

1953

## The Queenship of Mary During the Patristic Period

Malachi J. Donnelly

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies)



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Donnelly, Malachi J. (1953) "The Queenship of Mary During the Patristic Period," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 4, Article 8.

Available at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies/vol4/iss1/8](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol4/iss1/8)

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](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

## THE QUEENSHIP OF MARY DURING THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

As we all know, there are two sources of divine revelation, Sacred Scripture and Tradition.<sup>1</sup> In this study, we are concerned only with the second source, tradition, and with that merely during the first nine centuries. My task will be to ascertain what the ancient Christian writers wrote about the Queenship of Mary. Hence, I shall confine my investigation to the written monuments exclusively, making no mention of other vestiges of revelation, such as the liturgy, archeological remains in the forms of catacomb paintings, sculpture, inscriptions, architecture, and the like.

The development of my paper will follow roughly, at least, the chronological form. Under several headings, I shall indicate the various stages through which the doctrine of Mary's Queenship has passed. As we progress, I shall indicate the more appropriate patristic sources. There will be no clearcut distinction between the Fathers of the East and those of the West. I am primarily interested in what they tell us, not in where they resided or were born.

It seems superfluous even to mention that, as Catholics, we must hold that divine revelation, at least in its public form, came to a end with the death of St. John the Evangelist.<sup>2</sup> If the doctrine of the Queenship of the Blessed Virgin Mary seems suddenly to emerge like a bubble arising to the surface of a still body of water, we must not suppose, for one moment, that this doctrine first had being at the moment of its appearance in an explicit and easily recognizable form.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Concilium Tridentinum*, Sessio IV, D.B. n. 783; *Vaticanum*, Sessio III, D.B., n. 1788.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Lamentabili*, D.B., n. 2021: "Revelatio, obiectum fidei catholicae constituens, non fuit cum Apostolis completa." I need not mention that this proposition was condemned.

No, the doctrine—if it be a revealed doctrine (and who will deny that it truly is revealed?)—was contained in its substantial completeness in the original deposit of faith. The same doctrine was handed down from generation to generation of Catholics, either in written or unwritten revelation. What did change, then, in the doctrine? One may say that the apprehension of and deeper penetration into this original revelation of Mary on the part of the faithful, both the teaching and the taught Church, did increase, as the doctrine itself came more to the foreground of consciousness with the passing of time.<sup>3</sup> Somewhat like a vast cathedral or an intricate painting, the original deposit of mariological revelation remains the same; but the spectator of this rich treasure sees more of the beauty revealed, more of the fine lines of the edifice brought into clearer focus, into sharper relief.

Again, may I insist that the writings of the Fathers are not tradition itself? They are mirrors of tradition, at least under certain specified conditions. Strictly speaking, tradition is the *praedicatio magisterii ecclesiastici*. At times, perhaps, the ancient Christian authors will reflect more directly this *praedicatio*. More often, at least in our subject, they will mirror forth tradition, as such, rather indirectly. Their writings will reflect the belief of the common folk, of the *fideles simplices*, a belief that truly has had its origin in and is directed by the official *magisterium* of the Church. Hence, my study will not be directly of tradition, as such, but rather an examination into the criteria of tradition, into the writings

<sup>3</sup>For two excellent modern studies of Tradition, cf. Gottlieb Söhngen, *Überlieferung und apostolische Verkündigung: eine fundamental-theologische Studie zum Begriff des Apostolischen*, in *Episcopus: Studien über das Bischofsamt*, Regensburg, 1949. This is a *Festschrift* symposium in honor of His Eminence Michael Cardinal von Faulhaber on his eightieth birthday. The articles are written by the theological faculty of the University of Munich. Also, cf. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., *The Catholic Concept of Tradition in the Light of Modern Theological Thought*, in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention of The Catholic Theological Society of America*, 1951, pp. 42-75.

of the early Christians. And, it will be well to note, not all—by any means—of the writers under consideration are truly Fathers of the Church, if one use that word “Fathers” in its technical sense. Nonetheless we can, by an examination of their writings, get a true knowledge of the tradition in the strict sense of the word.

## THE BEGINNINGS

### 1. *East and West*

Although, as I have noted, we shall not always separate strictly the writings of the West from those of the East, it will be well, however, to indicate some differences between the Eastern and Western mind. The East, briefly, was more mystically inclined, a people endowed with an extremely rich vocabulary. The West, on the contrary, was a more practical people, one with the limited vocabulary of a nation of doers. Hence, perhaps as de Gruyter suggests,<sup>4</sup> in this difference of the two peoples, Eastern and Western, one may find the reason for the correspondingly different tone of the heresies by which the locally distant parts of Christendom were plagued. In the East, the first heresies were largely those dealing with cognition and speculation. In the West, on the contrary, the fifth century heresies, for example, had to do largely with practical affairs: the necessity of actual grace for placing salutary actions. One might recall, also, the rebaptism of people baptized in heretical sects and the quarrel between Pope St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, in the third century.

In the East, with the emphasis placed on the Trinity and Christ, it was, perhaps, only natural to expect that there, first of all, attention should also be devoted to the Mother of Jesus and that Eastern penetration into mariological revela-

<sup>4</sup> *De Beata Maria Regina*, Buscoduci, 1934, p. 106.

tion should develop faster than in the West. As we shall see, there were certain exceptions to this general rule.

## 2. *Patristic Commentaries on Sacred Scripture.*

As de Gruyter indicates<sup>5</sup> and as is quite obvious, from even a cursory reading of the early Fathers, Mary was looked upon in the beginning as the second Eve. While the doctrine of the Divine Maternity was not neglected, nevertheless more emphasis was given the relationship between Mary and Christ in the work of the Redemption. Shortly before the Council of Ephesus, the emphasis shifted. The insistence upon the title of *Mater Dei* became pronounced.<sup>6</sup> Whereas St. Irenaeus had been preoccupied with the idea of Mary as the *Nova Eva*,<sup>7</sup> at the beginning of the fifth century, the Divine Maternity becomes the center of the whole of Mariology.<sup>8</sup> All the other qualities, including her Queenship, are considered as consequences of Mary's being the Mother of God.

According to Barré,<sup>9</sup> the explicit belief in Mary's Queenship does not date back beyond the fifth century. However, as Luis quickly points out,<sup>10</sup> there are, nevertheless, true indications of the Queenship even before the fifth century.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

<sup>6</sup> *Viz.* St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*, III, 12, P.L. 94, 1029.

<sup>7</sup> *Adversus Haereses*, V, 19-20, *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> De Gruyter, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>9</sup> H. Barré, C. S. Sp., *La Royauté de Marie pendant les neuf premiers siècles*, in *Rech. de sc. relig.*, vol. 29 (1939), pp. 129-162; pp. 303-34; cf. p. 145: "... la croyance explicite à la Royauté de Marie n'apparaît pas clairement avant le V<sup>e</sup> siècle." I may mention here that, in this paper, I am heavily indebted to Barré's articles in *Recherches* and, also, have been deeply influenced by his *Marie, Reine du monde*, in *Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales*, Paris 1937, pp. 21-76. Also interesting are the *Echanges de vues après le rapport du R.P. Barré*, *ibid.*, pp. 77-90.

<sup>10</sup> Angel Luis, C.S.S.R., *La Realeza de María*, Madrid, 1942, p. 34 s. In this paper, I owe much, also, to the fine work of Luis.

a. *Mater Domini*

The first patristic writings are largely brief commentaries on the scriptural accounts of Mary, chiefly the accounts of the Annunciation and Visitation. As Barré tells us,<sup>11</sup> the Fathers and theologians, with St. Cyril of Alexandria being the first, have emphasized the natural relation between the scriptural account of the Visitation and the divine Motherhood of Mary, between the *Mater Domini* and *Mater Dei*. All rightly saw that, in the *Mater Domini* of Elizabeth, there was a natural bridge joining the Mother of Jesus in the gospels and the Mother of God in subsequent centuries.<sup>12</sup>

Regarding the words *Mater Domini* of Elizabeth and, especially, the meaning of *Dominus*, most modern authors have recourse to the fine articles of L. Cerfaux.<sup>13</sup> Cerfaux holds that the word "Kyrios" in the language of the New Testament, and especially in the Visitation passage, manifests the divinity of Christ, but equally, and, even principally, His Kingship and perfect sovereignty.<sup>14</sup>

Hence, one may well say that, in the words of Elizabeth, *Mater Domini*, there is not only the bridge leading to the fourth century *Mater Dei*, but also a sure indication that the natural terminus of these words will be Lady, Sovereign, Mistress, and, finally, Queen, as applied to Mary. The very attitude of Elizabeth is that of one who, in her cousin, sees one who is truly her own Sovereign Lady. This demeanor of Elizabeth will not pass unnoticed by subsequent ages.<sup>15</sup> A text, seemingly belonging to Origen (+254), and preserved in

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 134.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 133.

<sup>13</sup> *Le titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus*, in *Rev. des sc. phil. et théol.*, 1922, pp. 40-71; 1923, pp. 125-53; cf. 1931, pp. 27-51 and 417-52.

<sup>14</sup> For a good discussion of the nature of kingship, cf. Luis's *La Realeza . . .*, p. 11 ss.; also, de Gruyter, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-53.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Barré, *art. cit.*, p. 133.

Macarius Chrysocephalus, brings out that Elizabeth looked upon Mary as her true Sovereign Lady:

Cur me igitur prior salutas? Nunquid ego sum quae Salvatorem pario? Oportebat me ad te venire: tu enim super omnes mulieres benedicta: tu Mater *Domini mei*: tu *mea Domina*. . . .<sup>16</sup>

In this light, the expression *Mater Domini* takes on new significance and indicates a first step forward in the development of the doctrine. According to Barré, this formula, *Mater Domini*, is quite frequent in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, and is found in the writings of Gaudentius of Brescia. For reasons that I have indicated, in the early Church, other expressions were more commonly used of the Mother of Jesus.

Nevertheless, this formula, *Mater Domini*, will continue its march of development in early Christian writings. This is evident in the texts from St. Ephraem of Syria (+373) cited by Barré.<sup>17</sup>

Beata es, Maria, quia mater effecta es gloriosissima

(Domini regum . . . .

Beata es, O Maria, quia digna fuisti ut mater fieres

(Domini omnium creaturarum).<sup>18</sup>

Again, St. Ephraem cries aloud:

Sanctissima Domina, Dei Genitrix . . . Sola facta domicilium universarum gratiarum (Ed. Assemani, III, 524).

He maintains that the protection of Mary is most efficacious, for she is the Sovereign Mother of God. Hence, she can most confidently approach God, her Child, and can protect Ephraem from all evil and sin. She is the Virgin, a Sovereign Lady, the

<sup>16</sup> *Fragmenta Origenis, ex Macarii Chrysocephali Orationibus in Lucam*, P.G., 13, 1902.

<sup>17</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 134.

<sup>18</sup> *Hymni de B.M.*, xvi, 6 (Ed. Lamy, II, col. 590), et *Hymni de Ecclesia et virginitate* xv, 4 (Ed. Lamy, IV col. 532), as cited by Barré, *art. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

true mother of God.<sup>10</sup> Finally, allow me to cite the following text:

Quo die Gabriel ad meam humilitatem venit, ex ancilla, Dominam fecit, et quae eram Divinitatis tuae famula, repente mater evasi humanitatis tuae, Domine et Filii: ancilla, extemplo facta sum regis filia, tu me fecisti, qui es filius Regis. Inter omnes Davidis posteros elegisti puellam humilem, terraeque filium, caeloque invexisti, qui est caelestis.<sup>20</sup>

From the *Mater Domini*, therefore, of Elizabeth to the *Domina* of St. Ephraem and many others was but a short and most natural step in the development of the doctrine.

Basil of Seleucia (+459) speaks of Mary as the Holy Mother of the Lord of the universe.<sup>21</sup> St. Augustine (+430)<sup>22</sup> and St. Jerome (+420)<sup>23</sup> will also speak of the sovereignty of Mary. As Barré states rather succinctly, "Bref, une idée est en marche, qui ne tardera pas à s'épanouir au grand jour."<sup>24</sup>

#### b. *Mater Regis*

As we all know, the word "King" is applied to Christ many times in the New Testament. Since Mary is His Mother, it is but natural to call her *Mater Regis*. The beautiful hymn of Sedulius expresses this very well:

Salve Sancta parens, enixa puerpera Regem,  
Qui coelum, terramque tenet per saecula, cuius  
Numen, et aeterno complectens omnia gyro  
Imperium sine fine manet.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, III, 548 sq., 528 sqq.

<sup>20</sup> *Opera omnia*, Syr. et Lat., Sermo iv, in natalem Domini, II, 415.

<sup>21</sup> *Orat.* 39, In SS. Deiparae ann. P.G., 85, 448.

<sup>22</sup> In Joannis Evangelium, VIII, 9, P.L. 35, 1456.

<sup>23</sup> *Homilia in die Dom. Paschae* (Edit. D.G. Morin, in *Anecdota Maredsolan.*, t. III, pars. II, p. 414), as cited by Barré, *art. cit.*, p. 134.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>25</sup> *Opus paschale*, P.L. 18, 599; cf. *Corp. vindob.*, X, 48.

and, again, in prose:

Sola, parens optima, tanti regis puerperio consecrata, qui super-  
nis ita jugiter et infimis dominatur, ut eius imperium, potestas, et  
nomen nec initium noverit habere, nec finem, quae beati ventris  
honore conspicuo simul et mater esse probaris, et virgo.<sup>26</sup>

Prudentius expresses the same sentiments:

Hic pretiosa magi sub virginis ubere Christo  
Dona ferunt puero, myrrhaeque, et thuris et auri.  
Miratur genitrix tot casti ventris honores,  
Seque Deum genuisse hominem, regem quoque summum.<sup>27</sup>

Hesychius of Jerusalem repeats the praises of Mary, giving  
her the title "Mater regis coeli et terrae."<sup>28</sup>

And among the *spuria* of St. John Chrysostom, we find:

Advenit igitur ad virginem Mariam angelus, et ingressus ad eam  
dixit, Ave gratia plena. Conservam vocavit ut dominam, et ut  
eam quae jam esset Mater Domini.<sup>29</sup>

Finally, Chrysippus of Jerusalem will sum up the evolution  
of the doctrine in a late fifth-century homily (the author died  
in 479) on psalm forty-four. Mary is called Mother of the  
King and Chrysippus says that she will be changed into a  
heavenly Queen.<sup>30</sup>

As Barré sums up, the steps of the evolution proceeded  
from "Mother of Christ who is King", to "Mother of the  
King," and finally to "Queen." It is a clear case of the  
emergence of the implicit into the explicit. Before going on,  
a few remarks are in order concerning the name "Mary."

<sup>26</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>27</sup> *Dittochaëon*, 17, *P.L.* 60, 102.

<sup>28</sup> *De Sancta Maria Deipara homila*, *P.G.* 92, 1368.

<sup>29</sup> *Homila contra Arium (Spuria Chrysost.)*, *De Annuntiatione*, *P.G.* 62,  
765.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Patrologia Orientalis*, 19, 336 sqq.

c. *Et Nomen Virginis Maria.*

The beginning, of course, is found in the passage of St. Jerome's *Liber de nominibus hebraicis*,<sup>31</sup> where we read:

... sciendumque quod Maria sermone Syro domina nuncupatur.

As Barré aptly remarks, it matters very little whether "Mary" does actually mean *Domina* in Syriac or not. The one important thing is the influence that Jerome's interpretation exercised upon subsequent thought.

From the contention that Mary does mean Sovereign Lady to the explicit profession of her queenship is not a long leap. Jerome does not bridge the gap, for he does not comment on the passage. That will be the work of others.

St. Peter Chrysologus (+451) is inspired by Jerome. The testimony of the former, then, is not to be looked upon as an isolated flare in the darkness of the past, but rather as the bringing to full fire of the tiny spark ignited by Jerome. We read:

Ante causam dignitas virginis annuntiatur ex nomine; nam Maria hebraeo sermone, latine Domina nuncupatur: vocat ergo angelus dominam, ut dominatoris genitricem trepidatio deserat servitutis, quam nasci, et vocari dominam ipsa sui germinis fecit et impetravit auctoritas.<sup>32</sup>

Mary is called *Domina*, therefore, because she is Mother of the Lord. Furthermore, this preeminent dignity shines forth in her very name. It is as though the angel had said, "Ave, Domina"; for Mary means *Domina*, or Sovereign Lady.

d. *Summary*

Briefly, the doctrine of the early Christian writers down to the time of Ephesus and shortly thereafter seems to be this. They began with the accounts of the Annunciation and Visitation. Mary is the Mother of Jesus the King, of Jesus

<sup>31</sup> P.L. 23, 842.

<sup>32</sup> Sermo 142, *De Annuntiatione B. Mariae Virginis*, P.L. 52, 579.

the Lord. The next step: Mary is Mother of the King, Mother of the Lord. And, finally, the next step will be: Mary is Queen, Mary is Sovereign Lady. The further development of the doctrine will largely be concerned with the exploration, in the concrete, of the contents of Queen and Sovereign Lady.

The conclusion, which Barré draws from the apocryphal literature and the most ancient *Transitus Mariae*, from various inscriptions, and the like, is that, around the time of Ephesus, the title of "Sovereign Lady" (*Domina*) began to be set aside for the Blessed Virgin.<sup>33</sup> The expression had penetrated into the very lives of the simple people. Later on we shall see, in the appeals made to Our Lady, how the Christian world has apprehended the royal power of Mary by which she leads all men onto their final end. Here, I should like to direct momentary attention, at least, to a passage of Basil of Seleucia, cited by Barré and others. The Greek text is: *vũν μὲν διεξάγοις ἐλθηνικῶς*.<sup>34</sup> The meaning of the Greek is: may you lead us to our final end in peace. The word (*διεξάγω*) is often used, as equivalent to rule.<sup>35</sup> It illustrates the sentiment of the people that Mary is truly the one who can lead men on to their final destiny, union with God in heaven.

#### THE SIXTH CENTURY

With the definition of the Divine Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the development of the doctrine of her Queenship grows apace. From now on, the Divine Maternity will occupy the center of Mariology and the other preroga-

<sup>33</sup> For those interested in the apocryphal literature, architectural proofs, paintings, etc., I recommend Barré's treatment, *art. cit.*, p. 143 ss. It is beyond my province to deal with such matters.

<sup>34</sup> *Orat. 39, In SS. Deiparae Ann., P.G. 85, 432.*

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament illustrated from the papyri and other non-literary sources*, Grand Rapids, 1949, under *ἐξάγω*, p. 220. Often this work is invaluable in determining the precise meaning of *Koine* Greek expressions in the Fathers.

tives will flow more spontaneously from it than ever before.<sup>36</sup> As Barré also points out,<sup>37</sup> all the other titles of Mary, her Queenship and Sovereignty included, will crystallize around the expression "Mother of God" as in a center of attraction.

Barré, citing Dom Cellier (*Histoire générale des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, 2<sup>e</sup> ed. t. XI, p. 820), notes that, in 518, the Council of Tyr celebrated a feast for the glory of God . . . and of the ever-glorious Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, *our Sovereign Lady*.<sup>38</sup> About the same time the Bishop of Constantinople, Epiphanius, wrote to Pope Hormisdas (+523) asking him to pray for the unity of the Catholic faith through the intercession of Our Lady, the holy and glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God.<sup>39</sup>

Similar expressions are found in the Life of Eutychius (+582),<sup>40</sup> in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus,<sup>41</sup> and, in the early part of the seventh century, in the writings of Maximus the Confessor (+662).<sup>42</sup> The latter habitually concludes his writings with an appeal to the prayers and intercessory powers of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, our Immaculate Sovereign Lady.<sup>43</sup>

In the East, also at this time, we find Timothy of Jerusalem ascribing ruling powers to Mary (βασιλεύειν).<sup>44</sup> Byzantium

<sup>36</sup> Cf. de Gruyter, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>37</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 147.

<sup>38</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Barré, *loc. cit.*, and *P.L.* 68, 498 (*Corp. vindob.* XXXV, 710).

<sup>40</sup> *P.G.* 86, 228, *et passim*.

<sup>41</sup> *H.E.* V, 4, *P.G.* 86, 2796 sq.

<sup>42</sup> *De duabus Christi voluntatibus*, *P.G.* 91, 212.

<sup>43</sup> ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις . . . τῆς δεσποίνης. It is well to bear in mind that the expression πρεσβείαις is very close to our "through the intercession of." It is used in *Koine* to express the pleading done by an ambassador at the court of a king. Since it is so commonly used by the Eastern writers in reference to Mary, does it not, perhaps, afford an insight into the kind of queenly powers ascribed to Mary, namely, rule by way of intercession with the King of kings?

<sup>44</sup> *Adversus Nestorianos*, III, 9, *P.G.* 86, 1641.

calls Mary "Queen" and "Holy Queen."<sup>45</sup> Then there are the poems of Romanos, now generally ascribed to the sixth century.<sup>46</sup> In these poems we find Mary called the "Queen of the world," "Sovereign Lady," and she is described as being seated royally on the throne of her Son.<sup>47</sup>

In the West, during this period, we have the beautiful verses of Venantius Fortunatus (+600). I cite the following stanzas, so frequently referred to in authors treating of the Queenship of Mary:

Conderis in solio felix regina, superno,  
Cingeris et niveis lactea virgo choris,  
Nobile nobilior circumstante senatu,  
Consulibus celsis celsior ipsa sedens.  
Sic iuxta genitum regem regina perennem  
Ornata ex partu, mater opima, tuo.<sup>48</sup>

I am aware of the fact that critical scholars are by no means in agreement that the above lines were written by Venantius. But, as Luis says,<sup>49</sup> if Leontius did write them, then he is the first of the Latin poets *ex professo* to sing of the grandeur of the Queen of Heaven.

It might be worthy of note to mention that the poem, *De virginitate*, certainly that of Venantius, is begun in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ and of His Mother Mary, (our) Lady.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>45</sup> *Oratio in Simeonem et in B.M.V.*, P.G. 86, 250.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. C. Chevalier, *Mariologie de Romanos* (490-550 environs), *le Roi des mélodes*, *Rech. de sc. rel.* vol. 38 (1938), pp. 48-72. Also, E. Amann's article, "Romanos," *D.T.C.*, vol. 13, col. 2895-98.

<sup>47</sup> Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicileg. solesm.*, Parisiis, 1876, vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>48</sup> *De Laudatione Mariae*, P.L. 88, 282.

<sup>49</sup> *La Realeza* . . . p. 41.

<sup>50</sup> P.L., 72, 669.

In his poem *De Laudatione Mariae* Venantius points out how the Son of Mary shows His gratitude to His Mother:

Ventris pro hospitio restituendo thronum,  
Componendo caput niveum diademate fulvo,  
Et gemmis rutilam comet honore comam.<sup>51</sup>

#### SEVENTH CENTURY

With the advent of this century, the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary spread rapidly throughout the Christian world.<sup>52</sup> During the first quarter of the seventh century, we encounter a host of writings eulogistic of Our Lady in heaven. And there is not a little written about her queenly role. John of Thessalonica (+c. 649) calls Mary "Sovereign Lady of the universe," "Blessed Sovereign of the Word," and other royal titles issue from his lips. It is thus that he begins his homily on the *Dormitio* of Mary, dedicating it to her, the Sovereign of the entire universe.<sup>53</sup>

St. Modestus of Jerusalem (+634) applied to Mary the same glorious titles, in praising her intercessory power.<sup>54</sup> As Barré points out,<sup>55</sup> Modestus is the first to apply verse 10 of psalm 44 to Mary: "Astitit Regina a dextris tuis." Others will imitate him.

St. Isidore of Seville (+636), a connecting link between the patristic period and the middle ages, harks back to Sts. Jerome and Peter Chrysologus in his encomium of Mary by his book on the etymology of names. I quote:

Maria . . . illuminatrix, sive stella maris: genuit enim lumen mundi. Sermone autem syro Maria Domina nuncupatur, et pulchre quia Dominum genuit.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>51</sup> *P.L.* 88, 283.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 42; Cf., also, B. Capelle, *La fête de l'Assomption dans l'histoire liturgique*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, vol. 3, 1926, p. 33 ss.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *Patrologia Orientalis*, 19, 375.

<sup>54</sup> *Encomium in dormit. SS. Deiparae*, *P.G.* 86, 3289 sq.

<sup>55</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 151.

<sup>56</sup> *Etymolog.*, VIII, 10, *P.L.* 82, 289.

The Bishop of Seville advances beyond St. Jerome, in that the former gives the reason for Mary's being aptly called *Domina*, "quia Dominum genuit."

St. Sophronius of Jerusalem (+638), in his life of Mary of Egypt,<sup>57</sup> has the Egyptian penitent address Mary as "O most upright and kind Sovereign Lady" (ὦ φιλόγαθε Δέσποινα).

St. Maximus Confessor, as we know, had the habit of concluding his writings by calling on "The Mother of God, Our Sovereign Lady."<sup>58</sup>

But there is one Western writer of this period who, in my opinion, far surpasses all the others. His language reminds one of the ebullience of the best Greek panegyrists of Mary. St. Ildefonse of Toledo (+669) has a heart and mind that overflows with love and praise of Mary. For example: In his *De virginitate perpetua B.M.*, cap. 1,<sup>59</sup> the Archbishop of Toledo accumulates royal encomia of the Blessed Virgin, such as surpass anything that had been written before him. He is her servant, she is his queen; she has complete dominion over him and it is to her that he has recourse in all his trials.<sup>60</sup> He wishes to serve Mary in an outstanding way in order better to serve Jesus.<sup>61</sup>

This idea of being a "slave" of Mary will, as Barré says, be the inspiration later on of those who, like Grignon de Montfort, will develop the idea of complete consecration to Mary.

Barré,<sup>62</sup> echoed by Luis,<sup>63</sup> mentions that these titles bestowed upon Mary by St. Ildefonse are not isolated cases. Leaden medallions have been found in Africa, bearing the

<sup>57</sup> *P.G.* 87, 3716; cf. *SS. Cyri et Joannis Maricula*, *ibid.* 3557.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *supra*, note 42.

<sup>59</sup> *P.L.* 96, 105 sqq.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.* 105-110. There is a richness and deep significance in the titles which the author gives to the Virgin Mary.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>62</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 307.

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

name of the owner followed by the title ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΥ, "slave of the Mother of God."<sup>64</sup> Also the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome has the ambo of John VII (705-707), bearing a similar inscription in Greek and Latin:

*Johannes servus Scae Mariae*, ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΔΟΥΛΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΥ.<sup>65</sup>

And then there is a homily, erroneously attributed to Venerable Bede, that tells of a cleric who, about to contract marriage, thought he should visit the pope. The latter told him to become a monk and, in the monastery, to serve God and the Blessed Virgin his whole life through. Whence, the author concludes that one should serve always such a *Queen* who never deserts those having recourse to her. Also, at this time, the Bishop Ansebert tells of his sister Sigolina who joined herself to Christ as a perpetual handmaid of Mary ("... jugiter se Christo obtulit et sanctae Mariae in ancillam se tradidit").<sup>66</sup>

There is another final, striking text, cited by Luis, which he claims that Baronius did not hesitate to attribute to St. Cyril of Alexandria or to a learned and holy Patriarch of Alexandria by the name of Athanasius.<sup>67</sup> No matter who wrote it, the text is worth citing. I quote:

Siquidem is ipse qui ex Virgine natus est, Rex est et ipse Dominus Deus. Eiusque gratia, quae ipsum genuit, *Regina*, *Domina* et Deipara proprie ac vere praedicatur. Hincque decet nos eam respicientes, necnon ex ea genitum carniferum filium, dicere: nunc adstitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumamicta, circumdata varietate. Ut enim femina, *Regina est atque Domina* et Mater Dei: imaque ut *Regina* adstans a

<sup>64</sup> "Forum chrétien," *Dict. Arch. et Lit.*, vol. 5, c. 2017. For African inscriptions, cf. Delattre, *Le culte de la Sainte Vierge en Afrique*, pp. 109, 123 s.

<sup>65</sup> P.L. 94, 423.

<sup>66</sup> P.L. 88, 1233.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *Epistola apologetica*, P.G. 26, 917, cited by Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

dextris omnium Regis Filii sui, in vestitu deaurato incorruptionis et immortalitatis, circumamicta, varietate circumdata, sacris verbis celebratur . . .<sup>68</sup>

### THE EIGHTH CENTURY

The fact of the Queenship of Mary has been established. In the future, especially in the East, the Christian writers will endeavor to investigate the exact significance of this Queenship. With St. John Damascene (ca. 749), the Mariology of the Orient will reach its climax. In the West, to a certain extent, it will just be emerging from its adolescence.<sup>69</sup>

In the East, the outstanding exponents of Mary's Queenship are St. Andrew of Crete, St. Germanus of Constantinople and, above all, St. John Damascene.

St. Andrew of Crete (+740) takes it upon himself to follow successively Mary, Our Queen, along the various stages of her life. She has been prophesied as a Queen.<sup>70</sup> Her birth is royal;<sup>71</sup> likewise her entry into the temple,<sup>72</sup> and her coronation in heaven is that of a veritable Queen.<sup>73</sup> It is interesting to observe that, for St. Andrew, the favorite term for expressing the Queenship of Mary is βασιλίσσα, rather than δέσποινα. He continually forces himself to coin new expressions, such as even the overly rich Greek language did not contain, as his most expressive title for Mary: ὁ πανόλβια τρισάνασσα

<sup>68</sup> *Sermo de Annuntiatione*, P.G. 28, 938.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. de Gruyter, *op. cit.*, p. 107: "Mariologia Orientalis huius temporis . . . plenitudinem aetatis attingit. Postquam autem pervenit ad florem suum in S. Joanne Damasceno, vigor ille vitalis extinctus est. Doctrina vero Occidentalium potius comparari debet aetati juvenili: perfectionem attingit nonnisi in tempore sequenti."

<sup>70</sup> *Hom. IV in nat. B.M.*, P.G. 97, 872 (The reference, of course, is to Ps. 44, 10: "Astitit regina." Cf. *Canon in B. Annae concept.*, P.G. 97, 1313-14).

<sup>71</sup> *Hom. III in Nat. B.M.*, P.G. 97, 833.

<sup>72</sup> *Hom. I in Nativ.*, *ibid.* 820.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *Hom. I, II, III, in Dormit. B.M.*, P.G. 97, 1045. Here St. Andrew is extraordinarily effusive in eulogizing and heaping titles of praise upon Mary, his Queen.

ΘΕΟΥΕΝΝΗΤΡΙΧΑ, "O All-blessed thrice queenly Mother of God!"<sup>74</sup> The homily concludes with an appeal to the ever-efficacious intercession of Mary before her Son and King.

St. Germanus of Constantinople (+733), beginning with the words of the Angel at the time of the Annunciation, uses words which hark back to a passage in St. Andrew of Crete:

You will be called the throne bearing God and the Royal Chair of the King of Heaven, for you are Queen and Sovereign Lady, descended from a King of the World and adorned with beauty and royal majesty.<sup>75</sup>

Another passage, forming the third nocturn of the office for December 8, stresses the royal power of Mary.<sup>76</sup> And, when Mary is troubled by the angelic salutation, she is told by the angel that angelic reverence is due her and that he, the angel, should tremble before her royal dignity.<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, since she is truly queen, the first place is her right,<sup>78</sup> being the queen of the universe.<sup>79</sup> God cannot refuse her intercessory petitions. Her power is coextensive with her will.<sup>80</sup>

St. John Damascene (+c.749), even more than Sts. Andrew and Germanus, eulogizes Mary and describes her queenly power. Though perhaps not quite so effusive as his contemporaries, his is a more penetrating theological mind, pointing out precisely and clearly the *raison-d'être* and foundation of Mary's Queenship. She is truly the Mother of her Creator.<sup>81</sup>

Anne (a name meaning grace) gives birth to Mary (a name

<sup>74</sup> *Hom. IV in Dormit. B.M., P.G. 97, 1108.*

<sup>75</sup> Barré gives the following reference: *In Ann. SS. Deiparae, P.G. 98, 324-325.* Luis, on the contrary, errs in giving the reference to *Or. 3a in Dormit. B.M. P.G. 97, 1103.* The reader may just possibly be interested in discovering how Luis erred.

<sup>76</sup> *Hom. in Praesent., P.G. 98, 307-10.*

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid., 110.*

<sup>78</sup> *Orat. prima in Praesent. Deip., P.G. 98, 303.*

<sup>79</sup> *Orat. secunda in Dormit. Deip., P.G. 98, 351.*

<sup>80</sup> *P.G. 98, 319.*

<sup>81</sup> *De fide orthodoxa, IV, 14, P.G. 96, 1157, 1162.*

meaning Sovereign Lady), a true Queen, because she is the mother of her Creator. She is truly *Theotokos* and Sovereign, because she is mother of the Creator. And, precisely because she is mother of the Creator and the Ruler of the universe, she is also sovereign mistress of every creature.<sup>82</sup> The Son has subjected all creatures to His Mother,<sup>83</sup> and Mary will reign with Him in heaven.<sup>84</sup> St. John begs Mary, as Queen, to rule his life and all he has, just as she thinks best.<sup>85</sup> Hence, he consecrates himself, body and soul, to her as a servant to his Sovereign Lady.<sup>86</sup>

With St. John Damascene, mariological tradition remains, in the East at least, in a suspended state, so to speak. Yet, there are other writers who do mention Mary as Queen. Such are John of Eubea (ca. 735), Cosmas Melodius (760), and Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople (+806). The first of these speaks of Mary's Queenship in commenting on verse fifteen of Psalm forty-four: "Adducentur regi virgines post eam."<sup>87</sup> Cosmas dedicates his Maunday Thursday hymn to Mary.<sup>88</sup> And Tarasius, in his letters, spontaneously hails Mary as Sovereign and Queen.<sup>89</sup>

In the West, Venerable Bede (+735), commenting on St. Luke, follows the lead of Sts. Jerome, Peter Chrysologus, Eucher of Lyons, and Isidore of Seville, with regard to the argument from the etymology of Mary's name.

Et nomen Virginis Maria . . . Maria autem hebraice stella Maris, syriace vero Domina vocatur, quia et totius Dominum et lucem saeculis meruit generare perennem.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>82</sup> *Hom. II in Dormit.*, P.G. 96, 721.

<sup>83</sup> *Hom. II in Dormit.*, P.G. 96, 741.

<sup>84</sup> *Hom. III in Dormit.*, P.G. 96, 760.

<sup>85</sup> *Hom. I in Dormit.*, P.G. 96, 721.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 720.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *Sermo in Concept. Deip.* XIV, P.G. 96, 1482.

<sup>88</sup> P.G. 98, 482.

<sup>89</sup> *Orat. in Praesent. Deip.*, P.G. 98, 1499; cf. 1490.

<sup>90</sup> *Comment. in Luc. I, 1*, P.L. 92, 316 (Text cited from Barré who, in

As Barré mentions,<sup>01</sup> the point of departure is here put very exactly in the gospel text, not only by the affirmation of the name of the Virgin, but also and principally in the title, "Mother of the Lord," indicated by Elizabeth. Putting it in another way, there is stressed here the double truth of the Kingship of Christ and of the Maternity of Mary. There is an unbroken line of authors, following this line of reasoning: St. Jerome, St. Peter, Chrysologus, Eucher of Lyons, St. Isidore of Seville, and now Venerable Bede. All these authors were read and reread by the middle ages in the West. We have, then, an uninterrupted sequence of development from the very beginning right down to the Carolingian period.

Whereas the East had, seemingly, forgotten the etymological significance of the name "Mary," the West frequently had recourse to it, as a justification for the universal Queenship of the Mother of God.

At this time, in the West, there are minor writers who reproduce in a rather servile school-boyish way the words of their masters. Such was the so-called Haymon of Halberstadt or Christian Druthmar. Haymon's Fourth Homily is found among the *spuria* of Bede.<sup>02</sup> Druthmar's *Expositio in Matthaeum*,<sup>03</sup> adds little to what others had written before his time.

#### NINTH CENTURY

There were, of course, other writers having more originality. Such a one was Wallafrid Strabo.<sup>04</sup> Mary is Queen,

turns, cites from Bardenhewer's *Der Name Maria*, p. 83, cf. Barré, *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 308).

<sup>01</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 308.

<sup>02</sup> *P.L.* 94, 324-27.

<sup>03</sup> *P.L.* 106, 1276.

<sup>04</sup> The *Initium Evangelii S. Matthaei*, *P.L.* 114, if it really belongs to Strabo.

because as Mother of the Kings of kings, she leads us towards the kingdom of heaven. She does this by giving us divine grace.

Maria, ut plerique aestimant, interpretatur illuminatrix et stella maris. Sermone syro Domina dicitur . . . Domina vero cur sit nominata explanatione non indiget, quae Dominum peperit Salvatorem. Revera etenim Mater Regis Christi Regum Regina, Mater Domini Dominorum, Domina debuit nuncupari, per quam lumen fidei et divinae gratiae accipientes ducamur ad ineffabilem Dei omnipotentis visionem, in qua gaudentes, ab omni tristitia saeculi liberati, in aeterna beatitudine regnare cum Christo mereamur.<sup>95</sup>

Let it be enough to point out that Strabo holds that Mary is rightly called "Domina" because she is the *Mater Domini*. And, being Mother of Christ the King of kings, she should rightly be called Queen. Through her we get the light of faith and grace, through her we are led on to our final goal. This idea of Mary's "leading" men on to eternity is a real development in the idea of Queenship. In this "etymological school", though not chronologically the next writer in order, we find Rabanus Maurus, (+856), the disciple of Alcuin. Deeply influenced by Jerome, Bede, Venantius Fortunatus and Sedulius, in his *Commentary on St. Matthew*, he again brings out the etymological significance of Mary's name:

Sciendum quoque est quod Maria, sermone syro, Domina vocatur; et merito illa Domina vocatur, quae Dominum generare meruit coeli et terrae, sicut et ille nobilis versificator in laude eius ait:

Conderis in solio, felix Regina, supremo:  
Cingeris et niveis, lactea Virgo, Choris.

Et Sedulius in *Carminibus Paschali* ita proloquitur:

Gaudia matris habens cum virginitatis honore  
Nec primam similem visa est nec habere sequentem.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 859.

<sup>96</sup> *Comment. in Matthaeum*, I, 1, P.L. 107, 744.

As Barré again says, the influence of the interpretation of the name of Mary is beyond question. It is found later on in the works of Odo of Cluny, Sts. Albert, Thomas, Bernadine of Siena, and a host of others right up to the present.

Rabanus Maurus was also influenced, especially in his poetry, by Alcuin (+804), his master. In the latter's *Carmina* Mary, as Queen, is not infrequently mentioned.<sup>97</sup> Alcuin also indicated the manner in which Mary is said to rule over souls:

Virgo Dei genitrix, nostra Regina salutis,  
Hic *precibus* famulis auxiliare tuis.<sup>98</sup>

And again:

Tu Regina poli, vitae spes maxima nostrae  
Tu *precibus* nostris semper clementer adesto,  
Atque dies nostros *precibus rege* semper ubique  
Ut nos consurgat Jesu pia gratia Christi.<sup>99</sup>

Hence, it is precisely by Mary's intercessory power, as we shall consider more in detail later, that she rules over mankind.

Hincmar of Rheims (+882) addresses Mary as Sovereign and Queen,<sup>100</sup> co-ruling with Christ in heaven.<sup>101</sup>

One might refer back briefly to Rabanus Maurus, who tries unsuccessfully to surpass the poetry of Alcuin. In an inscription for an altar of Sts. Agatha and Petronilla he writes:

Regina virgo conjuncta sororibus istis  
Tu nobis pandas regna poli *precibus*.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Carm.* 86, *P.L.* 101, 749; cf. *ibid.*, 760, 774.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 771.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 749.

<sup>100</sup> Hincmar, in his letter to Odo, speaks of Mary as *Domina* and *Domina-trix*, *P.L.* 25, 1140 s, 1196.

<sup>101</sup> For references to Mary as co-ruler with Christ, cf. *Carmen de B. Virgine* (*Monum. Germ. Hist., Poetae III*, 412, as cited by Barré, *Rech. de sc. rel., art. cit.*, p. 311). Luis follows Barré, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>102</sup> *Carmen* 37, *P.L.* 112, 1623.

Likewise in his hymn, *De Natali Domini*, Mary is called Queen.<sup>103</sup> The influence in style and thought of Venantius Fortunatus and Alcuin are obvious. That is hardly my concern. The important thing to remember and note is the permeation of the Queenship of Mary into the very life of the people in the early middle ages.

In concluding our survey of the authors of the Carolingian Period, let us comment briefly on Ambrose Autpert (+781) and Paschasius Radbert (+865). Because the works of these two writers were, as Barré, tells us,<sup>104</sup> peddled about under the spurious names of Sts. Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, they had a wide and long vogue and considerable influence. I am not even going to touch upon the thorny subject of the establishment of the authorship of Autpert's *Sermon on the Assumption*. The text I shall cite is generally conceded to be genuine.

Neque enim dignum est de corpore eius notitia sollicitum quempiam esse, quam non dubitat super angelos elevatam cum Christo regnare, sufficere debet tantum notitiae humanae hanc vere fateri reginam coelorum, pro eo quod regem peperit Angelorum.<sup>105</sup>

Mary is Queen and Mistress of the Angels.<sup>106</sup> She is ornamented with the brilliants and pearls of heavenly happiness. The King of kings loves her above all else as His true Mother and beautiful Spouse. They are, before all others, most intimately united in the embrace of love. In virtue of her prerogatives, she is the refuge of sinners on earth.<sup>107</sup>

Paschasius Radbert holds the same doctrine as Ambrose Autpert. The letter of Pseudo-Jerome *ad Paulam et Eustochium* (P.L., 30, 126-147) is now generally accredited to Paschasius. Paschasius, as was Ambrose Autpert, is very cautious about the apocryphal literature. However, in address-

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 1652.

<sup>104</sup> *Rech. de sc. rel.*, p. 312.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. P.L. 39, 2129-34; P.L. 89, 1275-78. Text is from P.L. 39, 2130.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 2131.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 2134.

ing his hearers, he urges them to celebrate the enthroning of the Virgin Mary. For, of that there can be no doubt. He speaks of her as being a co-ruler in heaven with her Son. She is truly Queen of the world. Moreover, she has been raised up unspeakably high to that heavenly throne where she sits with her Son. And then our author utters significant words: "Sic itaque ubique confidenter sancta Dei canit Ecclesia."<sup>108</sup> He imagined Christ leading His Mother to her throne, as an act of honor due her. And the lesson for us is obvious: to be exalted as is Mary, we should imitate her virtues.<sup>109</sup>

Then there is the inspiring sermon of "incerti quidem auctoris, sed excellentis" (*P.L.*, 95, 1490-97). In his homily he made use of the well-known text of the Cantic (III, 2):

Filiae Jerusalem, venite et videte matrem Domini in diademate regalis gloriae suae, quo coronavit eam filius suus, in die laetitiae cordis eius, in die beatæ assumptionis in coelis.<sup>110</sup>

He continues that it is most fitting that all things should be subjected to her rule, who bore the Creator of the universe. In commenting on Psalm 44, this unknown author details the glories of Mary the Queen.<sup>111</sup> Imitation of her life is again the lesson to be drawn.

One can conclude the survey of the ninth century by brief mention of Joseph Hymnographus, or Hymn Writer. Luis mentions that he has found 239 passages in which Joseph acclaims Mary as Sovereign of heaven and earth.<sup>112</sup> Space forbids our listing all the grand titles which he applies to Mary.<sup>113</sup> And the reason for Mary's exaltation is ever the same: she is the mother of the King of the universe. With these words we close our survey of the first nine centuries.

<sup>108</sup> *P.L.* 30, 130 sq., esp. 131.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 134-35, 145.

<sup>110</sup> *P.L.* 95, 1490.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 1495-96.

<sup>112</sup> *La Realeza* . . . , p. 52.

<sup>113</sup> For an enumeration of twenty or so, cf. Luis, *loc. cit.*

### CONCLUSIONS

The course of the development of the doctrine of the Queenship of Mary is, I think, by now clear. Scripture has spoken of Mary as Mother of the Lord and has said that the Son whom Mary bore was a true King. The Fathers, accordingly, in the beginning described Mary as Mother of the Lord and Mother of the King. From this repetition of Scripture to the calling of Mary *Domina* and *Mater Regis*, later, *Regina*, was a clear and logical step forward.

The permeation of the hearts of the faithful by the Queenship of Mary took on real vigor from the definition of the dogma of *Theotokos* at the Council of Ephesus in 431. In the earlier ages, as already indicated, Mary was looked upon rather as the "Second Eve" who, with her Son the New Adam, restored, partially at least, what the original Adam and Eve had lost. But, after Ephesus, the role of Mary in the personal lives of the faithful began to be more widely recognized. Hence, after Ephesus and, especially, after the spread of the feast of the *Dormitio* in the sixth century, Mary's role as Sovereign Lady and Queen of all creatures came to be recognized by all.

Also, because of the genius and temperament peculiar to the East and the ensuing Christological controversies, with the resultant emphasis being placed on Christ, it was only to be expected that the doctrine of the Queenship of Mary should develop more rapidly in the East than in the West. Furthermore, the expression of the doctrine was facilitated by the particularly rich vocabulary of the Greek language. Whereas, in the West, the Latins, ordinarily, had to be satisfied with the two words, *domina* and *regina*, as applied to Mary, the Greek writers of the East used very many different words to express Mary's Queenship.

It should be noted that, although Mary is called Queen of heaven, Sovereign of the human race, and the like, this

does not restrict her universal queenship. It is simply the application to a particular object or sphere of her general dominion. Her Queenship, exercised by intercession, is co-extensive with the Kingship of her Son. Since the Kingship of Christ is universal, so, also, is the dominion of Mary.

Again, in the writings of the ancients, there is no question merely of a primacy of excellence, or of a queenship in the purely metaphorical sense. Mary is truly queen in the proper sense of that word. Barré goes so far as to say that not a single text exists that must be necessarily understood of a queenship only in the metaphorical sense.

On the other hand, I am forced to conclude from the statements of the early Christian writers that Mary, as Queen, may hardly be said to exercise true jurisdiction, either proper or vicarious jurisdiction. By that I mean that, in my opinion, there is not the slightest trace of the patristic writers ascribing true legislative, judicial, and executive power to Mary. With Barré, I am forced to hold that Mary's Queenship and her directing power as Queen are limited to a power of intercession alone.

That such an interpretation of her Queenship is the more reasonable, seems to be confirmed by a consideration of the texts cited in the body of this paper. One has but to recall Alcuin's "*Atque dies nostros precibus rege.*" And I need not mention that many texts similar to the above could be cited.

One must insist, however, that this restricting of Mary's queenly powers to intercession does not lessen her queenly role. One must not confuse the power of Mary, the Queen Mother, with the often rather weak power of the ordinary queen mother among men. Nor is Mary the Queen to be likened absolutely to the empresses that have ruled in East and West. Mary is truly Mother of the King of kings. As Queen Mother, Mary has a true share in the royal powers of her Son, precisely because He has willed that it be so. True,

the exercise of this queenship is had by Mary's efficacious intercession. One must always insist upon the truth that Mary's intercessory prayers are ever granted. One need not inquire overly into the matter of priority of wills. But, it is certain that Mary always asks what her Son wills and her Son Jesus ever wills what His Mother petitions. This has always been the belief of Christendom, a belief that is so beautifully put into a concrete setting in the scene at the wedding feast in Cana. Mary's petitions are always answered by her Son. Mary the Queen, with mind and will and heart ever in harmony with the mind and will and heart of her Son Jesus, can never ask an unobtainable favor from her Son. Does this power of efficacious intercession explain satisfactorily the truly queenly power of Mary? I believe it does.

If the power of a king consists, ultimately, in the ability to lead his subjects towards their temporal end and goal, the common good of the kingdom and the good of each subject, then, Christ the King exercises His royal power by leading men on towards their eternal end and goal, the beatific vision. This is begun, in this life, by everything leading up to the justification of the individual soul, and by ensuring that the soul remain in and retain the state of grace till death. Christ does all this, largely, by the law of grace by which men are drawn on towards the performance of supernatural and meritorious actions and the avoidance of sin. This is truly the exercise of royal power by Christ the King of men's souls. For His kingship is primarily, though not, of course, exclusively, a kingship in the supernatural world of grace, a kingship exercised by the imposition of the *lex gratiae* and all that this law implies.

Now, Mary also rules through this law of grace. She exercises her royal powers not, of course, independently of her Son. She obtains all graces, both actual and habitual grace towards which actual graces are finally directed, by

interceding with her Son, by an intercession that is always efficacious. By obtaining for all men actual graces, Mary as true Queen, leads and conducts men on towards eternal life. By preserving them from falling into temptation and averting from them all evil, she shows forth the power of a Sovereign Lady defending her subjects from the assaults of the enemy. That Mary exercises all this royal and truly queenly power through her power of efficacious intercession, does not in the least derogate from her genuine Queenship. Rather, it enhances her power, in that such an explanation binds her most closely to her divine Son, Christ the King.

With these suggested conclusions, I leave further development of this engaging study to those who will follow me in this Convention. If the present paper stimulates others, who are more competent, to make a more searching and profounder inquiry into the patristic writings on Mary's Queenship, then I shall be most happy.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>114</sup> By way of a concluding note, I think it but right again to acknowledge my heavy debt to H. Barré, C.S.Sp. His learned articles in *Recherches* have, together with the masterful work of Angel Luis (*La Realeza de Maria*), been my guide throughout this study. At times, somewhat shamelessly, I am afraid, I have taken over bodily the patristic discoveries of these two outstanding theologians. But, in every case, I have verified the texts and tried to study them carefully. Should there be anything new in my own contribution, it will, perhaps, be found in a more careful tracing of the development of the doctrine and, it may be, a slightly more pointed presentation.