

1968

The Sacramental Theory in John 19:26-27

Theodore Koehler S.M.
University of Fribourg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>

Recommended Citation

Koehler, Theodore S.M. (1968) "The Sacramental Theory in John 19:26-27," *University of Dayton Review*.
Vol. 5: No. 1, Article 7.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol5/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

The Sacramental Theory in John 19:26-27

Theodore Koehler, S.M.

In studying late sixteenth century theology concerned with the significance of the words of the dying Christ spoken to His mother and to His beloved disciple – “Woman, behold thy son . . . Behold thy mother” (John 19:26-27) – one notes a protest against certain preachers who were likening these words of Jesus to those of the consecration of the bread and wine at the Last Supper, including their miraculous power of transubstantiation. Thus Suarez, in his *Mysteries of the Life of Christ*, published in 1592,¹ after studying the text according to his method of solid traditional scholarship and taking note of the patristic texts furnished in the exegetical glosses of his times, added at the end of his exposé a critique attacking that explanation which we might call sacramental:²

There were some who affirmed and published in writing that these words of Christ were so efficacious that they produced the proper and real effect which they signified, imparting to the Virgin and to John true physical relations of maternity and filiation. This is imaginary and impossible, for such relations could not be established without some foundation. However, it is probable that by these words Christ imparted to the Virgin Mary and to John a very singular mutual affection – maternal and filial. I shall, however, treat of this elsewhere.³

Suarez did not return to the question. Is it possible, nevertheless, to determine to whom he was alluding?

Terrien, relying on the precious *Diptycha Mariana*⁴ of Theophile Raynaud (+1663), has brought certain information to light in his great work, *The Mother of God and the Mother of Man*.⁵ The hypothesis, he concluded, attributing the origin of the theory to the great Scotist Nicolas d’Orbelles (c. 1472-75) must be abandoned. It is St. Peter Damien (+1072) who must be considered to have been the first known author to have drawn the parallel between the words of Christ on the Cross and those of the consecration at the Last Supper. However, as Terrien also shows, it was not this holy monk-bishop-reformer of the eleventh century who invented the theory of a sort of transubstantiation of John into the natural son of Mary. His thought was far from such speculations. Of the some fifty-five authentic homilies in which the bishop of Ostia exalted the Lord and his saints, there are two sermons in honor of St. John the evangelist. It is in the second (Sermon 64) that we find the text which later proved popular to the point of giving rise to the curious sacramental explanation of the *Behold thy son*:

These words which our crucified Savior pronounced could not simply be understood as having been uttered in a purely human fashion. They are much more efficacious, since they were delivered by a divine power and sustained by the authority of the Truth from which we cannot withdraw. For this Word of the Father which hung on the cross, is a substantial Word, consubstantial with the eternal Father. Thus the words which he pronounced, being spirit and life, could not have passed in vain. Just as he said to his mother, "This is thy son," so he said to his disciples "This is my Body" and these latter words had such an effect that the bread which he gave immediately became the body of the Lord. Indeed, he spoke and all was accomplished; he commanded and all was created (Ps. 148). This is why be a certain analogy, if we dare so to speak, blessed John did not only receive the name of son but, since these were the Lord's words, he merited to obtain a more important bond of intimate relationship with the Blessed Virgin. Let us consider, then, beloved, what great glory we must attribute to this man who by a sort of mystery of secret adoption is the son of the Virgin and the brother of the Savior.⁶

In his panegyric, St. Peter Damien followed a classical pattern, using as framework the traditional praises bestowed on St. John; but to highlight the importance of the privilege received by the apostle on Calvary he presented the idea that natural adoption was here transcended by the special intervention of the word of God. With such an approach, he risked a comparison, original but dangerous, between the efficacy of the creative word and that of the word of sacramental consecration. He thus created a new theme that the panegyrists of St. John were going to use, to wit, the efficacy of the words of Christ in his filial last will and testament; subsidiarily, the above mentioned comparisons to prove it; and, finally, the relationship thus created between Mary and John.

These elements of the theme are going to be diversely retained. The idea of the efficacious power of the word of Christ is going to be taken up most often at first. Among others taking up the theme Terrien⁷ cites St. Thomas of Villanova (+1555), Cornelius à Lapidé (+1637) and Bossuet (+1704). But the author who must not be forgotten is, above all, Jacopo of Voragine (+1298). The Dominican archbishop of Genoa has left us not only his *Golden Legend* but a *Mariale* and some highly appreciated *Sermons*. He uses our theme in two sermons in which he shows Mary to be not only the Mother of Jesus but also of St. John the Baptist, of St. John the Evangelist, and of all Christians. In one sermon he simply copies the text of St. Peter Damien. This has been cited above.⁸ In the other he summarizes the theme by a distinction which shall establish it firmly in tradition.

As St. Peter Damien says: just as the word of the Lord is so powerful that it transforms bread into the true body of Christ, so the word of Christ, "Woman behold thy son," was of such a force that it made of John a true son of Christ's mother, true not by nature but by the divine power.⁹

This still vague distinction would evolve into the notion of a special grace, not to be confused with generation according to nature. The Franciscan François de Meyronnes (+before 1328), in his panegyrics on St. John, introduces a new term when he speaks of the substitution effected by Christ:

The ninth article (of the sermon) is to be dedicated to his ineffable substitution: when he was substituted by Christ as The son of his virginal mother, “while his mother was standing beneath the cross” (Jn 19:25). By this substitution, four outstanding blessings were granted to him. In the first place, through the word of Christ, who accomplished everything by his word alone, he was made son of the virgin by an absolutely singular grace (just as Christ was the son of Mary by human nature). This is in accord with the text: He spoke and all was created (Ps. 148:5).¹⁰

The term *substitution* bears similarity to the language of Anselm de Lucques (-1086), first to understand the *Ecce filius tuus* in the sense of the universal spiritual maternity of Mary.¹¹ Condensing a whole doctrine, he, as a good jurist, had spoken of the *subrogatio*¹² by which Christ substituted all of us for himself in the person of John in order to entrust us as sons to his mother. We have here, undoubtedly, nothing more than a simple rapprochement. But the theme, whose evolution we are following, is uncovered again in a richer doctrinal synthesis furnished by Simon of Cassia (-1348), an Augustinian hermit. His commentary on the Gospels approaches the *Ecce Filius tuus* with a brief allusion to the efficacy of Christ’s word and to the questions connected with the theme; he then insists on the distinction between the generation by nature and that of grace:

Jesus said to his mother: *Behold thy son!* Then he said to the disciple: *Behold thy mother!* The spirit of all those who read or have heard this is struck with astonishment. Under what impulse, in what sense, for what reason, by what possibility, by what authority, strictly speaking, were these words pronounced, so that the disciple is transformed into the son of the virgin, and the virgin, who had begotten only the man-God, takes on as son a mere man; and so that he who was born of woman according to a tainted lineage becomes a son born of a virgin? And lastly, why is it said only to these two? These things are certainly impossible; yet nothing is impossible to God. It is the truth that Christ as thus spoken. It is the truth that the well-beloved disciple of Christ has written and we know that his testimony is true. At the same time, we must have recourse to piety and prayer in order to penetrate such a secret, such a deep mystery. By what kind of filiation was John made son and the virgin made his mother? Nature here is of no help. We have here neither conception, nor childbirth, neither a return to the maternal womb to be born again, nor a case of adoption in order to lay hold of a temporal inheritance. Here we do not have a sonship through some kind of juridical adoption of a discipleship. The words of Christ were not concerned with such matters. Nevertheless, more than just a simile was intended. We reject any idea of a verbal

disguise. We read what Christ said, "Woman, behold thy son!", in such a way as to penetrate the secret of the mystery to the exclusion of all that would be superfluous.¹³

This commentary is an initiating source for other explanations among which we recognize the theme of the efficacious power of the *Ecce filius tuus*, that of the change caused by these words and the relationship which they created between Mary and John. Simon of Cascia only retains the first aspect and appears to react against any discussions or opinions which he considers, at the very least, superfluous. This is the first indication we have of a theological inquiry of this kind and of possible preaching or discussion at the time. However, the text designates neither the protagonists nor the antagonists.

But the continuation of the text has, in actual fact, more importance; for it is a remarkable explanation which renewed the tradition according to which Mary, at the foot of the Cross, represented the Church. In this tradition the Church is conceived as a mother of grace, given us by Jesus, to supplement the deficiency contained in natural maternity.

Eve is the evil mother of a corrupted nature, the Church is the good mother of the grace which remakes the soul.¹⁴

It is useless to take up again a study which has already been made.¹⁵ We have only to recall that this text was copied by St. Bernardine of Siena (-1444) in one of his sermons on the same scene of Calvary. It then passed into the third nocturne of the Office of Mary Mediatrix; for the eminent Franciscan preacher made the transposition (from the spiritual maternity of the Church to the spiritual maternity of Mary.) Furthermore, he introduced an interesting correction, for no allusion is made to filiation by juridical adoption: "Nor is there question of filiation by *imitation* or by reason of discipleship. The word of Christ was not concerned with that."¹⁶ The apostle to the Italian masses of the 15th century did not wish to lose them in theory but rather to give them solid doctrine. There only remains the remembrance of the efficacy of the Divine Word; but Simon of Cascia's analysis of the *change of relationship* between our Mother the Church and St. John is hereafter applied to the relationship of grace between our Mother Mary and the apostle who represented us:

Maternity and filiation change here by the authority of the words of the crucified Christ; nature proceeds into grace and grace ennobles nature. Not that the one is commuted into the other but that nature is made perfect by grace. A mother of grace is given to us to supplement natural motherhood, but both remain.¹⁷

The distinction of Voragine between nature and divine power has become the more precise distinction between nature and grace. We are "sons of Eve according to nature, sons of Mary according to the gratuitous perfection of nature by grace."¹⁸ The preaching

of this spiritual grace-relationship with her whom Christ proclaimed our mother, is going to be, hereafter, the foundation used by St. Thomas of Villanova, an Augustinian monk like Simon of Cascia; and also by Bossuet and Chaminade.¹⁹

This last mentioned (+1851) considers only the reference to the efficacy of the Divine words and shows, following Bossuet, Mary's charity for us – the ultimate transformation²⁰ due to the action of the Redeemer in obedience to his proclamation of the divine plan:

On the sorrowful bed of the cross the new Adam brought us forth by his word in the heart of the new Eve, a word all powerful, one whose power produced a new mystery rendering Mary at this moment the mother of all men.²¹ Jesus addresses himself first of all to His mother. Mary accepts. Mary conceives us. And Jesus immediately notifies his well-beloved disciple because the mystery of his rebirth in Mary does not take place solely in his person but in the person of all the disciples of Jesus Christ.²²

The theme of St. Peter Damien is thus reabsorbed in the general progress of tradition. The *Ecce mater tua* expresses the will of him who accomplished on the cross the will of His father for the restoration of sinful humanity, giving to his brothers a true mother of the living in the person of his own mother. This declaration then is incorporated into the redemptive action, without which it is incomprehensible. Its "efficacious power" is not sacramental in the precise sense of a consecration transforming matter. There is "power" and "sign" but the revelation made concerns the order of the all-powerful Love which, in order to recreate the world, opens the heart of the true Eve, standing beneath the tree of the cross, to the mysterious ways of the divine plan; for the *fiat* of the mother of the living is as necessary at Calvary as at the annunciation. And we, all of us, by reason of Baptism, must respond to his order, Behold thy Mother, listening to it in the docility of faith and charity.

We have rapidly traced the evolution of the theme in its progress through tradition. But how was it sidetracked into the sacramental theory? In his commentaries on the Gospels, Salmeron (-1585) gives us more precise information than his illustrious confrère, Suarez.²³ In fact he points out that, in his own time, a preacher of Tarragona and, formerly, a certain Baurinon of Rome maintained the theory that John by the *ecce filius* was made son of the Blessed Virgin according to nature. He adds that at Rome this theory was contested by the Bishop of Brescia, Dominico de Dominicis. With this reference we take up the story.

Dominico de Domenicis (1416-1478), great friend of the humanist Pope Pius II (+1464), was also a controversialist whose works are well known. He wrote a small treatise which later had the honor of being printed, under the title "Treatise on the subject of the filiation of John the Evangelist with regard to the Blessed Virgin."²⁴ This treatise was appended to another, "On the Blood of Christ." Actually, it is an edition of a part of the manuscript containing the dossier of the *Disputatio* held at Rome in 1462.

The subject matter of this *Disputatio* was concerned with the blood of Christ which was poured forth on the Cross.²⁵ Did this blood, once it was spilled upon the earth, remain united to the divinity of the Word and was it necessary to adore it during the triduum of the death of Christ? During Eastertime at Brescia, the Franciscan James of the Marches, former companion of St. Bernardine of Dienna, had preached that it was not. The inquisitor of Lombardy, the Dominican James of Brescia, demanded a retraction in virtue of prior Roman decisions going back to 1352. There followed a quarrel between the two orders. Pius II, despite his little taste for such theological games, called them to Rome to explain their views. This took place on the 18th of December, 1462. The dossier that we have of the case was put together in 1468, by Mathurin Espiardi, then assistant of the Master-General of the Preachers. Furthermore, the events were recorded in the memoirs of the Pope himself.²⁶ The dossier also contains Domenico's treatise on the filiation of St. John in regard to the Mother of God. How were these two controversies brought together? The memoirs of Pius II only speak of the *Disputatio* on the blood of the Saviour. But Domenico, who was then Bishop of Torcello near Venice, and not yet bishop of Brescia, tells us in the prologue of his little work – a text cited by Quetif-Echard²⁷ – that, invited to intervene in this debate, he gave his arguments against the theory. It came, he said, from a former teacher who had once exposed the theory to the people and, when referred to Rome, had defended it by alleging other authorities and especially François de Meyronnes. Why did things come to a head in 1462? The dossier specifies that the Bishop of Torcello was answering a British Franciscan, William Varallon, surnamed the Eagle of the Friars Minor. Now this William Varrallon²⁸ (alias Vallerovillonis, de Valle Reullon, Vaurilongus and probably the Baurinon that Salmeron mentions – owing to the Spanish confusion of b and v was one of the Franciscan delegates sent to Rome in 1462 (where he died in 1464) to defend the cause of the Friars Minor. A known Scotist, with a doctorate from Paris²⁹, this theology teacher enjoyed little favor with Pius II, as the commentaries show. Nevertheless, neither indicates that he maintained the Marian theory under dispute. Whatever the case, the Domenico's response points out, among other things, that the holders of the opinion under dispute disclaimed any mention of a transubstantiation but affirmed the possibility of a natural sonship produced by God in John the apostle without intervention of generation.³⁰

But we find that four years later this theory of the transubstantiation of the apostle St. John into the son of the Virgin Mary by the words of the *Ecce filius tuus* became precisely the object of a long refutation written at Cambrai, by the vicar-general Gilles Charlier (-1472). In their preaching on Good Friday 1466, at Cambrai, two Franciscans had spoken of the Roman dispute on the subject. The Vicar-General demanded that one of them give a declaration from the pulpit in order to erase all misunderstanding. The preacher complied and said that he had mentioned the controversy to show that he was acquainted with this current question. Gilles Charlier saw fit to put in writing the arguments against the new error, citing for support the declarations of his disciples Jean Tinctor, canon of Tournai and professor at Cologne, Jean d'Ecoute d'Enghien, treasurer of Saint Peter of Lille, Andrew Boucker, the Dominican prior at Douai, and Pierre de

Vaucelle, rector of the University of Paris³¹. These names are recognizable as those ordinarily cited on this matter³² from the time of Theophile Raynaud, who referred to them.

But it is unavailing to follow Gilles Charlier, when he accuses Nicholas Bonet, a Franciscan doctor who died as Bishop of Malta in 1343, and Francois de Meyronnes, whose ideas we have seen, of being the originators of the contested theory. As Fr. Martin of Barcelona shows with good reason³³, we must really refer to another witness who brings us back, in effect, to the 14th century, but who appears to exclude Bonet (and François de Meyronnes) from this history. In 1395, the inquisitor of Catalonia, the Dominican Nicholas Eymeric³⁴, wrote a “treatise against those who heretically affirm that blessed John the Evangelist was the natural son of the Blessed Virgin.” He dedicated it to the inquisitor of Carcossonne, Bonitus Litelli. (Could this name have caused confusion with the name Bonetus Nicholas? At any rate, it is a matter of a dedication and not of an accusation.) The little work tells how the error was preached “for the first time” in the presence of Urban V (-1370) by a Franciscan doctor of theology, and was then condemned by the Cardinal of Ostia, William Sudre (+1373). Eymeric adds that the matter was renewed at the court of Avignon, for his anti-Lullist activities³⁵ were the cause of his banishment during that period (1393-1397). This time another Franciscan, the Bishop of Bergamo³⁶, maintained the controverted opinion in the presence of Pope Clement VII, and was then – after the meal – severely criticized by the theologians, reproved by the Pope, and forced to retract.

Such are, briefly presented, the presently known facts allowing us to trace the history of an aberrant doctrine in the development of the tradition concerning the spiritual maternity of Mary. Without entering into the details of the documents and into a discussion of the ideas, the historian must admit some discomfort over incidents rather strongly marked by the rivalry of the schools. He may fear a rather facile assemblage of accusations without much foundation. Why so many names cited by error and others left in anonymity? Why is the argumentation of the theory only furnished by the theologians who wish to refute it? Moreover, incriminated authors are regularly Friars Minor and, at that, Scotists of high reputation. Most often it is a mistaken accusation: in this regard think of Francis of Meyronnes, Nicholas Bonet, Nicolas of Orbelles. The two authors with treatises on the question are zealous specialists of controversy: Domenico de Domenichi and Nicolas Eymeric. It is necessary then to maintain a prudent reserve, for any hypothesis is permissible, from that of a verbal excess in preaching to that of an exercise of logicians on the then discussed question of relation.³⁷

In any case, whether the controversy took on real proportions or whether, on the contrary it was more or less artificial, it demonstrates quite well the danger of the genre, especially when it is attached to the deficiencies of Panegyric – another quite dangerous genre. Speculation had lost the real meaning of Revelation as well as its truly theological explanation. In an age when the tradition of the spiritual maternity of Mary had already (with men like Rupert of Deutz (+1130) and Gerhoh of Reichersberg (+1169) correctly situated the scene of Calvary in the plan of divine redemptive love – giving us the Mother

of Jesus as mother – the panegyric of St. John became fixed on the idea of a personal privilege for the apostle. Jacopo de Voragine introduced the theme into that of the spiritual Maternity of Mary and posed the vague and insufficient distinction between filiation by nature and a filiation by divine power. And from before 1370 – according to the testimony of Nicholas Eymeric – preaching fell into the strange invention of a filiation imparted by the Divine Omnipotence to the apostle St. John to make of him a real child of the Virgin Mary. Was the term “transubstantiation” really employed? Domenico denies it. Did those refuting the theory wish to crystalize the error by this paradoxical term? It would not be a unique example of such a procedure.

This case is practically marginal to the great history of the development of the Christian faith. Yet it is necessary to retain it. It shows how easily doctrinal truth may suffer from the insufficiencies of its ministers, to the point of finding itself imprisoned in poorly understood themes and in dead-locked disputes from which even a Suarez will not be able to extricate it. Comparison with the doctrinal development sketched at the beginning of this study allows us then to better understand the efforts of men like Simon of Cascia, Gerson, and Bernardine of Sienna to cleanse the faith of all impurities in search of a better understanding of the Word of God, when he speaks to us of His Mother.

¹ Fr. Suarez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in III p. Divi Thomae*, tomus secundus, Alcalá, 1592.

² W. J. Cole, *The Spiritual Maternity according to the writings of F. W. J. Chaminade*, 1958, Kaye Schooley, p. 149.

³ Fr. Suarez, *Opera omnia*, Commentarii et Disputationes in III P. D. Thomae Q. 27s. Disp. XXXVII, Sect. IV, 10. – Ed. Veves, 1860, t. XIX, p. 593. -Cf. Salmeron Alf., *Commentarii in Evangelicam historiam . . . Coloniae Agrippinae*, 1604, t. X, Tract. XLI, 343b-344a.

⁴ J. B. Terrien, *La Mère de Dieu et la Mère des hommes*, Lethielleux, 1900-1902 (repr. 1950), 2 part. *La Mère des hommes*, I, p. 307-312.

⁵ Th. Raynaud, *Diptycha Mariana*, Pars I, Punctum IX, 10s., 28: Cf. Opera, t. 7, Marialia, I. Lyon, 1665. p. 108, 115, 116.

⁶ S. Petrus Damianus, *Serm.* 64, PL 144, 868 cd.

⁷ Terrien, *op. cit.* 310-313.

⁸ Jacobi De Voragine, archiep. Januensis, OP., *Mariale: de laudibus Deiparae Virginis . . .* ed. Rudolphii Clutii, OP., Lugduni, 1667-88: t. IV, 169, Serm IV.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 310: Serm. X. - Cf. Etudes Mariales (Lethielleux): *La Maternité spirituelle de Marie*, II, 1960, p. 28. -P. Lorenzin, *Mariologia Jacobi a Varagine*, O.P., Romae, Acad. Mar., 1951, p. 70.

¹⁰ Fr. De Meyronnes: *Sermones de Laudibus sanctorum et dominicales per totum annum cum aliquibus tractatibus utilissimis pro predicandi officio, preclarissimi sacre theologie doctoris illuminati magistri Francisci de Mayronis O.M.*: Serm II in eodem festo (Johannis), ed. Basilea, 1498, f^oXXXV r.

¹¹ Cf. Etudes Mariales, *La Maternité spirituelle de Marie*, I, 1959, p. 144s.

Koehler: The Sacramental Theory in John 19:26-27

- 12 Anselme de Lucques, *Oratio* III, Ed. A. Wilmart: *Cinq textes de prière composés par Anselme de Lucques pour la comtesse Mathilde*, Rev. d'Asc. et Myst. 1938 (19) p. 61, 62.
- 13 Simone da Cassia (Cf. The Cath. Encyclop. XIII: Simon of Cascia), *De gestis Domini Salvatoris*, Coloniae 1540, Lib. XIII, cap. 114, 878-79.
- 14 *Ibid.*
- 15 Cf. Etudes Mariales, 1960, 1. c. p. 35-37.
- 16 S. Bernardini Sen., *Opera omnia*, Quaracchi, 1950, t. II 247: *De christ. relig.* Serm. 55, cap. III.
- 17 *Ibid.* Simone de Cassia, *op. cit.*
- 18 Etudes Mariales 1960, 1. c. p. 41.
- 19 W. J. Cole, *op. cit.* p. 145S, 175s.
- 20 Bossuet, *Oevres oratoires*, Ed. Lebarcq-Urbain-Lévesque, II, 301s: Sermon à la confraternité du Rosaire.
- 21 G. J. Chaminade, *Notes d'instruction*, Cahiers cartonnés III p. 2: Sur la Sainte Vierge, Mere des chrétiens. -Archives de la Société de Marie, B. 9. Rome.
- 22 *Ibid.* Cahiers Gris, I, p. 155. -Cf. Cole, W. J., *op. cit.* p. 178.
- 23 Alfonsi Salmeroni Toletani, *Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam*. X, tr. 41, 343-44. Coloniae Agr. 1604.
- 24 Domenico De'Domenichi, *De sanguine Christi — Accessit tractatus ejusdem de filiatione Joannis Evangelistae ad B. Virginem.* — 1557, Venetiis.
- 25 Cf. Dict. Théol Cath. XIV, *Sang du Christ* (M. D. Chenu) c. 1094-7. — L. Pastor, *Histoire des Papes* (trad. franç.) III, 1892, 273-4. — Quétif-Echard, I, 822-23. — Jedin Hub., *Studien über Domenico de'Domenichi* (1416-1478) — Akademie der Wissensch. u. Lit. — Mainz-Wiesbaden. 1957. Nr. 5: p. 188s.; 268s.
- 26 L. Pastor, 1. c. — PII II *commentarii rerum mirabilium*, ed. 1584, I, II, p. 512s.
- 27 Quétif-Echard, I, 825, 1.
- 28 Cf. Fr. Pelster, *Wilhelm von Vorillon, ein Scotist des 15ten Jahrhunderts*, Franzisk, Studien, VIII, 1921, 48-66.
- 29 *Ibid.* p. 49. — Cf. Denifle H., *chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 n^o 2330, 2347, 2525, 2634. Paris, 1897.
- 30 Dominicus de Dominicis, *Tractatus*, . . . l.c. f. 94.
- 31 Gilles Charlier, alias Aegidius Carterius, *Sportula fragmentorum*, f^o223-224. -Cf. P. Martin de Barcelone, *Nicholas Bonet* (+1343), *Tourangeau, Doctor proficiuus* O.M., in *Etudes francisc.* XXXVII, 1925, p. 654s.
- 32 Th. Raynaud, l.c.
- 33 Martin de Barcelone, a.c. p. 654. -Cf. DHGE, t. 9, *Bonet N.*, c. 849-52 (F. O'Briain).

- ³⁴ Cf. Quéatif-Echard, I, 712: n^o 12: Tractatus contra haereticaliter asserentes B. Joannem fuisse B.M.V. filium naturalem. 1395. -Ms. Lat. 3171, Bibl. Nat. Paris, f^o 98r.
- ³⁵ Cf. Dict. Théol. Cath. V, c. 2027-8 (E. Mangenot) -*ibid.* IX, c. 1135-7 (E. Longpré).
- ³⁶ Fr. Mateo de Agaciis: cf. Martin de Barcelone, *op. cit.* p. 654 note 1.
- ³⁷ Cf. Martin de Barcelone, *op. cit.* p. 657.
- ³⁸ Cf. Etudes Mariales 1959, p. 94 (H. Barré), p. 148. -Cf. Dillenschneider Cl., *Marie au service de notre Rédemption*, 1947, p. 212; id. *Marie dans l'économie de la création renouvelée*, 1957, p. 270.