

Marian Studies

Volume 11

Article 6

1-14-1960

The Problems of a Biblical Mariology

Eric May

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



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

May, Eric (1960) "The Problems of a Biblical Mariology," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 11, Article 6, Pages 21-59.
Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol11/iss1/6

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 PROBLEMS OF A BIBLICAL MARIOLOGY

This first paper of the conference is general, and has one purpose: to discuss some of the more pressing problems confronting a biblical Mariology. This, by way of background for the later papers. We hope to give information—not cause consternation, although something of the latter might be occasioned by the former. We will attempt, then, an over-all factual summation of some of the problems affecting biblical Mariology, without offering any solutions or even personal opinions about them. As a conclusion, however, we shall offer briefly, for what it is worth, our own evaluation of modern trends in this field.

I

DEFINITION OF TERMS

First, a definition of terms. We ask ourselves: granting that a distinction is to be made between biblical theology and other forms of theology, what then is biblical theology? And in particular, what is biblical Mariology?

It would seem that biblical theology might fairly be defined as: the scientific and systematic treatment of divine revelation as known from Sacred Scripture, the primary source of theology.¹ In a recent article Fr. Ceslaus Spicq, O.P., who has written more than once on the subject, offers the following descriptive analysis of biblical theology:

Biblical theology is specifically distinct from a *Religionsgeschichte*, from a religious history of revelation, its genesis and

¹ Another suggested definition of biblical theology: "It is the science which studies divine revelation as it is recorded in the inspired Word of God, and combines it into an intelligible body of doctrine according to the concepts and patterns of the inspired writers;" R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, in *PCTSA* (1955) 63. Cf. also P. Heinisch-W. G. Heidt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Collegeville, 1955) 5-6; M. Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* 1 (Bonn, 1950) 1-7.

evolution, and even from exegesis properly so-called. As a scientific expression of the Word of God, it goes beyond the descriptive stages of semantics or history, or textual analysis, in order to gather and synthesize their data into its own unity. Though it remains an historical discipline by reason of its material object, it is theological by reason of its formal object and by its elucidations. It elaborates—by a union of human knowledge and faith—revealed truth as such. Furthermore, it cannot help taking account of tradition, the Church, and the analogy of faith. So its method has indeed strict affinities with that of speculative theology; both are “architectonic.”²

Biblical theology, then, is commonly thought of as a positive discipline (as distinct from speculative theology), supported by the analogy of faith, but objective in the sense that its re-

² C. Spicq, O.P., *Nouvelles réflexions sur la théologie biblique*, in *RSPT* 42 (1958) 209-219; translated and abridged in *ThD* 7 (1959) 29. In the course of the article Father Spicq associates himself with the growing tendency to insist on the profound unity of biblical revelation. He disassociates himself from an attitude toward biblical theology which would make it no more than a systematic presentation of the religious teaching contained in the Bible. “It is here,” he says, “that I differ from most of my predecessors. They insist on keeping the conceptual and historical categories of each inspired writer. Even when they seek to make a synthesis and recognize that a scientific theology should be unified and systematic, they dare not go beyond the partitioned multiplicity in which the biblical message happens to have been concretely imparted. Now it seems to me that biblical theology is at an impasse unless it comes to grips with the object of faith, with revealed truth, by freeing itself from such limitations. There is no question here of identifying this effort with that of speculative theology. This latter must give an account of the divine mystery in the light of human reason; this calls for the intervention of philosophy, especially metaphysics and logic, to elaborate the notions of being, cause, creation, nature and so on. Biblical theology, on the contrary, presupposes no philosophy (save that of common sense), no rational scheme, no intellectual co-ordinates; or rather, it adopts the Semitic and Hellenistic categories of thought which were those of the inspired authors; only it re-thinks them, decants the meaning of words, purifies concepts, and translates them into a language which is eternally valid,” 30-31.

sults are drawn from the sacred text itself as illumined by the light of modern research.³

In view of such a definition, however, there are several other questions raised. Just what is an exegete, for instance? Is he to be identified with the biblical theologian, or not? In fact, what is the relationship between exegesis and biblical theology?

There is a tendency on the part of some authors to distinguish between the function of exegesis and that of biblical theology, almost as though it were the task of the exegete to lay the foundation, that of the biblical theologian to erect the structure (and that of the speculative theologian, perhaps, to adorn the structure?). Fr. Max Meinertz finds place among those who separate the exegete from the biblical theologian.⁴ And there are others.

On the other hand, some writers tend to identify the work of the exegete with that of the biblical theologian—or at least hope for such an identification. As Fr. R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., has put it:

It is very much to be hoped, too, that with all the growth of our specializations, the unfortunate separation between dogmatic

³ Cf. J. L. McKenzie, S.J., reviewing De Lubac's *Histoire et Esprit: L'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*, in *TS* 12 (1951) 381.

⁴ M. Meinertz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 4: "Die biblische Theologie ist systematischer und verzichtet auf der die Darstellung der geschichtlichen Einzelheiten sowie die des äusseren Verlaufes der Geschehnisse. Weitgehend abhängig ist sie von der eigentlichen Exegese. Wie diese die Voraussetzung der biblischen Theologie ist, so ist letztere die Krönung der exegetischen Erklärung des NT. Die Exegese bietet die Bausteine dar, mit der die biblische Theologie ihr Gebäude errichtet. Diese muss immer wieder die Ergebnisse der Exegese übernehmen und kann nicht für die eigenen Urteile jedesmal die Gründe im einzelnen angeben. Darum kann auch nur derjenige ein Gesamtbild der ntl Theologie entwerfen, der das ganze NT exegetisch bearbeitet und verstanden hat. Andererseits erfährt die exegetische Arbeit aus der biblischen Theologie heraus oft genug ihre Bestätigung, und es findet sich auch manche Gelegenheit, exegetische Urteile mehr oder weniger eingehend zu begründen." Cf. also A. Bea, S.J., *Il progresso nell'interpretazione della S. Scrittura*, in *Gr.* 33 (1952) 85-105.

theology and exegesis will not widen but tend to close. Down to quite recent times it was taken for granted that every exegete was a theologian, and every theologian an exegete. It is only the enormously increased sum of positive knowledge that has split these into two separate vocations in the Church—I would say, with harm to both of them. It is still required that a specialist in Scripture studies first obtain the Licentiate in theology; the exegete cannot but regard it as unfortunate that a specialist in dogmatic theology is not obliged to get his Licentiate in Scripture. Anyway, if the breach is to be healed, the responsibility falls first upon the exegete, who can and should proceed beyond mere exegesis, to build up a connected theology of his materials.⁵

This consideration will turn up in another form later in the paper, in treating the relationship between Scripture and Tradition, and their bearing on Mariology.

Given the above definition of biblical theology in general, a fair definition of biblical Mariology in particular would seem to be: The scientific and systematic treatment of divine revelation concerning Mary, as known from Sacred Scripture, the primary source of Mariology.⁶ The fortunes of this specialized science have kept pace with the increased interest in biblical theology in general, and with Marian devotion in particular, over the past several decades. While there have been some successful attempts at publishing Catholic biblical theologies,⁷ we still await the first comparable biblical Mariology.⁸

⁵ R. MacKenzie, *art. cit.*, in *PCTSA* (1955) 53.

⁶ Cf. J. Carol, O.F.M., *Fundamentals of Mariology* (New York, 1956) 3-5.

⁷ E.g., Heinisch-Heidt, *op. cit.*; P. Van Imschoot, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, 2 Vols. (Tournai, 1954-1956); M. Meinertz, *op. cit.*; J. Bonsirven, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1951).

⁸ What Father R. MacKenzie, S.J., has suggested with regard to biblical theology can be adapted to biblical Mariology in particular: "The ideal biblical theology, then, lies in the future; but it is already possible to describe the form it will take and the techniques necessary in producing it. There are two stages in the work: first, there must be an exact determination of the data,

II

REASONS WHY THERE ARE PROBLEMS

We turn now to a few of the reasons why problems exist for a biblical Mariology. We are not concerned here so much with facts like the occasional lack of a universally-accepted terminology, which perhaps is only natural for a growing discipline but which can involve a needless expenditure of time and effort. We are thinking rather of a phenomenon which one might call "Mariolatry-sensitivity."

What is meant by Mariolatry-sensitivity? We refer to a certain fear, frequently expressed by Catholic scholars in one way or another, that the heart is liable to run away with the head in the case of those interested in Mariology.⁹ In more

namely the theological truths expressed in each particular inspired book; secondly, the testimonies thus determined and collected must be arranged in their right doctrinal relationships, and co-ordinated into a complete system according to the patterns that are implicit in them. Even the first stage requires much skill and training (to say nothing about talent); its author must not only be a theologian, thoroughly familiar with the Church's doctrine, so as to keep the *analogia fidei* and tradition as guiding principles of interpretation; he must also be an expert scientific exegete, at home in all the complicated auxiliary sciences—languages, history, literary criticism, psychology—which make up the equipment of the biblical scholar. He must be both textual critic and commentator, and in the latter capacity he must treat his subject theologically. As *Divino Aflante* admonished, he must not think his work is done when he has discussed his text from every literary, cultural, and historical point of view. He has to uncover and synthesize that for which it exists—the witness it bears to some particular stage of God's saving activity toward men. . . . When . . . we have an abundance of Catholic commentaries which are both scientific and theological, on all the parts of Scripture, the way will be clear for the second stage, which offers new and even harder problems. The main one is the question of arrangement: what order to follow, and what central theme to make the backbone of the synthesis?" *Art. cit.*, 65.

⁹ Perhaps typical of this fear is the statement by Father J. B. Alfaro, S.J.: "Scientificus rigor non minus requiritur in Mariologia, quam in aliis partibus Theologiae (imo, aliquo modo requiritur maior severitas scientifica in isto Tractatu): dolendum est quod in multis scriptis mariologicis iste scientificus rigor non habetur;" *Adnotationes in Tractatum de Beata Virgine Maria* [pro MS] (Rome, 1958) 7. Father Alfaro does not identify the "multis scriptis,"

recent years, with emphasis being placed upon the ecumenical movement, it would seem that this fear is often linked with a sincere desire to avoid offending non-Catholic sensibilities.¹⁰ Disregarding for the moment the propriety or impropriety of such an attitude, it would surely seem to have an influence on work done in the field of biblical Mariology, particularly with regard to possible use of Scripture as Marian dogmatic proof.

Another, more far-reaching reason for problems in this field of theology is the unprecedented advance made in modern biblical scientific research. Even before the famous encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* of Pope Pius XII¹¹ in 1943 gave the

nor, as a general rule, do others who urge great caution in the field of Mariology. Cf. also R. E. Kekeisen, *Dangerous Marian Year reefs: emotionalism vs. orthodoxy*, in *HPR* 55 (1955) 287-290, and a reply by J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *ibid.*, 698 ff.; T. R. Heath, O.P., *Our Lady in Biblical and Speculative Theology*, in *The Thomist Reader* (Washington, 1958) 107; J. L. Murphy, *The Development of Mariology*, in *AER* 138 (1958) 162; B. LeFrois, S.V.D., *The Function of Mariology*, in *AER* 136 (1957) 242-245.

¹⁰ Cf. W. M. Abbott, S.J., *The Bible is a Bond*, in *America* 102 (1959) 100-102. Catholic scholars have done much writing in recent years in re Protestant attitudes toward *scriptura sola*, and toward the Blessed Mother. Cf. J. Hamer, O.P., *Mariologie et théologie protestante*, in *DTFr* 30 (1952) 347-368; P. F. Palmer, S.J., *Mary in Protestant Thought and Worship*, in *TS* 15 (1954) 519-540; J. A. Hardon, S.J., *Christianity in Conflict* (Westminster Md., 1959) Chap. 1; G. H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church* (London, 1959). At times on the popular level, the writing can become quite barbed, as with the following remarks of T. P. Coffey, *Is there an American Catholic Literature?*, in *The Saturday Review of Literature* 42 (1959, No. 36) 12. In a context intended to show how non-Catholics are coming to despise ultra-conservatism of Catholics in this country, he states: "They [non-Catholics] observe the charming medieval lore that infests our scholarly journals. They notice the general unconcern among Catholics with what are regarded as 'passing things' what I recently heard called the 'sepulchre of time.' They view the ever-mounting pile of convert novels. They consider an all-pervasive Mariolatry—some non-Catholics are getting a better sense of what belongs to the Catholic tradition in this respect than Catholics have—commingled, strangely enough, with authentic Catholic theology." For a reply to this article, cf. D. Herr in *The Critic* 18 (1959, No. 2) 22 ff.

¹¹ Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *AAS* 35 (1943) 297-326; or, *EB* (3rd ed., Rome, 1956) 200-207.

green light to more advanced biblical studies, Catholic scholars had been assimilating and "baptizing" the literary and historical work of previous higher critics. But since the encyclical, the work has gone on with ever-increasing vigor and confidence. For one thing, this has led to the acceptance of a whole new vocabulary, incorporating strange phraseology like "Heilsgeschichte," "Sitz im Leben," "Semitic Totality Thinking," "Form-Criticism," "Kerygma and Myth," "De-mythologizing," etc. Sciences like archeology and philology have enlarged our knowledge of ancient civilizations and cultures as never before, helped us better to understand the languages they spoke, their thought processes, their methods of writing. It would be surprising indeed if all this had no impact on biblical theology, including Mariology. Hence the subsequent problems of the literary genres and the senses of Scripture in their bearing on what we know of Mary from the Bible.

III

SOME PROBLEMS OF A BIBLICAL MARIOLOGY

We have now come to the main section of the paper. In a terse, non-controversial and by no means complete fashion, we wish to outline some of the main problematic trends of thought with which the biblical Mariologist must concern himself today. Our concern is not so much what the central theme of the Bible might be,¹² nor yet wherein the basic principle of Mariology might lie.¹³ Our problems are the following:

¹² Many authors would make Christology the focal point of Sacred Scripture. E.g. R. Kugelman, C.P., *The Central Theme of the Old Testament*, in *HPR* 50 (1950) 631-635, sees in the historical and mystical Christ (i.e. Jesus, the Incarnate Son of God, and the Church as His continuation in history) the central theme of the Bible, binding Old and New Testament and every book of both Testaments together in unity. Cf. also C. Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible* (London, 1958) 202-205.

¹³ Various principles have been suggested: Mary's divine maternity, her spiritual maternity, her bridal maternity, her co-redemption, etc. Cf. J. Carol,

1. *Relation between Scripture and Tradition, and Mariology*

The questions have been raised: is Sacred Tradition really to be distinguished from Sacred Scripture? What relationship exists between them? What influence would this exert where exegesis and Mariology are concerned?

The commonly accepted notion of Sacred Tradition as a second source of divine revelation is this: that body of revealed truths not contained in the Bible, but transmitted from generation to generation under the guidance of the magisterium or teaching authority of the Church.¹⁴ There have been and are theologians, however, who suggest possible modifications of this idea. Again, it would seem that more recent efforts along these lines have been inspired by non-Catholic work in the field together with a desire for greater ecumenical harmony, as well as by the influence of Marian papal pronouncements.

Fr. Joseph R. Geiselmann, S.J., has been a leader in suggesting a new/old approach to the understanding of Tradition. He distinguishes, historically, three different attitudes of the Church toward Scripture and Tradition: (1) *before, and even after the Council of Trent*, theologians for the most part held that revelation is contained partly in Scripture, partly in Tradition (influenced largely by Peter Canisius and Robert Bellarmine, and the Nominalistic trend in general); (2) *during the age of classicism*, with a new insight into Tradition as a result of Protestantism, men like Engelbert Klüpfel settled on a new formula: revelation is found partly in Scripture, entirely in Tradition; (3) *the final and more recent stage*, as developed by Johann Adam Möhler and his disciple John B. Kuhn (influ-

O.F.M., *Fundamentals of Mariology*, 7-9; also the entire 10th volume (1959) of *MS*; and A. A. Di Lella, O.F.M., *The Blessed Virgin. I. Mary's Predestination, a Key to a Synthesis of Mariology*, in *The Cord* 9 (1959) 129-138.

¹⁴ Cf., for example, the manner in which Pope Pius XII referred to Scripture and Tradition in his encyclical *Humani generis*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 568-578.

enced by Vincent of Lerins): revelation is contained entirely in Scripture and entirely in Tradition.

That third view, as outlined by Kuhn (and evidently approved by Geiselmann) holds that Scripture is perfect and complete in content. One cannot find in the entire early age of the Church any dogmatic formulation for which there is not at least some premise or starting point in Scripture. Hence it is Tradition's function to interpret a doctrinally complete Bible. Scripture gives the principles, the starting points, or indications which Tradition explains and applies. This, then, according to Geiselmann, is really the most "traditional" understanding of Scripture and Tradition and their interrelation: "The word of God may be found in its totality in the living Tradition of the Church, and in its totality in Sacred Scripture. All of the revealed word of God is to be found in Sacred Scripture as interpreted by living Tradition."¹⁵ This view has other supporters.¹⁶ It has also been opposed by other theologians, as we shall see.

A somewhat similar approach to Tradition was taken re-

¹⁵ J. R. Geiselmann, S.J., *Das Missverständnis über das Verhältnis von Schrift und Tradition und seine Überwindung in der katholischen Theologie*, in *US* 2 (1956) 131-150. The article represents a conference given before Catholic and non-Catholic theologians in Germany. We have had access only to the digested article as it appeared in *ThD* 6 (1958) 73-78. Cf. also W. J. Burghardt, S.J., *The Catholic Concept of Tradition in the Light of Modern Theological Thought*, in *PCTSA* (1951) 42-75. Father Burghardt remarks (p. 69): "An argument from Scripture is theologically an argument from the Church's understanding of her own book; and that is in argument from tradition."

¹⁶ For example, G. Tavard, *op. cit.*, 246: "The secret of re-integration, or of Christian unity, or of a theology of ecumenism (whatever name we chose to give this) may lie in opening a way back to an inclusive concept of Scripture and of the Church: Scripture cannot be the Word of God once it has been severed from the Church which is the Bride and the Body of Christ. And the Church could not be the Bride and the Body, had she not received the gift of understanding the Word. These two phases of God's visitation of man are aspects of one mystery. They are ultimately one, though one in two. The Church implies the Scripture as the Scripture implies the Church."

cently by Fr. Henry St. John, O.P., commenting on the Bampton Lectures of 1954 by H. E. W. Turner, Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham.¹⁷ His view can best be explained in his own words:

The Council of Trent defined that the saving truth communicated by Christ to His Apostles, or brought to their minds by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is contained in the Scriptures and in unwritten traditions and that equal reverence is to be given to both. The interpretation of this commonly current in post-Tridentine theology is that there exists an original, continuous authentic oral tradition from which can be supplemented the data provided by the Bible, and which is itself independent of the Bible, a body of doctrine, that is, not contained in any way in Scripture but handed down orally side by side with the truths later embodied in the New Testament. It is doubtful, however, how far such a view can be maintained in the light of the findings of modern research into Christian origins by scholars Catholic and non-Catholic. . . . The words of the Tridentine Decree might equally well fit not a separate body of doctrine handed down orally, but a traditional way of interpreting the Apostolic preaching and explaining the nature of Dominical institutions, derived from the Apostles and continuously applied to the written Scriptures upon which that preaching was based and in which it was subsequently incorporated.

This modification of current theological teaching is not indeed an innovation so much as a return to a pre-Tridentine tradition in classical theology, which is more in accord with Patristic thought and of which St. Thomas Aquinas is the chief representative. St. Thomas holds that revelation is indeed the Word of God, and is to be found in Scripture; but an article

¹⁷ H. St. John, O.P., *The Authority of Doctrinal Development*, in *Bfr* 36 (1955) 372-381, 412-424, 483-493. Cf. also E. C. Rich, *The Idea of Doctrinal Development*, in *ECQ* 12 (1958) 221-227.

of our belief is essentially the word of man, responding in faith to the Word of God. The articles of our belief are precisely what their name signifies—they are articles of *faith*, not immediately articles of revelation. The article of faith is of course an infallible expression of revelation, but it is not itself inspired or revealed. It is uttered, as St. Thomas says, *quasi ex persona totius ecclesiae*: in the person of the whole divinely guided Believing Community; for the Believing Community utters its belief in that which is revealed authoritatively, by a teaching magisterium divinely guided, the final determinant of which is the voice of the Apostolic See. For St. Thomas the whole purpose of the *articuli fidei* lies in the fact that “the truth of the Faith is contained in Scripture in a scattered manner and in widely differing fashions, and in some of these ways obscurely. To draw out the truth of faith from the Scriptures requires long study and labour which cannot be undertaken by many, for whom knowledge of the truth is necessary, because they are too busy or else incapable of such study. And so it was necessary that clear summaries (creeds and definitions) should be compiled which set before all compendiously the things to be believed; these are not something added to Scripture but rather are taken from it.”¹⁸

Fr. Henry Lennerz, S.J., has very recently written a couple of articles in defense of the commonly accepted notion of a distinct Tradition.¹⁹ His concern was to re-examine the decree of the Council of Trent in its fourth session: “Recipiuntur libri sacri et traditiones Apostolorum.”²⁰ After considering the *Acta* of the Council and the opinions of those presiding

¹⁸ H. St. John, *ibid.*, 375-377. His reference is to the *Summa* IIa IIae, I, 9 ad 3, and 10 ad 1.

¹⁹ H. Lennerz, S.J., *Scriptura sola?*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 38-53; and *Sine scripto traditiones*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 624-635.

²⁰ The decree is given in *DB* (29th ed., 1953) Nos. 783-786.

at the council, he concludes to the insufficiency of Sacred Scripture as a single source of revelation.²¹

These conflicting views about Tradition will lead to differing ideas about the precise function of Tradition in the interpretation of Scripture. It would not be out of place here to add some current trends of thought on the authority of the living magisterium, of the Fathers of the Church, and of the Biblical Commission in the interpretation of the Bible.

For those outside the Church, the infallible authority of her magisterium has ever been a stumbling block. No one has epitomized this non-Catholic attitude better than Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Humani generis*:

In all this doctrinal confusion it is some consolation to us to see today quite a few of former adherents of rationalism desiring to return to the fountain of divinely revealed truth, acknowledging and professing the Sacred Scriptures as the Word

²¹ "Inde patet: neque s. Scriptura continet totum evangelium, quod Apostoli praedicare debuerunt, neque sine scripto traditiones illud continent. Totum evangelium invenitur in s. Scriptura et illis traditionibus, quae sunt sine scripto, simul sumptis. Et hoc sensu concilium clare docet *insufficientiam s. Scripturae*"; *art. cit.*, 635. As part of his argument that not all doctrine is to be found in Scripture, Father Lennerz offers the following examples: "Der Kanon der hl. Schrift und die Inspiration aller Bücher der hl. Schrift; die Einsetzung aller Sakramente durch Christus (Firmung); die Kindertaufe; die Gültigkeit der Häretikertaufe; dass in drei Sakramenten ein unauslöschlicher Charakter eingeprägt wird (z.B. beim Weibesakrament); die ständige Jungfrauheit der Mutter Gottes; bei einigen Theologen auch der Ausgang der hl. Geistes vom Sohne; bei Thomas und Bonaventura die Bilderverehrung"; *art. cit.*, 51. Strangely enough (since it seems to run counter to his main thesis) Father H. St. John, O.P., *art. cit.*, has this to say regarding the Canon: "The inspiration of any particular New Testament document and its consequent reception by the Church into the Scriptural Canon is an instance of a constituent element of revelation not derived from biblical data, but realized solely by the intuitive insight of the common mind of the faithful under divine guidance and thence authoritatively embodied in Tradition by the infallible teaching magisterium." On Scripture as a self-existent source for our knowledge of revelation, cf. also G. Söhngen, *Episcopus: Studien über das Bischofsamt* (Regensburg, 1949) 89-109; or, the digest of this work in *ThD* 1 (1953) 88-91.

of God and as the foundation of theology. At the same time it is a matter of regret that not a few of them, while firmly clinging to the word of God, belittle human reason, and while exalting the authority of God the Revealer, severely spurn the Magisterium of the Church which Christ our Lord instituted to preserve and interpret divine revelation. Such an attitude is plainly at variance with Holy Scripture; but experience, too, reveals its inconsistency; for it often happens that those who are separated from the true Church, complain frankly of their mutual disagreements in matters of doctrine, and thus bear unwilling witness to the necessity of a living Magisterium.²²

A number of theologians have written extensively in an attempt to establish the exact relationship between the sources of revelation and the Magisterium. In one article Fr. G. Dejaive, S.J., after giving the Protestant idea of *sola scriptura* and how opposed this is to Tradition and the interpreting Church (i. e. Scripture becomes something useless in the light of an infallible Church; why pore over musty tomes when one can listen to the Vatican oracle and learn what Christ reveals to people of each age?), proceeds to justify the Catholic position. He calls attention to the dependence of the infallible Church on the sources of revelation outside herself.²³ In his words:

Recent mariological pronouncements, particularly the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, were common doctrine in the Church for centuries. What kept the Church from proceeding to a definition? Her sense of faith was there. If she is her own unique source of truth, why the hesitation? The principal Protestant difficulty arises from dogmas which are not clearly taught either in Scripture or in the unbroken testimony of

²² Pope Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in AAS 42 (1950) 564. English translation by A. C. Cotter, S.J., *The Encyclical "Humani Generis" with a Commentary* (Weston, 1952) 7-9.

²³ G. Dejaive, S.J., *Bible, Tradition, Magistère dans la théologie catholique*, in NRT 78 (1956) 135-151. The translation is from ThD 6 (1958) 67-72.

tradition from the beginning. The Assumption is cited as the chief example of such a dogma. . . .

In discerning truths implicit in revelation the teaching authority of the Church does not usually take the initiative. More often it is the faith of her members that anticipates dogma. This faith is examined by theologians and then sanctioned by the Church's teaching authority. In this way the teaching authority hears in the whole Church the voice of tradition.²⁴

Here again we find that modern trend to identify Tradition more and more with the living Magisterium of the Church, rather than an independent source along with Scripture of the *depositum fidei*. Not only is the Church seen to be the custodian of a faith once for all given to the Apostles, but as the perpetual interpreter of that faith in every age.

The authority of the Fathers of the Church in interpreting Sacred Scripture, when unanimous in matters of faith and morals, has always been recognized as the highest.²⁵ But as anyone engaged in patristic exegesis will testify, it is not always easy to recover the exact meaning of the Fathers, particularly in the matter of typological or allegorical exegesis.²⁶ Authors agree that a vast amount of work still remains to be done in the field of patristic exegesis. The problem for a biblical

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 68, 71. Cf. also J. A. Hardon, S.J., *The Mariology of Pope Pius XII*, in *RR* 18 (1959) 206-207.

²⁵ Cf. *DB*, index systematicus, II. Also, R. C. Fuller, *The Interpretation of Holy Scripture*, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. B. Orchard) (London, 1953) n. 42.

²⁶ For a general article, cf. W. J. Burghardt, S.J., *Early Christian Exegesis*, in *TS* 11 (1950) 78-116. The author sums up the work done and the difficulties encountered in the field up to that time. For an article on patristic typology in general exegesis, cf. J. Danielou, S.J., *The Fathers and the Scriptures*, in *ECQ* 10 (1954) 265-273; likewise his book, *Sacramentum Futuri, Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique* (Paris, 1950). For an article on patristic typology concerning a particular point of Mariology, cf. Y. Congar, *Marie et l'Eglise dans la pensée patristique*, in *RSPT* 38 (1954) 3-38. Cf. also C. Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible*, 27-31; R. E. Brown, *The "Sensus Plenior" of Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore, 1955) 36-55; and the pertinent remarks of Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* No. 554.

Mariologist, then, involved in a discussion of the Fathers' authority, is closely allied with the more general problem of the senses of Scripture.

With regard to the authority of decrees of the Biblical Commission, we are again on somewhat delicate ground, judging from the views expressed by recent writers. The words of Pope Pius X would seem to be clear enough: "We now declare and expressly enjoin that all without exception are bound by an obligation of conscience to submit to the decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, whether already issued or to be issued hereafter, exactly as to the decrees of the Sacred Congregations which are on matters of doctrine and approved by the Pope; nor can anyone who by word or writing attacks the said decrees avoid the note of disobedience and of rashness, or be therefore without grave fault."²⁷ Yet, in spite of the wording of this *motu proprio* of the Holy Father, biblical scholars today are not unanimous in their interpretation of the Biblical Commission's authority.²⁸ Because of modern progress in biblical work, and because of the very nature of the Commission's decrees (neither infallible nor irrevocable), many—but not all—Catholic scholars today incline toward the view that such decrees require both external and internal religious assent in matters of faith and morals, though not in matters merely of criticism and history.²⁹

The impact of this whole problem on exegesis in general

²⁷ Pope Pius X, *Motu Proprio. Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae*, in *EB* No. 286. The English translation is that of Father E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *The Replies of the Biblical Commission*, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London, 1953) No. 47c. In his article Father Sutcliffe also gives an overall treatment of the Commission's decrees, their authority, interpretation, and translation.

²⁸ See the report of a discussion by biblical scholars on the interpretation of the Commission's decisions, in *CBQ* 17 (1955) 50-53, 450-451.

²⁹ Thus, E. F. Siegman, C.P.P.S., *The Decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, A Recent Clarification*, in *CBQ* 18 (1956) 23-29; J. Mouson, *De valore normativo decretorum Commissionis Biblicae*, in *CM* 27 (1957) 154-157.

might be summed up in a further question: how necessary is it for the exegete to have faith? What is the relationship between his faith and his scriptural work? There are some outside the Church who protest bitterly against any mingling of faith with biblical scholarship. The idea is that any influence of faith will weaken the scientific value of scholarship.⁸⁰ The contrary view has been championed by Fr. R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., among others:

The chief gain among the Christian exegetes has been the general acknowledgment not merely of the legitimacy but of the necessity of faith, in anyone who approaches the Bible with the hope of receiving what it has to offer. They recognize now that coldly scientific—in the sense of rationalistic—objectivity is quite incapable of even perceiving, let alone exploiting, the religious values of Scripture. There must first be the commitment, the recognition by faith of the divine origin and authority of the book; then the believer can properly and profitably apply all the most conscientious techniques of the subordinate sciences, without in the least infringing their due autonomy or being disloyal to the scientific ideal.⁸¹

⁸⁰ E.g., R. H. Pfeiffer, *Facts and Faith in Biblical History*, in *JBL* 70 (1951) 1-14. Not that all Protestants share such a view. Just the opposite idea was expressed by F. V. Filson, *Method in Studying Biblical History*, in *JBL* 69 (1950) 1-18. Cf. further F. L. Moriarty, S.J., *Current Theology. Bulletin of the O.T.*, in *TS* 12 (1951) 323-325.

⁸¹ R. A. F. MacKenzie, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, in *PCTSA* (1955) 57-58. Cf. D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., *The Use of Sacred Scripture in Mariology*, in *MS* 1 (1950) 110-114. Father F. Moriarty, S.J., notes, *art. cit.*, 325: "You need more keys than that of archeology and literary criticism to unlock the treasure-house of the Bible. And it is in view of the unique character of the Bible as the word of God, disclosing a divine plan in the world, that we must, on the score of objectivity, reckon with a dimension which is not found in profane history. To be adequate, our handling of the O.T. must be both historical (in the narrower sense of the word) and theological. The two are distinct . . . , but they should not be separated." Cf. also J. L. McKenzie, S.J., *A Chapter in the History of Spiritual Exegesis: De Lubac's "Histoire et Esprit,"* in *TS* 12 (1951), especially 378-380; R. de Vaux, O.P., *A propos de la Théologie Biblique*, in *ZAW* 68 (1956) 225-227.

This would seem to represent the Catholic viewpoint. The further question—to what extent does the influence of the exegete's faith enter into his biblical work on the so-called "scientific" level—would not be as easily resolved, even among Catholic authors.

What influence, then, would the above divergent notions of Scripture/Tradition/Magisterium exert on biblical Mariology? Following the lead of the Popes, authors point out the necessity of the "Church's" guidance and interpretation in this science. Pope Pius XII himself stated this clearly in his address to the International Mariological Congress at Rome, Oct. 24, 1954.³² He asserted that the arduous study of Mariology will be all the safer and more fruitful the more we keep in mind the sacred teaching authority of the Church, which is the theologian's proximate norm for all truth in matters of faith and morals.³³ Growth in the understanding of Mary, he said, must always agree with Scripture and Tradition. He goes on to remark that the faithful, adhering to these norms, will aid in a deepening penetration into Mary's dignity and functions, by-passing on the one hand all error and exaggeration, on the other, the groundless fear of attributing too much to the Blessed Virgin, and the fear that honoring Christ's Mother is somehow derogatory to the honor and loyalty due to the divine Redeemer.

In particular, the Church at times will have to indicate in one way or another just which are the Marian texts. We have a good example in the Protogospel, Gen. 3:15. Catholics working on the Bible are now commonly agreed that in view of the use of this text made by the Popes in defining the dogmas

³² AAS 46 (1954) 677 f. The English translation of this document can be found in *The Pope Speaks*, 1 (1954) 344.

³³ How this will work in practice for the biblical Mariologist, is shown by Father Henry St. John, O.P., *The Authority of Doctrinal Development*, in *Bjr* 36 (1955) 490-493.

of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, there can be no doubt that the text does refer to Mary in some way.⁸⁴

A dogmatic definition, however, is only one of several ways in which the Magisterium can indicate the Marian force of a scriptural text. Authors insist that doctrine contained in (Marian) encyclicals, even if not defined, nevertheless demands obedience.⁸⁵ This evidently is what Pope Pius XII meant when he said in *Humani generis*:

Nor must it be thought that what is contained in Encyclical letters does not of itself demand assent, on the pretext that the Popes do not exercise in them the supreme power of their teaching authority. Rather, such teachings belong to the ordinary Magisterium, of which it is also true to say: "He who hears you, hears me" (Lk. 10:16); very often, too, what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical letters, already pertains to Catholic doctrine for other reasons.⁸⁶

There has been a recent upsurge of interest in the liturgy as a possible source of scriptural interpretation. Fr. Joseph Grispino, S.M., following leads suggested by Ciprian Vagaggini, is one author who has explored the possibilities.⁸⁷ The following will give an idea of the tentative results:

⁸⁴ Cf. the exhaustive treatment of this verse in its relation to Mary by D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap, *The First Gospel, Genesis 3, 15* (New York, 1954). Cf. also J. F. Sweeney, S.J., *Recent Developments in Dogmatic Theology*, in *TS* 17 (1956) 408; G. Filograssi, S.J., *Il dogma dell'Immacolata nell'Enciclica "Fulgens Corona,"* in *Gr* 36 (1955) 3-20.

⁸⁵ E.g., W. G. Most, *Papal Pronouncements and Mary*, in *PstL* 3 (June, 1955) 11-17.

⁸⁶ Pope Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 569; Cotter's translation, *op. cit.*, 21-22. Cf. also the paragraphs immediately following the given quotation.

⁸⁷ J. A. Grispino, S.M., *The Liturgical Meaning of Scripture*, in *AER* 141 (1959) 155-164; C. Vagaggini, *Il senso teologico della liturgia* (Rome, 1957). Cf. also T. Barrosse, C.S.C., *The Senses of Scripture and the Liturgical Pericopes*, in *CBQ* 21 (1959) 1-23; and the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* No. 552 (NCWC translation, No. 26).

Biblicists and liturgists have often asked: "What does a Scriptural text mean when the liturgy uses it." . . . The liturgy never wants to forget or suppress the literal Scriptural meaning which the Scriptural text conveyed to its Old Testament or New Testament contemporaries.^{87a} Since it is not incumbent upon the liturgy to ferret out the Scriptural meaning, the liturgy accepts a text as it is, clear or obscure. . . . Now when the liturgy uses a text, it *ipso facto* places this text in a liturgical context and thereby extends the meaning of this text.^{87b} It follows that this extended liturgical meaning is very different from an accommodated sense which readily disregards its Scriptural moorings. . . .

In Marian feasts, whenever the liturgy uses texts from the infancy narratives of Mt. and Lk. . . . she wants us to read them in the light of previous pronouncements of the *magisterium* and thus, through this extended meaning, which is the liturgical meaning, she expects us to see more dogma in those texts than the primitive Christians saw. A recent example is the new Mass of the Assumption. Its Communion verse is Lk. 1:48f: "Beatam me dicent omnes generationes, quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est." Notice how the liturgy, by placing this verse in the new Assumption Mass, wants us to see the Assumption as a clearer, nay more, a defined reason why all generations call her "beata." This also enriches the word "magna."⁸⁸

The author then proceeds to compare the new Mass formula for the Assumption feast with the old one, noting among other things that the new Introit is *Apoc.* 12:1, while the new Offertory verse is from *Gen.* 3:15 which, as he puts it, is "more ad rem."

^{87a} Author's note: "Even if this involves 'rereadings' or 'reinterpretations' especially in the Old Testament."

^{87b} Author's note: "There is no such sense as an *inspired* liturgical sense equivalent to the inspired Biblical sense. Moreover, the advocates of the *sensus plenior* do not claim that the latter exists in the liturgy, but only in the Bible."

⁸⁸ Grispino, *ibid.*, 155-156, 162.

2. Use of Scripture as (Marian) Dogmatic Proof

Closely allied with the first problem confronting biblical Mariology is another: the use of Sacred Scripture texts as (Marian) dogmatic proof. Exegetes, as distinguished (properly or improperly) from theologians, have at times questioned the validity of some of the biblical texts used as proof of theses in the manuals of dogmatic theology. More than that; they have also questioned the whole method of presenting Scripture in such manuals. A decade ago, for example, the exegete Fr. Edward F. Siegman, C.P.P.S., discussed the matter. For him, and others whom he quotes, the present method of quoting Scripture in textbooks of dogmatic theology is unsatisfactory because outmoded in its controversial approach, unpedagogical in presentation, ambiguous in that Scripture texts are taken out of their peculiar setting. The author agrees that by far the majority of proof-texts are used correctly. At the same time he offers examples from the manuals, of texts which are wrongly used either because they have been poorly translated, or torn out of proper context, or have had too much meaning read into them.³⁹ He concludes that a closer working-together of dogmatician and biblicist is imperative.

³⁹ E. F. Siegman, C.P.P.S., *The Use of Sacred Scripture in Textbooks of Dogmatic Theology*, in *CBQ* 11 (1949) 151-164. Here are some samples of texts which he suggests are wrongly used: (1) through mistranslation: *Job* 19, 23-26 as proof of an O.T. belief in the resurrection of the dead; (2) through tearing a text out of context: *Lk.* 1, 30-35 as certain proof of distinction of Persons in the Trinity, or as clear proof of Christ's divinity; *1 Cor.* 3, 15 as proof of the existence of fire in Purgatory; (3) through reading too much into the text: *Is.* 14, 3-21 as a direct argument for O.T. belief in the existence of hell. (Interestingly enough, none of Father Siegman's examples concerned Marian texts.) Father T. A. Collins, O.P., in his presidential address to the Catholic Biblical Association meeting, September, 1956, also urged caution against a too-ready acceptance of texts with regard to O.T. messianism; *CBQ* 19 (1957) 1-4. Cf. further the two articles by J. Levie, *Les limites de la preuve d'Écriture Sainte*, in *NRT* 71 (1949) 1009-1029; and *Exégèse critique et interprétation théologique*, in *RSR* 39 (1951) 237-252. There is also a very recent article in defense of current apologetical methodol-

Another prominent Scripture scholar, Fr. R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., in his discussion of the concept of biblical theology before the Catholic Theological Society of America, made some even more penetrating remarks on this subject. He said, in his prepared paper:

. . . Let me suggest that nowadays a dogmatic theologian has an obligation to re-examine the "traditional" Scripture proofs, checking them by some up-to-date translation and commentary (such as the *Bible de Jérusalem*) and seeing whether in their original context the words can support the interpretation which his dogmatic thesis requires. He may thus get some salutary shocks; and in any case he will receive some rather stimulating insights into what divine revelation, at a given stage, really revealed.

Above all one must deplore the technique which seeks in Scripture for brief isolated phrases, suitable to serve as major or minor of a scholastic syllogism; and it is here the exegete must feel most keenly, not only that the sacred text is being given less than its due respect, but that it is being distorted. The very idea of "proof" is a distortion; what Scripture offers is evidence (in the forensic sense), testimony given by living witnesses in their own words, and one feels again the slide toward Nominalism when testimony to a fact is volatilized into proof of a proposition. Regardless of strain on pupil's memories, one would like to see a little more strain on their understandings, to help them to realize that each of the sacred writers has his own personal message which he is intent on proclaiming; a message that deserves to be heard as a whole, and which as a whole takes its proper place in the sum total of God's gracious proclamation to mankind.⁴⁰

ogy, by J. C. Fenton, *The Case for Traditional Apologetics*, in *AER* 141 (1959) 406-416. Cf. also the warning issued by Pope Pius XII in *Humani generis*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 565; (Cotter, *op. cit.*, No. 11 ff.).

⁴⁰ R. A. F. MacKenzie, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, in *PCTSA* (1955) 61-62.

In the light of the discussion which followed his paper, Fr. MacKenzie re-examined his remark about Scripture proof as a distortion, and sought to clarify it in a lengthy footnote, which we deem well to include here as a footnote of our own.⁴¹

What about Scripture texts adduced in support of specifically Marian doctrine? The question is integrated with still further questions: which are the genuinely Marian texts? in what scriptural sense are they Marian? to what degree do they tend to support the tenets of Mariology? Though there still exists a surprisingly wide divergence of opinion among biblicists on individual texts—to which subsequent papers of

⁴¹ The footnote (*ibid.*) reads: “. . . it may be well to emphasize that it [the remark about Scripture ‘proof’] was not intended as a denial in principle of the *validity* of proof from Scripture. But there is a question of methods of approach, two ways of using the sacred text, and I am arguing for the priority, in time and importance, of one over the other. Briefly: there is a *res*, the Christian mystery, the Fact of God and His salvation, to which man is invited (and impelled by grace) to react, by faith and works. The Church presents that *res* by two sets of *signa*, not mutually exclusive: Scripture, and Christian doctrine, of which the scientifically elaborated form is dogmatic theology. (The liturgy might be considered a third such *signum*.) Insofar as they are distinct, the former is testimony of living experience, which tends to stir emotions and will, as well as enlightening the mind. The latter is intended to appeal, directly, only to the intellect. When Scripture is, in practice, treated mainly or primarily as material auxiliary to the scientific statement of doctrine, you lose, or at least you neglect, the motivating force which is proper to it: the unction, the actuality, the contact with the mind and heart of a witness—and through them, with the authority of the divine Author, Who writes *these* words for me to read or hear. Naturally the same Authority guarantees the affirmations of theology (those that are *De Fide*)—but it does not *make* them; and the text that is adduced in support of the affirmation is functioning only on the rational, logical level, while its effective, imperative values are in this context necessarily disregarded. In short, Scripture should first be evaluated and expounded for its own sake and in its own terms, and only secondarily be made to function as an element in dogmatic theology. Cf. some remarks of Bonsirven on the use of Scripture texts by the Apostles, in *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (1939), pp. 275, 300. Biblical theology, incidentally, should combine the advantages of both presentations: the immediate, personal appeal of the sacred text, and the clarity and comprehensiveness of a theological system.”

this Conference will bear witness—the following general norms have been proposed for the biblical Mariologist:

1. A scriptural argument should be drawn only from the literal sense (including the *sensus plenior*), or from the typical sense if it is well established.

2. This sense ought to be explained by rational and theological criteria, particularly by exegetical tradition and the analogy of faith.

3. If at times the *progressive* method will be found useful, the *regressive* method should nonetheless be used more often, keeping before one's eyes the integral doctrine now proposed to us by the Church.

4. Through this method, which we believe to have been used in both Bulls *Ineffabilis Deus* and *Munificentissimus Deus*, one gets the full meaning of texts.

5. The Mariological sense of Old Testament texts is to be subordinated to their messianic and soteriological character. Marian typology must be well-weighted, balanced.

6. New Testament texts should be handled with consideration for Mary's dignity and privileges.

7. Neither the relative silence of Sacred Scripture nor that of ancient Tradition (the causes of which should be zealously investigated), can be invoked as a valid argument concerning the sense and doctrine of texts.

8. A solid and fervent devotion to the Blessed Mother, instead of vitiating mariological exegesis, rather can and should help it.⁴²

One test case for the application of such exegetical principles toward the understanding of a Marian text might be

⁴² M. Peinador, C.M.F., *De argumento scripturistico in Mariologia*, in *EphM* 1 (1951) 350. Cf. also D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., *The Use of Sacred Scripture in Mariology*, in *MS* 1 (1950) 67-116; S. Alameda, O.S.B., *La Mariología y las fuentes de la revelación*, in *EM* 1 (1942) 41-71; cf. also A. Bea, S.J., *Bulla "Ineffabilis Deus" et Hermeneutica Biblica*, in *Vgl* 3 (1955) 1-17.

the Lucan pericope on the Annunciation. Just to pick out one of many difficulties: does the sacred text tell us whether Mary was aware—from the Annunciation on—of her Son's divinity? ⁴³ The question is widely controverted today. Many scholars answer negatively. Many others answer affirmatively, with or without restrictions.⁴⁴ The main difficulty seems to be the reconciliation of Mary's having to live by faith, with such an advanced knowledge of the Child's divinity. Perhaps the line of thought taken by Fr. Lyonnet, S.J., could help solve the problem. He points out that Mary's knowledge of Christ's divinity, at this early stage, was nonetheless an act of faith, with the same essential obscurity as any act of faith.⁴⁵

⁴³ Cf. Conleth Kearns, O.P., *Our Lady in the New Testament*, in *Mother of the Redeemer* (Dublin, 1959) 35-41, for a synopsis of recent exegesis on this pericope. Cf. Father R. Kugelman's paper, *ut infra*.

⁴⁴ Let it suffice here to exemplify some of the recent attitudes. C. X. Freithoff, O.P., *A Complete Mariology* (London, 1958), Chap. 1, speaks only of Mary's knowledge, at the Annunciation, that her Son was to be Messiah, and indeed a suffering Messiah. The author of *Marie dans la Bible*, in *AdC* 65 (Oct. 13, 1955) 619, thinks that Mary knew her Son would be the suffering Messiah (since she knew the Scriptures), and that "elle a dû avoir des intuitions [my emphasis] sur la divinité de son Fils, mais elle continuait de vivre de foi." R. Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris, 1957) 175 concludes "que Marie ait connu la divinité de Jésus, cela se présente, du point de vue exégétique, comme la meilleure probabilité, et non comme une certitude." J. Alfaro, S.J., *Significatio Mariae in mysterio salutis*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 20, implies that Mary knew of Christ's divinity in uttering her fiat, "sed admitti debet quod Maria dedit suum consensum in obscuritate fidei (Lk. 1, 45) et quod haec fides Mariae circa Personam et missionem Jesu progressive crevit." M. Peinador, *Conocimiento que de Jesús tuvo la Virgen*, in *EphM* 9 (1959) 283-304 argues that Mary had a clear and explicit knowledge of her Son's divinity, though it was more intuitive than conceptual.

⁴⁵ S. Lyonnet, S.J., *Il racconto dell'Annunciazione e la Maternità Divina della Madonna* (Varese, 1950) 36-37: "E così l'angelo dava alla domanda di Maria la sua vera risposta, la sola risposta soddisfacente: perchè se la maternità di Maria deve essere verginale, la ragione ne è che sarà una maternità divina. Così illuminata, Maria può stare tranquilla: 'Io sono l'ancella del Signore. . . .' Atto di ubbidienza al comando di Dio, ma più ancora atto di fede alla parola di Dio. . . . Atto di fede che includendo nel suo oggetto la divinità di Cristo, come abbiamo tentato di mostrarlo, *non partecipa*

3. The Senses of Scripture, and Mariology

One of the most vigorous discussions going on among Catholic biblical scholars today concerns the so-called senses of Sacred Scripture. It presents a problem also, and perhaps particularly, to the biblical Mariologist. We say "particularly," in that the Marian texts are comparatively few in number, and much dispute envelopes the meaning of even these texts. It would seem, however, that much of the conflict involves a highly indefinite terminology.

A much-written-about problem concerns the existence of the "higher" or "fuller sense." The yeas and the nays are many, and at times quite decided. One of the most exhaustive treatises on the matter to date, and one of the most authoritative, is that of Fr. Raymond E. Brown, S.S.⁴⁶ He is persuaded that there is such a true biblical sense, and he defines it thus: "The *sensus plenior* is that additional, deeper meaning, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, which is seen to exist in the words of a biblical text (or group of texts, or even a whole book) when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the understanding of revelation."⁴⁷ As proof for the existence of this biblical sense, Fr. Brown offers the following *a posteriori* evidence:⁴⁸ (a) the exegesis practiced by the N.T. writers and the Fathers posits the *sensus plenior*; (b) the problem of liturgical interpretation of Scripture seems to demand this sense; (c) so does the

meno dell'oscurità essenziale ad ogni atto di fede [my emphasis]; atto iniziale, primo di una serie indefinitamente rinnovantesi." Similarly, L. J. Suenens, *Mary the Mother of God* (New York, 1959), Chap. 4. Cf. further: M. O'Carroll, C.S.S.P., *Our Lady's Faith*, in *HPR* 47 (1947) 614-619; E. D. O'Connor, C.S.C., *The Faith of Abraham and the Faith of the Virgin Mary*, in *AER* 132 (1955) 232-238.

⁴⁶ R. E. Brown, *The "Sensus Plenior" of Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore, 1955).

⁴⁷ Brown, *ibid.*, 92.

⁴⁸ Brown, *ibid.*, 93-95.

exegesis of certain Marian texts by theologians; ⁴⁹ (d) the fuller sense aids in harmonizing the two Testaments.

Fr. Brown suggests the following relationship between the various biblical senses:

The *sensus plenior* is a distinct sense from either the literal or the typical, holding a position between the two, but closer to the literal. Like the literal sense it is a meaning of the text; unlike it, it is not within the clear purview of the hagiographer. It shares this latter characteristic with the typical sense; but unlike the typical sense, it is not a sense of "things" but of words. In practice, there will be many borderline instances in both directions where it is impossible to decide just what sense is involved.⁵⁰

While defending this thesis, Fr. Brown also lists the objections to this viewpoint and attempts to answer them: (a) the new meaning which constitutes the *sensus plenior* does not come from within the text but is added in by new revelation; (b) by classifying this sense as a homogeneous development of the literal sense, one distends and overstuffs the literal sense, and paves the way for abuses; (c) how can one speak of a text having a meaning which its author in no way conceived or intended? for if the human author of Scripture was not even vaguely aware of the fuller sense, how can we call it a biblical sense?; (d) the notion of inspiration is against the fuller sense, since for a text to be inspired there is required the mutual intention of the two authors; but if there is a fuller

⁴⁹ In this connection Father Brown, *ibid.*, 74-76, points out that recent writers have classified texts like *Gen.* 3, 15, *Is.* 7, 14, *Lk.* 1, 42, *Jn.* 19, 27 and *Apoc.* 12 as Marian in the fuller sense. "Therefore," he concludes, "in the employment of Marian texts by theologians (or perhaps by the Magisterium) and in the case of some Messianic prophecies, objectively there seems to be an exegesis which is neither strictly literal nor typical." Cf. also L. Turrado, *El sentido "pleno" de la Sacrada Escritura y la mariología*, in *Slms* 1 (1954) 749-759.

⁵⁰ Brown, *ibid.*, 122.

sense outside the pale of the author's deliberate intention, it is not inspired; (e) the *sensus plenior* has no background either in Tradition or authoritative teaching.⁵¹ In spite of the objections, Fr. Brown concludes: "The *sensus plenior* is, in our opinion, and *salvo meliori iudicio*, a fully justified classification for a valid inspired meaning of the Scriptures intended by Almighty God and recognized by interpreters of all time."⁵²

Allied problems under this general heading include those of "typology" and the so-called (and not always clearly defined) "spiritual sense" of the Bible. Theologians like Frs. Danielou and Charlier⁵³ strive to enrich biblical theology by establishing connections between texts in O.T. and N.T., and between people and events in the O.T. and their antitypes in the N.T.—a "biblical method of reading the Bible." It is frequently mentioned in connection with the liturgy. But the exact relationship of this sense to the literal and typical, not to mention the *sensus plenior*, seems still to be an open question.⁵⁴

Until these and other problems of the biblical senses are cleared up and a commonly-accepted terminology established,

⁵¹ Brown, *ibid.*, 123-139.

⁵² Brown, *ibid.*, 149-150. He had pointed out earlier in his dissertation (p. 97) that "the movement behind the *sensus plenior* is not confined to any group or school; it is a cosmopolitan trend in modern Catholic thought." Cf. the following more recent articles on the subject of biblical senses: R. H. Krumholtz, *Instrumentality and the "Sensus Plenior,"* in *CBQ* 20 (1958) 200-205; C. Stuhlmueller, C.P., *The Influence of Oral Tradition upon Exegesis and the Senses of Scripture*, in *CBQ* 20 (1958) 299-326; C. H. Giblin, S.J., "As it is written. . ."—*A Basic Problem in Noematics and its Relevance to Biblical Theology*, in *CBQ* 20 (1958) 327-353, 477-498; J. J. O'Rourke, *Marginal Notes on the Sensus Plenior*, in *CBQ* 20 (1959) 64-71.

⁵³ J. Danielou, *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris, 1950); C. Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible* (London, 1958) 265 ff. Cf. also A. Miller, O.F.M., *Zur Typologie des A. T.*, in *Ant* 25 (1950) 425-434.

⁵⁴ Cf. M. Aubert, *La théologie catholique au milieu du XXe siècle* (Louvain, 1954) sect. 1, *Le Renouveau Biblique*. The author considers typology a kind of theological speculation rather than exegesis strictly so-called. He approves of its use, with reservations.

biblical theologians and Mariologists in particular can hardly work in an atmosphere of greatest security and fruitfulness.

4. Inspiration and Inerrancy, and Mariology

A fourth problem for biblical Mariology involves the concept of biblical inspiration and inerrancy. There is a tie-in here with every other problem outlined in this paper. With all the advances in the physical sciences subsidiary to exegesis, and the consequent new lines of interpretation opened up, it was perhaps only natural that the concepts of inspiration and inerrancy should also be subjected to new examination. Dom Charlier gives us what might be considered the commonly accepted idea of biblical inspiration:

The infallible magisterium of the Church gives no technical definition. The Church's thought is nevertheless quite clearly enshrined in her ancient documents, and more especially in the encyclicals of Leo XIII, Benedict XV and Pius XII, all of which teach the following as certain: both the divine and human character of the Bible is to be preserved intact; God is its principal author; by determining its content through the positive action of His Spirit, He has made Himself responsible for it; the sacred writer is equally author in the true sense of the word; he has contributed to its production through the normal human activity which God has employed as an instrument.⁵⁵

Delving into the nature of this phenomenon more deeply, Dom Charlier asserts that inspiration falls under the general category of divine Providence, although it is not a substitution of God's action for the normal activity of the writer. In inspiration there is an immediate and personal contact between God and man. Man, of course, cannot touch God; but he can be touched by God. "God," he says, "has made of man's mind a cradle

⁵⁵ Charlier, *op. cit.*, 209.

to receive His Son, the everlasting Truth, and of his will a seed to be germinated by the vital energy of His Spirit." Hence it would seem that biblical inspiration affects man on the level where grace affects him, in a contact direct, but obscure and beyond consciousness. Grace and inspiration, it would seem, are closely inter-related, and yet distinct. Where grace belongs to the realm of faith, inspiration is more in the nature of a vision. Grace is a permanent state, inspiration is temporary; and of course the latter does not justify. Inspiration is the direct action of the Holy Spirit on man's will, an action which necessarily involves a supernatural illumination of the mind by the Word. And Dom Charlier concludes:

From all this it follows that by inspiration God does not simply substitute concepts and images and desires for those of the writer, but infallibly informs the writer's faculties at their source. Thus the divine action respects every constituent element of the writer's intellectual, moral and social make-up, and at the same time governs them so decisively that they never cease to be under the influence of the Spirit. At every level of his being and at every stage of his activity, even down to putting pen to paper, the inspired person is dominated by the power of the Spirit. Throughout there is only one influence at work. It acts directly on the mainspring of normal human activity, and from there permeates through the ordinary channels. It is a radical and sustained impulse, informing every detail of the writer's activity, making up for his deficiencies, elevating his natural abilities and consecrating his function in the community. It is the transcendent principle which governs all his work without supplanting it. Of his own free will the inspired man conforms infallibly to God's Design.⁵⁶

Other approaches to the notion of inspiration have been taken especially in the light of the literary genres used by the

⁵⁶ Charlier, *ibid.*, 209-214.

sacred writers.⁵⁷ One attitude, which could have far-reaching effects, is based on the theory of "re-reading" or "re-interpretation" of previous Scriptural writing by subsequent hagiographers. A fuller description and an application of this view was expressed thus by a recent writer:

One of the most characteristic qualities of oral transmission was its propensity to actualize older texts and bring them up to date by means of a continuous redaction. This tendency will have a double impact upon the literal sense—if we define literal sense as that meaning flowing immediately from the words and intended directly and clearly, or at least formally implicitly, by the Holy Spirit and the hagiographer. First of all, what may be a deeper, unknown meaning to an earlier author (i. e. first author of Ps. 21) is actually known and intended by the later redactor (the *anawim* who gave the ps. its messianic application). The dogmatic question of the inspiration of the entire Sacred Scripture remains intact, but the historical and literary problems of dating the various segments of a section presents a challenge. Second, when a later inspired author cites a pre-existing sacred text, he does not confine himself to the original meaning of the earlier author. He will be inclined to adapt the text to the theological development of his own day. He will manifest his devotion to God's Word, by expressing *his own* thoughts, which are also *God's*, in the sacrosanct language of the past. He will use the sacred words to express his own, consciously intended sense; therefore, it seems in better accord with Scriptural usage to speak of a *literal sense* of the *later* redactor than of a *fuller sense* of the *earlier* author. God intends the fuller sense only at the later period.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Cf. J. H. Crehan, S.J., *The Inspiration and Inerrancy of Holy Scripture*, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London, 1953) Nos. 36 ff.; O. Schilling, *Was heisst: "Die Bibel hat doch recht"?*, in *TG* 46 (1956) 321-335; Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* No. 556.

⁵⁸ C. Stuhlmüller, *art. cit.*, 323-324.

As for the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, there have not been wanting modern authors who have erroneously considered it as extending merely to those parts of the Bible which treat of God and of moral and religious matters—a view condemned more than once, and most recently in the encyclical *Humani generis*.⁵⁹ Among those to reconsider the question of immunity from error in the Bible, with particular reference to religious matters, is Fr. John Weisengoff. He concludes:

The Bible is to be evaluated as a whole and taken historically, in its development. Hence so-called biblical errors are to be interpreted in the light of later unfolding and precisising of religious ideas. . . . And to return to the place of Tradition (dogmatic and not necessarily historical), the writings, as partial reflections of Tradition, are to be controlled by Tradition. Sacred Scripture is to be interpreted in the light of the living voice of the Church.

From this it follows that formal truth, formal teaching in the Bible, i. e. God's definitive message to mankind, is to be found in the pronouncements of the divinely established Church. What conforms to the Church's immutable teaching is God's teaching; what approximates or goes counter to the teaching of the Church is either imperfect or wrong, but tolerated (*synkatabasis*) or accommodated to a stage of religious development to be superseded by the perfection of the NT.⁶⁰

There are a number of elements in such an explanation, however, which would seem to call for further clarification and discussion.

⁵⁹ Pope Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in *AAS* 52 (1950) 569; (Cotter, *op. cit.*, No. 22).

⁶⁰ J. P. Weisengoff, *Inerrancy of the Old Testament in Religious Matters*, in *CBQ* 17 (1956) 256-257. Cf. also Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* Nos. 539-540, 556.

5. The Literary Genres, and Mariology

The existence and possible influence of literary genres in the Bible provides the last but not least problem (treated here) to confront the biblical Mariologist. The reason why the literary genres should pose a problem can be gathered from the words of Pope Pius XII. In his encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*, Sept. 30, 1943, which gave tremendous encouragement and impetus to Catholic biblical studies, His Holiness said:

We may rightly and deservedly hope that our times also can contribute something toward the deeper and more accurate interpretation of Sacred Scripture. . . . For not a few things, especially in matters pertaining to history, were scarcely at all or not fully explained by the commentators of past ages, since they lacked almost all the information which was needed for their clear exposition. . . .

Let the interpreter, then, with all care and without neglecting any light derived from recent research, endeavor to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression which he employed. Thus can he the better understand who was the inspired author, and what he wishes to express by his writings. There is no one indeed but knows that the supreme rule of interpretation is to discover and define what the writer intended to express. . . .

What is the literal sense of a passage is not always as obvious in the speeches and writings of the ancient authors of the East, as it is in the works of the writers of our time. For what they wished to express is not to be determined by the rules of grammar and philology alone, nor solely by the context; the interpreter must, as it were, go back wholly in spirit to those remote centuries of the East and with the aid of history, archaeology, ethnology and other sciences, accurately determine what modes of writing, so to speak, the authors of that ancient period would be likely to use, and in fact did use.

For the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech, which we use today; but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those exactly were the commentator cannot determine as it were in advance, but only after a careful examination of the ancient literature of the East. . . . For of the modes of expression which, among ancient peoples, and especially those of the East, human language used to express its thought, none is excluded from the Sacred Books, provided the way of speaking adopted in no wise contradicts the holiness and truth of God.⁶¹

Obviously, the Holy Father's words encouraged work in a whole new field of biblical interpretation. This work is being zealously pursued by Catholic scholars all over the world today. It is a labor attended by growing pains; or perhaps the more apt expression would be: the pangs of parturition. There is great agreement among biblical scholars on some points, wide disagreement on others. New lines of approach are constantly being suggested for work on both Testaments. The entire problem has many facets, and some of them will undoubtedly turn up in detailed discussion in other papers of this Conference. So, all we wish to do here, by way of exemplifying the problems of literary genres, is give a few examples of the "new look" in exegesis, with particular reference to its influence on Mariology.

Take the question of "Semitic totality-thinking," in its possible bearing on exegesis. Fr. Bernard LeFrois, S.V.D., himself a biblical Mariologist, has written the following:

One of the characteristics of the Semitic mind is that it thinks in totalities and expresses itself accordingly. Much light is thrown on several parts of Holy Writ if this fact is properly

⁶¹ Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* Nos. 555-559; (NCWC translation, Nos. 31-37).

understood. . . . It is because the Semite thinks in totalities that he sees in the individual the whole species manifesting itself; with him a typical, concrete individual stands for the collective group; the first one of the dynasty or line of rulers can embody in himself the entire dynasty or line.⁶²

The author then suggests some texts by way of example. The Ebed Yahweh songs of Isaias might indicate that Messiah is being portrayed as one with His people with whom He identifies Himself. Apoc. 12 would refer to both Mary and the Church. And in the primacy text, Christ could have had in mind not only the individual (Peter) but also the collective (entire line of successors, the Supreme Shepherds).

Another example can be found in the modern Catholic approaches toward the account of the fall of man, in Genesis. Authors like Frs. John L. McKenzie, S.J., and Bruce Vawter, C.M.,⁶³ have seen in the biblical account a theology of the past in terms of the present writer; that is, the author of Genesis, who would have had no historical information whatever in re the moral species of sin, represented it to his readers as the cult of the forces of fertility so that they, who were easily seduced by such Chanaanite practices, would see themselves and their own condemnation in the fate of their first parents. Fr. Alexander Jones,⁶⁴ on the other hand, tends to see in the account a borrowing of local myths for the purpose of illustrating a universal truth; that is, the author of Genesis borrowed material from the Gilgamesh legends in order to teach theological truths which were foreign to the Sumero-

⁶² B. J. LeFrois, S.V.D., *Semitic Totality Thinking*, in *CBQ* 17 (1955) 315-323. Also by the same author, *Semitic Thought Patterns in Sacred Scripture*, in *AER* 134 (1956) 374-394.

⁶³ J. L. McKenzie, S.J., *The Two-Edged Sword* (Milwaukee, 1956) 90-108; B. Vawter, C.M., *A Path Through Genesis* (New York, 1955) 64.

⁶⁴ A. Jones, *Unless Some Man Show Me* (New York, 1951) 99-107.

Babylonian poems. Still other authors, like J. Edgar Bruns, have suggested a third possible viewpoint, based this time on the notion of depth-psychology.⁶⁵ As Fr. Bruns outlines his theory, the colorful, primitive narrative contained in Genesis bears a real relation to an actual fact. The narrative may be accepted literally. The human author who knew nothing of archetypes, or the collective unconscious, was nonetheless inspired to make use of this widespread primordial image (a tree as representing Unattainable Good, and a serpent as an obstacle to it), familiar to him no doubt from the literature of his polytheistic neighbors and ancestors, and to present it in a simple, direct manner. It was the divine plan to allow this presentation to correspond in fact with the historical origin of the archetype (and its unconscious expression).

Turning to the New Testament, there is for instance the current discussion of the possible midrashic character of the infancy sections in *Luke* and *Matthew*, as developed so thoroughly by Prof. René Laurentin's classic work, and recent articles in *Estudios Bíblicos*, among others.⁶⁶ There is also the highly complex theory of Form-Criticism as applied by critics, both Catholic and non-Catholic, to the Gospels, resulting at times in what has been called the "Christ of faith" vs. the "Christ of history" interpretation.⁶⁷ In fact, the whole notion of biblical history has been modified in the light of our fuller knowledge of the ancient East.

⁶⁵ J. E. Bruns, *Depth-Psychology and the Fall*, in *CBQ* 21 (1959) 78-82.

⁶⁶ R. Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris, 1957); S. Muñoz Iglesias, *Los Evangelios de la Infancia y las infancias de los héroes*, in *EstB* 16 (1957) 5-36, 329-382; J. A. Ubieta, *El Kerygma apostólico y los Evangelios*, in *EstB* 18 (1959) 21-61; etc.

⁶⁷ The question of the historicity of the Gospels on what has been called the "lowest level" of interpretation remains one of the biggest problems for form-critics. Until the problem is cleared up and reliable criteria established for discerning the various "levels" of interpretation, it would seem that theologians will feel uneasy in the presence of Form-Criticism.

IV. *An Evaluation of the Current Situation*

This very cursory glance at some of the problems which confront the biblicist and the Mariologist leaves much to be desired, certainly. The whole matter is quite complex and the final word has not been said on any of the individual difficulties. But with the knowledge that such problems are real, that they exist and tax the minds of the Church's scholars today, we have, I think, a broad general background against which our further discussion of specific questions in N.T. Mariology may be rendered more comprehensible, and perhaps more fruitful.

Throughout the paper we have merely reported some of the trends in biblical research without attempting a solution. By way of conclusion to the paper as a whole, we would like to offer our own impressions of these trends.

1. *Encouragement given in "Divino afflante Spiritu" not to be exaggerated*

There can be no doubt that *Divino afflante Spiritu* was intended by Pope Pius XII as a powerful encouragement and incentive for further Catholic biblical work, using all the best of modern profane scientific research. Catholic biblical scholars have rightly rejoiced in this vote of confidence in their scientific studies. But the question might legitimately be raised whether *all* of the encyclical is *always* taken into consideration by biblicists; and whether sufficient attention has been paid to cautions issued by the same Holy Father since 1943.

It is true that Pius XII, in the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*⁶⁸ urges that the work of exegetes and commentators be judged with equity, justice and the greatest charity, and that "all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imag-

⁶⁸ Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* No. 564; (NCWC translation, No. 47).

ines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected." But later, in *Humani generis*, in a context dealing with the acceptance by some Catholics of non-Catholic errors (fictitious tenets of evolution, false historicism, spurning of the Magisterium) he also says: "Although we know that the vast majority of Catholic teachers guard against these errors, there are some, today as in apostolic times, who hanker too much after novelties and who dread being thought ignorant of the latest scientific findings."⁶⁹ And a little later still, in the same encyclical, "Let no Catholic, then, whether philosopher or theologian, be too hasty in embracing whatever novelty happens to be thought up from day to day, but rather let him weigh it carefully and with a balanced judgment, lest he lose or contaminate the truth he already has, with grave danger and damage to his faith."⁷⁰

Surely these words are meant for the biblical scholar, and the Mariologist, as well as for any other theologian working for the honor and glory of God. And yet, as it seems to the present author, there is something of the spirit of novelty for novelty's sake connected with some recent articles in the field. There might be a good deal of truth to what one writer has written recently, to the effect that scholarship itself is impelled, among other factors, by the psychological need to say something new, and that the human drive of over-againstness pushes scholarship deeper into conflict.⁷¹

2. Too-Scientific an Approach?

The claim is often made today that too many of our Catholic biblical scholars are over-burdened with the scientific

⁶⁹ Pope Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 572; (translation by Cotter, *op. cit.*, No. 10).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 572; (Cotter, No. 31).

⁷¹ N. F. S. Ferré, *Notes by a Theologian on Biblical Hermeneutics*, in *JBL* 78 (1959) 106-108.

approach and neglect the doctrinal. This would seem to reflect the larger question as to the distinction between exegesis and biblical theology, and what their respective fields might be. The charge of over-scientific exegesis at times appears a valid one to us. That it is a wrong approach seems evident from *Divino afflante Spiritu* itself, which devoted a good deal of text to the idea that an exegete cannot stop at the so-called scientific level, but realizing that he is working with a divinely-inspired text, must set forth in particular the theological doctrine in faith and morals of the individual books or texts.⁷² In the Instruction regarding the correct teaching of Scripture in clerical seminaries and colleges of Religious, issued May 13, 1950, the same idea is repeated. The exegete will only be able to fulfill his duty easily, if "egregie versatus sit etiam in sacra theologia . . . neque unquam, solis principiis criticis et litterariis innixus, munus suum exegeticum ab universa theologica institutione separet."⁷³

As we see it, an exegete *must* be a biblical theologian if he is to uncover the real and full meaning of any text. His work will not be really "scientific" if he neglects the teaching authority of the Church, the writings of the Fathers, or the analogy of faith.

3. *Prudence with regard to the Faithful*

It is only natural that the "new look" in exegesis should cause some consternation among the faithful and clergy. Much of this is due to lack of proper knowledge of what is really going on. But *all* of it? There is such a thing as a "sensus catholicus" and it might be prudent for the scholar to bear it in mind. Sometimes, too, new theories are proposed in unenviable ways. There are authors who, fully persuaded that their view is *the* solution to some controverted problem,

⁷² Pope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *EB* Nos. 550 ff.

⁷³ In *EB* No. 598.

make no bones about proposing it as such. This has led to a lack of charity at times among scholars—all of whom are really striving for the same thing: the truth of the matter. If such an attitude is possible (though infrequent) in scholarly journals, what happens when the same thing is transferred to the forum of clergy and faithful on a more popular level? Anyone can sympathize with the scholar who has put much work into a particular study and who, convinced of the justice of his message, is impatient to pass the knowledge on to the faithful, to relieve them of misconceptions etc. in the light of modern research. But what happens should the scholar *de facto* be wrong in his approach to some controverted matter? What Pope Pius XII had to say about such an approach in other matters, could serve as a warning for the biblicist and Mariologist:

The new opinions, whether originating from a reprehensible itch of novelty or from a laudable motive, are not always advanced in the same degree, nor with the same clarity, nor in the same terms, nor with unanimity among their sponsors. What is today put forward rather covertly by some, not without precautions and distinctions, will tomorrow be proclaimed from the housetops and without moderation by more venturesome spirits. This is a scandal to many, especially among the young clergy, and could be detrimental to ecclesiastical authority.⁷⁴

It would seem, then, that if the solid modern advances in biblical knowledge are to bear their greatest fruit, especially in Mariology, they will have to be proposed with a great deal of patience, charity and prudence.

REV. ERIC E. MAY, O.F.M.CAP.,
Mary Immaculate Friary,
Garrison, N. Y.

⁷⁴ Pope Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in AAS 42 (1950) 566; (translation by Cotter, *op. cit.*, No. 13).