

CURRENT THEOLOGY

THEOLOGY ON THE VIRGIN MARY: 1966-1975

Bibliografia Mariana, 1967-1972, by G. Besutti, O.S.M., reached *Marianum* subscribers in late 1974, as the final double fascicle of the 1973 volume (35). It is a polyglot listing, with over 5,000 entries in 358 pages, not so surprising a total, considering the variety of languages and materials over a six-year span. Besutti, theologian in his own right, has reflected on the trends in two essays that appeared the same time as this latest edition of the ongoing bibliography he began in 1948, "Elementi per una panoramica della mariologia contemporanea," in *Miles Immaculatae* 10 (1974) 81-100, and "Panorama bibliografico," 200 titles in 17 categories, with comments, in *Maria mistero di grazia*, ed. E. Ancilli (Rome, 1974).

Since the Council, no works of synthesis have appeared; "tracts" of Mariology, like other systematic tracts and texts, have virtually disappeared. Growth areas have been the "sources" (Scripture, Fathers, and later historical studies) and ecumenism. The magisterium, conciliar, papal and episcopal, receives a certain measure of attention. Liturgy and cult are beginning to show promise, and this will be more evident as Pope Paul's *Marialis cultus* of Feb. 2, 1974, affects catechetics and public prayer life in the Church. Under the rubric "privileges and virtues," some topics get little notice, e.g., predestination, the Immaculate Conception, and even the divine maternity, though much falls under "virginity" and "Church and Mary." There are sections as well for "anthropology and myth," "pastoral," and many devotional categories.

This survey is limited; even a severely-restricted graded list of titles in main Western languages would take too many pages. The selection offered reflects inevitably the interests of the compiler as well as limitations of space. Some aspects are simply not touched; a few will be listed as "unfinished business" at the end. Rather than make a point of "trends" in the last decade, I have suggested the developments by the examples offered. The lacunae are perhaps even more eloquent than the publications, as they illustrate the fall-off of the interest in certain areas, particularly Mary's role as mediatrix and such cognates as coredeptrix, dispensatrix, etc.

After initial remarks about bibliographical and other overviews, there will be five sections: (1) Vatican II and other magisterial studies; (2) Scripture; (3) patristic and medieval developments; (4) ecumenism; (5) Mary and the Church.

I have used my own "Survey of Recent Mariology," presented each

January to the Mariological Society of America, 1967 to the present (1972 only excepted, devoted to a report on the Zagreb international congress of August 1971).¹ Throughout I will be using the acta of the international Mariological congress, multivolumed sets issued by the International Pontifical Marian Academy from their seat at the Antonianum, Rome, under the leadership of C. Balic O.F.M., and his lieutenant, P. Melada, O.F.M. For Balic's seventieth birthday, the Academia published *Studia mediaevalia et Mariologica* (Rome, 1971), with Mariology contributions by Rigaux, Feuillet, Manteau-Bonamy, Meinhold, Schmaus, de Aldama, Laurentin, Gironés, Most, Alonso, Philips, Koehler, Roschini, García-Garcés, Borowsky, and Galot, many of them names prominent in the field the past twenty-five years.

In the reckoning followed by the Academy, sponsor of the congress since their resumption in 1950, the series of international congresses on our Lady began at Lyons in 1900, continued at two-year intervals until Trier, 1912, not again until after two world wars, at Rome, 1950, with two adjoining portions, "Mariological" (first international Mariological) and "Marian" (eighth international Marian). This enumeration has been followed since 1950, where possible at four-year intervals: Rome, 1954 (second Mariological, ninth Marian); Lourdes, 1958 (third Mariological, tenth Marian); Santo Domingo, 1965 (fourth Mariological, eleventh Marian, the four-year cycle upset because of the Council; that planned for Ottawa and Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Aug.-Sept. 1962, was cancelled); Lisbon/Fatima, 1967 (fifth Mariological, twelfth Marian, timed to the Fatima anniversary); Zagreb, 1971 (sixth Mariological, thirteenth Marian); Rome, 1975 (seventh Mariological, fourteenth Marian).²

The proceedings of study societies devoted to Mariology will also be used: *Marian Studies*, the Mariological Society of America, which has met annually since 1950; *Estudios marianos*, since 1941, from Spain (the last volume I have seen is 38, from the October 1972, meeting; sometimes there are two volumes from a single convention); the always excellent *Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales*, founded in 1935 and after the interruption of the war meeting again annually since 1947 (last

¹In *Marian Studies* 18 (1967) 103-21; 19 (1968) 87-108; 20 (1969) 137-67; 21 (1970) 203-30; 22 (1971) 91-111; 24 (1973) 100-125; 25 (1974) 104-42; 26 (1975) 221-54; 23 (1972) 113-32 was the "Report on the Zagreb Mariological Congress"; the latest Survey, 27 (1976), is being published this spring.

²The titles of the acta from these congresses are: Rome, 1950, *Alma socia Christi*, 13 volumes; Rome, 1954, *Virgo Immaculata*, 18 volumes; Lourdes, 1958, *Maria et ecclesia*, 16 volumes; Santo Domingo, 1965, *De Maria in sacra Scriptura*, 6 volumes; Lisbon, 1967, *De primordiis cultus Mariani*, 6 volumes; Zagreb, 1971, *De cultu mariano saeculis VI-XI*, 5 volumes, 2 through 5 published, 1 still to come; Rome, 1975, theme *Cultus B.V.M. a saeculo XII ad saeculum XV*, not yet available.

volume was 29, 1972, with the promise of a double volume soon to catch up). The German Society has published sporadically its *Mariologische Studien*; five volumes are in print, the last typical of a coming critical approach, *Mythos und Glaube* (published 1972 from the 1970 meeting).³

Lexikon der Marienkunde, begun 1957, managed to complete Vol. 1 with the appearance in 1967 of fasc. 7/8, Cimabue–Elisabeth (Regensburg: Pustet) there is no word of more. The *Tables* of the DTC (Vol. 16) issued fasc. 13 in 1967, Magie–Nicon, giving conciliar documentation and much else under “Marie.” The “Bulletin sur la Vierge Marie” of René Laurentin appears every other year in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*; the latest was in two parts, January and April 1974. A smaller popular form appears in *Vie spirituelle*. My debt to Laurentin will be evident throughout; his *Court traité sur la Vierge Marie* (5th ed.; Paris: Lethielleux, 1968) is indispensable. While the Council was still on, before *Lumen gentium*, Laurentin, himself a *peritus*, wrote *The Question of Mary* (New York, 1965; paperback, Techny, Ill., 1967), followed by *La Vierge au concile* (Paris, 1965) with text and commentary.

Theodore Koehler, S.M., curator of the Marian Library at Dayton, has written four volumes to be had in lithoprint from Centro Mariano Chaminade (Via San Remigio, 28048 Verbania, Pallanza, Italy, 1971 to 1974): *Storia della Mariologia*; it deserves a better format. The veteran G. Roschini, O.S.M., founder of *Marianum*, to which is now attached the pontifical Servite faculty in Rome, has out *Maria santissima nella storia della salvezza: Trattato completo di Mariologia alla luce del Concilio Vaticano II* (Isola del Liri: M. Pisani, 1969) in four large volumes. The Jesuit J. H. Crehan’s article “Mary,” in Vol. 3 of *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, ed. H. Francis Davis *et al.* (Camden: Nelson, 1971) is well informed: the author, expert in early Christian writings, emphasizes the Mary-Church approach.

Concilium has had a number of overviews: R. Laurentin, “The Virgin Mary in the Constitution on the Church,” 8 (1965) 155–72; Stanley Napiorkowski, O.F.M.Conv., “The Present Position in Mariology,” 29 (1967) 113–33, especially on European views, with section on devotion as well; Donal Flanagan, “Eschatology and the Assumption,” 41 (1969) 135–46. In the same vein is Flanagan’s “A Future for Marian Theology,” *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 20 (1970) 71–81. Michael O’Carroll, C.S.Sp., reported in “Marian Theology: Testing the Foundations,” *Irish Theologi-*

³ *Marian Studies*, from Marian Studies Office, 1600 Webster St. N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017; *Estudios marianos*, Editorial Coculsa, Madrid; *Etudes mariales*, 222 Faubourg St-Honoré, 75008 Paris; *Mariologische Studien*, Verlag Hans Driewer, Essen. The scientific quarterlies are *Marianum* (since 1939), Viale Trenta Aprile 6, 00153 Rome; and *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, (since 1951) c. Buen Suceso 22, Madrid 8. Best example of *haute vulgarisation* is *Cahiers Marials*, 5 times a year, from 80 rue de la Tombe-Issoire, Paris 14.

cal Quarterly 42 (1975) 212-8, on recent publications, biblical and patristic.

Full-scale tracts about our Lady have been very few since the Council, but a number of theologically significant books of a general character have been published, some intended for a larger public. M. J. Nicolas, O.P., has written three: *Theotokos: Le mystère de Marie* (Paris: Desclée, 1965); *Il est né de la Vierge Marie: Marie dans le mystère chrétien* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1969); *Marie, Mère du Seigneur* (Paris: Desclée, 1967). Wolfgang Beinert's *Heute von Maria reden? Kleine Einführung in die Mariologie* (Freiburg: Herder) came out in 1973 (2nd edition 1974).

The B.A.C. of Madrid published in 1974 Candido Pozo, S.J., *Maria en la obra de la salvación*. Steering between "Christological" and "ecclesiological" tendencies in modern Mariology, Pozo takes the conciliar teaching and Pope Paul's title "Mother of the Church" as guidelines. Mary's transcendence with respect to the Church of which she is herself a member must be respected. Both pastorally and ecumenically, the key to understanding Mary's role is human co-operation in salvation. Henri-M. Guindon, S.M.M., of the Canadian Mariological Society, put out a book of conferences in 1971, *Marie de Vatican II* (Paris: Beauchesne). After a lapse of some years the French-speaking Canadian Society has begun to meet again annually, from May 1972 (at Ottawa), and *Cahiers marials* (Paris) has published some of their papers. With the Poles they met as part of the section of the French Mariological Society at the international congress in Rome, May 1975.

VATICAN II AND OTHER MAGISTERIAL DOCUMENTS AND STUDIES

In January 1970, Alban A. Maguire, O.F.M., said in his presidential address to the Mariological Society of America: "The five years since *Lumen gentium* seem like a century and the memory of what took place may become a little blurred."⁴ That still holds true; yet there are some noteworthy studies on the Council documents, and the availability of the accessory materials should stimulate more: *Acta synodalia sacrosancti Concilii oecumenici Vaticani* (2 vols.; Vatican Press, 1971); *Acta et documenta Concilio oecumenico apparando* (4 vols.; Vatican Press, 1960-61), not for sale, but able to be consulted. More readily available are Besutti, "Il tema mariano negli Acta synodalia del Vaticano II," *Marianum* 25 (1973) 241-52; also *Marianum* 26 (1964) 4; and for preliminary schemata, again Besutti, *Lo schema mariano al Concilio Vaticano II: Documentazione e note di cronaca* (Marianum and Desclée, 1966; also in the periodical *Marianum* 28 [1966] 1-203).

⁴*Marian Studies* 21 (1970) 21; the yearly presidential addresses provide a good running commentary on matters of Mariological interest: G. W. Shea, A. Vaughan, C. W. Neumann, S.M., G. F. Kirwin, O.M.I., and others.

Of commentaries, the best by far is Vol. 2 of G. Philips (d. 1972), *L'Eglise et son mystère au IIe Concile du Vatican: Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution "Lumen gentium"* (2 vols.; Paris: Desclée, 1968), on the Virgin Mary. With Laurentin, Philips was a *peritus*, had a large hand in chap. 8 of *Lumen gentium*. H. du Manoir, S.J., died in 1973, but lived to complete his monumental eight-volume encyclopedic *Maria: Etudes sur la sainte Vierge* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1949-71), from the heyday of Pius XII, through John XXIII and the exciting events of the Council, into the efforts at adjustment under Paul VI after the Council. Vol. 8 came out in 1971 and bears the subtitle "La Vierge Marie à la lumière de Vatican II." Along with du Manoir's own *liminaire*, which can serve as the author's valedictory, there are *tables générales* for the full set, and G. Philips' farewell "The Virgin at the Second Vatican Council and the Future of Mariology."

H.-M. Manteau-Bonamy, O.P., Council *peritus*, wrote *La Vierge Marie et le Saint-Esprit* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1971; 2nd ed., 1972); in the words of its subtitle, it is "a doctrinal and spiritual commentary on chapter 8 of *Lumen gentium*." The same author put out in 1975 *La doctrine mariale du Père Kolbe: Esprit-Saint et Conception immaculée* (Paris, Lethielleux), with Pope Paul's homily of Oct. 17, 1971, at the beatification of Maximilian Kolbe, Polish victim of charity at Auschwitz.

Etudes mariales 22 (1965) was on "La Vierge Marie dans la Constitution sur l'Eglise," with Laurentin, Koehler, etc. *Estudios marianos* gave their 1965 meeting to this theme also (vols. 27 and 28). The Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos series published *Concilio Vaticano II: Comentarios a la Constitución sobre la Iglesia* (Madrid, 1966); N. García-Garces, M. Llamera, and J. de Aldama write on our Lady. *Theologie und Glaube* 58 gave (1968) its January number to *Lumen gentium*, chap. 8; among the contributors was B. Langemeyer, O.F.M., who wrote also a reflection of ecumenical import, "Konziliare Mariologie und biblische Typologie: Zum ökumenischen Gespräch über Maria nach dem Konzil," *Catholica* 21 (1967) 295-316.

The Council documents require careful reading and need to be measured one against another; nor was *Lumen gentium* the final conciliar word, for there are further cogent references to our Lady in fourth-session decrees: so contends M. O'Carroll, C.S.Sp., in "Vatican II and Our Lady's Mediation," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 37 (1970) 24-25.

The United States bishops issued the joint pastoral *Behold Your Mother: Woman of Faith*, Nov. 21, 1973 (Washington: USCC), and almost the same time a Spanish edition, *He aquí a tu madre: La mujer de fe*; French and Italian translations have been made also. On background to the American letter, see my lecture at the thirtieth anniversary of the Dayton Marian Library, given the fall of 1973, in

University of Dayton Review 11 (Spring 1975): "How the Joint Pastoral, *Behold Your Mother*, Came to Be Written."

Among other episcopal letters are the collective pastorals from the Netherlands and Switzerland: the Dutch, Oct. 5, 1968, appeared in English in *Queen of All Hearts* 20 (Nov.-Dec. 1969) 17-19 (Montfort Fathers, Bay Shore, Long Island); the Swiss, Sept. 16, 1973, was in *Marianum* 36 (Sept. 1974). Archbishop Philip Pocock of Toronto wrote his people during the Council for the month of May, 1964, "Mary and the Mystery of the Church," among other places in the *Ecumenist* 2 (May-June 1964). For the 150th anniversary of the dedication (by Archbishop John Carroll, 1791) of the old Cathedral, the Basilica of the Assumption, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore issued "Mary Mother of God and Woman of Faith," Sept. 8, 1971 (*Catholic Review*, Baltimore).

MARY IN SCRIPTURE

Many articles and a few books on Mary in the Bible have appeared in the past decade. The Council gave the lead here, as much by its stated intent not to solve questions freely discussed by scholars (*Lumen gentium*, no. 54) as by its sober appeal to biblical evidence. The nonuse of the Apocalyptic woman is a good example. Even better, and ignored in virtually all vernacular translations, is the deliberate protocol of the abbreviation *cf.* (for "confer") in the Latin original documents. *Cf.* in the footnotes is a signal the Council is alluding to but not proposing a biblical argument on behalf of the matter indicated. Thus, in the body of chap. 8 of *Lumen gentium*, 14 of 17 references to the Bible carry the limiting *cf.* The three that bear no *cf.* are cases where there is no dispute about the sense of the text; e.g., one of the conciliar notices of the virginal conception has as footnote the Is 7:14 citation prefaced by *cf.*, but Mt 1:22-23 without the *cf.* (no. 55). The Vulgate translation *gratia plena* is footnoted "*cf.* Lk 1: 28" (no. 56).

Laurentin and other commentators, as LeDéaut in *Etudes mariales* 22 (1965), have explored the Council's use of Scripture. The American Marianist C. H. Miller did his doctorate on the Council's use of the OT, *As It Is Written* (St. Louis Marianist Communications Centre, 1973); one chapter was in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* 163 (Dec. 1970) as "Mary and the Old Testament in Vatican II." Miller would like more scientific rigor in the conciliar use of the OT. Other Christians have also looked at the conciliar practice, e.g., W. Quanbeck and O. Cullmann, in *Dialogue on the Way*, ed. G. Lindbeck (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1965), on the Council's favorable reading of the "difficult sayings" of the true

kinsmen and enthusiastic woman stories.⁵

In January 1967, R. Kugelman, C.P., gave a survey "Mariology and Recent Biblical Literature" to the Mariological Society (*Marian Studies* 18 [1967]). Since 1968 I have included these materials in my annual survey. T. R. Heath, O.P., has an appendix "Recent Studies on our Lady in the New Testament" in the volume he translated and commented, *Our Lady*, Vol. 51 of the Blackfriars edition of St. Thomas' *Summa* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969). Ernest Lussier, S.S.S., wrote "Mariology Post-Vatican II" for *Chicago Studies* 11 (1972) 73-88.

Even before the Council ended, attention was being given to Mary and the Bible at a meeting of systematic theologians and exegetes at Santo Domingo, Spring 1965, with over seventy papers. The theme, suggested by Pope Paul, looked to a meeting of minds between biblical theologians and systematicians, and the congress proved a good forum for the airing of views, with the attempt of the early sixties to discredit responsible exegesis successfully overcome and with most of the Council over, although the Constitution on Divine Revelation had not yet appeared. Some papers were specifically on the relationship between the two disciplines, as in Vol. 2 of the acta (*Exegesis et theologia biblicodogmatica*), with P. Benoit and G. Philips each looking at the other side, and from the United States Eugene Maly and Eamon R. Carroll doing the same.

Other papers were by H. Cazelles, on a favorite theme, the maternal function of Sion and of Mary; S. Lyonnet on "L'Annonciation et la mariologie biblique"; B. Rigaux on the meaning of Mk 3:31-5; R. Silić on Semitic antifeminism as possible explanation for the quasi silence of Paul, Matthew, and Mark about the Virgin Mary. A. Feuillet suggested Jn 16:21 as key to Jn 19:25-27. A. Voegtle spoke of "Matthew 1:25 and Mary's Virginité *post partum*," concluding that Matthew neither affirms nor denies, it falls outside the Gospel purpose of showing Jesus as descendant of Abraham, successor to David. A volume of the proceedings concerns Mary and the ecumenical movement, itself a sign of the conciliar outlook, though in fact only one paper was given by a Protestant, F. W. Kuenneth, on the place of Mary in Lutheran Reformed outlook. Dr. Kuenneth took part in subsequent international congresses, e.g. Portugal in 1967, Zagreb in 1971. William J. Cole, S.M., gave a lengthy report on "Scripture and the Understanding of Mary among American Protestants," and has reported similar investigations for *Marian Studies* and the *University of Dayton Review*.

⁵Note that the scriptural references used by the Council, Mk 3:35 and Lk 11:27, are prefaced by the qualifying *cf.*

At Santo Domingo, Laurentin spoke on Mary's faith according to Lk 2:50, which was the principal subtheme in his *Jésus au temple: Mystère de Pâques et foi de Marie in Luc 2 48-50* (Paris: Gabalda 1966) in *Etudes bibliques*, the same series as his *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (1957).⁶ Mary's faith, both trial of faith and growth in faith, is put at the service of the understanding of the paschal mystery, when there is resolved the tension of "father," "your father and I," and "my father's house." The Evangelist has in mind the full mystery: Passover time, Jerusalem, the Temple, the three days, the anguish of loss, the return to the Father in the Ascension, and the joy of fulfilment.

In 1967 J. Blinzler published *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesus* (Stuttgart). The book investigates the Gospel brothers and sisters and shows that no one of them is described as a son or daughter of Mary—indeed, in most cases they are identified as having another mother. Conclusions are not apodictic but should assist ecumenical dialogue on the sensitive issue of Mary's perpetual virginity by modifying such assertions as "obvious sense of Scripture," "it goes without saying," etc., as biblical objections contrary to the perpetual virginity.⁷

At the Lisbon congress, 1967, on the development of the cult of Mary, F. Mussner spoke of Lucan evidence for veneration of Mary in the primitive Church, the Magnificat, and the enthusiastic woman of Lk 11. The article appeared first in *Catholica* 21 (1967) 287-94, then in the acta: "Lk 1:48 f; 11,27 f und die Anfänge der Marienverehrung in der Urkirche." The gist of Mussner's argument is that the early Church would not have tolerated such extraordinary praise of Mary as "blessed" unless they already had great veneration for her. The generations that will call her blessed belong to her Son's messianic kingdom. M. Miguens, O.F.M., gave a paper at Lisbon on a similar theme, and had done a lengthy study on the final statement of our Lady at the Annunciation, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord," at Santo Domingo, 1965.⁸ He has since taken an active part in the Mariological Society, giving a paper in 1975 on the virginal conception.

In 1967 J. F. Craghan, C.S.S.R., defended at Munich the dissertation *Mary the Virginal Wife and the Married Virgin: The Problematic of Mary's Vow of Virginity* (Esopus, N.Y.: St. Alphonsus Book Shop). He surveys patristic views, and interprets Mary's intent of virginity as a readiness to accept God's will fully. When this meant for her messianic

⁶I reviewed this book for THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 29 (1968) 531-32, and at somewhat greater length for *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968) 454-57.

⁷S. Benko, *Protestants, Catholics and Mary* (Valley Forge, 1968), sees no biblical difficulty whatsoever in identifying the brethren as Mary's children.

⁸A summary form of the Miguens Santo Domingo paper appeared as "Servant of the Lord," *Marian Era* 9 (1969), an annual of the Franciscan National Marian Commission that ran through eleven volumes.

motherhood and perpetual virginity, she accepted it in faith. Conversant with Craghan's position, the English Marist Geoffrey Graystone defended at Rome in 1968 the thesis *Virgin of All Virgins: The Interpretation of Luke 1:34* (from author, St. Mary's Hill, Paignton, Devon). After assessing the arguments, the author finds an intent on Mary's part to remain a virgin, that this is required by the internal unity of the Lucan narrative and not excluded by known circumstances of Mary's day.

In *Biblische Zeitschrift* 11 (1967) 222-39, 12 (1968) 80-93, A. Dauer studied the Johannine Calvary scene and concluded that the "beloved disciple" was a person distinct from the Evangelist, and that the Gospel focused on him rather than the mother of Jesus, though the mention of Mary helps identify and accredit the beloved disciple, showing the veneration in which she was held.

The outstanding book of 1969 was written by a Protestant from Finland, H. Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Helsinki, 1969). C. Barnas, reviewer in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (Oct. 1969), put it whimsically but well in calling it "the quest for the kerygmatic Mary," and saying it might even prepare the way for "a new quest of the historical Mary." Räisänen examines the NT texts, beginning with Paul's letters, as Gal 4:4, and going beyond the Apocalypse to a brief *Exkurs* on Mary in the letters of Ignatius. He divides Bible texts into "Christological" and "typical." Paul and Matthew are Christological, limited to the fact of the origin of Jesus from Mary. Mark and John see Mary as model of specific groups, Mark with the uncomprehending brethren, John as model of trust at Cana and fidelity on Calvary, though he holds Dauer's view the beloved disciple has the greater prominence at the cross. Luke combines both Christological and typical elements. However, neither daughter of Zion nor ark of the covenant strikes him as applicable. The "brethren" are literally such, but he defends the virginal conception strongly, in terms of the new creation, which is the saving Incarnation.

The French Mariological Society devoted three meetings to "Mary and the Holy Spirit," 1968, 1969, and 1970 (*Etudes mariales* 25-27). A. Feuillet (25) and H. Cazelles (26) contributed biblical articles. Feuillet shows that the work of the Holy Spirit is the creation of a new people, not simply the virginal conception of the Son of Mary. Raymond E. Brown, S.S., published his two-volume Anchor Bible commentary (29 and 29A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday): *The Gospel according to John I-XII* (1966) and *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI* (1970). Brown offers an ecclesial interpretation of Mary's place at both Cana and Calvary, skilfully relating the two.⁹

⁹See also Raymond Collins, "Mary in the Fourth Gospel: A Decade of Johannine Studies," *Louvain Studies* 3 (1970) 99-142, much from A. Feuillet.

In *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972) 131–36, J. A. Grassi of Santa Clara wrote “The Wedding at Cana (Jn 2, 1–11): A Pentecostal Meditation.” A. M. Serra, O.S.M., in a thesis defended in 1974 under LeDéaut at the Biblicum on the contribution of ancient Jewish literature to the exegesis of Jn 2:1–12 and 19:21–27,¹⁰ argues the same point as Grassi, i.e., John views Cana in constant reference to the theophany of Sinai. The mother of Jesus is likened to the people of God; her word echoes Ex 19:8 and 24:3, 7, where the people promise they will do whatever God asks. This view is supported by G. Bamphylde, writing in *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969) 247–60 (“John XIX, 28: A Case for a Different Translation”). In his reading, the final accomplishment of the Scriptures refers to what has gone before, not to the “I thirst.” Jesus’ last will, entrusting the disciple to his mother, is the first step on the way of final accomplishment signified in v. 30: the gift of the Spirit, joined to the water and blood symbolic of the sacraments whence the Church takes its origin. Mary’s bond with the Holy Spirit, insinuated at Cana in the “new wine,” is here made more explicit.

Feuillet’s *Jésus et sa mère d’après les récits lucaniens de l’enfance et d’après saint Jean: Le rôle de la Vierge Marie dans l’histoire du salut et la place de la femme dans l’église* (Paris: Gabalda, 1974) is a welcome further demonstration of his ability to bring biblical scholarship to the understanding of less qualified readers. As a sample I mention his view on the Apocalypse and comment on the virginal conception as sign of the origin of the new people of God. He calls attention to the final verse of Ap 11 on the “ark of the covenant,” and the seer’s description, once the sanctuary has opened, of the great sign, the woman clothed with the sun. She personifies the Church and refers to the Virgin Mary, who for both Luke and John personifies the ideal Sion of the prophets. “Effectively it is only by Mary that this ideal Sion gave the world Christ and the messianic people.” There is a close connection between the ark symbolism in Luke’s narratives of the Annunciation and Visitation and the ark of the Apocalypse, and between “full of grace” and “clothed with the sun.” On the infancy narratives of Luke, however stylized they are—though not midrashic, for they set out from real events—Feuillet defends the historical character of the virginal conception against Bultmannian demythologizing and M. Dibelius’ view, first expressed in 1932, restated by A. Malet in 1970.

When Laurentin spoke before the international ecumenical conference at Birmingham, April 1973, on “Mary in the Communion of Saints,” he noted that no significant study on Acts 1:13–14 had appeared since

¹⁰Serra, “Le tradizioni della teofania sinaitica nel Targum dello pseudo-Jonathan, Ex 19, 24 e in Giov 1, 19–2, 12,” *Marianum* 33 (1971) 1–39.

Cardinal Bea's article for the Roman Mariological congress of 1950 ("Erant perseverantes . . . cum Maria matre Jesu in communicatione fractionis panis," *Alma socia Christi* 6/1 [Rome, 1952]). That lacuna has since been filled by a long article by Benedetto Prete, O.P., in the Italian Dominican journal *Sacra doctrina* 17 (Jan-June 1973), special double-number devoted to *Maria di Nazareth nella Chiesa*, in commemoration of the fourth centenary of the liturgical feast of the Rosary. Prete's article, "Il sommario di Atti 1, 13-14 e suo apporto per la conoscenza della Chiesa delle origini" analyzes the pericope in the context of its immediate setting, in relation to the rest of Acts, and in the larger biblical setting.

Prete advocates a middle way between the extremes of using Acts 1:14 to attribute to Mary royal power in the infant Church (as da Spinetoli) and of conceding no more than that this is simply the final mention of Mary in the NT (G. Stählin). Among Prete's observations are these: Mary is "mother of Jesus," hence of that Jesus with whom the previous verses in Acts have been concerned, who has died and who has appeared alive to his followers "over the course of forty days speaking to them about the reign of God," commanding them to wait in Jerusalem for the "fulfilment of my Father's promise." The plane is the continuity between the Jesus who suffered and was raised up and the Church which is his Body. Not accidentally the Council referred to the parallel between the origin of Jesus through the Virgin Mary under the power of Spirit in the nativity chapters and the infancy of the Church in Acts.¹¹ He makes much of the word *homothumadon* (the English "with one accord" seems to capture it) echoed in Acts 4:32: "believers . . . united heart and soul." "One only heart" recalls Sinai: "Everything the Lord has said we will do" (Ex 19), typical of the community united in prayer. "With one accord" fits well also the *koinōnia*, the brotherhood, the fellowship of the first Christians.

A *Festschrift* for R. Schnackenburg, edited by J. Gnllka, came out in 1974 (Freiburg: Herder): *Neues Testament und Kirche*. I. de la Potterie, S.J., contributed "Das Wort Jesu 'Siehe, deine Mutter' und die Annahme der Mutter durch den Jünger (Joh. 19, 27b)," which also appeared as "La parole de Jesus, Voici ta mère, et l'accueil du disciple Jn 19:27b," in *Marianum* 36 (1974) 1-39. Apart from F.-M. Braun, almost no one has studied the climactic verse "From that hour onward, the disciple took her into his care" (NAB, though this translation hardly suits the sense of the study in question). The author gives (a) history and interpretation of the verse, (b) analysis, (c) exegesis and theology. Going into the text, de la Potterie weighs in turn "took . . . into," "into his care," and precisely "his care." The Greek *idios* or *ta idia* is the

¹¹ *Lumen gentium*, no. 59; *Ad gentes*, no. 4.

determinant: it has the sense of religious belonging especially to Christ, as in John's prologue, "to his own he came." To "receive" means "to welcome"; *eis ta idia* means the condition of the disciple, his *bona spiritualia*. "These words mean the spiritual space in which the disciple lives, a space constituted by his communion with Jesus; it is in this spiritual milieu, in this communion with Jesus, that the disciple now receives as his own the mother of Jesus." John, who receives the mother of Jesus, represents believers; the work of Jesus henceforth continues in the work of the Woman, a perspective of the Church opens up. On Calvary the Church is doubly represented: as mother of the faithful, the Church is personified in the mother of Jesus; as the eschatological people, the believers, the Church is represented by the disciple.

John McHugh, professor of Scripture at Ushaw, Durham, published *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* in 1975 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday). It consists equivalently of three books: (1) *Mother of the Savior: Lk 1-2*; (2) *Virgin and Mother: The Virginité of Mary in the New Testament*; (3) *Mother of the Word Incarnate: Mary in the Theology of John*. He writes to reassure Catholics of the service to the faith of serious biblical scholarship and to offer other Christians a good look at a Catholic position. McHugh is an active member of the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary and has used parts of the book for conferences to the Society. He is well aware of the "much deeper differences concerning the relationship of Scripture and tradition."

The central section, on Mary's virginité, takes up both the virginal conception of Jesus and his mother's lifelong virginité, with the associated questions of the Gospel "brethren" both in the very early Church and in the late-fourth century in interchange between Helvidius and Jerome. McHugh's praise for Jerome in this matter contrasts with J. N. D. Kelly's blame in *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975) pp. 104-7. McHugh gives an extensive defense of the virginal conception as literally true, with a chapter apiece in assessment of "legend of Jewish derivation," "legend of Hellenistic origin," "legend derived from both Hellenistic and Jewish motifs," and "a Christian theologoumenon." Chapters on the religious significance both of the virginal conception and of our Lady's lifelong virginité round out the section.

The Johannine part has much of interest, on the Apocalypse as well as Cana and Calvary. Cana does not mean separation between mother and Son; the Evangelist added to an older narrative the dialogue between Jesus and Mary "to make the sign-value of Cana evident," for it heads the list of great Johannine signs, which point towards the full revelation of God's love in Jesus' cross and resurrection. Mary appears throughout

as "believer"; she believes in her Son before the first of his signs at Cana. Calvary conveys the same lesson, in sorrow. To Mary above all others applies the Beatitude with which the fourth Gospel closes: "Blessed those who have not seen and yet have learned to believe."

Thus far I have seen only two reviews of McHugh, one a favorable article by Bishop B. C. Butler in the September 1975 *Clergy Review*, the other short but incisive and mildly unfavorable by R. E. Brown in the weekly *America*, Oct. 25, 1975. Brown himself is working on a book-length study of the infancy narratives, and is involved in the announced *Mary in the New Testament*, an ecumenical collaborative effort similar to *Peter in the New Testament*, ed. R. E. Brown, Karl P. Donfried, and J. Reumann (Paramus, N.J.: Paulist 1973). Samples of Brown's longer books to come are two complementary essays just published: "The Meaning of Modern New Testament Studies for an Ecumenical Understanding of Mary," in his Hoover lectures *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church* (Paramus, N.J.: Paulist, 1975), and "Luke's Method in the Annunciation Narrative of Chapter One," in *No Famine in the Land*, ed. J. W. Flanagan and A. Robinson (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975). In the Hoover lecture, originally delivered in Chicago, Brown shows the Lucan modifications (Lk 8:19-21) in the "true kinsmen" Synoptic story. These changes modify and mollify the adaptation Matthew has already made of the Marcan story, and place Mary and the brothers no longer "outside" but among the true followers of Jesus even before Pentecost; in Acts the mother of Jesus and his other relatives are also counted with the disciples. In the historical datum of the public ministry Brown finds the key to the faith of Mary made manifest in the Annunciation: "'Let it be done to me according to your word' was simply transposing to the first person the affirmation that Jesus' mother heard the word of God and did it."

The "Virgin Birth" Discussion

For weal or woe, the phrase "virgin birth" is the customary term, as used by ordinary dictionaries and the media, for the virginal conception of Jesus—from the standpoint of Mary, her *virginitas ante partum*. The Virgin Birth has to be distinguished from that aspect of her virginity which is related to the actual parturition, to the delivery of Mary's Son, the *virginitas in partu*. A still further element of our Lady's virginity, after the conception and birth of Jesus, is her lifelong or "perpetual" virginity, *virginitas post partum*. I employ the threefold category aware of its weaknesses and the danger of breaking down into isolated points a unified mystery intimately bound up with the Incarnation, the Church, and eschatology. Here I add nothing to what has already been said in

brief about the *virginitas post partum* (to the degree it is connected with the question of the brethren, in Blinzler's book, above). I will mention current literature on *virginitas in partu*, but will concentrate on the Virgin Birth, i.e., the virginal conception of Jesus, or the *virginitas ante partum* of his mother. To deny a literal virginal conception means, of course, the denial also of Mary's lifelong or perpetual virginity. And even though the teaching and example of Christ are the justification for freely-chosen virginity/celibacy as a Christian way of dedicated life, and our Lady's exemplar role is definitely only secondary, that role is not trivial, nor can the analogy of faith be left out of consideration.

Virginitas in Partu

Current writing on this topic is an extension of a discussion that arose in the fifties. The measured statement in the conciliar chapter on our Lady reflects the Church's present mind. Rather than specify in what *virginitas in partu* consists, the Council called on patristic language to present the mystery as relating Mary more intimately to Jesus her Son, the Holy One: at his birth Jesus "did not diminish his mother's virginal integrity but hallowed it" (no. 57). The conciliar references in the footnotes are prefaced by the limiting abbreviation *cf.*; they are the customary ones for *virginitas in partu*: Chalcedon, Lateran (of 649 A.D.), Ambrose, Leo the Great.

As for contributions of the past decade, K. Rahner, "*Virginitas in partu*: A Contribution to the Problem of Development of Dogma and of Tradition," *Theological Investigations* 4 (Baltimore: Helicon, 1967) 134-62 (from the 1960 German) inclines towards a miraculous interpretation, but emphasizes the meaning of the sign rather than the hidden character of the physical factor(s). In *Theological Investigations* 13 (N.Y.: Seabury, 1975) he returns to the topic with a short article "Human Aspects of the Birth of Jesus." Bishop Alan C. Clark of England has written twice on this theme: "The Virgin Birth: A Theological Reappraisal," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 34 (1973) 576-93, and in the *Way*, Summer supplement 1975, a paper read at an ecumenical conference, "Born of the Virgin Mary." He concludes: "Can one hold the dogma of Mary's perpetual virginity, while denying the miraculous mode of birth for Christ? I think there is little doubt that one can, and more than that, one should."¹² Laurentin continues to defend a miraculous virginity *in partu*, which he relates very strongly to theological values, a sign in Christian understanding, not a prodigy or marvel sufficient unto itself.

¹² Bishop Clark defends strongly a historical virginal conception, as in the pamphlet *The Virgin Birth* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1973).

"The essential is the religious significance of the mystery." His views recur in his biennial bulletins and are summarized in his latest *Court traité sur la Vierge Marie*, including a "remise en question de 1952-1960," "doctrine du Concile" (the changes between the first schema and final form of the present no. 57, in parallel columns) and "signification de cette doctrine." Laurentin quotes a sixth-century statement: Mary is here the ikon of Eve, the punishment of Gn 3:16a has been annulled in the birth of the new Adam. Gabriel's "rejoice" announces the messianic maternity.

The "Virgin Birth"

At the fifth annual theological seminar for bishops, held at Catholic University in July 1973, one day centered on the virginity of Mary, specifically on the virginal conception of Jesus. Joseph Fitzmyer, S.J., presented the paper "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," which appeared in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 34 (1973) 541-75.¹³ On the same program with Fitzmyer I presented a *status quaestionis* from the viewpoint of a systematic theologian; it is as yet unpublished, but I dip into it here. For well over the decade Laurentin has been defending the literal truth of the virginal conception, and without attempting to give a full bibliography for him, easy enough to find in his own writings, I do note the latest of his treatments, the lecture he gave in the United States the summer of 1975, at the Marian Library, Dayton, and at San Antonio. It is being prepared for publication: "The Virginal Conception: Myth or Reality?" In title and conclusions it is similar to the essay by John Sheets, S.J., "Virginal Conception—Fact and Faith," *Chicago Studies* 14 (1975) 279-96.

Laurentin recounts a recent experience. *Lumière et vie* asked him for an article on the infancy Gospels (no. 119, pp. 84-105). When it appeared, the journal ran its own refutation by H. Cousins, not a Scripture scholar (no. 121, pp. 109-11), adding to it Laurentin's rebuttal, consisting of seven questions which he notes have remained unanswered both in public and in private. In his initial article Laurentin criticized "the simplistic manner in which exegetical data are ignored in order to present this Gospel and the virginal conception according to current taste."

Staying within Catholic writings, and leaving aside a rumble or two earlier in the sixties, particularly a paper read to the German Mariological Society in 1962 which never made it past the censors (so Laurentin reports), and Dutch Jesuit Van Kilsdonk's public advocacy in 1965 of a

¹³R. E. Brown expresses a difference with some of Fitzmyer's views in "Luke's Description of the Virginal Conception," in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 35 (1974) 360-62.

purely symbolic, nonbiological virginal conception, the appearance in October 1966 of *The New Catechism*, the "Dutch Catechism," quickly translated into other languages (English 1966), "made this opinion respectable, in that what was written allowed for both views" (Laurentin). The Dutch Catechism did bring out often overlooked values in the Virgin Birth, as "this birth is infinitely greater than that of any man, has no relationship at all to what men can accomplish of themselves." But as John Coventry, S.J., noted in his (London) *Tablet* review, Sept. 23, 1967, "The question of the virgin birth is, in the last resort, shirked. The treatment treads delicately round the subject, with consummate theological skill, though without mention of the Church's teaching. The reader will find no answer to the question, 'Is it, or is it not, necessary to believe that Christ had no human father, in view of his divinity?' . . ."

By then P. Schoonenberg, S.J., had come to the defense of the Catechism, in reply to criticism by other Dutch Catholics. Alluding to the credal "conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary," he asked if such professions of faith are to be understood as concerned with Jesus' bodily origin and Mary's bodily motherhood. He answered: "It does not seem certain that an affirmative answer has been given by the extraordinary magisterium." Great though the importance of the ordinary magisterium be, and giving "the strong impression that the virginal origin of Jesus is to be understood in a bodily sense," Schoonenberg still holds the question an open one. He definitely does not deny it, equally definitely he does not regard it as unquestionably of faith. He holds the NT references a possible "poetical expression for the unique divine sonship of Jesus." He asks: "Is the phrase, *natus de Maria Virgine*, which the greater number of the creeds join to *conceptit de Spiritu Sancto*, to be taken as historical narrative or a theological interpretation couched in legendary form?" Theological reasons for a normal human origin are the full humanity of Jesus and the fact that God and man are not rival forces.

The Holy Office intervened in a letter sent to all bishops July 24, 1966, with respect to Jesus' virginal conception and other matters. The Dutch hierarchy replied March 25, 1967, mentioning the Virgin Birth as a disputed question. At the Gazzada conversations, April 8-10, 1967, Schoonenberg defended *The New Catechism*, and a month later lectured at Innsbruck on the difference between *Geschehen*, as the event or occurrence, the attributing of the human origin of Jesus to the work of God, and *Ereignis*, the biological fact of the virginal conception, not verifiable historically.¹⁴

¹⁴ This Innsbruck lecture was printed in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 90 (1968) 1-21. Eugene Maly, in his laudatory review of R. E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, for THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, Dec. 1973, notes the important

After Gazzada a commission of cardinals, assisted by theologians, further explored the question and issued on Oct. 15, 1968, a request that the Catechism state clearly the fact of the virginal conception of Jesus, without passing over the symbolic significance of the freedom of God's gift to us in His Son. The Dutch hierarchy found this decision unacceptable. Eventually, however, a compromise was reached: editions of the Catechism would carry an appendix giving further instruction on the virginal conception and a few other doctrinal matters; and this is now being done.

In a double number of the 1971 *Ephemerides Mariologicae* (Vol. 21) editor J. Alonso and P. Schoonenberg presented the two sides. Alonso admitted that the Church has never taught the Virgin Birth with the same solemnity as the Assumption. With Ratzinger, however, he argued that the presence or absence of such an extraordinary intervention of the Church's teaching authority cannot be the sole criterion in a matter of such unanimity in Church history, where there is an uninterrupted magisterial tradition from earliest times before the Apostles' Creed to Pope Paul's Credo of the People of God.¹⁵ To the objection that a human father would satisfy better the Chalcedonian requirements of Jesus' full humanity, Alonso replies that in Christian mysteries not rational reconcilability but their real existence is the starting point of investigation—not to cite one mystery against another, but given them both to seek to find what unites them. In his summation Schoonenberg thanked Alonso for his full and fair summary, then wrote:

I believe that, like Father Alonso, I am rooted in the same Roman Catholic tradition and must confess my faith in God and His Christ within the same Catholic Church. But my theological position is quite different from Father Alonso's. Therefore I do not expect we can convince each other. I am sorry this is so. I think this situation, where we know we are one in faith and still find ourselves divided over matters of faith, is a sorrow of our time. We must bear this sorrow in the hope that thereby the faith may find new strength and the means of expression to make itself understandable in the world.

Laurentin argues that Matthew and Luke, otherwise so different, agree on the Virgin Birth. Matthew does not speak explicitly of divine Sonship in his infancy Gospel, so can hardly be said to have employed the Virgin

difference between pagan and biblical approaches to the divine action in history, and adds: "Hans Urs von Balthasar puts it oversimplistically but trenchantly when he writes: 'are we to begin trying to distinguish between 'theological' and 'historical' truth in a religion which is concerned precisely with incarnation and therefore with the historical truth of its central content of belief?' " (p. 709).

¹⁵J. Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970) p. 212 n. 52, with specific reference to Schoonenberg.

Birth to convey divine Sonship. In fact, it is an embarrassment to him as he seeks to show Jesus as a son of David through the genealogy of Joseph, then having him name the child. The tradition is extremely cogent, argues Laurentin: after the Gospels themselves, it is as old as early second century; Ignatius of Antioch knows it, Justin offers an apologia for the Virgin Birth. The truth has never required solemn definition, no more than such truths as the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. "Hence it is a subtlety arising from juridical thinking to consider as a weakness what is in fact the strength of this tradition" (Laurentin).

A series of presuppositions influences opposition to the Virgin Birth: (a) outlook has shifted from a medieval acceptance of miracles to a conviction of the determinism of the world; moreover, miracles seem opposed to divine transcendence; (b) moderns put a higher value on sexuality; (c) demythologizing has become a fashion and a kind of rage; many ill-trained people attempt this delicate task.

In preparing his recent lecture, Laurentin submitted his notes to Schoonenberg and he admits some weaknesses Schoonenberg pointed out in the traditional case for the Virgin Birth, such as an excessively ascetic approach: e.g., if no Virgin Birth, what of Mary's example to religious? It is also true that for many moderns the virginity of Mary, or virginity in general, is meaningless. Too often in times past we tended to see in the Virgin Birth a "marvel" rather than a divinely-given "sign." But the question Laurentin insists upon is: Although the sign comes first in value, if Jesus' virginal conception is reduced to a symbol alone, what meaning is left? He suggests two great examples of meaning bound up with the truth that God sent His Son without a human father. One example is from the past: from the third to the fifth century, Mary's virginity, rooted in the virginal conception of Jesus, was a living light for a great ascetic movement oriented towards eschatology. "The virginity of Mary was discovered within this very experience." The other example is modern Protestant experience: both the attempt to retain an existential meaning even without a historical reality of the Virgin Birth, and, as with K. Barth, a strong affirmation of the Virgin Birth as the great sign of God's merciful intervention, the breaking-through of the new creation. For Barth, as for Augustine and other Fathers, "virginity is the icon of the Incarnation." Primarily Christological, it has been accomplished in Mary not only in her flesh but in her freedom, in her faith, the ancient "prius mente quam ventre concepit."

Laurentin concludes that we should not overdramatize the crisis here: "It is perhaps better than formalism and the crabbed and pedantic verbal repetition of *formulas* empty of their meaning . . . rediscover the meaning of the mystery. This requires a well-understood commitment to

evangelical poverty, including all its aspects, notably celibacy for the kingdom. It is through this prophetic and demanding experience that, beyond certain clouds of today and yesterday, we will rediscover the true light of the virginity of Mary, the sign of our salvation."

In the United States the single event that attracted most notice to this topic was the lecture Raymond E. Brown gave at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, Nov. 18, 1971. It was printed the following spring in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 33 (1972) 3-34, then revised slightly and printed again with an important preface and epilogue in *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus* (Paramus, N.J.: Paulist, 1973).

This was not the first notice American theologians had given the topic. The Mariological Society had taken up the theme at recent conventions. The 1970 meeting (*Marian Studies* 21) had three papers: John F. Craghan, C.S.S.R., "The Gospel Witness to Mary's *Ante partum* Virginity" (in briefer form, June 1970, in *American Ecclesiastical Review*); Frederick M. Jelly, O.P., "Mary's Virginity in the Symbols and Councils"; Austin Vaughan, "Interpreting the Ordinary Magisterium on Mary's Virginity" (*Marian Studies* 22 [1971]).¹⁶ The 1973 meeting (*Marian Studies* 24) was totally on the Virgin Birth, with papers by H. Richardson (Presbyterian), the late A. C. Piepkorn (Lutheran), as well as A. Vaughan, whose paper has not been published, although the discussions in which he took part, along with the discussions after Richardson's and Piepkorn's conferences, are printed in *Marian Studies*.

Brown's essay is sufficiently known not to require summary, except to say that he finds the biblical evidence inconclusive for a historical virginal conception, and to the degree that he looks into them he wonders about the precise content and force of the magisterial and "traditional" statements. All the same, the long record of the Church's profession of the Virgin Birth appears to him as supporting it.

The Council and subsequent expressions of papal and episcopal teaching have reaffirmed the Church's faith in a literal virginal conception. The joint pastoral of the United States bishops, *Behold Your Mother: Woman of Faith*, Nov. 21, 1973, is a clear and strong example, but also a good illustration of speaking out unambiguously without prejudice to the legitimate and necessary efforts of loyal scholars to explore even sensitive matters. In a section of the pastoral on Jesus' virginal conception, the "faithful and loving work of Christian theologians" (no. 43) is mentioned as one way the Holy Spirit guides the

¹⁶The German Mariological Society took up this matter at its Sept. 1968 meeting, *Mariologische Studien 4: Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute* (Essen: Driewer, 1969): J. Michl, H. Haag, E. Nellesen, H. M. Koester, and others.

Church in interpreting the Bible. Further, one of the "suggested readings" at the end of the document is Brown's *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*.

Manuel Miguens, O.F.M., presented to the 1975 Mariological Society convention (*Marian Studies* 26) a lengthy paper, "Mary, a Virgin? Alleged Silence in the New Testament." Disclaiming any intent to question Brown's faith or intentions, he disagrees with him "in the forum of scholarship and scientific analysis." Miguens rejects the contention of Fitzmyer that Jesus' virginal conception in Matthew and Luke may be regarded as a theologoumenon, i.e., according to Fitzmyer, "a theological assertion that does not directly express a matter of faith or an official teaching of the Church, and hence is in itself not normative, but that expresses in *language that may prescind from factuality* a notion which supports, enhances, or is related to a matter of faith" (my emphasis). Miguens argues to Jesus' virginal conception as historical from Mark, John, Paul, then the infancy chapters in Matthew and Luke. For example, in Mark he shows the consistent avoidance of any reference to a human father for Jesus, and the expression "son of Mary" (6:3). Paul, though steeped in Jewish outlook and surely aware of Jesus' human origins, never mentions Joseph; "born of a woman" (Gal 4:4) suggests a virginal conception. Miguens' article has been published also as a book, *The Virgin Birth* (Westminster, Md.; Christian Classics, 1975). So far I have not seen a full review, though Brown has expressed disagreement with Miguens' methodology.

PATRISTIC AND MEDIEVAL DEVELOPMENTS

The last three international Mariological meetings stimulated many studies on the Fathers and other early evidences. Lisbon, 1967, centered on the development of the cult of Mary up to 500 A.D. At Zagreb, 1971, the same theme was continued to the death of Anselm (1109). In Rome, May 1975, the study progressed to 1500 A.D., eve of the Reformation. Here I can indicate only a few items that have come to my attention. The reader seeking more will find in Laurentin's bulletins extensive appendices of critical editions of early, medieval, and later authors on the Marian mystery, often with his own corrections, e.g., the thirteen-page "Datations, attributions, rééditions en patristique grecque," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 52 (1968).

S. Alvarez Campos is bringing out in five volumes *Corpus Marianum patristicum* (Burgos). Up to 1974 three volumes had appeared; see the extended favorable note by E. Toniolo in *Marianum* 34 (1972) 475-8. The Spanish expert J. A. de Aldama, S.J., issued a volume on his speciality in 1970: *Maria en la patristica de los siglos I y II* (Madrid: B.A.C.). *Diakonia piteos* (Biblioteca teologica Granadina, 1969), a *Festschrift* in honor of

de Aldama, has a section on Mariology with articles by Balic, Roschini, Galot, and others, and a bibliography of de Aldama's writings, 1932-68, many on our Lady. The B.A.C. issued in 1971 *Santos Padres españoles 1: San Ildefonso de Toledo: La virginidad perpetua de Santa Maria*, ed. V. Blanco Garcia; 2: *San Leandro, San Isidoro, San Fructuoso: Reglas monásticas de la España visigoda: Los tres libros de la "Sentencias,"* ed. J. Campos Ruiz and I. Roca Melia. Useful for students is *Texte zur Geschichte der Marienverehrung und Marienverkündigung in der alten Kirche*, ed. W. Delius, an expanded second edition of an original 1956 title by Hans-Udo Rosenbaum (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973).

In an address to the National Liturgical Week in 1965, published in 1966 as "Relevance: The Preoccupation of Theology" (in Vol. 26: *Jesus Christ Reforms His Church*), Jaroslav Pelikan mentioned Mariology and Eucharistic thought on transfiguration as two "problems of Protestant vs. Catholic theology to which a study of ante-Nicene theology would be relevant." He said: "The parallelism of Eve and Mary still awaits a first-class study by a patristic scholar, who could benefit from the many second-class studies available. That parallelism seems to me to have much to say that is relevant to present-day discussions." Pelikan's hopes are not yet fulfilled, but some partial studies have been done. In *Etudes mariales* 23 (1966) M. Jourjon writes of the intercession of Mary in representative Fathers of the first five centuries: Irenaeus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Ambrose. Irenaeus' phrase *advocata Evae*, in the context of letters of intercession by martyrs for apostates at Lyons and Vienne, implies a rudimentary Marian intercession. Lucien Regnault contributed four columns on the New Eve to the article on Irenaeus in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, fasc. 50-51, out in 1971. Jean Plagnieux wrote of "La doctrine mariale de Saint Irénée" in *Revue des sciences religieuses* 44 (1970) 179-89. Robert Murray, S.J., had an article "Mary the Second Eve in the Early Syriac Fathers," in *Eastern Churches Review*, Autumn 1971, with much from Ephrem. L. Cignelli surveyed the field from St. Justin to Theodotus of Ancyra (d. before 446) in *Maria nuova Eva nella patristica greca* (Assisi, 1966). Ernest Guldan pursues the theme iconographically in *Eva und Maria—Eine Antithese als Bildmotiv* (Vienna, 1966), covering Eve-Mary, Eve-Church and Mary as prototype of the Church. Ross Mackenzie spoke at Birmingham during Easter week 1975 on "The Theme of Eve and Mary in the Early Christian Church" (Justin, Irenaeus, and Athanasius; cf. *The Way*, Supplement 25, Summer 1975).

Over many years B. Bagatti, O.F.M., has been engaged in archeology in the Holy Land. At Lisbon in 1967, Bagatti and P. E. Testa reported on Nazareth graffiti demonstrating ancient veneration of Mary. Bagatti has added to archeology some interesting literary considerations, attempting

to trace the Transitus and Dormition accounts back to a single, now lost, primitive second-century form, belonging to the early Judeo-Christian community, as did the cult that sprang up around holy places associated with the Virgin—Nazareth and the Jerusalem tomb. The later Transitus narratives were Greco-Roman, with the Judeo-Christian traces eliminated; Epiphanius, Cyril, and Jerome passed over in silence stories of the Virgin's tomb in the Valley of Cedron. Bagatti reports in the article "Ricerche sulle tradizioni della morte della Vergine," *Sacra doctrina* 18 (1973) 185–214; also "Scoperte archeologiche alla tomba di Maria a Getsemani," *Marianum* 34 (1972) 193–99. His hypothesis has been bolstered by the Ethiopian/Latin edition, by V. Arras in 1973 for the CSCO, of *The Book of Rest*.¹⁷

St. Athanasius is J. Pelikan's example for Marian doctrine and cult in *Development of Christian Doctrine: Some Historical Prolegomena* (New Haven, 1969). These were the St. Thomas More lectures given at Yale in 1965; the three instances of patristic doctrinal development, prolegomena also to informed ecumenical dialogue, were: Cyprian on original sin, Hilary on *Filioque*, Athanasius on the Virgin Mary *theotokos*. A first part of the book is on "The Problem of Doctrinal Development," with many allusions to Newman. There is an echo of Athanasius in Newman's advice "to consult the faithful in matters of doctrine," especially "in the case of doctrines which bear directly upon devotional sentiments." Two factors influenced Athanasius: (a) an ascetical one, in his *Letter to the Virgins*, which Ambrose was to make part of his own writings; (b) *theotokos*, a cult term based on doctrine and perhaps celebrated already in a "commemoration of Mary." The ancient prayer known to the West as *Sub tuum praesidium* (though the Greek reads *eusplanchnia*, mercy or compassion) may have been known to Athanasius. The way Athanasius joins office with commemoration, *orthodoxia* with *eusebeia*, suggests that proper praying and proper teaching together keep the Church faithful.

G. Giamberardini, O.F.M., continues the studies he has been doing for years on early Coptic veneration of Mary. At Zagreb, 1971, he spoke on the Coptic month of Mary within the Christmas liturgy, its development from the fifth century to the ninth: "De mense Mariae dicato in liturgia Copta" (Vol. 4 of *Acta*).¹⁸ At Lisbon, 1967, A Wenger, A.A., spoke on the recently discovered Assumption homily of Theoteknos (late sixth or early

¹⁷ *The Bible Today* carried good popular reports: L. D. Marino, C.P., "Can Anything Good Come from Nazareth?" Dec. 1973 and Feb. 1974, and "The Tomb of Mary," April 1974. See also Joseph Crehan, S.J., "The Assumption and the Jerusalem Liturgy," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 30 (1969) 312–35.

¹⁸ Also by Giamberardini, "Il 'Sub tuum praesidium' e il titolo 'Theotokos' nella tradizione Egiziana," *Marianum* 31 (1969) 324–62, and "Nomi e titoli mariani nella filologia e nell'esegesi degli Egiziani," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 22 (1972) 205–30. See also

seventh century) which he has edited. For *Etudes mariales* 23 (1966), on the intercession of Mary, Wenger studies Eastern writings from Romanos Melodus in the sixth to John the Geometer in the tenth century. He regrets that Eastern Rite bishops at the Council had so little to say about the place of Mary in the Church, her mediation and intercession. To help remedy this omission, Wenger added a dossier of Eastern texts to his *Vatican II: Chronique de la troisième session* (Paris, 1965) pp. 122-39. The opening paper at Zagreb was by the Italian Servite, H. Toniolo, on the Akathist hymn, which exercised an enormous influence on the West as well, as Meersseman has shown.

Even before its complete publication, the doctorate thesis defended at the Gregorian University in 1965 by the Colombian Jesuit Robert Caro was being hailed as outstanding, and portions were in various journals, *Marianum*, *Eclesiástica Xaveriana*, etc. Now the entire study, brought up to date, has been published in the new annual of the Marian Library of Dayton, where it ran through several volumes: *La homilética Mariana griega en el siglo V* (with foreword by R. Laurentin), in *Marian Library Studies* 3 (1971), 4 (1972), and 5 (1973). Caro assesses 57 distinct homilies, 29 authentic, 28 pseudoepigraphical, as to authors, liturgical usage, symbols for our Lady, doctrinal themes, and other information, with an array of tables and other helps. The Fathers he studies are Hesychius, Proclus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Antipater. It is impossible to do justice here to Caro's work; among his findings, however, is the clear restoration to Cyril of the authorship of the "fourth homily pronounced at Ephesus," which Schwartz said was not Cyril's; it was likely given June 28-30, 431, after the deposition of Nestorius. Through the fifth-century homilies *theotokos* identifies Mary, and her virginity is sign of the incarnation of the Son of God. Mary's holiness is that of God's temple. There is an opening-up to a mediatorial role for Mary, but no hint of an immaculate conception, assumption, or "coredemption."

Henri Barré, C.S.Sp. (d. 1968), was a light of the French Mariological Society for many years and enriched Mariology with a long list of medieval studies; some samples: "Antiennes et répons de la Vierge," *Marianum* 29 (1967) 153-254, from ancient Latin liturgy; "L'Intercession de la Vierge aux débuts du moyen âge," *Etudes mariales* 23 (1966) 78-104; "Un plaidoyer pour le samedi marial," *Revue bénédictine* 77 (1967) 375-99, another topic of keen interest to him; and it is hoped some colleague may publish the many notes Barré left on Saturday as Mary's day.¹⁹

D. Montagna, "La lode alla Theotokos nei testi greci dei secoli IV-VII," *Marianum* 24 (1962) 453-543.

¹⁹ Necrology and bibliography of H. Barré by G. Jouassard in *Revue des études augustiniennes* 15 (1969).

The young and energetic Spanish theologian Gonzalo Gironés has taken part in recent international congresses; at Zagreb he spoke on Marian cult in the Visigothic-Mozarabic liturgy, which began in the sixth century, was influenced by Leander, Isidore, and Ildefonsus, was affected by the Mohammedan invasion of 711, and the Cordoba ninth-century Mozarabic liturgy. Feasts of the virginal maternity and Assumption were kept, as well as special Advent and Christmas Marian commemorations. Gironés produced one of the few tracts on Mariology of recent years, the inventive and original *La humanidad salvada y salvadora: Tratado dogmático de la madre del Cristo* (Anales del Seminario de Valencia, 1969). He has written also on Christology: *Unos de nosotros es Hijo de Dios* (Valencia, 1971) and *Jesu Cristo: Tratado de soteriología cristológica* (Valencia, 1973).

At Zagreb Laurentin spoke on what the West borrowed from the East from the sixth to the eleventh century, which he broke into three parts: (a) sixth to eighth century: infancy apocrypha, Eastern liturgical prayer, e.g., the commemoration of Mary at the Eucharist, the Roman adoption of the four classic Marian feasts; (b) Carolingian period: influence of the Akathist hymn, the miracle stories of Theophilus and Mary of Egypt, translated for Charlemagne by Paul the Deacon; (c) up to 1100: more borrowings, as Greek Assumption homilies, spread of the feast of the conception of Mary.

Many of the authors and trends summarized by Laurentin were subjects of distinct papers at Zagreb. G. Soell, S.D.B., spoke on Latin trends, Bede (d. ca. 735) to Anselm (d. 1109); Leo Scheffczyk on the hymn-writer of St. Gall, Notker the Stammerer (d. ca. 900); O. Perler on Swiss veneration of Mary in late antiquity; A. Hamman, O.F.M., on Latin homilies seventh to ninth century; T. Gallus S.J., on Paul the Deacon (d. p. 785); G. Geenen, O.P., on the Theophilus legend, known in Greek from the seventh, in Latin from the ninth, century. Donal Flanagan of Ireland gave a fascinating conference "Mary in the Poems of Blathmac," based on eighth-century Irish poems discovered only in 1960. Over the years Flanagan's studies and judgments have been a steady light in the Mariological field, back to the fifties and his doctorate on the patristic background of Scheeben's bridal-motherhood imagery. His commentary on chap. 8 of *Lumen gentium* is in K. McNamara, ed., *Vatican II: The Constitution on the Church* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1968). In the *Irish Theological Quarterly* 24 (1967) he wrote on "Eve in the Writings of Paschasius Radbertus" (d. 865).

At Zagreb W. J. Cole, S.M., gave a paper on "Theology in Paschasius Radbertus' Liturgy-Oriented Marian Works." At Santo Domingo, Cyrin Maus gave a paper "De modo quo P. Radbertus regulam 'de specie et genere' circa Mariam et Ecclesiam usurpavit," based on his S.T.D.

thesis defended in 1965 at the Antonianum and published in 1970, *A Phenomenology of Revelation: Paschasius Radbert's Way of Interpreting Scripture*, for which "Marian ecclesiotypality in Scripture" is a test case (Dayton: St. Leonard's College). He explains the Tyconian rule as used by Paschasius.

At Zagreb there were eight papers on Anselm of Canterbury; among others, by H. du Manoir, S.J., A. Krupa, O.F.M., of Poland, and Protestants Henri Chavannes and Peter Meinhold. In 1973, Penguin Classics issued Anglican Sister Benedicta Ward's delightfully translated and commented *The Prayers and Meditations of St. Anselm*, with the famous three prayers to St. Mary. She calls the third, closest to Anselm's own heart, "to ask for Mary's and for Christ's love," "the high-water mark of early medieval piety towards the Mother of Jesus." Cistercian Publications, which has moved from Spencer, Mass., to Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, is putting out a double series, each promising a hundred volumes: *Cistercian Fathers* and *Cistercian Studies*. Guerric of Igny, *Liturgical Sermons* 1 (1970), has a section in the introduction on our Lady.²⁰

At Zagreb, in a country one-eighth Moslem, a couple of papers were on Mary and Islam. E. Testa gave his opinion that the respect for Mary, holy Virgin, in the Koran came from ancient Jewish-Christian sects. Another paper was by Nilo Geagea, O.C.D., who published in 1973 his *Maria nel messaggio coranico* (Rome; also in *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* 23 [1972]). The September 1973 *Cahiers marials* (no. 89) was mainly on this theme, sensitive to the more than million Mohammedans living and working in France.

MARY AND ECUMENISM

In the English-speaking world the single most important endeavor affecting ecumenism and the Virgin Mary has been the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, founded in England in 1967 and already sponsor of three international conferences, 1971, 1973, and 1975, with another in planning for 1977. Disregarding prophets of doom, the differences between Christians in this sensitive issue were still far too great even after the Council, they said. H. Martin Gillett, one-time Anglican divinity student and long-time convert to Roman Catholicism, now a retired schoolmaster, talked it over with friends, clerical and lay, from different Christian communities, and with a board of directors set up the Society "to promote ecumenical devotion, and the study at

²⁰ Hilary Costello of Mount St. Bernard Abbey, England, one of the scholars involved in the Cistercian project, did a popular piece on Abbot John of Ford, of the thirteenth century, "The Mother of Jesus: Our Common Heritage," for the magazine put out by the Discalced Carmelites in London, *Mount Carmel* 24 (Winter 1973) 193-201.

various levels of the place of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church, under Christ." Every word in that statement of purpose was thrashed out to avoid offense and at the same time give priority to devotion, whatever form veneration of the Mother of Jesus might take for different members, with strong agreement on centering in Christ, for the sake of the Church. Membership was declared "open to all who are willing to give support to a Society with these declared aims, in the cause of Christian unity."²¹

Within a short time chapters had been set up and regular meetings arranged, usually with a lecture on a Marian topic, in London, Oxford, Birmingham, and Glastonbury. A series of pamphlets, reprinted local conferences, was begun under the title *Mother of Jesus*, and some twenty have appeared, by men and women, clergy and laity, Methodist, Anglican, Orthodox, Free Church, and Roman Catholic writers; the latest to appear is *A Woman in Israel*, by Rabbi Nicholas de Lange, lecturer in rabbinics at Cambridge.

The first international conference on "Mary in the Church" was held in the spring of 1971 in the London area. Cardinal Suenens gave the first paper, "The Holy Spirit and the Blessed Virgin Mary."²² Other speakers were Alan Richardson, P. Delhaye, J. McHugh, Canon John de Satgé, E. L. Mascall, Donal Flanagan, and F. J. Jelly, O.P., of Washington. Only the last two papers have been printed by the Society: Jelly's "The Place of the Blessed Virgin in a Secular Age," and Flanagan's "An Ecumenical Future for Roman Catholic Theology of Mary" (also appeared as "Mary in the Ecumenical Discussion," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 40 [1973] 227-49).

The second conference was on "Mary in the Bible," Birmingham, April 1973. Copresidents were Anglican Bishop Cyril K. Sansbury, then general secretary of the British Council of Churches, and Bishop Alan C. Clark of the Roman Catholic Ecumenical Commission. Some 150 attended, and eight papers were given. I had the honor of the first, "Systematic Theology of the Blessed Virgin in Relation to Exegesis," continuing ideas first offered at Santo Domingo in 1965. Sebastian Brock of Cambridge spoke on "Mary in the Syriac Tradition," with examples from past (Ephrem and Jacob of Sarug) and present (current Eastern liturgies). Duncan Derrett's "Mary in Midrash and Mary in Fact" applied to the Virgin Birth the law and custom of Gospel times, the field of his expertise. Laurentin's conference has since been printed by the

²¹ Applications for membership in the Society and requests for copies of publications can be directed both to Mr. H. Martin Gillett, 237 Fulham Palace Road, London NW3 5JT, and to Rev. Edward J. Yarnold, S.J., Champion Hall, Oxford OX1 1QS.

²² Cardinal Suenens writes about the Ecumenical Society in his new book *A New Pentecost?* (New York: Seabury, 1975), which also has a chapter on "The Holy Spirit and Mary."

Society, *Mary in the Communion of Saints*. Working from the Scriptures, Mary's ancient place in the *communicantes*, through the gradual obscuring of a sense of fellowship by placing Mary above the Church, through the the Reformation reaction, into the new balance of Vatican II, Laurentin stressed that we have moved from "privilege" back to "sharing," and this poses an ecumenical challenge and invitation. D. Flanagan's "Luther's Commentary on the Magnificat" has since appeared in *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 24 (1974). W. Borowsky of Germany gave "The Role of Mary in the Bible: The Viewpoint of a Lutheran." J. McHugh's "The Woman Clothed with the Sun (Apoc. 12)" can be found in his book *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*.

The third international conference was on "God and Mary: Place of the Mother of the Savior in God's Plan of Salvation." Thanks principally to Edward A. Yarnold, S.J., now cosecretary of the Society, the eight papers were in the Summer 1975 supplement to *The Way* (no. 25). A Belgian and two Dutch bishops attended, Cardinal Suenens sent a personal representative, as did the Archbishop of Canterbury. John Macquarrie spoke on "God and the Feminine." Alasdair Heron of Edinburgh, who has been on the faculty of the Irish School of Ecumenics, gave a Calvinist viewpoint in his "Predestination and Mary," which he described as another way of stating the conference theme "God and Mary." We mentioned earlier Bishop Clark's paper on *virginitas in partu*, and earlier also R. Mackenzie's paper on the New Eve. Yarnold spoke on "The Grace of Christ in Mary" and contributed a short but pointed introduction to the supplement of *The Way*.

Jack Dominian, Catholic psychiatrist, spoke about the formative influence of his home and mother on Jesus' development, "The Relationship between Christ and Mary." Mary's trust gave her Son the means of trusting himself and reaching others as well. Jesus gave no evidence of a possessive mother; quite the contrary. Nor did the Saviour show any shyness as an adult with respect to the bodily and the sexual; the Gospels depict him in a relaxed relationship with women of all walks of life. Marie E. Isaacs, Baptist minister, spoke on "Mary in the Lucan Infancy Narrative." John McHugh had the final paper, "On True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary." In the discussion at the end, Marcus Ward said when McHugh concluded his paper with a quotation from Dante, "I was almost there—I felt like standing up and shouting out the Magnificat, saying 'Praised be God,' and going home!" He pleaded for common study of Mary's role in the communion of saints as cardinal to ecumenism.

Conferences given to the Society have appeared in various other publications, e.g., G. Wainwright, "Mary in Relation to the Doctrinal and Spiritual Emphases of Methodism," in *One in Christ* 11 (1975) 121-44. The English clergyman John C. de Satgé, who describes himself

as of the Evangelical wing of the Anglican Church, has taken an active part in the Ecumenical Society, and gave one of its first printed conferences, in November 1967, "Mary in the Church: Some Matters for Ecumenical Study," in no. 1 of the Society series *Mother of Jesus*. He has a full-length book on our Lady soon to appear, by the S.P.C.K. in England, likely by Consortium Press (Washington, D.C., and Gaithersburg, Md.) in this country.

Conversations between Catholics and other church bodies, Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, etc., have not yet taken up directly the issue of the Virgin Mary. Within the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue, which is currently concerned with papal infallibility, I presented a paper in September 1975 on the Marian dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption as instances of exercise of papal infallibility, but my reaction was that more basic considerations are required in dialogue on this hypersensitive issue: I mean the *theotokos* and Mary's place in the communion of saints. However, the topic as assigned for the consultation did offer scope for such factors as the *sensus fidelium* and the "hierarchy of truths" (Decree on Ecumenism, no. 11).²³

The Mariological Society of America took up Mary and ecumenism in 1964 (*Marian Studies* 15); one paper was by T. O'Meara, O.P., "Marian Theology and the Contemporary Problem of Myth," a topic still in need of serious study.²⁴ Since 1964 the Mariological Society has had many papers of ecumenical interest, with speakers from other traditions, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Orthodox. A. C. Piepkorn spoke in 1967 (*MS* 18) on "Mary's Place within the People of God according to Non-Roman Catholics," again in 1973 (*MS* 24) on Lutheran views on the Virgin Birth. A. C. Cochrane (Presbyterian) spoke in 1968 (*MS* 19) on "The Theological Basis of Liturgical Devotion to Mary Re-examined," a comparison of Rahner and Barth. Responding to Cochrane was D. K. Gorrell of the United Theological Seminary, Dayton. A. Schmemmann, Orthodox, spoke at Dayton in 1968 (*MS* 19) and again at San Antonio in 1972 (*MS* 23). Herbert W. Richardson (Presbyterian) spoke at St. Louis in 1973 (*MS* 24) on the Virgin Birth. The discussions after both Richardson's and Piepkorn's papers are recorded in *Marian Studies* of that year; B. de

²³ See my articles "The Mary-Church Analogy in the Ecumenical Dialogue: Agreements and Disagreements," *Acta congressus internationalis de theologia concilii Vaticani II* (Vatican, 1968), given at Rome, September 1966; "The Mother of Jesus in the Communion of Saints—Challenge to the Churches," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 21 (1966) 249–65.

²⁴ T. O'Meara's *Mary in Protestant and Catholic Theology* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966) went to press sometime during the Council, well informed on Protestant difficulties; O'Meara also wrote the introduction for the new printing of the Heiko A. Oberman lecture first given at the University of Notre Dame, 1964, as the Facet paperback *The Virgin Mary in Evangelical Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

Margerie led the discussion for Piepkorn, P. Donnelly, S.J., for Richardson. W. J. Cole, S.M., gave a lengthy paper "Was Luther a Marian Devotee?" in New York City, 1970 (MS 21). Ross Mackenzie spoke on "Mariology as an Ecumenical Problem" for the Atlanta convention, 1975 (MS 26). Scottish-born, raised a Presbyterian, Mackenzie speaks from the Calvinist tradition, though with great sympathy also for Anglicanism; he teaches at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

Hierarchy of Truths

Since the 1964 Decree on Ecumenism, a number of authors, though far fewer than the importance and urgency of the topic would seem to warrant, have dealt with the hierarchy of truths and its ecumenical implications for teachings about Mary, especially the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. Follow-up documents to *Redintegratio unitatis* refer to the hierarchy of truths also: April 16, 1970 ("order based on degree"); *Mysterium ecclesiae*, June 24, 1973; "Reflections and Suggestions on the Ecumenical Dialogue," September 1970. H. Muehlen was one of the first to consider it in two 1966 articles: "Neuorientierung und Krise der Mariologie in den Aussagen des Vaticanum II," *Catholica* 20 (1966) 19-53; "Die Lehre des Vaticanum II über die 'hierarchia veritatum' und ihre Bedeutung für den ökumenischen Dialog," *Theologie und Glaube* 56 (1966) 303-35.

Ulrich Valeske's *Hierarchia veritatum: Theologiegeschichtliche Hintergründe und mögliche Konsequenzen eines Hinweises im Ökumenismusdekret des II. Vatikanischen Konzils zum zwischenkirchlichen Gespräch* (Munich: Claudius Verlag, 1968) goes into the matter from a Protestant standpoint, touching also Marian dogmas. Y. Congar, O.P., has dealt with the underlying "order of truths" in many writings, and does so again in "On the 'Hierarchia veritatum,'" in D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, ed., *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (Rome: Oriental Inst., 1973). Another French Dominican, J. M. R. Tillard, addressed himself to the *sensus fidelium* for the Anglican-Roman Catholic international commission (in *One in Christ* 11 [1975] 2-29) and comments as follows: "The Pope's intervention comes second, and is conditioned by the *lived* content of ecclesial faith." He is writing of the Assumption. "One may even wonder whether, when it is a question of 'defined' dogmatic points, a subsequent declaration on the same level of hierarchical authority might not place in a new and less important light what another age had expressed according to its own categories. Dogmatic progress does not primarily mean addition of *truths*, but the clarification of *the* truth. This would hold good particularly for definitions based principally on the *sensus fidelium*."

Oscar Cullmann's comment on the Council's reference to hierarchy of truths is often quoted: "the most revolutionary to be found, not only in the schema *de oecumenismo*, but in any of the schemas. . . . In accordance with this text, it will be possible to place dogmas concerning the primacy of Peter or the ascension of Mary (without denying them of course) on a different plane from dogmas concerning Christ and the Trinity . . . a point of departure for ecumenical developments which justify every hope" ("Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," *Ecumenical Review* 17 [1965] 93-95).²⁵

A recent discussion of Mary and the hierarchy of truths took place in January 1976 at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Mariological Society of America, in Washington, D.C., when F. M. Jelly, O.P., spoke on "Marian Dogmas within Vatican II's Hierarchy of Truths," with Avery Dulles, S.J., as discussion leader.²⁶ In an address of Dec. 6, 1974, Dulles proposed that the anathemas associated with the definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption be removed as a gesture of ecumenical good will, appealing to the hierarchy of truths.²⁷ Jelly brought out the complex character of the hierarchy of truths, a polyvalent model, for there are many ways in which to relate secondary truths to the center who is Christ. The secondary derive from the central truth(s) through life and liturgy as well as through faith-intelligence, in a living tradition transcending human laws of logic. D. Dietz, O.M.I., in "Hierarchy of Marian Truths," brought out that doctrines concerning the Virgin Mary have their own interrelationship, and above all must be linked to the biblical theology of Mary as the faithful woman. In the discussion Dulles noted that the hierarchy of truths is a double-edged sword. If it stresses what Catholics hold in common with other Christians, it also underscores Catholic appreciation of the bond between primary and secondary truths, labels not always easy to affix.

Several additional books and articles deserve special mention. *Maria in der evangelischen Theologie der Gegenwart* by Albert Brandenburg (Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1965) is the result of ten years of dialogue, especially with Lutherans. There are chapters on Vatican II, Reformation basic principles as background to Protestant criticism of

²⁵ And O. Cullmann, *Vatican Council II: The New Direction*, arranged by J. D. Hester (New York: Harper & Row, 1968). Useful to consult is the exchange between E. J. Yarnold, "Marian Dogmas and Reunion," *Month*, June 1971, pp. 177-79, and B. de Margerie, "L'Immaculée Conception et l'Assomption dans l'unité de l'église," *Esprit et vie*, July 26, 1973, pp. 465-74, on hierarchy of truths. Also A. Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971) pp. 162-64, and G. Tavard, "Hierarchia veritatum," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 32 (1971) 278-89.

²⁶ To appear in *Marian Studies* 27 (1976).

²⁷ "A Proposal to Lift Anathemas," *Origins* (N.C. Documentary Service), Dec. 26, 1974, pp. 417-21.

Catholic Mariology, current Evangelical positions, and possibilities of dialogue. A study on Luther that appeared subsequently was Hans Duefel (Lutheran), *Luthers Stellung zur Marienverehrung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968); in spite of the title, much more doctrine than cult. Brandenburg quotes G. Ebeling: "Mary is the mystical personification of the Church which understands itself as the mediatrix of all graces. . . ." Ebeling made this point in a 1950 article "The Mariological Dogma," in his collection *The Word of God and Tradition: Historical Studies Interpreting the Divisions of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968). Interestingly Walter Ong, S.J., found it worth while to reprint an article from the same time in reaction to Protestant criticism of the definition of the Assumption, "The Lady and the Issue," in *In the Human Grain* (New York: Macmillan, 1966). Ong and Ebeling note the changed ecumenical climate since 1950, but both feel their points are still valid. Brandenburg is guardedly hopeful, but cautions against easy answers. He counsels Catholics to hold fast to *theotokos*, regarding Ephesus-Chalcedon (with Rahner) as a necessary agreed-upon starting point, yet to purge out any suspicion of Monophysitism, making room for a mediatrix at the expense of the Mediator's full humanity. Further, we need to develop a theology of Mary and the Holy Spirit.

Hungarian-born Presbyterian Stephen Benko, already known for *The Meaning of Sanctorum communio* (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1964), wrote *Protestants, Catholics, and Mary* in 1968 (Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson). He contributed to *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 24 (1974) a comment on Marian mediation, and the article "An Intellectual History of Changing Protestant Attitudes towards Mariology between 1950 and 1967." The 1968 book contrasts Catholic with Reformed views. Far more than the veneration of the Mother of Jesus is at stake; three key issues are Scripture and tradition, Christology and the Incarnation, justification and grace. Benko's position is much like Berkouwer's: "in the debate on Mariology the issue is God's grace." Two chapters outline a Protestant view: chap. 6, "Mary as the Figure of the Church," and chap. 8, "A New Principle of Mariology: The Kenotic Motif," a fascinating, enriching essay which appeared previously in 1967 in a Cullmann *Festschrift*.

In 1973 Herder of Germany published in *Quaestiones disputatae* Klaus Riesenhuber's *Maria im theologischen Verständnis von Karl Barth und Karl Rahner*.²⁸ Current theology is less centered on the person of Mary than on the doctrine of grace; she is the most radical instance of man's relationship to God. The author considers Barth's ideas and Rahner's,

²⁸ See also K. Barth, *Ad limina apostolorum* (Richmond, 1968), containing "A Letter about Mariology"; and L. Gordon Tait, "Karl Barth and the Virgin Mary," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 4 (1967) 406-25.

they compares them. From the twenties Barth gave increasing attention to *natus ex Maria virgine* and continued to interest himself in Mary, always from a strictly Christological viewpoint. As his final "Letter about Mariology" shows, his criticism of Catholic views remained strong, though he changed his judgment from *widerchristliche Irrlehre* to simply *zu viel*. His defense of Jesus' virginal conception is well known: God, the one grace-giver and sovereign Saviour, fills positively the emptiness of Mary. Later volumes of *Church Dogmatics* admit more value to Mary's free and obedient consent, although as early as 1934 he had written that Mary who conceives and bears is *our* part in the wonder of Christmas.

Riesenhuber had access to Rahner's unpublished manuscript written when the Assumption was defined, and uses this and forty other Rahner titles to weave together a Rahnerian Mariology in which the thread is the biblical principle that Mary is most perfectly redeemed. Catholic Mariology of the Rahner kind and Barth's outlook are not in disagreement, at least on the level of basic truth. The accents can remain different (are we back to the hierarchy of truths, a matter he does not explore as such?), yet a Protestant stress on Mary's "pure-service" function does not exclude a Catholic view of Mary's free deed under the power of grace.

In the United States Alexander Schmemmann, John Meyendorff, and other Orthodox experts have taken part in conferences and dialogues about our Lady, through the Mariological Society and at such places as the Dayton Marian Library and the Catholic University of America. For the thirtieth anniversary of the seminary at Tuckahoe, N.Y., *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 13 (1969) 53-75 printed "The Great Sign of the Heavenly Kingdom and Its Advent in Strength" by Alexis Kniazeff, rector at St. Sergius, Paris.²⁹ He seeks to define "the central biblical and dogmatic premises of the unique character of the veneration of the Mother of God by the Orthodox Church and the clarification of the significance of its several facets." The development is liturgical. *Theotokos* of Ephesus is the starting point; then comes Mary's holiness as the Church glorifies it. The Blessed Virgin, full of grace, is "the one in whom God, the creator of all existence, sees the perfection of all his works." "Manifesting in herself the whole mystery of Christian existence, she by the same fact manifests in herself the whole mystery of the Church."

Has ecumenical concern affected the international Mariological congresses? The answer is a modest yes. At Santo Domingo, 1965, F. W.

²⁹ Kniazeff had given a similar paper to the French Society of Marian Studies in 1962; that Society devoted three annual meetings to Mary and ecumenism: *Etudes mariales* 18 (1962), 19 (1963), 20 (1964); see review in *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 26 (1965) 459-64.

Kuenneth was among the speakers: "Maria im Glaubenszeugnis der Kirche Evangelisch-lutherischer Reformation" (*Acta 6: De Beata Virgine Maria et hodierno moto oecumenico*). At Lisbon, 1967, there was a dialogue, reported in the *Acta*, with three Lutherans, P. Meinhold, Kuenneth, and W. Borowsky, all of whom also gave papers at the congress, Frère Laurent from Taizé, and Catholics F. Mussner, P. Ortiz de Urbina, G. Soell, Laurentin, and Miguens. The interchange was frank and fruitful. At Zagreb, 1971, the panel was broadened to include still others. From England came E. L. Mascall and J. Neville Ward. Both spoke at the meeting, Mascall on "The Place of Mariology in Christian Theology: An Anglican Approach," Ward on "Mary and the Prayer of Christians." In 1971 Ward published in England a book that has gone round the world: *Five for Sorrow, Ten for Joy: A Consideration of the Rosary* (Image paperback; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974).

At the congress in Rome, May 1975, there was another ecumenical gathering, again with equal numbers of Catholics and participants from other churches; a set of "unofficial" resolutions resulted that have been circulated fairly widely, e.g., in the *1976 Catholic Almanac*. As a member of the Roman congress and observer of the ecumenical "round table," I rejoice at any attempt to face and overcome our differences, but feel that much more preparation is required even for an effective "informal" meeting, and that it is less important to achieve consensus statements than to understand each other's views, coming to grips with surprisingly common semantic difficulties and really seeing what the other church holds about the Virgin Mary; the discovery can be joyful as well as painful.

John Macquarrie gave some pages to the Virgin Mary in his well-known *Principles of Christian Theology* (New York: Macmillan, 1966) on Mary, "blessed" woman of the Gospels, and on the ecumenical merit of Pope Paul's title "Mother of the Church." The title of Macquarrie's new book, *Christian Unity and Christian Diversity* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), is a sort of play on "Catholic substance and Protestant principle." He puts Mariology among five *quaestiones disputatae* (the others are ministry, Eucharist, marriage, and authority). He concentrates on the Immaculate Conception: Does this belong to the Catholic substance, and may it even be implicitly acknowledged already by those who find the particular formulation of 1854 unfortunate? Macquarrie thinks that more personal categories may help. He puts aside the concept of sin as "stain," in favor of "estrangement," with original sin "that corporate alienation of the whole race from God that distorts human society." The West has been very conscious of original sin; why not speak rather of original righteousness? "And could we say that, in the history of

his people Israel, God was, so to speak, nursing that spark of righteousness that it might gain strength and burn more brightly and clearly? And could we say that with Mary the spark bursts into flame? She is the gathering up of the unscathed righteousness and the unquenched grace—she is ‘full of grace.’”

ARCHETYPE OF THE CHURCH

By 1965 the understanding of Mary as model of the Church was no longer a novelty. The Council had come out clearly for this approach, from the brief statement in the Constitution on the Liturgy (no. 103, “most excellent fruit of the redemption . . . spotless model to the Church”), through chap. 8 of *Lumen gentium*, into still other documents. The careful studies that had been done on the Mary-Church analogy in the years after World War II were influential, and Mariology had taken a new direction, what Laurentin has called a shift from “privilege” to “sharing,” rediscovering what the Fathers had expressed and what belongs to the Marian symbolism of the Scriptures.

H. M. Koester, S.A.C., of Germany (*Die Magd des Herrn*; 1st ed., 1947; 2nd, 1954; *Unus Mediator*, 1950) has continued actively in theology: German Mariological Society, international congresses, teaching (e.g., summer session 1967 at the University of Dayton). He contributed the summary article “Mariologie,” to *Bilan de la theologie du XXe siècle*, ed. R. Vander Gucht and H. Vorgrimler (Paris: Casterman, 1970; also a German edition by Herder in Freiburg) Vol. 2, 351–70. Otto Semmelroth, S.J., of Germany (*Urbild der Kirche*; 1st ed., 1950; 2nd, 1954; tr. from the 1st ed., *Mary, Archetype of the Church*, 1963) did the commentary on LG 7 and 8 for Vol. 1 of the Vorgrimler-edited *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967).

Alois Müller of Switzerland (*Ecclesia-Maria: Die Einheit Marias und der Kirche*; 1st ed., 1951; 2nd, 1955) wrote the article “Contemporary Mariology” for J. Feiner *et al.*, ed., *Theology Today: Renewal in Dogma* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965; from the German, first issued 1957), with a section on “Mary and the Church.” According to Laurentin, Müller is now devoting himself to pastoral work, so that his excellent article for the series *Mysterium salutis* may be his last in Mariology: “Marias Stellung und Mitwirkung im Christuserignis,” in *Mysterium salutis* 3/2: *Das Christuserignis* (2nd half-volume) edited by J. Feiner and M. Loehrer (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1969) 393–510, and in French, “Place et coopération de Marie dans l’événement Jésus-Christ” (Paris: Cerf, 1972, Vol. 13).

I list a few further essays on the Mary-Church analogy. At Santo Domingo, 1965, R. Kugelman, C.P., spoke briefly on “The Hebrew

Concept of Corporate Personality and Mary the Type of the Church" (in *Maria in SS. Scriptura* 6). In the magazine he edits, *Diakonia*, from the Fordham John XXIII Centre for Eastern Christian Studies, G. A. Maloney, S.J., had the article "Mary and the Church as Seen by the Early Fathers" (Vol. 9, 1974, 1st quarter). He recommends the patristic perspective as "the best rapprochement with the Orthodox and Protestants who cannot understand our principle of secondary instrumentality in effecting salvation." His editorial "A New but Ancient Mariology," in *Diakonia* 8 (1973) 303-5, is similar.

Comments inspired by the Council include the volume edited by B. Lambert, *La nouvelle image de l'église: Bilan du Concile* (Paris: Mame, 1967), to which Abbot (now Bishop) Butler contributed "Marie, figure de l'église." J. M. R. Tillard, O.P., wrote on "The Church in Recreated Man," urging theology to go beyond the Council in exploring the implications of Mary's femininity and the Church's woman-role, towards a Christian anthropology of woman.

Herbert W. Richardson, formerly of Harvard and now at St. Michael's, Toronto, has been fascinated by the mystery of Mary. *Toward an American Theology* (New York, 1967) has a sympathetic reading of *theotokos* in Ephesus-Chalcedon, also in II Constantinople, as the one term in Christian history which adequately expressed the truth that God became man; he is also convinced that the Virgin Birth is the only non-Hellenistic explanation of the Incarnation. In a student publication from Harvard, *The Current* 5 (Spring 1965) 48-61 (*Theology Digest* 14 [Spring 1966] 60 has a summary), Richardson wrote of "Mother of the Church," the title Pope Paul announced Nov. 21, 1974. As he sees it, the Holy Father thereby emphasized Mary as archetype of the Church, and he compares this with the more Petrine approach of the Council itself.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There are many aspects of the Marian mystery not taken up in this survey, some especially suitable for interdisciplinary study. John A. Saliba, S.J., wrote for *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 36 (1975) 428-54 on "The Virgin-Birth Debate in Anthropological Literature: A Critical Assessment." Saliba has a study soon to appear about Mircea Eliade. Such investigations as Eliade's, Mary Douglas' in England, and Saliba's point to a further dimension of the Virgin Mother in conjunction with her Son the Saviour.³⁰

The December 1975 issue of *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* (Vol. 36, no. 4) was all on "Woman: New Dimensions," signpost to another important im-

³⁰G. Gualerni, *Maria espressione della società e della Chiesa: Il compito dell'uomo e del cristiano in una lettera mariologica della storia della salvezza* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 1972): controversial work, asks sharp questions.

mense area where the Virgin Mary belongs, as was illustrated by references in two of the articles: one by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (“myth of Mary sanctions a double dichotomy in the self-understanding of Catholic women”), the other by R. E. Brown on women in the fourth Gospel, with Mary’s discipleship part of Cana and Calvary. R. Laurentin did an earlier article “Marie et l’anthropologie chrétienne de la femme” for *Nouvelle revue théologique* 89 (1967) 485–515.

In the world of myth and symbol Christian iconography remains a neglected *locus theologicus*. Some of the great lexicons of Christian art appearing especially in Germany may open up artistic treasures about our Lady, great symbol of the Church, especially the icons of the vast East, where the bond between art and liturgical prayer has been so intimate. V. Lossky and P. Evdokimov are among those who put their Western fellow-Christians in debt by their studies on the theology of the icons and the understanding of Mary contained therein: L. Ouspensky and V. Lossky, *The Meaning of Icons* (Boston Book and Art Shop, 1969); Paul Evdokimov, *L’art de l’icône: Théologie de la beauté* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1972).

Biblically and beyond, the relationship between Mary and the Holy Spirit needs to be explored. Some beginning has been made here, especially by the French Society of Marian Studies, as mentioned above, but that is only a first break-through. H. Mühlen has gone into this matter as a systematic theologian in many writings of the past decade, e.g., in *Una mystica persona: Die Kirche als das Mysterium der Identität des Heiligen Geistes in Christus und den Christen: Eine Person in vielen Personen* (Paderborn, 1967).

⁵ This survey did not take up questions of cult and devotion except for their doctrinal and historical underpinnings, which are being examined in the current series of international Mariological congresses, 1967 to the present. The place of Mary in the public prayer of the Church, with an appeal to the many liturgies of the Christian East, and the whole wide range of popular devotions all require study. Such investigations must be historically accurate, culturally sensitive, theologically informed. Along with his other researches, Laurentin has been official historian for Lourdes and Pontmain (1871), and the French Society met at Pontmain, September 1971, for its annual meeting, on the subject *Vraies et fausses apparitions dans l’église* (*Etudes mariales* 28 [1971]). J. Alonso, C.M.F., Spanish editor of *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, is doing a similar investigation on Fatima (1917 and following).

A good index of the theological concerns of the late seventies about the Blessed Virgin Mary is the double-number of the quarterly journal of the Johann-Adam-Möhler-Institut of Germany, *Catholica* 29 (1975: 2–3). The issue has as theme “Maria in Geheimnis der Kirche: Bild der neuen

Frau. Kult und Frömmigkeit—Lehre—Ökumene,” and is in memory of Cardinal Jaeger, whose last article was on Mary and ecumenism. The concern is pastoral, liturgical, catechetical, and ecumenical, with a skillful use of Council documents but even more of Pope Paul’s *Marialis cultus* of early 1974.

Coeditors of the magazine are Albert Brandenburg and Heribert Mühlen; both have articles, Brandenburg on present-day Mariology, “Lehrschreiben Papst Paul VI: Maria und Kirche—Krise des Reformatorischen,” Mühlen on “Der Heilige Geist und Maria,” a plea for a new charismatic orientation in Marian devotion. Leo Scheffczyk writes of Mary as “manifestation of the Trinitarian self-giving of God.” On Hans Küng’s recent *Christ sein*, Scheffczyk has reservations, shared here by Brandenburg and R. Padberg (“Remarks on Preaching about Mary”): he claims Küng is renewing the long-answered Nestorian objections to *theotokos*. Bishop Scheele writes on “Mary in the Community and History of Israel”; H. Zimmermann gives a short exegetical study on Lk 11:27, a macarism fulfilled in the Magnificat; P. Schmidt reflects on the Magnificat. Bishop Graber’s paper from Rome, May 1975, is here: “Maria und Petrus.” Bishop Degenhardt summarizes Catholic teaching on Jesus’ virginal conception. J. Madey describes Syrian Church (non-Chalcedonian) daily prayers to Mary in the liturgy.

Catholic University of America

EAMON R. CARROLL, O.CARM.