

1999

Marian Studies--Scripture

Bertrand Buby

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



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buby, Bertrand (1999) "Marian Studies--Scripture," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 50, Article 13.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol50/iss1/13

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

MARIAN STUDIES—SCRIPTURE

*Bertrand Buby, S.M.**

Introduction

Journeying through the last fifty years of *Marian Studies* is a pilgrimage with the giants of the past, some of whom are now with God, others who still walk with us. Here we intend to survey the path that past biblical scholars have paved and to celebrate the contributions which they made—evidence of their competence, reverence, and love for the Virgin Mary. A sound approach and help from the Church's magisterium helped us stay on the path.

Some of the texts serving as beacons along the way were Genesis 3:15 and Isaiah 7:14, and the Marian texts of the New Testament, especially from Luke, John, and Revelation. We used thematic, canonical, and liturgical approaches; through form criticism, redaction criticism, and canonical criticism, we came to a deeper understanding. Our predecessors provided much nourishment for the journey. We are grateful for those who have brought us to this point. The task of this biblical survey is to highlight what has happened along the way and to encourage all to read many, if not all, of these splendid studies dedicated to the Mother of Jesus.

In this review, only articles which appeared in *Marian Studies* dealing primarily with Scripture will be studied. Of the more than three hundred articles which appeared in *Marian Studies* in the past forty-nine years, there were forty-three that dealt with biblical topics, written by thirty-seven different contributors. (Studies of the patristic commentaries are not part of this survey.) Certain issues appeared focused on biblical topics—1956, 1960, 1962, and 1975. This survey of the past fifty years is divided into the following sections: 1) Methodologies; 2) the Hebrew Scriptures; 3) Mary's Virginité; 4) Christology, Eschatology, and Soteriology; 5) New Testament Texts; 6) the Historical and Jewish Image of Mary; and 7) the Liturgical Year with Mary.

1. Methods for Biblical Research in *Marian Studies*

In the first issue of *Marian Studies*, Dominic Unger, O.F.M., outlined the use of Scripture in Mariology (*MS* 1 [1950]:67-116). He defined the senses or meanings of Scripture, with emphasis on the literal sense, but with awareness of the fuller and spir-

*Father Buby is president of the Mariological Society of America (1998–2000). He is on the faculty of the Religious Studies Department of the University of Dayton and a professor with the International Marian Research Institute (The Marian Library/IMRI, University of Dayton).

L (1999)

MARIAN STUDIES

151-162

itual meanings. The context, parallel passages, historical settings, sources, liturgy, and tradition are important in interpreting Marian texts, and the best methods of scholarly exegesis should be employed. (116). Much of his article anticipated what was later said in the 1988 Letter from the Congregation for Catholic Education: "The Study of the Sacred Scriptures, therefore, must be the soul of Mariology" (*The Virgin Mary in Intellectual and Spiritual Formation: Letter from the Congregation for Catholic Education* [March 25, 1988]).

Richard Kugelmann, C.P., employed an exegetical approach in his article, "The Object of Mary's Consent in the Annunciation" (*MS* 11 [1960]:60-84). Kugelmann attempted to determine the content of the revelation concerning the person of Jesus, which Mary received at the Annunciation (60). Luke is the evangelist who presented his theology through historical narration (61). The account of the Annunciation is midrashic, that is, essentially a reflection or meditation on Scripture, so as to penetrate more fully and understand more clearly the hand of God in salvation history (62). Mary thought in the language of the Hebrew Scriptures; Luke delivered the narration, through Gabriel, in Koine Greek. Kugelmann adds a final note saying, "It is always dangerous to construct a theological edifice without a solid biblical foundation. It will fall an easy victim to the winds and storms of adverse criticism" (84).

In the 1960 issue, one completely dedicated to biblical topics in Marian research, Eric May, O.F.M.Cap. (*MS* 11 [1960]:21-59), presented a definition of biblical Mariology as "the scientific and systematic treatment of divine revelation as known from Sacred Scripture, the primary source of Mariology." Marian biblical theology is challenged both by an excessively devotional approach and by the advances in modern biblical scientific research. The heart of the article deals with the relation between Scripture and Tradition, especially when dealing with Marian texts. May endorses Joseph R. Geiselmann's position: "The word of God may be found in its totality in the living Tradition of the Church, and in its totality in Sacred Scripture. All of the revealed word of God is to be found in Sacred Scripture as interpreted by the living Tradition" (29). May concludes by offering eight specific norms to determine the meaning of Marian texts in the Scripture (43).

Richard Kugelmann's essay and survey entitled "Mariology and Recent Biblical Literature" (*MS* 18 [1967]:122-134) speaks of Vatican II's *Lumen gentium* (ch. 8) as a "mariological watershed" and offers insightful comments on the Scriptural references in that document, many of which were studied at the Mariological Congress of Santa Domingo. *Lumen gentium's* chapter 8 has become the foundational document for Marian studies for both Scripture and theology.

Thomas A. Collins, O.P., offered the most recent article to appear on biblical methodology: "Towards a Biblical Theology of Mary" (*MS* 25 [1974]:82-102). He emphasizes the inerrancy of the sacred writers, while looking at the Bible as a unified whole. Collins pointed out the importance of the following scholars: Oswald Loretz, Norbert Lohfink, Luis Alonso-Schökel, and Pierre Benoit.

2. The Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament)

This section will be devoted to articles dealing with the Old Testament in Marian presentations. Many of these papers were presented at the 1961 meeting. The approach is exegetical, with little use of typology. Some of the articles anticipated the emphasis of contemporary biblical research on Mary's Jewishness.

"The Scriptural Basis for Mary's Queenship" (*MS* 4 [1953]:109-117), by Eustice Smith, O.F.M., proposed that the scriptural basis for the Queenship of Mary is one of appropriateness and convenience, and provided an accommodated interpretation of the relevant texts. Smith had a balanced approach: "The portrait of Our Lady given in the Old Testament is one seen in shadowy outlines behind that of the Messiah and progresses in clarity with the revelation of the New Testament. We are not to cancel out that background, neither are we to give it a false emphasis" (109). One of the difficulties for using the Old Testament to illumine Mary's queenship consists in defining the relevant terms. "One is almost forced to project a terminology into the sacred text. That is why some will deny the existence of queenship as an affirmation in the Scriptures and allow it as present only in a metaphorical sense" (110). Genesis 3:15, Revelation 12, and Luke 1:26-38 are the major texts for this Marian title (111). Some insight comes from Psalm 45:10—"The queen stood on thy right hand in gilded clothing, surrounded with variety" (114). Caution is necessary concerning the types or figures foreshadowing the Blessed Virgin. "A Mariological type must conform to all the requirements of a messianic type and, above all, that it be revealed as such in Scripture. This explains why modern exegesis is quite wary of adducing a Marian typical sense for these alluring Old Testament personalities and their history" (115).

Barnabas Ahern, C.P., the noted Old Testament scholar, studied the Queenship of Mary in "The Mother of the Messiah" (*MS* 12 [1961]:27-48). Ahern paralleled 2 Samuel 7:12-16 with Luke 1:32-33. He also compared 2 Samuel 24:21 with the important text of Luke 1:43; in the latter text, the title "Mother of my Lord" was given to Mary by Elizabeth. Both texts illuminate each other. In the first, "the dignity accorded to the royal widow when her son ascended the throne was no mere token honor. It reflected the high privilege and influential office of a dowager queen who exerted real power both in her son's rise to kingship and in his rule of the kingdom" (28). Ahern investigated the notion of motherhood in the period before the monarchy. He then proceeded to illustrate monarchical and royal messianism. The section on the queen-mother in the non-Israelite nations deepened the background for the Old Testament texts. Here is where the *gebirah* ("the powerful lady") who has given birth to the *geber* (the king) is founded (2 Kgs. 10:13; Jer. 13:18; 29:2 and 2 Sam. 23:1). Ahern pointed out that "the role of the queen-mother is of paramount importance in studying the fuller meaning of texts like Isaiah 7:14 and Micah 5:2, which feature the pregnancy of a woman [who is] at the very heart of a dynastic sign" (45). Ahern concluded: "The early Church had to devise also a fitting title for Mary. Historically, she was the Mother of Jesus. Theologically, then, she was the *gebirah*, the Queen-Mother of Christ's kingdom. The Church expressed this faith through the title which she gave to Mary in the words of Elizabeth, 'the Mother of my Lord'" (46-47).

Complementing Fr. Ahern's work is that of another Passionist, Carroll Stuhlmüller, C.P., who wrote "The Mother of Emmanuel (Is. 7:14)" (*MS* 12 [1961]:165-204). Stuhlmüller had the gift of combining spirituality with biblical acumen. He studied the context of Isaiah 7:14 within the history of Israel and the literary development of Isaiah in the Book of Emmanuel (ch. 7-12). In the text from Isaiah, he sees an anticipation of what would come. "From Genesis 3:15 and more clearly from Micah 5:2, we receive corroboration that Isaiah quickly passed beyond Ezechia and his mother Abia to a King and Queen-Mother of the messianic future" (193). He concludes: "there must be a sign that God alone saves—a maiden lost in obscurity and absorbed in humble

faith. *The Mother of Emmanuel in Is. 7:14*, begged of God by centuries of prayer, was the poorest and the most humble of God's handmaids: *Mary, the Virgin Mother of Jesus*" (196).

Studies of Genesis 3:15 appeared frequently in *Marian Studies*. Stephen Rowe, O.F.M.Cap., wrote "An Exegetical Approach to Gen. 3:15" (*MS* 12 [1961]:49-79); he studied the text within the directives of Pius XII's *Divino afflante Spiritu* and of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's letter to Cardinal Suhard. The text is in the genre of a historical narrative, but its meaning has to be determined (55). Rowe analyzes the text, basing his research on the meaning of the Hebrew words in the context of the pre-history of Genesis I-XI. The conclusion is determined from the fuller and typological sense (which stands in contrast to the reductionist interpretations of the same text in today's leading commentaries).

In "Gen. 3:15 and Johannine Theology" (*MS* 27 [1976]:99-109), Peter J. Kearney joins the text of Genesis 3:15 with the biblical notion of the queen-mother (*gebirah*), and makes a relation to the Cana narrative which is a symbol for the Christian community in the apocalyptic Messianic banquet. He identifies Revelation 12 as part of the Johannine school of theology and sees in the woman a figure of the "Queen-Mother" (105). The same relationship is also seen in Raymond E. Brown's commentary on John, except that he relates John 19:25-27 to the woman; so, too, does Kearney (107-108). "Mary can be termed our mother insofar as she expresses in her own historical person the truth that the eschatological community which she symbolizes has become historical reality, that despite all the imperfection of our present human existence, we have already been reborn" (108-109).

James T. Forestell, C.S.B., completed a noteworthy issue of *Marian Studies* on biblical topics with "Old Testament Background of the Magnificat" (*MS* 12 [1961]:205-244). The Magnificat reflects Old Testament passages in almost every phrase. Forestell used the Greek text of the Magnificat while searching the Septuagint for similarities in words and phrases. "A convergence of themes was discovered pointing to the community of the poor, centered about the temple of Yahweh on Mount Zion. This community recognized itself as the true people of God and was often personified in the literary figure of the daughter of Zion" (206). Forestell classifies the Magnificat as "a thanksgiving hymn for national salvation, spoken in the name of the daughter of Zion" (225). He concludes by pointing out the rich benefits that Mariology and Marian piety could reap from a biblical perspective, such as suggested by the Old Testament background of the Magnificat (242).

3. Mary's Virginty

A. *Scriptural Background and the Church's Teaching*

The entire 1956 issue of *Marian Studies* is devoted to the virginity of Mary. This volume is a valuable resource for an appreciation of both a biblical and doctrinal approach to this perennial topic. Philip J. Donnelly, S.J., researched "Our Lady's Virginty *Ante Partum*" (13-42). The Annunciation is central to this datum of revelation. Both Luke's account (1:26-38) and Matthew's annunciation to Joseph (1:18-25) are interpreted as confirmation of this mystery. Donnelly also researches the silence of St. Paul and St. Mark with the parallels from Matthew and Luke.

Gerard Owens' "Our Lady's Virginty in the Birth of Jesus" (*MS* 7 [1956]:43-68) carefully examines Matthew 1:23 against the background of Isaiah 7:14, asking whether the Isaian text can be classified as a messianic text, either literally or typically.

Owens reviews the statement of the magisterium (47–50), the Scriptural texts (51–54), and the witness of the early Church. He concludes that “the formula was comprehensive enough to include not only the virginity in conception but in birth as well” (68).

Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., treats with great clarity “Our Lady’s Virginity *Post Partum*” (*MS* 7 [1956]:69–102). Carroll gives the position of the magisterium and deals with the early church’s silence on the topic (72–74). Tertullian, Origen, Gregory the Wonder-worker, the Cappadocians, and the Western Fathers are studied. Carroll concludes: “She is a sign and reminder to mankind of complete surrender of self to God . . . a manifestation of God’s glory and a symbol of the union of Christ with His Church” (102).

Neal M. Flanagan, O.S.M., wrote “Our Lady’s Vow of Virginity” [esp. Luke 1:34] (*MS* 7 [1956]:103–121). The presentation is a survey of the exegesis of the text as well as Flanagan’s own comments. He asks, “Is it possible that the solution to the problem lies in emphasizing the meaning which the question in *Luke* 1, 34 had, not in the mind of Mary, but in that of St. Luke? . . . perhaps Luke is using a literary device—that is, putting this question on Mary’s lips—for purposes of his own. . . . the insistence upon Mary’s virginity ‘since I do not know man’ at the time of Christ’s conception” (120–121).

An insightful article, “Our Lady’s Marriage to St. Joseph,” by Geron G. Fournelle, O.F.M., concludes this worthy volume. It places the marriage of Joseph to Mary in its historical context, and shows that although the marriage was virginal, it was, nevertheless, a true marriage, entered into with full conformity with the customs of New Testament times (129).

B. Marian Exegetes on the Virginity of Mary

In addition to the 1961 issue of *Marian Studies*, there are three presentations on Mary’s virginity. Eugene H. Maly’s “Virginity in the New Testament” (*MS* 13 [1962]: 41–62) shows the progressive revelation of virginity in biblical revelation (41). Luke 1:34 and Matthew 1:18–25 are key texts for the virginity of Mary. Further development can be seen in Luke 2:41–52 and John 19:27. The logion on the eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom (Mt. 19:10–12) shows the total dedication to the reign of God. I Corinthians 7:25–35 is the most extensive pericope on virginity in the New Testament.

John F. Craghan, C.Ss.R., “The Gospel Witness to Mary’s *Ante Partum* Virginity” (*MS* 21 [1970]:28–68), encourages us to view Mary through the eyes of Luke, who used implicitly the Isaian text of Emmanuel (Isa. 7:14). Matthew has the slightly rephrased Septuagintal text of Isaiah 7:14, a proof-text that the virgin birth is the fulfillment of Scripture (53). Luke 1:35 is realized eschatology: “The transcendent qualities of the Risen Christ were indeed rooted in the flesh of the Son of the Virgin” (59). In Luke’s mind the Virgin Birth is not isolated, by and for itself. Rather, “. . . to be born of the Virgin is linked to the glorious exaltation of the Resurrection” (59). The evidence for the Virgin Birth is limited. It is found in Matthew and Luke, some three quarters of a century removed from Jesus’s birth. “Ultimately a study of Mary’s *ante partum* virginity reveals, not primarily a personal prerogative, but God’s continuity in salvation history. . . . [the Virgin Birth] is as biblical and as Jewish a doctrine as any belief that can be found in the N[ew] T[estament]” (68).

The most extensive exegetical study (and also the longest article in *Marian Studies*, with 105 pages) on Mary’s virginity was by Manuel Miguens, O.F.M., “Mary a Virgin? Alleged Silence in the New Testament” (*MS* 26 [1975]:26–179). Though Raymond E. Brown had strong critical objections against this work, it is nevertheless a

great contribution to the discussion of Mary's virginity in the New Testament. Every explicit and implicit text on Mary is carefully analyzed and researched. Miguens' own meticulous and cautious observations are resources for any future study of the question, and he is in dialogue with the work of Brown and Fitzmyer. Miguens' premise is the absence of any reference—implicit or explicit—of a human father for Jesus whenever there is a reference to Mary's conception of Jesus. He discusses whether Mary's virginity is a *theologoumenon* (171), and questions the position that would make the virginity of Mary a necessity for the virginity of Christ (168–179).

4. Christology, Eschatology, Soteriology

Reginald Fuller's "New Testament Roots to the *Theotokos*" (*MS* 29 [1978]:46–66) demonstrates that Paul combines both the Son-of-David title for Jesus with a sending-of-the-Son Christology (one which emphasizes the pre-existence of the Son). The Infancy Narratives manifest this combination which facilitates our understanding of the virginal conception with the pre-existence Christology in the post-New Testament period. The synthesized Christology explains inalienable truths about God and his self-disclosure in creation history and the Christ-event (60).

Fuller contends that *theotokos* became possible only after the wisdom Christology of pre-existence and incarnation was combined with the birth narratives after the New Testament period. And the step was only taken when the wisdom Christology was ontologically defined. "But the *theotokos* undoubtedly stands at the end of a trajectory which is rooted in the New Testament" (64).

In a comprehensive study entitled "Mary in the Christologies of the New Testament," Vincent Branick illustrates a method that fosters a positive and sound Marian theology (*MS* 32 [1981]:26–50). It is a sketch of the principal Christologies of the New Testament and a reflection on how the figure of Mary relates to those Christologies. Branick uses a synchronic approach, concentrating on the final form of the New Testament texts.

a) In Mark, Mary is the Mother of the Son of God who has authority over nature, demons, and sin. She is the Mother of the Son of Man whose glory will appear on the final day. Mary in Mark's Gospel is an eschatological sign: humble, obscure, weak, yet destined for something new in the future. As Jesus' Mother, she is the cause of her son's humble estate and she remains an inseparable part of that estate (29).

b) In Luke-Acts, Mary is involved in the history of salvation. Luke stresses that Jesus is the "holy offspring" of Mary. She is consistently called his Mother (Lk. 2:33–34, 48, 51; 8:19). Mary is representative of the poor of God (the *Anawim*). She is dedicated to the plan of God (Lk. 1:38; 8:21). Like Jesus, she is a person of prayer (Acts 1:14). "Mary remains the *doule* (1:38) along with the disciples who are *doulo!*" (34).

c) In Matthew, this figure of Mary recedes into the background. Her clearest involvement with Christ is in the first two chapters. In Chapter 2, we find four mentions of the child with his mother (2:13, 14, 20, 21). Her pregnancy by the Spirit illustrates that Jesus was the Son of God throughout his earthly existence, not just from his baptism (37). "Matthew has the powerful figure of the Old Testament *gebirab* or queen-mother in mind as he repeatedly mentions Mary in the story of the birth and infancy of 'the newborn king of the Jews'" (2:2) (38).

d) In Paul, the unique explicit reference to Mary is Galatians 4:4. "The reference relates Mary directly to the kenosis of Jesus. 'Born of a woman' is equivalent to 'born

under the Law,' and describes the self-emptying and humiliation of the pre-existent Son" (43). In this text, Paul forges an important link between pre-existence Christology and conception Christology. "'Born of a woman' qualifies and explains the phrase, 'God sent forth his Son.' Paul thus implicitly relates Mary to this person through and for whom all things exist" (44).

e) In John, both at Cana and Calvary, Mary is "the woman" who relates to the saving work of her son. Mary represents the Church whose maternal role coincides with the hour of Jesus. Mary also appears consistently as "the mother of Jesus" (2:1,3); "his mother" (2:5, 12;19:25), or simply as "the mother" (6:42, 19:26 twice). She is thus associated with the Incarnation (48).

Mary provides the medium, Jesus' flesh, by which humanity can perceive the revelation of the Word. "Her role in the incarnation . . . leads eventually to her role as mother of the disciple and symbol of the Church. . . by implication, she is the *theotokos*: Jesus is God; Mary is his mother" (48-49). "As a thread running through the major works of the New Testament, the figure of Mary symbolizes the unity of the canon, and reminds us that the christologies are only weak human tools to attain Christ" (50).

"Principles of Salvation History" (*MS 16* [1965]:29-40), by Christian P. Ceroke, O.Carm., develops the "history of salvation" or the "history of God's salvific acts" as seen throughout the New Testament (29). As a chronicle, salvation history collects from the Bible the successive stages of God's revelation. The Old Testament history of salvation culminates in Israel's firm faith in ultimate lasting deliverance from her enemies—the messianic expectancy formulated through her history by her prophets (30), and the contention of the New Testament is that "the salvific action of God experienced by Israel came to term in the person of Jesus, who is the Son of God" (30). "The Bible portrays God's salvific action in history as a panorama in which sinful humanity, withdrawing from God's rule, is gradually returned to Him through a series of divine actions in history itself" (31). The Exodus, the Resurrection of Jesus, and the Church (Acts 1:13-14) are seen as classical and key events in salvation history. In naming Mary, the Mother of Jesus, "Luke invokes the saving history he has described in the Annunciation and other events of his infancy gospel" (40).

"Eschatology and Our Lady" (*MS 17* [1966]:65-85), by George T. Montague, S.M., presents eschatology in "the matrix of revelation" (65). Old Testament eschatology is not uniform; it is progressive. Important passages for Mary's role are Acts 1:14; Galatians 4:4-6; Philippians 2:5-11; Mark 3:31-35; Luke 8:19-21; Luke 11:28. As "Daughter Zion," Mary is the summit of Old Testament realization. The Apostolic Church, at least as Luke presents it to us, finds its eschatological self-realization in Mary. The "hour" in John refers to the Paschal Mysteries. John's realized eschatology stems from Genesis and Wisdom motifs. It is in his Apocalypse

. . . that we have Mary set in the eschatological forecast of the Church. True, she is nowhere mentioned in the phase of consummation described in chapters 21-22, though there can be no reasonable doubt that the heavenly Jerusalem there is identical with the woman of chapter 12. But in *Apoc.* 12 the opening of the era of the Church is described as a painful birth, recalling the sorrows of Calvary, necessary prelude to the new birth of the resurrection. The Church on its pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem, where there will be neither night nor tears (21:4, 23), must

take courage in its present struggle from the fact that the Messianic age was begun at the price of Calvary, the new birth on Easter morning by the birthpangs of Good Friday. At that moment, the image of the woman bearing the Messianic people in pain was no longer merely a metaphor but, as Luke 1-2, was dramatized and realized in the person of Mary, the Mother of Jesus. The sorrowful mother who became Mother of the disciples of Jesus, her other offspring, is an encouragement to the Church in distress—for she is, in and because of her suffering, just what the Church is, the Woman clothed with the sun and pregnant with victory, the *great sign* of the final age. (85)

5. New Testament Texts Referring to Mary

A. Pauline Texts

In "Our Lady and St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification" (*MS* 16 [1965]:94-120), Carroll Stuhlmueller contrasts Mary's faith with Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. His article is a most spiritual essay, based on a profound biblical and Marian theology. Mary's faith is studied "by means of the full self-manifestation of St. Paul" (119).

Not by works, but by faith in Jesus' presence was man justified; through a complete surrender to God's sanctifying power in Christ Jesus were the divine promises realized in the Church. . . . Just as Jesus suffered and was tempted, even to the abandonment of His Father, Mary suffered and was tempted, and in the process of learning her role in the justification of all men, the power of justification was sanctifying her own person with great conformity to Jesus. In this last section we recognize, at least at a distance, the scriptural foundation for Mary's role as Mother of the Church. (120)

B. Mark 3: 31-35

In "Some Difficult Marian Passages in the Gospels" (*MS* 11 [1960]:104-122), Roger Mercurio, C.P., deals with Mark 3:31-35; Matthew 12:46-50; Luke 8:19-21 and 11:27-28. Mercurio uses both form criticism and source criticism in his interpretation of these passages. He points out the different context in Luke 8:19-21 which results in a different interpretation of the passage.

C. Lukan Texts

Luke 1: 29-35

"The Theme of the Divine Maternity in the Scriptures" (*MS* 6 [1955]:102-119), by Bernard J. Le Frois, S.V.D., shows that, though divine revelation is progressive in Scripture, it must be seen as a whole. Genesis 3:15 is within a prophetic context and is bound up with eschatology and has a messianic import. The strong woman as conqueror is emphasized. This messianic ideal continues through Psalms 110:1; 22:10-11 (cf. Mt. 22:45; Mk. 12:36.). Isaiah 7:14 and 9:5 are seen as the Virgin-Mother of Emmanuel (or the *El Gibbor*), mother of the shepherd ruler born in Bethlehem (Micah 5:2-3; Jer. 31:22). Thus the divine maternity has its origins in Old Testament concepts. The major New Testament texts take on larger meanings when viewed from their Hebrew equivalents. The fullest portrait of the divine maternity is found in Luke 1:29-35 (115). A reference to the Virgin Birth can be seen in John 1:13.

Luke 1:38

“Our Lady’s Holiness in the New Testament” (*MS* 14 [1963]:62-74), by Msgr. James C. Turro, first defines the biblical notion of “holiness” from the Bible: Mary’s holiness consists in doing the will of God (Lk. 1:38). Her holiness is exemplified by the *Anawim* (the Poor of Yahweh) who are totally dependent on God (cf. Zeph. 3:11-13; 2:3; Jer. 20:13; Mt. 11:29; Lk. 6:20). Mary stands at that point in salvation history at which, through her freedom, the world’s salvation takes place definitively and irrevocably as God’s act. Mary is the abode of all grace (73). He concludes:

... there are reflected in Mary several of the attitudes, orientations, modes of behavior that the New Testament inculcates or at least speaks of approvingly. Concurrence with the Divine Will, the spirit of lowliness, a spirit of confident prayer, all these are sketched in various places in the New Testament as the marks of the man who measures up to the ideal, the holy man. These same characteristics are demonstrably in the life of Mary as that life has been delineated for us in the New Testament. (74)

The Magnificat (Luke 1:46-56)

In “The Magnificat: Reflections” (*MS* 38 [1987]:63-77), Matthew F. Morry, O.P., considers the Magnificat from a biblical, patristic, and ecclesial viewpoint. In this way, a “contextual mode of communication flowing from a philosophy adequate to enlighten the realities under examination” is presented (64, n. 1). Attitudes taken from the Magnificat which speak to a theology of freedom and liberation are outlined. The outlook of the *anawim* arises from faith and is sustained through certain hope. Authentic existence is to be in the kingdom of God. There must be the conviction that God has fulfilled his promises. Mary remains a viable model for each member of the Church today, because of her identification with the lowly, her faith, and the certitude of her hope.

Luke 1:48

Edward A. Ryan, S.J., gives an historical and philological study in “Historical Notes on Luke 1:48” (*MS* 3 [1952]:228-235). The article focuses on how Mary’s humility (*tapeinosis*) has been interpreted, especially by Renaissance commentators: “. . . it is clear that the modern commentators who reject ‘humility’ are led principally by philological considerations. It is certain that they do not give adequate attention to the solid theological arguments against their position advanced by Canisius and Salmerón” (235).

Ecclesiology (Acts 1:14)

“Mary, a Model of *Ecclesia-Orans*, in Acts 1:14” (*MS* 35 [1984]:87-99), by Bertrand A. Buby, S.M., is a redactional study of Acts 1:14 with a view towards its Marian implications. Luke is the first ecclesialogist of early Christianity and he interprets the woman of faith, Mary the Mother of Jesus. Within Luke’s theology of prayer, Mary is a model for the Church at prayer. “Prayer was thus an integral part of the Christian movement from the start, and its vitality was closely related in Luke’s eyes to the growth of the Church (2:47) . . . through the coming of the Spirit” (99).

D. Mary in the Gospel of John**John 2:1-11**

"The Marian Significance of Cana (John 2:1-11)" (*MS* 11 [1960]:85-103), by Stephen Hartdegen, O.F.M., is a comprehensive study of the Cana account including several dimensions: the exegetical, the theological, and the spiritual. References to the Hebrew Scripture help the reader to understand Jesus' statement to Mary: "What is this to you and me? (John 2:4). The meaning of "hour" and "woman" are developed. "Through Mary, Christ's miracle at Cana introduces to the world the beginning of the public manifestation of His divinity which till then was hidden from the world by the humanity which Mary gave to Christ. . . . The presence of Christ, God and Man, sanctified human marriage and engendered what was destined to develop into the mystical marriage between Christ and the Church through His sleep of death on the Cross. The banquet of this marriage . . . [is] the Eucharistic feast of His body and blood" (102-103).

John 19:25-27

Christian P. Ceroke, O.Carm., treats "Mary's Maternal Role in John 19, 25-27" (*MS* 11 [1960]:123-151). Guided by Pius XII's directive—"the supreme rule of interpretation is to discover and to define what the sacred writer intended to express" (*Divino afflante Spiritu*) (123), the literal sense is followed by the fuller sense, the *Sensus plenior*, or the typical sense (124). In looking at the literary form of this pericope, the evangelist's record of the last will of Jesus would be intended by him as a final testament to the Church (129). Fr. Ceroke sums up the filial role of John toward Mary as taking "its historical origin in an act of filial piety by Jesus on Calvary. John's original motive of regard for Mary in her bereavement was transformed by the resurrection of Jesus into an increased understanding of her personal dignity as Mother of the Messiah and Son of God" (135). The nature of the task entrusted to Mary is clear: she is to uphold the faith of John in the messianic mission of Jesus (138). The "title [woman] cannot be merely a natural form of address" (139). "In our final judgment, the literal sense of Jn. 19,25-27 certainly invokes the spiritual maternity of Mary over mankind. Her spiritual maternity is posed by the evangelist as a mysterious sequel to Jesus' redemptive death. In the religious mystery of the term *gyné*, the fourth gospel has bequeathed, as a legacy to the Church, what is very probably the most important key to the Mariological conception of the NT" (151).

E. Revelation 12

"The Twelfth Chapter of the Apocalypse and Our Lady's Assumption" (*MS* 2 [1951]:170-177), by George Bissonnette, A.A., speaks of Mary in the book of Revelation: In the twelfth chapter of the Book of Revelation, both Mary and the Church are literally intended. The whole book concerns the church and its struggles. Mary is present because of the parallel between Genesis 3,15, and the Book of Revelation. "Since Mary is the 'new Eve' facing the Dragon just as the first Eve did, then, Apocalypse XII has a mariological meaning and the interpretations which fail to see Mary at all in the Woman must be modified considerably" (176).

"The Mary-Church Relationship in the Apocalypse" (*MS* 9 [1958]:79-106), by Bernard J. Le Frois, S.V.D., develops the Mary-Church relation by a thorough look at the background of Johannine thought. The symbolism, thought patterns, literary de-

vices and theology are all considered. "That the mystery of Mary-Church was bound up with the theme of rebirth in the baptismal liturgy, and with the idea of the baptismal font, becomes more evident with the attentive study of the early Christian inscriptions and writings" (83). The function of the Woman in chapter 12 of John's Apocalypse is "to pour forth upon the world the divine Light that is Christ, manifested in the human form of the Child, and simultaneously to bring forth those who share His divine Life as faithful sons of Light (12:17)" (89). Mary represents the Church, both in the Gospel and in the Book of Revelation. "If the Church brings forth Christ amidst the sufferings of her temporal vocation, it is in reality Mary sharing her spiritual Motherhood which brought forth each and every member in the birth pangs of Golgotha" (94).

In "The Scriptural Basis for Mary's Spiritual Maternity" (*MS* 3 [1952]:111-141), Eric E. May, O.F.M.Cap., analyzes the Scriptural basis for the spiritual maternity of Mary: Genesis 3:15, Revelation 12, and John 19:26-27. Other texts include Luke 1:26-38 and Luke 1:44; John 2:1-11; and Acts 1:14. May concludes: "Her maternal activity in the spiritual rebirth of mankind is implicit in every text which links the faithful with Christ as members with their Head, or as His brothers in the supernatural life. Finally the Apocalypse (chap. 12) shows us Mary once more as the Woman in a special way, and again her Seed comprises the complete Christ, including the Mystical Body. Thus does Sacred Scripture give accumulative support to the doctrine that Mary is really and truly our spiritual Mother" (141).

C. Gilbert Romero traces the biblical roots of Marian piety in "The Bible, Revelation and Marian Devotion" (*MS* 44 [1993]:19-40). Much Hispanic devotional symbolism and imagery are drawn from experiences analogous to those found in the Bible (27). The passages from the Old Testament—Genesis 3:15, Isaiah 7:14, Sirach 24—receive their Marian dimension from the perspective of the New Testament authors and their subsequent interpreters, as well as from the community of faith we call Church (28). Marian devotion should have an established connection with some biblical event, theme, or image. "Perhaps our most significant conclusion—in light of what has been said regarding the Bible, revelation, and Marian devotion—is that we acknowledge our participatory role in the ongoing understanding and interpretation of the Christ-event and then pledge ourselves to recognize and honor, however we can, the part that Mary plays in that ongoing event through some form of devotion, so that through the motivation of the devotion we can transform ourselves and the world" (40).

6. The Historical and Jewish Image of Mary

"The Historical Image of Mary in the New Testament" (*MS* 28 [1977]:27-44), by James M. Reese, O.S.F.S., posits that Acts 1:14 embodies the historical tradition of Mary's presence among the apostles from the earliest period. This scene, together with that of Jesus in the temple, indicates Luke's view of Mary's "role in response to God's revelation"(33). In John's Gospel the historical image of Mary shines through the Cana narrative, even though it is presented in dramatic form. "There is a loyal and true historical tenor, but it is not a question of "history" in the modern sense" (40). "The historical image of Mary in the New Testament is that of a loyal mother who constantly teaches the Church that we are justified only by faith" (43).

Laurence E. Frizzell's "Mary and the Biblical Heritage" (*MS* 46 [1995]:26-40) is an exploration of the resonances of the biblical and Jewish piety "that might cast light on aspects of Mary's life and her role in the divine plan" (26-27). "The spirit of the

prophets and psalmists is captured in Mary's Magnificat, a hymn that resonates well with Jewish prayer of the first century. Like the typical blessing of Jewish prayer, thanksgiving and praise are the framework of gratitude that is the foundation for all petitions. The compassion in the prayer for the poor and downtrodden is linked to a profound assertion of faith in the God of Israel. This comes not merely from a knowledge of the Greek Bible, but from a lived experience of Jewish faith" (40).

Because the Gospel is rooted in Jewish culture, all who wish to imitate the Master should be familiar with this privileged vehicle as the context chosen for divine revelation. "Refreshing our memory concerning the patterns of piety in the Jewish home and larger community will help us to model our lives on the examples of Jesus and his Mother" (27).

Dominic F. Ashkar's "The Sources for the Marian References in the Qur'ān" (*MS* 47 [1996]:65-87) demonstrates how the Qur'ān, which includes references to the Torah, the Psalms, and the Gospels, has remarkable parallels to Marian verses from the Proto-evangelium (74-76) and from Luke's Gospel, especially the Annunciation. There are about forty verses dedicated to Mary in the Qur'ān. Muslims acknowledge the virgin birth and Jesus as prophet.

Christian apocryphal stories and legends regarding Mary and Jesus influenced the Qur'ān, not literally, but through the oral tradition. In addition, the Syriac tradition also has numerous mythological descriptive images that should be examined, serving as "many windows allowing the eyes to see a wider horizon—the mystery of Mary and Jesus" (86-87).

7. The Liturgical Year with Mary

In three consecutive years, *Marian Studies* featured the biblical references of the liturgical year used in Marian feasts and commemorations. "Mary in the Mysteries of Christ from Advent to the Baptism of the Lord: Biblical References" (*MS* 41 [1990]:31-48), by Bernard A. Lazor, O.S.A., placed the context for interpretation as the mysteries of Christ (31). His introduction offered a framework for viewing Mary in the mysteries of Christ as seen from a biblical, liturgical, and theological perspective. Lazor concludes with the following: ". . . the rich treasure of liturgical usage of scriptural passages continues a long history of awareness of Mary's relationship to the Mysteries of her Son" (47).

Bertrand A. Buby, S.M., covered the theme of "Mary in the Lent and Easter Seasons: Biblical References" (*MS* 42 [1991]:15-44). Here the Scriptures were interpreted within the celebration of the Paschal Mystery, an event which encompasses the suffering, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, as well as the sending of the Spirit. Mary is always to be understood within the context of the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation among the people of God, the Church.

James C. Turro, in "Mary in Ordinary Time: Biblical References" (*MS* 43 [1992]:60-71), dealt with Gospel readings for Marian celebrations in Ordinary Time. "In the Gospels, and in the Liturgy which is a vibrant re-experiencing of Christ in the Gospels, Mary is encountered at the beginning of the story of Jesus, at the beginning of His hidden life, at the beginning and end of His public life. In attempting to live out the Mystery of Christ, the believer must be prepared to meet up with Mary and profit from that meeting at every important turn in the Christ story" (70-71).