


1-26-1959

The Fundamental Principle of Mariology in Scholastic Theology

Edward D. O'Connor

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies

 Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Connor, Edward D. (1959) "The Fundamental Principle of Mariology in Scholastic Theology," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 10, Article 9, Pages 69-103.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol10/iss1/9

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF MARIOLOGY IN SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY

THE search for principles in the light of which the doctrines of Faith can be viewed with a kind of scientific understanding is characteristic of scholastic theology. In patristic literature there was, of course, sporadic recourse to such principles, but only in scholasticism are they systematically employed in the construction of scientific treatises. For the question of the fundamental principle of Mariology, therefore, the doctrine of the scholastics will naturally have a special interest. The present paper is a survey of the first 180 years of scholastic theology with regard to this question.¹

We will confine attention (with few exceptions) to scholastic literature in the strictest sense: in other words, to the theological *Summae* and Books of Sentences, plus the commentaries on them. These bold efforts to organize the whole of Christian Doctrine into a rational synthesis were the characteristic fruit of mediaeval scholasticism. The sermons and poetry of the period, as well as the Scriptural commentaries, will not be treated because they have not that same concern

¹ An exhaustive study of this period is not yet feasible, because many of the texts remain unpublished. We have been obliged to confine our study, with few exceptions, to printed sources; hence it contains regrettable lacunae, especially for the early years of the thirteenth century, and the critical period between Hugh of St. Cher's Commentary on the Sentences (ca. 1232) and John of La Rochelle's treatise, *De sanctificatione Beatae Virginis* (prior to his death in 1245). However, the works available seem to indicate adequately the main lines of development during this period, and their homogeneity suggests that nothing of radical importance is to be expected from the works still to be edited. (Cf. the last paragraph preceding part III of this article.)

70 *Mariology Principles in Scholastic Theology*

for principles which lends interest to the properly theological works.²

The period to be treated has a twofold interest. On the one hand, it extends from the beginning of scholasticism, with St. Anselm Canterbury (+1109), to its finest achievement, in St. Thomas Aquinas (+1274). (We do not stop there as though nothing that followed were important, but because John Duns Scotus is better seen as the beginning of a new era than as the end of the preceding.³ On the other hand, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries belong to one of the most creative epochs in western Mariology. The Fathers of the Church did not bequeath to the scholastics a body of Mariological doctrine comparable to that on the Trinity, or the Hypostatic Union, or grace, for example. Not until well into the Middle Ages did western devotion to the Mother of God take on the warmth and enthusiasm that led, in turn, to a full exploration of the Marian mystery, which found expression in the sermons of St. Bernard and the *Mariales* of the thirteenth century. During our period, the doctrines of the As-

² Isolated *quaestiones* and fragments will also, as a rule, be disregarded. Comparatively few of them have been published; and the very fact that they are not integrated into a general synthesis makes them less instructive regarding fundamental principles, which are called forth particularly by the demands of a synthesis. The works of St. Anselm are an important exception, as will be explained below.

³ In his *De regula mariologica Joannis Duns Scoti*, in *ED* 9 (1956) 110-133, Father C. Balić, O.F.M., has made an extensive study of Scotus' famous principle ". . . si auctoritati Ecclesiae vel auctoritati Scripturae non repugnet, videtur probabile quod excellentius est attribuere Mariae" (*Ordinatio*, lib. 3, dist. 3, q. 1; critical ed. by C. Balić, *J. Duns Scoti theologiae marianae elementa* [Sibenici, 1933] 31) in relation to its predecessors, particularly William of Ware's dictum, "Si debeam deficere, cum non sim certus de altera parte, magis volo deficere per superabundantiam, dando Mariae aliquam praerogativam, quam per defectum diminuendo vel subtrahendo ab ea aliquam praerogativam quam habuit" (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, q. 1). A. Emmen, O.F.M., in his article *Einführung in die Mariologie der Oxforder Franziskanerschule*, in *FzS* 39 (1967) 99-217, has situated Scotus' principle in a fuller historical context.

sumption, the Immaculate Conception, the Mediation of grace, and the Coredemption were in various stages of coming into general acceptance.

But it was in devotional rather than theological literature that these doctrines were first developed. This is, of course, a normal order, and will not surprise anyone who is acquainted with the history of doctrine. However, one may not be prepared for the extreme meagerness of the theological treatment of the Blessed Virgin during our period. Many *Summae* of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries omit all mention of her, and none of them say very much about her. Not until the *Summa* of St. Thomas do we find what may reasonably be called a treatise of Mariology; and even it is quite meager in comparison with the sermons of the same epoch (including St. Thomas' own sermon on the *Ave Maria*). Certain beliefs that were already common stock in the sermons were apparently not yet sufficiently assured or rationally analyzed so as to be accessible to the theological reasoning of the scholastics.

The question of the fundamental principle of Mariology is itself not discussed by any of the authors of our period. The most we can find in them is the occasional formulation of a principle that may be considered fundamental; and in many cases, we can only surmise from the general shape and inspiration of the Mariology in question what sort of principles are functioning beneath it. Furthermore, all of our authors are affected by a limitation which restricts the scope of their inquiry and so prevents them from producing a principle that would be adequate in terms of modern Mariology: they ignore almost totally (at least in their theological works) ⁴ everything pertaining to the "spiritual maternity" of the Blessed Virgin—that is to say, such doctrines as the mediation of grace and the Coredemption. Consequently, such principles as they formu-

⁴ St. Bonaventure is the one exception, and he only slightly, as will be explained below, note 50.

late have reference only to the personal graces and privileges of the Mother of God.

The epoch we are treating divides quite naturally into three periods. The first, covering the last decade of the eleventh century and the first four of the twelfth, is dominated by the great names of Anselm and Bernard. The second period is a hundred years of comparatively minor figures, from the anonymous *Summa Sententiarum* (ca. 1138) down through Hugh of St. Cher's *Commentary on the Sentences* (ca. 1232).⁵ The third period is that of the great thirteenth century masters, beginning with John of La Rochelle's treatise on the Sanctification of the Blessed Virgin (sometime before 1245) and ending with the *Tertia Pars* of St. Thomas' *Summa* (ca. 1273).

I

THE PIONEER PERIOD

(1095 - 1138)

The first period is that of the earliest crude *Summae* and Books of Sentences, inspired by Anselm of Laon (+1117) and William of Champeaux (+1121). So far as can be judged from the few of these works that survive, and from their imitations in subsequent decades, most of them did not treat Mary at all.⁶ When they do, it is only incidentally to

⁵ In dating works, we will follow the Chronological Table given by Dom O. Lottin at the end of tome IV/3 of his *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (Gembloux-Louvain, 1954), for all the works that he treats.

⁶ Abaelard must be classified among those authors who do not treat of Mary in their theology. We do not say this on the basis of his *Theologia "Scholarium"* (formerly known as the *Introductio ad theologiam*; PL 178, 979-1114; cf. V. Cousin, *Petri Abaelardi Opera*, 2 [Paris, 1849] 1-149), his *Theologia "Summi Boni"* (formerly: *Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina*; edited by H. Ostlender in *BGPTM* 35, fasc. 2/3 [Münster i. W., 1939]), or his *Theologia Christiana* (PL 178, 1123-1330). In these works, which—so far at least as they have survived—treat only of the Godhead, there was no reason to speak of Mary. But Abaelard's theology of the Incarnation can be

the Incarnation,⁷ and in connection with two topics: the Virgin Birth and the problem of the sinlessness of Christ's human nature. The latter was a problem, because the human nature assumed by Christ was descended from Adam, yet had not

judged from the works of two of his disciples: the *Sententiae Hermanni* (ca. 1138; formerly known as the *Epitome theologiae christianae*; PL 178, 1685-1758) and the *Sententiae parisienses* (1139-1140; edited by A. Landgraf in SSL 14 [1934], *Écrits théologiques de l'école d'Abélard*). The latter work is considered by its editor to be a student's notes on Abaelard's lectures (p. xxxix). Neither of these works treat the Blessed Virgin.

It is true that there are several Mariological questions in Abaelard's *Sic et Non* (PL 178, 1339-1610). This work, however, contains no doctrine of the master, but only arguments pro and con doctrines disputed by earlier writers.

Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis fidei christianae* (1135-1140) speaks lengthily of the Virgin Birth (PL 176, 391-393), but strangely avoids even the mention of her name in treating the important problem of Christ's sinlessness (*ibid.* col. 381-383). Other twelfth century works, the scope of which would lead us to anticipate some treatment of Our Lady, but which do not in fact devote any question to her, are: *Sententiae atrabatenses* (ca. 1130), O. Lottin ed., RTAM 10 (1938) 205-224, 344-357. *Sententiae berlinenses* (date unknown; listed by Lottin immediately after the preceding work). Stegmüller ed., RTAM 11 (1939) 39-61. Herman, *Epitome theologiae christianae* (ca. 1138; see above, under Abaelard). *Sententiae parisienses* (ca. 1139-1140; see above, under Abaelard). *Sententiae florianenses* (after 1138). Ostlender ed., *Florilegium Patristicum* 19 (Bonn, 1929). *Quaestiones Varsovienses trinitarie et christologice* (second half of twelfth century). Ed. Stegmüller in ST 122 (Vatican City, 1946) 282-310. (This is not a unified work; nevertheless, it contains a considerable number of Christological questions, and even one on the thesis, "Caro Christi corrupta fuit" [#23, p. 389], in which no reference is made to Mary.) John of Cornwall, *Apologia de Verbo Incarnato* (PL 177).

There are a number of other *summae* and collections of sentences from the twelfth century in which Mary is not treated, but in which, by reason of the limits of their scope, such a treatment would hardly be expected. Cf. the list of early sentences collections by F. Stegmüller in RTAM 11 (1939) 34-35.

For some early thirteenth-century works which also omit any Mariological treatises, see the remarks concluding part II of the present study.

⁷ Not uncommonly, a question is also raised about the marriage of Mary and Joseph in the treatise on the sacrament of Matrimony. But this question can scarcely be considered Mariological, since Our Lady's vow of virginity and marriage here serve only as test cases to illustrate the nature of the sacrament.

inherited original sin as had all of Adam's other descendants. Mary was involved in these questions only because she was the Virgin who had given Christ birth, and because she was the representative of sinful humanity from whom Christ's flesh had been derived in all sinlessness.

The most significant treatment of these questions is also the earliest: that by St. Anselm of Canterbury during the last decade of the eleventh century.⁸ In his *Cur Deus homo* (1094-1098)⁹ and *De conceptu virginali* (1099-1100),¹⁰ he gave two quite different answers to them. His definitive position¹¹ is that each question answers the other; that is to say, that it was the Virgin Birth (or, more precisely, virginal conception) that preserved Christ's human nature from original sin. But no properly Mariological principle is involved in the entire discussion. Anselm bases his argument solely on general principles about the transmission of original sin and the economy of the Redemption. The same seems to be true of all the other authors who treat these questions during the twelfth century, whether or not their solutions agree with Anselm's.¹²

After stating his solution to the problem of Christ's sin-

⁸ At first sight, Anselm would not seem to deserve treatment in an essay on the scholastic syntheses of the twelfth century, since he wrote no *summa* or Book of Sentences. However, the search for universal principles and the effort to place each question in its ultimate perspective which animate Anselm's work make each of his "monographs" a kind of virtual *summa*. Moreover, Anselm deals with precisely the same Mariological questions as would be treated by the *summae* and Books of Sentences of the following decades.

⁹ PL 158. Critical edition by F. S. Schmitt, O.S.B., in *S. Anselmi . . . Opera Omnia*, 2 (Rome, 1940). Another edition by the same editor in *Florilegium patristicum* (Bonn, 1929). See Liber II, c. viii and xvi.

¹⁰ PL 158. Critical edition by F. S. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi . . . Opera Omnia*, 2 (Rome, 1940). See c. viii, xi-xxi.

¹¹ St. Anselm, *De conceptu virginali*, c. xi, xii.

¹² *Summa divinae paginae* (date undetermined; but listed by Lottin between two works both dated about 1120; *op. cit.* 833). Bliemetzrieder ed., *BGPTM* 18/2-3 (Münster, 1919). Honorius of Autun (+ after 1152), *Elucidarium, sive dialogus de summa totius christianae theologiae*. PL 172,

lessness, however, Anselm does formulate what might be called a general principle of Mariology. To illustrate his theory, he remarks that Mary's sinlessness was not necessary to preserve Christ from sin; even the child of a sinful mother would have been born in a state of justice, provided his conception had been virginal. Why then was the Son of God conceived of an all-pure mother? Simply because this was more fitting:

It was fitting that the Virgin to whom God the Father was to give His . . . beloved . . . Son . . . , and whom God the Son chose for His Mother, and in whom the Holy Spirit saw fit to work so that she should conceive and bear the very [person] from whom He Himself proceeded—it was fitting that she be clothed with a purity so splendid that none greater under God could be conceived.¹⁸

1122D-1123A. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis fidei christianae* (1135-1140). *PL* 176, 381-383, 391-393. (Cf. remarks on him in note 6, above.) *Summa Sententiarum* (ca. 1138). *PL* 176, 72-73. Robert Pullus, *Sententiarum libri octo* (ca. 1142). *PL* 186, 780-784; 795. *Sententiae divinitatis* (ca. 1145-1150). Geyer ed., *BGPTM* 7/2 (Münster, 1909) 73-74, 103-104. *Ysagoge in theologiam* (ca. 1150). Landgraf ed., *SSL* 14 (Louvain, 1934) 140 ff., 165-168. Peter Lombard, *Libri IV sententiarum* (1155-1157), lib. III, dist. 3, 4. Quarachi ed. (2nd. ed., Florence, 1916), II. Magister Bandinus, *Sententiarum libri quatuor*. *PL* 192, col. 1072, 1073 (= Lib. III, dist. 3, 4, abridging Peter Lombard). Hugh of Rouen, *Dialogorum libri VII*. *PL* 192, 1150-1152. Robert of Melun, *Sententiae* (ca. 1160). Martin ed., *SSL* 21 (Louvain, 1947). (Only Book I has so far been edited, and the Mariological questions are all contained in Book II, ch. 68-83. The titles, however, are listed by the editor at the beginning of Book I, p. 59 ff.) Gandulph of Bologna, *Sententiarum libri quatuor* (1160-1170). De Walter ed. (Vienna & Vratislava, 1924). Alan of Lille, *De arte seu articulis catholicae Fidei*, III, 9 (after 1179). *PL* 210, 612A. ———, *De fide catholica contra haereticos*. *PL* 210: 335-337; 415-418; 421-423. Simon of Tournai (+ 1201), *Disputationes*. Warichez ed., *SSL* 12 (Louvain, 1932) 236f. (Disp. 82, q. 3). Peter of Poitiers, *Libri quinque Sententiarum*, IV, 7 (ca. 1170). *PL* 211, 1161-1166. Stephen Langton, *Commentarius in Sententias* (before 1206). Landgraf ed., *BGPTM* 37/1 (Münster, 1952) 106 f.

¹⁸ "Quamvis ergo de mundissima virgine filius dei verissime conceptus sit, non tamen hoc ea necessitate factum est, quasi de peccatrice parente iusta proles rationabiliter generari per huiusmodi propagationem nequiret, sed quia

This principle was capable of rendering marvelous service to Mariology, as the theologians of the thirteenth and following centuries were to demonstrate. During the twelfth century, however, it was not used—not even by its author, St. Anselm himself. It is appended as a supplement to an argument already finished; it does not function whatsoever in the theological reasoning. This fact will not surprise us if we keep in mind that Anselm, like those who come after him, was writing a Christology, not a Mariology. Only in a proper Mariology will such a principle be called upon to deploy its fecundity.

The early decades of the twelfth century produced no scholastic Mariology comparable to Anselm's, either for its theological quality, or for its Marian insights; and such works as did appear, so far as we have been able to determine, formulated no principles which could be considered fundamental to Mariology. This is the period in which the problem of the feast of Mary's Conception is raised, first in England, about 1125, by St. Anselm's secretary, Eadmer, then in France, about 1138, when the celebration of the feast at Lyons elicited the famous letter of St. Bernard, condemning both feast and doctrine. We are not going to consider the documents of this controversy, because they do not belong among the scholastic *Summae* which are the field to which the present investigation is restricted. It is in fact to be noted that this controversy found not the least echo in the general run of scholastic works during the entire twelfth century.¹⁴

decebat ut illius hominis conceptio de matre purissima fieret. Nempe decens erat ut ea puritate qua maior sub deo nequit intelligi, virgo illa niteret, cui deus pater unicum filium, quem de corde suo aequalem sibi genitum tamquam se ipsum diligebat, ita dare disponebat, ut naturaliter esset unus idemque communis dei patris et virginis filius, et quam ipse filius substantialiter facere sibi matrem eligebat, et de qua spiritus sanctus volebat et operaturus erat, ut conciperetur et nasceretur ille de quo ipse procedebat."—St. Anselm, *De conceptu virginali*, c. xviii; ed. Schmitt, 2, 159.

¹⁴ For the sake of comparison, however, it may be interesting to recall a

But when, about a third of the way through the thirteenth century, the theologians at Paris took note of the problems raised by the feast of Mary's Conception,¹⁵ St. Bernard's letter became a *locus classicus* for the argument over Mary's initial sanctity. For this reason, we must take note of an argument used by St. Bernard, which has somewhat the character of a Mariological principle, even though Bernard is the last person who could be dubbed a scholastic.

Bernard opens his letter by summarizing what the Church believes about the Mother of God. He takes special pains to justify the belief that, before her birth, she was sanctified in her mother's womb. He finds that Scripture teaches that this was the case of Jeremias and John the Baptist; then he argues:

It would certainly not be right to suspect that what was granted even to a few mortals was denied to that great Virgin through whom all mortals were brought to life.¹⁶

Stated in these terms, this is a practical rule of faith rather than a theological principle. But if we see in it the conviction on which it is obviously based, namely, that Mary's sanctity

text from Eadmer's argument in defense of the Conception feast. After asking whether God would not have been able to preserve Mary's body from sin in its conception, he proceeds: "Potuit plane. Si igitur voluit, fecit. Et quidem quicquid dignius unquam de aliquo extra suam personam voluit, patet eum de te, o beatissima feminarum, voluisse."—Eadmer, *Tractatus de conceptione S. Mariae*. Thurston and Slater edition (Freiburg im Br., 1904) #10-11; *PL* 159, 305D.

¹⁵ The earliest allusion to this controversy that we have found in our literature comes in Stephen Langton's gloss on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (the text is given below, in note 25). The date of this work has not been established. Langton is conjectured to have begun his teaching as *Magister in sacra pagina* in Paris about 1180; and he "most probably . . . wrote most if not all of his theological and Biblical works while teaching at Paris, before 1206." Louis Antl, O.F.M., *An introduction to the Quaestiones theologicae of Stephen Langton*, in *FS* 12 (1952) 152, 157.

¹⁶ "Quod itaque vel paucis mortalium constat fuisse collatum, fas certe non est suspicari tantae Virgini esse negatum, per quam omnis mortalitas emersit ad vitam." St. Bernard, *Epistola 174*, *PL* 182, 334C.

was of such an eminent order that no grace given to any other saint could have been wanting to her, then St. Bernard's argument can be considered as the expression of a fundamental Mariological principle. Bernard has not given it a properly theological expression; but then much of the progress of Mariology during the Middle Ages and for a long time thereafter was made possible precisely by means of such non-theological crutches.

Thus we reach the end of the first part of our period with two Mariological principles, one the work of St. Anselm and the other the work of St. Bernard. Both would be made famous by the great scholastics of the thirteenth century, but only after having gone unnoticed by most of those of the twelfth century.¹⁷ Bernard compares Mary with other mortals; Anselm goes much farther, setting her ahead of all creation, actual or possible. On the other hand, Bernard speaks of Mary's endowments quite generally, whereas Anselm refers only to her purity. Both, however, are attempting to express the supereminence of her holiness, which not only surpasses that of other mortals or other creatures, but is of an order that quite transcends them.

II

FROM THE *Summa Sententiarum* (1138) TO HUGH OF ST.
CHER'S COMMENTARY ON PETER LOMBARD'S
Sentences (CA. 1232)

The next hundred years are comparatively fruitless, as regards the expression of fundamental principles in Mariology. Not a single theologian during all this time seems to have formulated a principle comparable to those of SS. Anselm and Bernard, or even to have been acquainted with the prin-

¹⁷ Perhaps this was because neither one appeared in a *summa* or Book of

ciples that these two had proposed. Nevertheless, these years have a fundamental importance for medieval Mariology, for during them the early scholastic doctrine on the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin took on the shape it was to hold until the revolution caused by Duns Scotus' doctrine on the Immaculate Conception. Perhaps a few general indications of the main developments during this time may give at least an inkling of the Mariological principles that were functioning implicitly in men's thinking.

This period opens with an anonymous work, the *Summa Sententiarum* (1138?), which for many centuries was wrongly attributed to Hugh of St. Victor.¹⁸ This little book was one of the main sources of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard; it is of special interest to us because it is the first scholastic *summa* that says a word about Mary over and above the demands of the Christological questions in which she was involved. Hence, it may be considered, in a sense, as the starting point of scholastic Mariology.

The author is dealing with the question, by now standard, of the sinlessness of the human nature assumed by Christ. "Was [His] flesh subject to sin at the time when it belonged to Mary?" he asks, and answers that it was; "but in the very instant of its separation from her flesh, it was purified by the Holy Ghost from sin, as well as from the *fomes peccati*."¹⁹ This answer, which had been proposed not long before by

Sentences, and neither was relevant to any of the questions then treated in these works.

¹⁸ *PL* 176, 41-172. Several manuscripts ascribe the work of one Odo, Bishop of Lucca from 1138 to 1146. According to Father J. De Ghellinck, S.J., Odo is the best supported of the various names that have been proposed, although his authorship is by no means established. *Le mouvement théologique au douzième siècle* [Louvain, 1948] 200, 293-295.)

¹⁹ ". . . in ipsa separatione per Spiritum Sanctum mundata fuit, et a peccato et a fomite peccati." The Christology of the *Summa* occurs, surprisingly enough, in Book I. The Mariological questions are all in chapter 16 (*PL* 176, 72-73).

Hugh of St. Victor,²⁰ and seems to derive ultimately from a text of St. Augustine,²¹ would for a long time compete quite successfully with St. Anselm's explanation by the Virgin Birth. Anselm's theory would eventually triumph; but not until after Hugh's had served to introduce the doctrine of Mary's special sanctification. For immediately after the line just quoted, the *Summa Sententiarum* adds (in reference to the moment of the Incarnation):

[The Holy Spirit] also purified Mary herself from sin, although not from the *fomes peccati*; the latter, however, He weakened to such a degree that Mary is believed never thereafter to have sinned.²²

This doctrine, which dates Mary's sinlessness from the time of the Annunciation, is much weaker than that which St. Bernard was proposing about this very same time to the Canons of Lyons. It is weaker even than St. Augustine's famous text on Mary's sinlessness, which the author quotes, but interprets in his own sense.²³ Nevertheless, it is this text of the *Summa*

²⁰ "Quando assumpta est mundata est."—Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis*, liber 2, pars I, c. 5 (PL 176, 382). There is only this difference, that Hugh attributes this cleansing to grace rather than to the operation of the Holy Ghost.

²¹ "Solutus ergo ille etiam homo factus manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam, nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de materna carne peccati. Quod enim carnis inde suscepit, id profecto aut suscipiendum mundavit, aut suscipiendo mundavit." Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* 2, 38 (PL 44, 474-475).

²² "Mariam vero totam prorsus a peccato sed non a fomite peccati mundavit, quem tamen sic debilitavit, ut postea non peccasse creditur."—*Loc. cit.* 73A.

²³ Augustine is quoted in the following terms: "Excepta sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Dei nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, habere volo quaestionem—inde enim scimus quod ei plus gratiae sit collatum ad vincendum ex omni parte peccatum, quod concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum. Hac ergo virgine excepta, si omnes sancti et sanctae

Sententiarum which must be given the credit for introducing into scholastic theology the notion of a special sanctification of the Blessed Virgin, the central concept in the history of medieval Mariology.

Peter Lombard adopted the teaching of the *Summa* with only slight modification.²⁴ Subsequent writers and commentators supplemented it with the doctrine that Mary had already been purified from original sin in her mother's womb, before she was born.²⁵ (Although this coincides with the teaching of

congregari possent, quid responderent nisi quod Joannes ait, 'Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nosmetipsos seducimus et veritas in nobis non est.'"
—*Ibid.* 73B. Actually, St. Augustine was not nearly so positive as this citation makes him out to be. Modern editors agree that for the words we have italicized, the true reading of the *De natura et gratia* should be, "Unde enim scimus quid . . . quae. . ." In other words, Augustine's suggestive question has been converted into a definite assertion. (Cf. *PL* 44, 267; *CSEL* 60, 263-264.) The reading of the *Summā*, copied by Peter Lombard, was accepted by all the subsequent writers of the period we are examining in this paper. Hence the testimony of St. Augustine in favor of Mary's sinlessness was credited with a force that its author did not intend it to have.

²⁴ "Mariam quoque totam Spiritus sanctus, in eam praeveniens, a peccato prorsus purgavit et a fomite peccati etiam liberavit, vel fomitem ipsum penitus evacuando, ut quibusdam placet, vel sic debilitando et extenuando, ut ei postmodum peccandi occasio nullatenus exstiterit." Peter Lombard, *Lib. 3 Sententiarum*, dist. 3.

²⁵ Peter of Poitiers (ca. 1170) teaches this quite clearly: ". . . prius ita mundata fuit in utero, ut esset sine peccato, potens tamen peccare; in conceptione vero Christi, ita ut penitus peccare non posset."—*Sententiarum libri quinque*, *PL* 211, 1165BC.

Simon of Tournai (+ ca. 1201) asks the question, "Quando fuerit purificata Virgo," and opens the discussion by declaring, "Videtur quod ab utero sanctificata fuerit." He cites one authority (cf. Ps. 45:5) for this opinion: "Inquit enim auctoritas, 'Dominus mundavit eam in tabernaculo suo,' id est, in utero matris"; and one authority (John Damascene—*PG* 94, 987) against it: "Alia dicit auctoritas, 'Tum sanctificata est quando Verbum Dei concepit.' . . ." His own position seems rather confused: "Redditur. In utero sanctificata est ab originali, concipiendo Verbum prorsus ab omni peccato et fomite peccati, quia post Verbum conceptum non peccavit." Ed. J. Warichez, *Les Disputations de Simon de Tournai*, in *SSL* 12 (Louvain, 1932) disp. 71, q. 3; p. 236 f.

Stephen Langton (cf. note 14, above) simply declares, without any specifi-

St. Bernard, there is no indication that the authors in question took it from him; on the contrary, Bernard was obviously defending an opinion that already had a wide reception in his time.) Thus became established the Parisian doctrine that would remain standard throughout the entire thirteenth century—that of Mary's two sanctifications. The first, which preceded her birth, had cleansed her from original sin and, in addition, had made her exceedingly holy; the second, at the Annunciation, brought her to a certain perfection of holiness.

cation of the time, that Mary was cleansed by the Holy Spirit from the original sin which she had contracted. He goes on to conclude: "Per hoc liquet quod hereticum est festum conceptionis carnalis beate virginis celebrare, sed ad instans sanctificationis eius referri debet."—*Commentarius in Sententias*, A. Landgraf ed., *BGPTM* 37/1 (Münster, 1952) 106, n. 10.

Alexander of Hales (not long before 1224): "Licet Virgo beata sanctificata erat in utero, non postea peccavit, quia potestas peccandi ita erat exinanita in ea, quod non habuit potestatem declinandi nec in veniale nec in mortale; sed post carnem Verbi susceptam, omnino exstinctus est fomes in ea."—*Glossa in libros Sententiarum*, lib. 3, dist. 3, #2. Quaracchi ed. (Florence, 1954) 3, 35.

Hugh of St. Cher (ca. 1232): "Duplex est corruptio inflicta humanae carni propter peccatum, scilicet corruptio poenalitatis sensibilis, secundum quam homo passibilis est a fame et siti et hujusmodi, et corruptio vitii, qua caro facit animam sibi conjunctam pronam ad peccatum: haec est idem quod fomes et idem quod originale secundum quosdam, sed verius potest dici quod illa corruptio causa est originalis, sed dicitur originale ratione intentionis. Haec tollitur in Baptismo quantum ad intensionem et quantum ad reatum, et in sanctificatione similiter. Unde ab hoc fuit mundata Beata Virgo in utero quantum ad intensionem et reatum (sed non omnino quantum ad reatum, quia adhuc descenderet in limbum si decederet ante conceptum Filii Dei, ex debito originalis peccati, quod numquam plene fuit purgatum ante adventum Christi. Corruptio ergo vitii secundum ecclesiam fuit in carne Virginis quando angelus venit ad eam, secundum quam peccare poterat; sed tunc, in adventu Spiritus Sancti, repleta gratia, omnino purgata est ab hac corruptione et ita bis sanctificata fuit, tamen aliter et aliter."—*Commentary on Peter Lombard*, *Lib. Sent.*, 3, dist. 3. (We are indebted to Rev. Walter Principe, C.S.B., of St. Michael's Seminary, Toronto, for the transcription of this text from Bruges Ms. 178 and Vat. lat. Ms. 1098. We have disregarded a few trifling variants in Brussels Ms. 1424, which was also transcribed by Father Principe. The punctuation is ours.)

The doctrine of the later scholastics will be discussed below, in Part III.

In the course of time, less and less attention was paid to the second sanctification, in proportion as the first was judged to have been more and more perfect.²⁶

It would shed a valuable light on our question to know what motivated these theologians, first, to assert that not only the flesh assumed by Christ, but also Mary herself was purified at the Annunciation; then to move this purification back to the earliest moments of her existence and to make it a more and more perfect sanctification. Their motive would surely have the character of a fundamental Mariological principle. Unfortunately, these authors do not give any reason for their assertions. Can we determine for ourselves what deep but hidden conviction impelled them to grope after a constantly purer state in which to visualize the Blessed Virgin? It must have been substantially the same conviction as that felt by Anselm and Bernard—that only the highest possible holiness, one quite incommensurate with that of the other saints, befitted the Mother of God.

Our knowledge of the theology of the last two decades of the twelfth century, and the first two of the thirteenth, is relatively sparse. In all probability, however, there were no significant developments in Mariology. The glosses composed by Alexander of Hales (before 1224)²⁷ and Hugh of St.

²⁶ Beginning with John of La Rochelle, the "first sanctification" receives chief attention. Albert the Great barely touches on the second sanctification, to ask what it adds to the first. (*Commentarii in 3 Sententiarum*, ed. Borgnet, 28, 49b) St. Thomas, in the *Summa* (Pars 3, qu. 27) abandons the expressions, *first* and *second sanctification*, which he had employed in his commentary on the *Sentences* (Book 3, dist. 3), and uses the term *sanctificatio* solely for the "*sanctificatio in utero*." The further grace received by Mary at the Annunciation, he mentions only incidentally in his replies to art. 3, obj. 2 and art. 5, obj. 2, of Part 3, question 27.

²⁷ *Magistri Alexandri de Hales Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi* . . . studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 4 vols. (Quaracchi, Florence, 1951-1957) (*Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi*, Tom. 12-15). Only the gloss on Book 4, dist. 3, is relevant to our inquiry.

Cher²⁸ (ca. 1232) differ very little in this field from Peter of Poitiers's *Books of Sentences* (ca. 1170),²⁹ or from the *Commentary* of Stephen Langton which lies somewhere in between.³⁰ The fact seems to be that theologians simply paid very little attention to Mariological questions at this time. The great and influential *Summa Aurea*, composed by William of Auxerre between 1220 and 1225, contains no Mariological questions in its Christology, despite the fact that the work as a whole follows the outline of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.³¹ William of Auvergne, one of the greatest pioneers of the "high" scholasticism of the thirteenth century, as well as Bishop of Paris (1228-1249), has nothing to say about Mary either in his *Cur Deus homo* or in his *De universo*.³² But then suddenly, during the third and fourth decades of the century—in other words, during the years when St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas were students—Mariology seems to have gained new vigor, so that the works of the following decades have a distinctively different character.

III

THE GREAT THIRTEENTH CENTURY MASTERS: JOHN OF LA ROCHELLE, BONAVENTURE, ALBERT, THOMAS (CA. 1236-1273)

In large measure, the new development was nothing peculiar to Mariology, but simply the effect of the tremendous

²⁸ Cf. the remarks at the end of note 25.

²⁹ Peter of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque*. PL 211, 1161-1166.

³⁰ *Der Sentenzenkommentar des Kardinals Stephen Langton*, edited by A. M. Landgraf in *BGPTM* 37/1 (Münster, 1952).

³¹ There is no modern edition of this work. We have used the Pigouchet edition (Paris, 1500).

³² *Guillermi Parisiensis episcopi doctoris eximii Operum summa*. Regnault ed. (Paris, 1516), vol. II.

growth and perfection that theology in general underwent at this time. The old glosses on occasional terms of Peter Lombard were replaced by methodical commentaries that became practically independent treatises; and new *Summae* were composed with a power and a scope of quite a different order from those of the past. Naturally, Mariology, too, benefited from the general improvement.

But there was also a development proper to Mariology itself, the principal factor in which seems to have been the introduction of the problem of the feast of Our Lady's Conception into theological discussions. It is true that Stephen Langton had declared, probably no later than the beginning of the century, that to celebrate the feast of Mary's carnal conception was heretical.³³ Subsequent theologians, however, seem to have paid no attention to the matter: at least, neither Alexander of Hales nor Hugh of St. Cher allude to it.³⁴ But in the treatise on the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin which John of La Rochelle, O.F.M., composed some time before 1245, the problems raised by the feast of the Conception have become central. In the same work appear numerous citations from St. Bernard's letter to the Canons of Lyons, as well as texts and concepts from St. Anselm's *De conceptu virginali*, both of which had been quite neglected by previous writers.³⁵

³³ See his text in note 25, above.

³⁴ See the references in note 25, above. It is true that one of the three principal manuscripts of Alexander's gloss used in the preparation of the Quaracchi edition (London, Lambeth Ms. 347; XIIIth C.) contains a *Quaestio . . . quantum ad conceptionem*, followed by a long citation from St. Bernard's letter to the Canons of Lyons. There is no trace of them in the other two mss., however (Assisi, Bibl. Mun. Ms. 189; Erfurt, Stadtbibl. Ms. Amplon. O 68; both XIIIth C.), and the incoherence and incompleteness of the *quaestio* confirm the supposition that it is a later interpolation. The editors publish it as an appendix to the text on which otherwise the three mss. agree.

³⁵ Although Stephen Langton condemns the celebration of the feast of

In other respects, the Mariology of the thirteenth century continues to be quite like that of the twelfth. There is still no distinct treatise on the Blessed Virgin; and what is said about her continues to revolve chiefly about her virginal motherhood and sanctification.³⁶ But the latter has become, above all, the question, "When was Mary sanctified?"; and it is answered especially with a view to the new opinion that she had been preserved from contracting original sin.

Just who maintained this new opinion is not clear. All the theologians up until almost the end of the thirteenth century seem to have rejected it.³⁷ They adhere to the doctrine, developed in Paris and now supported by the authority of St. Bernard, that Mary had been conceived in sin like all the rest of mankind, although she was sanctified by an extraordinary intervention of divine grace before she was born. But they go to great pains to discuss and refute all conceivable forms of an "Immaculate Conception," and in the course of their discussions begin to formulate, for the first time since St. Bernard, what might be called fundamental principles of Mariology.

Mary's "carnal conception," he gives no indication that he is acquainted with St. Bernard's pronouncements on this point. His text is given above, in note 25.

³⁶ The most important of the new topics added to Mariology during this time was the concept of the divine motherhood. It had already begun to be discussed somewhat obliquely in the commentaries on Distinction III of Peter Lombard's third book of Sentences. Not, however, until St. Albert the Great brought a new text of St. John Damascene (*De fide orthodoxa*, lib. 3, cap. 2, PG 94, 983-987) into the discussion, did the question come into clear focus. Cf. Albert's *Comment. in 3 Sent.*, dist. 4 (Borgnet ed., 28, 84a).

³⁷ Cf. C. Balić, O.F.M., *The Mediaeval Controversy over the Immaculate Conception up to the Death of Duns Scotus*, in E. O'Connor, C.S.C., *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance* (Notre Dame, 1958) 161-212; A. Emmen, O.F.M., *Einführung in die Mariologie der Oxforder Franziskanerschule*, in FzS 39 (1957) 99-217. M. Mildner, O.S.M., *The Oxford theologians of the thirteenth century and the Immaculate Conception*, in *Mm* 2 (1940) 284-307.

John of La Rochelle, the earliest theologian we have found who treats this new problem, was a Franciscan closely associated with Alexander of Hales. It is quite possible that he is only publishing doctrines which Alexander had developed in his oral teaching since the composition of his gloss on Peter Lombard. At any rate, John's treatise on the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin³⁸ was incorporated into the *Summa* which was generally ascribed to Alexander even within his own community.³⁹

In stating the position of his opponents, John gives the following principle as its basis:

Whatever good could be conferred on Mary was in fact conferred on her.⁴⁰

In his reply, John does not object to this principle; he appeals to other considerations to show that Mary could not have been sanctified in her conception. He would seem rather favorably

³⁸ John of La Rochelle is apparently the author of the questions on the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin which have been incorporated into the *Summa fratris Alexandri*, i.e., the *Summa theologica* attributed to Alexander of Hales, Quaracchi ed., IV/1 (Florence, 1948) 109 ff. At any rate, these questions are found separate from the *Summa* in a manuscript (Toulouse Ms. 737, fol. 33b-36d) which ascribes them to La Rochelle: "Qo fratris Io. de Rupella de sanctificatione." (Cf. the editor's *Prolegomena* to the Quaracchi edition, IV/2, ccxvi.) There are only "insubstantial" differences between the text of this manuscript and that of the *Summa*. (Cf. the editor's note, IV/1, 109, n. 1.)

It should be observed that the work is not intended as a complete Mariology, not even in the sense in which the term would have been taken at that time; it is simply, as it is announced in its opening line, a treatise "De sanctificatione Virginis gloriose Marie."

³⁹ Cf. the *Prolegomena* (= Tomus IV/2) to *Alexandri de Hales . . . Summa Theologica*, Quaracchi ed. (Florence, 1948) lix. f.

⁴⁰ "Quidquid potuit ei boni conferri est ei collatum."—John of La Rochelle in *Alexandri de Hales . . . Summa Theologica*, 4 (Quaracchi, 1948) 112a. In the following objection, the principle is repeated in slightly different terms: "Quidquid potuit habere boni habuit—hoc supponimus." In the following article, it reappears (p. 113b): "Quidquid boni potuit ei dari, datum est."

inclined toward the principle itself, although he is certainly not committed to it.

And what, precisely, does this principle amount to? It seems to be essentially an assertion of the boundlessness of Mary's gifts. Whereas other saints are given particular graces proportionate to their particular vocations, Mary is said to have been given all that could possibly be given to her. Her grace, in a word, has no limits, other than the limits of possibility itself.

This goes much farther than the principle of St. Bernard, that whatever was given to other mortals must also have been given to Mary. La Rochelle's principle has more the absolute character of St. Anselm's, which spoke of "the greatest conceivable under God." But whereas St. Anselm spoke only about Mary's purity, as we have already noted, La Rochelle refers with complete generality to "whatever good could be conferred on her." He quite surpasses his two predecessors, therefore, in the fullness of his statement, and presages a new epoch in which the transcendence of Mary's grace will be better recognized and emphatically asserted—when Suárez will declare, and Pope Pius XII will repeat: "The mysteries of grace which God produced in the Blessed Virgin are not to be measured by the ordinary laws, but by the divine omnipotence."⁴¹

⁴¹ ". . . mysteria gratiae, quae Deus in Virgine operatus est, non esse ordinariis legibus metienda, sed divina omnipotentia, supposita rei decentia, absque ulla Scripturarum contradictione aut repugnantia." F. Suárez, *De Mysteriis vitae Christi*, disp. 3, sec. 5, n. 31 (= commentary on the *Summa theologiae*, 3, 27,2). Cf. Pius XII, *Munificentissimus Deus*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 767, note 43. In a recent article, I described the text appearing in the Encyclical as a rephrasing of that of Suárez. That was a mistake; it is an exact quotation. The misunderstanding came from the fact that, being obliged to work with the Venice edition of 1746, which does not have the paragraphs numbered as the 1860 Paris edition does, I did not find the actual text cited, but another one analogous to it. Cf. *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance* (Notre Dame, 1958) 427, n. 23.

However, the principle formulated by John of La Rochelle seems open to the criticism of going too far. Taken literally, it says that Mary was given all that could possibly be given to her. It leaves no room for graces which it was possible but not fitting for Mary to receive. Perhaps the expression, "Whatever could be given to her," was meant to be understood in view of the divine plan into which Mary fitted. Nevertheless, the terms La Rochelle uses do not bring this out, and that perhaps is why St. Bonaventure was to revise the formula.

St. Bonaventure joined the Paris Franciscans shortly before the death of John of La Rochelle and Alexander of Hales.⁴² He knew well the *Summa* they had produced, and he, too, coins a sort of fundamental Mariological principle in a context quite analogous to that of La Rochelle: that is to say, not as his own assertion, but as the basis of an opinion he will reject, namely, that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from original sin.⁴³ Like his predecessor, he makes no objection to the principle itself, but rather seems to regard it favorably, without, however, committing himself. In fact, it looks as though Bonaventure was, on this point, following the lead of the *Summa Fratris Alexandri*,⁴⁴ but revising the principle he found cited there.

⁴² According to Father J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., he began his studies in the faculty of arts at Paris around 1236, and joined the Franciscans there around 1243. John of La Rochelle and Alexander of Hales both died in 1245. Cf. the article *Bonaventura, Santo*, in *ECt* 6 (Vatican City, 1949).

⁴³ He is discussing the question, "Utrum anima beatae Virginis sanctificata fuerit ante originalis peccati contractionem."

⁴⁴ This appears also from other details, e.g., the objections which Bonaventure proposes, many of which occur also in the *Summa* (which, in any event, Bonaventure could not have failed to be acquainted with). However, Bonaventure revises the materials furnished by the *Summa* with great freedom. In particular, the question in connection with which he enunciates his "principle" (cf. the preceding note) is different from that in which the *Summa* does so ("An ante conceptionem fuerit sanctificata").

He formulates the principle in the following terms:

It is fitting to suppose that God gave [Mary's] soul whatever it was fitting for her to receive.⁴⁵

The most obvious feature of this statement is its epistemological complexity. It is not directly an assertion about Mary, but rather a rule for a certain type of position to be held concerning her. It does not say that such a position *must* be held, nor merely that it *can* be held, but rather that it is *fitting* (*congruum*) to hold it. And there is no question of demonstrating or arguing about the position in question: it is merely to be adopted. Evidently, Bonaventure is aware of the tremendous epistemological difficulty with certain beliefs about Mary that are not clearly taught in Scripture.⁴⁶ At the same time, he seems to recognize that the opinions held about her, in questions that are open, are not determined solely in the intellectual order, but involve our piety toward her.⁴⁷ Hence he speaks of the given position not merely as possible or probable, but as something which it is right or fitting to hold.

And what position does he refer to? That God gave Mary whatever "it was fitting for her to receive." This could be taken in a literal sense that would make it say almost nothing; after all, every saint receives that which, in God's wisdom, it is most fitting for him to receive. But Bonaventure ob-

⁴⁵ ". . . congruum est ponere quod animae illi id Deus dederit quod congruebat ei suscipere."—St. Bonaventure, *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum*, lib. 3, dist. 3, p. 1, art. 1, q. 2, obj. 6 (Quaracchi ed., 3, 66a). Elsewhere, he phrases the principle thus: "Si ergo beatae Virgini hoc concessum est, quantumcumque congruum est concedi purae creaturae. . ." (*Ibid.*, q. 1, obj. 3; p. 61a.)

⁴⁶ Hence he speaks of them, not as something that can be demonstrated, but as something to be presumed or supposed: "congruum est *ponere*. . ."

⁴⁷ Cf.: "Pietati fidei magis concordat. . ." (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2; p. 68a); cf. Dist. 4, a. 3, q. 3 (p. 115a).

viously intended to express the distinctive greatness of Mary's endowments. The sense in which he understood the principle in question seems to appear most clearly when it is viewed against the background of its predecessor. La Rochelle had attributed to Mary whatever it was *possible* for her to receive. Bonaventure is more refined; he distinguishes between what is *possible* and what is *fitting*, and measures Mary's endowments by the latter term. Thus the force of his principle comes almost to this: that Mary received every grace, except such as may have been for some reason unbecoming for her.

If this interpretation be correct, La Rochelle and Bonaventure are substantially agreed in the intention of characterizing Mary's grace by the boundlessness that contrasts with the particularity of the grace of other saints; they differ chiefly in the caution and refinement with which Bonaventure expresses himself.⁴⁸

The very terms used by these two pioneers of the Franciscan school inevitably call to mind the famous formula of the fourteenth century Immaculists, "*Potuit, deuit, ergo fecit.*"⁴⁹ At first glance, they would seem to be related to it in this sense: that whereas La Rochelle had said, "*Potuit, ergo fecit,*" and Bonaventure, "*Deuit, ergo fecit,*" the school had ultimately combined the two formulas into one. In reality, however, the development was not quite so mechanical. La Rochelle had probably meant his *potuit* to be understood in

⁴⁸ It is interesting to note that elsewhere, St. Bonaventure expresses himself more concretely with respect to Mary's graces, etc.: ". . . decebat in ea esse omnis nobilitatis et sanctitatis privilegium. . . . Altissimus qui fundavit eam (cf. Ps. 86:5) omnis dignitatis privilegio adornavit, ut sicut ipse eam prae ceteris adamavit, sic ipsa omnibus esset sanctior et amabilior universis. . . ."—*In 4 Sent.*, dist. 30, q. 2; Quaracchi ed., 4 (Florence, 1949) 696b.

He also rephrases the "principles" of Anselm and Bernard: ". . . maxime accedit ad Christum puritate. . . . Virgo Maria"; ". . . sanctificatio beatae Virginis excellit sanctificationem aliorum Sanctorum."—*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2, obj. 4 and 5 (Quaracchi ed., 3, 65b).

⁴⁹ Cf. A. Emmen, *art. cit.* 152-158.

view of God's concrete plan for Mary and the universe; while Bonaventure surely intended that his *quod congruebat* be considered only within the limits of possibility. Hence their two principles express the same idea as the later one, only not so explicitly.⁵⁰

Our notion of Albert the Great's Mariology is in the process of drastic revision. On the one hand, the great Marian writings formerly attributed to him are no longer considered authentic.⁵¹ On the other hand, of his three authentic Mario-

⁵⁰ It should be noted that St. Bonaventure also contributed indirectly to the formation of a Mariological principle by his influence in favor of the development of an adequate Mariology. We have already pointed out the poverty of scholastic Mariology in contrast with the homiletic literature of the same period. In Bonaventure we see the beginning of a change; for while he treats the same Mariological questions as his contemporaries (chiefly the sanctification of Mary and her virginal motherhood—the two points with which scholastic Mariology had been occupied since the beginning), he is much freer in bringing into his theological considerations notions that had hitherto been dealt with only by the preachers. Thus he argues (in a passage that reads like a sermon!) that Mary was immune to actual sin: "Quoniam igitur beata Virgo Maria advocata est peccatorum, gloria et corona iustorum, sponsa Dei et totius Trinitatis triclinium et specialissimum Filii reclinatorium, hinc est quod speciali gratia Dei nullum in ea peccatum habuit locum."—*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1. (Quaracchi ed., 3, 73b). A few lines earlier he calls her "advocatam generis humani," and in art. 1, qu. 1 (p. 65b): "auxiliatrix et amatrix . . . omnium fidelium suorum laudatorum, sicut illi qui tales sunt experimento multiplici cognoverunt."

Elsewhere he bases arguments on Christ's special assimilation to her, due to His having had no other human parent (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 4, a. 1, q. 2; p. 101a); on our piety toward her, which can never be too great (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1, ad 4; p. 64a); on the fact that she in some sense "reconciliationem toti generi humano promeruit," and "cunctas haereses interemit in unverso mundo, Veritatem ex se ipsa concipiendo et pariendo . . ." (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 4, a. 3, q. 3; p. 115b); and on the fact that she was given as a model for women, as Christ for men (*In 4 Sent.*, dist. 30, q. 2; p. 696b).

⁵¹ In particular, the *Mariale super Missus est* (published in *Alberti magni Opera omnia*, Borgnet ed., vol. 37), the *Biblia Mariana* (*ibid.*), and the *De laudibus B. Mariae Virginis Libri XII* (*ibid.*, vol. 36), as well as a *Compendium super Ave Maria* that has never been printed. Cf. B. Korosak, O.F.M., *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni eiusque coaequalium* (Rome, 1954) 18, 32 f., 28, 27.

logical treatises, two have not yet been published,⁵² while the third is available only in a poor edition. At present, therefore, we must be content to construct such a picture as we can from this last-mentioned text, the commentary on Distinction III of the third book of Sentences.⁵³ It was written in Paris not long after 1240,⁵⁴ hence probably not far in time from John of La Rochelle's treatise.

In maintaining the superiority of Mary's grace to that of Jeremias and John the Baptist, Albert appeals to the following argument:

Holiness was received into [Mary] more than into anyone else; for she drew so near to Holiness [itself] that the [flesh] which was to be united to God was taken from her.⁵⁵

This statement is made in the course of a particular discussion; it is not presented as a principle of the whole of Mariology any more than those of La Rochelle and Bonaventure.

⁵² The Mariological treatises of, the *De natura boni* (the authenticity of which is still somewhat uncertain), and of the *De Incarnatione*, written as part of Albert's first *Summa theologiae*. Korosak lists the questions dealt with in these two treatises, *op. cit.* 39-40 and 42.

⁵³ St. Albert, *Opera Omnia*, 28 (Borgnet ed., Paris, 1894).

⁵⁴ According to Dom O. Lottin, O.S.B., this lies in one of the earliest parts of the *Sentences* commented on by Albert; only the first few distinctions of Book I had previously been commented by him. (*Commentaire des Sentences et Somme théologique d'Albert le Grand*, in *RTAM* 8 [1936] 138.) It is debated whether Albert began his commentary in 1240 (i.e., immediately upon his arrival in Paris), or only in 1244. Cf. the *Prolegomena* (= vol. IV/2) to *Alexandri de Hales . . . Summa Theologica* (Florence, 1948) ccxxxvi. In the Chronological Table at the end of his *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, IV/2 (Louvain, 1954) 858, Dom Lottin dates the beginning of this commentary at 1243.

⁵⁵ "Prae omnibus illa recipit sanctitatem quae sic ad sanctitatem accessit, ut de ipsa sumeretur quod Deo uniretur."—Albert the Great, *Comment. in 3 Sent.*, dist. 3; *Op. omn.* 28 (Borgnet ed.) 51b.

Albert does, however, assert it in his own name, not just as an argument of his opponents.

The basic assertion is simply that Mary's holiness surpasses that of all other saints. This is nothing more than what had been said a century before by St. Bernard, whom Albert is probably consciously paraphrasing. From this point of view, his statement is much less satisfactory as a Mariological principle than those of the two Franciscans.⁵⁶ On the other hand, however, Albert has the advantage of stating explicitly the reason and measure of Mary's grace: the divine motherhood. And he relates cause and effect in a Dionysian spirit⁵⁷ that powerfully brings out their connection (even though it leaves many questions yet to be answered): Mary participated in holiness to an unsurpassed degree, because she had drawn nearer than any other to the substantial holiness of the divinity, the source of all created holiness. This presentation of the reason for Mary's grace appears to be the an-

⁵⁶ Albert also repeats the "principle" of John of La Rochelle, with a slight revision: "Quidquid concedi potuit, concedebatur matri quae gratia plena fuit (Borgnet ed. 28, 45b). This occurs in a context that is the exact parallel to that of la Rochelle's text: as the principle underlying objection 1 (the opinion that Mary was sanctified "before her conception"); and it is repeated in objection 2.

On the significance of the "*gratia plena*" added by Albert, see the remarks on St. Thomas' use of this concept below, in note 66.

As a general rule, Albert is more cautious in his assertions of the glories of Mary than are the two Franciscans. Thus, on the matter of the "boundlessness" of Mary's grace, he clearly guards against the excess to which their expressions were perhaps open: ". . . si consideretur gratia beatæ Virginis in se, finita est et crescere potuit. Si autem consideretur in ordine ad conceptum et partum redemptoris, quoad hoc melior esse non potuit, ut dicit Anselmus. Et quoad hoc est gratia plena, et per consequens gloria plena super omnem creaturam puram: quia quoad hoc nihil ei defuit nec aliquid addibile fuit."—*Summa theologiae* (Borgnet ed., 31, 822b). He also refuses to admit that Mary was confirmed in grace, even at the Annunciation.—*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3 (Borgnet ed., 28, 52a).

⁵⁷ It should be kept in mind that St. Albert was one of the earliest western theologians fully to exploit the doctrines of "Dennis the Areopagite."

cestor of the one which Albert's greatest disciple was to make famous.⁵⁸

St. Thomas wrote four important treatises⁵⁹ on the Blessed Virgin, but it will be sufficient for us to consider that which appears in the *Summa*, for it is the only one that makes a significant contribution to the question of Mariological principles. It was composed about 1273, just before the end of St. Thomas' life, and some twenty years after the work of Bonaventure. It is the most complete Mariology in the literature we are treating.⁶⁰ Questions on Mary's vow of virginity

⁵⁸ As Bonaventure was to do some ten years later (see note 50, above), Albert also contributed to the general development of Mariology, and thus created a need for a Mariological principle of greater depth. Albert's most notable contributions appear to have been the following: He introduced a new question, dealing with the Annunciation (Borgnet ed., 28, 55-58; note that the editor has, by his titles and numbers, camouflaged the fact that this section was conceived by St. Albert as a distinct question). Albert seems to have been the first to use the text of St. John Damascene on the notion *theotokos* (*De fide orthodoxa*, lib. 3, c. 2; PG 94, 983-987), and thus to introduce a profounder and more precise concept of the divine maternity into western theology (Borgnet ed., 28, 83-86). Finally, Albert seems to have been the first to speak explicitly of the Assumption—not, however, in the questions on Mary's sanctification, but in a later question on the resurrection from the dead—*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 43 (Borgnet 30, 534, 536). Note that when we speak of Albert as first, we mean only relatively to the authors and the type of literature we have treated in this paper. He certainly did not antedate the preachers and biblical commentators in treating the first and third of these points, and it is quite possible that some as yet unpublished theological writings may also have preceded him on one point or another.

⁵⁹ *Scriptum super quatuor libros Sententiarum*, lib. 3, dist. 3 and 4 (written at the very beginning of St. Thomas' teaching career, between 1253 and 1257). Moos edition, IV (Paris, 1947); *Compendium theologiae*, cap. 224 (1271-1273). Marietti edition: *Opuscula theologica*, 1 (Rome, 1954); *Expositio salutationis angelicae* (1273). Marietti edition: *Opuscula theologica*, 2 (Rome, 1954); and *Summa theologiae*, Pars 3, Qq. 27-35 (1272 or 1273).

⁶⁰ In one respect, however, it seems to be less complete than that of St. Albert, and even over St. Thomas' own work in the Sentence Commentary: it omits all discussion of the Assumption. In commenting on Book III, Dist. III (Q. 1, a. 2, sol. 3) of the Sentences, St. Thomas had made a remarkable synthesis of Mary's Assumption with her two prior sanctifications. In the

and her marriage to St. Joseph, which other writers generally remitted to the treatise on matrimony, are incorporated into it. There is also a question on the Annunciation, following the example given by St. Albert.⁶¹

Nevertheless, St. Thomas' Mariology has the same fundamental limitations as the others of that epoch: it treats only Mary's personal relationship to Christ, with no reference to any aspect of her spiritual maternity over Christ's Mystical Body;⁶² furthermore, it considers only that part of her life which is related to the birth of Christ:⁶³ nothing is said about her role during Christ's ministry,⁶⁴ on Calvary, nor after the Resurrection.⁶⁵ The most important question (just as had

Summa, he retains this synthesis (3, 27, 5 ad 2), but instead of the Assumption speaks only of Mary's glorification. This revision, however, can be explained simply on the grounds that not the Assumption as such, but only the state of glory, is pertinent to the discussion.

It is, of course, possible that St. Thomas intended to treat of the Assumption in the part of the *Summa* which he left unfinished, where he was to treat of the resurrection of the dead. Albert, as we have seen (cf. note 58), wrote of the Assumption in that place. Perhaps a more logical place would have been in Book III, Qq. 53-58, in connection with the Resurrection and glorification of Christ; but it is not there mentioned.

In any event, he does refer incidentally to the Assumption in 3, 83, 5 ad 8, besides citing with approval the argument of the Pseudo-Augustine in favor of the belief (3, 27, 1). According to Roschini, these are the only Assumptionist texts in the Third Part of the *Summa*.—Cf. *La Mariologia di San Tommaso* (Rome, 1950) 282 ff.

⁶¹ St. Albert, *In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3 (Borgnet ed. 28, 55-58).

⁶² Except, of course, for such a degree of mediation of grace as is involved in the fact of having given the Author of grace to mankind. Cf. 3, 27, 5 ad 1. Note also the suggestive observation that Mary gave consent "loco totius humanae naturae" and to the "marriage" between the divine and human natures in the Incarnation (3, 20, 1).

⁶³ As St. Thomas himself declares in the prologue to Question 27, he is about to treat "de his quae pertinent ad ingressum [Filii Dei] in mundum."

⁶⁴ There is, however, an article on the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (Q. 37, a. 4).

⁶⁵ Cf. note 60, above.

been the case with St. Thomas' predecessors and contemporaries) is that which deals with the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin. In it, principles are consciously and deliberately formulated in order to render an account of Mary's grace.

To grasp the significance of these principles, we must first note that St. Thomas characterizes Mary's grace as a "fullness"—"*plenitudo gratiae*."⁶⁶ This is the element of St. Thomas' Mariology which corresponds to the Franciscan assertions that she had received all the graces that could possibly or fittingly be given to her. It is open, at least, to being interpreted in the sense of the "boundlessness" which La Rochelle and Bonaventure were trying to express. In St. Thomas' actual thought, however, it does not seem to have gone so far. It means only that Mary's grace was sufficient for the state to which she was called⁶⁷—a sense in which other

⁶⁶ St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, 3, 27, 5. Many preachers and biblical commentators had previously commented on the words of the angel Gabriel, *gratia plena*, in the text of Luke 1:28. When did the theologians begin to attach profound significance to them? John of La Rochelle recalls the words, but without any developed discussion of them, in *Alexandri de Hales . . . Summa theologica*, 3, Quaracchi ed., IV/1 (Florence, 1948) #82. St. Albert sought to give to the concept, fullness of grace, a certain theological rigor (not, however, in his Sentence Commentary; see texts cited by B. Korosak, O.F.M., in *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni eiusque coaequalium* [Rome, 1954] 170-172). The *Mariale super Missus est* formerly attributed to St. Albert (cf. notes 51 and 76) is constructed largely as a commentary on the words *gratia plena* (they take up chapters 33 to 164!). St. Thomas employs the concept more soberly in the culminating article of his question on Mary's sanctification (3, 27, 5). Cf. also note 69, below.

⁶⁷ "Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Beata Virgo dicitur gratia plena, non ex parte ipsius gratiae, quia non habuit gratiam in summa excellentia qua potest haberi, nec ad omnes effectus gratiae: sed dicitur fuisse plena gratiae per comparisonem ad ipsam, quia scilicet habebat gratiam sufficientem ad statum illum ad quem erat electa a Deo, ut scilicet esset mater Dei. Et similiter Stephanus dicitur plenus gratia quia habebat gratiam sufficientem ad hoc quod esset idoneus minister et testis Dei, ad quod erat electus. Et eadem ratione dicendum est de aliis. Harum tamen plenitudinum una est plenior alia: secundum quod aliquis est divinitus praeordinatus ad altiorem vel inferiorem statum."—St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, 3, 7, 10, ad 1.

saints too can be called *full of grace*. St. Thomas contrasts the *plenitudo gratiae* common to Mary and the saints with that which is peculiar to Christ, who has grace in the highest excellence and fullest efficacy of which grace itself is susceptible.⁶⁸

It is not simply the “fullness” of Mary’s grace, therefore, which distinguishes it from the grace of other saints.⁶⁹ The distinguishing feature lies rather in the office or state of life with respect to which Mary is said to be full of grace—namely, the divine maternity:

She is said to have been full of grace . . . because she had grace sufficient for the state for which God had chosen her, namely, that she should be Mother of God.⁷⁰

It is to be noted, however, that St. Thomas uses two distinct principles to relate Mary’s grace to her maternity. The first, which is probably intended in the passage just cited, is made more explicit elsewhere: Mary, like anyone else, was

⁶⁸ “Ex parte . . . ipsius gratiae, dicitur esse plenitudo ex eo quod aliquis pertingit ad summum gratiae et quantum ad essentiam et quantum ad virtutem: quia scilicet habet gratiam et in maxima excellentia qua potest haberi, et in maxima extensione ad omnes gratiae effectus. Et talis gratiae plenitudo est propria Christo.” *Ibid.*, corpus.

⁶⁹ In the *Expositio salutationis angelicae*, St. Thomas expounds on Mary’s fullness of grace with much greater richness. She was full of grace: (1) as regards her soul (which was sinless and practiced every virtue), (2) as regards the overflow from her soul upon her body (so that she conceived the Son of God,) and (3) as regards the overflow from her soul upon all mankind. Cf. *Opuscula theologica*, Marietti ed., 2 (Rome, 1954) #1114-1118.

Concerning the last of these points, St. Thomas says that Mary’s grace, like Christ’s, was sufficient for the salvation of all men; for from her can be obtained salvation in every danger, and help in every good work (*ibid.* #1118). This text is remarkable, as speaking about Mary’s spiritual maternity, about which nothing is said in the *Summa*, nor in the Commentary on the *Sentences*, nor in the *Compendium theologiae*. But note that the *Expositio* was a sermon rather than a theological treatise.

⁷⁰ See note 67, above.

certainly given such grace as would make her suited for the function for which God had chosen her.⁷¹ Here, grace is seen as disposing Mary for the divine motherhood.

But when he takes up the question of Mary's fullness of grace *ex professo*, St. Thomas seems to look upon it as resulting from her motherhood:

The closer you are to the source in any genus, he declares (we are paraphrasing), the more you undergo its influence. Mary, being closest of all to Christ, the source of grace, received, therefore, a greater "fullness of grace" than anyone else.⁷²

St. Thomas gives greater precision to this teaching by distinguishing between Christ's divinity, in which He is source of grace "*auctoritative*," and His humanity, in which He is source in an instrumental sense. It is Mary's nearness to Him *secundum humanitatem* that is the foundation of her exceptional grace (which, in turn, we might add—although St. Thomas does not—produces a nearness to Him *secundum divinitatem*).

It is this second principle, in which Mary's motherhood is looked upon as the source of, and not just the reason for, her

⁷¹ "Dicendum quod illos quos Deus ad aliquid eligit, ita praeparat et disponit ut ad id ad quod eliguntur inveniatur idonei. . . . Beata autem Virgo fuit electa divinitus ut esset mater Dei. Et ideo non est dubitandum quod Deus per suam gratiam eam ad hoc idoneam reddidit: secundum quod Angelus ad eam dicit, 'Invenisti gratiam apud Deum: ecce, concipies,' etc."—St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, 3, 27, 4.

⁷² "Dicendum quod, quanto aliquid magis appropinquat principio in quolibet genere, tanto magis participat effectum illius principii: unde dicit Dionysius, iv cap. *Cael. Hier.*, quod angeli, qui sunt Deo propinquiore, magis participant de bonitatibus divinis quam homines. Christus autem est principium gratiae, secundum divinitatem quidem auctoritative, secundum humanitatem vero instrumentaliter: unde et Ioan. 1 dicitur: 'Gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est.' Beata autem Virgo Maria propinquissima Christo fuit secundum humanitatem: quia ex ea accepit humanam naturam. Et ideo prae ceteris maiorem debuit a Christo plenitudinem gratiae obtinere."—*Ibid.*, art. 5.

grace, that seems to be the fundamental principle of St. Thomas' Mariology.⁷³ This principle—Mary's "nearness" to Christ—is well known, and yet it involves a concept that would have to be exegeted with great delicacy. For both reasons, to undertake a full analysis of it would be out of place here. We will merely compare it with the other principles we have examined, so as to bring out its distinctive tendency.

It seems to be a refinement of the principle formulated by St. Albert. Both put the source of Mary's grace in her motherhood. But whereas Albert alludes to the latter somewhat vaguely as a "nearness to holiness" (meaning presumably the divine holiness of the Second Person of the Trinity), Thomas characterizes Christ precisely as the source of grace, distinguishes between the roles proper to His divinity and humanity in this function, and finally specifies that Mary's "nearness" to Him was according to His human nature. Albert's somewhat confused intuition has been given greater clarity and precision by the genius of his disciple, while retaining its radical intention.

Compared to the principles enunciated by the two Franciscans, the Dominican principle is more modest about trying to "measure" Mary's grace. The Franciscans said that Mary received all the grace that could possibly (or at least fittingly) be given to her; the Dominicans were content to point to the divine motherhood as the cause and measure of Mary's grace, and to say nothing about the "amount" of grace resulting, except that it surpassed that of all others. The Franciscan principle is more positive in asserting the greatness of Mary's

⁷³ This is the principle to which St. Thomas appeals in characterizing Mary's distinctive fullness of grace; the other principle is used only to argue that she never sinned. Furthermore, St. Thomas clearly contrasts the "perfectio gratiae . . . in Beata Virgine ex praesentia Filii Dei in eius utero incarnati," with the "perfectio gratiae . . . quasi dispositiva, per quam reddebatur idonea ad hoc quod esset mater Christi," as the greater to the lesser. *Summa theologiae* 3, 27, 5, ad 2; cf. 27, 3, ad 3.

grace, and it anticipates the direction that the sentiment of the Church actually seems to have taken in subsequent centuries. On the other hand, it tends to be rhetorical rather than theological; its value lies in what it suggests more than in what it literally declares; and it is quite liable to exaggerated interpretations, especially in the form in which it was proposed by John of La Rochelle.⁷⁴ The Dominican principle, theologically more certain and precise, carefully avoids this danger. However, it does not declare the magnitude of Mary's grace so explicitly as does the Franciscan principle, although it is entirely open to such a conception.

In short, the one is perfectly correct, but fails to satisfy the desire of faith to express fully and concretely the grace of the Mother of God. The other is less inadequate in this respect, but fails to satisfy the exigencies of a precise theological principle. And the fundamental reason in both cases is the same: the immensity of the mystery about which they are trying to speak. The two efforts complement one another, and give us reason to be glad that, in the dream of Pope Innocent III, the Church was supported by two pillars, and not just one.

* * * * *

Lack of space and time prevent us from taking up all the available works from the time of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas (as we have done for the two preceding periods). In particular, we have neglected the famous *Mariale super missus est*,⁷⁵ written perhaps about the time that the two saints were

⁷⁴ See note 40, above, together with the criticism three paragraphs farther on. St. Bonaventure avoids the dangers of La Rochelle's principle, but only by restating it in a form in which it ceases to be a genuine theological principle.

⁷⁵ Published among the *Opera Omnia* of St. Albert, Borgnet ed., 37 (Paris, 1898).

students or young teachers.⁷⁶ But this curious work, even though written in the form of a theological disputation (in the framework of a commentary on the Annunciation Gospel), is too heterogeneous, compared with the writings we have been treating, to be treated satisfactorily with them. And insofar as it is a work wholly devoted to the Blessed Virgin, it belongs to the age which would follow St. Thomas rather than to that of which he was the culmination. The four authors whom we have considered from the middle of the thirteenth century are the most important of their period, and suffice to illustrate the general situation of Mariology at that time.

All told, we have found only six enunciations of principles that might be construed as fundamental to Mariology in the first 180 years of scholastic literature; and one of them (Bernard's) belongs to this literature only by reason of its subsequent usage. Of these six, moreover, St. Thomas' is the only one which can in any sense be said to have been formulated as a fundamental Mariological principle. The Franciscan "principles" were not even offered as the personal convictions of their authors (although that may well have been the case); St. Anselm states his principle but does not use it; St. Bernard and St. Albert use their principles only in particular arguments. And all of these principles, St. Thomas' included, were formulated with respect only to Mary's personal grace. The theology of the Blessed Virgin had still to undergo considerable development before the need would be recognized for principles of a wider scope.

As regards the "content" of these principles, there is a

⁷⁶ Korosak concludes, "sine praeiudicio melioris sententiae," that it was written after St. Albert's *De Incarnatione* (1241), and prior to the sermons of St. Bonaventure (it is used in the Saint's *Sermo 6 de Assumptione*, in the Quaracchi ed. of his *Opera Omnia*, 9, 701 ff.). Korosak is less sure about the place of composition, but presents serious evidence to indicate that it was Paris or its vicinity. Cf. *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni eiusque coaequalium* (Rome, 1954) 18.

distinct kinship between that of St. Anselm, who said that Mary's purity was the greatest conceivable, and that of the two Franciscans, who said that she received all the grace possible (or at least all that was fitting). St. Bernard, on the other hand, was content to say that nothing given to another saint was wanting to Mary, and the Dominicans follow him, only in a more positive tone, saying that Mary's grace was greater than anyone else's.

However, St. Anselm explicitly (albeit rhetorically and imprecisely) indicated the divine maternity as the reason for Mary's holiness. In this respect, it was the Dominicans who adhered to him more closely, although the idea itself was surely not lacking from the minds of the Franciscans. St. Bernard, however, seems to explain Mary's grace, not precisely by the divine maternity, but on the grounds that Mary was instrumental in bringing grace to all others. None of our authors followed him in this path, which could have led them to study the concept of Mary's spiritual maternity, the element most needed to deliver their Mariology from its shortcomings.

REV. EDWARD D. O'CONNOR, C.S.C.,
University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana.