, Paris, Le-thielloux, and Rome, Marianum, 1951.

G. Meersseman, the most knowledgeable expert on the origin of litanies (cf. *infra*, p. 104, n. 1) gave the following explanation of the first uses of the title *Redemptrix*: it represents the Marian transposition of a series of Christological invocations occurring at the beginning of litanies.

61. Barré, *Prières anciennes* . . . pp. 100-127.

#### FOURTH PERIOD

### FROM THE ELEVENTH CENTURY TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (1050-1563)

During the preceding period the East played the leading role in the development of Marian theology while the West followed in several areas, notably in the liturgy. In others it remained stationary, as in the question of the Immaculate Conception and especially the Assumption. This situation will now be reversed. To be sure, the Eastern writers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries outline some original syntheses; sometimes they even apply to their tradition the conceptual framework offered by western Scholasticism. But the fall of Byzantium (1453) soon puts an end to this development. During the present period and those to follow, devotion and reflection concerning the Virgin Mary remain alive in the East but tend to become closed in. This will reach a point even where the Easterners will be discomfited when tardily and in their own manner the Latins give expression to the Immaculate Conception, the original idea of which they owed to the Byzantines. From the viewpoint of development adopted in this study, there will be little further to say about the East. Before the chapters in which they were in the forefront are concluded, justice should be rendered them: the

Latins of the beginning of this period still owe them the decisive part of their own inspiration.<sup>1</sup> What is more, the separation culminating in 1054 will henceforth be for the western world a factor of impoverishment, particularism, and imbalance.

1. Cf. H. Barré, "L'apport marial de l'Occident à l'Occident, de saint Ambroise à saint Anselme," EM 19 (1962), pp. 27-89. The main Eastern contributions to Western thought in Marian doctrine, as covered in Barré's article, would be the following:

a. The apocryphals of the infancy and the Assumption are brought to the West at a very early date (pp. 44-46). They play a considerable role in the liturgy and especially in art. Latin iconography reflects the eastern models directly, and these latter are entirely dependent on the apocryphals (Mahuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-183).

b. At the end of the seventh century four Marian feasts are imported to Rome (cf. *supra*, p. 93).

c. At a date difficult to determine (9th century or shortly thereafter) three Marian homilies — two of Proclus (d. 446) and one of Antipater of Bostra (d. after 451) — are substituted for Latin readings in which Mary's corporal glorification was not yet envisaged (Wenger, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-144).

d. In the Carolingian era Paul the Deacon's translation of the *Life of Theophylus* transmits to the West the theme of the merciful Virgin and the title "mediatrix" (cf. *supra*, p. 97, n. 53).

e. Toward 800 the Akathistos hymn is translated into Latin (G. Meersseman, *Der Hymnos Akathistos* . . . ) as also the *Sub tuum* (PL 78:799d 8).

f. At the end of the tenth century a group of homilies on the Assumption is translated at the abbey of Reichenau (cf. *supra*, p. 101, n. 58). Cf. Barré, *loc. cit.*, pp. 78-88.

g. At the end of the eleventh century (toward 1060) the feast of the Conception, instituted in the East toward the end of the seventh century, passes over to Ireland, whence it spreads onto the continent beginning with the second half of the twelfth century (cf. *infra*, p. 107, n. 8).

h. In the twelfth century the MS Heiligenkreuz 12 attempts to fill in the silence of the "Illustrious ones" of the East on the Assumption by citing eastern witnesses: Pseudo-Dionysius (PG 3:681), Germanus of Constantinople (PG 98:357ab), the Euthymiac history (PG 96:747-752), and Cosmas Vestitor (Wenger, *op. cit.*, p. 176, where the Latin version of Cosmas' homilies is found; cf. H. Barré, "Dossier complémentaire," EM 8 (1950), pp. 67-68).

What date can be assigned to the beginning of the new stage in the West? Nothing is more difficult than to discern the first appearances of a living reality. Distant and isolated anticipations have been noted in the period preceding. Some-what more precise beginnings emerge in Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1031),<sup>2</sup> and Odilo of Cluny (d. 1049).<sup>3</sup>

The movement picks up speed with St. Peter Damian (d. 1072),<sup>4</sup> Anselm of Lucca (d. 1086), and Gottschalk of Limburg (d. 1095).<sup>5</sup> But, apart from this preamble, if the actual blossoming of the new phase is sought, there can be little hesitation: its key author is Saint Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109). His thought touches on Mary's compassion, her intercession, her maternal role with regard to mankind, her perfect holiness, her exaltation, and a boundless confidence to be placed in her. All this wealth is centered on a fundamental intuition: "the admirable reality that Mary has given birth to God" (*Mira res . . . Maria Deum genuit*). It is around Anselm that the first writings in favor of the Immaculate Conception will spring up, as well as the work of the Pseudo-Augustine which in a decisive way sets the devel-

2. The Marian works of Fulbert of Chartres were compiled critically by the simultaneous efforts of J. M. Canal and H. Barré between 1962 and 1964. R. Laurentin, "Bulletin mariale," RSPq 50 (1966), 544-545, drew up a list of the works and bibliography on them.

Fulbert inaugurated a new interpretation of Gen. 3:15: *Isa conteret caput tuum* was taken to signify the victory of Mary over concupiscent (PL 141:320d-321a). Cf. R. Laurentin, "L'interprétation de Gen. 3:15 dans la Tradition," EM 12 (1954), pp. 102-104 and 125, n. 74.

3. *Sermons* 1, 3, 4, 12, PL 142:991-1088. (*Sermons* 13 and 14 are borrowed from earlier authors: *Court Traité*, 1st edition, p. 144).

4. *Sermons*, PL 144:505-924. (Several sermons of Nicholas of Clairvaux — 11, 23, 40, 43, and 60 concern Mary — are mixed with this collection; cf. *Court Traité*, 1st edition, pp. 144-145). *Hymns* 44-61, PL 144:933c-939c and 940-941a. (The other hymns are inauthentic; cf. *Court Traité*, *loc. cit.*).

5. Ed. G. Dreves, *Godescalcus Lintpurgensis* . . . , Leipzig, Reiland, 1897.

opment of the dogma of the Assumption on its way again.<sup>6</sup> St. Bernard is only a witness of this current of thought, a witness with more marks of contrast than ordinarily thought. Certain acquisitions he solidified in striking formulas that passed on to posterity, but on other points his influence served rather to brake the movement, as will be seen shortly.<sup>7</sup> The main lines of doctrinal development strikingly evident in this period are now to be examined.

### Immaculate Conception, Assumption, Mediation

The feast of the "Conception" established by the Greeks toward the end of the seventh century remained unknown to

6. PL 158-159. Cf. J. Bruder, *The Mariology of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, Dayton, 1939 — a more detailed bibliography in *Court Traité*, 1st edition, pp. 146-148 — and especially H. Barré, *Prières anciennes* . . . pp. 287-307, where an important chapter (the last) is consecrated to St. Anselm of Canterbury, showing his importance on the level of prayer as well as of theology.

7. The critical edition of St. Bernard's works has been undertaken by Dom J. Leclercq. The *In laudibus Virginis matris* is found in *S. Bernardi opera omnia*, Rome, 1966, t. 4. The ensemble of texts on Mary contained in PL 182-184 has been conveniently collected and translated by P. Aubron, *L'Œuvre mariale de saint Bernard*, Paris, Cerf, 1935, with indications of Migne's numbering, and by P. Bernard, *Saint Bernard et Notre-Dame*, Paris, Desclée, 1953. For bibliography and treatment of questions of authenticity cf. *Court Traité*, 1st edition, pp. 152-154. (Leclercq's subsequent work indicates that PL 184:1013-1022, seemingly authentic, was put together by a secretary.) The essential study is H. Barré, "Saint Bernard docteur marial," *Analecta sacri ordinis cisterciensis* 9 (1953), 92-113. St. Bernard's Marian theology is sober, profound, traditional, and spiritual. But it must be said clearly that it occupies a limited place in the ensemble of his work. He was able, for example, to preach on the feast of the Assumption without saying a word on Mary (PL 184:1001c-1010a). He contributes no new theme of any importance. He was so mistrustful of innovations that he opposed the Immaculate Conception (*Ep. 174*, PL 182:333-336; cf. *Sermo 2 in Assumptione* 8, PL 183:420d) and kept silence about any bodily Assumption. Often he gave the acquisitions of the 11th-12th centuries the stamp of approval that assured their triumph in the West.

the Latins for a long time. Brought over by some unknown monk returning from the East, it appeared in England toward 1060 but with the Norman conquest (1066) disappeared almost as soon, without leaving any other trace than a memory, though a memory tinged with regret at its passing. Thus it was that the feast was enthusiastically reinstated about 1127-1128 on more solid foundations, passing soon into Normandy and thence to the rest of Europe,<sup>8</sup> despite the opposition of St. Bernard. Somewhat undetermined at the beginning, the object of the feast is clarified little by little, not without struggle.<sup>9</sup>

8. X. Le Bachelet, "L'Immaculée Conception," DTC 7:978-989, thought he had found the origins of the feast of the Conception in Ireland around 900. But this affirmation did not hold up against critical research. The fundamental studies on the origins of the feast are: A. W. Burridge, "L'Immaculée Conception dans la théologie mariale de l'Angleterre du Moyen-Âge," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 32 (1936), 570-597; P. Grosjean, "La prétendue fête de la Conception dans les Eglises celtiques," *Analecta Bollandiana* 61 (1943), 91-95; A. M. Cecchin, "L'Immacolata nella liturgia occidentale al secolo XIII," *Marianum* 5 (1943), 58-114.

9. The theological problem of the Immaculate Conception was raised by the introduction of the feast of the Conception. The twelfth century situation remains quite complex. There were adversaries of the feast, in the front rank St. Bernard (*Ep. 174*, PL 182:332-336) and Peter of Celle (*Ep. 171* and *173*, PL 202:613-632). The feast had also its defenders — they were the immense majority — but they did not for all that support the Immaculate Conception; their positions were diverse and perplexed.

Some celebrated only the promise of the future Mother of God (as did, for example, the two anonymous authors published by H. Barré in *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 10 (1958), 353-359). The anonymous Parisian author of the late 13th century (Bibliothèque Nationale MS Lat. 5347, fol. 200 v., *ibid.*, 352) included in the word "conception" only the "sanctification" of Mary in her mother's womb.

Others held to the original holiness of Mary, but in very different senses. Some understood her holiness to begin at the moment of her conception; others with her spiritual conception, that is, with the infusion of the soul marking the beginning of Mary's personal existence.

Still other explanations presented themselves, and some were ridiculous. The Pseudo-Comestor and the anonymous author at Heiligenkreuz

Ever since the Carolingian epoch the Assumption had been in a critical phase, as has been seen (p. 55). Writing under the pseudonym of St. Jerome, Rabbertus had launched a harsh attack on the *bodily* Assumption: Scripture did not inform us in the least about what happened to Mary's body, he observed, and on this matter the tales of the apocryphals are no safe guide. For almost three centuries this argument held fast. Nevertheless, certain documents coming from the East had made their way into tenth century Europe, and thus a reversal of opinion began to take shape, reaching expression by the twelfth century. Toward the end of the eleventh, in fact, an anonymous author using the name of St. Augustine<sup>10</sup> wrote a treatise in favor of the bodily Assumption. This Pseudo-Augustine quickly outshone the Pseudo-Jerome. And doctrinal merit rather than a false passport were mainly responsible. The Pseudo-Augustine fully recognized the

had recourse to the strange hypothesis of a "vena pura," a particle of the body of Adam, that had remained apart from sin and been transmitted from generation to generation until from it Mary was born.

They all were wrestling with a problematic falsified by the Augustinian idea that the cause of the transmission of original sin was the impurity of the *libido* involved in every human generation. Some tried to explain that the act of Mary's parents was free of *libido*, others that the effect of this *libido* had been neutralized by God, either in his preventing the effect from taking place (Eadmer), or in his destroying the effect immediately (Osbert of Clare), or in his destroying it the moment the fetus was animated. As a matter of fact, the problem was poorly set up. The generative act is not tainted with sin nor is it this act that sullies human nature; yet the human nature that is transmitted is sullied. It is not surprising that time would be needed to emerge from this maze and many another.

What is moving is to follow the efforts of the faith as it seeks to express itself in such a new area, amid notions still poorly unraveled and tied in, yet with all kinds of confusion (original sin, its transmission, conception, animation, etc.). Still more remarkable is the way Eadmer succeeds, amid so many difficulties, in approaching substantially the idea that Mary was preserved from sin by a special grace of God.

10. Numerous hypotheses have been proposed on the date of the author (*Courr* Traité, 1st edition, p. 130). The certain and very limited conclusions of H. Barré have been adopted here.

criticisms directed against the apocryphals and instead founded the Assumption on a serious theological basis, treating the problem raised by doctrinal development here, and doing so with a precision remarkable for the age.<sup>11</sup>

It should be noted also that beginning with the eleventh century, and especially with the early twelfth, the title "Mediatrix,"<sup>12</sup> hitherto exceptional in the West, is found spread abroad widely.

### A New Perspective<sup>13</sup>

A study as brief as this should focus its attention not so much on the detail of the ideas and new institutions,<sup>14</sup> that crop up everywhere at this time, as on the key intuition that gives rise to them.

One basic appraisal can be made: at the end of the eleventh

11. In particular the celebrated methodological reflection should be recalled: "Fecunda est . . . veritatis auctoritas, et dum diligenter discutitur, de se genere quod ipsa est cognoscitur — The authority of truth . . . bears fruit, and when it is diligently debated, it is known to beget of itself what it is" (PL 40:1143). "Sunt etiam quaedam quae quamvis ex toto omnia sint, vera tamen ratione creduntur, ad quod ipsa convenientia rei quemadmodum dux et praevia creditur — Certain things even there are which, although totally omitted (i.e., passed over in silence by Scripture), are rightly believed; the very fittingness of things is trusted as a guide and leader in this regard" (*Ibid.*, 1144).

12. Cf. *supra*, p. 97, n. 53.

13. This shift in perspective has been excellently described by H. Coakley, *Le parallélisme entre la Sainte Vierge et l'Église dans la tradition latine jusqu'à la fin du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (*Analecta Gregoriana* 74), Rome, Gregorianum, 1954, the delayed printing of a thesis defended in 1939.

14. The listing of the Marian discoveries and innovations of the twelfth century has not yet been completed. H. Barré, "Une prière d'Eckbert de Schönau au saint coeur de Marie," *EphM* 2 (1952), 409–423, has shown how, for example, the first prayer to the heart of Mary appears at that time. (Eckbert was abbot of Schönau from 1166 to 1184.) G. G. Meersseman, "Études sur les anciennes confréries dominicaines," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 22 (1952), 5–176, has drawn attention to the appearance and rapid multiplication of Marian confraternities, etc.

century Marian theology widens its horizon. Prior to this Mary had been considered for the most part in the mystery of Christ's infancy. Her role on *Calvary* and in the *present life of the Church* remained in the shadow.<sup>15</sup> Crossed here and there before, this boundary will henceforth be left behind everywhere.

1. In the first place, the attention hitherto centered on Mary's role in the Incarnation, root and pledge of salvation, is extended to her role in the sacrifice of Calvary. Obviously it did not take until the eleventh century for Mary to be recognized as having played a role in the salvation of the world. But apart from two or three imprecise intimations, this role had not been considered beyond Christ's infancy. At the dawn of the twelfth century Mary's presence on Golgotha captures the attention of authors and reveals riches unsuspected until then. They discover her compassion,<sup>16</sup> her

15. As always, whenever anything new appears it is possible to find distant harbingers of it in more or less isolated predecessors. Thus St. Ambrose commented on the presence of Mary on Calvary in almost the same terms in three texts (*In Lc.* 10, PL 15:1837-1838; *De Insr. Virg.* 5, PL 16:318; *Ep. 63 ad Vercell.* 109-110, PL 16:1218bc), though his presentation is very reserved and concerned above all about the Redeemer's transcendence. On the role that Mary exercises from heaven in the present life of the Church the texts earlier than the 11th-13th centuries are more numerous.

Obviously the 11th-13th centuries do not constitute a revolution or a complete turnabout, which would be a heresy. But various points which had been envisaged only hesitantly, inchoately, or sporadically now became the object of firm, distinct, and systematic consideration and moved into the foreground. Elements which had appeared disjointed or even scattered in previous periods now join together and assume recognizable form.

16. St. Peter Damiani (d. 1072) is the first known witness of the theme of Mary's compassion on Calvary. But he did not express its theological importance. Commenting on the brief sentence of Lk. 2:35, "A sword shall pierce your soul," he limits himself thus: "Ac si diceret dum Filius tuus senserit *passionem* in corpore, te etiam transfiget gladius *compassionis* in mente — As if he were saying that when your Son would feel the *passion*

active union with the offering of her Son,<sup>17</sup> the ecclesial dimension of her faith during the three days of his death (*triduum moris*).<sup>18</sup> They finally grasp the implications of the

in his body, the sword of *compassion* would transfx you also in spirit!" (*Sermo 46 in Nativitatem B.V.*, PL 144:748a). This theme has been studied by H. Barré, "Le Planctus Mariae," *Revue ascétique et mystique* 28 (1952), 244-246. The earlier text on the theme from Milo of St. Amand was cited supra, p. 98, n. 55.

17. Concerning the offering made by Mary on Calvary, Arnold of Bonneval opens the way in his *De Laudibus Virginis*, PL 189:1727a: "Unum holocaustum ambo (sc. Christus et Maria) pariter offerrebant — Both (Christ and Mary) together offered a single holocaust." On Arnold's texts cf. Laurentin, *Maria, L'Eglise* . . . vol. 1, pp. 145-153. Haunted by a restrictive text of St. Ambrose (PL 16:1218bc) whose terms he takes up anew, Arnold broadens these limits by developing suggestions of St. Bernard (*Sermon on the Twelve Stars*, PL 183:429d and 437c-438a; *Sermon on the Nativity, ibid.*, 441cd) and the resulting views are both rich and balanced.

Concerning the offering made by Mary at the time of the presentation of Jesus in the Temple, the lead probably falls to St. Bernard (Laurentin, *Maria, L'Eglise* . . . vol. 1, pp. 132-182). This may well be the most original innovation of the abbot of Clairvaux who, in using Autpert, goes beyond him without hesitation (*Loc. cit.*, pp. 140-143). Two other texts, not at hand at the time of Laurentin's study, may be earlier than St. Bernard, although that is not certain: Geoffrey of Vendôme (d. 1132), *Sermo 7 de Purificatione*, PL 157:262d, and Abelard, *Hymnus 38 in Purificationem* . . . PL 178:1793a (composed at St. Gildas, thus between 1125 and 1136). The terms are in part identical with those of St. Bernard.

18. The theme that the faith of Mary alone remained alive during the death of Christ (as the last candle of the office of Tenebrae) is met with for the first time in Odo of Ourcamp (d. 1171), *Quaestiones* II, 56, ed. J. Pitra, *Analecta novissima spicilegii Solesmensis*, t. 2, Rome, Tusculanus, 1878, p. 53: "Maria Magdalena . . . passione turbata hanc fidem amisit, etiam cum discipulis; cuius infidelitatis matrem Domini solum immunem credimus — Mary Magdalen . . . overcome by the passion lost this faith (sc. in Christ's divinity), as did his disciples; only the Mother of the Lord, we believe, remained immune to this loss of faith." (The work was written about 1160.) On the considerable expansion this theme will undergo during the Middle Ages and its variations in the Renaissance, cf. Y. Congar, "Incrédence ecclésiologique d'un thème de dévotion mariale," *Mélanges de*

dying Christ's words, "This is your mother."<sup>19</sup> Until then, thanks in part to arguments stemming from controversy, Christ's words had been understood as a gesture of filial piety: he was confiding his mother to Saint John in her abandonment. Hereafter the spiritual sense of Jesus' words will be seen: Mary was given to be mother of men.<sup>20</sup> Little by little the idea dawns that in her own way she cooperated in the sacrifice of Calvary.<sup>21</sup>

2. Meanwhile the perspective is being broadened in a second direction. Prior to this period Mary had been considered as part of the mysteries of Christ's infancy in the perpetually enduring quality these mysteries have. If attention had begun to focus, for example with Autpert, on her present and active role today, this kind of consideration was only a passing matter and it remained rooted primarily in the perpetuity of the infancy mysteries. When, for instance, it was said that

*sciences religieuses* 7 (1950), 277-291. A complete listing is given by H. Barré, "Marie et l'Eglise, du Vénérable Bède à Saint Albert le Grand," *EM* 9 (1951), pp. 83-84, and Laurentin, *Marie, l'Eglise* . . . vol. 1, pp. 138-139.

19. *Jn.* 19:26.

20. In the East, Origen and George of Nicomedia (cf. *supra*, p. 92, n. 39) are the only witnesses of the spiritual sense for the first ten centuries, and their views moreover are still restrained.

In the West there is nothing earlier than Anselm of Lucca (d. 1086) in his *Oratio I*, ed. A. Wilmart, *Revue ascétique et mystique* 19 (1938), p. 53, lines 98-104. Jesus said, "Ecce mater tua, ut tanto pietatis affectu pro omnibus recte credentibus mater gloriosa intercederet. . . et adoptatos in filios. . . custodiret — 'Behold your mother,' so that this glorious mother might intercede with so great tenderly affection for all who rightly believe. . . and might keep them as adopted children." The same theme is found in Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135), *Com. in Joannem* 13, PL 169:789c-790c. Cf. G. Ducloux, *La Vierge Marie dans l'histoire du salut selon Rupert de Deutz*, Typewritten thesis, Rome, Gregorian, 1953, pp. 91-102.

21. All the elements of the problem are already found with Arnold of Bonneval (cf. *supra*, n. 17). A similar density of expression will not be met with for quite some time.

Mary "destroyed all heresies," the reference was less to any present intervention exercised from on high than to her act of faith at the Annunciation, an act victorious once for all time.<sup>22</sup> Mary's present role was explained by saying that we continue to benefit from what the Virgin did at the beginning of Christ's life, and that we do this in entering into communion with the fundamental mysteries of the history of salvation. Henceforth it will be said rather that Mary does all this today from heaven, because she is our mother, our queen, our mediatrix, and ultimately because she is the Mother of God, powerful in her influence on his love. From the mystery-filled perspective where everything gravitated around the plenitude realized once and for all in Christ, authors have shifted to an analytical perspective where attention is focused on what Mary daily accomplishes here below, in virtue of the titles and privileges that are hers. The new element is not that the Virgin's daily role has been "discovered": it was already spoken of after a fashion by Autpert, Alcuin, and Rabertus.<sup>23</sup> What is new is that this role is considered systematically as a present action performed from on high by Mary, who was taken body and soul to heaven,<sup>24</sup> an action per-

22. A. Emmen, "Cunctas haereses sola interemisti. Usus et sensus huius encomii B.M. Virginis in liturgia, theologia et documentis pontificis," *Maria et Ecclesia* 9 (1961), pp. 93-159, suggests that the antiphon in question is of Greek origin and earlier than 650-700. However, H. Barré, "Antennes et réponses. . ." *Marianum* 29 (1967), 196, #67, inclines toward the Roman origin mentioned in the legend.

23. Autpert, *supra*, p. 97, n. 54. Alcuin (*Inscriptio* 86, PL 101:749b and *MGH Poetae* I, 305) addresses Mary in these terms: "Dies nostros precibus rege semper et ubique — Rule over our days always and everywhere by your prayers." Rabertus, *Letter "Cogitis me"* 3, PL 30:124c. Rabanus Maurus, *In natali S. Mariae*, PL 110:55a. Paul the Deacon, *Sermo I in Assumptione*, PL 95:1569c.

24. An example: a text of Ambrose Autpert was cited *supra*, p. 97, n. 54, in which Mary's spiritual motherhood takes the concrete form of "intercession" and of "motherly affection." But Autpert understands all this not so much in terms of an action performed from heaven during the era of

formed today in virtue both of prerogatives acquired during her life on earth and of the intermediary position she occupies between Christ, who is above her, and the world below.<sup>25</sup> Very typical in this respect is the new image found with Hermann of Tournai (d. 1137): Mary is "the neck of the Church" (*Collum Ecclesiae*).<sup>26</sup> She is "between Christ and the Church," St. Bernard will say even more clearly.<sup>27</sup>

the Church, but rather as the ever living presence of an action exercised by Mary on the day of the Purification, when she "offered" Jesus to Simeon: "*Non desinit . . . offerre quem genuit, Redemptorem electis unificat — She does not cease to offer the one she begot, she brings the Redeemer into union with the elect.*" Of course, this is a simple nuance, for Autpert, of all the ancient authors, is the one who most clearly sketched in advance the discoveries that were to be made in the twelfth century. But this important nuance has its historical interest.

It is at the end of the eleventh century and especially during the twelfth, that Mary's spiritual motherhood with regard to men progressively takes on its concrete shape and its localization in heaven. Representatives are St. Peter Damian and especially St. Anselm (*Oratio* 52, PL 158:956ab-957a) along with his disciples Eadmer, Hermann of Tournai, and William of Malinesbury. In the thirteenth century this theme becomes the subject of a special chapter and the object of an *ex professo* study with Richard of St. Lawrence, *De laudibus* IV, 1, # 11-12, in *Alberti Magni . . . opera*, ed. Borgnet, t. 36, p. 327, and with Pseudo-Albert, *Mariale*, q. 145 *Utrum ei conueniat esse matrem omnium*, *ibid.*, t. 37, pp. 204-206. Cf. H. Barré, "Marie et l'Eglise . . ." EM 9 (1951), pp. 77-80. For anticipations of the theme cf. *supra*, pp. 85-88, n. 26-32 and p. 91, n. 38, and *infra*, Appendix #7.

25. On these themes cf. Barré, "Marie et l'Eglise . . ." EM 9 (1951), pp. 94-99.

26. *De Incarnatione* 8, PL 180:29d-30a.

27. "Vellus est medium inter rorem et aërem (Jgs. 6:37-40), mulier inter solem et lunam (Apoc. 12:1), Maria inter Christum et Ecclesiam constituta — The fleece is in the middle between the dew and the ground, the woman between the sun and the moon, Mary between Christ and the Church." St. Bernard, *In Dom. infra Assumpti*, 5, PL 183:432a.

The image of the aqueduct that channels grace is found for the first time in St. Bernard, *Sermo de Aqueductu*, PL 183:437-438.

The title "Mater Ecclesiae" appears for the first time in the twelfth

### Impact of This Change

What is the significance of this change? It corresponds first of all to a new religious consciousness of duration. In meditating on the life of Christ the Fathers did not have the feeling that it was distant in time. They were taken up with the perpetuity of these mysteries. They had the feeling of perpetually gravitating around a mystery that escaped time-limits: the liturgical cycle remains the striking impression of their state of mind. Progressively, and with the thirteenth century marking a definite stage, more attention will be given to the stability proper to the cosmos and to time, a stability such that one is deeply rooted in them both. Thus the mystical life will be considered less as a return to the source and more as a laying hold of the source, less as an entry into a mystery that does not pass away and more as a daily descent of mystery into the moving duration of this world which has to be fashioned to God's image. Hereafter contact with Christ will be sought less by way of commemoration and more by raising one's gaze toward heaven. Hence the presentation of heaven in medieval art takes on growing importance, later to yield to that abusive portrayal of the heavenly struck gaze by then become the commonplace of pietistic religiosity.

This change of spatial and temporal perspective in the century with Berengaudus (c. 1125), *In Apoc.* 12, PL 17:876cd: "Possumus per mulierem (Apoc. 12:1) . . . et beatam Mariam intelligere eo quod ipsa mater sit Ecclesiae; quia eum peperit qui est caput Ecclesiae; et filia sit Ecclesiae quia maximum membrum est Ecclesiae — In the 'woman' of Apoc. 12:1 . . . we can understand Mary, inasmuch as she is herself mother of the Church, because she brought forth him who is head of the Church; and inasmuch as she is daughter of the Church, because she is the Church's most important member." The title "mother" is balanced by those of "daughter" and "member" of the Church. Earlier witnesses of the title "Mother of the Church" are at least doubtful (Laurantin, *La Vierge* . . . pp. 174-175). The title remains quite exceptional up to recent years.

religious world is accompanied by another, less noticed but in need of little more than being recalled here: the subjective point of view begins to overshadow the objective, persons become more important than mystery.

This double shifting of perspective extends very far beyond the case of Mary. It corresponds to a turning-point in civilization and culture. An analogous evolution takes place at this time in the sacramental order: the personal presence of Christ, till then enwrapped in the whole of the Eucharistic mystery, now comes to the forefront. Likewise the person of Mary, hitherto enveloped in some way within the objective mystery of the Church, is brought into clearer light. In the Eucharist what had earlier been seen was the return to the redemptive sacrifice by way of sign. Henceforth the Eucharist is seen more readily as the effective presence of Christ on earth, and the "reproduction" or "reiteration" of his sacrifice.

As will be surmised, these changes of perspective open unexplored horizons and renew theological reflection. But they also have their danger. No doubt they make it possible to grasp authentic aspects of the realities of the faith, but risk sets in when these newer insights, which had unfolded within the ancient and fundamental perspective, tend to supplant or even to eliminate the latter. The twelfth century and in great measure the thirteenth still keep things in balance, in part thanks to a living contact maintained with the Fathers of the Church. But later on, this fruitful tension gives way to enthusiasm over the new perspective alone. The viewpoint of former times tends to become the patrimony of archeologists. To be sure, the objects of faith remain the same, but they tend to be considered from a narrower angle. The perennial quality of the mysteries is lost sight of, in favor of becoming engrossed in the movement of time; the point of view of the religious object is forgotten, in favor of becoming wrapped up in an increasingly barren attention to the subject — and this inflexible turn will take on dramatic proportions with the

Renaissance. Marian theology shifts in the direction of a personal exaltation of the queen of heaven, setting aside her place in the Church. The unfurling of her activity toward her clients, the succession of her miracles — these now win attention more than does her exemplary role at the starting-point of the history of salvation. The stages of this decadence must now rapidly be surveyed.

### Decadence (13th to 15th Centuries)

Armed as it was with the most lucid and powerful of philosophical instruments, the thirteenth century succeeded in putting order in many a domain that had felt the impact of the excited discoveries of the twelfth century. But Mariology was among the less fortunate of these domains. The Marian synthesis that was most conspicuous at the time and that exercised most influence was the famous *Mariale super missus est*,<sup>28</sup> attributed till recently (1954) to St. Albert the Great. This work exhibits the first symptoms of the decadence. It is the first effort made to tie in the whole of Mariology systematically with a unique guiding principle, but in this very effort it tends to make Mariology a closed system. The principle of synthesis chosen is narrow. It is the all-containing quality of the grace that is Mary's, a "plenitude" that includes the diverse gifts distributed among all other creatures. Thus it is that the author finds in Mary the universality of human knowledge, the properties of the angels, and the grace of the seven sacraments, including penance, which she is held actually to have received, and holy orders, whose dignity, grace, and powers she is held to have possessed eminently.<sup>29</sup> The work does, in fairness, have its merits. For

28. The work appears in *B. Alberti Magni . . . Opera*, ed. Borgnet, Paris, Vives, 1898, t. 37, pp. 1-362, and ed. Jammy, Lyons, 1651, t. 20, pp. 1-156.

29. Laurentin, *Marie, l'Église . . .* vol. 1, pp. 183-194. At the time of

the most part a sharp sense of Christ's transcendence counterbalances the excessive inventory of Marian privileges. Mary's association with the Savior is pointed up in new and striking formulations: she is the associate of Christ (*Socia Christi*), and in an expression taken from Gn. 2:21 "a helpmate like to him" (*adjutorium simile sibi*); here the Eve-Mary parallel is enriched with a last trait, neglected until then.<sup>30</sup> In all these respects the *Mariale* is remarkable. Today writing (1953) the author still believed, as did everyone else, that St. Albert was the author of the *Mariale* and he was concerned about the severity with which he felt obliged to comment on what was taken to be the work of a doctor of the Church.

In a certain sense a fundamental principle was already discernible in St. Anselm, the outstanding figure of the preceding period in the history of Marian theology: "Maria Deum genuit . . . mira res." Barré, *Prières anciennes* . . . pp. 294-299, had already demonstrated this. But the principle had not yet given rise to any systematic undertaking, and, what is especially notable, it was Christocentric and not Mariocentric. Thus the innovations of the Pseudo-Albert bear an early responsibility in setting Marian theology on the way to decadence.

30. Hermann of Tournai, or of Laon (d. 1137) had applied to Mary the "*adjutorium simile sibi* — helpmate like himself" of Gen. 2:18 (*De Incarnatione* 2, PL 80:36b), but he seems to have thought of her as "helpmate to the Father" rather than "helpmate of Christ" (H. Barré, "La nouvelle Eve dans la pensée médiévale d'Ambroise Autpert au pseudo-Albert," *EM* 14 (1956), p. 12). The Pseudo-Albert seems therefore to be the herald of this new theme. Why did this element of the Eve-Mary parallel end up being the last to be exploited?

a. This title, "helpmate like himself," was linked to the episode of Eve's being drawn from Adam's side (*ex latere Adam*, Gen. 2:18-20), and thus was considered a specific attribute of the Church, which was born on Calvary from Christ's side.

b. St. Ambrose had set up an impressive barrier against the Marian interpretation of the title, in three texts where he raised the problem of Mary's role at the foot of the cross: "*Jesus non egebat adjutore ad redemptionem omnium* — Jesus did not need a helper for the redemption of all" (*Ep.* 63, 110, PL 16:1218c and *In Lc.* X, 132, PL 15:1837c), and "*Sed Christi Passio adjutorio non eguit* — But Christ's Passion needed no helper" (*De Inst. Virg.* VII, 49, PL 16:350bc). Among Greek authors no

it is possible to pronounce a sober judgment on both the greatness and the weakness of this work which in its time was praised to the skies and ordinarily preserved from criticism by its attribution to Albert the Great. But it is not his work, as two scholars demonstrated almost simultaneously in 1954.<sup>31</sup> The genuine author, who is placed in the second half of the thirteenth century, remains unknown. Mariological circles were stirred deeply by the discovery of this false attribution, as deeply, for example, as literary circles would be if the thesis denying to Shakespeare his dramas were scientifically justified.

More than the Pseudo-Albert with his principle of all-containing grace, St. Thomas Aquinas advanced Marian doctrine by his contributions to a knowledge of the mystery application of Gen. 2:18 to Mary has been found before Cabasilas (d. after 1396). Even with him the Theotokos is presented not as the helpmate of Christ but of God: "Eve was a helpmate (*boēthos*: Gen. 2:18) for Adam. Only Mary helped (*boēthēsēn*) God in the manifestation of his goodness" (*Hom. in Nativ.*, PO 19:482, lines 35-38).

31. A. Fries, *Die unter dem Namen des Albertus Schriften* (Beilage 37, 4), Münster, Aschendorff, 1954, situates the *Mariale* toward the end of the thirteenth century. B. Korošák, *Mariologia sancti Alberti Magni eiusque coequalium* (*Bibliotheca mariana medii aevi* 8), Rome, Academia Mariana, 1954, situates it before St. Bonaventure. F. Pelster, "Zwei Untersuchungen," *Scholastik* 30 (1955), 388-401, who expertly treats the divergences of detail between the two previous works, supports Korošák's mid-13th century dating. A listing of these studies is found in R. Laurentin, "Que reste-t-il de l'oeuvre mariale d'Albert le Grand?" *Supplément à la Vie Spirituelle* 38 (1955), 348-360.

A. Kolping, "Zur Frage des Textgeschichte Herkunft und Entstehungszeit des anonymus 'Laus Virginis'," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 25 (1958), 285-288, suggests attributing the famous *Mariale* to Engelbert of Admont, but this is only a conjecture.

The numerous monographs consecrated to Albert the Great's Mariology (a bibliography in J. B. Carol, *De Corredemptione*, Rome, 1951, p. 164, n. 2) have thus become out of date. Hereafter one should consult A. Fries, *Die Gedanken des Heiligen Albertus Magnus über die Gottesmutter* (*Thomistische Studien* 7), Freiburg/Schweiz, Paulus, 1959.

of Mary, Mother of God, and of the *relationship* involved in this mystery.<sup>32</sup> Mariologists have sometimes expressed the regret that he did not carry through from this notion of relationship to a complete Marian synthesis. But there is hardly any regrettable inferiority implied in the fact that for him the Virgin Mary was not the object of a science apart, or that he spoke of her only "in context," that is, in function of Christ, as did the other doctors of his age. Moreover, had he attempted a synthesis, it would have been marred by the difficulties relative to the Immaculate Conception that he inherited and was not able to overcome.

Without accomplishing a synthesis either, Duns Scotus opens a breach in these last-mentioned difficulties.<sup>33</sup> When he

32. G. Roschini, *La mariologia di San Tommaso*, Rome, Belardetti, 1950, pp. 24-33, gives a good bibliography of works consecrated to the Mariology of the Angelic Doctor. R. Laurentin adds some in an article in *Bulletin Thomiste* 8 (1947-1953), 1091, n. 1. Since 1854 very many authors have made St. Thomas into an unacclaimed immaculist. Concerning the most important of these attempts, J. A. Robiliard in an article in *RSP* 39 (1955), 464-465, has explained why the cause is a hopeless one. It remains no less true that principles are found in St. Thomas' works which serve to establish and profoundly explain the Immaculate Conception.

33. C. Balic, *Joannis Duns Scoti, Doctoris mariani, theologiae Marianae elementa (Bibliotheca mariana medii aevi 2)*, Sibenik, Kacic, 1933, and *Joannes Duns Scotus, Doctor Immaculae Conceptionis*, Rome, Academia Mariana, 1954.

G. Roschini, *Duns Scoto e l'Immacolata*, Rome, Mariannum, 1955 in very scholarly manner presented all the arguments capable of minimizing the historical importance of Scotus. A widespread controversy followed, the chronicle of which is given by R. Laurentin in an article in *Supplement à la Vie Spirituelle* 35 (1955), 467-470 and *Vie Spirituelle* 101 (1959), # 456, 545-548. Cf. also G. Bessutti, *Bibliografia mariana 1952-1957*, Rome, Mariannum, 1959, pp. 67-69, # 1286-1322.

Scotus' importance remains considerable. His principle merit is in having taken up and turned back the main objection currently given, that a sinless conception compromised the universal Redemption. On the contrary, Scotus replied, the Redeemer's perfection requires that he have preserved (and not simply purified) the holiest of creatures from sin.

began teaching at Paris in the last years of the thirteenth century, the Immaculate Conception was universally disowned by theologians.<sup>34</sup> Therefore out of fear of censure he was able to propose it only as an opinion. But his line of argument modified the whole approach to the question to the point of reversing this situation. Later authors did little more than recognize or refine the value of the arguments he drew up. The change of mind occurred rapidly. In 1439 the theologians gathered at Basel for the council were in agreement for defining the Immaculate Conception as a dogma of faith.<sup>35</sup> The definition, duly drawn up in correct form, remained without effect because the council had ceased to be in communion with Rome. But the consensus that lay behind its promulgation (and that was no longer to be found at Trent) is significant.

The diffusion of this belief in the Immaculate Conception ought not to lead to an exaggeration of the accomplishments of this period. What is represented is rather the strong impact of Scotus' ideas than any broad theological progress properly so called. Once the fifteenth century has been reached, there is no longer anything worthy of note, except for the important decisions of Sixtus IV in officially adopting the feast of the Conception at Rome and in protecting the immaculist thesis against the violent attacks of Bandelli.<sup>36</sup> By

34. On the lack of recognition generally suffered by the idea in the thirteenth century and the spread of the immaculist thesis beginning with Scotus and Ware, see F. de Guimaraens, "La doctrine des théologiens sur l'Immaculée Conception de 1250 à 1350," *Études Françiscaines* 3 (1952), 181-204; 4 (1954), 23-52, 167-188. On the spread of the idea in Spain, see A. Braña Arrese, *De Immaculata Conceptione B. V. Mariae secundum theologos hispanos saeculi XIV*, Rome, Academia Mariana, 1950.

35. On the Council of Basel see H. Ameri, *Doctrina theologorum de Immaculata B. V. Conceptione tempore concilii Basileensis*, Rome, Academia Mariana, 1945.

36. The Pope did not go to the root of the debate. He defended the "Immaculate Conception" against the attacks of Bandelli and his support-

that time the phase of calm expansion of this doctrine had ended and the "immaculist" debate entered a sharply polemic phase from which it was not to emerge until almost the nineteenth century.

Apart from these rare positive traits that have just been touched upon, the fifteenth century offers a drab and mediocre picture.

On the level of doctrine there is simple repetition rather than original thought. Now that it had systematized itself, theology cut itself off progressively from its own sources and from human life. It fell victim to complexity and conceptual sclerosis. Nominalism raged uncontrollably.

On the level of devotion the liturgy progressively becomes foreign to the people since it no longer speaks their language. It is neglected in favor of private devotions that increase in number and grow corrupt.

More and more disconcerted by the abstraction of both theology and the liturgy, the people look for life elsewhere. Their fervor turns to the sentimental and the superficial, if not the superstitious. Too often it is nourished by unhealthy elements: trumped up miracles, double-meaning slogans, inconsistent babble—all as ersatz for doctrine and liturgy now and become things quite distant.

The evolution of art exhibits this sliding from mystery to naturalism and from naturalism to artifice. For the Romanesque Virgin, unperturbed throne of Incarnate Wisdom,<sup>37</sup> the ers, who were sowing discord in declaring this opinion heretical. But he also forbade the immaculists (whose opinion he shared, as he imperceptibly hinted) to declare heretical or sinful the maculist opinion. The two opposing theses had therefore the same juridical status, which consisted for each in the prohibition of condemning the opposite view. This discretion may surprise some. But in the emotional state of confusion and immaturity in which the debate unfurled, it would not have been prudent to intervene more deeply. Full light came only with peace on the subject. Then the Church would be able to proceed to a dogmatic definition. But three centuries would be required for the Holy See to reach this result.

37. Articles by E. Male, E. Bréhier, M. Gromaire, and photo by G. Cary

twelfth century substitutes a new kind of Virgin, gracious and smiling—presenting her smile more than her Son. The infant Jesus loses his place in the center and passes to one side. For the sober and hieratic costume artists substitute feminine finery with ever more complicated folds of clothing. Little by little mannerisms and quackery replace genuine art. By the fifteenth century the Virgin on Calvary is swooning in a faint of grief. Sermons play up her tears, her sobbing, her weakness; all too often do they forget to mention her strength and her cooperation in the work of salvation.

This miserable state of affairs was just about reaching its depths when the Protestant crisis broke out. The Marian author of the hour was Bernardine de Busti whose *Mariale*, published for the first time in 1496, went through very many editions.<sup>38</sup> An idea of the decadence of the period can be formed from the fact that it should have esteemed so highly a work like this where traditional doctrine is drowned in a welter of outlandish and inconsistent opinions.

The time to clear the air and especially to put essential things back in place was long overdue. But the Fifth Council of the Lateran (1512–1517) had no such concern. The position of the Virgin seemed incontestable enough not to be compromised by these pious shortcomings.

In fact, on this point the position of the first reformers was a moderate one. Luther may well have written, "I should like to suppress the Virgin on account of the abuses." But he was very reserved in his criticism. He held to all that Catholic dogma had defined in her regard: Mary, Mother of God, holy, virgin before and after childbirth. One of his texts even seems to point in the direction of the Immaculate Conception. Throughout his life he celebrated the feast of the Visitation.

in the issue #25 entitled "Vierges romanes d'Auvergne," Le Point 5 (1943).

38. F. Cucchi, *La meditazione universale negli scritti di Bernardino de Busti*, Milan, Ancora, 1943, loyally tried to extricate what is best from this author.

tion with particular fervor, and he consecrated a book to the *Magnificat*.<sup>39</sup> By comparison Calvin is in second rank, but he too keeps all the essentials.<sup>40</sup> It is little by little, in the aftermath of criticism of devotion to the saints, that devotion to the virgin will be eliminated. This elimination assuredly was something demanded by the radical application of the principles of the Reform: *Scripture alone, grace alone, God alone*. Protestants of succeeding generations will thus soon return to the situation as it was before Ephesus. Difficulties long since surmounted, difficulties that had been a stumbling-block to thinkers like Tertullian, Chrysostom, or Cyril are with time restored to favor in Protestantism, where sometimes even a kind of hostility toward the Virgin Mary will be found. Battle-lines are thus drawn up that condition the development of doctrine for centuries to come: disparaged by

39. *Note on the Virgin Mary in Luther's thought*: Any scientific study on this subject should refer to the Weimar edition of Luther's works. The principal texts have been conveniently assembled by W. Tappolet, *Das Marienlob der Reformatoren*, Tübingen, 1962, pp. 17-162. (The original text has been transcribed in modern spelling, and the Latin insertions in the sermons translated into German.) Luther's *Tractatus super Magnificat* was published in Latin in 1526 under the title *Martini Lutheri in divinae (sic) Virginis Mariae Zachariaeque odas: Magnificat puta et Benedictus commentarii*. In recent years this work has gone through several new editions and translations.

Among the works on Luther's Marian thought the following may be noted: on the Protestant side, W. Deltus, *Geschichte der Marienverehrung*, Munich-Basel, 1963, pp. 195-229; on the Catholic side, E. Stakemeir, "De Beata M. Virgine ejusque cultu juxta reformatores," *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo*, Rome, Academia Mariana, 1962, pp. 423-449, and T. O'Meara, *Mary in Protestant and Catholic Theology*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1966, pp. 109-125.

These three studies also present the positions of Zwingli and Calvin. On Mary in Protestantism as a whole see R. Schimmelpfennig, *Die Geschichte der Marienverehrung im deutschen Protestantismus*, Paderborn, 1952 (excellent bibliography, pp. 150-160).

40. On Calvin's Mariology see, in addition to the above studies, B. D. Dupuy's article in *Istina* 1958, # 4, 479-490.

Protestantism, the Virgin Mary is going to be systematically exalted in Catholicism, under the force of an impulse without precedent.<sup>41</sup> But the drama had not yet reached this point when the Council of Trent finished its work. In 1563 the Council came to a close without ever having treated the Marian question, which thus remained in a notably deficient state.<sup>42</sup>

41. On Protestants and Mariology cf. *infra*, Bibliography, p. 363.

42. The Council of Trent touched the Marian question only briefly and occasionally, in relation to original sin (Denz. 792 (1515)) and to the saints' images and relics (Denz. 986 (1823)). B. Korošak, *Doctrina de Immaculatae B. V. Mariae Conceptione apud auctores ordinis minorum qui concilio Tridentino interfuerunt*, Rome, Academia Mariana, 1958, gives an excellent bibliography of studies on the problem of the Immaculate Conception at the Council of Trent. It is to be noted that the behind-the-scenes activities of the "maculists" succeeded in eliminating the clause relative to the Immaculate Conception from most of the older editions of the Council's acts (Paris 1546 and 1550; Antwerp 1546 and 1556).