

1970

## Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge

Theodore Koehler S.M.  
*University of Dayton*

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Koehler, Theodore S.M. (1970) "Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 7: No. 1, Article 5.  
Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol7/iss1/5>

This Opinion or Commentary 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](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

# Marian Theology And The Continuing Evolution Of Human Knowledge

Rev. Theodore Koehler, S.M.

Marian theology begins for Christians when they reflectively search biblical passages in an attempt to understand God and his son Jesus Christ, with a particular attention to the fact: that the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary. We do not listen, however, to the words of the angel Gabriel to Mary, or those of Yahweh to the disobedient Adam and Eve in terms of the ancient Jewish mentality, nor with the perspective of the Apostles and Evangelists, but with our own scientific and technical understanding. When we read the text in which God calls the Virgin of Nazareth to be the Mother of the promised Messiah, we come in contact with this event through a text written 70 years after it took place and transmitted through 20 centuries; at the same time believing in the Spirit of God who unites Mary, the Evangelists and all succeeding generations faithful to the Father and his son, Jesus. This living Word of God joins us and saves us now, in our present conditions of life, thought and understanding. With this in mind, we will begin our reflections on “Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge.”

Among the numerous changes which characterize the current evolution of society, we can easily discern the emergence and developing importance of the sciences. Just as we speak of the demographic explosion in world population, so we can speak of an explosion of knowledge and technology, although we should keep in mind Jacques Barzun’s observation in the *Librarian Journal*, Nov. 1, 1969, denouncing the “illusion of an increase in knowledge” and judging that “it is barely an increase in information.”<sup>1</sup> We observe particularly the continuous transformations in the hardware of our technology, necessitated by their rapid obsolescence, even the early obsolescence of new patterns which are constantly outstripping one another with each discovery of an improvement. A major automobile manufacturer, for example, must constantly keep abreast of new trends and products in his market, while retaining and developing his own style. This is but one aspect of the accelerated era of history in which we live, an era that at times can approach the spectacular as we recently witnessed in the successes of the Apollo program. It is natural then for a science like theology to amass a growing number of publications and pieces of research which bibliographers have great difficulties cataloguing.

But a true picture of the acceleration of the scientific movement is more difficult to determine than the previous examples might exhibit. Indeed, we must recognize that the scientific discoveries of Pasteur, Einstein, early research in astronomy — all have prepared the way for the rapid progression of technical development. It is also important to note that the sciences and technology are growing together. Nevertheless, strictly scientific progress is more profound and less spectacular than its practical applications seems to

manifest. This is because science identifies more directly with human knowledge and, consequently, relates more to man than to his creations. This difference between science and technology requires more precision, but our distinction is sufficient for us to ask the question: where are we going in this evolution of human knowledge related to the development of our sciences? It may seem strange to consider Mariology as a useful example in understanding this evolution, and for a theologian, it would be a more usual approach to be immediately confronted with the standard questions: Why is Mariology a science? And then, how can we assign it a place in the overall development of the sciences?

Before engaging, however, in this classic and familiar inquiry, it is essential that we trace the evolution that Mariology has undergone in the past in order to be better able to comprehend what its status is today and what it can become in the future.

How then is the history of Mariology bound not only with that of theology but more broadly with the general scientific movement, particularly during the past 100 years? It would obviously take an inordinate amount of time to analyze the progressive development of theological interest in the Mother of God, so we must resign ourselves to only a very linear exposition of the facts without probing too deeply into their background.

The first event of significance beyond the age of the New Testament writings emerges during the 5th century with the Council of Ephesus (431) and the "theotokos" controversy. The resulting theology was an astute compromise between that of Antioch, which emphasized the two natures in Christ, and that of Cyril of Alexandria who, putting in relief the unity of Jesus Christ, insisted on the appropriateness of the title, "theotokos." But the advocates and opponents of this title were men who lived and debated in an intellectual climate dominated by Greek influence. The city of Cyril's residence, Alexandria, is an excellent example. Founded by Alexander the Great in 331 B.C., the city rapidly became, under the Ptolomaic Pharaohs, a cultural center influencing the whole Orient and before long a capital of the Greek "intelligentsia." It is to the Jewish community established at Alexandria that we attribute the Septuagint, the renowned Greek translation of the Old Testament composed in the latter part of the 2nd century B.C. and the last stage of Jewish scriptural tradition. It was with this text that the first disciples of Christ passed from the old to the new Alliance. The work of the great Jewish philosopher, Philo of Alexandria, who died around 45/50 AD marks another stage of development, for we see in the encounter of Jewish tradition with Greek thought the philosophical renewal which prepared the way for Neoplatonism and notably influenced the formation of early Christian tradition. In the third century of this era, we find in Alexandria the school of Origen. The influence of this scholar was so widespread that, according to St. Gregory Nazianzen, all the masters of Christian thought in this period were his disciples. We can even find an extension of this influence into the Middle Ages in the writings, for example, of St. Bernard and William of St. Thierry. Finally, it is in Alexandria that Arius and St. Athanasius lived.

So the theology of the Incarnation and of the Theotokos is the fruit of the genius of

## Koehler: Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge

these disciples of the Greeks who attempted to understand the Word of God with the intelligence they received originally from this Logos, Creator of the Cosmos, the Pantocrator whose immense figure illuminates the vaults of byzantine basilicas.

There was, some years ago, a discussion about the platonism of the Fathers.<sup>2</sup> Such studies must be pursued and extended to the whole scientific evolution of past history, so that theology should no longer be understood as a monolith in this evolution of human knowledge.

We should no longer consider dropping our ties with Greek thought. In the 13th century, St. Thomas Aquinas caused a revolution in theological science with his use of Aristotelian philosophy in the study of Divine Revelation. The impact of Thomism on its time is sometimes forgotten today, although it did not gain status in official teaching easily. Perhaps the too slow substitution of commentary on the *Summa* for that on the *Sentences of Lombard* is the reason why the Thomistic revolution was lost in a pure scholastic methodology. The dreadful words of the critic Paul Reloux are substantiated: Nature takes its revenge on genius by providing it with disciples.

In the Marian field, the contrast between St. Thomas and other 13th century authors permits us to measure the advance. Two systematic works of this period achieved great fame, probably due to their association with the name of St. Albert the Great, supposed to be their author: the *De Laudibus* of St. Richard of St. Laurent<sup>3</sup> and the *Mariale*, written by an unknown author.<sup>4</sup> The two works are large compilations of material concerning Mary; some of it, however, quite trivial (the color of her eyes, her hair, etc.). The riches and the poverty that occur when one proceeds to deal with quantitative methods in matters of the spirit!

In the *Summa*, St. Thomas turns his attention to the Blessed Virgin only in the third part, in the historical questions related to the Incarnation of the Word.<sup>5</sup> In this Christological inquiry, he places in relief the personal relationship which unites Mary as Mother with her son, God made man. So St. Thomas formulated in his Graeco-Latin renewal of theology a doctrinal synthesis and consequently a “Mariology,” if we accept the title boldly given by Morgott to his study, *The Mariology of St. Thomas*.<sup>6</sup> In short, we can truly say that St. Thomas, deepening theology with Aristotelian philosophy, has given marian studies its formal object: the relation of Mary to her son.<sup>7</sup> This corresponds to the scientific development of this period: theology, metaphysics, cosmology, and the other scientific areas then distinguishable, were each seeking their own formal objects, seeking to determine their own uniqueness.

Moving out of the 13th century, the next period we will consider is that of the Renaissance, so called because of its rediscovery of the ancient genius of Graeco-Latin culture. Towards the end of the 16th century, the great Jesuit theologian, Francis Suarez, wrote the first treatise on Marian theology, thus marking a definitive stage in the evolution of this science. While teaching at the Roman College (around 1585) he exposed the Marian questions of the *Summa* in a manner which, according to the notes of a student, seems to indicate a systematic plan thought out by the young teacher, thus liberating him from simple commenting on the *Summa*.<sup>8</sup>

Whatever the case may be, a treatise published in 1592 was entitled by Suarez *The Mysteries of the Life of Christ*<sup>9</sup> in which he intended to give to marian doctrine all the fullness due, in his opinion, such a subject. He was clearly conscious of the importance of this kind of contribution to theological science, for he writes in his preface:

“When it is a matter of considering the sublime dignity, the unequaled virtues, the wonderful life and glories of the Blessed Virgin, who could be so sterile in thought or speech and so inarticulate as to hasten quickly over the subject with parsimonious treatment? It often seemed to me . . . that our theology has in this fashion been too brief and concise, whereas the dignity and scope of the subject, which carries with it so much delight, knowledge and usefulness justly demands from a theologian far different treatment. Hence I have treated the subject of the Most Blessed Virgin more fully . . .”,<sup>10</sup> translated by Fr. Richard J. O’Brien, who also quotes the praise of Suarez by one of his contemporaries, Gabriel Vazquez: “Suarez has rendered an outstanding service to sacred science, when he used the scholastic method and submitted to strict theological criticism all the questions relating to the life of the most pure Virgin Mary, our Lady.”<sup>11</sup>

After Suarez, as before him, the evolution was long and difficult to follow, for we do not have at our disposal a complete bibliography of marian publications, still less a tracing of their history. We should also note, with the few examples given, that valuable material is found, in each period, alongside worthless publications, as happens in every science. Thus, in the 19th century, the vast undertaking of the abbe Migne to publish a universal library for the clergy resulted in the impressive patristic editions still in use.<sup>12</sup> Other collections, however, are not so valuable. The work by Canon Bourasse, first announced as the *Book of Mary and her Children*, was eventually published in the form of an encyclopedic *Summa Aurea* (Golden Treatise), comprising 13 volumes (1866).<sup>13</sup> It includes many valuable publications, such as a new edition of the great Marian work by Peter Canisius, *Maria Virgine Incomparabili* (1577).<sup>14</sup> Bourasse’s documentation, however, oftentimes requires selection and criticism, including the correction of mistaken authorship.

From Bourasse we pass, by way of contrast, to the work of a great master: Scheeben. In 1882, Scheeben published the third volume of his *Dogmatic*<sup>15</sup> in which he introduces a special section on Mariology, as understood in the modern sense of the word. He studies the divine Maternity in a Christological context, standard procedure in a complete theological treatise. Thus, to elucidate his Mariology in a complete fashion, one must begin with the section of his treatise concerning the Incarnation.<sup>16</sup> As Suarez had done, therefore, so Scheeben too prepared a special theological treatise, gathering and synthesizing all Marian doctrine. He himself calls it a “Mariology” and delineates it as a specialized area within theology:

“Mariology can and must be considered a link connecting the doctrine of the Redeemer and His work with that of the grace of Christ and its distribution by the Church. Mariology, thus conceived, is called to occupy an important place in the system of dogmatic theology. From this viewpoint it appears as the development of the profound

## Koehler: Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge

concept manifested in the early Christian era, which ideally beholds Mary in the Church, and the Church in Mary (Apoc.12.1) . . . As a treatise on the personal bride of Christ and the personal mother of mankind, Mariology becomes a rich source from which light is shed on the doctrine of the Church as a supernatural organism . . . ”<sup>17</sup>

We already find ourselves in the perspective of Vatican II.<sup>18</sup>

Moreover, Scheeben, in his search for the theological synthesis that gives marian doctrine its coherence, used the exegetical and historical works which arose out of the renewal of textual criticism. For this reason, he introduced the notion of a fundamental principle in the revelation of the mystery of Mary, a principle that gives theological unity to the doctrine. He saw this principle as a divine gift which he called “the personal character of the grace of divine Maternity in Mary.”<sup>19</sup> The German expression is difficult to translate: *die gottesbrautliche Mutterschagt*: the divine bridal Motherhood.<sup>20</sup> For Scheeben, Mary is to be understood simultaneously and indissolubly as both the Mother and Spouse of God. If there were time, we could discuss the exigency of such a speculative synthesis further.<sup>21</sup> In any case, the work of Scheeben represents a considerable scientific effort, of which his Mariology is the best example. It was a half century before its time, delineating the course that Marian studies would take.

To return to Scheeben’s own period, the prime Marian topic taken up by its theologians was the long-discussed question of the Immaculate Conception, proclaimed a dogma in 1854.<sup>22</sup> Another event of this period, the First Vatican Council (1869-70) not only defined papal primacy and infallibility, but involved itself in the new problems that arose concerning the relation between faith and science.<sup>23</sup> In the theological studies which ensued, textual criticism bore its fruits, providing a better understanding of biblical and historical texts. But an Ernest Renan lost his faith even as he became a great scholar studying the Near East and the origins of Christianity. He is a good representative of his time with his prophetic announcement of *The Future of Science*<sup>24</sup> as the “religion” of truth which would take the place of all superstition. When Renan published this book in 1892, towards the very end of his life and more than 40 years after he wrote it (1848), he included a preface which tempered the over-enthusiastic pages of his youth, while still affirming the same faith in science and its progress.<sup>25</sup>

The case of Renan shows the danger that theology was facing because of its retarded development in comparison with the other sciences. The sociologist, Folliet, some years ago deplored the error of the theologians of the eighteenth century, who engaged in learned discussions about sufficient or efficacious grace, while during the same period, d’Alembert, Diderot, and others published the *Encyclopedie* (1750),<sup>26</sup> a work which gave its subscribers the opportunity, in spite of its deficiencies, to update their knowledge of the sciences, though it also carried the ideas of various philosophers and quite often their biting attacks on the Church and on the faith. The retarded development of theology in the 19th century became a great danger because of a recasting of scientific knowledge: with the numerous discoveries in studies of the atom, the cell and natural energies, western civilization felt the need of a new integration of human knowledge. Note, for example, the considerable success of Charles Darwin, who, in his book on *The*

*Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection* (1859) gave expression to his theory of evolution. It is in this general involvement with the new philosophical ideas (Kant, Hegel, etc.) that we have to see the courageous effort of those 19th century theologians who overcame the deficiencies of their science.

Our last examples will bring us into modern times. Of great importance is the foundation of several Mariological societies, whereby teams of specialists gather each year to work on precise themes (the Assumption, Spiritual Maternity, Queenship, etc.); the lectures are published in the bulletins of each society.<sup>27</sup> The first of these organizations was the one established in Belgium by Canon Bittremieux in 1927. The French society was founded in 1935. Other countries followed: Spain in 1941, the United States in 1949, Germany in 1951, Poland in 1953 and Mexico in 1957. These societies completed extensive research in all areas: biblical, patristic, liturgical, historical, the arts, etc. After the war, certain special themes were carefully studied. Thus, the French society devoted three years to *Mary and the Church*, four years to *The New Eve*.<sup>28</sup> When John XXIII decided upon a second Vatican Council, all this work bore its fruits . . . unexpectedly! We all know how the Council, while concentrating its attention on the Church, decided to devote the last chapter of this Constitution to (I quote the title of the chapter) "The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church."<sup>29</sup> To this rapid sketch we can add that two specialized marian periodicals were begun: *Marianum* in Rome, and *Ephemerides Mariologicae* in Madrid<sup>30</sup>; encyclopedias were published (*Mariology*, in 3 volumes by F. Juniper Carol; *Maria* in french, and others); Marian Libraries were founded, like ours in Dayton (1943).<sup>31</sup>

In summary, then, the sciences progressed through a process of differentiation, following the lines set down by the Greeks. In the general movement towards specialization, Mariology became a science possessing its own formal object, even while remaining part of the science of theology. After its striking rise in the Middle Ages, theology suffered a retarded development in the evolution of the sciences. As Jan G. Barbour presents the situation in his book, *Science and Religion Today*,<sup>32</sup> the general relations between science and religion first degenerated into "conflicts"<sup>33</sup> (creation-evolution, miracles-determinism) and finally ended in the absolute separation of the two fields. Barbour notes that it was "motivated by concern, not just to avoid the unnecessary conflicts of the past, but to be faithful to the distinctive character of each enterprise"<sup>34</sup>. Fortunately, several 19th century theologians adopted the new critical methods and worked in accord with the complementary character of the sciences. Mariology availed itself of this important scientific renewal, especially in recent decades, as previously noted.

The last Council strongly contributed to the acceleration of Catholic progress in its opening to the needs and problems of the modern world. That openness is noticeable in the orientation of chapter 8 in *Lumen Gentium*: its doctrine is biblical, pastoral, ecumenical, and anthropological in so far as Mary, type of the Church, is presented as the type of all mankind in the plan of God. The openness to current trends of Christian thought, and human thought in general, has had an immediate effect on theological

Koehler: Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge activity, as can be seen in recent publications.<sup>35</sup>

An examination of post conciliar Mariology brings us fully into our question. Using it as an example, we can see how the sciences, at this particular stage of their evolution, are opening to a process of integration, which is taking place at two levels: they are integrating, opening to one another, in their interdependencies; and so they are resulting in a truly human knowledge.

#### 1. The first level of integration:

Father Besutti has recently published a new bibliography which includes materials written between 1958 and 1966.<sup>36</sup> For these nine years he catalogues 8,727 publications, indicative of an active and vibrant Mariology. The studies listed come from various scientific disciplines: hermeneutics, philology, psychology, anthropology, sociology, history and its various branches including liturgy, art, literature, doctrinal and theological development, etc. Mariology thus offers us insight into the way the sciences are opening to a process of integration, through the discovery that they are, in fact, interdependent. Specializations are undoubtedly necessary, and through the specific attention needed in each special line of study, each researcher has his own limits. These limits, however, are not boundaries which separate scientists, but borders at which they are obliged to come together. We can call this phenomenon the development of sciences at their furthest horizons. The problems researchers confront do not arise at the center of acquired science, but at the outer limits of our knowledge, where we seek what is still unknown and where different scientific disciplines collaborate, in the case of cancer research, for example, or space investigation. In this manner new sciences develop. From psychology and sociology comes social-psychology. Bio-physics and psychosomatic medicine are other examples. The evolution is such that the trend towards specialization<sup>37</sup> is moving towards an integration of science, not a fragmenting of our knowledge. We can no longer speak of a mosaic of sciences, or of sciences confined to their respective ghettos or ivory towers. The mosaic represents something; we have to discover that it is the face of man.

#### 2. The second level of integration.

Using Mariology as an example, we can see the direction this evolution is taking. Integration does not imply reduction, as in the mathematical operation whereby fractions are reduced to their lowest denominators. To confirm this, we can begin with St. Anselm of Cantorbury's definition of theology as "faith seeking understanding" (*fides quaerens intellectum*), in other words, faith seeking scientific knowledge. This definition is still workable, capable of giving precision to the differences and similarities which characterize theology among the sciences. The mariologist approaches his subject scientifically when he uses all the resources of his intellect and all its attainments, as does every scientist. Like any other science, theology has its special area, and the theologian, his personal scope – so that theology cannot be reduced to any other science. It is integrable but irreducible. The Mariologist studies the biblical texts and various doctrinal sources which explain Mary's maternity. Using Matthew and Luke, for example, he studies the virginal



Incarnation of Jesus as a revelation of the impact of God's action in history, because this impact is a call directed to us through a human person, Mary of Nazareth, married to Joseph, etc. Indeed, we study God's impact in the relations of this person, Mary, to God and to mankind, and consequently God's impact in the evolution of mankind. This Word of God proposes questions to all sciences.

There is no reason to reduce every science, or even a group of sciences, to one having some kind of primacy. Nor is it possible to reduce certain sciences to others that might be more basic, that is, more elementary. This would be, in fact, a non-scientific operation, the result of some aprioristic imagination and reflective, perhaps, of a certain intellectual laziness. If we were to reduce man to the animal level and finally to an atomic system, we would have to ignore that the world is in evolution, that man is in evolution, that our science is evolving. The result would be a kind of anachronism, as in the case of the Sadducees who, in the time of Jesus, tried to return to the mentality of Abraham, refusing to acknowledge Jewish progress after him. We don't have time now to involve ourselves with the discussions and essays which in our day have established a dialogue between theology and the other sciences.<sup>38</sup> We follow with our own approach. As Michael Polanyi explains in *Science, Faith and Society*, we must keep in mind that the scientist is always responsible for what he chooses or accepts in his observations. In other words, human subjectivity is a part of the real objectivity which we are seeking. Furthermore, when speaking of scientific progress, we say that we do not seek to reduce man to the level of our machines, but that we invent machines to serve the human development. At the present stage of our development, purely materialistic hypotheses will make it impossible for us to progress. We know that the sciences are now moving towards their integration into a truly human knowledge. If robots have a future, it is at the service of mankind, the society of persons.

Our sciences are the result of what Renan calls "the Greek miracle." Parmenides, Heraclites, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle – to name only a few of these early philosophers – decided that reason, the *logos*, is the power which makes man, man; and gives him his rank in the cosmos. They were correct, and thus initiated a human evolution that will not end. The first Greek philosophers studied the universe; Greek thought became cosmological. Socrates gave to the proverb, "Man, know thyself," a profound significance and thus transformed Greek thought; it became anthropological. Later, despite the genius of Plato and others, the two concepts became antagonistic; for many philosophers they became contradictory. The danger still remains: to reduce man to the cosmos is materialism; to reduce the cosmos to man is idealism.

Theology – Marian theology – is seeking its integration into a true human knowledge, without losing sight of either exigency, cosmological or anthropological. According to Vatican II (ch. 8 of *Lumen Gentium*) Mary is the daughter of Adam; she is part of the cosmic evolution in which we are all living. She is the daughter of Sion, in whom Israel heard the word of God and began to accept the full impact of God in our evolution. This evolution is part of the history of mankind, conceived as a part of, or perhaps as the axis of the cosmos.<sup>39</sup> Vatican II stresses the liberty, the conscious Fiat of Mary;<sup>40</sup> in her

Koehler: Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge  
person mankind met God and God met mankind; the Son of God became man through Mary's free decision; and by the grace of God, she became the glory of God.

Do we see a final goal for mankind's progress? What new paradigms, what new terminologies must we invent for theological problems ( the Assumption, Resurrection, etc.)? The answers are to be found in a better integration of the sciences, especially in the search for a true human knowledge, which will be accomplished without the reduction of any science to elements which are only a part of our evolution and history. So we arrive at new questions, which is natural for any kind of scientific research.<sup>41</sup>

In conclusion, the mystery of Christ and his Church, in which we contemplate Mary, is a call to all peoples; and so, as St. Peter Chrysologus points out, the mystery of Mary is that of the woman who puts the yeast in the dough, and the dough will rise.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jacques BARZUN, *The new Librarian to the rescue*, in *Librarian Journal*, Nov. 1, 1969 - p. 3964.

<sup>2</sup> cf. the critical study of R. ARNOU, *Platonisme des Pères*, in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.* xii, 3, 2258s. and the more general article of T. P. HALTON, *Christianity and Hellenism*, in *New Cath. Enc.* III (1967) 653-4, who quotes S. Thomas (S.Th. I, q. 84, a 5) who appreciated the openness of S. Augustine to platonism: "Whenever Augustine, who was imbued with the doctrines of the Platonists found in their teaching anything consistent with faith, he adopted it; and those things which he found contrary to faith he amended".

<sup>3</sup> RICHARD DE SAINT LAURENT, (died after 1245), *De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis*, published in the works of Saint Albert the Great by P. Jammy, *B. Alberti Magni . . . opera quae hactenus haberia potuerunt . . .*, Lugduni, 1651, tom. 20; and by Borgnet Aug. et Aem., *B. Alberti Magni . . . opera omnia . . .*, L. Vivès, Parisii, 1890-99, tom. 36-Edition under the right name, by Bogardus Joannes, *Domini Richardi a S. Laurentio, qui ante quadringentos annos floruit. De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis libri XII . . .*, Duaci, 1625. — Analysis of the work and its merits: art. *Richard de Saint Laurent*, by E. Amann in *Dict. de théol. cath.* XIII (1937) 2675-6, and by Bruno Korosak, *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni ejusque coaequalium*, Romae, Acad. Mar. Intern., 1954, 28s. (authorship of the book) and passim (see Index 629). — Notice on *Richard de Saint-Laurent* and his works, by P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des Maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle*, Paris, Vrin, 1933, vol. I, P. 331-2, n<sup>o</sup> 148.

<sup>4</sup> Edition P. Jammy, tom. 20; edition Borgnet, vol. 37 — Different titles: *Super Evangelium Missus est quaestiones CCXXX*, or *Summula de laudibus Christiferae Virginis*, or *Mariale . . .* -Cf. Korosak, o.c.: analysis of the book; and a presentation of the manuscripts and the editions (p. 3-18). — Datation: second part of the XIIIth century?(cf. *Etudes Mariales. Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales. La Maternité spirituelle.* II (1960). Th. Koehler, *Moyen âge occidental*: p. 25 note 27); according to Korosak: after 1241, before the time of the homelies of Saint Bonaventure (it is: between 1250-1274); o.c.p. 18. — a critical edition of Albert the Great began in 1951: *Opera omnia. Ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum edenda . . . curavit Institutum Alberti Magni Coloniensis Bernharo Geyer praeside.* Aschendorff. —Cf. also art. *Albert the Great*, by J. A. Weisheipl in *New Cath. Ency.* vol. 1 (1967) 257-8 (*Writings and Bibliogr.*) — For the marian writings of Albert, cf. Albert FRIES, *Die Gedanken des Heiligen Albertus Magnus über die Gottesmutter.* Thomistische Studien/VII. Pauluswerk, Freiburg, Schweiz, 1959; and his art. *Albert der Grosse*, in *Lexikon der Marienkunde* (Pustet) 1,111s. (1957) with a Bibliogr. p. 121 (esp. the other publications of the author).

- <sup>5</sup> S. Theol. III, q. 27, prol., . . . de his quae Filius Dei incarnatus in natura humana sibi unita fecit vel passus est.
- <sup>6</sup> Franz Morgott, *Die Mariologie des Heiligen Thomas von Aquin*, Herder, 1878.
- <sup>7</sup> S. Theol. III, q. 35, art. 4 and 5 (Christus dicitur realiter filius Virginis Matris ex relatione reali maternitatis ad Christum). Cf. H.M. MANTEAU-BONAMY, *Maternité Divine et Incarnation*. Paris, Vrin, 1949. p. 117 s. — For more details on the evolution of the theology in this doctrine see Gerald VAN ACKEREN, *Mary's Divine Motherhood*, in *Mariology* (Juniper B. Carol-Bruce/Milwaukee) vol. 2 (1957) p. i77s. (bibl. p. 178). Philip Ch. HOELLE, *Mother of God*, art. in *New Cath. Ency.* X, (1967) p. 21s. (bibl. p. 24). M. J. NICOLAS recently presented a synthetical Mariology in *Théotokos. Le mystère de Marie*. Desclée (1965) and *Marie Mère du Sauveur*. Desclée (Coll. Le Mystère chrétien-Théologie dogmatique. 9.) 1967 (p. 77: bibl. with his own art.). — Saint Thomas founds the marian devotion in the same relation to God: S.Th. II, II, q. 103, art. 4 ad 2; III, q. 25, a. 5 (non debetur ei adoratio latriae, sed solum veneratio duliae: eminentius tamen quam ceteris creaturis, inquantum ipsa est mater Dei).
- <sup>8</sup> See the art. of J. A. DE ALDAMA, *Piété et système dans la Mariologie du "Doctor Eximius"*, in *Maria. Etudes sur la Sainte Vierge* (H. du Manoir — Beauchesne/Paris) tome II (1952) p. 978 s. The Manuscript is quoted in the bibliography (p. 990): Mss 3571: Gesuit. 1.442 fol. 501-10: Vittorio Emmanuele Library, Rome.
- <sup>9</sup> Franciscus SUAREZ, *Commentariorum ac Disputationum in Tertiam Partem Divi Thomae*. tomus secundus (Mysteria vitae Christi et utriusque adventus ejus . . .) 1592. Compluti (Alcala) — cf. SOMMERVOGEL VII, c. 1662/3.
- <sup>10</sup> Francis SUAREZ, *The dignity and Virginity of the Mother of God*. Disputations I, V, VI from *The Mysteries of the Life of Christ*. Transl. by Richard J. O'BRIEN. West Baden College. West Baden Springs, Indiana (West Baden Readings in Philosophy and Theology) 1954. p. VII.
- <sup>11</sup> id. p. VIII.
- <sup>12</sup> See the appreciation of Migne's work by J. QUASTEN, *Patrology*, Spectrum/Newman, vol. I, p. 14. — A. Hamman (Garnier-Paris) is now editing *Patrologiae cursus completus. Supplementum* (Series latina); the vol. IV began in 1967 and will go till Beda.
- <sup>13</sup> Summa Aurea. De laudibus Beatissimae Virginis Mariae sine labe conceptae . . . Joannes Jacobus Bourassé . . . Hoc opus quod sub titulo *Liber Mariae et filiorum ejus* annuntiaverat nunc. edit J. P. Migne. 1866 — 13 vols. — See praef. vol. I, p. II.
- <sup>14</sup> De Marie Virgine incomparabili et Dei genitricis sacrosancta libri 5, auctore D. Petro Canisio S.J.: Bourassé, vol. 8 (631-1450) and 9 (9-408). — See the note of SOMMERVOGEL, II, 617s. for the complete title of the first edition (1577): Alter tomus Commentariorum de Verbi Dei corruptelis . . .
- <sup>15</sup> Matthias Joseph SCHEEBEN, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, Herder, Freiburg, 3 vols., 1873-82: the Mariology is given in vol. III. p. 455-629 — *Mariology*, transl. by Rev. T. L. M. J. Geukers, 2 vols., Herder Book Co., 1948 (on the basis of the flemish translation by H. B. van Waes, with the preface and the annotations of Rev. Dr. Eugene Druwé (see engl. transl. p. XXXIV).
- <sup>16</sup> Handbuch . . . III, n<sup>o</sup>229-231. See: Scheeben-Feckes, *Die bräutliche Gottesmutter*. Verl. Fredebeul & Koenen, 1951 — French transl. by A. Kerkvoorde, *La Mère virginale de Sauveur*. Desclée de Br. 1953 (ch. 2).
- <sup>17</sup> See *Mariology* (tr. Geukers) vol. 1, p. XVIII (cf. note 15).

## Koehler: Marian Theology and the Continuing Evolution of Human Knowledge

- 18 Const. *Lumen Gentium*, chapter VIII, n<sup>o</sup>63, 64.
- 19 See in the new edition of Scheeben (Matthias Joseph Scheeben – *Gesammelte Schriften*. VI/2. *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*. V/2. Erlösungslehre. 2te Aufl. hergg. von Carl Feches. p. 348. (Fünftes Hauptstück. 276. n<sup>o</sup>1587s. Die Gnade der göttlichen Mutterschaft als übernatürlicher Personalcharakter Mariens. (with new bibliogr.).
- 20 See *Mariology* (Geukers), vol. I, p. 154, and the preface of E. Druwé: P. XXXI.
- 21 See the cited art. (note above 7) of G. van Ackeren (p. 203s.) and Ph. Hoelle.
- 22 Cf. Denzinger-Schönmetzer (1965) n<sup>o</sup>2800-4.
- 23 See Const. dogm. *Dei Filius*, de fide catholica: Denz. Schön. n<sup>o</sup>3000s.
- 24 Ernest RENAN, *L'avenir de la science*, transl.: *The Future of Science*, Boston, Roberts Bro. 1893.
- 25 id. preface (transl.) p. V-XX – p. X: “My religion is now as ever the progress of reason, in other words the progress of science. But in looking over these pages of my youth, I often found a certain confusion which distorted certain deductions.” Afterwards Renan writes: “The aim of sciences is an immense development of which the cosmological sciences give us the first perceptible links, of which history proper shows us the last expansions. Like Hegel I made the mistake of being too confident in attributing to mankind a central part in the universe. The whole of human development may be of no more consequence than the moss or lichen with which every moist surface is covered”. The atheism of Renan in his last years was pessimistic, ignoring our immortality and coming to impossible conclusions: “The inferiority of certain races to others is proved” (p. xv). “For us idealists, there exists one true doctrine, the transcendental doctrine according to which the aim of humanity exists in constituting a loftier consciousness of the universe, or as we used to say, the highest glory of God, but it is very clear that this doctrine will afford no basis for a practical policy. Such an aim must, on the contrary, be carefully dissimulated. Man would revolt if they knew they were being thus exploited (p. XVII)”. And we recognize a certain modern confusion: “How long will national spirit be able to hold out against individual egotism? Who, in centuries to come, will have served humanity most, the patriot, the liberal, the reactionary, the savant? No one knows and still it would be a capital thing to know, for what is good in one of these hypotheses is bad in the other” (p. XVII, XVIII).
- 26 Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers par une Société de gens de lettres, mis en ordre par Diderot,; et quant à la partie mathématique par d’Alembert. Paris, Briasson, 1751-72; with suppl. till 1780. Today, the work is only of historical interest.
- 27 Cf. Eric MAY, *Mariological Societies*, in *MARIOLOGY* (J. Carol) vol. III, p. 272s.
- 28 Bulletin de la Société française d’études mariales, *Marie et l’Eglise*: 1951, 52, 53 – La Nouvelle Eve, 1954, 55, 56, 57. (Paris-Lethielleux).
- 29 Constitutio *Lumen Gentium*, chapter VIII.
- 30 *Marianum*, viala Trenta Aprile, 6, Rome: founded in 1939 by F. G. Roschini and the Servite Fathers; with the publication of the bibliographical work of F. G. M. Besutti – *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, Buen Suceso, 22, Madrid: founded in 1951 by the Claretian Fathers.
- 31 See *Marian Centers, Libraries, and Publications*, by Rev. William G. MOST, in *MARIOLOGY* (J. Carol), vol. 3, p. 283s.
- 32 Jan G. BARBOUR, *Science and Religion Today*, in *Science and Religion. New Perspectives on the dialogue*, Edit. by Jan C. Barbour. Harper and Row. N.Y. 1968, p. 3s.

33 id.

34 id. p. 9.

35 See for ex.: *Concilium. Theology in the age of Renewal*. Glen Rock — N.J. Paulist Press. 1965s.

36 Giuseppe M. BESUTTI, *Bibliografia Mariana*. 1958-1966. Roma Ed. Marianum. 1968.

37 For that problem, see: E. CASSIRER, *The problem of Knowledge. Philosophy, Science, and History since Hegel*. 5th ed. Yale University Press. 1969.

38 Alfred N. Whitehead, in *Science and the Modern World* (New York-Cambridge. 1925) wrote: "When we consider what religion is for mankind and what science is, it is no exaggeration to say that the future course of history depends upon the decision of this generation as to the relations between them. (p. 180)" quoted in the more modern study of that dialogue *Issues in Science and Religion* (p. 12), by Jan. G. BARBOUR. Prentice Hall. N.J. 1966.

39 It is the idea of Pierre TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, *Man's place in Nature. The human zoological group*. (Transl. by René Hague) Collins. London. 1966. p. 78.

40 Lumen Gentium, ch. VIII, n<sup>o</sup> 56.

41 See my article in the next issue of *Ephemerides Mariologicae* (1970): "Théologie et Mariologie, dans l'actuelle compénétration de sciences."

42 Cf. St. Peter CHRYSOLOGUS, Sermo 99: PL 52, 478-479.