

Marian Studies

Volume 37 *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh National Convention of the Mariological Society of America held in Tampa, FLA.*

Article 12

1986

Mary and the Church: Lumen Gentium, Arts. 60 to 65

Charles W. Neumann

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



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Neumann, Charles W. (1986) "Mary and the Church: Lumen Gentium, Arts. 60 to 65," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 37, Article 12.
Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol37/iss1/12

This Front Matter 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.

MARY AND THE CHURCH: *Lumen Gentium*, ARTS. 60 TO 65

In the title of the Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium* already a twofold doctrinal theme is announced: the role of Mary in the mystery of Christ and of the Church. As the chapter opens, the Council declares its intention "to describe with diligence the role of the Blessed Virgin in the mystery of the Incarnate Word and the Mystical Body" (Art. 54). With Article 60 the chapter reaches the second half of this doctrinal theme, as the title for this section indicates: *The Blessed Virgin and the Church*. The section extends from Art. 60 through Art. 65 and is about as long as the first half of the doctrinal section in which the role of Mary in the mystery of Christ is treated — 77 lines as against 83 lines in the official edition.

But the treatment of Mary and the Church differs considerably from the section immediately preceding on the union of Christ and His Mother: the approach becomes systematic after having followed a salvation-history sequence, the theological material evokes patristic insights unfamiliar to many today, and spirited controversy among the Council Fathers marks the presentation of some Marian titles and functions in the Church and is still reflected even in the finished document.

But for all the unfamiliarity of the material, the pressure of writing a new schema which for this section could find little to borrow from the original *De Beata*, the solicitude about further controversies that might place consensus beyond reach — the anguishing division on October 29, 1963, over the Marian schema and its integration into the Constitution on the Church was a fresh memory — these six articles contain the distinctive teaching that probably first comes to mind when the question is asked,

What did Vatican II say about Mary?¹

The approach in Arts. 60-65 no longer follows the unfolding of salvation history. Consequently, of Sacred Scripture there is only one citation, about the unique Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5), and two references, about the firstborn of many brethren (Rom. 8:29) and the spouse without spot or wrinkle (Eph. 5:27). What scriptural allusions there are concern mainly Mary's union with Christ rather than with the Church (cf. Arts. 61, 63, 65). Instead, a systematic synthesis is presented, built around the double function of Mary in the Church, namely, her continuing motherly role of intercession and her exemplarity, with the latter function seen in her being type of the Church and model for all disciples in the Church.

I. ORIGIN OF THE MARY-CHURCH SECTION (Arts. 60-65)

A. *Controversies: Mediatrix, Mother of Church, Integration*

The principal controversy that dogged the evolution of the Mary-Church section concerned the use of the title "Mediatrix" to describe Mary's continuing role in the Church. But the controversy was limited to the term itself, its meanings, and the opportuneness of its use in a conciliar document; there was unity about the truth expressed in the term, namely, Mary's continuing involvement in the work of Christ as it unfolds in the Church. An alternate way of expressing this truth as motherhood in the order of grace enjoyed more gratifying consensus from the earliest discussions on.

Yet on this issue of Mary's spiritual motherhood again minds clashed concerning an associated title, Mother of the Church. It got no farther on the way to acceptance in this section, and indeed the Council came nearest to endorsing it explicitly in an earlier article in the introduction to the chapter, when the simple statement was made that "the Catholic Church honors her

¹ For initial orientation this study is indebted to Salvatore M. Meo, *Maria nel Capitolo VIII della "Lumen Gentium": Elementi per un'analisi dottrinale* (Pro Manuscripto) (Rome: Pontificia Facolta Teologica "Marianum," 1974-75).

. . . as most beloved mother" (Art. 53). Strangely nowhere in this section is the term "member of the Church" ascribed to Mary in any explicit sense. The term was used for the only time in Chapter VIII when in the introduction Mary was described as "preeminent and altogether singular member of the Church" (Art. 53). There her relationship was sketched in advance in a triple synthesis—mother, member, type-exemplar; and although "mother" and "type-exemplar" will grow into the two parts of the present section on Mary and the Church, "member" is presumed throughout the entire chapter but receives no special mention.

Mary's relationship with the Church was not the subject of any section in the original Marian schema *De B.M. Virgine, Matre Dei et Matre hominum* circulated among the Fathers in 1962 and 1963. Its focus was strongly Christological, its purpose to show what "the Catholic Church as such believes, holds and teaches about (Mary's) role, her privileges, and Marian devotion."² Without any change of content the schema was re-titled *De Maria, Matre Ecclesiae* and redistributed in 1963. In formally presenting the latter schema on October 24, 1963, Cardinal Santos Rufini lightly touched on the issue of integrating the Marian schema into the Constitution on the Church and admitted that "insertion or close connection would require a new ordering of the material."³ He mentioned the advisability, on ecumenical grounds, of treating Mary as "type, image, and exemplar of the faithful," reporting that the Japanese bishops and two others had referred to her as "type or figure of the Church," one even holding this to be both traditional and ecumenical.⁴

² "Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticae de Beata Maria Virgine Matre Dei et Matre hominum. Praenotanda," printed with Gen. Cong. 31, Dec. 1, 1962, *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Secundi*, (4 vols.; Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970-80), Volumen I, Pars iv, 98. Hereafter *Acta*, followed by volume (e.g., I), part (e.g., iii), and page. The date of an oral intervention will be given, as also the General Congregation (G.C.) and date under which written interventions or printed versions of the successively amended document and its notes appear in the *Acta*.

³ "Schema . . . De Beata Maria Virgine Matre Ecclesiae. Observationes Generales," Oct. 24, 1963, *Acta* II, iii, 302.

⁴ *Ibid.*

No such language on the Church-Mary relationship was to be found in the schema itself, which referred only to "the place which the Mother of God and men occupies in the Church."⁵ The Cardinal had to admit that in the written observations received in the summer of 1963 most of the more than 200 Fathers represented did not comment on the new title; some disliked it for a variety of reasons; the change of title pleased only one of them; and most significantly, two remarked that such a title would require further extensive change since "the schema's contents do not match its new title."⁶

On the same day, October 24, 1963, Cardinal Rufini fulfilled the assignment given him and presented the case for keeping the Marian schema independent of the Constitution on the Church. Mary, he said, "belongs to the People of God and is member of the Church, supereminent indeed and altogether unique, but still member." She is found "in the Church gathered in one body with all the elect, so that she is the first and principal member of the Church, and yet somehow she is above the Church." Nonetheless this "very great relation" between Mary and the Church does not justify joining the two documents under discussion, because the schema on the Church treats the Church "principally as pilgriming on earth," nor can "Mariology be correctly reduced to ecclesiology since it shares areas of great importance with Christology and Soteriology."⁷

Responding with the assigned defense of a proposed integration of the two documents, Cardinal Frings spoke almost another language. "Both the Church's eschatological end and destiny," he said, "and the Virgin's *terrestrial* life and saving function" must be treated together. The Church is not only "institute of salvation," but also "People of God and community of saints," wherein "the Blessed Virgin as eminent member" is to be placed. "In conceiving only by faith" she is "type of the Church itself." Consequently "these Marian privileges, though

⁵ Schema . . . hominum" (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 93.

⁶ "Observationes scripto adhibitae," June 1 to Sept. 24, 1963, *Acta* II, iii, 306.

⁷ "Patrum orationes. Relatio," Oct. 24, 1963, *Acta* II, iii, 339.

personal, contain at the same time an eschatological meaning, that is, *in* the Church and *for* the Church. In such a way is Mary type of the Church."⁸

These two positions on the Church-Mary relationship sound poles apart, and the straw vote five days later on October 29, 1963, on the question of integrating the two documents would reveal the contrary opinions to be shared by almost equal numbers of Fathers. As already mentioned, the decision taken that day for integrating the Marian schema required its entire recasting, since the original *De Beata* simply had not had in its scope to treat the Church-Mary relationship. This was the situation exactly a year to the day, as events would reveal, before the Council would have a document on Mary that would be satisfactory.

B. How the Mary-Church Section Was Composed

This new schema would be the fruit of six months of intense efforts on the part of two theologian-experts enlisted by a special Sub-Committee appointed for re-writing the Marian schema. Canon Gerard Philips of Louvain had broadly sketched a new document that would include the Mary-Church relationship. Father Carlo Balic, O.F.M., was the principal author of the previous schema, the main focus of which had been the relationship between Mary and Christ. These two experts also drew elements from two schemata officially presented by the bishops of Chile⁹ and by the bishops of England and Wales,¹⁰ both of which were available also in editions that had been conflated with each other and with the original *De Beata*.¹¹

By July 1964 the new schema was in the hands of the Council Fathers. The ecclesial dimension of Mary's role in salvation history which now had been added was not, however, familiar

⁸ *Ibid.*, 343.

⁹ "Appendix—Animadversiones scriptae," printed with G.C. 58, Oct. 30, 1963, *Acta* II, iii, 824-829.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 818-820; also called the schema of Abbot Christopher Butler, O.S.B.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 821-824, 830-834.

throughout the Catholic world, even among theologians. Here the contribution of the French Mariological Society in making it known and even in introducing it into the new schema should be mentioned, however briefly. "Mary and the Church" had been the theme of a three-year series of scholarly studies 1951-1953 sponsored by the Society.¹² Their influence reached the schema directly through Canon Philips, long an active member of the Society. In the notes accompanying the schema the French studies are listed as one of the three sources on the Mary-Church theme.¹³ Philips' own articles in years immediately preceding the Council witness to his mastery of the theme.¹⁴

Fr. Balic, of course, made his major contribution in the Christological section of the schema, and borrowings of text and ideas from his *De Beata* are discernible there and in the first three articles of the Mary-Church section. In particular the treatment of Mary's mediation in the earlier schema, in Laurentin's opinion, already contained in substance what would be in the definitive text, so that "it is even debatable whether the definitive text has advanced on this particular point. Thus the accomplishments of the first text were not in vain."¹⁵

If the two doctrinal sections of Chapter VIII are viewed as respectively Christotypical and Ecclesiotypical, it must be remembered, in the words of Archbishop Maurice Roy who officially presented the chapter to the Council on September 16, 1964, that "the Christotypical and Ecclesiotypical interpretations in no way exclude but rather complement each other," nor was it the intention of the Council to "impose any determined solution in the controversy between the tendencies so styled."¹⁶

¹² *EtdM* 9-11: *Marie et l'Eglise* (3 vols; Paris: Lethielleux, 1951-53).

¹³ "Schema Constitutionis de Ecclesia . . . Caput VIII. Relationes de singulis numeris," printed with G.C. 80, Sept. 15, 1964, *Acta* III, i. 372, with an error, however, in dating the *EtdM* volumes as 1954-56.

¹⁴ Gerard Philips, "Marie et l'Eglise: Un thème théologique renouvelé," in Hubert du Manoir (ed.), *Maria* (8 vols.; Paris: Beauchesne, 1949-71), 7 (1964): 363-419. Also, "L'orientation de la mariologie contemporaine. Essai bibliographique 1955-1959," *Mm* 23 (1960): 209-253.

¹⁵ René Laurentin, "Genèse du texte conciliaire," *EtdM* 22 (1965): 10.

¹⁶ "Patrum orationes. Relatio introductiva super Cap. VIII," Sept. 16, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 436.

C. Relation to Other Sections in Chapter VIII

But the bond between the two doctrinal parts of the chapter is much more than mutual respect for complementary opinion on a controverted issue. In the one-page report at the end of the new schema distributed in July 1964 it was stated:

There is question of the mystery of *Christ*, the Word Incarnate, to which mystery everything regarding the Blessed Virgin pertains as to its source. This same mystery, however, is continued in the Church, and its salutary effects are applied by her to the faithful. Therefore in the title the word *mystery* is designedly put in the singular. Thus is justified the fact that the treatise on the Blessed Virgin is placed in the Constitution on the Church, and indeed at its end as a kind of crown, because she who is Mother of God and at the same time mother of those who constitute the "People of God" (is also) type and example of the Church.¹⁷

Archbishop Roy expanded on the interrelatedness of the two doctrinal parts. The Marian chapter, he went on, was

. . . introduced into the Constitution on the Church, the Council's main theme, because she is intrinsically connected with the mystery of the Church. On the other hand, to explain this connection, the role of the Mother of God must be expressly considered in the very mystery of the Word Incarnate.¹⁸

In the accounting of some 24 last-minute requests (*modi*) for a change of title, the Theological Commission defended the present title as "corresponding accurately to the material presented. The subject is not only the relation of the Blessed Virgin to the *Church*, but also her relation to the *Word Incarnate*. This last relation is the foundation of all the rest."¹⁹

¹⁷ "Schema . . . Relatio Generalis" (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i, 374. Emphasis in original. The last sentence is defective in lacking a main verb, using a superfluous *ac*, and misspelling *quod* as *quoad*.

¹⁸ "Patrum orationes" (cf. *supra* n. 16), *Acta* III, i, 435.

¹⁹ "Caput VIII . . . Modi Generales," Nov. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, viii, 151f.

The Mary-Church section of Chapter VIII is then obviously closely connected with the Christological part preceding. It leads naturally also to the section following, on devotion to Mary. For the relationship between the Church and Mary will there be considered, as it were, from below, in the veneration which the Church on earth pays Mary. Here in the section now to be studied Mary's relation is considered, so to say, from above in concentrating on the person of Mary who, now joined to her Son, both inspires the rest of Christ's disciples to follow and prays in Christ that they do so.

* * * * *

The six articles on Mary and the Church fall into two parts of exactly equal length, each containing three articles. Mary's two-fold role in the Church, intercession and exemplarity, is treated in terms that show how much a part of the Church she really is. For these are the two roles eminently fulfilled by the Risen Christ who, having redeemed mankind, lives forever to intercede for them (Heb. 7:21) and inspires them by the example of how He himself lived on earth. Likewise, "from the saints we seek 'example in their way of life . . . and the help of their intercession'" (Art. 51:1). In Mary, who is *Beatissima* (Art. 65) among the saints, the *beati*, this two-fold role is exercised in closest union with Christ, " 'the crown of all the saints,' and through Him in God who is wonderful in His saints and is glorified in them" (Art. 50:3).

II. PART ONE: MARY'S ENDURING ROLE AS MOTHER (Arts. 60-62)

A. *Preoccupation: How Express Mary's Mediation* (Arts. 60, 62:2, 3)

The chapter takes up Mary's intercessory role as mother in Arts. 60 to 62. Already the role was described in the original *De Beata* in terms of Mary's mediation, and this approach was adapted to the new schema; but at first (July 1964) the term "Mediatrix" was not used. Even without this term in the text, it

was judged necessary to begin the entire section with a direct scriptural citation, the only one in the six articles, affirming that Christ is the one Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5). As if by way of inclusion this affirmation is reiterated in two more paragraphs as this first part on Mary's intercessory role comes to an end, paragraphs added to Art. 62 in subsequent revisions. Significantly Art. 62 is the only article in Chapter VIII that is divided into paragraphs, a further indication of the successive re-handling of the Mediatrix problem and a sign of the tension on the issue manifest even in the structure of the text.²⁰

1. The "One Mediator" (1 Tim. 2:5)

It is almost as though an objection had to be answered before even it was made. Be it noted also that the intercession of Mary and of the saints had been extensively treated throughout Chapter VII in a quite relaxed style replete with evocations of the language of the Book of Revelation and with more than 45 references to Scripture and four direct citations, without anywhere the text of 1 Timothy on the one Mediator. Even the original *De Beata* was into its third page, quite larded with New Testament references, before 1 Timothy was cited—and then only after the introduction of the title "Mediatrix." It was cited in the early draft of the new schema, the *Textus prior* (May 1964), but only after an opening statement of Mary's intercessory role had been made in at least a general way, without mention of the title "Mediatrix" there or anywhere else in the *Textus prior*.

It seems almost that on mediation and especially on "Mediatrix" the document is being clearly defensive, toward non-Catholic Christians and even toward many of the Council Fathers themselves. One half of the text of these three articles, at their beginning and end, is taken up with the cautionary reminder that Mary's mediation does not obscure or threaten or impinge upon Christ's. It is certainly a record for affirmation-oriented Vatican II that here in 17 lines of text *non* occurs four times, *nullo modo* twice, *nihil* twice, *nulla* once—no less than nine

²⁰ Cf. Appendix II for the changes of text of Arts. 60-65, July to November 1964.

negatives. The positive portrayal of Mary's role that follows is sandwiched between the two layers of cautions; though of equal length—17 lines again—the passage contains only one negative, saying that “she has not laid aside her saving role.”

2. Difficulties with Mediation Language for Mary

It may be assumed that the principal difficulties with mediation language for anyone but Christ are familiar. They were mentioned frequently in the conciliar debates and written interventions. Problems also were voiced that Catholic theologians themselves raise. With whom does Mary mediate? Official notes accompanying the original *De Beata* observed that “sometimes she is said to be Mediatrix toward Christ the Mediator, other times toward God. In the Constitution both formulas are used.”²¹ In what sense does she mediate grace? By instrumental causality? By dispositive causality? Again, the notes on the original *De Beata* advised that

. . . while there is no difficulty in admitting that she is Mediatrix associated with Christ in *acquiring* all grace (abstraction made of whether immediately or mediately, directly or indirectly, *in actu primo active recipiendo vel alio modo*), questions arise when the step is taken to calling her Mediatrix inasmuch as she *distributes* graces, especially if *all* graces are meant.²²

Indeed when it is said that she mediates all graces, are all graces really meant to be included? The graces of the sacraments that are nonetheless effective *ex opere operato*? The Old Testament graces and those in general that preceded her entrance into salvation history? One can understand those who at the Council cautioned that the issue had not matured, certainly not enough to view favorably the request said to have come from some 500 Fathers for a dogmatic declaration of some “social role of the B. Virgin, and especially of her universal mediation as to graces.”²³

²¹ “Schema . . . hominum. Notae” (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 110, footnote 17.

²² *Ibid.*, 111, footnote 21.

²³ *Ibid.*, 108, footnote 17.

Moreover, many Fathers were alert to the fact that the enthusiasm for the title "Mediatrix" was relatively recent, popularized especially by the papal magisterium but with decreasing ardor, and not shared by the Eastern Churches who were long accustomed to a variety of titles of the same general meaning, rather than to just this one.

Indeed a catena of some eleven papal texts, themselves dating back a century, was supplied in the notes of the original *De Beata*²⁴ from which the following titles can be culled: *Pius IX*—mediatrix, conciliatrix; *Leo XIII*—minister of heavenly graces, Reparatrix of the whole world, Conciliatrix, Minister of grace, most acceptable Mediatrix with the Mediator, Interceder with God for our peace, means and interceder for our salvation; *Pius X*—Reparatrix of the lost world, dispensatrix of all gifts, most powerful mediatrix and conciliatrix with her only-begotten Son; *Pius XI*—advocate of sinners, minister and mediatrix of grace; *Pius XII*—our most loving Mother.²⁵ For the great Marian pope of this century, "most loving Mother" is the only contribution listed, and the notes fail to add that Pius XII avoided the use of *mediatrix*, preferring *sequestra* (helper, interceder).²⁶ In the schema as presented on October 29, 1964, the printed notes accompanying it referred to "the use of the title in devotion and in ecclesiastical documents (not however with Pius XII and afterwards)."²⁷

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 109f., footnote 17.

²⁵ Here are the titles in the original: *Pius IX*—*mediatrix, conciliatrix*; *Leo XIII*—*caelestium administra gratiarum, Reparatrix totius orbis, Conciliatrix, Administra gratiae, peraccepta ad Mediatorem Mediatricis, pacis nostrae ad Deum sequestra, nostrae salutis media et sequestra*; *Pius X*—*Reparatrix perditis orbis, universorum munerum dispensatrix, potentissima apud Unigenitum Filium suum mediatrix et conciliatrix*; *Pius XI*—*peccatorum advocata, gratiae ministra ac mediatrix*; *Pius XII*—*nostra amantissima Mater*.

²⁶ René Laurentin, *La Vierge au Concile* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1965), p. 188, n. 1; cf. p. 127. Cf. *Acta* III, viii, 164.

²⁷ "Caput VIII . . . Relatio de particularibus," printed with G.C. 112, Oct. 29, 1964, *Acta* III, vi, 31.

3. Solution: Mediatrix Used with Other Titles

In handling the delicate issue of this title, therefore, a middle course was chosen after the Theological Commission restored it in the July 1964 *Textus emendatus* in the form of a simple statement that "Mary is customarily embellished (*condecorari suevit*) by the Church with the title Mediatrix in addition to others,"²⁸ though no others were mentioned at this stage of editing. Requests that the title be totally removed again were not heeded. Contrary requests to emphasize the title or explain it or give it broader scope were likewise turned down. Instead it was kept in the text but preceded by three other titles that do not have technical meaning or theological systematization but are no less witnessed to in tradition and are free of controversy. They deserve some explanation.

"Advocate" is a translation of the Greek *paraklētōs*, familiar from Johannine literature. *Paraklētōs* is used in Jn. 14:26, 15:26 and 16:7 of the Holy Spirit, in the sense of helper or interceder, and is there transliterated by the Vulgate as *paraclitus*, but in 1 Jn. 2:11, *paraklētōs* is used of the Risen Christ with an additional soteriological nuance, and there the Vulgate translates it *advocatus*. In Christian literature the title was first used of Mary by Irenaeus (c.130-c.200) who called her "Advocate of Eve";²⁹ his text is preserved only in a Latin translation, and therefore has *advocata*, but it probably contained *paraklētōs* in the lost Greek, though the matter is controversial.³⁰

"Auxiliatrix" is a translation of the Greek *boēthos*, meaning "helper." It is used of Eve in the Septuagint translation of Gen. 2:19, "Let us make for him a help suitable to him." Its only use in the New Testament is in Heb. 13:6 where Ps. 117:6 is quoted, "The Lord is my helper"; the term is common in the Old Testament. In Christian literature it is a familiar title among the Greeks, and its closest Marian echo in the prayer language of the

²⁸ "Schema . . . Caput VIII" (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i. 359, col. 2. Cf. *infra*, Appendix I for the sentence being discussed in Art. 62:1.

²⁹ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, V, 19, 1. PG 7:1176—*ut virginis Evae Virgo Maria fieret advocata*.

³⁰ Michael O'Carroll, *Theotokos* (Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1982), p. 190.

West is possibly *Auxilium Christianorum*, "Help of Christians," in the Litany of Loreto.

"Adjutrix" comes from a derivative of the Greek *boēthos* and is not at all as common in Western prayer language as in the East. Its general sense too is "helper." English-speaking Catholics, even devotees of Mary, may have encountered it for the first time in their lives in its transliterated form in Art. 62 here under discussion. Flannery's rendering of the title as "Benefactress" is felicitous; Abbott's transliteration serves no purpose; the French Mariological Society and Laurentin both translate it *aide*.

Originating in the prayer language of the Greeks, these titles in Latin offer difficulties that are even compounded by English transliteration, and they may do little to stir fervor or even interest. Hardly can a rendering of the latter two, in particular, suggest the note of urgency that the Greek verb *boētheo* has: originally "run on a call for help," "hasten to the help of the oppressed," and thus "help."³¹ The Greeks in their homiletic literature are well known for an openness to titles for Mary in superabundance, without any of the drag of controversy that clings to the titles from resemblance to corresponding titles of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

The presence of these titles expressive of Mary's intercessory role serves to bring to light how much more deeply rooted in tradition the notion of Mary's role is than just the expression of it in the title Mediatrix. Moreover the variety of titles, each also with a corresponding title applied to Christ, can perhaps serve to lessen the scandal taken over the apparent clash between the text about the one Mediator and a more relaxed prayer language in which Mary can also properly be called Mediatrix. It is not unheard of, after all, that Christians even call one another by many names and titles that they use eminently of God—to begin with, "Father" and "Son," despite Mt. 23:9.

Laurentin, among others, rightly observes that the debate at the Council was actually over a word or title, not over the idea,

³¹ Gerhard Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76), 1: 628.

and that if instead of "hastily choosing the word mediation because of its attractiveness" the parties interested "had preferred a more modest word, less open to discussion, more broadly rooted in tradition, more theologically tested — 'patronage' or 'motherly protection' for example — there would have been no difficulty."³² In fact, an alternative expression, "mother in the order of grace," was used in the very three articles here under discussion and provided the opportunity for a positive description of Mary's saving role, as will be seen shortly.

Perhaps too, the debate settled down too narrowly to considering the whole issue of mediation only in terms of Mary's relation to Christ the Mediator, despite the ecclesial context of the Marian chapter. In fact, in the passage in the definitive text on Mary's mediation the Church is mentioned only twice, as "invoking" Mary under the title *Mediatrix* and as "not hesitating to profess her subordinate role." Jean Galot remarks quite perceptively:

Perhaps the objections to the word "mediatrix" would have been less strong and more easily answered if Mary's mediation had been affirmed as model and essential element of the *Church's* mediation. If one intended to give too narrow a meaning to the text declaring Christ the unique mediator (1 Tim. 2:5), one would exclude not only Mary's mediation but the Church's as well.³³

4. Elaborating the Doctrine of Mediation

The energy spent on securing a place in the text of Arts. 60-62 for the title *Mediatrix* did not extend to elaborating the truth it expresses. But it would be faithful to the Council's thought to consider her mediation in both its phases, the past during her life on earth and the present in her existence and activity in the communion of saints. Only the second phase occupied the Council's attention, and not to any depth.

Mary is most clearly seen as *Mediatrix* at the Annunciation — which the Council does not mention in terms of her mediation

³² Laurentin, *La Vierge*, p. 124.

³³ Jean Galot, "Marie, type et modèle de l'Eglise," in Guilherme Barauna and Y. M.-J. Congar (eds.), *L'Eglise de Vatican II: Etudes autour de la constitution conciliaire sur l'Eglise* (3 vols.; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1966), 3: 1250.

but rather of her maternity (Art. 62:1). Yet at the Annunciation, by God's free choice and her cooperation, she very clearly mediates between God and humanity, who are separated by the infinite gap of both creation and sin. But once God's Son becomes human in her womb, this form of her mediation ended, for the unique Mediator hereafter ontologically unites in His person the divine and the human, and by his own loving *fiat* in death will reconcile sinful humanity to the Father.

Mary's mediation will however take the form of a relative and subordinate share in His, thanks to her God-willed union with Him. Thus she carries Him to John the Baptist and to Simeon, not as though coming between Jesus and them but rather bringing Him into the presence of those who first receive His grace. That too is obviously a dated form that her mediation takes for a while.

At Cana she speaks to her Son on behalf of others. The Council uses "intercession" to describe her role at Cana (Art. 58) and speaks of "intercession" as her heavenly role (Art. 62:1). One must of course remember that in the Kingdom there can be no need for her to transmit information to her Son or instruction to others, and that, even more, it is precisely in the Risen Christ that she herself is at all aware of the needs of others and of their appeals to her.

And so, actually, in the Kingdom mediation has been transmuted into something higher, a communion and participation in all the salvific intentions and actions of Christ, the one Mediator who lives ever to intercede for His brethren. There is no question of distance from Christ—many of the Council Fathers expressed the fear that the term *mediatrix* could suggest that—no room for the thought that Mary can draw Christ's attention to some need of which He is not already aware or to which He would not otherwise be kindly disposed. Christian prayer can rightly be addressed to her, and in prayer language and from our terrestrial viewpoint she will be spoken of as mediating. But the heavenly reality is that in the communion of saints "there is room only for a mediation *in Christo*," as Laurentin, whose thought is being summarized here, notes.³⁴

³⁴ Laurentin, *La Vierge*, pp. 119 and 118-20 *passim*.

Otto Semmelroth echoes the same thought:

Neither must we envisage her continued mediation as essentially the continuance of what she did on earth—as a sort of historical activity on a higher plane. At a man's death his history . . . passes into eternity in the presence of God, there revealing itself in the intercessory power it has as a share in the redemptive work of Christ. . . . So Mary's share in the redemptive work of Christ—and that of the other saints in their own measure—continues in intercessory existence before God.³⁵

In a written intervention Bishop John Julian Weber expressed this thought and its ecumenical significance in a forceful way at the Council:

It would be useful to specify that this mediation of Mary is exercised by her "pious intercession," and indeed "in Christ," since she is the noblest member of the mystical body of Christ. The expression "mediation in Christ" (*Mittlerschaft in Christus*) is admitted by some separated brethren (e.g., by the Lutheran theologian Asmussen in his *Maria, die Mutter Gottes*, p. 51). This mediation of Mary has its parallel, though in a very minor aspect, in the mediation of the faithful of Christ, who can pray for one another to the Lord (cf. 1 Thess. 5:28; Col. 4:12; Eph. 5:18-20).³⁶

This refined notion of mediation *in* Christ was clearly expressed even earlier at the Council in the original *De Beata*, in a context immediately after the citation of 1 Tim. 2:5 and the statement that "the unique mediation of our Mediator is not obscured or diminished; indeed this mediation of Christ is exalted and honored. *For Mary is Mediatrix in Christ* and her mediation does not stem from any necessity but from the divine disposition etc."³⁷ Remarkably every single part, even many of the exact words, of this text won a way into the definitive Art. 60, except

³⁵ Otto Semmelroth, "Chapter 8," in Herbert Vorgrimler (ed.): *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (5 vols.; New York: Herder and Herder, 1967-69), 1: 291.

³⁶ "Animadversiones scriptae," up to July 10, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 783-4.

³⁷"Schema . . . hominum" (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 94f.

the most theologically accurate, perceptive, and ecumenical phrase—the one positive note about Mary’s mediation—that is italicized. Clearly the Council had its problems with “*Mediatrix*.”

B. Intercession and Maternal Care (Arts. 61 and 62:1)

But the alternative expression of Mary’s continuing intercessory role as mother in the order of grace found much more acceptance and led to a positive description (Arts. 61 and 62:1), alluded to earlier, sandwiched between the cautions about mediation. Galot observes that the reality of Mary’s mediation is expressed when one attributes to her a motherhood in the order of grace that still endures. To affirm this motherhood is to affirm a certain uninterrupted mediation in the diffusion of grace:

It is moreover preferable that the conciliar text vigorously underlined motherhood, for it thus more exactly expressed the mode of mediation proper to Mary; the concept of mediation is in fact very broad and needed to be determined with exactitude.³⁸

1. Foundation of Mary’s Spiritual Motherhood (Art. 61)

The single problem that was faced here found solution only at the last stage of amending, through the acceptance of some final changes, *modi*, which normally had to be only slight touchings-up of a text already essentially approved. One last-minute change was rather substantial. In the opening lines of Art. 61, the foundation of Mary’s motherhood in the order of grace was given originally in two titles: humble handmaid of the Lord and generous associate. Many interventions, oral and written, alerted the editors to the fact that in Luke’s Gospel “Lord” in the expression “handmaid of the Lord” refers to the Father. Even when subsequently the phrase in the conciliar text came to be accompanied by “for Christ the Redeemer” it still did not adequately express for some Mary’s union with Christ. Others in turn found “associate” (*socia*) too weak to express her cooper-

³⁸ Galot, “Marie type,” p. 1250.

ation in Christ's work of Redemption, especially since Christ associated other persons besides Mary; hence the qualification "in a singular way" entered the text before "generous associate." But neither of these titles, handmaid or associate, said what seemed generally to be the clearest foundation of her role: that she was Christ's Mother. Hence the final change, approved only as late as November 17, 1964, to introduce before the two titles the third phrase, "gracious Mother of the divine Redeemer."

Abbot Jean Prou, O.S.B., had earlier offered a slightly different wording and a more elaborated text on this point: "She was made Mother of God so that the Word of God Incarnate might become perfect Redeemer and Mediator of the human race." Although his suggestion was not accepted, the reason he offered serves to explain quite well the final crucial inclusion of "Mother":

Reason for this amendment: so that the true foundation of Mary's spiritual motherhood or motherhood of grace might be indicated. For Mary is Mother of all the redeemed inasmuch as she gave birth to the incarnate Son of God precisely so that He might become perfect Mediator and Redeemer of men. For He would not be our perfect Mediator or Redeemer if He had not been born of the stock of Adam the sinner. . . . But Mary gave birth to Him . . . and principally deserves to be called Mother of grace.³⁹

The Dutch bishops had observed that the text, as it stood prior to this last-minute change, offered as intrinsic causes of Mary's motherhood toward us her role as "handmaid of the Lord" and "associate of Christ" and they rightly observed, "The transition from these titles to the title 'Motherhood' (spiritual) does not seem immediately evident or cogent."⁴⁰ Their suggestion was to let the text be silent about the foundation of Mary's motherhood toward us and speak only more generally, for example, of the "motherly protection of the Blessed Virgin toward men," leaving the specification of her role to theologians.

³⁹ "Animadversiones scriptae quoad Cap. VIII," printed with G.C. 83, Sept. 18, 1964, *Acta* III, ii, 153.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 187.

Their suggestion and many others briefly inventoried at the final handling of the *modi* were laid aside without comment as the Theological Commission submitted the definitive text on November 17, 1964. Hence the set of three titles—*mater, socia, ancilla* in the final ordering—is rather remarkable for having had to be born, as it were, as fruit of committee composition.

2. Two Sketches of Mary's Spiritual Motherhood (Art. 62:1)

Article 62 is remarkable too for the felicitous ease with which it continues the positive presentation of Mary's "motherhood in the economy of grace" as an enduring reality. For the first time in the entire Mary-Church section an allusion is made to the eschatological nature of the Church, subject of Chapter VII with which the Marian chapter must always be read. Mary's motherhood in the order of grace, it is said, continues uninterruptedly until all reach salvation. "Until the eternal fulfilment of all the elect" was an expression already in the special Sub-Committee's original schema finished by May 1964, followed by a reference to those "still in pilgrimage" toward their "happy fatherland."

In July 1964 the Theological Commission inserted a perhaps less elegant statement of her motherly role, paraphrasing theologian-expert Joseph Kleutgen's language in the revised text of his schema "On the Mystery of the Word Incarnate" that suffered the fate of unfinished business at Vatican I but was resurrected here to fashion most of the following sentence: "Taken up into heaven she did not lay aside this saving role, but by her manifold intercession in a marvelous way continues to secure for us gifts of eternal salvation." Kleutgen's exact words were: "Thus, bearing Christ, our Lord and God, she became mother of grace for us . . . nor does she cease to secure for us eternal gifts of salvation by her powerful intercession."⁴¹ At the request of one amendment (E/3107), the expression "in a marvelous way" to describe Mary's intercession was dropped without comment.⁴² Kleutgen had simply described her intercession as

⁴¹ Cf. *infra*, Appendix IV, for complete text and translation of footnotes for Arts. 60-65.

⁴² "Schema . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 30.

“powerful.” In the definitive text it is called “manifold” (*multiplici*). Perhaps the only elements of this added sentence that are not more beautifully phrased in the one that it upstaged are the reference to the Assumption and the mention of intercession—strangely enough, the only occurrence of the latter word in the six articles on the Church-Mary relation.

For the next sentence speaks much more lyrically of the “maternal charity” by which Mary “cares”; and in this latter word the editors could hardly have used a more contemporary idiom. “Cares” indeed comes from the new schema drawn up by Philips-Balic collaboration between November 1963 and May 1964, but “maternal charity” was already present in the original *De Beata*: “For all she intercedes through Christ, in such a way that in the conferral of all graces on mankind the maternal charity of the B. Virgin is present.”⁴³ Earlier in the *De Beata* it had been said that “assumed into heaven and established as Queen by the Lord, she keeps toward all the mind of a mother” (*maternum animum*) and later came mention of her “maternal heart” (*materno cordi*) and her “motherly nearness” (*materna propinquititas*). The language bears the Franciscan tenderness of its renowned author, and is traceable back to Ambrose Autpert (784). In a note on the first passage mentioned from *De Beata* the following explanation of “maternal charity” was given:

(It is asserted) in a very general way that in all graces that are conferred the motherly charity of Mary is present, at least according to that statement of Augustine at the beginning, “She cooperated in charity that the faithful should be born in the Church,” and that they might be born always.⁴⁴

Again it is evident, as Laurentin remarked, that not all the labor spent on the original *De Beata* was in vain. This gracious language of Art. 62 was yet further enhanced in two details: “cares for her children” became “cares for the brethren of her Son” in a more Christological perspective;⁴⁵ and again in the last round of

⁴³ “Schema . . . hominum” (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 95 and 97.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 111, note 21.

⁴⁵ “Schema . . . Caput VIII” (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i, 359, col. 2—a change made by the Theological Commission in July 1964.

changes one alert Father suggested that "who still journey on earth and struggle against sin" be replaced with "who still journey on earth surrounded by dangers and difficulties," because, said he, "the B. Virgin cares even (*etiam*) for those who do not struggle against sin." A delightful touch; the editors agreed without comment; *Scribatur*.⁴⁶

In the text of this brief positive portrayal of Mary's motherhood in grace three more proposals of slight change offer interest. One got no farther than the stage of proposal, though it was suggested independently by several Fathers. "Intercession," it was said, seemed to evoke only that form of mediation that consists in prayer, and should therefore be replaced by a stronger word such as "action" or "intervention," lest other more active ways of mediation than simple intercessory prayer be excluded.⁴⁷ But the Theological Commission defended "intercession," answering that it was meant simply to assert, not to exclude anything.⁴⁸

Where it was said that Mary is "customarily embellished" (*suevit condecorari*) in the Church with certain titles, the correction "is invoked" was accepted, since the former expression "seems to allude too much to external display."⁴⁹

And without discoverable explanation,⁵⁰ the verb "is understood" replaced "must be understood" when the sense of Mary's mediation was being explained as neither adding to nor detracting from Christ's. Similar concern had been taken at the beginning of Art. 60 to remove mention of the "absolute meaning" of 1 Tim. 2:5, since, as was observed, "it does not appear to all exegetes that St. Paul's words have an absolute meaning."⁵¹

⁴⁶ "Caput VIII . . . Relatio de particularibus," Nov. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, viii, 162f.

⁴⁷ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 506f.; "Animadversiones scriptae" (cf. *supra* n. 39), *Acta* III, ii, 155.

⁴⁸ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 162.

⁴⁹ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 30-32: no explanation was given where it would have been reported; the change simply appears in the text presented for vote that day, Oct. 29, 1964.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

In the second paragraph of Art. 62, added by vote of October 29, 1964, a lengthy caution concerning the way any creaturely mediation participates in Christ's unique mediation returns to the taut atmosphere in which this whole part opened. These six lines emerge as the longest segment so far to undergo no change of text at all, once they were introduced. By means of a double analogy of faith the doctrine is presented that, while every comparison between creature and Redeemer is excluded, Christ's unique mediation stirs up on the part of the creature a varied and manifold cooperation. The original *De Beata* had already mentioned the first analogy to this participative mediation, namely, the divine goodness communicated in different degrees to creatures;⁵² several Fathers had recourse to the analogy, though some deemed that "the parallel between the order of creation and the order of grace cannot be explained clearly enough in such few words and opens the door to ambiguity."⁵³ The other analogy—the share of ministers and faithful in various ways in Christ's unique priesthood—was used, for example, by Fr. Giocondo Grotti, O.S.M., a Council Father, whose suggestions for the Marian chapter are unmatched for length and frequency. "The prerogative or action of the Co-Redemptrix," he said here, "does not diminish or obscure the work or merit of the Redeemer: as the priesthood of ministers does not blur the eternal work of Christ, of which it is both derivative and help."⁵⁴

3. Footnotes 15, 16, and 17

Art. 62:1 occasions the first footnotes in the Mary-Church section, three of them, half the total for the entire section.⁵⁵ Footnote 15 gives the source of Kleutgen's words paraphrased in the text of the article. The three other references in that note could more properly be appended to footnote 16 on the various titles

⁵² "Schema . . . hominum" (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 94.

⁵³ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 18, 1964, *Acta* III, ii, 11 (Frings); also "Animadversiones scriptae" (cf. *supra* n. 39), *Acta* III, ii, 119 (Forer).

⁵⁴ "Observationes scriptae," June 1 to Sept. 23, 1963, printed with G.C. 55, Oct. 24, 1963, *Acta* II, iii, 323.

⁵⁵ Cf. *infra*, Appendix IV.

mentioned along with Mediatrix, except that the references given in footnote 15 are early patristic instances of the use of the corresponding Greek title, whereas footnote 16 will introduce the medieval tradition. Three Greek Fathers are referred to: Andrew of Crete (660-740): "Hail, mediatrix (*mesitis*) of law and grace"; Germanus of Constantinople (635-733): "Truly good mediatrix (*mesiteia*) of all sinners"; John Damascene (675-749/53): "Fulfilling the role of mediatrix (*mesiteusasa*) you became a stairway for God to descend to us." The full context of the citations is given in Appendix III (Latin) and Appendix IV (Eng.). The three authors along with citation of their works had been offered in the notes of the original *De Beata* as illustrations, among many other Church Fathers, of how "the title (sc. Mediatrix) came more and more to light."⁵⁶ The actual texts, as cited above, were given in explanatory notes appended to the new schema distributed to the Fathers in July 1964.⁵⁷

Footnote 16 gives four documents from the pontifical magisterium, a sampling of eleven such witnesses to the use of "mediatrix" cited in a note in the original *De Beata*.⁵⁸ The three encyclicals are already found in that note, but Pius XII's radio message was added to the final revision of the present note as the response deemed appropriate by the editors to a request from one Father to include in the text a long citation from Pius XII on the Mother of Mercy.⁵⁹ It was the last addition to the footnotes in the Mary-Church section. The intent of this footnote 16 is to illustrate how many other titles were used along with "Mediatrix," even in the pontifical documents on which so many based their case for giving special emphasis to the one title.

Hence the texts have to be read in their entirety to satisfy the intent of the footnote. They are given here as found in the original note in *De Beata*, with the variety of titles italicized to enable the present footnote to deliver its message more easily:

⁵⁶ "Schema . . . hominum. Notae" (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 107.

⁵⁷ "Caput VIII . . . Relationes" (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i, 370.

⁵⁸ "Schema . . . hominum. Notae" (cf. *supra* n. 2), *Acta* I, iv, 108-110, footnote 17.

⁵⁹ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 165.

Among her many other titles we find her hailed as Our Lady, our *mediatrix*, the *reparatrix* of the whole world, the *dispenser* (*conciliatrix*) of God's gifts. (Leo XIII, *Adjutricem populi*)

From this community of will and suffering between Christ and Mary "she merited to become most worthily the *reparatrix* of the lost world" (Eadmer, *De Excellentia Virginis Mariae*, c. 9) and *dispensatrix* of all the gifts that our Savior purchased for us by His death and by His blood. . . . By this union in sorrow and suffering, as we have said, which existed between the Mother and the Son, it has been allowed to the august Virgin "to be the most powerful *Mediatrix* and *Consolatrix* of the whole world with her divine Son (Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus*)." (Pius X, *Ad diem illum*)

May the most gracious *Mother of God*, who gave us Jesus as Redeemer, who reared Him, and at the foot of the cross offered Him as Victim, who by her mysterious union with Christ and by her matchless grace rightly merits the name *reparatrix*, deign to smile upon Our wishes and Our undertakings. Trusting in her intercession with Christ our Lord, who though "sole mediator between God and man" wished however to make His Mother the *advocate* for sinners and the *dispenser* (*ministra*) and *mediatrix* of His grace. . . . (Pius XI, *Miserentissimus*)

Associated as *Mother* and *Minister* to the King of martyrs in the ineffable work of man's Redemption, she is likewise associated with Him forever, with power, so to speak, infinite, in the distribution of the graces which flow from the Redemption. . . . Subordinated to Him, Mary is *Queen* by grace. . . . For this reason the Church salutes her as *Sovereign* and as *Queen* of the angels and the saints . . . *Queen* of heaven and earth, the glorious and most worthy *Queen* of the universe . . . and she exhorts to invoke her day and night, amid the mourning and the weeping of this our exile: Hail holy *Queen*, *Mother of Mercy*, hail our life, our sweetness and our hope. (Pius XII, *Radio Message* in Portuguese to Fatima assembly, 1946)

Footnote 17, added by the Theological Commission before July 1964 in the first wave of additions expressing solicitude about the subordinate character of Mary's mediation, brings back St. Ambrose in only his second appearance in Chapter VIII so far—he had been part of footnote 10—for a sobering remind-

er that would become memorable in Marian literature: "Jesus had no need of helper for the redemption of all, he who saved all without a helper." Taken from his Letter 63, the thought is repeated almost verbatim in other works of his.⁶⁰

As a final comment on the three articles which form the first part of the Mary-Church section, the words of Archbishop Roy as he presented the new schema to the Council for the first time on September 16, 1964, offer a succinct summary of the three articles so far treated. The italics are his:

The second part of the chapter deals directly with the *relation of Mary to the Church*, and first insists on the *cooperation* of the B. Virgin for the salvation of all, in the initial consent to the incarnation of the Redeemer, in the offering of sacrifice accomplished on the cross, and in perpetual heavenly intercession. In this context the term *Mediatrix* is cited, among other titles, something which did not please all the members of the Commission; it is however so explained that the excellence of the unique Mediator is thereby in no way impaired.⁶¹

One notes with regret that, taken up with concern over *Mediatrix*, he failed to mention the serenely beautiful and positive sketch of Mary's motherhood in the order of grace, for which these three articles are most noteworthy.

III. PART TWO: MARY, TYPE AND MODEL OF THE CHURCH (Arts. 63-65)

As the second part of the Mary-Church section, Arts. 63-65, opens, the atmosphere is patently less troubled. In initially presenting the schema, Archbishop Roy offered this summary of the part now to be taken up:

⁶⁰ Ambrose, *In Luc.* X, 132, CSEL 505 and *De Inst. Virg.* VII, PL 16:319. *In Luc.*: "But Jesus had no need of a helper for the redemption of all, he who said, 'I am become like a man without help, free among the dead.' So he accepted indeed the love of a mother but did not seek the help of a human being." *De Inst. Virg.*: "But the passion of Christ did not need a helper, as the Lord long before said, 'I looked around, and there was no helper. . . .'"

⁶¹ "Patrum orationes," (cf. *supra* n. 16), *Acta* III, i, 437.

Then it is explained how Mary, Virgin and Mother, is rightly recognized as *type of the Church*, which itself works virginally and maternally for the salvation of all. This consideration certainly has special importance, as the Council is principally taken up with the various lofty aspects of the mystery of the Church, a mystery to be placed before the world for its salvation and joy.

Then the B. Virgin, Mother of all men, is rightly considered also as example of all virtues, not only to be admired but according to circumstance to be imitated by all.⁶²

There are two sub-divisions in this second part of the Mary-Church section, dealing with her role of exemplarity in the Church. The first sub-division, Arts. 63 and 64, presents her to the Church as a whole as type of the Church, in both her virginity and her motherhood. The second sub-division, Art. 65, takes a more down-to-earth stance and shows how Mary is model for the faithful of Christ in the Church, in the essential virtues of Christian holiness and in a particular way in the love that should animate those engaged in the apostolate. Again it happens, as in the preceding half of the Mary-Church section devoted to Mary's intercessory role, that the two divisions here concerning Mary's exemplarity are each of exactly the same length as the other. Unlike the two divisions on mediation and spiritual motherhood in the previous half of the Mary-Church section, however, there is no difference of tone between Arts. 63-64 and Art. 65, no tension, and, as a comparison of the successive versions of the text will indicate, relatively little evidence of amendment throughout the history of the text.

As was indicated earlier, this is the section of the Marian chapter that was most novel to the ears of many Council Fathers and remains today the part of Vatican II's thought on Mary that has most interest for Christians, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Mary's exemplarity is a theme spared of controversy and deeply rooted in tradition, patristic and especially medieval.

A. *Type, yet also Member and Mother*

Before a study of Mary as type of the Church is taken up, it is

⁶² *Ibid.*

well to recall the threefold Mary-Church relation mentioned already in the introduction to Chapter VIII: "preeminent and altogether singular member of the Church," "her type and exemplar," "most loving mother" (Art. 53). Mary's exemplarity should first be considered in connection with the other two relationships mentioned here, and only then studied in itself.⁶³

While type and exemplar, Mary is also member of the Church. This limits her exemplarity in a sense; she should not, for example, be made out to possess all the different graces and charisms given to the members of the Church, as certain authors did in the past in an effort to explain how she is "full of grace." Rather, the Council considers her in the history of salvation and concludes that in her personal role and virtues she is type of the Church and exemplar for everyone in the Church. In yet a more positive direction, because she is member, Mary as type enters into the reality of the Church. She is type and exemplar from within the Church, sharing the Church's life. She is not to be considered type as Old Testament figures are taken to typify the Messiah or His Mother. "The image of the Church is sketched in her, not remaining in the domain simply of images or types. In a perfection already acquired Mary realizes what will constitute the essential of holiness for the Church's members."⁶⁴

Again, while type and exemplar, Mary is mother. In her is found a prefiguring of the Church somewhat in the way one finds in a mother the facial features and traits of character of her children. It is through generation that this resemblance is passed on; analogically, the Church bears Mary's resemblance because the Church was generated with Mary's cooperation, as the initial patristic citation of Chapter VIII—first also in the original *De Beata*—so boldly stated: "By her charity (Mary) cooperated in bringing about the birth of believers in the Church, who are members of its head" (Art. 53). Mary became mother in the order of charity, and it is this mother's exemplary charity that makes her the type and model of the Church.

⁶³ Galot, "Marie type," p. 1243.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

B. Mary, Virgin-Mother, Type of the Church (Art. 63)

1. Ambrose's Contribution: *Typus Ecclesiae*

Turning now specifically to Mary's role as type, one is immediately led by Art. 63 to meet the Church Father who in the West first expressed this Marian truth. As the official presentation accompanying the schema in July 1964 read:

Mary is type of the Church. 'This designation, proposed by St. Ambrose, evidently is not to be understood in the order of hierarchical institution or sacramental signs, but as the Doctrinal Commission explicitly added, "in the order of faith, charity, and perfect communion [sic] with Christ."⁶⁵

The draft prepared by the special Sub-Committee (Philips-Ballic) had simply stated, "The Godbearer, as already St. Ambrose taught, is type of the Church." No reference to Ambrose's works was given, but it was rightly to be understood from the text, as it continued, that Ambrose built his idea of type on Mary's motherhood and virginity. But, concerned that the notion "type" might by its unfamiliarity disturb some of the Council Fathers, the Theological Commission added in the July 1964 text that she was type "in the order of faith, charity, and perfect communion with Christ." And they gave the exact reference to Ambrose's work, placing the footnote at the end of the sentence.

Later an alert Council Father drew attention to the ambiguity that thus resulted from the placing of the footnote, since now the sentence read as if Ambrose were author also of the addition made by the Theological Commission. So without quibble—*Certo admittendum*—the amendment was accepted to move the footnote back from the end of the sentence and attach it immediately to Ambrose's name.⁶⁶ But unfortunately the correction seems not to have got to the printers, so that as a result the footnote remains at the end of the entire sentence and leads the reader, even of the official text, to wonder how exactly Ambrose considered Mary to be type of the Church, unless he looks up Ambrose's actual text.

⁶⁵ "Schema . . . numeris" (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i, 367.

⁶⁶ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

Before turning to his text it might be noted, as a curiosity, that the expression "type" seems to have been bedeviled for the printers. In the Mary-Church section, in addition to this Art. 63, the expression appears only in Art. 65, where it is capitalized, whereas earlier the "t" was in lower case. But the printers are not at fault: "Type" entered into Art. 65 as a late replacement for the word "Figure," which had been capitalized, and the editors evidently were inadvertently influenced to do the same for the replacement word.⁶⁷

Ambrose himself was laconic in introducing "type." Commenting on Luke's description of Mary as *desponsata* he says, "Indeed espoused, yet virgin: because she is type of the Church, which is immaculate yet married." Articles 63 and 64 will unlock the wealth of meaning in that simple sentence.

2. A Medieval Contribution: *Praecessit*

But before it explains Ambrose's thought, Art. 63 makes yet a second addition to his notion of Mary as type. Having augmented it by the phrase on faith, charity, and union with Christ, Art. 63 now adds the thought that from within the mystery of the Church Mary "stands out" or "comes first." *Praecessit*: the word is variously translated here: Abbott and Flannery—"stands out"; French Mariological Society—"is the first"; Laurentin—"came first." Bishop Peter van Lierde offers help in grasping the meaning of the verb in three interrelated dimensions:

1. Before the Church the Blessed Virgin Mary was created: *praecessit*.
2. The Blessed Virgin Mary as *type* of the Church stands out for the Church in a twofold way, in the graces and in the roles given her by God. In *graces* she appears as type of the Church in the order of faith, charity, and perfect communion; in *roles* she appears type of the Church, being her most excellent exemplar both as Virgin and as Mother. . . .
3. The Blessed Virgin Mary, already glorified in body and soul in

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

heaven is at last the *image* and *beginning* of the Church to be fulfilled in future ages.⁶⁸

Hence *praecessit* designedly has multiple connotations: in a temporal sense Mary came first before the Church; in an exemplary sense she stands out in the Church; in an eschatological sense she goes on in advance of the Church. And all this she has done "in an eminent and singular fashion," as found in no other created type of the Church. The notion is a remarkably rich one, a heritage, as note 19 (*Lumen Gentium*) indicates, of the medieval tradition.

Three medievals among a host of possible representatives are referred to, perhaps unfamiliar to most readers and difficult to trace down for the works there cited, unless one has convenient access to either the *Patrologia Latina* or the memorable collection of texts on Mary and the Church compiled for the French Mariological Society by Fr. Henri Barré, C.S.Sp., as his contribution to one of the 1951-53 volumes of *Etudes mariales*⁶⁹— which is evidently the source on which fellow-member Philips drew for footnote 19. The texts are too lengthy to give in entirety and are available in Appendix III (Latin) and Appendix IV (Eng.). However much they suffer from being cited out of context, samplings of each author can suggest the heart of his thought: Nicholas of Clairvaux, the Ps.-Peter Damian (d. after 1176): "From Mary the Church is seen to have come forth" (*Ex Maria videtur produsse Ecclesia*); Geoffrey of St. Victor (d. 1194) preaching on the feast of Mary's Nativity: "Although the Virgin Mary alone is born today, in this one nonetheless and with this one is born, as is said, the universal Church. . . . Because (today) is born the first person of the Church" (*Prima nascitur Ecclesiae persona*); Gerhoh of Reichersberg (1093-1169): "After her Son (she is) the new beginning of holy Church" (*Ecclesiae sanctae nova inchoatio*).

⁶⁸ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 512. Emphasis in original.

⁶⁹ Henri Barré, "Marie et l'Eglise: Du Vénéral Bède à Saint Albert le Grand," *EtM* 9 (1951): 60-143.

In none of the authors, even in the context from which the above excerpts are taken, does Ambrose's expression *typus Ecclesiae* occur, but that notion is in reality what they are developing by saying in one way or another that Mary "preceded" (*praecessit*) the Church. Barré's assessment of their manner of speaking should be noted:

If then the expressions *typus* or *figura* are relatively rare, and still rarer the explanations given of them, it is clear that the medievals well understood their meaning and exact scope. The contrary, moreover, would have been surprising in an age particularly attuned to the implications of symbolism and to spiritual or mystic interpretation. . . . As to the manner in which the Middle Ages understood that Mary is *typus Ecclesiae*: The three terms *sponsa*, *mater*, and *virgo* concretize in their eyes the three fundamental aspects that prefigure the mystery of the Church.⁷⁰

But of these three foundations of the Church-Mary relationship that attracted the medievals, Arts. 63 and 64 develop only two, virgin and mother. A suggestion to show how Mary is type of the Church also as spouse of Christ⁷¹ did not elicit much following and was reported on unfavorably by the Theological Commission with the comment, "The Spouse theme would require a rather complicated explanation."⁷²

3. As Virgin, Mary Type of the Church

Mary's virginity is first taken up, in a spiritual sense that will be capable of being extended to the Church as a whole. A double approach here was possible: 1) hold to the idea of integrity that is naturally associated with virginity and, of course, understand integrity in a spiritual sense; or 2) recall the essence of virginity, also in a spiritual sense, as bridal union with the Lord. The second approach was touched upon in Ambrose's text⁷³ and

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 65, 87.

⁷¹ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 522 (Kempf).

⁷² "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

⁷³ Cf. the context where Ambrose's *typus Ecclesiae* occurs: *Bene desponsata, sed virgo; quia est Ecclesiae typus, quae est immaculata sed nupta. Concepit nos de Spiritu, paret nos virgo sine gemitu. Et ideo fortasse sancta Maria alii nupta, ab alio repleta. . . .*

was prominent in medieval thought on the subject; the first was preferred by the Church Fathers, especially Augustine, and it was taken in Art. 63. In terms evocative of Irenaeus and of earlier parts in Chapter VIII, Mary's virginity is described in a spiritual sense as consisting in integral faith and obedience, the work of the Holy Spirit—and this is the first of four times that He will be mentioned in the Mary-Church section of Chapter VIII. The passage on Mary's virginity was stated in terms so familiar that it underwent no change at all, even from the draft of the Sub-Committee onwards, the first instance of such material, neither added nor amended, in the Mary-Church section.

4. As Mother, Mary Type of the Church

Only a slight touch was added in the short sentence describing Mary's motherhood, again in spiritual terms that would be transferable to the Church as mother. In inserting the words "whom God placed" to qualify "firstborn," the Theological Commission in its July 1964 version may have wished to close the door on any hasty misreading into the text of the "brothers and sisters of the Lord" controversy. But it is preferable to think that an allusion was again being made thereby to the overall divine plan in which Mary's virginal motherhood is "by decree of divine providence" (Art. 60; cf. Art. 52).⁷⁴ In the sentence, the Augustinian citation that opened Chapter VIII (Art. 53) is paraphrased—it will reappear a third time, also in paraphrase, in Art. 65—but with two significant alterations. Augustine had said that Mary "cooperated" in the "birth" (*nascerentur*) of believers in the Church, whereas the Council here says she "cooperates" in their "birth and development" (*gignendos et educandos*). The emphasis on the continuing aspect of Mary's motherhood in the order of grace is immediately evident, and only a trifle less the broadening of Mary's maternal role. Augustine saw her role in what theologians would later call objective redemption; the Council sees it also in subjective redemption, though

⁷⁴ For a further development of the theme of Mary in the divine plan, cf. Théodore Koehler, "Le chapitre VIII dans la constitution dogmatique *De Ecclesia*," *EtM* 22 (1965): 25-53, esp. 31-37.

of course only in general terms. There is also the gentle touch of "a mother's love" (*materno corde*), reminiscent of "motherly charity" (*materna caritas*) in Art. 62 and still to recur as "maternal affection" (*materni affectus*) in Art. 65.

Brief as is this three-line sentence on Mary's motherhood, the doctrine is profound. The bond between her divine motherhood and her spiritual motherhood is rooted in the divine plan: she who gave birth to the one who by God's decree is firstborn is mother also to His brethren and exercises a motherly love toward them, collaborating in their generation and education as Christians. Hers is not simply a motherly role on the level of affection, but a work of generation and education, properly a mother's role. "Generating" (*gignendos*) was contested, and "raising up" (*suscitandos*) proposed, on grounds that generation suggested Baptism,⁷⁵ seemingly removed from Mary's sphere of action—that is one of the contested questions, in fact, about the extent of her mediation of all graces. But the Theological Commission defended "generating" precisely on the grounds that Augustine had described Mary as having "cooperated in the *birth* of the faithful in the Church," a birth, the Commission pointedly added, "that is indeed not without Baptism."⁷⁶ Thus, whatever the difficulties raised in the discussion about the extent of her mediation, matters move much more easily here: "In the generation which takes place at Baptism, the maternal intervention of Mary is thus affirmed."⁷⁷

Art. 63 is here also going beyond what had already been beautifully stated in Art. 62 concerning the prolongation of Mary's spiritual motherhood in a multiple intercession and a concern stirred by motherly charity in view of bringing the brethren of her Son to heaven. Here, an activity concerned with generation and education of Christians is affirmed. "The maternal cooperation of Mary takes place notably in the spiritual birth at Baptism; the Theological Commission showed that it was indeed aware of the implications of its text."⁷⁸

⁷⁵ "Animadversiones scriptae" (cf. *supra* n. 39), *Acta* III, ii, 151f. (Pourchet).

⁷⁶ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

⁷⁷ Galot, "Marie type," p. 1248, whence much here is borrowed.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 1249.

In fact, it is precisely by her present cooperation in the generation of Christians that Mary's motherhood appears as the type and model of the Church's own motherhood, which in the next article will be said to be realized "by her preaching and by Baptism."

Moreover, motherhood seems a better name for Mary's present cooperation in Christ's work than mediation. It is easier to recognize in Mary a mother who watches over the spiritual development of her children than the intermediary who has a part to play in the granting and distribution of divine grace; just as the Church becomes nearer to us under the title of mother than of mediatrix.

C. Church, Antitype of Mary (Art. 64)

To the Church, then, the text now turns, having described Mary as type on the twofold ground of virginity and motherhood. The Church is antitype of Mary. But whereas Mary was considered first as virgin, the text now reverses the order, considering the Church first as mother, then as virgin. Was the order in each case influenced simply by Christian consciousness and language—Virgin Mary, Mother Church? At any rate, Philips has observed that the Church's virginity is less familiar a theme to us than her motherhood, "because we have lost sight of the fact that for the (Church) Fathers virginity meant an unconditional fidelity-obedience to integral revealed doctrine," to the point that "*virgo fidelis* was almost tantamount to a pleonasm."^{79a}

1. The Church as Mother

The Church's motherhood, then, is described as the antitype of Mary's: fulfilling the will of the Father through His Word faithfully accepted, she becomes mother, generating to new and immortal life children conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of God, through preaching and Baptism. The very terms evoke Mary's own motherhood of Christ, as also the allusion a few lines

^{79a} Philips, "Marie et l'Eglise," pp. 397-8.

earlier when it was said of the Church that “she herself becomes a mother . . . by faithfully fulfilling the Father’s will.”

It is from Mary’s motherhood, in fact, that the Church’s motherhood should draw its personal aspect. The Church cannot be a mere collectivity; it must have a face and from its earliest time it has been called Mother Church. As type, Mary must remain at the heart of the Church’s motherhood. She who became mother of the Church in the past by cooperating with Christ’s redemptive work in the birth of the Church must imprint on the Church her own touch, enabling the Church to present itself to mankind as indeed a motherly Church.

2. The Church as Virgin

Art. 64 continues with explaining the Church’s virginity, the other ground on which she is Mary’s antitype. And here occurs the only real difficulty this serene article met—not unexpectedly, perhaps, in the light of Philips’ observation cited a moment ago. It is easiest to grasp the difficulty by sketching the textual evolution of this last sentence of Art. 64.

Up to October 29, 1964, the sentence concluded with a direct citation of Augustine who spoke of the Church as virgin because she kept pure and integral faith in her Spouse and “imitating the mother of her Lord, is both mother and virgin in mind, since she could not so be in body.” Understandably objecting that the citation is not “very lucid,” a dozen Fathers suggested replacing these words of Augustine from *Sermon 191* with an allusion to his *Treatise on John*, the other text of his given in the footnote accompanying this sentence. The latter text reads: “What is virginity of mind? Integral faith, solid hope, sincere charity.” So a conflation was made, retaining only “imitating the mother of her Lord” from the first Augustinian text and using his exact words on the theological virtues from the second, dispensing with quotation marks altogether. And between these two Augustinian borrowings was now inserted “by the power of the Holy Spirit.” Thus also, said the Commission, “the Holy Spirit would be cited, according to the desire of many.”^{79b}

^{79b} “Caput VIII . . . particularibus” (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

The alteration was perhaps ingenious in clarifying the latter part of the sentence, but now the first part offered a problem of sorts by saying, "The Church herself is a virgin who keeps whole and pure the *fides* she has pledged to her Spouse. . . ." *Fides* here, without mention of other virtues, seems to require a different rendering, at least in English, from *fides* as used in the very next line in the familiar trilogy of theological virtues. "Fidelity" seems appropriate.⁸⁰ On the other hand, it can be argued that the *fides* which the Church pledges to *her* Spouse is indeed not just in a general way the covenantal "fidelity" pledged to another but precisely "faith" given to the Word of God; and so "faith" would be an appropriate translation in both instances, however fortuitously they came to be juxtaposed. But the verb governing *fides* in each of these uses, now brought into two successive lines, was also the same. And the close repetition of this same expression, *fidem integre servat* in one line and *servat integram fidem* in the next, called for some kind of remedy, though such was given only at the last minute⁸¹ by varying at least the verbs: "keeps" (*custodit*) . . . "preserves" (*servat*).⁸² Thus one might argue that since only the verbs were changed and not *fides*, it may have been the clear intention of the editors to retain *fides* in both instances, however it might be translated; on the other hand, they may just have reached that point in editing under pressure where, as occasionally they would report in rejecting yet another amendment, they simply drew the line: *Sufficit*. At any rate, this is perhaps in the Mary-Church section the salient instance where the seams show in committee patchwork.

Cardinal Bea thought that the first part of this sentence, even considered without the above difficulties arising once the second part had been altered, was open to the following objection:

⁸⁰ Abbott—"fidelity . . . faith"; but Flannery—"faith . . . faith"; French Mariological Society and Laurentin: "*foi* . . . *foi*."

⁸¹ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 165.

⁸² Abbott—"keeps . . . preserves"; Flannery—"keeps . . . keeps"; French Mariological Society and Laurentin—"garde . . . conserve."

On the face of it, at least, this text seems to suggest that the Church is to be considered a virgin because she keeps faith in Christ her Spouse. Indeed it follows that she is the faithful spouse of Christ, but nothing follows concerning her *virginity*. Therefore the text lacks any explanation of the principal idea, namely, that the Church is virgin and in this respect also, antitype of the Blessed Virgin. Perhaps a reply is to be sought in the fact that the Church, when she generates her children, does so “neither from the will of the flesh nor from the will of man” but—as the Blessed Virgin herself—from the Holy Spirit.⁸³

Since the Cardinal's objection was not heeded, was it because, to recall Philips' words, he was thought to “have lost sight of the fact that for the Fathers virginity meant an unconditional fidelity-obedience to integral revealed doctrine?”⁸⁴ At any rate, probably many another reader, unacquainted with the Fathers, finds the virgin Church as portrayed here less captivating than the Mother Church of the earlier part of this same article.

3. The Church as Spouse

Two reflections suggest themselves in connection with the Commission's reference to the *Church* as spouse in a context where she is being considered as antitype of Mary, especially when the Commission has itself admitted that calling *Mary* spouse of Christ would require “a rather complicated explanation.”⁸⁵ The clash in viewing the same person as both spouse and mother toward the same other person is evident, however comfortably the medievals (and Scheeben) moved in their spiritual and mystical handling of the theme. And the Council rightly avoids calling Mary spouse of the Holy Spirit, since that would throw the Church-Mary theme awry because of the New Testament assertions that the Church is spouse of Christ. The fact that titles, proper to Christ, are legitimate in an analogous, spiritual, and subordinate sense applied to Mary does not mean that their application is always an easy matter, as the Council ex-

⁸³ “Patrum orationes,” Sept. 16, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 458.

⁸⁴ Cf. *supra* n. 79^a.

⁸⁵ Cf. *supra* n. 72.

perienced: Mediatrix caused difficulty, Advocate and Helper slipped by uncontested, Co-Redemptrix was never brought in even in the original *De Beata*, Spouse was here refused. As to the three titles the medievals used in the Mary-Church parallel, the titles when applied to the Church seem to stir increasing challenge as one moves from mother to virgin to spouse.

Perhaps, then, since the explanation required about *Mary* as spouse of Christ could admittedly not be entered upon without explanation in the document, it would have been advisable to omit the two incidental references to the *Church* as spouse of Christ in this *Marian* context, that is, in Arts. 64 and 65. They are the only references to spouse in Chapter VIII. Astonishingly, Chapter VII on the eschatological Church, so inviting a context for spousal language regarding the Church, does not contain the expression, and amid the cluster of four allusions to and citations of Revelation toward the end of the chapter, Rev. 22:17 ("The Spirit and the Bride say, 'Come' ") is not found. Far back in Art. 6, where the images of the Church were being sketched, she is, of course, called "Spouse of Christ" with a host of New Testament passages to illustrate the term and, significantly, with an explanation longer than that given for any of the other images—a "complicated explanation" of sorts even there. Nearby in Art. 4, the actual words of Rev. 22:17 are cited, in an article on the Holy Spirit and the Church.

4. Mary, Type as Sanctuary of the Holy Spirit

That leads to the second reflection. Perhaps the authors and editors of the document at this point were too taken up with filtering out medieval typology to give more serious attention to the suggestion of Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger that Mary be portrayed as type of the Church on yet another ground, as sanctuary of the Holy Spirit. Let his suggestion speak for itself:

1. Mary is also type of the Church, because she is sanctuary (*sacrarium*) of the Holy Spirit. If according to the testimony of Holy Scripture the Holy Spirit intimately dwells in all the living members of the Church as in His temples (*templis*) so that He himself prays in them with groans that cannot be put into words, all the

more is the B. Virgin as noblest member of the Church the living temple (*templum animatum*) of the Holy Spirit. . . .

2. The Church receives its supernatural essence and subsistence from the Holy Spirit as from its soul and the uncreated principle of its unity. But since Mary is type and exemplar of the Church, it can be deduced that the B. Virgin in an analogous way is joined and united with the Holy Spirit. This joining follows on the motherhood of the B. Virgin. . . . Thus the Mother of God's Son becomes in a unique way the property (*res propria*) of the Holy Spirit, and this personal relation of hers is signified in the words "temple" or "sanctuary of the Holy Spirit." And as the Church is animated and vivified by the Holy Spirit, so also Mary is the instrument of predilection of the Holy Spirit, from whom she received even her name and personal description (*notam*). . . .

Moved by these reasons (3 and 4 were also given), I propose that this brief text be inserted (at the end of Art. 64): "Moreover, Mary is type of the Church inasmuch as she is animated and vivified and directed by the Holy Spirit, who dwells in the Mother of God's Son in an altogether special way as in His loftiest temple, the sanctuary dedicated to Him. For the same Paraclete Spirit who is the soul of the Church and who in an ineffable way unites all the parts of the Mystical Body of Christ with the exalted Head Christ, since He is Spirit of the Son or Spirit of Christ, likewise joins the Virgin Mary in a unique way with Christ and in this manner also establishes her as exemplar of the Church."⁸⁶

On this beautiful proposal, which surely went beyond the "desire of many"⁸⁷ to mention the Holy Spirit, an unfavorable judgment was pronounced without comment—*non videtur acceptandum*—and it lies buried in the *Acta Synodalia*.⁸⁸ Its ideas had not yet surfaced ten years later in the two Arts. 26 and 27, densely footnoted, that Paul VI in his Apostolic Exhortation *Mariialis cultus* gave to the Holy Spirit-Mary relationship, except perhaps implicitly in the invitation to "theologians to meditate more deeply on the working of the Holy Spirit in the history of salvation."⁸⁹

⁸⁶ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 517f.

⁸⁷ Cf. *supra* n. 79^b.

⁸⁸ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 32.

⁸⁹ Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation *Mariialis cultus*, Feb. 2, 1974, Arts. 26-27.

5. Footnote 20: Typology in Tradition

Footnote 20, attached to Art. 64, may be viewed as pendant to footnote 19 on Art. 63: whereas note 19 gave medieval authors who saw Mary as type of the Church, note 20 gives four authors, two patristic and two medieval, whose first focus is on the Church as Mary's antitype.⁹⁰ The two citations from Ambrose stress the Church's motherhood, the two from Augustine its virginal aspect. Ven. Bede's (c673-735) lengthy citation, given in entirety in the official notes accompanying the July 1964 text, was offered because, it was said, "he collects the sayings of the Fathers into one synthesis."⁹¹ Isaac of Stella (d. 1178) speaks very boldly in showing that Mary's motherhood and the Church's "so complete each other that there is really only one single Mother of the Whole Christ, Mary *and* the Church."⁹²

D. Mary, Model of Disciples (Art. 65)

Art. 65 moves from the plane of typology to the moral plane and sketches Mary as model of virtue for all disciples of Christ in the Church. No reference is made to her being especially the model of women, although some interventions asked for this; the theme would be taken up again ten years later in Paul VI's *Marialis cultus*, Arts. 36-37, where the Gospel portrayal of Mary is the principal source.

1. Model of Christian Holiness

Twenty-two Fathers asked that Mary be presented with greater precision than simply as "exemplar of virtues."⁹³ One hundred and four asked that explicit mention be made of her chastity and fortitude.⁹⁴ Still others, in a repeated request, wanted to see her as having lived in our human condition especially among the poor.⁹⁵ Some of these requests were still being made

⁹⁰ Cf. Appendix III and Appendix IV.

⁹¹ "Caput VIII . . . Relationes" (cf. *supra* n. 13), *Acta* III, i, 372.

⁹² Barré, "Marie et l'Eglise," p. 75.

⁹³ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 33.

⁹⁴ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 165.

⁹⁵ "Animadversiones scriptae" (cf. *supra* n. 39), *Acta* III, ii, 152; also "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, vi, 33.

in the last weeks of revision in the form of *modi*, but the definitive text limited itself to the general expression “model of virtues” here, accompanied in earlier articles by explicit mention of her humility and obedience—patience was dropped from the list in Art. 65 by October 29, 1964—and, of course, the theological virtues. Without contesting the merit of many of these suggestions, the editors held to only the theological virtues and the other two, giving replies such as these: “Not all can be enumerated: the principal ones, along with the theological virtues” and “More things yet of this kind could be added.”⁹⁶

The manner of handling the theological virtues in this portrait of Mary’s holiness deserves comment. Various Fathers expressed concern over the listing of any moral virtue alongside faith and charity, particularly since hope was omitted from all the lists until the change at the end of Art. 64.⁹⁷ The lists are found in Arts. 53, 61, 63, 64, and 65. Summarizing the results of the many revisions:

1) *faith* and *charity* are mentioned without hope in Art. 53 and in Art. 63 (where “*perfect union with God*” is also listed);

2) *hope* was added to the other two virtues in Art. 61 (where *obedience* heads the list!) and in Art. 65 (where patience and obedience were removed, still leaving “*seeking out and doing the divine will*” coupled with the three theological virtues);

3) *all three theological virtues* were present in the listing added to Art. 64 where the exact words of Augustine are borrowed;

4) *faith*, of course, is mentioned alone in several articles—it is the most frequently mentioned of Mary’s virtues in Chapter VIII—as also *charity* (often appearing also as “love” or “affection” or something similar).

Thus, perhaps surprisingly, it emerges that, until the introduction of Augustine’s words in Art. 64, nowhere did the trilogy of theological virtues appear in the original text of Chapter VIII. The entrance of the trilogy into the text was everywhere due to successive amendments. Nowhere do these amended listings

⁹⁶ “Caput VIII . . . particularibus” (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 165.

⁹⁷ “Animadversiones scriptae” (cf. *supra* n. 39), *Acta* III, ii, 154 (Przyklenk).

present the trilogy of theological virtues alone, without any other virtue or disposition. Only in the Augustinian borrowing, which once it gained entry suffered no amendment, do the three theological virtues, and they alone, appear together. *A chacun son goût.*

These virtues are not presented as if they were some fixed and static ornament, however beautiful, in Mary's character—the word “privileges,” all too common in the original *De Beata*, occurs only once (Art. 67) in the entire Chapter VIII.⁹⁸ Nor, obviously, is there the shadow of suggestion that Mary's virtues were the fruit of struggle against sin, as is the situation of most of Christ's disciples. But in the light of Arts. 56 to 58, one is invited to keep in mind in the Mary-Church section with its sketch of her holiness that Mary grew in these virtues until she reached complete union with her Son in the Assumption. When in Art. 65 it is said that “the Church becomes more like her exalted type, continually *progressing* in faith, hope, and charity . . .” one is reminded of Art. 58 where it was said that Mary “*advanced* in her *pilgrimage* of faith.” The pastoral applications are obvious.

The opening sentence of Art. 65 looks at the stage of unalterable perfection of virtue that Mary has indeed reached in the Kingdom. In this article echoes the whole of Chapter VII on the eschatological Church, a chapter where her person is often mentioned. In a delicate touch, almost certainly intended, she who everywhere else is *Beata* is here called for the single time in Chapter VIII *Beatissima*, suggesting how truly she is sovereign over all the other *beati* in the Kingdom. By way of curiosity, for the second and final time in the text of Chapter VIII—not counting sub-title II—Mary is referred to as *B. Virgo* in Art. 62:1. Possibly in the heat of debate over the four Marian titles in the sentence added there and then amended, no one noticed the abbreviating liberty being taken with the title of hers most

⁹⁸ Synonyms are often used for “privileges” (*privilegia*), as in Art. 63: “her singular graces and functions (*gratis et muneribus*)” and Art. 56: “gifts (*donis*) befitting such a role” and “splendors (*splendoribus*) of an altogether unique holiness.”

traditional of them all. (The other use of *B. Virgo* in Art. 58, also an amendment, may have resulted similarly when attention was being concentrated on the beautiful thought of Mary's advance in her pilgrimage of faith expressed in the same sentence.)

It is said in Art. 65 that in Mary the Church has already reached that perfection by which she exists in her exalted type without spot or wrinkle, an allusion to Eph. 5:27 without explicit mention of spouse, be it noted. And the intent of the text is to assert that this state of perfection is attained in Mary alone, since although the other saints no longer suffer, the defilement of sin, they do not enjoy, as does Mary, the complete victory over death, fruit of sin, that comes with bodily assumption. At the final revision one *modus*, intent on altering the expression "the Church . . . in the Most Blessed Virgin," gave the editors the occasion to defend their words by the simple reply, "The sense is that the Church, not yet glorified, has in the B. Virgin reached total perfection."⁹⁹

The middle sentences of Art. 65 go beyond the thought of simply imitating the virtues of a perfect model. Two steps in advance are made. It is first said that thanks to contemplating Mary in the light of the Word Incarnate the Church enters more deeply into the mystery of Christ and is more closely conformed to Him: an elaboration of the theme "To Jesus through Mary," in terms other than intercession or mediation. It is said, secondly, that for having herself entered so deeply into the mystery of the Incarnation, Mary unites and reflects in her own person "the most important *truths* of the faith" (*placita*: Abbott—truths; Flannery—doctrines; French Mariological Society and Laurentin—*exigences*, demands). However one translates *placita*, the connotation is assuredly not a static mirroring of orthodoxy in faith or rectitude in conduct, but a summons, as the next sentence says, to enter more deeply into her Son's sacrifice and His love for the Father. To this she "summons" (*advocat*), because as was stated in Art. 62 she is *Advocata*: another reminder that she does much more than intercede for her children or mediate.

Devotion to her is indeed involved here, not just preaching

⁹⁹ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 165.

and studying about her. One Father's suggestion was accepted that to the expression "When she is the subject of preaching" there be added "and veneration" (*Dum praedicatur et colitur*) so that it be made clear that devotion to Mary leads to Christ, or rather, that Mary leads those who are devoted to her into deeper knowledge and experience of the mystery of Christ.¹⁰⁰

2. Model of Apostolic Charity

Throughout the successive stages in the evolution of the text a painstaking account is always given to the Council, whether orally or in the printed versions of the text, of how the various suggestions of the Fathers were handled, from initial often sweeping amendments (*emendationes*) to the final changes of detail (*modi*). But whatever the action recommended to the Council on these proposed changes, the names of their proponents are never mentioned. At times national groups of bishops would be referred to as the source of some suggestion, and often the number of proponents sponsoring a change would be mentioned. But not individual names. To discover those one must go through the hundreds of pages of speeches recorded from the floor of the aula (*Patrum orationes*) or the written interventions (*Animadversiones scriptae*). But there was one exception.

On October 29, 1964, at the end of his recommendations of action on the now amended Mary-Church section the reporter announced, "His Eminence Suenens insists (*cum insistencia proponit*) on an addition concerning the apostolate," and he then read what became the last two sentences of Art. 65, and what could therefore rightly be termed the Suenens amendment.

The Cardinal had very early served notice that the Marian schema should contain something explicit about the apostolate. In his memorable and applauded speech on the Church *ad intra* and *ad extra* on December 4, 1962, he had said:

This one thing I underline: At the end of our whole exposition let us raise our eyes to the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, who is the most eminent member, the type, and the Mother of Christ's Church, in-

¹⁰⁰ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 27), *Acta* III, ii, 33.

deed the most perfect exemplar according to which all the faithful should exercise their apostolic activity for the glory of the Lord.¹⁰¹

It would be a year and nine months before the Marian schema, now rewritten, would be placed in the hands of the Fathers and opened to debate in the aula. At that first opportunity on September 17, 1964, the Cardinal returned to the charge, saying at the end of his address:

The schema fails also in an omission of the greatest importance. For nowhere in the text does the bond appear between Mary's spiritual maternity and the apostolate of evangelization of the world. The motherhood of the B. V. Mary is the type and exemplar of the motherhood of the Church. So intimate is the bond between Mary's motherhood and today's evangelization. . . . I ask therefore that this bond be clearly indicated, so that Mary not only be an example to be admired, but also that the faithful of Christ be invited to associate themselves actively in some way in her spiritual maternity, in the service of mankind in today's world. If this is omitted I fear that our schema will have none or little of the practical, vital and pastoral influence that we all wish for it.¹⁰²

The Commission therefore formulated a text which evidently met with the Cardinal's approval and that of the rest of the Council, since it underwent no major modification once it got into Art. 65. But three points that were contested and defended are worth mentioning. Cardinal Frings objected to saying that apostolic love should be animated by the motherly kind of love that Mary showed, since this gives a false notion of the apostolate. For the apostolate, said he, should be understood as coming not from *maternal* affection but from a continuation of the mission of the Son, who proceeds from the Father.¹⁰³

Two other Fathers objected to the same phrase on the grounds that not all apostolic activity, especially that of males, is animated by maternal affection, and they suggested replacing the phrase by "her extraordinary charity." The Commission replied, however, in briefest terms that "maternal affection is as it were

¹⁰¹ "Patrum orationes," Dec. 4, 1962, *Acta* I, iv, 226.

¹⁰² "Patrum orationes," Sept. 17, 1964, *Acta* III, i, 505f.

¹⁰³ "Patrum orationes," Sept. 18, 1964, *Acta* III, ii, 11. Emphasis in original.

the climax of the sentence," a sentence which ends up talking about regeneration and thus is evidently in maternal context. No problem for males, they went on to observe, as appears from Paul's manner of speaking in Gal. 4:19 ("the pain of giving birth to you all over again").¹⁰⁴ They could also have recalled Jesus himself in Mt. 23:37 ("as a hen gathers her chicks").

Finally, several at the last stage of revision still did not like it said that Christ was by design conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of Mary *so that* He might "be born and grow in the hearts of the faithful." The meaning was not clear, they said, and at any rate "it should not be said that the conception and birth of the Son of God took place by reason of his spiritual birth in the hearts of men." But the Commission simply replied that the idea is patristic and held to it, only inserting the word "Church" twice to make evident that it is the Church's motherhood that is involved here, on the pattern of Mary's. Indeed, the idea of Christ being born in His brethren dates from Origen, and it was already twice used in Chapter VIII, once under Augustine's own pen (Art. 53) and a second time in the Council's expansion of his thought (Art. 63). What is remarkable about the contested sentence is that with a simple "thus" (*ideo*) a clarifying argument of fittingness for the virginal origin of Jesus is succinctly given: one of the reasons Christ was conceived and born of Mary in *this* way, virginally, was *so that* in a way entirely transcendent of human generation this same Christ might also be born and grow in the hearts of the faithful, thanks to the Church from whom, of course, Mary is never absent.

And so Cardinal Suenens' insistence paid off royally. His amendment, in closing the Mary-church section, opens out onto the whole mission of the Church *ad extra*, which was the main concern of his that led to the conciliar decision to compose the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. The Church looks to Mary as model of a motherhood which they both share. Furthermore, everyone in the Church is to find in Mary the example of that disposition of soul that should animate the apostle, a parental charity whose goal is the birth and

¹⁰⁴ "Caput VIII . . . particularibus" (cf. *supra* n. 46), *Acta* III, viii, 166.

growth of Christ in the hearts of others. For of all of them is she Mother, in being Mother of their Brother, the firstborn.

The Suenens amendment was paraphrased, credit being given to Art. 65 in a footnote, in Art. 4 of the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, adopted at the next year's session:

The most perfect example of this type of spiritual and apostolic life is the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, Queen of Apostles . . . (who) was always intimately united with her Son and cooperated in the work of the Savior in a manner altogether special. Now that she has been taken up into heaven, "with her maternal charity she cares for these brothers of her Son who are still on their earthly pilgrimage and are surrounded by dangers and difficulties; she will care until they are led into their blessed fatherland." All should devoutly venerate her and commend their life and apostolate to her motherly concern.

It is noteworthy also that, in citing Art. 62, the authors of the Decree selected the second more elegant and more contemporary expression of Mary's care, rather than the one that had been built around Kleutgen's words on Mary's intercession.

* * * * *

A lengthy study of Mary's twofold ecclesial role of saving intercession and inspiring exemplarity can be fittingly summed up in Art. 103 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, which was adopted December 4, 1963, only some five weeks after the close vote of October 29 on integrating the *De Beata* into the Church schema and some eight months before the revised Chapter VIII would even be in the hands of the Fathers. For everything Chapter VIII would contain on Mary's ecclesial role was synthesized in two successive sentences in that Art. 103:

Her intercessory role:

"She is inseparably joined with her Son's saving work."

Her exemplarity:

"In her the Church . . . joyfully contemplates, as in a faultless model, what she herself wholly desires and hopes to be."

CHARLES W. NEUMANN, S.M.
Department of Theology
St. Mary's University
San Antonio, Texas