

A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE IN MARIOLOGY

WILLIAM J. MCGARRY, S.J.

CAMPION HOUSE

New York, N. Y.

- I. THE PRINCIPLE IN PATRISTIC SOURCES
- II. THE PRINCIPLE AMONG THE SCHOOLMEN
- APPENDIX: MARIAN EPITHETS
(To follow)
- III. SUAREZ' USE OF THE PRINCIPLE
- IV. CONCLUSIONS AND EVALUATIONS

THE principle to be discussed has been quoted often in the words of Saint Anselm, and for convenience we may refer to it as his. In his form it reads, "Decens erat ut ea puritate qua sub Deo major nequit intelligi Virgo illa niteret."¹ Some brief account of the origin and use of this axiom is here intended with a view to set out emphatically how large, and yet too unnoticed, a place it has in Mariology. Again, it is hoped that the historical review, necessarily summary, will encourage professors of the theology of Our Lady to be no less bold than their patristic and scholastic ancestors in applying the principle.

The extensive use of the principle in the writings of Suarez deserves treatment while at the same time it suggests that audacity in deriving conclusions from the principle must be cautious. Hence, after the historical review, some analysis and reformulation of the axiom seem called for, as well as a discussion of the theological note attaching to it. Throughout, emphasis is to be laid upon the dynamic characteristics of Catholic tradition in the applications of the principle. It will be seen that the Anselmian principle has played a tremendously important part in the past and present theology of Our Lady. It should play a part in future discussions.

¹*De conceptu virginali*, c. 18; ML 158, 451: In the *Mariologia* of Father Merkelbach, O.P. (Desclée, de Brouwer, 1939, pp. 72-74) the principle is discussed under the wording, "De Maria numquam satis." Apart from these pages the writer knows of no theoretical discussion of the axiom *in extenso*, though all theologians apply it in several theses of Mariology.

THE PRINCIPLE IN PATRISTIC SOURCES²

The headings in Mariology from which the principle developed and which in turn the principle developed are Mary's Divine Maternity, her plenitude of Grace, and in a lesser degree, her dignity as Queen of angels and of men. That Mary is the second Eve may be said to be the first principle of Mariology in the historical order, because of the text of Genesis and of the ante-Nicene notice of the Eve-Mary contrast in Justin; some claim that this is a first principle of Mariology ontologically.³ But it seems that this contrast has not been operative directly or largely in developing Saint Anselm's principle, though indirectly Saint Thomas emphasized a phase of it—the similarity between Christ and His Mother. For, akin to the conjunction suggested in *Adam: Christ::Eve:Mary* is the statement that Christ and Mary are similar⁴ in many respects (though, of course, immensely different) and have similar effects on others.⁵ This statement of likeness is but another phase of the thought which prevails in the Greek Fathers, namely, that Mary is most close to God, a point which was very influential in developing the principle of Anselm.

²Since the purpose of this essay is to emphasize in the history of the principle only those features which will aid the eventual analysis and reformulation, extensive quotation from the Fathers may be omitted. This omission is all the more justified since we have Passaglia's statement that the principle is, in a sense, an expression of the mind of the Fathers. In his *De Immaculato Dei parae Semper Virginis Conceptu Commentarius* (Naples, 1855) on the first page following the Prolegomena, (Sect. 1; Vol. I., p. 15), Passaglia sets out as "a Patribus praeformatum et ab iisdem constantissime traditum," the axiom in the form in which it was proposed by Benedict Plazza (1677-1761) in his *Causa Immaculatae Conceptionis SS. Matris Dei Mariae*. Passaglia cites it as follows: "privilegium sive donum ad gratiam gratum facientem pertinens, et ad majorem animae sanctitatem, perfectioremque cum Deo unionem conducens, quod in aliquem servum Dei novimus esse collatum, Dei Genetrici negare non debemus."

³F. H. Schüth, "Mediatrice," (1925) p. 73 ff., with a claim that Scheeben and Billot agree.

⁴In general this likeness is moral, but occasionally the similarity of bodily (facial) features is mentioned, as in Suarez, (XIX, 15, Ed. Berton). All authors imply and many expressly state that they mean "similar" and not "equal."

⁵Thus Saint Ambrose conceives that mere nearness to and familiarity with Mary is a factor of Saint John's more penetrating theology, "Non miror prae caeteris (S. Joannem) locutum esse divina mysteria cui praesto erat aula caelestium sacramentorum." *De Instit. Virginum*, c. VII (ML 16, 233).

Obviously the privilege of being the Mother of God is, like the mystery of the Incarnation itself, beyond man's power to plumb or express. The epithets found in all writers betray their valiant yet fumbling attempts to say out adequately Mary's exaltation.⁶ In attempting to describe this dignity, every form of the rhetorical *locus topicus* was exhausted, and the principle itself that Mary possesses the highest possible purity comes under the head of comparison. For as it stands in Anselm it alludes to the sanctity of other creatures. There are also expressions of the axiom with and without the comparison, some of which may be advantageously set out for the purpose of approaching a study of the principle itself.

Saint Athanasius speaks of Mary's supereminent glory, and even calls her *theioeides* (god-like). He suggests that we can measure the place of Mary by considering that holy children reflect back honor upon their parents; Christ's Divine honor is thrown back upon His Mother.⁷ The Latins too exalt Mary above comparison though I cannot cite so bold an expression as *theioeides*. Saint Augustine premises that in the question of sin all mention of Mary is to be omitted. "Unde enim scimus quod ei plus gratiae collatum fuerit ad vincendum ex omni parte peccatum quae concipere et parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum."⁸ Saint Gregory the Great, commenting on the "Mount Ephraem" of First Samuel, asks, "Annon mons sublimis Maria, quae ut conceptionem aeterni Verbi pertingeret, meritorum verticem supra omnes angelorum choros usque ad solium Dei erexit. . . . Altitudo Mariae supra omnes sanctos refulsit."⁹ Petrus Chrysologus

⁶Passaglia (op. cit., Vol. I., p. 33-224) has a section called "Virginis Apposita." His point is to argue for the Immaculate Conception from the Patristic epithets of Our Lady. The pages serve equally well to show the support of the Anselmian principle which is found in the Fathers. Even a list of the adjectives, singly with the Greek article (*antonomasia*) and in combining forms with *pan*, *hyper*, and *panyper*, is sufficient support of the axiom, "De Maria numquam satis." A selected list of these epithets will be found in the Appendix.

⁷Fragments on Saint Luke's Gospel, MG 27, 1394.

⁸*De Natura et Gratia*, c. 36, ML 44, 267.

⁹ML 79, 25.

presents an initial form of the principle which grows out of the above patristic expressions: "Quia singulis gratia se est largita per partes, Mariae simul se totam dedit gratiae plenitudo."¹⁰

Similar passages in praise of the Mother of God number up into the thousands in the preaching, the scriptural commentaries, and the liturgy of the early Church.¹¹ It will suffice, since no direct study of Patristic Mariology is intended, to note the general tendency of these praises; it is to exalt the Mother of God, to confer on her all possible privileges, and to assert that any Grace which God gave men or angels, He also gave to Mary. Such phrases as "treasury, abyss, ocean, of Graces" occur, and their bearing is clear even when many of their implications are not. In general, however, it will not be illogical to conclude that they say implicitly all that is stated in the principle. But it will be recalled that the vast bulk of these phrases is used in passages where there is no question of theological analysis or the refutation of heresy; they belong mostly to homiletic and devotional, not theological literature.

Theological discussion about Our Lady's Assumption began as early as the ninth century. The principle has always been a feature of such discussion, the argument running that if God providentially saw to it that the relics of other saints were preserved, He could not have omitted to do so in Mary's case, had her body not been transported gloriously to heaven. This argument impinged even on the mind of those who doubted the Assumption. Pseudo-Hieronymus (saec. 9) illustrates the attitude of one who is reluctant to admit the certainty of the Assumption because it is contained in an apo-

¹⁰*Sermon on the Annuntiation*, ML 52, 583. This phrase, or a modification of it is found also in Methodius and Pseudo-Hieronymus. It passed from these writers to the medieval schoolmen and was frequently cited.

¹¹It may be recalled that the Second and Third Nocturns which are read during the Feast of the Immaculate Conception form a very abundant *Mariale*; the selections from the Fathers are carefully made and the expressions in the Bull of Pius IX are the quintessence of Patristic thought on Our Lady.

cryphon and he fears theological difficulties here; yet he is cautious too not to deny the doctrine of the Assumption, for the argument from the principle strikes him.

In the Patristic period the implicit statements of the principle bear upon the intensity and exaltation of the Graces of Mary. The distinction between intensive and extensive phases of Grace is not made, although here and there specific applications show that the writers are ready to assert of Mary any grace which is found in other creatures. Especially are the features of holy persons and things in revealed history asserted of the Mother of God, and in a more excellent way. Sufficient illustration of this may be found in the homily of Saint Germanus which is read in the third nocturn of the feast of the Immaculate Conception, in which the Old Testament is searched for analogies to Mary. Other homilies used during the octave bear out the same point (cf. especially those of Saints Epiphanius and Tarasius), but to be impressed with the incredibly wide range of the use of scriptural accommodation or typology, one must turn to Passaglia who devotes some 360 pages to biblical references to Our Lady.¹²

One remarkable feature of the Patristic usage may be pointed out. It is nearly always taken for granted that statements exalting the Mother of God never need defense. The fact of the Divine Maternity and the bearing of Gabriel's salutation are sufficient proofs, and innumerable contexts indicate that one or the other, often both, features are present in the writers' minds. The principle is predominantly a devotional, ascetical and homiletical motivating force, but it is nonetheless regarded as a genuinely correct principle of the true Faith. No direct theological analysis was brought to bear on it, and oftentimes apart from the context it might seem to have led to loosely phrased conclusions. But when we read that God exhausted the Divine armory of privileges, or that no possible gift was denied Mary, and similar statements,

¹²Op. cit. I, 313-680.

it is clear that the writers have in mind, not the infinite range of possible privileges and gifts, but that field of possible gifts which befitted the Mother of God. Moreover, it is to be noted about these hyperbolic expressions of Mary's exaltation that they did not lead to heresy (and the possibility of the protection of the *interemptrix haereseon* is not to be ruled out here); the Fathers plainly put Our Lady in a place of honor beneath that of her Son. Thus, Saint Ambrose sets out the superior place of Mary over the saints and at the same time suggests that she was redeemed separately and before other men: "Nec mirum, si Dominus redempturus mundum, operationem suam inchoavit in Maria, ut per quam salus omnibus parabatur, eadem primum fructum saltis hauriret ex pignore."¹³

THE PRINCIPLE IN THE SCHOLASTIC WRITERS

The outstanding features about the principle as it appears in the writings of the schoolmen are that they subscribed to it unanimously and, until Scotus, almost as unanimously denied that an argument could be drawn from it for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.¹⁴ Let us throw the argument into the following form: "All that God could possibly and fittingly confer on Mary, He conferred. But He could fittingly confer on her the privilege of the Immaculate Conception. Therefore." All the schoolmen admitted the major; the preponderant number of the better known among them denied the minor, and principally for the reason that such a privilege derogated from the universal salvation wrought by Christ or was an invasion upon privileges peculiar to the Sacred Humanity. The theologians admitted

¹³ML 15, 1559.

¹⁴"Almost as unanimously," because many of the less well known writers contended for the doctrine and used the Anselmian principle in proof of it, and because many still claim that Saint Thomas did not deny the doctrine. The minor celebrities of the middle ages who persevered in proclaiming the doctrine and spreading the devotion were certainly the *vox populi Dei* in this case. For the standpoint of the less well known writers, consult the letter of Nicholas of Saint Albans, ML 202, 626. For an excellent account of the doctrine of Nicholas, confer "The Immaculate Conception in the writings of Nicholas of St. Albans," by P. F. Mildner, O.S.M. [*Marianum* 2 (Apr. 1940) 2, 173-192].

the general principle and denied a specific application of it. Such a denial was an implicit restriction of the principle itself, and as such is to be welcomed; for as it stood the axiom needed to be formulated more precisely.¹⁵

Thus, Saint Anselm, while formulating one of the strongest of theological arguments for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, does not allude to it either in the *Cur Deus Homo*, or in the *De Conceptu Virginali*, in which he stated that "decens erat ut ea puritate qua sub Deo major nequit intelligi Virgo illa niteret."¹⁶ Yet he can arrive at very much less important statements by an argument from the principle, as he does in common with other writers.

Saint Bernard cries out at the novelty of the feast of the Immaculate Conception, yet in the same page admits "quod vel paucis mortalium constat fuisse collatum, fas certe non est suspicari tantae virgini esse negatum,"¹⁷ and elsewhere, and substantially in a thousand passages, "quem vere amavit, *prae omnibus* ornavit."¹⁸ Here one might ask Saint Bernard to be more conscious of his own *prae omnibus*. But if he refused to allow the extraordinary Grace, because not even "to a few" had been given the privilege, later schoolmen might be expected to take account that probably both angels and men had been created in Grace and that Mary might have a similar Grace, even though a daughter of Adam.¹⁹

The systematic theology concerning our Lady began with the writers of the "Sentences." Peter Lombard has his very

¹⁵For instance, the grace of the priesthood, strictly understood, is one which God *could* confer on Mary; it is also one for which arguments could be drawn to show its *fittingness*, were it a fact. But it was not conferred on Mary formally. A brief but complete brochure on Mary's priesthood was written by R. P. Edouard Hugon, O.P., *Le Vierge-Priêtre*, in 1911. Even here we see the principle operating in the words of Saint Antonine; "Licet autem beata Virgo Maria sacramentum ordinis non receperit, quiddam tamen dignitatis vel gratiae in ipso confertur, de hoc plena fuit." These words which occur in the Saint's commentary on the Third Part are included substantially in the prayer to Mary the Virgin-Priest, approved by Pius X. Cf. Hugon, l. c. p. 10, 36.

¹⁶ML 158, 451.

¹⁷Epist. 174, ML 182, 334.

¹⁸ML 183, 438.

¹⁹A friendly critic informs me that Prevostin of Cremona (after Saint Bernard's time) was probably the first to hold that the Angels were *created* in grace.

brief treatise on Mary in the Third Distinction of the Third Part [Migne, PL. 171, or the Quaracchi edition], and this fixes the reference of the writings of the schoolmen who commented on him. Here Lombard fixed in theology for some centuries the argument for our Lady's sanctification in the womb from the examples of Saint John the Baptist and Jeremias. He concludes to a similar privilege in Mary's case, "cum credendum sit ei collatum quidquid conferri potuit." Lombard made no further explicit use of the axiom. Alexander of Hales follows the Master, and phrases the principle, "quod potuit ei boni conferri, est ei collatum." Saint Bonaventure, in his comment on Lombard, has the principle, but denies the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception: elsewhere he expresses the axiom strongly: "perfectiones omnes, in caeteris rebus divisae et distributae, in Virgine beata excellentiori modo congregatae sunt; omnia flumina intrant in mare, et mare non redundat."²⁰

Saint Albertus Magnus sets out the axiom emphatically twice. In his book *De Beata Maria*, he goes a step beyond others: "Principium ex terminis per se notum est: Virgini perfectius collatas omnium sanctorum gratias."²¹ The terms are the Divine Maternity, simply as a fact and a relation, and the Divinity of the Son, as the principle and source of all Grace. Again, he writes "Filius infinitat bonitatem matris; infinita bonitas in fructu infinitam quamdam adhuc ostendit in arbore bonitatem."²² This passage is reflected in the vocabulary of Saint Thomas in the *Summa*.

Saint Thomas gave the impetus to a wider use of the principle in his comment on the Lombard and in the *Summa*. He used it principally in discussing the sanctification of Mary in the womb and her vow of virginity. In dealing with the sanctification of Mary in the comment on Lombard's Third Distinction, he amplifies the principle. "Plus gratiae collatum est Virgini quam alicui sanctorum." "Non est dubitandum

²⁰*De laudibus virginis*, c. 7.

²¹Cc. 69-71. As far as I know this is the first attempt to analyze the principle.

²²*Mariale super Missus est*, qu. 197.

hoc (sc. sanctificari in utero) multo excellentius matri Dei collatum fuisse."²⁸ In a third reference to the principle on the same topic, Saint Thomas makes an advance in marking out the dynamic feature of the axiom and its operativeness in the matter of scriptural exegesis. "Quamvis sanctificatio Virginis in utero expresse in scripturis veteris et novi testamenti non legatur, tamen pro certo haberi potest ex his quae ibi leguntur." Here he refers to Jeremias and Saint John the Baptist.

The Angelic Doctor advances over Lombard in extending the theses to be derived from the axiom. Thus in his comment he further defines Mary's sanctification as including an exemption from mortal and venial sin; he marks out more clearly the restraint and the extinction of concupiscence in her case; he notes her privilege of not stirring others' concupiscence by her beauty. Again, Lombard in his Fourth Book, Distinction 30, touches on the marriage of Joseph and Mary, yet without mention of the principle. Saint Thomas discusses here the virginity of Mary, her vow, the congruity of an annuntiation, the dignity of the angel sent, the fact that Mary merited *de congruo* that the Incarnation be effected through her. For all these points the principle is invoked, generally in a very brief form such as, "in matre Dei debet esse omnis perfectio," or "in beata Virgine Maria debuit apparere quidquid perfectionis fuit."

In only two cases in the Comment on the Sentences does Aquinas deny an inference derived from the principle. The first concerns a question which no longer is pertinent since the passing of medieval biology. According to the theories then accepted the male agent only was an active principle of generation; the female was passive and merely supplied the

²⁸This *multo excellentius* of Aquinas was later developed in the Dominican school in the way of noting the intensity and extent of Mary's Graces. Since the school, before Trent, did not hold the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, the *multo excellentius* could eventually be brought to declare a sanctification of Mary *almost immediately after* the infusion of her soul. Thus Didacus Deza, O.P., holds that Mary was under Original Sin "per unum tantummodo instans." The same doctrine is found in Aegidius Romanus.

matter to be vivified. Certain (unnamed) writers contended in Saint Thomas' time that Mary had the exceptional privilege of being an active principle of generation in the conception of the Sacred Humanity. Saint Thomas denies that an exception is postulated in this case out of honor due to our Lady.²⁴ The long discussion of the point might at first glance seem a page of theological biology which can be passed over now. But its thorough treatment of the data of science in their relation to doctrine is a model of methodology. Further, it may be noted that Aquinas here brings to bear on scientific data ontological considerations. Apart from their specific validity, the general validity of so doing is wrongfully denied by some today.

The other instance in the Comment concerns the Immaculate Conception, and while not prejudicing the dispute whether or not the Angelic Doctor held or rejected the doctrine in general or in other passages or writings, the passage in the comment on Lombard's Third Distinction is a clear denial.²⁵ It is cited here to emphasize the fact that after Aquinas a very influential controlling force of the applicability of Anselm's principle was the consideration that certain prerogatives were peculiar to Christ as Man. "Dicendum quod sanctificatio beatæ Virginis non potuit esse decenter ante infusionem animæ, quia gratiæ capax nondum erat, sed nec etiam in ipso instante infusionis, ut scilicet per gratiam tunc sibi infusam conservaretur ne culpam originalem incurreret. Christus enim hoc singulariter in humano genere habet ut redemptione non egeat quia caput nostrum est, sed omnibus convenit redimi per ipsum. Hoc autem esse non potuit, si alia anima inveniretur quæ

²⁴In 3, dist. 3, qu. 2, art. 1, corp.

²⁵Father Merkelback, O.P. (*Mariologia*, pp. 127-130) notes that the opinion of Saint Thomas has been disputed since the 16th century, and even among the Dominican theologians. He sets down his own excellently argued view as probable, under three headings: a) Aquinas does not refute or deny the Immaculate Conception as it is defined by the Church; b) neither does he affirm it, making no distinction in dealing with this question between "peccatum et ejus debitum," nor between "prioritatem naturæ et temporis"; c) he holds the common opinion of his times and of his school (the Parisian) and defends it as more probable, not as demonstrated.

numquam originali macula fuisset infecta, et ideo nec beatae Virgini nec alicui praeter Christum hoc concessum est."²⁶

In the *Summa* the use of the axiom does not differ greatly from that of the *Comment* on Lombard. But in the later treatise Saint Thomas emphasizes the check whereby undue extension of the principle is restrained, namely, "ea quae sunt propria Christi non sunt alteri tribuenda."²⁷ Yet along with this precautionary principle, Saint Thomas also has one which is provocative, a better formulation of the patristic assertion of Mary's propinquity to God. "Quanto aliquid magis appropinquat principio in quolibet genere, tanto magis participat effectum illius principii."²⁸ Thus, Mary's concupiscence, restrained since her first sanctification, was extinguished at the Nativity of Christ, "ut Filio conformaretur."²⁹ On the other hand Mary did not have the use of free will permanently before her birth, for this was a singular privilege of Christ.³⁰

It may well be said that in emphasizing this deterrent, as it were, in the use of the principle, Saint Thomas made a real contribution. He called explicit attention to the privileges of the Humanity of Christ. Certainly, former statements that our Lady is near God, or next below God, included the God-Man and the Sacred Humanity. But Saint Thomas made

²⁶This passage has been cited frequently to show that Saint Thomas did not admit the doctrine. In the *Summa* (3, qu. 27) the words *in ipso instante* do not occur, and certainly the passage is not so clear a rejection of the doctrine as that cited above. However, it is to be noted that in the *Summa*, the same two reasons which favor the rejection of the doctrine (the universality of Christ's redemption and the peculiar privileges of the Sacred Humanity) are cited to reject "sanctificationem quomodocumque ANTE animationem." But obviously this is not the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The clearest text in favor of the doctrine is in Aquinas' comment on Lombard's 44th Distinction, and is conjoined with the principle, "Puritas intenditur per recessum a contrario, et ideo potest aliquid creatum inveniri quo nihil purius esse potest in rebus creatis, si nulla contagione peccati inquinatum sit, et talis fuit puritas beatae Virginitatis quae a peccato originali et actuali immunis fuit." The reason why these words do not settle the question of Saint Thomas' opinion is his omission to state in this context that Mary's immunity from original sin is only conceptually subsequent to her existence.

²⁷3, qu. 27, art. 5, 1.

²⁸Ibid. art. 5.

²⁹Ibid. art. 3.

³⁰Ibid. art. 6.

this truth more noticeable in arguing to Mary's honors out of the principle. At the same time, in balance, he noted the similarity (not equality) in certain privileges which belonged to our Lady through our Lord.

There is suggested evidence that the contenders for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception were not phrasing their definitions too clearly; otherwise, why do we meet in so many treatises as in Aquinas', the discussion of a sanctification of our Lady *before her animation*? There is also evidence that they were using the Anselmian principle as a major premise. For the schoolmen who developed the principle beyond earlier usage had to write it occasionally among their objections, and while admitting it as a major, denied the inference from it and pointed out that Christ's unique privileges as Man precluded consideration of an immunity from Original Sin in Mary. But this situation is but an emphatic approval of the principle itself and an indication of its theological value, permanence, and inclusion among the very fundamental axioms of Mariology. And so, all the more is the theological value of the principle sustained when we note a writer, Petrus de Palude, O.P., (14th cent.) attempting to seize it for his own position against the Immaculate Conception. Certainly, he says, Mary could be preserved from Original Sin, "sed non deuit, nec factum est. Et quod dicit Anselmus pro nobis est. Deuit enim ut puritas matris esset sub puritate Christi Dei, qui non contraxit originale, nec commisit actuale, quod fit per hoc quod mater actuale non commisit sed originale contraxit."³¹ It cannot be said that the argument drawn out of the axiom for the Immaculate Conception impressed the theologians of the Dominican school between the time of Aquinas and Trent. But at least it had the effect of making them push back the hour of Mary's sanctification in the womb towards the moment of animation until eventually Deza and Aegidius Romanus were asserting

³¹Comment on the Lombard, in 3, d. 3, qu. 1.

that there was a lapse of merely an instant between the infusion of the soul and its reception of sanctifying grace. I remark this to emphasize the dynamic feature of the axiom in Marian theology.

Scotus turned the thought of the Franciscan school in this matter. His comment on Lombard's Third Distinction made beautiful use of the principle, doubling it and applying it both to Christ and Mary. First, as perfect Mediator Christ should have the most perfect act of mediatorship. But in the case of no human being should there be a more perfect act of mediatorship than in the case of Mary. But in respect of Original Sin, she can have differed from others only in this that she was *preserved*. This conclusion is only tentatively drawn. For this mediatorship could have been exercised in one of three possible ways, one of them, the Immaculate Conception. "Quod autem horum trium quae ostensa sunt possibilis factum sit, Deus scit. Si auctoritati Ecclesiae vel auctoritati Scripturarum non repugnet, videtur probabile quod est excellentius tribuere Mariae." Here we notice a willingness to go as far as possible in drawing out conclusions from the principle, providing the Church and the Scriptures do not restrain one. Following Scotus, the Franciscan writers applied the axiom frequently in the support of the doctrine.

(To be continued)



APPENDIX: MARIAN EPITHETS

The following epithets, applied by the Greek Liturgy or in writings of the Greek Fathers to Our Lady illustrate the tendency of the oriental tradition which supports the Anselmian principle. The list is made out of Passaglia's work on the Immaculate Conception; it is not exhaustive. It may be remarked that many adjectives are used with the article and without a noun; just as Mary is *The* Virgin, so often she is *The* Holy (One), *The* Innocent (One), etc.

ἄβυσσος θαυμάτων	abyss of miracles
ἀδιάφθορος	uncorrupted, chaste
ἄγίασμα	sanctuary
ἄγιόπρωτος	first of the saints
ἄγιωτάτη	most holy
ἀγνείας τὸ πάναγνον ἐνδιαίτημα	all-innocent hospice of innocence
ἄθικτος	untouched, [chaste]
ἀκήρατος	uncontaminated
ἀκίβδηλος	guileless, unadulterated
ἄμεμπτος	inculpable
ἀμίαντος	unstained
ἀμόλυντος	undefiled
ἀμόμητος	immaculate
ἄμωμος	immaculate
ἀναμάρτητος	sinless
ἄνωτέρα πάντων χωρὶς Θεοῦ μόνου	above all save God alone
ἄνωτέρα πάσης κτίσεως	above all creation
ἀξιόγαστος	admirable
ἀπήμαντος	unharméd, inviolate
ἄσπιλος	spotless, stainless
ἄτηκτος	adamantine, invincible

ἄφθορος	incorruptible
ἄχραντος	undefiled
θαυμαστή	most wondrous
θεόκλητος	divinely chosen
θεομακάριστος	divinely most blessed
θεοχαρίτωτος	divinely most favored
ἱερωτάτη	most holy one
καθαρωτάτη	most pure one
καλλίστη	most beautiful one
κεφάλαιον τῶν ἁγίων	head of the saints
κεχαριτωμένη	full of grace
ναὸς ὄντως ἄξιόθεος	temple truly worthy of God
πάγκαλος	all-beautiful
πάγκλυτος	all-renowned
παμμακάριστος	all-blessed
πάμφωτος	all-splendid
πανάγια	all-holy
παναγιώτατος	all-holiest
πάναγνος	all-innocent
πανακήρατος	all-uncontaminated
παναμόμητος	all-immaculate
πανάμωμος	all-immaculate
πανάσπιλος	all-spotless
πανάφθορος	all-incorruptible
πανάχραντος	all-undefiled
πανένδοξος	all-glorious
πανευπρεπής	all-decorous
πανεύφημος	all-renowned
πανθαύμαστος	all-wondrous
πανίερος	all-sacred
πανόλβιος	all-blessed
πανσεβάσμιος	all-adorable
πάνσεμνος	all-sacred
παντευλόγητος	all-blessed

πανυπερευλογημένη	supremely all-blessed
πανύμνητος	all-celebrated
πανυπερθαύμαστος	supremely all-wondrous
πλήρωμα τριαδικῶν χαρίτων	fullness of the Triune's graces
πολυτίμιος	fully honorable
πολυώνυμος	fully renowned
πολύφωτος	fully splendid
πρωτίστη τῶν ἀγίων	first of the saints
ὑπεραγία	supremely holy
ὑπέραγνος	supremely innocent
ὑπεράμωμος	supremely immaculate
ὑπεράχραντος	supremely undefiled
ὑπερδοξαμένη	supremely glorified
ὑπερένδοξος	supremely glorious
ὑπερευλογημένη	supremely blessed
ὑπέρολαμπρος	supremely splendid
ὑπερέτερα πάντων θαυμάτων	beyond all miracles
φῶς ἀνέσπερον	light without an evening





Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.