

Marian Studies

Volume 1

Article 12

1950

The Beginnings of Scientific Mariology

Eugene M. Burke

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



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burke, Eugene M. (1950) "The Beginnings of Scientific Mariology," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 1, Article 12.
Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol1/iss1/12

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 mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

THE BEGINNINGS OF A SCIENTIFIC MARIOLOGY

DOGMA and devotion are so closely intertwined in the history of Mariological thought that it is, at times, very difficult to separate them without doing an injustice to one or the other. In fact it would seem at least arguable that the *lex orandi* has played a greater part in the development of Marian theology than in any other tract. Nor does it seem unsound to think that the Protestant polemic against devotion to Mary derived from a failure to see this intimate historical relationship between the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi* in the Marian devotion of the middle ages.

Yet, in saying this, we must not fall into the deceptively facile solution of dismissing all charges of "mariolatry" as mere bigotry or polemic. For without a clear awareness of the dogmatic roots of Marian devotion there can easily arise an attitude that borders on the extreme and the superstitious. This paper is presented, therefore, with the aim of illustrating that the clarification of this relationship is the work of theology. Thus it concerns with St. Anselm since he initiates a period when the content and inferences of dogma and liturgical devotion to Mary are beginning to be formulated and developed. And it is this process that is the foyer for the organized tracts on Mariology that the later centuries will produce.

First of all it should be noted that, in common with other theological developments, the question of an organized theological treatise is historically the last thing that develops. It is only when there is a considerable body of formulation, inference, application and speculation that the possibility and necessity for a systematic organization arises. Accordingly,

in the particular period being dealt with here much of the material will not be found in special theological treatises on Mary. Rather must it be drawn from commentaries on scripture, from letters written in answer to particular problems, or from treatises dealing with questions arising from the central reality of Mariology—the Incarnation. But above all in this period it finds a rich source in the sermons and devotions centering around the liturgical honor given to Mary.

This last point is of peculiar importance in any study of this period because of the historical place of the liturgy in Western culture itself. For it must be remembered that in the period of transition from the fall of the Roman empire until the development of an organized Western society, it is the liturgy that is the pivot of the Christian culture and is an essential factor in the intellectual and spiritual life of the times. In the dark and bloody anarchy of these centuries it more than anything else served as a principle of unity and as a means of introducing the barbarian to the Christian view of life and interpretation of history. For the liturgy was a re-presentation of the historical reality of the Incarnation and Redemption and at the same time a real and regenerating entrance into the supernatural order of which this sacred history was the instrument.

Since, then, it was the historical fact of the Incarnation that was the central reality of this sacred cycle, it is easy to see how Mary's place in that life would be strikingly apparent and be in turn a rich source of liturgical thought and devotion. In turn this would enter very deeply into the culture of the times through the medium of the monasteries which became the prime social organ of the developing culture. For these institutions were not only the guardians of this liturgical tradition but made of the *opus Dei* the center and principle of their monastic life itself. Hence it is easy to see how so much of the Marian theology of a man like

Bernard will have for its point of departure the liturgical feasts and titles of Mary.

To fill out the picture of this theological development it should also be noted that one of the fundamental elements of the medieval religious thought is a loving concentration on, and a deep devotion to, the humanity of Jesus.

The great novelty of the middle ages, their incomparable religious merit was the understanding and the love, or rather one may say, the passion for the humanity of Jesus. The Incarnate Word, *homo Christus Jesus* is no longer only the model to be imitated, the uncreated light that lightens the interior of the soul; He is interior even in respect to his humanity; he is the spouse of the soul who acts with and in it; he is the friend.¹

Thus also Mary by reason of her obvious and striking relationship to the humanity of the Word will be the object in prayer of much of this tender and lovely attitude that is so integral a part of the devotion and hymns of the age. It finds voice in Anselm, is enlarged upon by Bernard, richly developed by Francis, but is also manifest in great scholastic theologians such as Bonaventure and Albertus Magnus.

It is in the light of all these elements, then, that the Marian theological thought of this period is best judged. Otherwise, we run the danger of not being aware of the loving thought and devotion that underlies the sources that are used. Likewise it will enable us to perceive the fact that the language of love and devotion need not and does not exclude a rich theological development.

ST. ANSELM -

St. Anselm offers an excellent point of departure for a study of the beginnings of Marian theology, because he is

¹ Rousselot-Huby, *Le Christianisme du Moyen Age*, in *Christus* (edit. V. Huby) p. 1124.

the first to apply formally the laws and resources of human reason to the content of revelation. By reason of this systematic and ordered application of the rational process he stands as the herald and in a real sense the father of scholasticism. His master is without doubt Augustine, but his method and approach is that of the future. This is apparent in his use and understanding of his basic principle: *Credo ut intelligam; fides quaerens intellectum*.² Its dependence on Augustine is evident,³ but Anselm employs it with a rigor and an attitude that is definitively scholastic. He believes and holds without question the deposit of faith proposed by the Church of Christ. This is the certitude upon which he initiates his inquiry and by which he guides his search. But believing with all his heart, he seeks to explain this deposit by using reason, by co-ordinating these reasons into systematic form and then by drawing out the logical consequences.⁴ He never forgets the dependence of reason on faith, but he does not hesitate to employ all the power of his intelligence in the service of his *Credo*. His *QUAERENS INTELLECTUM*, therefore, is a search and exploration into the object of his faith. It is because of this that in him the patristic and the scholastic ages meet historically.

To appreciate fully St. Anselm's method, however, it is necessary to recognize that his approach is neither a pure rationalism nor an unalloyed intellectualism. It is an effort that bodies forth from an organic union of faith, love, and reason; a living partnership between speculation and love. Devotion, affection and speculation are combined into a single tool. This is evident in his meditations and he himself expressly makes of this attitude the very soul of his inquiries:

² *Proslogion*, prooemium and c. 1 (ML 158: 225, 227).

³ Cf. Augustine, *De vera religione* c. 5.

⁴ Bainvel, *Anselme* in DThC I, 2, 1343.

By always holding the same faith without doubt, by loving and living in accord with it, then humbly to seek the reason of how it is, as far as possible. . . .⁵

Who does not believe does not understand. For he who does not believe does not experience, and he who has not experienced does not understand. . . .⁶

There are a number of like statements in the writings of St. Anselm, but these will suffice to throw into relief his whole process of theological activity and introduce his actual Mariology.

The heart of the Mariological doctrine of St. Anselm is the divine maternity of Mary and this is itself the clue to the solid theological approach which he takes. For any scientific Mariology takes this eminent dignity for its point of departure. From this flows the privileges and graces that raise her above all other creatures. Out of this unique status stems her intercessory power and function. Hence, whether by way of necessary inference, or the systematic relationship of revealed truths concerning her, or by reason of fitness, the whole theological framework of Mariology rests on this as on a first principle. And this is explicitly recognized by St. Anselm and developed accordingly. As he writes:

Therefore, while the Son of God was truly conceived of a spotless Virgin, this was not necessary because it would be contrary to reason for a just offspring to be begotten of a sinful parent, but because it was fitting that the conception of that particular man should be of a most pure mother. Hence it was becoming that that Virgin should be resplendent in a purity so great that nothing under God is greater. For to her He determined to give His only Son whom He begot of the heart, equal to Himself and whom He loved as Himself. (And He gave Him to her) in such wise that He should be by nature one and the same Son common to God and to the Virgin. It is she whom the Son chose to make substantially

⁵ *De Fide Trinitatis* 2, (ML 158: 265).

⁶ *Ibid.*

a mother for Himself. Over her the Holy Spirit moved and brought about that she should conceive and bear Him from Whom He Himself proceeded.⁷

In this passage one can see the divine maternity as the very well-spring of Mary's dignity. And the reasons adduced bring into close relationship the dogmas of the Incarnation and the Trinity. For one and the same Christ is the Son of Mary and the Son of the Father "*naturaliter*." But even more profound is the allusion that by her maternity she enters into the triune life of the processions Father, Son and Spirit. From this whole relationship St. Anselm infers the high fittingness of Mary's purity. Out of this basic principle the theologians of the succeeding centuries will elaborate all her privileges. And as is evident here the degree of purity in Mary is due not to necessity or merit but congruence with her office—*non necessarius sed decebat*.⁸

What is of especial interest here is that the same basic theological principle that will be applied to Mary's Immaculate Conception is present here at least in germ. While it is hard for the present writer to see the cogency of the arguments which claim that Anselm himself applied it, still it is of interest to this study to note that St. Anselm did recognize the problem that his principle raised in the matter of original sin and Mary. Moreover, within the theological possibilities of his time, he did try to deal with it.

The problem is raised first in his *Cur Deus Homo?* As formulated there, the question is posed in these terms: How can a man without sin be raised up from a member of the human race which is completely infected by sin? For the Virgin herself is conceived in iniquities, born with original sin, and has herself sinned in Adam.⁹ This, then, is the question

⁷ *De Conceptu Virginali* 17 (ML 158: 451).

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Cf. *Cur Deus Homo?* II, 16 (ML 158: 416).

as he first sees it. But before taking up the answers he gives, it will be of value to this study to consider the question itself. First of all, it is obvious that it is a properly theological question conceivable only within the framework of the Incarnation and the universality of Original Sin. It is in view of these certainties that reason is being used to analyze the particular issue that arises in regard to Mary. Secondly, it should not be forgotten that the ability to see and frame the terms of the problem is itself a decisive theological step. After all, in the matter of understanding any truth or teaching, a sound and valid answer necessarily presupposes a clear understanding of what the problem is. One might go further and say that no real answer is possible until one has actually realized that there is a problem and then taken the first methodical step which is to formulate the question. The same may be said of Anselm's effort to answer this question. Even though he lacks a clear distinction between the natural and supernatural, and his concept of original sin and primitive justice remains in the psychological order, St. Anselm's tentatives are an excellent example of the beginnings of theological development on this point. For he sets down the two principles from which logically the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception can be deduced viz., the unexcelled purity of Mary in view of her divine maternity and the application of the anticipated merits of Christ. Hence, despite its deficiencies, his teaching here is a great step forward in the theology of the Immaculate Conception.

St. Anselm's first effort to deal with the problem is hesitating. He affirms that it is possible for God in His wisdom to accomplish it without our being able to understand it or know how it was done.¹⁰ Granting this, he proposes a tentative solution which is based on the fact that the redemptive work of Christ looks to all men in all times.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 417).

This principle he states thus:

The redemption which Christ made ought to be of benefit not only to those who lived at the time but to other men as well. . . . for all men could not be present when Christ performed his redemptive work, yet so great was the power of his death that its effect extended also to those who were absent in time and place. For even if all those who were present anywhere at that time were admitted to the redemption there still could not be as many present as were needed for the erection of the heavenly city. Hence it is easy to see why it would be of profit to others than those present.¹¹

Anselm then cites the case of Adam and Eve of whom he says it would be unbelievable that they should be excluded from the divine will to assume men into the heavenly city, yet no soul could enter paradise before the death of Christ.¹² From this he infers that the time at which a man lived need not exclude and ought not of itself to exclude him from the redeeming work of Christ. He then applies this general principle to Mary:

That Virgin, therefore, from whom that man was assumed, was of that number who were cleansed of their sins by him before his nativity and so he was assumed from her in his own spotlessness.¹³

Mary's spotlessness, then, is from her Son, but His is of Himself: "PER SE IPSUM ET A SE MUNDUS FUIT."¹⁴

Having once opened the subject, the problem raised apparently continues to bother Anselm, for shortly afterwards we find him devoting a whole work to the subject *viz.*, *De Conceptu Virginali et Originali Peccato*. In this treatise he deals on a large scale with the question of original sin. As he himself points out: "To see, therefore, how God assumed a

¹¹ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 417-18).

¹² *Ibid.* (ML 158: 419).

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

man from the sinful mass of human nature it is necessary first of all to inquire into original sin because it is from this alone that this question stems."¹⁵ The theological nature of his inquiry is made clear in his prologue. "I will not defend my position if it can be reasonably shown that it is repugnant to truth. Yet I hold that the explanation set down in the work (*Cur Deus Homo*) is quite valid and sufficient, but nothing forbids that there be many explanations for the same thing of which one alone can suffice."¹⁶

Before taking up Anselm's exposition of the nature of original sin it might be well to recall in passing that the object of this study is the theological approach of the saint and not the dispute over his teaching on the Immaculate Conception.¹⁷ But since it is present, at least by implication, it may be of value to consider that since St. Anselm's approach to the subject is by way of his teaching on original sin, that teaching will play an essential part in determining whether or not he could have taught an explicit doctrine on the Immaculate Conception.¹⁸

For Anselm the essence of original sin consists in the absence of rectitude in the will with regard to God: an "absentia iustitiae debitae."¹⁹ Original justice being the service of the will of God owed by man.²⁰ This justice and, therefore, original sin, must be in the will and not in the human body.²¹ The sin (as would be the justice) is transmitted by the willed

¹⁵ C. 1 (ML 158: 433).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ For a resumé of this dispute cf. R. T. Jones, *Sancti Anselmi Mariologia* (1937) pp. 25-34; X. Le Bachelet, *Immaculée Conception*, in DThC VII 1, 995-1001; A. Gaudel, *Péché Originel* in DThC XII 1, 435-441.

¹⁸ Cf. Jones, *op. cit.* p. 34.

¹⁹ *De Concordia Praescientiae et Praedestinationis cum Libero Arbitrio* c. 7 (ML 158: 517).

²⁰ *Dialogus de Libero Arbitrio* c. 3 (ML 158: 493-94).

²¹ Cf. *Dialogus de Veritate*, c. 12 (ML 158: 482); *De Conceptu Virginali* c. 4, 7, 15 (ML 158: 437, 441, 449).

act of generation on the part of a man and woman. Hence the sin in us arises not from the fact that the semen is evil or that concupiscence is evil, but because we are sharers of the will and procreative nature of Adam with whom we are one.²² For the nature which God bestowed on Adam was one that had the power to propagate other creatures but at the same time was subject to the will of Adam.²³ Thus all natures that come from Adam are subject to his will.²⁴ So then, we who were causally or materially in the semen of Adam would receive that same nature with its evil will by way of human generation; itself a willed act.²⁵ Accordingly, by being generated we receive human nature not only from Adam but as it was in Adam, not subject to the will of God and lacking its "*debita justitia*."²⁶ "Therefore all who are propagated by the operation of the nature which Adam possessed are born bound by his *debitum*."²⁷

Employing this conception of the nature and transmission of original sin, Anselm then devotes the rest of the work to the exceptional case of Christ. He formulates this inquiry in this wise: "Now it must be considered carefully whether this *quasi* inheritance of sin and the penalties of sin pass on to (Christ) through the virgin propagated of Adam."²⁸ The resolution of this question centers around the "*natura propagandi*" which is the nature Adam transmits unless God wills otherwise.²⁹ First he makes a distinction with regard to the manners of propagation possible in creatures. This he divides into *naturalis*, *voluntaria*, and *mirabilis*. *Natural* he applies

²² *De Conceptu Virginali* c. 10, 12 (ML 158: 444, 447).

²³ Cf. *Ibid.* c. 10, 23 (ML 158: 444, 456).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.* c. 12 (ML 158: 447); cf. also the references in n. 23.

²⁶ *Ibid.* c. 10 (ML 158: 444).

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.* c. 11 (ML 158: 445).

²⁹ *Ibid.*

to trees, plants; *voluntary* refers to the generative act by which a man is begotten of a man and a woman; *miraculous* is that which is subject neither to nature nor the will of man; and this is the case with Christ.³⁰

The propagation of a man solely of a virgin is neither natural nor voluntary but miraculous just as is (the propagation) which brought forth a woman solely from a man (Eve) and the creation of man from the slime. This is obvious because it is not subject to the laws and merits of that propagation which is brought about, though in diverse ways, by nature or will; for nature does it one way and will another. None the less he is truly man whether it be Adam who is of no man, or Jesus Who is of woman alone, or Eve who is of man alone, in the same way he is truly a man, be it man or woman, who is of both man and woman. For everyone is either Adam or of Adam. Thus Eve is of Adam and all others are of Adam and Eve. And since Mary, from whom alone Jesus is, is of Adam, then it cannot but be that Jesus is of them also. For it was expedient that he who was to redeem the human race be of the father and mother of all men.³¹

The application of these conceptions to the doctrine under discussion extends itself over the remainder of the work. This application may be formulated into the following conclusions: (a) It is most unfitting that, in those cases where God intervenes directly, the man resulting from such intervention should not be a just man. Such would be the case in the creation of Adam or a *homo purus*.³² (b) The Blessed Virgin, in view of her function and consequent dignity, was cleansed by her faith in the future death of the Redeemer.³³ (c) Christ, although of Adam through His mother, was not subject through

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 446).

³² *Ibid.* c. 13 (ML 158: 447).

³³ *Ibid.* c. 17 (ML 158: 451).

His human nature to the will and power of Adam.³⁴ (d) His conception and therefore His nature are free of this subjection to Adam because "the will of a creature did not implant this offspring in His mother nor did nature germinate it but rather the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High miraculously procreated this man of the Virgin woman."³⁵ Hence, while Christ was of Adam because He is the Son of Mary, yet He is not subject to the will and propagating nature of Adam because His conception does not result through the voluntary act of human generation by which sinful nature is transmitted.

Taken simply as an endeavor to penetrate the object of faith with the then available resources of reason this whole treatment is a superb illustration of a nascent but vital theological effort. The formulation of the question; the realization of the ramifications of the problem; the distinctions posited as to the possibilities of propagation; the analogies drawn between Christ and Adam and Eve and Mary; the relation of the whole to the work of Christ as the Redeemer of the race and the application of all this to the question raised. All these represent the work of a deeply and acutely theological mind. Obviously, judged in the light of the later accomplishments, it is diffuse and very often lacks their systematic precision and organization. But judged on its merits as an initial effort, it bears the same stamp that will characterize the brilliant theological efforts of the thirteenth century when not only logic but metaphysics have been fashioned into an effective theological tool.

The Virginity of Mary. This notable prerogative of Mary which is so organic a part of the *traditio catholica* Anselm unites intimately with her maternal office. Mary was uniquely a Virgin because she was the mother of the unique Son.³⁶

³⁴ Cf. *Ibid.* c. 22 (ML 158: 454-55).

³⁵ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 455).

³⁶ *Homilia IX* (ML 158: 646).¹

Consistently, therefore, he brings into correlative relationship Mary's maternity and virginity. "O Lady, admirable by thy singular virginity, lovable in thy saving fecundity."³⁷ What is of bearing here, however, is the theological analysis that he makes of the relationship between the maternity and the virginity of Mary. This analysis is found primarily in his *Cur Deus Homo?* The question that gives rise to this exposition has its source in the discussion of the redeeming work of the Incarnation. The problem, as he conceives it, stems from the fact that in order for the Redeemer to give due satisfaction for the race he must take human nature from Adam.

Therefore, as Adam and Eve propagated sin among all men, so no one ought to satisfy for the sin of man save themselves or one born of them. Furthermore, if Adam had not sinned, then he and his whole race would have stood firm without the support of any other creature; so it is fitting that by its own means the same race arise and be elevated again after its fall. . . . Hence, if the race of Adam were lifted up by some man not of the same race, it would not be elevated to that dignity which it would have had if Adam had not sinned; thus there would not be a complete restoration. Moreover, God would appear to have failed in his purpose. But both these (suppositions) are incongruous. It is necessary, therefore, that the man through whom the race of Adam will be restored should himself be assumed from Adam.³⁸

With this as a guiding principle, St. Anselm then takes up the virginal birth of Christ. First he contends that there are three ways in which a man can be of the human race; either from a man alone, or a woman alone, or from both. He affirms that any of these ways is equally easy for God. He further affirms, without discussion, that the procreation of a man from a man alone or a woman alone will be purer and nobler

³⁷ *Oratio* 50 (ML 158: 948).

³⁸ II c. 8 (ML 158: 405-6).

than if it results from both a man and a woman.³⁹ Accordingly, the Redeemer will be taken from man alone or a woman alone. In view of this, he presents his first *ratio* why the Redeemer ought to come from a woman alone.

God can make a man in four ways: of a man and a woman, which is the ordinary way; or neither of a man or a woman, as is the case of the creation of Adam; or of a man without any woman, as with Eve; or of a woman without a man, as he had not yet done. So in order to show that this last way is also in his power and was set aside for this very work, nothing is more fitting than that he assume this man who is the object of our inquiry from a woman without a man.⁴⁰

That this woman should also be a virgin seems to Anselm to be beyond discussion. Hence he concludes: "It must be asserted without any hesitation that the God-man ought to be born of a virgin."⁴¹

To this general argument he adds one of fitness which he introduces with a sound bit of theological advice: "Paint not on an artificial emptiness, therefore, but on the solid truth." This whole argument is itself a beautiful example of his own advice and an impressive illustration of that living conjunction of speculation and contemplative ardor which is so much the mark of Anselm.

Tell how extremely fitting it is that as the sin of man and the cause of our condemnation took its beginning from a woman, so, too, the remedy of sin and the cause of our salvation is born of a woman. And that women may not despair of attaining to the company of the blessed despite the fact that this great evil came forth from a woman, it is proper that to renew their hope this very great good should also come forth from a woman. Add this also:

³⁹ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 406).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

If it was a virgin who was the cause of all evil for the human race it is much more becoming that a virgin should be the cause of all good. Further too: If the woman, who was made of a man without a woman, was made a virgin, it is particularly fitting that the man who should be made of a woman should be made of a virgin without a man. With regard to additional reasons showing how the God-man ought to be born of a virgin, these should suffice.⁴²

If these arguments be viewed in the light of what has already been seen on Anselm's teaching about original sin and the conception of Christ, we have a rich theological analysis of the fitness of the relation between our Lady's maternity and virginity. Notable, too, are the theological inferences and application made from the patristic comparisons between Eve and Mary. Also of importance to the general object of this paper is the fact that, seen in the light of this theological approach, the praise of Mary's virginity by Anselm in his prayers, meditations and homilies takes on a richness and depth that would otherwise be lacking. Lastly, though somewhat indirectly, the argument from fitness quoted above is an excellent indication of the process by which the dignity of woman became an integral part of Western culture.

The Sanctity of Mary. The relation between the sanctity of Mary and her maternal office is clearly stated in the principle we have already seen: "It was fitting that the Virgin be resplendent in a purity so great that nothing under God is greater."⁴³ Thus in his prayers we find the Saint addressing Mary as "Maria sanctissima" or as "Lady who shineth forth in such great holiness."⁴⁴ He sees Mary's holiness as being above that of the angels and saints "You overcome the angels in purity and surpass the saints in holiness."⁴⁵

⁴² *Ibid.* (ML 158: 406-7).

⁴³ Cf. n. 7.

⁴⁴ *Orationes* 50, 51 (ML 158: 948-950).

⁴⁵ *Oratio* 50 (ML 158: 949).

What is of bearing here in St. Anselm's treatment of the sanctity of Mary is that he sees it as arising from her maternity. Because of this, her sanctity is "super omnia,"⁴⁶ and she can be invoked through the plenitude of her grace.⁴⁷ It is by the grace of this office that Anselm invokes her: "I beseech thee, O Mary, through the grace by which the Lord was with thee and thou didst will to be with Him";⁴⁸ or "O woman full and overflowing with grace, from whose flowing shower of fullness every creature is thus made to flourish."⁴⁹ But perhaps the most profound exposition of the intimate relation between Mary's maternity and sanctity is found in his famous ninth homily:

O how great was the extent of the sweetness of the Lord in the blessed Virgin when the Holy Spirit came upon her and the power of the most High overshadowed her and she conceived of the same Holy Spirit. What of God did she not taste in whom the wisdom of God was concealed and in whose womb he fitted unto himself a body. "Christ" says the apostle, 'is the power of God and the wisdom of God' and 'In him are hidden all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God.' Therefore, the power of God, the wisdom of God, and all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge were in Mary.⁵⁰

Hence it is that St. Anselm can say: "Nothing is equal to Mary, nothing save God is greater than Mary,"⁵¹ but always in relation to Christ.

The Intercession of Mary. In the teaching of St. Anselm the intercessory office of Mary is not an explicit theological analysis. As was indicated earlier, this aspect will be found in his devotional writings and in the titles that he accords

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 52 (ML 158: 955).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 956).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 955).

⁵⁰ *Homilia IX* (ML 158: 648-49).

⁵¹ *Oratio* 52 (ML 158: 956).

her. Yet, what must be avoided is the conclusion that such devotional expressions have no organic connection with his theological inquiries. Enough of his theological effort has been seen as well as his whole approach to such an inquiry to enable us to realize how intimately they are united in him: "he who has not experienced does not understand." It is the same man, the same mind, the same attitude burgeoning forth in prayer. To look upon his devotion as a separate compartment of his life is to blind oneself to the man who was Anselm. Such an attitude also fails to take into account the whole spirit of the Middle Ages. For in these theologians there was no dichotomy between intelligence and love but rather a living union that found its characteristic expression in prayer. Because of this, it is not only right but necessary to view the saintly doctor's devotion to Mary in the light of all that he says about her maternal office, virginity, and sanctity. If we separate the theologian's prayers to Mary from the context of what we have seen, we are but trying to divide Anselm the thinker from Anselm the saint. Such a separation would be as unintelligible to Anselm as it is contrary to the facts.

Of Mary's intercessory function there is no doubt whatever in Anselm's mind. She is the "Mother of salvation,"⁵² the "court of propitiation,"⁵³ "She asks and beseeches what is expedient for us."⁵⁴ He himself prays: "O good mother, I ask thee that as thou dost truly love thy Son and wish Him to be loved; so do thou impetrate for me that I may truly love Him";⁵⁵ or "Do Thou, O Christ, have mercy on a miserable man by sparing him and do thou, (O Mary), by intervening for him."⁵⁶ This fusion of doctrine and devotion is

⁵² *Ibid.* 50 (ML 158: 948).

⁵³ *Ibid.* 51 (ML 158: 933).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 52 (ML 158: 957).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* (ML 158: 959).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 51 (ML 158: 952).

beautifully voiced in the exordium of one of his orations to Mary.

O holy Mary, after God uniquely holy among the saints, mother of admirable virginity, virgin of lovable fecundity who didst beget the Son of the Most High and didst bring forth a savior for the lost human race. O lady shining in such great sanctity, super-eminent in such great dignity, it is certain that thou art possessed of no less power or piety. To thee, a begetter of life, mother of salvation, temple of piety and mercy, my miserable soul dares to present itself.⁵⁷

The source of this intercessory power is Mary's maternal bond with her Divine Son. By reason of this bond she is also our Mother. The saint brings this out in a particularly striking passage:

For their is no reconciliation save that which thou, O chaste one, didst conceive; nor is their justification save that which thou, O integral one, didst foster; nor is there salvation save that which thou, O Virgin, didst bring forth. Therefore, O Lady, thou art the mother of justification and the justified, the begetter of reconciliation and the reconciled, the parent of salvation and the saved. O blessed confidence! O safe refuge! the Mother of God is our mother, the mother of him in whom we hope and whom alone we fear is also our mother. The mother of him who alone saves, alone condemns, is our mother.⁵⁸

It is because of the maternal office of Mary that we can have such confidence in her intercession. Thus her power with her Son and her place in the economy of salvation as our intercessor have their roots in her maternal relation with the Savior of mankind.

While the divine maternity may very well be termed the

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 50 (ML 158: 948).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 52 (ML 158: 956-57).

ontological foundation of Mary's intercessory office, still it is her sanctity and grace that make of that relation an effective instrument of intercession. This correlation of maternity and sanctity St. Anselm brings out very beautifully in the following excerpt:

For when I have sinned against the son I have provoked the mother. What shall you do, O sinner, and whither will you fly? For who shall reconcile you to the son if the mother be inimical, or who shall please the mother for you if the son be wrathful? But if you have offended both, are not both forgiving? Therefore, let him who has offended the just God fly to the virtuous mother of the merciful God and let him who is guilty of offending the mother seek refuge with the virtuous son of the benign mother. Let him who is guilty of offending both cast himself between both; let him throw himself between the virtuous son and the virtuous mother. Good Son, please thy mother in thy servant; good mother, reconcile thy servant to thy son. And I who cast myself between two such great *pietates* shall not then fall between two great severities. Good Son, good mother, let it not be in vain that I confess this truth about you nor let me be ashamed that I trust this virtuousness in you (both). For I love the truth I confess concerning you and I beg of the virtuousness that I trust in you.⁵⁰

For St. Anselm, then, the confidence with which he prays arises from this conjunction of truth and virtue—*veritas et pietas*. He balances delicately the relation between Son and Mother. The Son acts to please the Mother, the Mother acts to reconcile the sinner to her Son. And this because in both is an immense "pietas" so that both are joined in truth and grace. As the prayer itself concludes by addressing both Christ and Mary:

I therefore beg that you hear me, not for my sake but for yours that through the piety which overflows in you and the power that

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 51 (ML 158: 951-52).

abounds in you that I may avoid the deserved griefs of the damned and may merit to enter into the joy of the blessed.⁶⁰

Thus the theological heart of St. Anselm's thought on Mary's intercessory office may be summed up in the three words that underlie this whole passage: *veritas*, i. e. truly the Son of Mary, truly the mother of God; *pietas*, i. e. blessed and engraced above all the angels and saints and, therefore, *potestas*, i. e. effective and universal intercession.

Much more could be added to these general ideas to show that there is implicit in the devotional writings of the Saint a conception of Mary as *Mediatrx gratiarum*. However to make this explicit would call for the use of theological technique and formulation that only develops later on.⁶¹ Such a process was felt to be beyond the object of this paper and so has been omitted. However, some of the material that has been seen and a great deal that has not been touched in this paper might very well serve to corroborate this theology on Mary's mediatorial function.

By way of conclusion, it may be of importance to emphasize once again the value of Anselm as a Mariologist. Even in the brief confines of this study there is evident the close relation between doctrine and devotion and how the whole emanates from an essentially theological approach. Similar studies of other earlier medieval writers such as Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bernard might do much to give a mature understanding and a vital appreciation of the Marian devotion of that period. For it is the spirit of men such as Anselm and Bernard that is at once the flower and the impulse of that tender devotion to Mary which is so much a part of our own Catholic tradition that never separates the Mother from the Son. In the words of St. Anselm:

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ For an example of this procedure cf. Jones *op. cit.* p. 61 seq.

May my mind venerate you both as befits thee; may my heart love you as is right; may my soul cherish you as it should and my flesh serve you as it ought and may my life be consummated in this that my whole substance may chant forever: Blessed be the Lord forever.⁶²

DR. EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.
Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

⁶² *Oratio* 52 (ML 158: 959). In general, with regard to the devotional writings of St. Anselm, it is true, as Rousselot points out, that Anselm's devotional writing did not exert a decisive influence on popular Marian devotion akin, say, to that of St. Bernard or St. Francis. This he attributes to its predominant speculative character. However, it seems to this writer that it is just this speculative character that is of importance to this paper because of its influence on the later scholastics and its exemplification of the relation between dogma and devotion.