

The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

À jilonthln tournai unèrr Episcopal Sanction

JtLV τo DECEMBER, 1953

VOLUME LXXX

FIFTH SERIES

DUBLIN
BROWNE AND NOLAN LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

ILL RIGHTS RESERW·

DID OUR LADY DIE?

THE REFLECTIONS ON 4MVNIHCENTI>MW >
DEI'S 1

i.; M. -vi- Ih-.v. GABRIEL M. ROSCHINL O.s.M..
IH-.Rvr>>H Gexkhm. nr nr .VKVIT. OKIi.k.
TaiS'i.rri.n r.v Rev. G. M. (ORR. O.S.M.)

THE President of the first international Marini

The Cardinal Pizzard. Secretary "t th" 4 ontn.
-v.i.^ of the Holy Office, spoke, on the occasion of
the "Lady's earthly life/as a matter which calls for
attention on the part of Mariologists. adding that
we are enabled to 'admire in her this
splendour of Gixl's munificence. 2
In response to this invitation that I have thought
a to consider this problem in the light of the dogmatic
"Miinilicentissimus Deus."
The situation created by the publication of
this must begin with an historical conspectus.

s - nr. m.<r three cextvrh>

"The first references there is no textual reference at
all; (v wLi'li wv. can be certain—the writings
of the writers, to the death of
Eh. P \ts fpc.-ted from Leueius (second century) and
is considered very doubtful. We know of the
"Assumption" of Leucius (who
is mentioned in the Gospel of St. John the Evangelist) only from
Meliton who himself wrote a similar work in the
second century. Meliton refers to Leueius as "a
he ilrvil." Of the content of Leueius's work

Af.tr-'i'n-i hi .v. or.ilvua! -i-.η λ .ipp-^reà.
Ij-ir<"!...> Al-cr/nri' U--inn->
S, itninari'.tt! K-ηχτ :

we know nothing. There is merely a reference to 'disappearance' of the body of Our Lady, as also of of St. John. It is therefore of no use as an argumerit favour of the death of Our Lady.

The text for which Origen's name is claimed is from tv eaten» 0·η St. John's gospel (*Origen,s* Worifcs, ed. Prviisdvv. t. IV. Leipzig 1903. p. 506, fragm. 31). We read there iltf Mary 'remained a virgin till death.' The authenticity of this text is held by Dcvreese to be very doubtful. It should noted, moreover, that Origen's usual phrase for the p̄perpet virginity of Our Lady is not 'till death' but l to the end.

It is generally admitted that in the first three c̄ennn then is no mention ,>f a sepulchre of Mary, either in Jc';! salem or at Ephesus. Father Abel, O.P., the most, outstov i ing archaeologist (>f Palestine, maintains in his monnnv » * work on Jerusalem that the sepulchre of the Mother ..! '* . was known and venerated at Jerusalem from the midi. l the fifth century onwards.³ It was only when th»· O i' of Ephrsus (481) officially inaugurated, so to speak. cultus <† Our Lady that the subject of the sepulchre l-v' t̄ i x d̄iscuss The barrenness, from the point ‡ l of evidence, of the preceding centuries did not faeiiihdi M-urcl». l radii i<jiiš Were conflicting. In Jerusalem itself to linut oursehes to one place—the so-called ' m tuli pointed to the Garden of Olives (an analogy <<.3 Asoiivi-)>† o' Our Lord), while the Patriarch <† J - ' rJniwd that it w&\$ jn the valley of Josaphat.

11- Till· IOCRTK CEXTi F.Y TO 1HE XtM.TtfSW

GH» -irlit references to Jhe maimer hi wlmA ' L>iy l n.njd her fife on earth are ivund in tin α i /-;

' l . . «' SippCww i- t.. i\., . t. J. «“ l l § I!»».

< V.MMQtini O.AB.. ”””’ . >p~ —'I-’)

* (t. I. § men». <l p, _ μ . . * V. Ai) § ”. ’ . ••U, t.. ... * :r 4

*T l m hsc 'W . '9 *κ Λ v \s- << th» Hfcijf tnaee« wmen EÜ» * *** *»»« ef» i-ij# sw. i k:w:

4 St. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamina, and Timotheus, a

W nF M' v hanius 1138 two Passages bi the Panarion, (a.d. 37M77) m wu «4iieh he speaks of the end of Our Ladys life

understanô his words fully we must remember that he w Conscious, when writing, of two heresies which were then

dangerous: that of the Antidicomarianites, and artoÎthe Collyridians. The former denied the perpetual

... .. 4 Mary, the latter, erring in the opposite direction, -WttU'j,d that divine worship should be given to her. To loert that Our Lady died was to give a handle to the one

1·IH AK· foll,ws :

T hnc damno sit nhqibus, nt ad conttiberimK-s .« dilectas, v.t retinenti.». tpi'id E-nus p."ssin.v i sibi aniim >>rr>r' machinati t.. ñui < !>·i >! t·4i>η·ηi ar'i'ssiss>' videant!·. Varum illic certa t, λ π ιι π & »· fuhmuMtniti sunt omnia, ita ut fua facta sejuncta ** λ / τ i ·· -'t'i'mn 'lil[w' ·?·* !&<< mandato praestanda sunt disciplina. Nam M· -M·i id ua gestuiu est, et- nd sese illam i.h.haniws) m-c-pit. ηηη ; iiiilt!. Mτrua:·<it.

' vk fr.ll> "■' on-pt-tru t-xisrim-î, i,·t·i>rur'H· wntriur rextiÿin, ih -ptihnit " «■·rtb·. M :riir ■«"· l.«tftte ulri/m n,»rfuo e>t, rwi non Tnnrtva sd. '^çoe l · ij w. &· -ion Aii spolia. Ac, cum ·Iohannes pn.f.-ctiis sit .atr. tr'·. <" U atatr >irgim-in it'ttons comitem secum habuisse signiivui. ' b ·, · « .pit·jc·· Koituxticit <icriptura pmpte!· r.ccv&mr> ininir'll>, >f in - i ■·.wr ðhim'· hnminur·.

D, 'Γ>Δ>(ζiι«π illuri »<);. - d me-um reputans m.'bi χ'Γ· v>'·ñ·\

I I A!·! m'ò an vestigia inveniuie Sar.ct· fñs ->e Burin, >·.wffl. *·"·e> .p,·,·. ,) ··. X·i'n A·.. Snur-m nit de ea : ' Et tutuu ipsitw animtu>a " ' · z'i't·n·. ut d,r« ex u'idf. rutti er-rdibus &■«gitatimies, ilb'fc, eum ' · π λ : >»· ■■' ; t'le.r.-'at · ' Properavit draco adversus mulierem ipjæ . << ; ■ >' u fV< siiiir e> p-nnav aqutiai: >v wansiatiî <<t in desnrntn. . . · "i.-.r"-henJervt. b t it. ilia i':rte peresi impb-ri.

' , , · ■ ' ; <"< nÿiria,, n-gu- ·j-îl n> wrl }>rv-v'·j m '·.λ * «ru . >. s ·>·n]Arvi'trr pm-nuHi. Qui,i,ii· wr-ptum o·i-nfl' Asiannne 'r's>· -rrrrfr-rrru, « . '■'·'· rr,'>>·J.> prrvtrr m-x iUuri 'ic pm-st-tr-s, · t < i' · λ ^a.cquui.'· iMrtwXlier. errera.

I j l· · .ηî, λ,τ< cpriN *l Non tamen utiam <>st ■■..... -n-ris >χρτ:î'. · absit ut i'· ui «i-rimomus. - H.^res. "rt. II,

■· I... ,;4irjJ, c4. s.u- ·t Virg SC sepulra : <·. :·f< " >r · è m &Γ>πξ ' Aut. ii-te.rfi-cta &·> ut -criptum &· . " ... rii^iius' : &·>t martyr»» est sé ria, cju., et- Zc ■· A'· · r·T·J w.s, yw- 9>a>» Iw-w· tū iieln Irritant. "· :/■ >· e.i't fXrrJ-it ' t p-te-Jt 'Htm <i.U. qUi«i libuerit, s ifkerc , "· : ih.î, 'it-vif. v-rte -fitra quæ f&t wwtrw venerari netæe *π η,·H·,·-β7<i <<t τ>·πûη«·.—Haeres- 7à, 23, PG 42, 731.

heresy (for it was to suggest that the hotly oi. subject to the corruption of the tomb, anti thus nJ— her prerogatives): to assert that she did not df encourage the other. St. Epiphanius. who con<d.: probable that she did not die. and secs a relcrenv. idea in Apjcalypse xii. prefers to avoid both dant'. a non-committal statement: 'I do not say that >De I nor yet that she did not die?': and he justitio apparently neutral position by an appeal to the r-»η, ■, sileiKT of the Scriptures on the subject. And indv...'. silence of the Scriptures is complete.

Yet St. Epiphanius is certain, from tradition. cud of Our Lady's exile- on earth was marked by a ■. marvel, and such as to HU men's minds with astonish™. What was this great marvel? Was it resurrection ■ death, or immediate translation out of this world r? glory of heaven? He does not tell us. But he gran" th latter supposition is plausible, and lie makes it suin! clear by his rlmj.-e »f words that Ju, is restraining bis :.' fear of the Çnlhridian hen-ties.

What greater man el. in fact, could there l-“. in nmt>-xt, than tm- hith.-rto unlc-ard-of mirarie of inii"!- ffaitslation jy, U.dy and >..ñi to the glorv of hrav.n. žli.i more žk h t. !-nd eoim† m.m† t< those wh? ' 1" d;H;.. !|i.-i.;;rs a' M.III ?

Tie contt nif »rarv Tin; a h.-us <-f Jf nisilrin > :i:hd'<!i>:. ('U'si-n ;u. :!<■ propho'-v ..;? Simeon, !I . .'" s.i'l! a §.-.....o d.ae. pare..,' h-' . ž o riJLVliJ ž.. * rprei.ih'.t, l(f ^.=tp.< ar:'< r^ . 'nat ATisrv d'd "a^ da ž m or d'.e u. d lha' ' sj;. >= mis < n t.H η...t ;;u;u;u. " ' ' "

.hvdt in her took her from this earth t< the
 the Ascension.' that is. t< heaven. It 'A" tl'
 :-^ñjv fur those who maintain that Our Lath tin'
 !'< rihH assertion from its obvious sense : it remain'.
 !' il.liny i>f the highest order, along with w»rib
 i.ai'haniis. to support our thesis. Such. then. y
 tradition concerning the termination ot Mary s
 #=: oirth. These two witnesses against the idea ot
 i'eb of Our Lady are worth moie than hundreds ot
 uihicssvs on the other side who simply never
 #' doubting it.
 ! ! nrst docninenhirv reference to the death <»t Mary is
 the. apiteryphal 'Transitus' writings ot the tilth to
 centuries. There is, however, one very early
 ' ' pM-ndo-IVocorus (450-500). who seems, by way ot
 'i. nul to wish to speak of * death when referring
 ' 'miisitus. In his Catholic recension ot the *Aeta*
 i;ii <tirdiiig to the reading of Codex A aticanus
 'i->k fol. 95p he says that the Holy Mother of God
 ' ' *Isjt t< life, from temporal life to eternal life and*
 <f hemt n. *iJiich teill never end.*' Here we have a
 ' r f-rence not to death hut to an immediate passing
to life. It is, of course, open to anyone to suppose
 'ii<.:r;- nvsde Ihr·rauh the. gate of death, but
 " ' 'ipj^riition pure and simple. Nothing need prevent
 ! f; :akmg these words as an echo of Timotheus of

' .■, under the inlhienee of the apocryphal writings
 ' lathers Mud later writers admitted, or asserted, that
 ' :. 'i. The question did not present itself to their
 ' i. :. d § j. hardly possible, historically, to imagine
 ■. , -p. .. y, .>Yv4 to her death as a
 - ■■.), ,v;h §i 5>- supposed. Death is universal: even
 ' I ihen fore the question of Mary s death does not
 ' c 'r i > .η-, < leration. Such, we may imagine, was the
 - i 'ivesi. Fathers and later ecclesiastical writers.
 ' ■ ~;Xth i'«Titny a codex ot the anonymous writer

of Piacenzal—a .d. 570—has the simple statement: ‘In tw same valley of Josaphat is the house of Holy Mary from which it is said that the Virgin was taken up to heaven.’

Hen- again, it is an immediate passing to heaven.

In the seventh century St. Isidore of Seville seen* inclined to doubt or to deny that Our Lady died. He sap that ' there is no written testimony concerning the death of Mary, though IUT sepulcht», as some say. is in the vallg of .Josaphat.”- If the death of Mary had been, a certainty in St. Isidore's mind, would hr thus have brought in tk-idea of ' wriMen testimonies ' for

The same attitude is seen in Spain in the eighth ce r in the written answer gi\ven hv Tus;irr<|<. a bishop i. ' l Asturias, to Asiano, a brother bishop in the same piioni/v. The falter tuid said thai. it was luting affirmed in f». : v r that Our Lndy «ulfered death in romnion with th. r-«' mankind and tha' her body .stdl remained in the tomb * It rig a glorious n^urreetion. Scandalized bv such statrnu”^ .I.μ i i y κ i turned to Tusaredo for fclp in erniiifing tl r Tusaredo. without hcMtafkx. <r argm-unt. r< ph<s : | Now ' in history do w learn rh-H d.-r »>-b-red mar'vrdon. <r o-her kind of dwitli ' - ' mor!' tilt-.r.,9 Th.'s further ifc.-m v. I' id.» had simply jxunted on; ‘hat there «en. r>· wr » ; ri* "IIS .; Murv » death ; it is a denial that she s ui- r-it } klld .? d>afb It fi.R\ | i<.tra>|ir.iMsi : ‘Hew »h i- IP! *pe- the th.r !.,,!. t; r π r .; f.-mli. when the is r : hist «rirai κ λ γ of lier l. iviuj . thirbr τ dvir.g n. vΛχ .; î? .|r.,> i 'Vid been ärti' -s ti-at t we exp. o? ‘ais s:i;w! V- a .-^rP'-te ,cBμ .γ ú cf Kus |ncx ‘ierice ô-r i' : |h» >·>·iv w> .X| ^tl is ii^τ H.;, i-> frjiind '»!' . |ü.'*...;| ' in if * >■ Vat-' W r-t < r-i,> n^i >♦ J.+n Jtanws.-' ' P. III! I'ij' p «,3 I I S«s. ■ Γ S I, . t » is: s I .>, , -oir.t. w TÄiu. F.r.,~' I.L' . ‘ * «frs-'riintf ün· þn--yþi» λ α ñ· h i

l
j
i
*
t
!
i
y
.
<
gb
“
:
?
”
; ü
ng

*“
g
”
T
λ
^
i



01

14.

in homilies on the *Dormitio* admit indeed that she
 but are full of wonder at the thought, and the former
 so far as to call it 'incredible/ St. John Damascene
 How then shall this blessed one lie a prey to death?
 both recognize that she ought not to have died. And
 the reasons they adduce for her death are by no means
 ent. They are reducible, practically, to this: Our
 Lord Himself died: therefore His holy Mother died.
 It is worth mentioning here, too, that about this time
 Theodore Abou-Kurra (d. c. 820) compares the 'death' of
 the ecstatic sleep of Adam in the Garden, during
 which life was taken from his body.³ This is equivalent
 asserting that Mary did not suffer death as we know it.
 of soul and body.

As is well known, an attitude of doubt and uncertainty
 obtained in the ninth-twelfth centuries.

In the thirteenth century it must be admitted that
 the Doctors considered Our Lady's death as certain,
 and this was evidently a logical conclusion from the denial of
 the Immaculate Conception—a denial which St. Bonaventure
 holds 'the more common, the more reasonable and
 the safer view/ His reasoning on the subject is clear
 and it was the reasoning of many of his time:

like— the Virgin was, free from original sin. she was also exempt
 from death, therefore, either her death was an injustice
 against the human race. But the former sup-
 poses that God is not just: and the latter,

implies that His Redemption is
 unnecessary. The latter is erroneous and impossible, and the former is
 not.

It is clear, therefore, that to question the dogmatic value of
 an assumption such as this, based as it is upon a false assumption,
 does not surprise us to find the natural reaction of doubt
 and denial of the Virgin's death, and open denials of it; every
 question of the Virgin's immunity from the penalty

³ *H. J. S. J.*, D. 3. p. 1. a. I, q. 2.

In *St. I.*, D. 1. 3, ad 3, Up. IU. 75 C.

death, precisely because of her immaculate conception, *3S thus discussed.

It is sufficiently clear from what has been said so far d l Father Ralic is mistaken in stating roundly that ' from Patristic age to our own times not a single writer is f''^ to deny the death of the Blessed Virgin.'l

In the seventeenth century, after the Council of Father Bartholomew Beverini, of the Clerks Regular of Mother of God. wrote a controversial tract (1667) against ' Athanasius l m pen-name) who asserted that the opin'0l those who lælievrd that Our Lady died was 'frivolous ;4lB' apocryphal.'2

In 1683 we find the Spanish Inquisition condemning ' sermon preached against 'lie opinion that Our Lady ðk

At the IM-giniing of the eighteenth century a celebM^ desuit theologian. Father Ignatius de Camargo (d. wrote a whole treatise on the immortality of Marv.

Father Gallus. S.J.. has noted, rightly, that foward dose ·if the Middle Ag.^ there are some writers who pr^v< the Iiumaculat.· O.iwpti.m with an argument which logk'»^ implies that <»ur Lady did no! ði They am: O'l'!* Per·/, of Valencia <d. I Pietro Barth· Cd.Mino of F·l^' Ambrogio < fthini.n of Sb-n;i (t[. 1553). Vim-m™ Ban·0'." id. 1506.. Th·' argument is as : Ttie -ting infernal »rprnt is fourfold, guilt in the s.,sll. (-i>III!^t,l.<fCr,^, in the lllesh, travul i> child-hearing, suffiring and reVl''' <.f the body to dus» through death. Bur God. luf.-r· Fr ' Mincing the universal doom to our hr>t jum-nS * v-mlll' " Marv from this fourfold sting, saying: I will C!!\ ,.,,-ñi: 't- î« en †? and the woman.' Man. tfarefon-' is l>>) fn l' all four ·■. ds.

V> d ðd· .s I'vher Ga ins ftes these writer- d'' n-c I « xpo-s,i· t. de-hsce ti-at (>;r Lady did not 'c i.'i: ' * d ■ "t! } ' ·ÿÿ· ðκ«.«

•,d'< J. » »F ' * r . * » r »»«■· '5. , f · t,f*) , / . ·) ? i . i ; ; · I * ; l l z "

THE DEFINITION OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

TO THE DEFINITION OF THE ASSUMPTION

liter the definition of the Immaculate Conception a con-
T'veiy iras aroused. chiefly through Dominic Arnaldi of
..ibo- <.LS'jjj on the question of Our Lady's death. Arnaldi
' that immunity from original sin logically implied
:;!■} from the penalty of death. His thesis rçrt-hcd
uian one imprimatur and he was congratulated by
cardinals and by reviewers in periodicals.

Professor Joseph Pennacchi defended it enthusiastically
his lectures at Propaganda. Monsignor Viridia (O.F.M.

.. Bishop of t'ariati, petitioning the Holy See for a
nf the Assumption, stated plainly his belief that
Iw'y did not die. Gaetano Guastalla y Schius ellicr
' n; die same opinion. Father J. Angelucei. O.S.M.,
tHaidy rejects the notion of Mary's death in several
**les written for Regina Martyrum \Caserta) and in a
'uudy which is to be published shortly.2 Father

-^"jrehe. O.S.M.. in La Vierge toute Sainte also reiects
' ●■-'e. indirectly? Father Friethoff, O.P., has: "The

il -H Mary is not certain, either historically or from
l Father Veermersch, S.J.. lias : ' Sur la mort
' Te plane un certain doute qu'il ne nous appartient
Λ. φ. dissiper.'5 In recent times the most ardent defender

^Sl's that Mary's death is not proved has been
'f?T, r'F Tl ^usie' A.A., in his monumental work, La
A s J. .amplum de la Sainte Vierge, published in 1945

to Pope pius XII.

L ioaai. Professors Van Combrugge,8 G. Coppens..7

Iktrn· P ■■■ Ar>-<iidi, <!;-p>»i· i>...-wI>I:<·u,·p'r> in .4»«

' ,Δ ' /""* OF-M-.rn4il,a. V: π... VUvpp. 3"l 4<ii. AU>
- ·W, s-V" , ^I'A tKJ,z.....R. Γ. .U ;r>i in .Vurtmwi 32 (HUM).

, ■ ' ■ ■ f π',Γ-iiō fi.M ■ i f,u^ i!tr.i,lu;icü denwn
h «mu· î2.
,ltlf ** η'T 'O ·SufI4> T',<'Te, l»rugi“. 1ft-1, * U. is.
ki î) v, 15h.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

It is a well-known fact that in the present day, owing to the lack of historical knowledge it is impossible to prove that the Blessed Lady died. Professor Philips, also of Louvain, has pointed out the necessary connection between immunity from mortal sin and immunity from death. He states that 'everything points to the fact that she entered directly into the fullness of heaven.' He has, then, written this volume of tears, this 'abode of the Blessed Virgin'.

It is a well-known fact that in the present day, owing to the lack of historical knowledge it is impossible to prove that the Blessed Lady died. Professor Philips, also of Louvain, has pointed out the necessary connection between immunity from mortal sin and immunity from death. He states that 'everything points to the fact that she entered directly into the fullness of heaven.' He has, then, written this volume of tears, this 'abode of the Blessed Virgin'.

It is a well-known fact that in the present day, owing to the lack of historical knowledge it is impossible to prove that the Blessed Lady died. Professor Philips, also of Louvain, has pointed out the necessary connection between immunity from mortal sin and immunity from death. He states that 'everything points to the fact that she entered directly into the fullness of heaven.' He has, then, written this volume of tears, this 'abode of the Blessed Virgin'.

in

>> £ i s

Fate Tiburtius Gallus, S.J., has recently “
k,t of which the professed theme is that Mars did

-rc die.l
I niav add that several bishops of my own acquaintance
- lwnic convinced and ardent defenders of the thesis
, f here maintain. Even Father Filograssi, who is
T:F>|v opposed to it, admits that

a a result of the public controversies aroused on this subject, the number
: those who will have nothing to do with the idea that Our Lady died
mase steadily, not only among priests but also among the educated
W->>«>->>« « « » _ » ® .. I) | ,

I. spit,- <f all this, there were some writers, before the
who held firmly and at all costs to the view that
•u-dh <f Our Lady was part of the Assumption itself
' n.t in its actual, concrete reality. Thus Father Balic.
| r" Jig F;dh<T Renaudin. holds that

the 'krm>ni<< a ç»«> <f th· Absumpti-»' i. the f· nth of Our Lads, th
f*nu η»,' Qvnn is the glorification of her body in heaven. The oldo-t
l A -iinipioii ' in neto' is the glorification of the living body. and
t k -itii mid f'-siirrection.'

î4tl.·τ I)i Fonzo maintained that

ñh .nid resurrection are considered to be the manner and the
' c .inerted circumstance of Our Lady's Assumption.

-N-, in favour of the inclusion of this * manner and
r' iPotantx-' in the definition of the dogma.4
Awl-i..» to Father Bonnefoy, O.F.M. :

■ ■.air. M>>t Holy Virgin ma;, be coroider>d a- historically
*» and rxpii'itii revealed: as 'uch (explicitly reveal-di it may be
* . ib . * , , t J .iji-a'ic .(eLnitii.n . th.er· b no reason why it should

·η·~τ·,I'. ■■■j Γ.49.

·.·?;< | | i -z ; n' ·i: M i r a h i ! z z - r ' t . ><h^:l · r i T : l >»■

■ ■ ■ ■ ■ s : ■ w . « terwnis » ou- · ■ « mors ; termir.w vero a! quem

■ · · · | · τ : Γ : i i ■ ■ - - i t . - m . ■ ■ j · c - t n m Absumpti- nis “in
” · · · c . | r ; · · · · · “ : n o r s < τ r e s n r n - t K » . -

i' p.-U- ii. V- -Ibir.ur, k..ril... p?· 4; <pq.i.

; J · « · > P ; <» M15c. priir_ ' i < 4β, pp.'46-57.

3d ”%«»« Mariai du Pcy-m-V.-Uj, L ■■■■ † îe'IX Sa.·>·■
vtr·. Par ia;,), ,K >4..

Father Bover, Father De Aklama and Father de Sob:

The fact of Our Lady's death is not a matter of opinion in the <> It is not even a ' pious opinion.' Modern theologians consider it at a *lenticia certa*. The denial of it cannot escape the note of ra<r

Father Consttintinc Koser. O.F.M., goes so far as to say the fact of Our Lady's death is | de fide divina et. cathici^ credendum.'2

The Congress of the Franciscans of Italy, at which til-general theme was the Assumption, arrived at the folli,v'?'-e conclusion :

Although the majority of lecturers in the Congress have maint t. || that the correct theological concept, of Assumption is composed of ^in-essential cli-ments— death, resurrection, bodily glorification - and Hi>". * three are included in the idea of Assumption as a revealed doctrine, I | First National Congress of the Friars Minor of Italy muminiouly ailt'!' that in the formulation of the definition itself it would not be necei>>.'} to make mention of the two elements which are presupposed. death fa" resurrection, though they would necessarily be mentioned in the L'di| the definition.

The * Mariological Week * <>f Salamanca in 19+9. wh"" was entirely taken up with the problem of the death Our Lady, notwithstanding some division in its ranks. to the Holv See a ' Votuni . . . de corporea AsMirnpt' ^' B. M. Virginis, in caelum, post mortem definienda.71

IV—AFTER THE DEFINITION

3'he definition, together with the dogmatic Constil'iti 'i has tlirown considerable light on the problem. It lms mi: clear the precise theological concept of the Assumption: has drawn a distinction between death and Assumption: bus left the question of Our Lady's death cunipletch

ii) Clarification of the concept nf

The Assumption is exactly defined in ihtse fim>> : k L.

im ?>>><<< if .Ifurvr. M-'dri i. Il't*. HZ I'fswrffniurwm. S ffMS., p 4H 5 .4>> (. mgr. .War. 5<C. <<> W +<<*.■ A I K »n. * ^ * ^ 5 UWAOHMT. vol. IX. 1>*. »' I* o

•ni>>ilriti Mother of God, Mary ever Virgin, having reached 'he end of her earthlv life, was taken up body and soul to S· S!>>ry of heaven.'

Tims a clear line of distinction is drawn between the ./. tilings. Assumption and death. Neither the definition the Bull considers the question of death at all. llenteforward we must, exclude " death and resurrection ' 'M'.ntely from the theological notion of Assumption. Avinnphtn ' taken also in its actual concrete reality, docs — wludt· anything hevond glorification of the body and '·' of Our Blessed Lady.

iiw Wi W: ck'': ooc --M '00 : K

;2) Diatini'tif/n betteeen Ax-mviiption and Death

This most valuable demarcation of the subject evidently presupposes that the death and the Assumption are two <early distinct things, ami, even more to our purpose, that, 'he arguments which are valid for the Assumption are not >&e same class as those which are used to prove Our Lady's : in fact there is no comparison: the question ot her * 'h remains, as before, uncertain ami obscure, lett to free. -w :sd>>u among theologians.

ft.' Bull prescinds absolutely from both alternatives--- died and rose again, and that she did not die. e tire I,ng exposition it contains merely illustrates >>> Moren Of clarification illrough which the precise, rtchm; "■< eoarept of Assumption, to. now PtoΛ>>™1 lor our Mn . * reur-li.l. The .hrenurents qu.m-.l in the sKetch ot »ht »■'· << .It', in.lred »...I, in mention «Γ M>r> ' den.h, but n " «WiW.y eW that Huy nre u'?' X't'wnplat<l— d--9- is. as we have saul. simpl? nm ni?(.onri.pt. -,■ „ hrmng out tm

which, progressively U.;? itn example- die l <, 5' k>cf that the faithful, argmnu ' lxxjy's sub- death—easily by taking note of Divine sou. actually ^iem {fidelibus) fuit th- notion That she 'r:d this life: ' diflæiK

assentiri Magnam etiam Dei Matrem, quwnadmwi»l'® J'l
 Lnigenam Suuni, ex hac vita decessisse/ f
 Three things must be noted here: (1) In place J
 stark expression 'died' the Bull uses the softer exP^l*.
 'ex hue vita decedere/ which is 'relinquished tld»
 literally? (2) The Bull does not attribute even this eP . f
 sion, attenuated as it is, to the teaching of the Church
 the Pastors, but to the faithful. (3) Then· are two very
 reasons to explain what must have seemed, after :|§ ' '
 obvious deduction on the part of the faithful—the fa('k ' *T.
 Our Lady was subject to suHering (proved by Scriptu^l*
 the teaching of the Pastors of the Church) and the IlC' ' ..
 of her likeness to Christ. These two reasons. considered l .
 fully, are by no means conclusive. There is. then, ® ' '
 appeal to an apostolic tradition, to a tradition prop' r^
 called, to the *magisteriurti eceletiiaxticum*, for the purp^l^
 proving that Mary died, but only to two reasons whil^l^ u
 not. by any means prove it—at least with certainty.

Therefore, although the death of Mary is here nieid'4
 (in attenuated terms. as we have seen) as a thing ɾ ' /.
 by the faithful, appearing obvious, not calling for pn«.»f. \
 (Irift of the whole fmssage is simply this : The faithful
 indeed admit, as being a matter of course, the «Iratil '
 Our I-ady. yet this admission did not prevent them l'1"
 tamen minime prohibuit ') from * openly believing «nd
 fessing tuar her holy ix»dy was not subject to the torrupiP
 of the §sepulchre but on the §i (trary. 'enlightened ' .
 divine grace, and implied by the love of her who is - Mot-"
 ot («od and our most sweet Mutho. ' they «Ontenipteted 'l
 ever-growing light the marvellous liannyony ' of her ρπvi'vΛ '
 Thus the presumption of her death and resurrection '>I;»V
 its >»H, and by n»> means a negligible <·η« :far nakIH-

iii< I nute. si.ñ - inline si· K«' * §' ' ' W· §·,nst. l
 •Irp.Hrt>,l .!., :!» fit.· 'i' p. .W3
 !! V- ■■, vvit : an-i ' < > - <1 ta i, «, ■
 . i Λ». W »i« it-'2' λ ■■■'■ '■;· §' ' TM.
 Ift t.m». ? eSr i: ? ■...-f -e 4 p-T!

t

is referred to in the Bull) in the development of the doctrine of the Assumption.

Another reference to the death of Mary can be seen in the quotation of the Secret Prayer from the Gregorian Sacramentary, 'Veneranda . . . but it is clear from the context that this document is quoted not to prove that Our Lady (tied (though there is mention of her death in that 'H, but solely to prove that ' in the liturgical books . . . h.-t are phrases which seem to conspire in asserting that, it:: the Virgin Mother of God *passed from this exile*, such

Providence, as were in accord with her dignity as the Mother of the Incarnate Word, and in keeping with the 'privileges granted to her.' The Bull continues, a few lines further down, 'This is affirmed, for instance, in the Sacramentary. . . . ' Thus the quotation of the Sacramentary prayer is intended as a proof of the thesis immediately preceding (which prescind entirely from the question of Our Lady's death)—and of nothing else. The same must be said of other quotations, from the Fathers and Doctors.

I

IM

discussion

Mr. Mutt has said above it is quite clear that the Bull has not made no pronouncement on the question of Our Lady's death. So much is clear from the whole tenor of the Bull. One natural consequence of this fact is that in the Mass of the feast the Secret Prayer in which the Virgin Mother of God is mentioned as having died ('pro conditione camis

I

t

\$

the Mar. Congregation Dec., 1950.
>> f Mary Aeww-ii irit=> hiwen' with
by Fop
I may a-hi that th' Holy
<n this «object in -ith-'r ways and
i-
p. 65>. It is t! b' taken-

Pin, XI], r. i., y.
hi/r.h p. . . . AI in'
I'w U! Their va'-i» sn iu
- «ki.t i,, 8u,,.y siH wk- wr
put up-'Ts f in r.uruber *
f tliH flict. Th h** mtprvrreT *h'

migrate cognoscimus') has been expunged: and this pray», as is well known, was a main plank in the argument.

But we can go further. In the Bull—as in the new ML we have not. only the complete exclusion of the Mary's death but also the positive inclusion of 'I'll' which definitely tells in favour of the opinion that 'M« nut die : I mean the reference to the. close Jink beb'-A'.t »M Assumption and the Immaculate Conception—' Arcuero· enim haec dut» privilegia inter se conectuntur. ΘαΓ Lady, preserved, not. like the rest of us, freed, from | sin, was the companion of Christ in his complete victor.' < both sin and death. In the Bull Our Lady's vwb-rx death is referred to as a consequence of her victory § } | She was not subject, therefore, like the rest ot men. ■ law of bodily corruption, and for this icason she inydt-u ». to await, as others must. ' the redemption of her bod } the word *re/lmption*. not *rcs-urnitimij* ' until the end »M | nte We have here, surely, an acknowledgement, that. Mm? :A the riirht to triumph uver death, and the reason ot d » " runjdete victory over sin.

For my part I am convinced that the definition o' f f' Assumption is th· darting-point for a steady increase number of those who hold that Our Blessed Lady din no- :

Mary's victory over death means that in iv-r. and ü; alone—or. to put it other words, in one member of tin h'ô race, despite death's general triumph --through th·: me- iv r Son our Redeemer, and for the greater g»ory aud <·v- tien of them both. God's plan of completely r<M Mî victory of Satan, authoi c-f sin ami d«^ir.h, is π a-j/x d ter· | the hnppj deathh-s·. passing «»f Mary from earth h··}· a transition such would hav·· terminât» d th»· | of our first parent, and of :dl Hμ-ir d«i. »nb», Eu tor t! •wigrud sin from which Mary, G" Mother --md ùur | preserved. The Inimaeul .tc Hear? of Mary, »? immaculate, neves ceased te· brat with ke <d a': her so th« Cn-at^r and ;'l His creator s.

LITERATURE AND PSYCHOLOGY

By Rev. JEREMIAH NEWMAN, M.A., D.Ph.,

Department of Scholastic Philosophy, Queen's University, Belfast

THE title of this essay is somewhat vague and needs to be made more precise. In recent years there has been quite a lot of writing about the influence of psychology particularly Psycho-analysis, on the development of their characters. The last chapter of C. G. Jung's *Guide to Modern Thought*, for example, is entitled 'The Invasion of Literature by Psychology' and describes the various literary tendencies illustrative of an analytical personality for which the Jungian theory of the unconscious is largely responsible. The chief concern, observes Jung, is not with the characters, which was the object of the analyst, but 'to find out exactly what people have discovered, and its purpose and nature.'

It is not this relation of psychology to literature which I propose to treat of. My object here may be compared with the unconscious rather than the conscious relation of psychology to literature.

The Jungian theory, which is the subject of the present book, goes far towards living decisive life. On the one hand, what a writer will produce, and on the other, what the reader will understand.

On the one hand, what a writer will produce, and on the other, what the reader will understand.

On the one hand, what a writer will produce, and on the other, what the reader will understand.

On the one hand, what a writer will produce, and on the other, what the reader will understand.

Lggxg^^

A writer is capable of factual inaccuracies, of failures of memory and even of downright deceit, and we keep a sharp eye for such pitfalls. But we can often be lulled by the author's unconscious to realize the author's point of view and by accepting it for all that is really a highly personal approach to a problem. This is particularly true in the case of the novel.