

ARCIC II (Mary) 457a/00

OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARIAN DOCTRINES

I. The Augustinian Heritage

For ease of discussion, the following, very cursory overview of the development of opinions on the person and prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been divided into three sections: 1) Augustinian Heritage summarizes the opinions which the medieval West inherited from the Latin patristic tradition, and regarded as authoritative; 2) Anselmian Appropriateness considers the theological contributions of Anselm, and pseudo-Anselm, and the explosion of Marian devotion in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; 3) Franciscan Probabilities covers the scholastic debates, particularly on the question of the Immaculate Conception, championed by the Friars Minor more vigorously than by any other single group.

In even a rapid survey of a small portion of the vast literature on Marian dogma and devotion no reader can fail to be struck by the decisive roles played by a number of factors other than theological development: convictions about the bases and bounds of theological inquiry itself; the evolution of other doctrines which impinged upon the understanding of the Conception and Assumption of the Virgin, in particular, just what it was people thought Mary was being cleansed of; and the liturgical and historical backdrop. While including even hints of these other topics has lengthened the paper, it did not seem that they could be overlooked or left entirely unmentioned.

LITURGICAL BACKGROUND

Lex orandi lex credendi, a principle dear to the Anglican heart, can be translated, very roughly, as 'As we pray, so shall we believe'. It complements and grounds the oft-cited medieval Vulgate rendering of Is 43:10: 'Unless you believe, you will not understand'. Both figure in what follows. By the end of the seventh century, the Latin church was celebrating four marian feasts-or, more accurately, two dominical feasts with marian implications and two marian festivals paralleling dominical feasts: the Annunciation, the Purification, the Assumption, and the Nativity of Mary.

The Purification, begun in the east during the fourth century and transferred in 542 to February 2nd, was adopted at Rome around 640.

Mary's falling asleep, commemorated at Jerusalem from c. 450 onwards and explicitly associated with the Virgin's death and assumption c. 600, was adopted at Rome around 640. The feast of the Annunciation was introduced at Rome c. 650, and that of the Nativity of the Virgin, introduced only in the first half of the seventh century in the East,¹

soon adopted between 660 and 670.

The annual celebration of these four feasts, the propers read on them, and the hymns and antiphons which came to be written for Mass and Offices lodged themselves in people's memories and provided the foundation on which Marian devotion and Marian theology could be build in the Middle Ages.

The Latin Church was also heir to the exegetical teaching of the Fathers of the Church who, absorbed with trinitarian and christological teaching, had treated the Mother of Christ only as she figured in the development of Christological doctrine or as her unique role could contribute to the refutation of heretical interpretations. Already in circulation by the mid second century was apocryphal literature which fired popular devotion, above all the *Protoevangelium of James*, which supplied detailed information on her birth, life, and death.² The faith professed by learned eastern Christians, before the Council of Ephesus released a flood of speculation by defining the Virgin as *theotokos*, can be estimated through the works of Epiphanius of Salamis (+403). A contemporary of Jerome, who reports that his 'several books *Against Heresies* and many others which the learned eagerly peruse because of their content and common folk love to read because of their style',³ Epiphanius affirmed Mary's perpetual virginity⁴--apparently the first to do so--and identified her with the woman in the Apocalypse.⁵ On the questions of greatest interest here, he held the opinion that 'she never did anything wrong as regards fleshly actions but remained stainless'⁶--by which he meant inviolate--and raised three possibilities regarding the end of her life: if she died, she died in virginity and honor; if martyred, as foretold by Simeon, 'she dwells among those who enjoy the repose of the blessed'; and if she continued to live, then 'no one knows exactly what her end was.'⁷

In the West, popular Marian devotion lagged far behind that of the East, but learned opinion did not greatly differ. Irenaeus of Lyons (+c. 202), a native of Smyrna, drew the parallel between Eve, the virgin who disobeyed, and Mary, the virgin who obeyed,⁸ and explicitly extended it to include the recapitulation of Eve in Mary.⁹ Tertullian (+ c. 200), also used the Eve-Mary parallel, contrasting Eve's belief in the serpent with Mary's belief of the angel, and Eve's fratricidal offspring with Mary's son, who saved Israel, 'his brother in the flesh'.¹⁰ Mary's virginity at his conception and birth, Tertullian affirmed in defending the true humanity of Christ, but her perpetual virginity he denied.¹¹

Hilary of Poitiers (+ c. 367), by contrast, found unacceptable the idea that Mary 'knew Joseph' after Christ's birth.¹²

That great supporter of virginal life, Ambrose of Milan (+397), held her up as a type of the Church¹³ and the model of the consecrated life, contrasting her with Eve and praising her as 'virgin in mind as well as body'¹⁴. He dismissed a persistent theory that the 'Mother of God'¹⁵ had suffered a martyrdom foretold by Simeon¹⁶ and suggested that Mary was 'not altogether ignorant of the heavenly mysteries'.¹⁷

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

The Bishop of Hippo also developed the parallel between Eve and Mary and between Mary and the Church, which, like Mary, is both mother in charity and virgin in integrity.¹⁸ Augustine was 'the first in the West to deduce from Mary's answer to Gabriel at the Annunciation that she had already taken a vow of virginity' and that Joseph acted as her protector in this.¹⁹ Having perpetually maintained virginity, before, during, and after childbirth,²⁰ she provided the perfect model for dedicated virgins²¹ as well as the model for wives.²² He too rejected, the martyrdom rumor, which nevertheless long continued to circulate. Unlike Ambrose, he did not refer to her as *mater Dei*, *deipara* or *Dei genitrix*; his favourite appellation was *mater Domini*. He never addressed her as the subject of intercessory prayer.²³ His interest in Mary was christological and ascetic: she is vital to understanding Christ's full humanity and full divinity, and the prototype of obedience and virginity.

The long shadow Augustine cast over Marian teaching in the west was due, not to his opinions on the Lord's mother, but to his theology of sin. In 396, he coined the term which was to set western theology apart from eastern and give rise to uniquely western speculation on the sinfulness or sinlessness of the Virgin Mother: *peccatum originale*.²⁴ Human beings, from the very instant of conception, are tainted by a 'disorder or perversity, that is, an aversion to the more preferable Creator, and a conversion to the inferior creatures'.²⁵ In his pre-Pelagian works he equated this with concupiscence. Augustine meant not simply *concupiscentia carnis*, which assails human beings at puberty²⁶ and by which, in sexual union, original sin and spiritual concupiscence are transmitted to future generation. After encountering Pelagius, who saw in Mary an example of someone able to live sinlessly by her own volition, Augustine came to identify concupiscence more precisely as grace's absence or incompleteness²⁷ and to write: that 'On account of the honor due to the Lord, I do not want to raise any questions here about her when we are dealing with sins'²⁸ - a passage which was to be quoted repeatedly over the centuries in support of the doctrine of the immaculate conception.²⁹

Augustine considered concupiscence as inseparable from the marital act by which original sin was transmitted. Because Christ was conceived without physical union or sexual passion, his humanity was not infected. In the virginal conception, the role normally played by concupiscence was taken by the Virgin's faith.³⁰ Mary herself, however, had been begotten in the same way as all other human beings and therefore inherited the same concupiscence.³¹ It is her obedience to God, her holiness, her humility, her modesty, her discipleship, and, above all, her charity, the love of God which annuls concupiscence, that command our reverence.

Gregory the Great (+604), transmitted much of Augustine's thought to the Middle Ages. He recorded one of the earliest Marian apparitions³² and testified to the existence of icons of the Virgin by sending one as a gift.³³ He too taught that Mary had remained a virgin, even in giving

birth (*in partu*),³⁴ that she remained a virgin, that her womb had not been opened in childbirth,³⁵ and had been preserved uncorrupt by the Holy Spirit.³⁶

BEDE AND THE EARLY ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH

The second great conduit by which Augustinian theology reached the Middle Ages was the Northumbrian monk, Bede. (+735). He was familiar with the four liturgical feasts connected with the Virgin Mary, which had been introduced into England at least by in 679-680, when the precentor of Saint Peter's Rome, arrived at Wearmouth.³⁷ Although he did not include a sermon for the Assumption in his collected homilies, there is no reason to suspect that Bede, or any of his contemporaries, did not celebrate it and did not believe that Mary now somehow dwelt in heaven.

That God both could and did preserve specially chosen persons from sin in the womb was an idea not unfamiliar to Bede. John the Baptist,

although as a human being conceived in iniquity, yet, contrary to what is usual in the human condition, was given birth to by his mother not in the moral fault of sin, but in the gift of pardon. We must not doubt that the Holy Spirit, with whom he was filled, absolved him from all sin.³⁸

Sanctified by the Spirit's intervention, John was enabled to recognize the Messiah whom he proclaimed. This imputation of prenatal purification from sin marks a break with the Augustinian 'conviction of the generic necessity of birth in sin'³⁹ and made the concept available for application to the Lord's Mother.

In his homily for the Feast of the Purification, Bede refers to Mary as 'God's blessed mother and a perpetual virgin' who was 'by a singular privilege above the law', gave us 'an example of humility'.⁴⁰ In Christ's conception there was no lust, for 'the heat of concupiscence does not exist where the Holy Spirit casts his shade'.⁴¹ Convinced that for Jesus to be without original sin his mother must have been free of all concupiscence, Bede held that Mary had been sanctified in the womb and, at the moment of Christ's incarnation, purified from original sin by the Holy Spirit, just as in the conception of John the Baptist, 'there was no consideration of sensual pleasure. . .but only the grace of a spiritual offspring'.⁴² He further believed that Christ's first redeeming act had been to save his Mother, 'who was not saved from iniquity by any of her own preceding merits, but redeemed by the blood of Christ....'⁴³

Bede contrasts Eve and Mary, calling her 'Truly full of grace' and hinting that she may have been raised up to heaven, as once she was 'raised from earthly to heavenly desires...and afterwards sanctified.'⁴⁴

THE CONTINENTAL EARLY MIDDLE AGES

New to the faith and living in a world of unrelenting warfare and sudden violent death, early medieval Christians focused their hope of eternal life on Christ the Judge and on the help of local saints, men and women buried, or presumed to be buried, locally and therefore 'closely tied to the places men knew'.⁴⁵ Gregory of Tours (+594), who recorded the group conversion of the Franks and their reliance on saintly succor, is also the first western witness to the transmission of apocryphal detail on the Virgin's assumption. Using a Latin translation no longer extant,⁴⁶ Gregory recorded that

...when blessed Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was about to be called from this world. . . the Lord Jesus came with his angels and, taking her soul, handed it over to the archangel Michael and withdrew. At dawn the apostles lifted up her body on a pallet, laid it in a tomb, and kept watch over it, awaiting the coming of the Lord. And lo, the Lord presented himself to them and ordered that her holy body be taken and carried up into heaven. There is now is, joined once more to her soul, exulting with the elect, rejoicing in the eternal blessed that will have no end.⁴⁷

Saintly devotion began to be extended during the eighth and ninth centuries with the relaxation of a longstanding ecclesiastical disinclination to distribute the remains of saints more liberally in death than history had in life. The absence of Marian relics raised the question of her body's whereabouts, but also meant that generally only the few churches or monasteries dedicated to Mary fostered her cult.⁴⁸

The Spanish Church, in their crusade to replace the arian with the Catholic faith, contributed not only the *filioque* but also a strong emphasis on the Virgin Mother of God. Ildefons of Toledo (+667) invoked her aid, defended her virginity, perhaps her assumption,⁴⁹ and likely composed a number of antiphons in her honor for the Divine Office. Paul the Deacon (+c. 799), who also wrote homilies on the Assumption,⁵⁰ translated the popular greek legend of Theophilus, who had been rescued from a Faustlike pact with the devil by Mary's intervention. Isidore of Seville (+ 636) provided the etymology of Mary's name⁵¹--*stella maris*--as well as a list of doctrinally acceptable titles, among them: rod of Jesse, garden enclosed, sealed fountain, Virgin before giving birth, Virgin after giving birth.⁵² He held her up as the type of the Church⁵³ and the head of female virgins--Christ he identified as the head of male virgins.⁵⁴ Granting the absence of any documentation, he nonetheless doubted that she had been martyred, and reported that her tomb, now empty, was located in the Valley of Jehoshaphat⁵⁵--evidence that the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae* was in circulation.⁵⁶

Half a century later, the Irish Monk Adamnan (+c. 704) repeated this in his description of the Holy Land, adding. 'But how or when or by what persons her holy remains were removed from this sepulchre, and in what place she awaits the resurrection, no one, they say, can know for

sure'.⁵⁷ Huneberc (Hygeburg), an Anglo-Saxon nun of Heidenheim, supplied more detail in her *Life* of her abbey's holy founder, an enthusiastic pilgrim, revealing 'when the eleven apostles were bearing the body of our Lady away from Jerusalem', it had been miraculously protected from assault and taken 'from the hands of the apostles and carried' to heaven by angels, 'in that very spot in the centre of Jerusalem which is called Holy Sion.'⁵⁸

The Carolingian monks who first dipped their quills into theological speculation relied on the authority of Scripture, the Fathers, and the liturgy as they explored the practical implications of the incarnation for beleaguered human beings. Ambrose Autpert (+784)-who passed as both Ambrose and Augustine-urged calling on Mary's prayers 'because we cannot find anyone more powerful in merits for placating the wrath of the Judge'.⁵⁹ While he counselled caution in believing apocryphal claims about her life and afterlife, he believed she had been 'assumed higher than the angels' even though 'no catholic history gives an account of the way she ascended to the heavenly realm'.⁶⁰ -apparently he had not read the *Life* of Willibald. This growing conviction that her virgin body as well as her sinless soul now dwelt in heaven was undergirded by the absence of marian relics and the increasingly commonplace knowledge of her empty tomb. In the mid ninth century, however, Pascasius Radbertus mentioned that differences of opinion still existed.⁶¹

Radbertus (+865) and Ratramnus of Corbie (+868) argued over Mary's perpetual virginity with much the same mutual misunderstanding as they did over the Eucharist⁶² and with the same common determination to support their case from Scripture.⁶³ Radbertus' compelling typological proof text, Ezekiel 44:12: *this gate shall remain shut, for the Lord, the God of Israel, has entered by it*, was to appear again many times over the centuries.

Radbertus' treatises on the birth and the assumption of the Virgin,⁶⁴ which took on heightened authority by being circulated under the names of Jerome and Isidore of Seville, cautiously warned against attempting too great a certitude in things unrevealed. From the fact that the Church authorizes the celebration of only three nativities-those of Christ, John the Baptist, and the Virgin Mary- he concluded that all three must have something in common, and since Christ and John the Baptist were both believed to have been born free from the taint of concupiscence, it followed logically that Mary too must have been preserved from sin. And since the Word received his human 'flesh from the sanctified flesh of the Virgin',⁶⁵ his freedom from sin must depend on her sinlessness at the moment of his conception.⁶⁶ 'Although she was herself conceived and born of the flesh of sin', she did not pass that flesh of sin on to her Son. If she had not been 'sanctified and cleansed' by the Holy Spirit, Pascasius asked, how could she not have transmitted her sin?⁶⁷ Radbertus reiterated that Mary had reversed Eve's curse and borne Christ without the pain and suffering which curses other postlapsarian women,⁶⁸ because she had been cleansed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

By the late tenth and eleventh centuries, signs of increasing marian devotion and speculation on the beginning and ending of her life were ubiquitous. Udalric of Augsburg (+973) was known to recite an Office of the Virgin daily. The *Regularis concordia* (c. 970) directed that a Mass be celebrated in the Virgin's honor on Saturdays, paralleling her Son's honor on Sunday. This, Peter Damian would later explain, was only appropriate, because God had rested on Saturday and Mary was the 'home Wisdom built and in it. . . as in an utterly sacred bed, he took his rest..' ⁶⁹ In the mid tenth century, bishop Atto of Vercelli displays an awareness of spreading apocryphal legends by mentioning the empty tomb in the valley of Jehoshaphat. As he affirmed his conviction that Mary was now exalted above the angels, whether in or out of her body, he and voiced the traditionalist restraint of the majority of early medieval churchmen when he cautioned in a sermon that 'we dare not affirm that the resurrection of her body has already taken place, since we know that this has not been declared by the holy fathers.' ⁷⁰

ENGLISH DEVOTION

Two new Marian feasts appeared in England around 1030. One, celebrating her Presentation in the Temple (21 November), paralleled the Purification and had been introduced at Jerusalem perhaps as early as the fifth century. The other, celebrating her Conception (8 December), paralleled the Annunciation and seems to have been an insular liturgical innovation which was 'not celebrated anywhere else in Western Europe'. ⁷¹

From Winchester, where it apparently took root, the new observance spread to the monastic communities at Canterbury and Exeter. ⁷² Later in the century, a collection of *Miracles Stories of the Virgin* attributed its institution and even its propers to a ghostly messenger who appeared during a storm at sea to the Anglo-Saxon monk Aelfsige, 'called in the church of Saint Augustine [Canterbury] «the apostle of the English» '. The terrified Aelfsige and his monks called on God to save them-no doubt willing to barter for deliverance-and

When they had finished speaking this and may similar prayers, suddenly they saw a person, decorated with episcopal insignia, near the ship. He called Abbot Aelfsige to him and addressed him in their words: 'If you wish to escape from the danger of the sea, if you wish to return to your native country safely, promise me in the presence of God that you will solemnly celebrate and observe the feast day of the conception of the mother of Christ.' Then the abbot said, 'How am I to do this or on what day?' The messenger said, 'You will celebrate it on the eighth day of December and will preach wherever you can, that it may be celebrated by everybody.' Aelfsige said, 'And what sort of divine service do you command us to use on this feast?' He replied, 'Let every service which is said at her nativity be said also at her conception.' ⁷³

The new feast also drew heavily on texts appointed for the existing feast of the Conception of John the Baptist, ⁷⁴ who was by then commonly

believed to have been born, but not to have been conceived, without original sin. Observance of the new feast seems to have remained fairly localized, to have been 'principally a monastic one, rooted in the centres of power and learning'⁷⁵ and to have been 'a purely devotion one, originating in the piety of the monks, who showed little interest in Marian doctrine'.⁷⁶ As one of his first acts, the Norman archbishop Lanfranc removed the liturgical innovation from the Canterbury calendar, stirring Saxon resentment which prompted a campaign for its restoration and the Aelfsige story a few years later.

Even without the new, and newly suppressed feast, marian devotion on the continent was also increasing. Hymns, sequences, and homilies, such as those of Fulbert of Chartres (+1028), praised the Virgin; the pious, like Odilo of Cluny (+1049)⁷⁷ and Peter Damian's brother Marinus,⁷⁸ made personal vows of homage and vassalage; parents dedicated their children to her. The office hymn *Alma Redemptoris Mater* was composed by Herman the Lame (+1054) of Reichenau⁷⁹—which by the late tenth century possessed a translation of Greek sermons on the Dormition⁸⁰—and the *Salve Regina* was added around 1035 to the repertoire at Cluny, the liturgical pacesetter of Europe. The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin was increasingly used by monks and in private devotions.⁸¹ Guitmund of Aversa (+c. 1095) referred to her giving birth with neither pain nor loss of virginity as her 'singular prerogative'.⁸² Peter Damian (+1072) spoke of the Virgin Mother as unique not only among women but among all created beings, even angels, because of her 'singular privilege of merits', merits which could be applied to 'our debts'.⁸³ On the subject of her assumption, he reported that the educated generally held the opinion that 'the blessed Virgin did undergo the vexation of the flesh by dying' before being raised to heaven.⁸⁴

Into this well prepared ground, 'Quite suddenly toward the end of the eleventh century,' writes R. W. Southern, '. . . large numbers of miracle stories of the Virgin began to appear.'⁸⁵ Behind many of them was the probable author of the Aelfsige tale, Abbot Anselm of Bury Saint Edmund.⁸⁶ This nephew of Archbishop Anselm had been a monk of Saint Michael's Chiusa, in the alpine foothills, and had had ties with greek monks who had fled West. When he returned to England with his exiled uncle and his travelling companions--his biographer Eadmer, and Ralph, his successor at Canterbury--the younger Anselm apparently introduced the lore of the east into England's green and pleasant and fertile land.

1. Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge UP 1990) 27 n.9. She cites in support Lafontaine-Dosogne, *Iconographie de l'enfance de la Vierge* 1:25ff. As will be apparent, I have drawn heavily on Clayton in this section.

2. Translated James K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993).

3. *De viris illustribus* 114; PL 23:746. For this translation and information, I have drawn on Luigi Gambero, *Mary and the Fathers of the Church: The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought*. First published Milan 1991, translated by Thomas Buffer (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999).

-
4. Haer 78.6; PG 42:705D.
 5. Haer. 78.11; PG 42:716.
 6. Haer 42.12; PG 41:77B
 7. Haer 78.23; PG 42:737.
 8. *Adversus Haereses* 3.22; PG 7:959-960.
 9. *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* 33; Sch 62:83-86.
 10. De carne Christi 17.5; PL 2:828.
 11. De monogamia 8.2; PL 2:989.
 12. In Matthaum 1.3; PL 9:921.
 13. *Expositio in Lucam* 2.7; PL 15:1635-1636.
 14. De virginibus 2.7; PL 16:220.
 15. Hexaemeron 5.20.65; De virginibus 2.2.7.
 16. *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 2.61; PL 15:1574. Nec littera nec historia docet ex hac uita Mariam corporalis necis passione migrasse...
 17. Exp. Luc. 2.61; PL 15: 1574: Et ideo prudentiam Mariae haud ignarem mysterii coelestis ostendit. . .
 18. Sermon 22.10A.
 19. Clayton, 12-citing H. Barré, *Prières anciennes de l'occident à la mère du Sauveur* (Paris 1963) 30.
 20. Sermo 291.5-6: Virgo es, sancta es, votum vouisti. Cf Sermon 196.1: Virgo concepit...virgo peperit...post partum, virgo permansit. Influenced by Jerome, he also specifically condemned Antidicomaritae who denied Mary's perpetual virginity; Jovinianistae, who denied her virginity *in partu*; and Helvidiani, who accepted Helvidius' opinion that Mary had other sons.
 21. Sermo 51.26; PL 38:348.
 22. *Contra Faustum* 23.8; PL 42:470.
 23. Aug Encycl. (545)
 24. Paul Rigby, 'Original Sin', *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allen D. Fitzgerald OSA (Grand Rapids:Eerdmans, 1999) 608, citing A. Vanneste, 'Le décret du Concile de Trente sur le péché originel' *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 88 (1966) 590.
 25. Ad Simplicianum .1.2.18.
 26. Sermo 214.6, De peccatorum meritis 2.24.38.
 27. De gratia Christi et de peccato originale 2.39.44, cited *Augustine through the Ages*, 224.
 28. De natura et gratia 36.42; PL 44:267; CSEL 60:263.
 29. Daniel E. Doyle OSA 'Mary, Mother of God' , *Augustine through the Ages* 544 : It is clear nonetheless that, given the various theories regarding the transmission of original sin current in his time, Augustine in that passage would not have meant to imply Mary's immunity from it.' 'His understanding of concupiscence as an integral part of all martial relations made it difficult, if not impossible, to accept that she herself was conceived immaculately'.
 30. Sermo 121.5: 'Nos filii hominum per concupiscentiam carnis; ille filius hominis per fidem virginis. Sermon 72A.7: Quae fide credidit, fide concepit . Contra Julianum

opus imperfectum 5.15.252: although [her humanity] came from this [concupiscence] nevertheless did not transmit it for she did not conceive in this way

31. De Genesi ad litteram 10.18.32 : ` And what more undefiled than the womb of the Virgin, whose flesh, although it came from procreation tainted by sin, nevertheless did not conceive from that source?`

32. In Book Four of his *Dialogues*.

33. *Ep.* 9.52; PL 77:990-991.

34. In *Ezechielem* 2.8.9; PL 76:1033-1034.

35. *Homilia in Evangelium* 26.1; PL 76:1197; ET David Hurst, *Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies* (Kalamazoo, : Cistercian Publications, 1990) 201.

36. *Moralia in Job* 24.3; PL 76:288.

37. *Life of Benedict Biscop* 6. See Clayton 53.

38. Homiliy 2.19 in uigilia nativitatis S. Joannis Baptitae; CCCM 122: 325; trans. L. Martin, *Bede the Venerable. The Gospel Homilies*, CS 111.198. `neque enim dubitandum est quod spiritus sanctus qui eum repleuit etiam a peccatis omnibus absoluit. Constat quippe ueredica patrum sententia quia lege non stringitur sancti spiritus donum.

39. Clayton (note 1) 16.

40. Sermo in Purificatione; CCCM 120:000; CS 110: 180.

41. In Lucam 1:CCCM 120:36. Erit in te conceptio, libido non erit. Concupiscentiae non erit aestus ubi umbram fecit Spiritus sanctus.

42. Homily 2.19 on the Nativity of John the Baptist; CCCM 122:000; CS 110:192.

43. Bede, In Luc 1; 36.

44. Adv 1.3; __ CS 110:21.

45. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*. New Haven: Yale, 1953. Page 242.

46. Gambero (note 3), 353.

47. *Liber miraculorum*, 1: *De gloria beatorum martyrum* 4; PL 71:708. Denique impleto a beata Maria hujus vitae cursu, cum jam vocaretur a saeculo, congregati sunt omnes apostoli de singulis regionibus ad domum ejus. Cumque audiissent quia esset assumenda de mundo, vigilabant cum ea simul: et ecce Dominus Jesus advenit cum angelis suis, et accipiens animam ejus, tradidit Michaeli archangelo, et recessit. Diluculo autem levaverunt apostoli cum lectulo corpus ejus, posueruntque illud in monumento, et custodiebant ipsum, adventum Domini praestolantes. Et ecce iterum adstitit eis Dominus, susceptumque corpus sanctum in nube deferri jussit in paradisum: ubi nunc, resumpta anima, cum electis ejus exsultans, aeternitatis bonis, nullo occasuris fine, perfruitur

48. See Southern, 252. Clayton, 61.

49. *De virginitate perpetua sanctae Mariae*, 1: Tu enim es electa a Deo, assumpta a Deo.-cited Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford: Clarendon) 1970) 176.

50. PL 95:1565-1574.

51. *Etymologiae* 7.10.1: PL 82:289; Cf. Bede, In Lucam 1:CCCM 120:31.

52. *De ortu et obitu patrum* 111; PL 83:148.

53. *Allegoriae* 139; PL 83:117.

54. *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 2.18; PL 83:804.

55. Isidore, *Quaestiones in Genesim* 2.18; PL 83:148-149: Specialiter tamen nulla docet historia, Mariam gladii animaduersione peremptam, quia nec obitus eius uspiam legitur,

dum tamen reperiatur eius sepulcrum, ut aliqui dicunt, in ualle Iosaphat.' = In particular, no text teaches that Mary was killed by the punishment of the sword, for her death is recorded nowhere, whereas, as some say, her sepulchre is found in the valley of Josaphat.' Clayton, 13, comments that 'the legend of Mary's tomb in the valley of Josaphat...seems to have arisen in the mid-fifth century and was the result of locating in this valley the house in which Mary was said to have lived with Joseph. The house was gradually transformed into her sepulchre, or the two were regarded as being in close proximity to each other.'

56. The cavern, between Saint Stephen's Gate and the Mount of Olives, is still identified as the Virgin's tomb. See. Jerome Murphy O'Connor, *The Holy Land* (Oxford 1998) 130, who identifies the *Transitus* as second or third century.

57. *De locis sanctis*, ed. and trans. D Meehan, *Adamnan's De locis sanctis*, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 3 (Dublin 1958) 58: Sed de eodem sepulchro quo modo uel quo tempore aut a quibus personis sanctum corpusculum eius sit sublatum uel in quo loco resurrectionem expectat ullus, ut refert, pro certo scire potest.

58. *Vita Willibaldi*, ed. Holder-Egger, MGH SS 15/1: 907-98; translated C. H. Talbot, *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1954) 166. *Cumque illi .xi. Apostoli tollentes corpus sanctae Mariae portauerunt illum de Hierusalem. . . Sancta Maria in illo loco in medio Hierusalem exiuit de seculo, qui nominatur Sancta Sion: et tunc apostoli .xi. Portauerunt illum, sicut prius dixi, et tunc angeli uenientes tulerunt illum de manibus apostolorum et portauerunt in paradiso.*

59. *Sermo* 208.11 (De assumptione); PL 39.2134: . . . quia nec potioem meritis inuenimus ad placandam irae Iudicis quam te . . .

60. *Sermo* 208.3; 2130: Sed quo ordine hinc ad superna transierit regna, nulla catholica narrat historia, Non solum autem respuere apocrypha, uerum etiam ignorare dicitur haud eadem Dei Ecclesia. Et quidem sunt nonnulla sine autoris nomine de eius assumptione conscripta; quae, ut dixi, ita cauentur. . .

61. *De assumptione* 8-9: 112-113. 8. Monstratur autem sepulcrum eius cernentibus nobis usque ad praesens in uallis Iosaphat medio, quae uallis est inter montem Sion et montem Olueti posita.... sed nun uacuum esse cernentibus ostenditur... 9. Haec idcirco dixerim, quia multi nostrorum dubitant, utrum assumpta fuerit simul cum corpore, an abierit relicto corpore.

62. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology* (600-133); *History of Christian Theology* 3:73: 'In many ways Ratramnus and Radbertus were arguing past each other, for the former did not teach that the virginity of Mary had been violated in the birth of Christ and latter did not deny that Christ had been born in a normal manner.' The exchange did, however, give a certain prominence in the West to Mary and belief in her perpetual virginity.

63. Ratramnus, *De partu virginis*-cited Pelikan 3:73-74.

64. *Paschasii Radberti de partu virginis cura et studio* E. Ann Matter & *De assumptione sanctae Mariae Virginis cura et studio* Alberti Ripberger CCCM 56C (Turnholt 1985).

65. *De partu virginis*, CCCM 56C:55: ex sanctificata carne uirginis Verbum carnem .

66. Radbertus, *Cogitis me* (c. 860); PL 120:1371: neque contraxit in utero sanctificata originale peccatum, PL 120:1372: [Mariam] ab omni originali peccato immunem.

67. *De partu virginis*; CCCM 56C:52: At uero beata Maria licet ipsa de carne peccati sit nata et procreata, ipsaque quamuis caro peccati fuerit, non tunc iam quando praeueniente Spiritus Sancti gratia ab angelo prae omnibus mulieribus benedicta vocatur. Spiritus sanctus inquit superviet in te et uirtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi. (Cf Rom 8:3) Alioquin, si non eodem Spiritu Sancto sanctificata est et emundata, quomodo caro eius non caro peccati fuit? Et si caro eius de massa primae praeuocationis venit, quomodo Christus Verbum caro sine peccato fuit, qui de carne peccati carnem assumpsit....

68. Genesis 3:16.

69. *De bono suffragiorum* 4; PL 145:565-566: ...quia sapientia domum aedificavit atque in ea . . . velut in sacratissimo lectulo requievit.

70. *Sermo* 17; PL 134: 856-7 Corporis vero ejus jam factam resurrectionem afirmare minime audemus, quia nec a sanctis Patribus hoc declaratum esse cognoscimus. . . Tamen sive in corpore, sive extra corpus, super choros angelorum in coelis exaltam confitemur. . . .

71. Clayton, 50. Whether it was known earlier at Naples, and whether it had still earlier, perhaps as early as the ninth century, arrived in Ireland is still apparently under debate. See Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), Chapter X, pp. 238-259.

72. Clayton, 46ff.

73. *Miracula Sanctae Virginis Marie*, ed E. F. Dexter (Madison, WI, 1927) 37-38-as cited in Clayton 48-49, n. 87.

74. Clayton, 83

75. Clayton, 272.

76. Clayton, 274.

77. *Vita Odilonis* 2.1; PL 142:915.

78. *De bono suffragiorum* 4; PL 145:566.

79. Chrysogonus Waddell, 'Blessed Herman and the *Alma Redemptoris Mater*', *Liturgy* OCSO 27:2-3 (1993) 85-95. 'Apodictic proof that Bl. Hermann was the author of this exquisite Marian antiphon is as a matter of fact, non-existent' (85). Other scholars, in fact, dispute his authorship.

80. E. R. Carroll, *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 9:365.

81. E.g. the Life of Margaret of Scotland, *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera* (1857) 51, 247-8.

82. *De corpore et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia* 1; PL 149:1443,

83. *Carmina* B.44.9-cited Pelikan 3:161.

84. *Opuscula* 55.1; PL 145:800-801.

85. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale, 1953) 248.

86. Southern, 251, deduces that 'we must give the chief place in making the collection of the stories of the Virgin, which first set the fashion in this form of literature and formed the nucleus of nearly all the later collections' from the frequent Italian and English settings of the stories and the role played by Anselm himself in one of them.

II. Anselmian Appropriateness

Anselm of Canterbury (+1109) is best known to posterity for his ontological argument--God is that being greater than which cannot be conceived--and for his demonstration of the logical necessity of the Incarnation of the God-man, without reference to Scripture. 'God could have made some man without sin, not of the sinful mass,'¹ and by him the work of redemption could have been accomplished, Boso pointed out to his Master. To which Anselm replied, establishing a much imitated anselmian principle, that Adam's sin introduced disorder and it is not appropriate that God forgive disorder without punishment.² God could have done it, but to have done so would not have been appropriate.

Anselm's personal devotion to the Virgin, 'gateway of life, door of salvation, way of reconciliation, approach to recovery',³ is echoed in his theology. The Blessed Virgin Mary enjoyed a purity 'than which, under God, nothing greater can be thought'.⁴ He entreated the prayers of the 'woman uniquely to be wondered at and to be wondered at for your uniqueness', by whom 'the elements are renewed, hell is redeemed, demons are trampled down and men are saved, even fallen angels are restored to their place.'⁵ And he praised

. . . the mother of the Creator and Saviour,
by whose sanctity my sins are purged,
by whose integrity incorruptibility is given me⁶. . .

Even while he believed that 'Nothing equals Mary, nothing but God is greater than Mary'⁷, Anselm remained consciously aware that her holiness and the help she provides depend absolutely on her unique relationship with Christ, 'the salvation born of your fruitfulness'⁸. Through her, God acts.

God created all things, and Mary gave birth to God.
God who made all things made himself of Mary,
and thus he refashioned everything he had made.

The Mother of the God-man cooperated with God the Father in Christ's salvific redemption of the universe.

He who was able to make all things out of nothing
refused to remake it by force, but first became the Son of Mary.

So God is the Father of all created things
and Mary is the mother of all re-created things.

God is the Father of all that is established,
and Mary is the mother of all that is re-established.⁹

In his *Cur Deus Homo*, Anselm convinced Boso that Christ could be born without sin even though 'the virgin herself, from whom he sprang, was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did her mother bear her, since she had sinned in Adam, in whom all sinned.'¹⁰ The Virgin Mother was 'among those who were cleansed through him from their sins before his birth' and that her purity 'by means of which he is pure came only through him and from him.'¹¹ It was by her faith that 'the virgin herself was made pure so that he might be born of her....'¹²

The original sin from which she was cleansed Anselm defined, not as a concupiscent infection of the body which taints the soul infused into it, but as 'an injustice. . . and injustice is naught but the absence of justice owed',¹³ it is 'that sin which is in an infant as soon as it has a rational soul, irrespective of what may have happened to its body before it was animated. . . the deprivation of justice owed caused by Adam's disobedience . . . [and] accompanied by the deprivation of happiness.'¹⁴

PSEUDO-ANSELM.

The Canterbury monks who accompanied Anselm in exile to Rome, visited Chiusa and travelled home in the company of the younger Anselm both wrote treatises in honor of the Blessed Virgin. Ralph, the next archbishop, penned a homily which passed under Anselm's name.¹⁵ Eadmer (+c. 1128), a Saxon, wrote a 'charming and naive, yet substantial little treatise',¹⁶ as part of his campaign to have restored to the Canterbury calendar the feast of the Virgin's conception, which had in former times been celebrated by those of 'purer simplicity and quite humble devotion', but then suppressed by those having 'greater learning and spurning the simplicity of the poor'.¹⁷ On the evidence of the text 'where the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom',¹⁸ he argued in that Mary, 'the court of appeal of all sinners was therefore free from slavery to all sin'.¹⁹

He could not have been unaware of Anselm's opinion, and cautiously professed himself unwilling to dissent from the truth of the catholic and universal Church.²⁰ But all the same, he pointed out, if Jeremiah and John the Baptist could be sanctified in the womb, which no one doubted, then

Who would dare say that the unique propitiation of the whole world and tenderest couch of the Son of Almighty God, was deprived at the outset of her conception of the enlightening grace of the Holy Spirit? . . . [God] clearly could do it, and he willed [to do it]. So if he willed it, he did it.²¹

As Southern observes, 'Eadmer here followed Anselm in method, and went beyond him in doctrine . . .'²² Subsequent generations, however, attached Anselm's more authoritative name to the treatise, without noticing the discrepancy in the two men's opinions..

Elsewhere the Saxon monk, in another display of logic, reasoned that, because the feast of her nativity is celebrated, so too ought her conception to be, 'for unless she were conceived, she would never have

been born. And just as her nativity was once necessary to save the human race, so her conception was necessary'²³

The feast of the Conception of Mary was restored in England sometime around 1125.²⁴

TWELFTH-CENTURY MONASTIC DEVOTION

The acceleration of devotion to Mary which is reflected in the increase of parish and monastery dedications to her patronage, was fired by crusading contacts with the East, a new theological inquisitiveness and internationalism, a new optimism and sense of human dignity, and a surge of vocations to the cloister. In a theological climate which equated grace with remission of sins,²⁵ reflection on and frequent imprecatory recitation of the angelic salutation *Ave Maria, gratia plena*, inexorably set some monastic minds meandering to the logical inference. In the castle, the cult of courtly love set women at either extreme of the moral scale: oversexed seductresses to be resisted or pure ladies to be given homage, defended, and entreated for favors. In both environments, the venerable typology of Eve and Mary provided a paradigm: 'The one was the handmaid of seduction, the other of propitiation. The one gave birth to lies, the other brought redemption.'²⁶ That noblest, most gracious and clement of all ladies, the mother of the Lord of heaven and earth, could provide the most potent and most enduring protection possible for sinners. 'Like the rain,' Southern writes, 'this protective power of the Virgin falls on the just and the unjust alike-provided only that they have entered the circle of her allegiance'²⁷ by their prayers and veneration.

The 'new monastery' at Cîteaux and its proliferating daughter houses were all dedicated to her honor.²⁸ The White Monks, goaded by Peter Abelard, daily sang marian antiphons; and several abbots ruminated unblushingly on the allegorical eroticism of the Song of Songs. Yet the appropriation of bridal imagery to Mary was not their invention, but that of the traditionalist Benedictines. Honorius of Autun, probably in the first decade of the century,²⁹ spoke of Mary as 'my sister, coheir in the glory of the father, spouse of the Father'³⁰ and interpreted her breasts as humility and chastity and as the active and contemplative life, 'nourishing little ones in faith.'³¹ Despite close ties with Canterbury,³² he does not mention the feast of her Conception, but remarks that 'her Nativity was not formerly celebrated, but being divinely revealed it is preached that it should be.'³³ His contemporary in the Rhineland, the arch-conservative Rupert of Deutz (+1135) opined that she had been cleansed of original sin through the Incarnation,³⁴ and, in his marian exegesis of the Canticle,³⁵ spoke of the 'utterly pure matter from which the holy Wisdom of God' had become man.³⁶ Guibert of Nogent (+1124), who had been dedicated at birth to the Virgin,³⁷ thought that, if any original or actual sin had in fact moved her, it had been cleansed by the Holy Spirit.³⁸

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX

No one was more eloquent in his praise of the Virgin than Bernard of Clairvaux (+1153). Throughout the late Middle Ages, and even in the mid twentieth century, his words have been quoted and the image of Mary expressing milk into his mellifluous mouth reproduced. Mary is the mother of Wisdom, the channel (*aqueducta*) of salvation, the prudent virgin, the splendid and wondrous star..whose beam enlightens this earthly globe, the woman clothed with the sun, the mediatrix of salvation, the restorer of the ages. Decontextualized from Bernard's allegorizing and christocentric mind-set, some of his ringing phrases were later to take on literalist overtones he never anticipated.³⁹

In the mind of Cistercian reformers, the whole point of the ascetic regime was conversion from blinding self-absorption (concupiscence) and growth from the voluntary assent of faith, through the understanding of reason, to the contemplation of God in love. No one riddled with concupiscence could perceive the living God. Mary, like John the Baptist, recognized the divinity of her Son and pondered his word in her heart. The question for Bernard was not whether she was cleansed of original as of personal sin, but when.

To fancy that a privilege which has been accorded to some, albeit few, mortals was denied to that virgin through whom all mortals have entered life would be intolerable. Beyond all doubt the Mother of the Lord too was holy before she was born... I think that there came upon her a yet more ample blessing of sanctification which not only sanctified her birth, but kept her life thereafter immune from sin--something which is believed to have been accorded to no other born of woman. This unique privilege of sanctity whereby she was enabled to live her whole life without sin is surely appropriate for the Queen of virgins who, in giving birth to him who destroyed sin and death, obtained for all the reward of life and justice. Her birth was holy, then, because great sanctity from the womb made it holy.⁴⁰

Sanctification in the womb meant for Mary that 'her conscience is utterly free from defect'.⁴¹ When he preached on the Gospel for the Assumption--the story of Martha and Mary--Bernard had no more difficulty than those

who appointed the lessons in conflating Mary of Bethany and Mary the mother of Jesus and affirming that 'Mary has chosen the better part' in contemplating the Word of God.

Of her preservation from sin at the moment of conception, however, he remained unconvinced 'by records of visions which are unsupported by sound reason or good authority'.⁴² Willing to tolerate this harmless sentiment among the unlettered--as he was willing to tolerate sculpture in cathedrals--he minced no words at finding 'this superstition amongst learned men'.⁴³ Not to speak out, he feared, would risk giving credence to the unscriptural and indefensible conclusion that she had been conceived by the Holy Spirit, and not in the usual way.⁴⁴

He therefore opposed the introduction into France of a feast celebrating her conception. In this, Bernard was in part echoing his Order's resistance to such other liturgical innovations as Trinity Sunday and the Transfiguration, and in part articulating the exegetical ground rules of the patristic tradition. To allow it would be to introduce

a new celebration of which the rite of the Church knows nothing, which reason does not demonstrate, and age-old tradition does not commend. . . . We would be perilously presuming something which [the more learned and holier Fathers], with all their prudence in such matters, passed over in silence.⁴⁵

The Nativity of John the Baptist he considered a 'unique exception' to the rule of the 'Church which judges and declares not the birth but the death of the saints precious', and then only because it was justified by the Scriptural promise that 'Many shall rejoice in his birth'⁴⁶; the Nativity of Mary, which lacks equal scriptural warrant, he countenanced because it was part of tradition and 'Holy Church is certainly not mistaken in keeping . . . and celebrating [it] every year '⁴⁷

The Church would not celebrate her birthday if she had inherited original sin from her parents; and it was, moreover, inconceivable that she was less sanctified in the womb than Jeremiah⁴⁸ or less filled with the Holy Spirit than John.⁴⁹ 'There is no question that Mary was preserved from original sin by grace alone'.⁵⁰ But 'she could not have been holy before she existed, and before she was conceived she did not exist.'⁵¹ With augustinian certitude, he reasoned that: nothing can be holy without the presence of the sanctifying Spirit; the Spirit is not present in sin; the carnal lust inseparable from procreation is sin; she was conceived in the usual way, and therefore the Holy Spirit cannot by his presence have preserved her from original sin.

Bernard had no hesitations over the Assumption. His sermons for this well established feast make clear his belief that the Virgin now dwells in heaven, but he does not specify that she is there bodily.⁵²

His position on her conception, but not his prose, was later undercut by another vision story, told a generation late by Peter of Celle⁵³ and

endlessly repeated. The recently departed abbot appearing to a lay brother in a white cowl blotched by a single black stain, informed him sadly that the blot was his error on the Virgin's conception.

Although the Cistercians followed their own calendar and liturgical rite, his brethren in England might be expected to have been more open to the feast celebrated in the realm and the doctrine championed by the monks of Canterbury.⁵⁴ Aelred of Rievaulx (+1178) believed Mary was uniquely cleansed of all impurity because of the identity of the flesh of Mother and Son.⁵⁵ One flesh with Christ, uniquely mother and uniquely bride of Christ,⁵⁶ she is our pledge of resurrection, having risen to eternal life in her own flesh.⁵⁷ Gilbert, abbot of Swineshead, (+1172) who continued Bernard's sermons on the Song of Songs, held that 'in his Mother, though there be its cause, still there is no corruption.'⁵⁸ Stephen of Salley (+1252) praised her virginal integrity,⁵⁹ believed she had been 'chosen from all eternity to be Christ's immaculate mother, his beloved and dearest spouse⁶⁰, and now sits in the flesh on the right hand of her Son, 'dispatching with clearcut efficiency...the pleas and complaints of her client as they continue to flood her with their requests day and night from this valley of tears.'⁶¹

THE SCHOOLS

Hugh of Saint Victor (+1141) conceded that 'on original sin many difficulties arise, and whether they are treated better by believing than by discussion I do not know-if indeed these questions admit of any discussion which can not have a full solution'.⁶² In exploring the meaning of 'conceived by the Holy Spirit', dismissed the theory that Mary received God's seed from the substance of the Holy Spirit in favor of the opinion that the Holy Spirit provided the substance of the divine fetus from the flesh of the Virgin, without virile seed. 'Accordingly, the lust of flesh did not operate conception in the Virgin who . . . conceived not through love of man but through the love and operation of the Holy Spirit'.⁶³ Since there was no sexual union, Hugh, like most of his contemporaries, concluded that 'When that flesh was assumed, it was cleansed'.⁶⁴ Because Hugh differentiated between ignorance, the effect of original sin on the soul and the punishment of pride, from concupiscence, its effect on the mortal body,⁶⁵ the inference follows that the Virgin Mary too had been cleansed of both at the moment of Christ's conception.⁶⁶

Peter Lombard (+1160) extended the span of Mary's freedom from sin by maintaining that the Holy Spirit had come to her in advance of the Annunciation to prepare her for God's invitation by cleansing her of original sin. To the Lombard, 'resolutely augustinian'⁶⁷ and anti-abelardian, this meant cleansed from the three elements of sin: guilt (*culpa*), punishment (*poena*), and the 'tinder of sin' (*fomes peccati*); that is, from responsibility for the fall, from vitiation of the will and corruption of the body, and from concupiscence, the proclivity to sin or original sin. As a result, Mary enjoys a unique privilege granted to no other human being, save Christ himself.⁶⁸ The Lombard also distinguished between two current theories on the transmission of original sin: lust

in the parents and vitiation of the seed, and arrived at differing conclusions on Mary's sinlessness. In summary:

. . . if one views the vehicle as the sexual feelings, it is clear why Mary would have to have been released from this consequence of original sin at the moment of Christ's conception. But if one adheres to the vitiated seeds theory, then presumably some backup time would be required to enable Mary to produce genetic materials, under his new dispensation, that would be as uncorrupted as those of the prelapsarian parents. The line of argument developed by the Lombard on this issue reminds us forcibly of the fact that Mariology in the twelfth century was fueled not only by the new winds of devotion blowing through western Christendom at this time but also by technical speculations in dogmatic theology.⁶⁹

Although criticized by some in his own day, Peter Lombard had provided the systematic foundation on which subsequent latin theology raised its impressive scholastic constructs, and had listed the doctrinal issues which long determined the content of their deliberations. Theological inquiry had moved from the cloister to the classroom, and in the following generations, above all at the University of Paris, to study theology was to gloss the Sentences. They 'provided a wealth of problems and opportunities for later theologians. . .[and] possessed a schema and a methodology that could accommodate these new materials, in whatever camp a commentator might choose to plant his standard'.'⁷⁰

1. *Cur Deus Homo* [CDH] 1.5; Schmitt 2:52: Potuis enim deus hominem aliquem facere sine peccato, non de massa peccatrice. .

2. CDH 1.12; 2:69: Non ergo decet deum peccatum sic impunitum.... Deum vero non decet aliquid inordinatum...imittere...deo non convenit....

3. Oratio 7; F. S. Schmitt ed, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, vol. 7 (Edinburgh 1946). Trans. Benedicta Ward, *The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm* (Penguin). Cited hereafter as 3 BVM.

4. De conceptu virginis 18; Schmitt 2:159.

5. 3 BVM, lines 152-153.

6. 3 BVM = Oratio 7; Schmitt 3:19: matri creatoris et salvatoris mei per cujus sanctiorem peccata mea purgantur, per suius integritatem mihi incorruptabilitatis donatur. . .

7. 3 BVM, lines 185-187.

8. 3 BVM, 188-194.

9. 3 BVM, 000

10. CDH II.16; Schmitt 2:116: Nam licet ipsa hominis conceptio munda sit et absque carnalis delectationis peccato, virgo tamen ipsa unde assumptus est, in iniquitatibus concepta est et in peccatis concepit eam mater eius, et cum originali peccato nata est, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt. (Psalm 51/50).

11. CDH II.16; 2:99: Virgo autem illa. . . fuit de illis qui ante nativitatem eius per eum mundati sunt a peccatis, et in eius ipsa munditia de illa assumptus est . . . sed quoniam matris munditia perquam mundus est non fuit nisi ab illo, ipsa quoque per se ipsum et a se mundus fuit.

12.CDH 2.18.

13. De conceptione virginalis et peccato originali 3; Schmitt 2:143: . . . ergo non est aliud originale peccatum quam iniustitia. . . et iniustitia non est aliud quam absentia debitae iustitiae. Throughout, I have translated *iustitia* literally as 'justice', rather than use the familiar Reformation term 'righteousness'.

14. De conceptu, 27; Schmitt 2:170-171: Originale igitur peccatum non aliud intelligo quam quod est in infante, mox ut habet animam rationalem, quidquid prius in corpore nondum sic animato factum sit. . .

15.Ps-Anselm, Homily XI; PL 158L644-9

16. E. D. O'Connor, *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7:380.

17. *De conceptu*; 301: . . . ab eis praecipue in quibus pura simplicitas et humilior in Deum vigeat devotio. At ubi et major scientia et praepollens examinatio rerum mentes quorundam imbuat et erexit, eadem solemnitate, sprete pauperum simplicitate, de medio sustulit; et eam quasi ratione vacantem redegit in nihilum.

18.2 Cor 3:17.

19. *Tractatus de conceptione B. Mariae Virginis*; PL 159:305B: . . . a servitute igitur peccatorum libera fuit, quae omnium peccatorum propitiatori aula. . .

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid. 305B, D.: . . . quis dicere audeat singulare totius saeculi propitiatorium, ac illi Dei omnipotentis dulcissimum reclinatorium, mox insuae conceptionis exordio Spiritu sancti gratiae illustratione destitutum? . . . potuit plane, et voluit; si igitur voluit, fecit.

22. R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm. Portrait in a Landscape*. (Cambridge University Press) 433.

23. *Sermo de conceptione Beatae Mariae*; PL 159: 521D. Sicut enim in sancta ecclesia ejus extollitur nativitas, ita debet ejus extolli conceptio; nisi enim conciperetur, nunquam nasceretur. Sicut enim ad salvandum enus humanum olim fuit necessaria ejus nativitas, sic fuit necessaria ejus conceptione jussi Dei concipitur et nascitur.

24. E. D. O'Connor, *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7:380. As yet, I have not discovered whether this usage was authorized throughout England or only in Canterbury province.

25. *Inter plurima: Glossa Ordinaria*; PL 114:559D.: Gratia Dei est remissio peccatorum. Lanfranc of Bec, *Epistola B. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, glossula interhjecta B. Lanfranci explanata* 1.9; PL 150:107B. Robert of Melun: *Commentary on Romans* 1.7; SSL 18 (Louvain 1938) 16. William of Saint Thierry, *Expositio in Epistola ad Romanos* ad 1.5 and ad 1.7; CCCM 86 (1989) 9, 10. Peter Lombard, *Commentary on Romans*; PL 191:1316B. I am indebted for these citations to Dr Aage Rydstrøm-Paulsen.

26. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermon on the Octave of the Assumption* 2; SBOp 5:263: Illa enim ministra seductionis, haec propitiationis; illa suggessit praevaricationem, haec ingressit redemptionem.

27. *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 248.

28. *Exordium cistercii VIII; Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell (Cîteaux 1999) 187.

29. Valerie Flint, 'The Chronology of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis', *Revue Bénédictine* 82 (1972) 215-242.

30. *Sigillum Beatae Mariae* 5, . trans. Amelia Carr, *The Seal of Blessed Mary* (Toronto: Peregrina, 1991) 69.

31. Ibid. 4; p. 67.

32. Carr, 6, relying on Flint (note 29), who places his earliest work in England. Cf. the dedication of his *Speculum Ecclesiae* (PL 172:813): Fratres Cantuarensis ecclesiae.

-
33. Ibid., 8; 86.
34. *Sermon 7*; PL 168:841C.
35. In what some scholars date as the first marian exegesis the Song. See Van Engen, *Rupbert of Deutz 275-282, 291-98*. F. Ohly, *Hohenliedstudien. Grundzüge einer Geschichte der Hohenliedauslegung des Abendlandes bis zum 1200* (Wiesbaden 1958) 121-135.
36. *Commentaria in Canticum canticorum*, ed H. Haacke, CCCM 26:12: *tota omnino munda materia, de qua sancta Dei sapientia....*
37. *De vita sua* 1.3; PL 156:842. Trans.C. C. Swinton Bland, revised with an introduction and notes by John F. Benton. *Self and Society in Medieval France; the memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064?-c. 1125)* (New York, Harper & Row, 1970).
38. *De laude s. Mariae* 5; PL 156:550B: *Si de peccato vel originali uel actuali ejus agitur, per sanctum qui ei ex utero coaluit Spiritus, id purgatur..*
39. *Homilia super Missa* est 4.1; SBOP 4:46: *Non est dubium, quidquid in laudibus Matris proferimus, ad Filium pertinere, et rursum, cum Filium honoramus, a gloria Matris non recedimus. [There is no doubt that whatever we say in praise of the other touches the Son, and when we honor the Son we detract nothing from the mother.]*
40. Ep 174.5; SBOP 7:390: *Quod itaque vel paucis mortalium constat fuisse collatum, fas certe non est suspicari tantae Virgini esse negatum, per quam omnis mortalitas emersit ad vitam. Fuit procul dubio et Mater Domini ante sancta quam nata. . . Ego puto quod et copiosior sanctificationis benedictio in eam descenderit, quae ipsius non solum sanctificaret ortum, sed et vitam ab omni deinceps peccato custodiret immunem, quod nemini alteri in natis quidem mulierum creditur esse donatum. Decuit nimirum Reginam virginum, singularis privilegio sanctitatis, absque omni peccato ducere vitam, quae, dum peccati mortisque pareret peremptorem, munus vitae et iustitiae omnibus obtineret. Sanctus igitur ortus, quoniam immensa prodiens ex utero sanctitas sanctum fecit illum.*
41. Asspt 4.7; SBOP 5:249 *...cum conscientia prorsus absque delicto...*
42. Ep 174.6; SBOP 7:391: *Ipse mihi facile persuadeo scriptis talibus non moveri, quibus nec ratione suppeditare, nec certa invenitur favere auctoritas.*
43. Ep 174.9; SBOP 7:392: *Verum apud sapientes. . .superstitione deprehensa....nescio an sine gravi offensa etiam vestri omnium dissimulare potuerim.*
44. Ep 174.7; 391: *Nisi quis forte dicat de Spiritu Sancto eam, et non de viro conceptam fuisse.*
45. Ep 174.1; 388: *. . . novam inducendo celebritatem, quam ritus Ecclesiae nescit, non probat ratio, non commendat antiqua traditio....Preiculose praesumimus quidquid ipsorum in talibus prudentia praeterivit.*
46. Lk 1:14. Ep 174.4-5; 389-390.
47. Ep 174.5; 390: *, . . nec fallitur omnino sancta Ecclesia sanctum reputans ipsum Nativitatis eius diem et omni anno cum exultatione universae terrae votiva celebritate suscipiens.*
48. Jer 1:5.
49. Lk 1:15.
50. Asspt 2.8; SBOP 5:237: *Quod si originalem a parentibus maculam traxit, sed minus a Ieremia sanctificatam in utero, aut no magis a Iohanne Spiritu Sancto repletam credere prohibet pietas christiana, nec enim festis laudibus nascens honoraretur. Postremo cum omnimodis constet, ab originali contagio sola gratia numdatam esse Mariam, quippe cum et nunc in baptisate sola hanc maculam lavet gratia, et sola eam raserit olim petra circumcicionis, si, ut omnino pium est credere, proprium Maria delictum non habuit, nihilominus ab innocentissimo corde etiam paenitentia longe fuit.*

-
51. Ep 174.7; 391. An dicitur sanctificatione praeventa. . . Sed non valuit ante sancta esse quam esse; siquidem non erat antequam conciperetur.
52. Asspt 4.1; SBOP 5:244: ...cum assumitur incarnati verbi Mater in caelum, nec cessare debet a laudibus humana mortalitas, cum hominis sola natura supra immortales spiritus exaltatur in Virgine.
53. Peter of Celle, Ep 2.172; PL 202:623.
54. Unless, of course, the feast was not being observed in York province, where all the monasteries of the following monks were located.
55. Sermon 45.13; CCCM IIa:355. This information is drawn from a paper presented by Dr Shawn Madison Krahmer at the 2000 International Medieval Studies Congress, Kalamazoo.
56. Sermon 20.6; CCCM 156.
57. Sermon 20.32; 163.
58. Sermon 40.6, trans. CF 26:483..
59. Meditation 6; trans. Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan, Stephen of Salley: *Treatises* (Kalamazoo 1984) 37.
60. Meditation 15; 60
61. Meditation 15; 57.
62. *De sacramentis* 1.7.25; PL 176:132: De originale peccato multae ac difficiles oboriuntur quaestiones, quae utrum credendo melius quam discutiendo (si tamen discussionem aliquam admittunt quae plenam solutionem habere non possunt) tractentur ignoro.
63. *De sacramentis* 2.1.8; No ergo libido carnis conceptionem in virgine operata est quae. . . nec de sua carne per amorem viri concepit sed per amorem et operationem Spiritus sancti. Trans. Roy J. Deferrari, *Hugh of Saint Victor on the Sacraments of the Christian Faith* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1951).230.
64. *De sacramentis* 2.1.5; PL 382: Quando assumpta est, mundata est. Deferrari 217.
65. *De sacramentis* .1.7.28 and 2.1.6; PL 299, 301-302, 384; Deferrari 134, 136, 219..
66. *De sacramentis*. 2.1.6; PL 383.
67. Marsha L. Colish, Peter Lombard. 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill 1994. Vol.1:393.
68. Sent 3.d.3.c.1.2; p. 32:. Mariam quoque totam Spiritus sanctus in eam praeueniens a peccato prorsus purgavit, et a fomite peccati etiam liberavit .
69. Colish, 1:421-422.
70. Colish 2:777.

III. Franciscan Probabilities

As Augustine cast a long shadow over the early middle ages, the penumbra over the late middle ages was the Little Poor Man of Assisi, whose love of godly chivalry and whose literalism marked the piety and the theology of his Order and his era. When he sang of God's love, he sang not plainsong in the cloister but troubadour verses in public. When he heard the voice of God instruct him to 'rebuild my church', he gathered stones.

'With St Francis and his followers,' writes Southern, 'the fruits of the experiences of St Anselm and St Bernard were brought to the market place, and became the common property of the lay and clerical world alike.'¹ Marian devotions developed in the cloister were by Franciscan preachers made accessible to, and amplified for, ordinary, unschooled, practical men and women to whom scriptural typology and monastic allegorization meant nothing. The friars dealt with practicalities: the imitation of Christ in simplicity and poverty; the love of a Mother who shielded her children from the well deserved punishment otherwise sure to be meted out by an utterly just and often irate Father. Lay fraternities clustered around the Mendicants stressed two themes: penance and praise, above all praise of the merciful, mediating Virgin Mother.² Various miracles stories of the Virgin which had circulated but rarely been cited in the monastic world provided a cornucopia of compelling sermon illustrations for the mendicants.

It was the Franciscans who first brought the fruits of the monastic experiences of the eleventh and twelfth centuries to ordinary people. Before they came, and before preaching became an important means of spreading new ways of thought and devotion... [s]tories of the Virgin, such as those collected by the younger Anselm and many others after him, were probably told...but all but a very few--and those chiefly of Greek origin--were beneath the dignity of letters. It was the growth of new devotional practices, spreading out from the monasteries, which suddenly gave them significance and brought them into prominence; and the stories in their turn were a powerful agent in advancing the popularity of the practices to which they owed their status in the religious world.³

In his sermons Anthony of Padua (+1231) laid great emphasis on Mary's plenitude of graces and her perpetual virginity, her cooperation in human redemption, and her mediating role. In the poetry of the Umbrian friar Jacopone da Todi (+1306), the musings of generations of monks and the mendicant themes of love, penance, and poverty converge in praise of the Virgin.⁴

O gracious Queen, heal, I beg of you, my wounded heart,
Despairing, I come to you, confiding in your alone.

Without your help I am ashes.⁵

Hail Virgin, more than woman, holy, blessed Mary!

More than woman, I say: For humankind,
as Scripture teaches us, is born in sin:

In you, holiness preceded birth.

Womb-hidden, a mighty presence enfolded you
And shielded you from all contagion.

The sin that Adam sowed did not take root in you;
 No sin, great or small, has place in you.
 High above all others is your virginity and your consecration.
 Your secret virgin vow leads you
 All unaware of charity's intent
 To a wedding feast, to your spouse.⁶

In her *Meditations on the Extreme Necessity of Prayer*, the Franciscan tertiary Angela of Foligno (+1309) repeated the well-established belief that Mary had vowed virginity, and at doing so had been flooded with a divine light which allowed her 'the most perfect manifestation of who God is and who she was.'⁷ Our model in virtuous living and in prayer, the Virgin Mary has been 'adorned with privileges and virtues so unique, and with gifts so ineffable' that during her lifetime she enjoyed perpetual union with God. And 'Although she was of our corrupted flesh, she was, nonetheless, personally chosen by God the Father and adorned by him with a privilege so unique, glorious, and perfect that she never needed to be purified or freed from the penalty of sin.'⁸

At the popular level, an increasingly personal devotion to the human Christ and his loving Mother produced a proliferation of verbal and visual images of the Infant and his adoring Mother, the Crucified and his grieving Mother, the Ascended Lord with the Queen of Heaven reigning at his right hand. Christians took comfort in the hope that where Mary had gone on before them, they too might follow. In representations of Pentecost, Mary began to be depicted at the head of the apostolic band in the place traditionally left empty to represent the Spirit's presence or, in the twelfth century West, occupied by Christ,⁹ the head of the Church.¹⁰ At the scholarly level, the *logica nova* of the rediscovered Aristotle ineluctably edged out the allegorical exegesis of the patristic and monastic ages. At the ecclesiastical level, caution was expressed by silence, and until 1245 the only marian feast observed with an octave at Rome was that of the Assumption.¹¹

By creating a lay piety expressive of the age the Franciscans laid the foundations for a learned clerical piety which would build upon not only the traditional, scripturally grounded reflections of the past, but also on ideas and images formed in childhood. The handwriting was on the theological wall. The content of sermons heard during formative years, like familiarity with the liturgical cycle, influenced the questions scholars asked as adults. The form in which the responses were couched leaves no doubt that theology had entered a new age. Among the burning questions were the Immaculate Conception and the manner of the Eucharistic presence. The eucharistic question was settled officially by the IV Lateran Council in 1215; the question of the Virgin's conception lingered to raise arguments and counter arguments for centuries.

THE FRANCISCANS

Alexander of Hales (+1245) the English *Doctor Irrefragabilis* at Paris 'took the fateful step of using the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, instead of the Bible, as the basic text for his lectures on theology'¹² and holding that the Incarnation was not contingent on the Fall. When he debated Whether the Blessed Virgin had been sanctified from fault (*culpa*), he first identified, from Lombard, three opinions on the meaning of sin (*peccatum*). Some scholars make a distinction between sin (*peccatum*) and

the penalty of sin (*poena peccati*); some, using Anselm's terminology, call 'sin' the tinder of sin (*fomes peccati*); some mean by 'sin' the guilty condition contingent on that sin (*reatus ipsius peccati*). The answer to whether the Virgin had been free of sin depended on the definition of sin being used. Those using the first definition must conclude that the flesh of the Virgin was tainted by sin before and perhaps even after she conceived Christ. Those using the second, that neither her soul nor her body had been tainted. Those using the third needed to make a further distinction between person and nature: In her person, Mary was uncorrupted by sin after her first sanctification--at the angel's greeting; according to nature, after her second sanctification--the Lord's conception.¹³ Then, turning to the question whether she were sanctified from the ability to sin (*potentia peccandi*), he concluded that 'the glorious Virgin, after that sanctification which she received in conceiving her son, did not retain the ability to sin, because it had been washed away through that very sanctification which she received when the Angel said, *Hail, full of grace*'.

Bonaventure (+1274) preached twenty-seven sermons on the virtues of the Blessed Mary, in them citing Bernard of Clairvaux some four hundred times.¹⁴ Like Bernard, he taught that 'no one was immune from the guilt of original sin, save only the Son of the Virgin'.¹⁵

Matthew of Aquasparta (+1302), lector at Rome and Franciscan Minister General before being raised to the Sacred College, followed Bonaventure in teaching the Augustinian doctrine of illumination, but differed in supporting the doctrines both of the Assumption and the sinless Conception of Mary. Repeating the story of the empty tomb in the Valley of Jehoshaphat¹⁶, and pointing to scriptural prefigurations,¹⁷ he drew from her assumption the corollary conclusion that she must have been 'utterly pure, in whom there was no enticement of the flesh'.¹⁸

And in that the most Blessed Virgin Mary was full, and superfull, of grace, being the very nearest to her own Son, the font of graces, she was therefore cleansed of original guilt and sanctified before birth and preserved immune from all actual guilt, and therefore, defended and quickened, she ascended by swiftest step into heaven without any impediment.¹⁹

His conclusions, he conceded, were not expressly supported by Scripture, but they were consonant with and not contrary to Scripture, and were eminently rational because 'God was able to do these things and it was appropriate that he do them'.²⁰

THE DOMINICANS

For many years the Dominicans remained impervious to the theological reverberations of popular devotion to the Virgin. Conceding that it would have been appropriate for her to have been cleansed of original sin before bearing Christ or perhaps even before her own birth, Albert the Great nonetheless held that she, like all humanity, had been conceived in original sin, yet was 'cleansed [of it] before her birth and drawn to righteousness'.²¹ Thomas Aquinas concurred, firmly convinced on the authority of Romans 5:12, 'that all human beings, save Christ, contract original sin from Adam'.²² He considered it reasonable to hold that she had been sanctified before birth, first in the flesh, then in the

spirit,²³ but only immediately after, and not before the infusion of her rational soul,²⁴ for guilt (*culpa*) can be cleansed only through grace, and grace can be given only to a rational creature.²⁵ For Mary to have been conceived without original sin, moreover, would be inappropriate, for she would not have needed to be redeemed by Christ, and Christ would not be the universal redeemer of humankind.²⁶ In short,

If the soul of the blessed Virgin had never contracted the stain of original sin this would have diminished the dignity of Christ in his capacity as Saviour of all. But after Christ, who as universal Saviour did not need salvation, the purity of the blessed Virgin was greatest of all. . . the blessed Virgin did indeed contract original sin but was cleansed from it before her birth.²⁷

Thomas acknowledged that the Church of Rome 'tolerates the custom of certain churches' which celebrate the feast of the Conception, and while 'this celebration are on this account not entirely to be deplored', no one should infer from the liturgical feast 'that she was holy at her conception'.²⁸ While the Blessed Virgin has a special dignity that allows her to receive *hyperdulia*, rather than simple *dulia* given the saints, she had been conceived in the natural way of carnal union, by which original sin is transmitted.

Peter of Tarantaise (+1276), a Dominican colleague of Albert and Aquinas, a friend of Bonaventure, and briefly Pope Innocent V, concluded in his *Commentary on the Sentences* that the Blessed Virgin had been sanctified in the womb shortly after her conception. He arrived at this by way of a series of distinctions:

She could have been sanctified :

- (1) before conception and birth;
- (2) after conception and birth;
- (3) in conception, at the very moment of conception and birth;

and

- (4) at birth, not at conception.²⁹

If, as he deduced, the last is true, then four other possibilities exist.

Sanctification could have occurred

- (1) before her soul gave life to her body;
- (2) at the moment of animation;
- (3) immediately after animation; or
- (4) a while after animation.³⁰

Like Thomas, he rejected the possibility that sanctification could occur before there was a soul to receive sanctifying grace. Sanctification at the moment of animation was dismissed as 'inconvenient'. That sanctification had occurred a while after animation was manifestly belied by Mary's great holiness. Therefore, despite the silence of Scripture, he concluded that she must have been sanctified immediately after animation.³¹

At the end of the thirteenth century, the increasingly general, but by no means universal, opinion-- defended by Henry of Ghent (+1293) on the Anselmian, in fact Eadmerian, principle of *potuit, voluit, ergo fecit*-- was that the Blessed Virgin had been cleansed of original sin after being afflicted by it only for an instant or in passing (*in transitu*).³²

As Europe entered the 'harvest of the Middle Ages' and coped with closing frontiers, climatic changes, crop failures and epidemic disease, recourse to the loving and compassionate Mother of God took on a heightened urgency. Images of the *Pietà* proliferated. New hymns and miracle stories circulated. In the controversies over the observance of poverty, Ubertino of Casale (+1330), the leader of the Spiritual Franciscans, held Mary up as the supreme example of total poverty claiming that as soon as she could manage it, she had given away the gifts of the Magi.³³ Dante painted irresistible picture of the influence exercised throughout the universe--on earth, in purgatory, in heaven, and even in hell--by 'a noble Lady, who doth take ruth...such that high doom is cancelled for her sake'.³⁴

From Oxford at the beginning of the century came the solution to the logical knot which had impeded scholarly assent to acceptance of the Virgin's preservation from original sin. Duns Scotus (+1308), a Franciscan, an Englishman, and an ardent supporter of the immaculist position, challenged the authority of Bernard, Thomas, and Bonaventure by demonstrating the possibility of an immaculate conception. Defining original sin in Anselm's terms as 'a lack of original justice, nothing other than the lack of justice owed'³⁵, and using Anselm's rational *remota scriptura* principle, he posited an argument from perfection. Not only could God have preserved Mary from sin at her conception, but it would have been entirely appropriate for God to have done so. Mary's pre-redemption anticipated the redemption on Calvary. Far from removing her from Christ's universal redemption, it made her the first of the redeemed on earth, as she is now first in heaven. For God to have preserved her from original sin--a sin to which she, like we, did not consent--would be a more perfect redemption than would his liberating her from sin already incurred.. The most perfect Redeemer was able to redeem this way, for with God nothing is impossible; for him to redeem at least one person in this most perfect possible way. would also have been appropriate, and most appropriate that he apply this most perfect manner of redemption to the human person nearest and dearest to him, his own mother. From these premises, the Immaculate Conception follows as a necessary conclusion.³⁶ It was possible. It was appropriate. It happened.

*Potuit, decuit, ergo fecit.*³⁷

The *Doctor Subtilis* also followed Anselm in holding that Christians should to ascribe to the Virgin Mary the highest possible honor that does not contradict Scripture or tradition.³⁸ Scripture, Scotus pointed out, does not state that Mary was conceived in original sin, and while her conception without sin is not overtly taught in Holy Writ, it can be inferred and is therefore not unscriptural.³⁹ Bernard, Thomas, and even Bonaventure, who had relied overmuch on Bernard, were mistaken, as, among others, Scotus' teacher William of Ware, another English Franciscan, pointed out in recycling the stained cowl story.⁴⁰

Most, but not all, Franciscans⁴¹ quickly accepted their confrère's teaching. Peter Aurioli (+1322) articulated the rule which he claimed 'Augustine set down, that what is congruent with reason and with the special holiness and special prerogative of the most holy Entryway of God, is to be attributed to the glorious Virgin.'⁴² He used Mary's bodily incorruption and assumption as evidence for her conception without sin,⁴³ which--in the face of nine scriptural, twenty patristic, nine early scholastic, and fourteen rational arguments which he cited against it only to demolish--he considered 'utterly appropriate'.⁴⁴ With an acuity which 'surpassed the Subtle Doctor not only in depth but also in clarity,'⁴⁵ he

articulated a precise analysis of the issues which sums up, as it advanced, the increasingly complicated logic of question.

'Conception' has three meanings:

- 1) fertilization (*seminis conceptio*),
- 2) generation of the fetus before the infusion of a soul, and
- 3) the moment of animation.

The underlying cause of sin (*ratio peccatis*) is threefold:

1) concupiscence of the flesh--the restrictive Augustinian definition of original sin;

2) the privation of original justice--the Anselmian definition; and

3) the offense against God resulting from both of the above.

'Original sin' can be understood causally, materially, or formally, as

1) the libidinous sexual act (*seminis conceptio*),

2a) the privation of original justice and

b) the rebellion inseparable from the carnally pleasurable genital appetite;

3) the habitual rebellion of sensory appetite against right reason which renders the sinner displeasing, even hateful to God.

As actual sin is said to be venial or mortal, so original sin may be said to be contracted *de jure* or *de facto*. By law, all descendant of Adam are infected with original sin; but God is not bound to that or any law, and the possibility that he may *de facto* remit original sin opens the door to exception. By his absolute power God could have removed from Mary concupiscence, lack of justice, and offenses. It would have been *inappropriate* for God to chose as his Only Begotten Son's mother someone displeasing and hateful to himself.⁴⁶

The Dominicans and the Augustinians, meanwhile, continuing, for the most part, in the tradition of Thomas and Augustine, argued against Mary's sinless conception. The leading spokesman for the 'maculist' position was the Augustinian Nominalist Gregory of Rimini. (+1358).⁴⁷ In his *Commentary on the Sentences*,⁴⁸ he considered the three current arguments from authority which were adduced in favor of the Immaculate Conception--not least by William of Ware and Scotus:

1) Because Augustine excepted Mary from his discussion of original sin, he believed that she did not suffer it.⁴⁹

2) Because Anselm argued the appropriateness that Mary be adorned with purity greater than which one cannot imagine, and because the human mind can imagine a state higher than conception in original sin, the conclusion that it happened is inevitable;⁵⁰

3) Liturgically, the Church has celebrated the conception of Mary for centuries, an authorization that would never have countenanced if Mary had been under the yoke of original sin.⁵¹

Gregory rejected all three propositions and contested the probable reasons put forward by Scotus. His argument he based on Scripture--Romans 5:12: 'In Adam all have sinned'--and the consistent tradition of latin theological exegesis down the centuries :

The question is not whether it was possible for her to be conceived without such sin, but whether she was in fact conceived without it. Since in this matter certitude cannot be had through human reason, it seems to me more compelling to hold what is more consonant with Holy Scripture and the sayings of the saints. Therefore without any prejudice against a better opinion and guarding the reverence due the Mother of God, it seems that one should say that she has been conceived with original sin.⁵²

No matter how many possibilities may suggest themselves to human reason, he argued, support for them must be found in Scripture and tradition.⁵³

Against the argument of appropriateness, Gregory argued that it would have been equally appropriate for Christ to have preserved everyone from original sin in the same way, something which manifestly he did not do and which was, as Bartholomew of Pisa pointed out, a *reductio ad absurdum*.⁵⁴

Acceptance of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, moreover, seemed to him in an inversion of Scotus' position--to open the door to the doctrine of her bodily assumption. Neither Mary nor any human being, save Christ alone, is conceived 'without the bedding of parents',⁵⁵ nor therefore without original sin. All persons, save Christ, stand in need of Christ's redemption, including his Mother. 'From Gregory's point of view', writes Heiko Oberman, '... the problem is not the absence of logically compelling syllogisms but the lack of evidence for this dogma in Scripture, Church, or tradition.'⁵⁶

Gregory and the Augustinians did not convince the 'immaculists', nor did they nullify the authorities Gregory had so carefully repudiated. In the next century, official recognition was given to the pious opinion that the Blessed Virgin had been conceived without sin, and the scholarly debate continued.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION

The *via moderna* distinguished between God's ordained power--his ordinary way of doing things--, and his absolute power--his total freedom to do whatever he wills. While all human beings are ordinarily subject to original sin, God is able to except whom he will. William of Ockham (+1347) explored a number of possibilities without committing himself on the question of Mary's exemption. While he accepted Anselm's definition of original sin as a privation of justice owed, he posited that original justice was something positive 'superadded' to the human being. He distinguished between original sin as it exists (*de facto*) and as it might exist (*de possibili*)⁵⁷ and located 'original sin exclusively in the soul', ignoring 'the material consequences of Adam's sin'.⁵⁸ Original sin *de facto* could be deleted either *de facto*, by created grace, or *de possibili*. Created grace may be indivisible, in which case⁵⁹ Mary had to be conceived without sin; or divisible, in which case Mary could have remained for an instant in the state of original sin. She may or may not have suffered the 'tinder of sin' which may have been weakened in her first sanctification at the instant of her conception or at some time between conception and birth; it may have been entirely removed or diminished to insignificance at her second sanctification, at the conception of Christ.

As his authorities in defending his belief that 'the most blessed Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, was utterly preserved from any contagion of original sin',⁶⁰ and from any actual sin, Gabriel Biel (+1495) also took Augustine, Anselm, and, most compellingly, ⁶¹ the Church's authorization of the feast of her conception.⁶² Against those who speculated that, had Mary been conceived without sin, but had died before Christ's sacrificial self-offering, she would not have entered into heaven, he contended that she had been predestined from all eternity to be the Mother of God⁶³ and had been endowed with sanctifying grace at the very beginning of creation.⁶⁴ The soul of the eternal Mother of God, ⁶⁵ he argued, had been endowed with sanctifying grace not merely in the womb, but at the beginning of creation.⁶⁶ She was twice sanctified, once at her conception, and again at the Annunciation.

Preserved from original sin, Mary, as a creature, was not however spared death. Yet because the body of Christ suffered no corruption, and because he received his body from Mary, therefore her body, like his, was not subject to decay, but was assumed into heaven. As her virginity is the proximate foundation of redemption,⁶⁷ the assumption of her 'pure nature' is the pledge of our future resurrection.⁶⁸ It gives hope of resurrection to men and women who dare not hope for heaven solely because of Christ's resurrection, for his nature, unlike Mary's and unlike ours, is not purely human, but united with Divinity.⁶⁹

Having swayed many to their position with the argument from convenience (appropriateness),⁷⁰ advocates applied the further rule of comparison. The most perfect Redeemer must redeem Mary in the most perfect manner. By preserving her from original sin, God has given Mary the highest purity and honor possible to a creature. As Christ came not to be served, but to serve, so Mary came to serve. As Christ suffered on the cross, she co-suffered, cooperating in the redemption. As Christ acted/operated to save humankind, so Mary cooperated. She is Queen of Heaven, Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, and necessary to our salvation because 'we know that God does not hear sinners...so there was need for a mediatrix to the Mediator'.⁷¹

On only one limitation to her power was Biel certain: she lacked priestly authority.⁷²

Jean Gerson (+1429), on the other hand, was willing to concede she had prophetic powers.⁷³ Gerson, as Chancellor of the University of Paris, was instrumental in urging a requirement, put into force in 1449, that all masters swear to affirm the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. He held that exemption 'from original sin, in which every person born of a mother has been conceived, with the sole exceptions of our Saviour Jesus Christ and his glorious Virgin Mother' ⁷⁴ pertained to Christ by right and Mary by privilege. And it 'was appropriate that he redeem his most perfect mother; yet this he could not more suitably do than by preserving her from falling than by raising her up once fallen. This is a truth both probable and suitable....'⁷⁵

On the question of her bodily assumption, however, he recommended avoiding 'temerity' and admitting 'probable opinion',⁷⁶ and 'conjectural probability'.⁷⁷ Over this teaching, which had been celebrated and pondered since late antiquity, there was less attention and less acrimony in the late middle ages than over the question of her conception.. In Jaroslav Pelikan's words:

Two questions that had attended the doctrine of the assumption still remained unanswered: the question on her death and possible resurrection, and the related question of whether she had been assumed in body as well as soul. Theologians of quite varying positions agreed that she had in fact died before being assumed, while the chronological precedence of the resurrection of Christ before that of any of the saints made a belief in her resurrection difficult in spite of the attractiveness of the idea. Those who held to the resurrection of Mary did so in order to affirm that her assumption was also in the body; Others, less inclined to speculate, preferred to leave the latter open. The stock argument from silence, that if Mary had not been assumed also according to the body she would have left the relics of her body on earth as lesser saints had, continued to be used to support a assumption according to both body and soul . . .⁷⁸

On the question of the Virgin's Conception, the lines were clearly drawn and the arguments well rehearsed. An authoritative decision was needed. In 1439 the Council of Basil, in its thirty-sixth session, officially proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Since Rome recognized only the first twenty-two sessions of the Council as binding and considered the Council in schism by this time, only those countries which recognized the later sessions--Aragon, Germany, France, Savoy, and Switzerland--received the decision as authoritative. With a vituperation worthy of the next century, some Dominicans repudiated 'the synagogue of Satan whose diabolic first born was the definition of the Immaculate Conception'⁷⁹ and continued to dispute the teaching. In 1476, Pope Sixtus IV, a Conventual Franciscan, approved an Office and Mass for the feast and granted a special indulgence to anyone attending services on 8 December. The following year, 1477, his constitution *Cum praeclsa* [*praeexcelsa*], provided the first official encouragement of the doctrine:

We deem it fitting, and even our duty, to invite by means of indulgences and the remission of sins all the faithful of Christ to offer thanks and praise to God...for the wondrous Conception of this same Immaculate Virgin....

The Constitution was repeated in the next century by Julius II (+1513), Leo X (+1521), Pius IV (+1565), and Sixtus V (+1590) . Twice it was suggested by the Dominican and future General of the Order, Bandelli, that the pope had in fact intended to promote veneration of Mary's sanctification, not her conception.⁸⁰ Twice Sixtus corrected this deliberate misapprehension, in two bulls, both entitled *Grave Nimis*, in 1481 and 1483, and tried to quell debate by forbidding anyone to censure the celebration.. The dispute continued, however, with such acerbity that Rome forbade all debate in 1482 on pain of excommunication--and then had to repeat it in 1483 and 1503.

REFORMATION DISREGARD

The Virgin Mary, like faith, scripture, and grace, fell victim to the increasingly shrill self-defining polemics of Protestants and Catholics. Martin Luther, trained as an Augustinian and a Scripture scholar, received a formation which predisposed him to accept neither the logical arguments or the theological bases in favor of the Immaculate Conception. As an Augustinian Eremit, he had preached on both the Conception and the Assumption, but looking back later in life, he wrote

For we all know, and I was as deep in it as all the rest, that we were plainly taught to hold Mary in Christ's place and office. We held Christ to be our angry judge and Mary to be our throne of grace, where all our comfort and refuge lay, if we did not wish to despair. Was that not a horrible innovation?⁸¹

In the theology of grace and in Marian teaching, as on the subject of indulgences, Luther 'was not just denouncing the excesses of the system' but the system itself.⁸² Not only did the mounting magnification of Mary detract from the unique role of Christ, in Luther's opinion, but it robbed Christians of the very help which Mary could, in fact, provide:

For they deprive us of her example, from which we might take comfort; they make an exception of her and set her above all examples. But she should be, and herself gladly would be, the foremost example of the grace of God, to incite all the world to trust in this grace and to love and praise it, so that through her the hearts of all men should be filled with such knowledge of God that they might confidently say: O blessed Virgin, Mother of God, what great comfort God has shown us in you, by so graciously regarding your unworthiness and low estate. This encourages us to believe that henceforth He will not despise us poor and lowly ones, but graciously regard us also, according to your example.⁸³

The protesters carried their reverence for the Lord's Mother with them out of Roman allegiance, but they looked for scriptural--and, in the case of Anglicans, patristic--foundations for their understanding of her place in salvation history. Roman Catholics meanwhile took Marian devotion as one of the hallmarks of the true faith and intensified their already generous speculation on her unique role in salvation history.

In England, the occidental 'home' of the feast of the Conception and of some of its most vigorous immaculist defenders, the 'innovative doctrine' which most agitated reformers, and therefore generated the greatest flow of ink, was not the Virgin Mother's conception or afterlife, but papal plenitude of power. English churchmen quoted Bernard frequently on the insidious dangers of the roman curia, but never⁸⁴ on marian doctrine.

On the grounds of Scripture and patristic teaching, Cranmer had no difficulty in assenting to her perpetual virginity:

. . . all the said [patristic] authors prove her perpetual virginity by this text of scripture: *This door shall be still shut, and not opened for any man to go through it, but only for the Lord God of Israel; yea, she shall go through it, else shall it be shut still*' (Ezk 44). For if these and such other fathers had not judged her perpetual virginity to have been written in the scriptures, they would never have judged it to have been a thing to be believed under pain of damnation.

He was similarly ready to condemn anyone who stepped over that scriptural/patristic line.

Saint Jerome also calleth Helvidium a rash and an ungodly man, because that he taught that our Lady had other children by Joseph after Christ's birth; which doctrine he could not prove by the scriptures of God. In like manner we call all them that

preach any doctrine in the church, without the authority of God's word, both ungodly, rash, and wicked members of antichrist.⁸⁵

When the Church of England began to define itself apart from papal or puritan polemic, there were many others who also believed in Mary's perpetual virginity on the authority of the church fathers. Jeremy Taylor (+1667) specifically mentions Assumption and Immaculate Conception as erroneous roman doctrines unsupported by Scripture,⁸⁶ but John Cosin (+1672) kept the feast of her Conception, and of her Nativity, in his *Collection of Private Devotions*.⁸⁷ John Pearson, in his career Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Master of Trinity College Cambridge, and Bishop of Chester, wrote that 'We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the Mother of Our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive Church. Let her be honoured and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored'.⁸⁸

A Dean of Worcester, George Hickes, in his *Speculum Beatae Virginis. A Discourse on the Due Praise and Honour of the Virgin Mary* (1686) admired 'her singular purity and holiness' but refused to 'admit her innocence'. With a broadmindedness uncharacteristic of the era, he was willing to

acknowledge with them [Roman Catholics] her perpetual Virginity, according to ancient tradition. And if it will gain or oblige any of them, let us not oppose them in the opinion they have, that she promised and vowed her virginity to God; for it is an innocent opinion, though it is precarious and hath no ground in Scripture or Primitive Antiquity.⁸⁹

Even so, he cautioned his 'brethren of this truly Catholic and Apostolic Church of England, let us take care to keep within the bounds and limits which our pure and holy mother, after the example of the Primitive Church, hath set to the praise and honour of the Blessed Virgin' by not letting 'our respect for her commence into worship, nor romance her into a deity. . . [nor] treat her . . . as if her graces were indeed Divine attributes and «her prerogatives of grace and glory», as a late book asserts, «one and the same with those of her Son»'.⁹⁰

'Whatsoever she can think not too dishonourable to herself and her Lord and Saviour,' Joseph Hall (+1656), would 'most gladly give it to her in the full.'⁹¹ William Clagett⁹² in his 1686 *A Discourse Concerning the Worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, with an Account of the Beginnings and Rise of it amongst Christians. . .*,⁹³ also freely conceded to Mary any honor he could base in Scripture or infer from the Fathers: that she was 'blessed among women', a perpetual Virgin, and now residing in heaven; and even-rehearsing the traditions off the western Church and allowing a latitude of which Anselm might have been proud-that

if nothing at all had been said of her personal qualities in the Scriptures (as indeed there is but very little), we might have presumed without rashness that because God (Who has no less regard to a holy mind than to a pure body) would have the Mother of Our Lord to retain the purity of a Virgin, He would also choose a most holy virgin to be His Mother; and since He was pleased to send us so heavenly treasure in an earthen vessel, He would choose one of the greatest honour. For which

reason likewise we might have concluded, without other testimony, that she became afterwards a faithful disciple of her Son....Finally, from all this we cannot but conclude that she is very happy and glorious in the Kingdom of Heaven. For though we have no particular revelations concerning this, to warrant any comparisons of her state with that of Angels and Archangels, yet upon general reasons we may say with sufficient assurance that her rewards and glories in Heaven are exceeding great, and such as hold proportion, not only with her faith and patience (for as some think she suffered martyrdom), but likewise with that honour which God was pleased to confer upon her in this world.

As for scholastic argument and 'polish' preaching devoid of scriptural or patristic foundation, he stood

amazed that it should be a main design of their Catechisms to instruct youth in the worship of the Blessed Virgin; of their sermons to excite the people to put confidence in her, and to call upon her for the present occasion . . . to make at least as frequent applications to Mary as to Jesus Himself for deliverance from sins and dangers:-when not one word, not one intimation of anything, like to anything of all this, is left upon record in the writings of the evangelists and Apostles.

. . . .⁹⁴

'How ought we to reverence the blessed Virgin Mary', asked the non-juring layman Robert Nelson in his popular and widely read *Feasts of the Church of England* (1704), considered by Samuel Johnson 'a most valuable help to devotion,' and a book 'which has, I understand the greatest sale of any book ever printed in England, except the Bible'⁹⁵: To this question he gave what had by that become the quintessential Anglican answer:

By entertaining a great Opinion of her Virtue and Piety, who had the great Honour of being the Mother of the Messiah. It being reasonable to believe, that a Person chose for that Purpose was endowed with great Excellencies: And the rather because she maintained so lively a Sense of her own Unworthiness to receive so great an Honour, and when she was advanced to be the Mother of the World's Saviour, seeks no greater Title than to be stiled Handmaid of the Lord: But not to invoke her; because we are directed in Scripture to offer up all our Prayers in the Name, and thro' the Mediation of Jesus Christ only; besides, the Church of God in the three first Ages maketh no Mention of it; neither are there any Footsteps of that Practice to be found among them.⁹⁶

1. *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale, 1953) 240.

2. John V. Fleming, *An Introduction to the Franciscan Literature of the Middle Ages*. (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977) 181.

3. Southern, 255-256.

4. See John V. Fleming, *An Introduction to the Franciscan Literature of the Middle Ages*. Chicago 1977.

5. *Jacopone da Todi: The Lauds*. Translated by Erge and Elizxabeth Hughes (New York: Paulist Press, Classics of Western Spirituality, 1982) 69

6. Jacopone; 70.
7. Angela of Foligno, *The Complete Works*. Translated by Paul Lachance OFM. CWS (Paulist 1993) 238
8. Ibid.
9. Notably, after the official pronouncement of the *filioque* at the Council of Bari in 1098. See Ouspenski, n. 10
10. Leonid Ouspenski, 'Iconography of the Descent of the Holy Spirit' SVTQ 31:4 (1987), esp. 340-344. Under Western influence the Virgin also began appearing in eastern icons of Pentecost in the seventeenth century. Ouspenski argues that putting the Virgin there «switches [the] focus from dogmatic and ecclesiastiological content to historicism (based on . . . Acts 1:14)» (340), marks 'A conscious switching of the focus of the image from dogma and the Church cultus to one of individual piety with its psychologizing' (344), and :Inasmuch as the scholastic teaching of created grace breaks the connection between the divine and created world, 'allows for' . . . no interpenetration of created and uncreated Being, . . . ' 344.
11. S. J. P. Van Dijk-J. Hazeldean Walker, *The Origins of the Roman Liturgy* (London-Westminster, MD 1960) 371.
12. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. Alexander of Hales.
13. *Alexandri de Hales Summa Theologica* 4 (Quaracchi 1930) 123 = Inq. Un., Tract. II. Quaest. C. II, a. 1, resp. : si peccatum dicatur poena peccati, dicendum est quod caro Virginis ante conceptionem filii fuit obnoxia peccato, et forte post conceptionem. Et dico «obnoxietatem» necessitatem ad sustinendum poenam peccati, sicut corporales necessitates et meritem. Si vero peccatum dicatur reatus peccati, quem reatum B. Anselmus dicit carentiam debitae iustitiae sive maculam, hoc modo nec caro ipsius nec anima fuit obnoxia peccato a statu primae sanctificationis. Si vero peccatum dicatur fomes peccati, dicendum quod fomes dupliciter comparatur, ad personam vel ad naturam. Secundum quod vitiat personam, non fuit obnoxia peccato post primam sanctificationem; secundum quod comparatur ad naturam, non fuit obnoxia peccato post secundam.
14. *Mariology*, vol. 1. Juniper B. Carol OFM, ed. (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1954) 294.
15. III Sent., d.3, p.1, q.2, conc. 1 (Quaracchi 3:67)
16. Matthew of Aquasparta OFM, De assumptione I, in De assumptione BV.M. 8 sermons, *Matthaei ab Aquasparta OFM, Sermones de Beata Maria Virgine*, ed. Caelestinus Piana OFM (Quaracchi Florentiae, 1962) 184.
17. Numbers 10:11-12, 18; 3 [1] Kings 18:44; Cant 8:5, 3:6, 6:6; 2 Cor 7:1. (P.184)
18. Assumpt 1.1. (185). purissima, in qua nulla carnis illecebra
19. Assumpt 1.I.4 (Piana, 160-161): Et quoniam beatissima Virgo Maria fuit gratia plena et superplena, eo quod filio suo fonti gratiarum propinquissima, ideo sanata atque sanctificata antequam nata a culpa originali, ab/ omni culpa actuali immunis conservata, et ideo fortificata et vegetata celerrimo cursu sine omni impedimento ascendit in caelum.
20. De assumpt 1.4 (p. 177): Et licet de hoc expressa non inveniatur auctoritas, non tamen Scripturae auctoritati repugnat, sed consonat; et multiplex ratio persaudet, quoniam hoc Deus potuit facere et eum sic facere decuit.
21. *Postilla super Isaiam* 11.1; *Opera Omnia*, ed. Geyer, 19:162, 76-78 (1952): Mater enim, quamvis in originali peccato concepta sit, tamen ante nativitatem mundata ad rectitudinem deducta est.
22. STh 1.2, 8.81, a. 3: Firmiter est tenendum quod omnes homines, praeter solum Christum, ex Adam derivati, peccatum originale ex eo contrahunt.
23. STh 3a, 27, 1: Unde rationabiliter creditur quod beata Virgo sanctificata fuerit antequam ex utero nasceretur. . . prius fuit secundum carnem concepta, et postea secundum spiritum sanctificata. . The standard opinion at the time was that the soul was infused into a male child forty days after physical conception, and eighty days after a girl's conception.
24. Quodlibeta VI, q.5, a.1: Creditur enim quod cito post conceptionem et animae infusionem fuerit sanctificata.
25. STh 3a, 27, 2: . . . sanctificatio beatae Virginis non potest intelligi ante ejus

animationem, ...Culpa autem non potest emundari nisi per gratiam: cujus subjectum est sola creatura rationalis.

26. STh 3a,27, 2r: ...quocumque modo ante animationem beata Virgo sanctificata fuisset, unquam incurrisset maculam originalis culpa: et ita non indiguisset redemptione et salute quae est per Christum. . . Hoc autem est inconveniens. . . .

27. Ibid.: . . . si nunquam anima beatae Virginis fuisset contagio originalis peccati inquinata, hoc derogaret dignitati Christi, secundum quam est universalis omnium Salvator. Et ideo sub Christo, qui salvari non indiguit tanquam universalis Salvator, maxima fuit beatae Virginis puritas. . . Sed beata Virgo contraxit quidem originale peccatum, sed ab eo fuit mundata antequam ex utero nasceretur.

28. Ibid.: . . . licet Romana Ecclesia Conceptionem beatae Virginis non celebret, tolerat tamen consuetudinem aliquarum Ecclesiarum illud festum celebrantium. Unde talis celebritas non est totaliter reprobanda. Nec tamen per hoc festum Conceptionis celebratum datur intelligi quod in sua conceptione fuerit sancta.

29. In IV Sent III d.3, q.1, a.1. Cited from DTC. ante conceptum et ortum, post conceptum et ortum, in ipso conceptu et ortu, in ortus non in conceptu.

30. In IV Sent III d 3 q i a 1 : ante animationem, in ipsa animatione, cito post animationem, diu post animationem. Quoted from DTC s.v. Immaculée Conception.

31. . . non convenit tantae sanctitati ut diu morata fuerit in peccato. Ergo, videtur conveniens et pie credibilis (libet de Scriptura non habeatur) ut cito post animationem, el ipsa die vel hora (quamvis non ipso momento) fuerit sanctificata.

32. Cited from A. di Lella, 'The Immaculate Conception in the writings of Peter Aureoli', *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955) 147, which cites C. Balié, 'De Immaculata Virginis Conceptione adimadversiones historico-theologicae', *Acta Orginis Minorum* 72 (1953) 281-282/

33. *Super tribus sceleribus Damasci*, Archivum Franciscanum historicum 101:124; *Arbor vitae crucifixae Jesu* 2.5; ed. Charles T. Davis, *Ubertino de Casale. Arbor vitae crucifixae Jesu*. Rpt. Turin 1961, pp. 103, 443. -cited from Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma, The Christian Tradition.*, 4.

34. *Hell*, 194, trans. Dorothy L. Sayers, Penguin 1949.

35. *Op. Oxon* 4, d.1, q.6. For *justitia*, I have used the literal 'justice' rather than the more usual reformation term 'righteousness'.

36. *Ox III* d.3, q.1, n.4.

37. Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 287: 'Since the days of Duns Scotus, the generally accepted procedure was to ask first whether the Immaculate Conception was possible, then whether it was suitable, and finally whether it had in fact happened in this way.' Cf. Richard O'Brien, *Catholicism* (Minneapolis 1981) 875.

38. Scotus, *Ox III* d 3 q 1 contra 2

39. *Ox III*, d.3, q.1, n.10.

40. William of Ware, *Quaestiones*, Bibliotheca Franciscana scholastica medii aevi. 3:3,9.

41. See Ignatius Brady, 'The Development of the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in the Fourteenth Century after Aureoli', *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955) 175-202, esp. 184-186 (Oxford), 186-194 (Paris).

42. *Nondum* 4: Illud igitur secundum regulam, quam hic dat Augustinus, attribuendum est virgini gloriosae, quod congruit rationi ac tantae sanctitati ac tantae praerogativae sanctissimae aulae Dei.

43. *Tractatus de conceptione BVM and Repercussorium editum contra adversarium innocentiae Matris Dei*. See A. di Lella, 'The Immaculate Conception in the writings of Peter of Aureoli', *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955) 146-158.

44. Tract 4, BFS 3:54-55: decentissimum .

45. A. Teetaert, 'Un grand docteur Marial franciscain, Pierre d'Auriol', *Etudes Frnciscaines* 39 (1927) 363-cited by di Lella, 158.

-
46. This very superficial summary of his very complex argument is taken from di Lella's article (note 43).
47. His general augustinian line as also taken by Giles of Rome and Albert of Padua. Oberman, 288.
48. Par III d 3 q 1 n 3, 7; Ox. III d 3 q 1 contra 1. His works and those of Gabriel Biel are cited from Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge: Harvard 1963) .
49. Gregory, II Sent d 30-33 q 2 art 1. Augustine, *De natura et gratia* 36.42; PL 44:267
50. II Sent d 30-33 q 2 art 1 secundum.-cited by Oberman, 287.
51. II Sent d 30-33 q 2 art 1. (Oberman, 287)
52. II Sent d 30-33 q 2 art 1....non queritur an fuerit possibile eam concipi sine tali peccato. Sed an de facto fuerit sine illo concepta; cum de hoc per humanam rationem certitudo haberi non possit, in hac parte id potius tenendum mihi videtur quod magis consonum est sacre scripture et dictis sanctorum; et ideo abque preiudicio melioris sententie et salva semper reverentia matris dei dicendum mihi videtur eam fuisse cum originali peccato conceptam.
53. II Sent, d.30-33, q,2, art 1: Ad secundam rationem quicquid sit de maiore, dico ad minorem quod oppositum habetur ex Scriptura in suo antecedenti et in dictis aliorum sanctorum, ut supra probatum est.
54. Quadragesimale de contemptu mundi 37 (1498) L7v-cited from Pelikan 4:
- 55..II Sent d 30-33 q 2 art 1: constat quod nec beata virgo nec aliquis homo alius preter Christum conceptus est sine concubitu parentum...
56. Oberman, 297.
57. *Quodlibeta, Quodl. III, q. 9*; ed. E. M. Buytaert, 'The Immaculate Conception in the Writings of William of Ockham', *Franciscan Studies* 10 (1950)151, discussion on 153.
58. Buytaert, 153. What follows is taken entirely from this article, which extends from p.149-163.
59. Buytaert 157: 'on this point the ideas of Ockham, or at least their expression, are not sufficiently clear',
60. III Sent, d.3, q.1, art. 2: Beatissima genetrix Dei Virgo Maria ab omni originalis peccati contagio fuit penitus praeservata.
61. III Sent, d. 3, q. 1, art 2 G: Sufficiunt igitur auctoritas et ecclesie determinatio.
62. III Sent, d.3, q. 1, art 2 G: . . . ecclesia statuit festum conceptionis. . . celebrandum, ergo eius conception fuit sancta, et per consequens de peccato immaculata, ergo sine [peccato] originali cum conceptio passiva non potuit peccato actuali maculari.
63. III Sent, d. 3, q. 1, art 2: Cum ergo Christus potuit matrem ab inhonoratione peccati que utique maxima est preservare, credendum est eum hoc omnimodis fecisse; nec impedit quod concepta nondum mater fuit quia quod nondum fuit inhibitione semper fuit in eterna predestinatione, nec enim temporaliter sed ab eterno in matrem Dei electa est.
64. Sent III I H: Fuit quoque anima eius necdum in utero sed in creationis principio sanctificata per gratiam sibi concreatam.
65. III Sent d 3 q 1 art 2: nec impedit quod concepta nondum mater fuit quia quod nondum fuit inhibitione semper fuit in eterna predestinatione, nec enim temporaliter sed ab eterno in matrem dei electa est. III Sent, d. 3, q. 1, art 2I: Nec sequitur quod si fuisset defuncta ante mortem Christi intrasset regnum caelorum....
66. S III 1H: Fuit quoque anima eius nedum in utero sed in creationis principio sanctificata per graiam sibi concreatam
67. Fundamentum proprium .
68. S III 18J: Quamvis enim scimus corpus domini corruptionem videre non potuisse;

quin unitum est deitati quod in nullo alio homine invenitur, idcirco nequaquam tantam spei sumimus fiduciam nostre resurrectionis future, quantam ex resurrectione virginis que puram habuit humanam naturam, i.e. deitati hypostatice non unitam.

69. III 25A: Gaudeamus...quoniam in eius assumptione nostram exaltationem certissimam intuemur: . . . cum nostram naturam puram in virgine Maria super omnes angelorum ordines fideliter credimus elevatam. Et quidem precessit natura nostra in Christo domino, sed non in se subsistens quinimo deitati in verbo hypostatice unita. Neque christus enim homo purus sed homo deus ad dexteram patris regnat omnipotentis. Quomodo enim hoo terra et pulvis, de terrestri paradisco extrusus, ad celestem adspirare auderet si non in aliquo suam naturam puram precessisse cognosceret?

70. The Carmelite John Baconthorpe (+1348) changed his opinion in favor of an immaculate conception on the authority of Anselm after reading Eadmer's treatise.

71. Biel, S III 22 I: Scimus quod peccatores deus non exaudit...Opus ergo erat mediatrice ad mediatorem.

72. Lect 4B: ...et si in gratie plenitudine creaturas supergrediatur universas, gerarchis hamen cedit ecclesie in commissi mysterii executione.

73. On the basis of Joel 2:28: 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy'. Sermon 247; ed. Glorieux, Jean Gerson. *Oeuvres complètes*. 10 vols. (Paris 1960-1973) 5:523-524.

74. Gerson, Ep 56 to Jean Bassandi, prior of the Celestines. (Glorieux 2:266)..veritas: Christus praeservando matrem suam ab originali non ob hoc dedit dignitatem aequalem sibi ipsi, etiam secundum humanitatem viatricem. Ratio: quia nunquam Christus habuit necessitatem originale peccatum contrahendi quia non descendit per naturalem propagationem; propterea ratio sumpta ex hac aequalitate quod Maria contraxit originale prorsus est invalida; . . .

75. Ibid. . . . decuit quod matrem perfectissime redimeret; hoc autem non potuit convenientius fieri quam praeservando ne caderet potius quam jam lapsam relevaret. Veritas haec probabilis est et propria; . . .

76. Gerson, Ep 56; Glorieux 2:269.

77. Gerson, Sermon 232; Glorieux 3:344.

78. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)*, p. . 43.

79. De Turrecremata, *Tractatus de veritate conceptionis*, p. xiii c 18, ed B. Spina et (De) Cataro OP (Rome 1547) 276-quoted at second hand by Oberman, p. 285.

80. Shea, *Mariology*, vol. 1., ed. Juniper B. Carol (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1954) 20, without specific reference.

81. Exhortation to All Clergy, trans . LW Spitz *Luther's Works*, edit Lewis W. Spitz (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press 1960) 34:27.

82. William C. Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence* (Louisville:Westminster, 1996) 41.

83. Commentary on the Magnificat: trans A.T.W. Steinhaeuser; *Luther's Works*. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. (St Louis: Concordia 1955).

84. To the best of my present knowledge.

85. Thomas Cranmer, *A Confutation of Unwritten Verities*, 10. *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thoams Cranmer*, John Edmund Cox, ed. Cambridge: Parker Society, 1846.

86. Dissuasive from Popery. **

87. John Cosin. *A Collection of Private Devotions*, ed. P. G. Stanwood with Daniel O'Connor (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 31.

88. *An Exposition of the Creed* (1659)-cited from Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross, *Anglicanism* (London SPCK 1962), 538.

89. More-Cross, 540.

90. More-Cross, 540.

91. *Sacred Polemics I: No Peace with Rome*-cited from More-Cross, 555.

-
92. Rector of Farnham Royal in Buckinghamshire, .
93. London 1686 (More-Cross, 535-6)
94. More-Cross, 535-536.
95. Boswell's Life of Johnson (Oxford 1927) 1:667.
96. *Feasts and Fasts of the Church of England*: Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin
(1826 edition.).