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PREFACE

As a religious education teacher and catechist, with an interest in the apostolic catechesis of the early Church, I wanted to explore the role that Jesus' Mother and first Teacher might have played in the nascent apostolic community. An article by Jean Leclercq\(^1\) was instrumental in giving clarity and focus to my interests in Mary as a Teacher in the post-Pentecost apostolic community. Leclercq wrote about the tradition of Mary being left on earth by Jesus for the consolation and the instruction of the apostles. Rupert of Deutz was not mentioned as one of the exponents of this tradition, but the curiosity aroused in me by this article led me to Rupert of Deutz.

My sincere thanks go to the late Rev. Jean-Marie Salgado, O.M.I. +1995, my former Spiritual Director, in the late 1960s, at the Pontificio Collegio Urbano "De Propaganda Fide", Rome, for introducing me to Rupert of Deutz and his use of the title *Magistra Apostolorum*, in reference to Mary's teaching function in the infant Apostolic Church. Consequently, this thesis is an attempt to highlight the Mariology of Rupert of Deutz, in which this twelfth-century Benedictine abbot referred to Mary as *Magistra Apostolorum*, instructing the Apostles.

Although he probably was the most prolific theological writer of the twelfth-century, Rupert of Deutz is not very well known today. In recent years some interest has been generated in his writings by European scholars in German, French, Italian and Spanish. John Van Engen's book is perhaps the most thorough study on Rupert of Deutz in English in recent times. This dissertation on the Mariology of Rupert of Deutz, is the first, as far as it is known, on Rupert's use of *Magistra Apostolorum* as a Marian title. It is this writer's hope that this work will serve as an

introduction to Rupert of Deutz and to his Mariology. Rupert deserves to be recognized for his insights and contributions to Marian doctrine in the twelfth-century, the "golden age of Mariology."²

I wish to thank my thesis director, Fr. Eamon R. Carroll, for accepting to direct this dissertation, and for graciously meeting with me whether in Dayton, or Chicago, or Rome, to read, correct, and direct the progress of this work. A word of thanks to the official readers of the thesis both at the Pontifical Theological Faculty, the Marianum, in Rome, and at the International Marian Research Institute (IMRI), University of Dayton for their helpful suggestions, and encouragement: Fr. Johann Roten, Director of the (IMRI); Fr. Théodore Koehler, Director Emeritus of the IMRI and the Marian Library; and Fr. Thomas Thompson, Director of the Marian Library.

To all the faculty and staff members of the IMRI and the Marian Library, thanks for your concern, kindness, and help over the past four years.³


I saved the best wine for the end, in thanking my family. To my dearest wife Wilma, to whom I dedicate this work, to my


³The original dissertation, submitted to the International Marian Research Institute in the summer of 1991, was defended in March 1992. This edition, prepared for publication, is a substantial rewriting of the original thesis.
children, Peter Anthony and Joanne Elizabeth, thanks for your love, understanding, patience, tolerance, and encouragement, without which I would not have been able to complete this dissertation.
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**Rupert's Writings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apoc.</td>
<td>In Apocalypsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant.</td>
<td>In Canticum Canticorum de Incarnatione Domini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliph.</td>
<td>Passio B. Eliphii martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incendio</td>
<td>De incendio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medit.</td>
<td>De meditatione mortis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off.</td>
<td>De Divinis Officiis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omn.</td>
<td>De omnipotentia Dei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegBen.</td>
<td>Super quaedam capitula regulae Benedicti, or Liber de Apologeteticis suis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trin. De Sancta Trinitate et operibus ejus.

Vict. De victoria Verbi Dei.

Vol. De voluntate Dei.

Other Works

AAS. Acta Apostolicae Sedis.
ASS Acta Sanctae Sedis.
CC Corpus Christianorum Latinorum.
CM Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis
DA Deutsches Archiv.
DTC Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.
MGH SS Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores.
PL J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina.
RB Revue Bénédictine.
RHE  
Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

RTAM  
Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale.

Saint-Laurent  
INTRODUCTION

With today's discussion and reflection on the dignity and the vocation of women,¹ and the role of women in the Church, it is heartening to know that in Catholic tradition, Mary the Mother of Jesus, referred to as "Woman", in Sacred Scripture², has been held in highest esteem. Rupert of Deutz (1085-1130), Abbot of St. Heribert in Deutz, near Cologne, Germany, in his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles³ referred to Mary as the *Magistra Apostolorum*, thereby denoting her exalted position in the Church, a position to which she brought all her femininity as woman and mother. As the Spiritual Mother of the followers of her divine Son, Mary cared for the Apostles following Jesus' Ascension, and she was a source of consolation and guidance for them as they gathered around her in preparation for their missionary task of evangelization. The *Magistra Apostolorum* was Mother and Teacher. A primary role of a mother is to be a teacher of her children, and just as Mary was the first human teacher of her Son Jesus, the Spiritual Mother of the followers of Jesus, became the first Teacher of the disciples of her Son newly born as a Church on Pentecost.

³ Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuutiensis), *Commentaria in Canticum Canticorum "De Incarnatione Domini"*, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis, XXVI, (hereafter cited as CM XXVI, ed. Hbabanus Haacke, O.S. B., Turnholt [1974]).
In her new role as first teacher of the infant Apostolic Community, the Magistra Apostolorum was not silent. She had moved from contemplation to an active ministry in the infant Church. She opened up her heart and revealed the mysteries about her divine Son that she stored up and pondered in silence in her maternal heart. In this magisterial role of instructing the Apostles, Mary guided, led, and comforted the infant Church, as a mother would prepare her child for a mission in life. In this case, Mary helped to prepare the Apostles for their mission of evangelization of the world. In addition to being a maternal title especially when applied here to Mary, Magistra was also a "regal" title. Magistra in the twelfth-century also implied "Queenship". Mary was the queen, the sponsa, the royal bride of the King in the Canticles of Canticles.

Mary identified as Magistra Apostolorum in Rupert of Deutz's Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles is the focus of this study, outlining the Marian doctrine of the Abbot of Deutz. In addition to this Introduction and an Afterword, there will be five chapters which reflect a Christocentric and Ecclesiotypical Mariology. Chapter One of this thesis will outline and survey the life and the Scriptural writings of Rupert of Deutz. Chapter Two will look at the Canticle of Canticles as one of the most widely read Scripture Books during the Middle Ages and a particular favourite of some twelfth-century monks, like Rupert of Deutz, who wrote Commentaries on the Song of Songs with a Marian interpretation. Chapter Three will be concerned with Rupert's Mariology contained in his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, highlighting Mary's magisterial role in the Church as Magistra Apostolorum. Chapter Four will concentrate on the title of Magistra Apostolorum and its biblical foundations in the pondering of Mary (Luke 2:19,51), the Spiritual Motherhood of Mary (John 19:25-26), and Mary's presence in the Cenacle at Pentecost, the moment of the birth of the Church (Acts 1:14). In addition, mention will be made of some Marian authors,
contemporaries of Rupert and earlier, in whose writings the pondering of Mary was clearly the basis for the concept of *Magistra Apostolorum*, even though they did not specifically refer to Mary by this title. Since the pondering of Mary is basic to Mary's role as Teacher of the Apostles, this chapter will consider the exegesis of Luke 2:19,51. Chapter Five will continue with the Mariology of Rupert, studying the etymology and the implications of the word *Magistra* as used by Rupert in the twelfth-century. In studying the significance of the word *Magistra* linkages will be made with the concept of *Regina*, implied in a fuller understanding of *Magistra*, thereby indicating both the maternal and queenly interconnectedness with Mary's role and ministry as *Magistra Apostolorum*. 
CHAPTER ONE
LIFE AND WRITINGS OF RUPERT OF DEUTZ

Early Education and Monastic Formation

Rupert of Deutz\(^1\), a Benedictine Monk of the Abbey of St. Lawrence of Liège, was born in 1075 near Liège.\(^2\) Nothing is known about his parents, but in one of his writings Rupert mentioned that he was the sole survivor of three children.\(^3\) He entered the Monastery of St. Lawrence while still very young, and received all his schooling there. His early education and monastic formation were under the direction of Heribrand of Fooz (+1128).\(^4\)

In spite of his extensive education, the background and focus of all his learning was the Sacred Scripture. He applied all of his secular knowledge in the service of the Scriptures, and he deplored the failure of secular masters to apply them fruitfully to the study of the Holy Scripture.

---

1 Rupert of Deutz was also and perhaps more correctly known as Robert of Saint Lawrence, or of Liège. H. Silvestre, *Le Chronicon Sancti Laurentii Leodiensis Dit De Rupert De Deutz*, (Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 3 série 43, Louvain) 327-329. John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), p. 14 points out that in the environs of Liège, his name was always «Robertus», and that in German speaking lands «Robertus» became «Rupbertus» or «Rodbertus».

2 According to Mabillon, Rupert was born in Liège. According to Trithem, Rupert may have been born near the source of the River Rhine. His date of birth is also not known with certainty. Séjourné thinks that since Rupert delayed his ordination to the Priesthood to a time when he would already have been 30 years old, it would be incorrect to place Rupert's date of birth later than 1075.


4 Heribrand taught Rupert both the Scriptures, and the liberal arts, including secular authors such as Vergil, Horace, and Ovid. Even after his return from exile, Rupert continued his education with Heribrand at the Abbey of St. Lawrence which was his home for about 40 of his 55 years. Rupert left for exile on three occasions because of theological or political problems: France (1092-1095); Siegburg (1116-1117); Cologne (April 1119).
Rupert was also well versed in the Fathers of the Church, and remained steadfastly faithful to their teachings; he was careful never to contradict the Fathers. However, unlike St. Bernard who protested about anything novel in scriptural interpretation, Rupert constantly sought new interpretations, and he frequently enjoyed going beyond the Fathers in order to find something that was "new" and "useful." In one of his early works, he quoted *verbatim* from Fathers of the Church and cited them by name, a practice subsequently stopped. Rather than specifically refer to Church Fathers, Rupert chose to integrate their thought in his writings without any reference.

**Mystical Visions**

Growing up and being educated in a medieval monastery implied also the question of the spiritual formation and the discernment of a true monastic vocation. As a result, some of the children who were placed as oblates in the monasteries grew up without a genuine vocation to the Religious Life, and as a consequence became unworthy and immoral churchmen, administering church properties for their own gain. On the other hand, Rupert's approach to scriptural interpretation was characterized by his ability to integrate the thought of the Fathers into his own work, while remaining true to their teachings. This approach, while innovative, was not without controversy, as some contemporaries viewed it as a means of confusing his adversaries.

---

6 John Van Engen points out that these new meanings seldom represented novelities either in theology or spirituality, "they were rather old truths freshly put, always with the salvation-historical accent and often discovered in new places" (Van Engen, p. 72).
9 John Van Engen sees this as sign of Rupert's growing independence and self-confidence. This was opposed to the view of Silvestre who thought that Rupert deliberately concealed his sources and references in order to confuse his adversaries (Van Engen. p. 47).
hand, there were others who experienced a genuine call to become true professed monks. Such was the case with Rupert, who as a young monk, underwent some form of conversion experience after overcoming a «vocation crisis», which he resolved, or was resolved for him, in what can be described as mystical and visionary experiences. Rupert described some of these experiences in his writings. These writings also reveal that Rupert, as a young monk, was very anxious about his personal salvation, given the violent nature of the temptations he experienced. He often wished that he would die because the dead were safely out of the devil's reach. He expressed these visions and mystical experiences as intimate love encounters with Christ. In his twelfth book on the Commentary of St. Matthew's Gospel, Rupert gave some details about his life, and spoke very modestly about his mystical visions. One detail is noteworthy, because it is an indication of the importance of Mary in Rupert's life. Whenever Rupert experienced a vision, it usually happened while he was at prayer before the statue of the Virgin Mary in the Abbey of St. Lawrence.

La Vierge de Dom Rupert

In the Abbey Church of St. Lawrence in Liège, there was a statue of the Virgin Mary with the boy Jesus sitting on her lap. Rupert prayed daily before this stone carved statue. «It was

10 It should be pointed out that the word "mystical" is used throughout this work to refer to a personal, individual, or very subjective experience.
through the Blessed Virgin’s intercession,” writes Daris, “that Rupert obtained from God the extraordinary gift of intelligence.”  

Daris notes that after Rupert left Liège, this image of the Virgin that Rupert venerated so much, came to be regarded and
celebrated as miraculous. Today this statue is known as La Vierge de Dom Rupert. The sight of this image of Mary served as a reminder to his fellow-monks of the gift of intelligence that Rupert had received from God through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

14 Jacques Stiennon speaks of this statue «not only as a masterpiece of mosan art (un chef-d'oeuvre de l'art mosan), but also as a symbol itself of all the artistic and intellectual activities which made the Abbey of St. Lawrence a particularly active centre of medieval culture. This sculpture, he says, «stirs up in us the same profound feelings with which it explores scientifically, tenderly, and admirably the mystery of femininity and of divine maternity» (op. cit. p. 81). The original La Vierge de Dom Rupert is on display in the Musée Curtius in Liège. There is also a replica of this same statue in Saint-Laurent de Liège, now a Military Hospital. I was able to see both statues, the original and the replica, on March 25th., 1991 in Liège.

15 Daris furnishes information about this statue of the Virgin before which Rupert used to pray. The Virgin is seated on a cushioned chair. Supported on her knees is the child Jesus, who holds his mother's left breast in his hands. Both of them have haloes around their heads, and they are wearing shoes. This sculpture measures 92 cm. tall, and 64 cm. wide. It is semi-circular at the top, and horizontal at the base. At the top is this inscription from Ezekiel 44:2: "This door will be closed, and will not be opened, and no man will pass through it, because the Lord, the God of Israel entered through it." (Porta haec clausa erit nec aperietur et non transibit per eam vir, quoniam Dominus Deus Israel ingressus est per eam). The Latin inscription as it appears on the sculpture is « PORTA HEC CLAVSA ERIT N(on) AP(er)IET(ur) ET N(on) TRANSIBIT P(er) EA(m) VIR Q(uonia)M D(omi)n(i)N(u)s ISR(ae)L = INGRESS(us) E(st) P(er) EAM ». (Lower case letters in brackets added to complete the words abbreviated on the sculpture).

In 1618 Abbot Otger de Loncin erected a marble altar on which this ancient image of the Virgin was placed. He had the following inscription placed at the bottom of the altar: "Audi curiosa et devota posteritas atque aemulare. Periculosae quaeeritur scientiae hac in aede terminus; studii modum, fontemque Marianae disce quam malo, dum sagax rogat hic Rupertus conscienti rudis posuit gravamen et animi infusum decus tota perfudit orbe. Nec tonum hoc satis. Quae struit Ogerus, temp/a sint, sint vel domus, cuncta Marianae numinis fulgent ope." In this inscription, Otger de Loncin affirms that it was before this statue of the Virgin that Rupert prayed, and obtained his gift of intelligence. In 1622 Abbot Otger engaged a sculptor, Jean Valdor, to make a replica of this same statue, but this time to include Rupert kneeling in prayer before the Virgin and the child Jesus. The inscription on this new statue reaffirms the intelligence given to Rupert through the intercession of
Replica of La Vierge de Dom Rupert by sculptor Jean Valdor, commissioned by Abbot Otger in 1622.
La Vierge de Dom Rupert (12th. cent.) - On display at the Musée Curtius, Liège, Belgium.
These mystical visions, coupled with his decision to be ordained a priest sometime in his early thirties, were the turning points in his life. The experience of the visions impelled Rupert to an even deeper study of the Scriptures. He saw this as a divinely inspired task to which he was called. Further, he was convinced that God had given him a special gift of understanding the Scripture. This was also the beginning point of his theological career and the writing of his commentaries on and interpretations of the Books of the Bible.

Rupert's Exegetical Writings

Rupert's theological writings were predominantly scriptural Commentaries on the Books of the Bible. Of the many Scripture Commentaries he wrote, very few were fully developed

---

16 At the beginning of his seventh book on the Commentary of St. Matthew's Gospel, J. Daris points out about Rupert that «Il y témoigne avec une sorte de crainte, à son ami Cunon, qu'il a fait l'expérience, quoique faiblement, de la manière dont Dieu se communique aux âmes saintes. C'est une déclaration que la nécessité l'oblige de faire, parce que quelques personnes se scandalisent de ce qu'il traite des mystères de l'Écriture, l'attribuant à la vanité» (op. cit., pp. 137-138).

17 Although Rupert made extensive use of St. Paul in his writings, he is not known to have written scriptural commentaries on any of the Pauline Literature. There is also no evidence that he wrote a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.

18 From the list of his works which will be given in this chapter, it will be clear that some works which are not Biblical Commentaries are apologetical (Anulus sive dialogus), or ascetical-moral (De Laesione Virginitatis), or historical (De Incendio). Nevertheless there are deep scriptural foundations in all of these works.
theological treatises. His theological views were scattered throughout his writings. On principle, he avoided the dialectic and speculative theology of his day, which he was not at all ignorant of. Not only did Rupert know the philosophical and logical processes of the twelfth-century and before, he even on rare occasions made use of philosophical language in his theological writings when such terminology enabled him to express himself in a "better and more precise manner." He remained to the end first and foremost a scriptural exegete and commentator. His exegesis was primarily concerned with the contents of sacred history as recorded in Sacred Scripture. He considered all of Sacred Scripture to be Salvation History, revolving around the four great mysteries of Christ, which he depicted as the Incarnation, the Passion and Death of Jesus, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. While he looked for spiritual meaning in these mysteries of Christ, he likened them to other "historical" events in the history of salvation. Rupert had an unusual genius for linking scriptural images together and then to the larger history of salvation, and took insatiable delight in discovering new spiritual meaning.

The «Historical» in Rupert's Exegesis

Rupert tended to vacillate between the spiritual sense and the historical sense, and ultimately to anchor himself in the historical sense. It was his conviction that almost everything in

---

19 His De Sancta Trinitate was hardly a full length treatise on the Trinity. His Commentary on the Gospel of St. John was also not a full Christological treatise.

20 "Melius et compendiosus" (Off. 11:7: CM. 7:376).


22 Van Engen, p. 71.
Scripture that can be interpreted in a spiritual sense ultimately refers back to events that occurred in history, in the history of salvation. Rupert’s use of the «historical» was based on his predisposition and liking for the historical books of the Old Testament. In his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, although this Book was poetic both in content and style, and hardly can be classified as historical, Rupert nevertheless treated it historically in so far as he collated all the themes and sentiments in the Canticle with the Gospel scenes of the lives of Jesus and Mary.

In his concern for the «historical», he did not bother much with matters of profane history, because, for him, «history» meant «salvation». So if and when he did consider profane kings in his writings, he dealt with their evil powers and schemes as instruments and acts of the devil against God’s Plan and the People of God.

Coupled with his tendency to embrace the «historical» in his exegesis, Rupert leaned towards the strictly literal sense in his interpretation of Scripture. For example, in his work De Sancta Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus, he had no difficulty interpreting the Creation as literally occurring in seven days. While for Rupert Creation may have occurred instantaneously in the mind of God, nevertheless it took place in time ending on the sixth day with the seventh day as the day of rest.

Henri de Lubac points out that

---

23 The adjective «historical» did not enter into Rupert’s exegesis in the modern sense of considering each text in all the circumstances real and objective that confronted the author; that which today is known as the Sitz im Leben. For medieval writers, like Rupert, the Sitz im Leben of the Old Testament was its fulfilment in the New Testament (M. Peinador, "Mariologia de Ruperta de Deutz", Ephemerides Mariologicae, Vol. 25, [1967], 128).
24 Peinador, p. 129.
25 Peinador, p. 130.
26 Peinador, p. 130.
27 Trim. (Gen). 1.37, 2.18: CM. 21. 165-166.
Rupert's fondness for the literal can be said to be true only to a certain point; he should not be considered as one of the founders or precursors of literalism.

The Allegorical In Rupert's Exegesis

Rupert's exegesis also had a strong proclivity for the allegorical which was also characteristic of the Latin exegesis of his time. In his quest to find spiritual meaning in Scripture, the Abbot of Deutz had a tendency to overdo, and perhaps be "carried away" with the allegorical. Rupert was not the first medieval allegorical writer. John Cassian (360-435) had already highlighted this mode of interpretation, but because Rupert wrote in the early part of the twelfth-century, he was reputed to have inaugurated mystical and allegorical tendencies in twelfth-century exegesis. In spite of this, and no matter how far he went with his use of the allegorical, Dom Séjourné notes that Rupert never lost sight of the historical, and that it could be said that

---

29ibid.
30ibid, p. 220.
31John Cassian, to whom Origen's work was transmitted by his teacher Evagrius Ponticus, preserved Origen's allegorical methods in his *Collationes* (xiv, viii, ed. E. Pictery, SC 54 (1958) 189-93). Rupert may well have been familiar with the *Collationes*, because it was widely known in the Latin Middle Ages, and was widely read in Benedictine Monasteries (E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity*, Philadelphia: University Of Pennsylvania Press, 1990, pp. 23-24, 42 fn.10, 54).
Rupert, while fascinated with the theological in history, was equally interested in the historical in theology.\textsuperscript{33}

To speak about the spiritual or the allegorical in Rupert is also to speak about the tropological\textsuperscript{34} and anagogical senses by which Rupert, in spite of his liking for the literal, had a tendency at times to go beyond the «letter» to find a deeper meaning in the inspired Word. Thus Rupert's extensive use of the allegorical, rooted in the historical, also embraced the anagogical and tropological senses,\textsuperscript{35} which were united cohesively in his scriptural writings. Henri de Lubac refers to this as: «l'unité des sens».\textsuperscript{36} The unity of these four senses of Sacred Scripture: (historical, allegorical, anagogical and tropological) revealed the history of salvation through levels of deepening contemplation, tending towards the interior, the spiritual, the "beyond this world" of the text.\textsuperscript{37} De Lubac adds to this by pointing out that the "silver wings" of a dove were not sufficient for Rupert. His desire was to contemplate the "golden reflection" hidden beneath, to penetrate right to the inmost beauty of the allegory. Consequently Rupert

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33}Hist. de la Philos. Scholastique, 1, 319, 317-2. DTC, 14, 183, As cited in Henri de Lubac, \textit{ibid}, p. 221.
\item \textsuperscript{34}The two central modes of interpretation (allegorical, relating the Song of Songs to Christ and the Church, and tropological i.e., a moral level of interpretation which understands the text as dealing with the love between Christ and the human soul, were made famous by John Cassian (E. Ann Matter, \textit{ibid}, p. 13).
\item \textsuperscript{35}Ann Matter notes that most medieval Latin treatments of the Song of Songs take one of these approaches as their starting point, even though they may touch on a number of other levels of interpretation (\textit{ibid}).
\item \textsuperscript{36}De Lubac also singles out a passage where Rupert affirms that both the historical and the allegorical are necessary to each other, and if one is missing there will be no complete knowledge (\textit{Et in historia spiritus habeas intelligentiam, et in tropologia historiae veriatem... si l'un des deux vient à manquer... perfecta caret scientia}. In Ez., 1.2, c.24 [1489 BC0, as cited in de Lubac, \textit{ibidem}).
\item \textsuperscript{37}Peinador, p. 131.
\end{itemize}
invites us to understand the sacred text anagogically to the deepest level of meaning ("juxta anagogen", "juxta altiorem sensum").

**Biblical Theologian**

Convinced that he was given a divine mandate to interpret Scripture, Rupert exhibited a unique sense of liberty in expressing his understanding of the revealed Word in Scripture. De Lubac characterizes this "liberty", not as a sign of departure from an older way of thinking, but simply as "the liberty of a great spirit". Rupert's reflection was free, but profound, on the most central themes in traditional thought. His exegesis was guided primarily by the rule of faith and the authority of the Fathers. In spite of his strict fidelity to the Fathers, his writings so independently stand on their own to warrant the question as to whether his scriptural commentaries constitute what might be called "Rupertan exegesis"; a new type of theology? Spicq makes mention of Rupert as the founder of biblical theology, which de Lubac concurs with, because no one since the letters of St. Paul had given so much of a priority to expressing theology biblically as the Abbot of Deutz in his copious works.

---

38 H. de Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 222. Based on his reading of *In Gen.*, 1.6,c.41 and *In ev.*, c.2 (1536BC). *In Gen.*, 1.5,c.4 (369C).
39 de Lubac: "La liberté de Rupert n'est donc par le signe d'un affranchissement par rapport à un mode ancien de penser: elle est simplement la liberté d'un grand esprit. Elle est libre réflexion, mais en profondeur, sur les thèmes les plus centraux de la pensée la plus traditionnelle (p. 230).
40 *Diximus, secundum Patrum sanctorum sententiam fideique catholicae regulam...* (In Joh. 1.3, CM. 19. 291).
41 de Lubac, p. 227.
43 de Lubac, *ibid*. 
List of Rupert's Works

Rupert furnished three separate lists of his writings. The first was in a letter written to Pope Honorius 11. The second was contained in the dedicatory letter of the *De Divinis Officiis*. The third list appeared in his Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict. These lists are valuable, not because they attest to the authenticity of Rupert's authorship of his major theological works, but because chronologically they confirm the exact dates of the writings. This triple compilation of separate catalogues of his writings was an unprecedented attempt for Rupert both to defend and to promote his writings.

Three additional lists are available which date back to a period not long after Rupert's time, and they serve as a confirmation of authorship both of his major works and of his smaller or secondary writings.

According to Daris, the best source of Rupert's works is the 1748 Venice edition, which is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, Volumes 167 to 170.

---

44 *Epistola Ad Romanum Pontificem*, PL. 169. 11-12.
45 *Epistola Ad Cunonem*, PL. 170. 10-12.
46 *RegBen.*, PL. 170. 489D.
47 Magrassi, p. 23.
48 Van Engen, p. 342.
49 Magrassi (op. cit., p. 23) lists these three additional lists in a footnote as: 1) The first was found in *Theoderici Catalogus Abbatum Tuiiension* (1164 circa), M.G.H., SS. X1V, 1883, P. 565: enumera 13 opere. 2) The second list was furnished from Ranier of St. Lawrence, *De Ineptis Cuiusdam Idiotae* (anno 1157/58-1160/61), M.G.H., SS. XX pp 595-596 (*PL.* 204, 21-23). This was the most complete catalogue. It introduced a chronological division of his writings before ordination and after ordination, but it did not distinguish between the writings before he was made Abbot and those after. 3) The third list was found in a catalogue from the Library of Liège: J. Gessler, *La Bibliothèque De L'Abbaye De S. Laurent A Liège Au X111 Siecle*, Tongres 1927, Brux. 9810-14.
Rupert's writings can be divided into three periods of his life: 1) The writings before his ordination to the Priesthood (1095-1110); 2) Those after his ordination, but before he was made Abbot (1110-1119); 3) The writings while he was the Abbot of Deutz (1120-1130). In addition, there are writings spuriously attributed to Rupert.

Writings Before Ordination

1. Of the writings before his ordination to the Priesthood, three works in poetry which have survived:
   - De Calamitatibus Ecclesiae Leodiensis, O Carmina De Sancto Laurentio
   - After his «vocational crisis» and his first set of mystical visions, Rupert wrote a poetic work on the Holy Spirit and addressed it to the Holy Spirit.
   - A work on the life of St. Augustine, whom Rupert greatly admired.
   - Other non-extant works written during this period are: a Libellus; a poem on the Canticle of Canticles; A life of St. Odila; and some liturgical chants.

51 During his exile in Northern France (1092-1095), Rupert wrote this apocalyptic style poem lamenting the assaults upon the Church of Rome by the «dragon» of Apoc. 12 (Nero), and upon the Abbey of St. Lawrence by the current «dragon» in the person of Henry 1V, with the help of «Simon Magus» (Bishop Otbert), the «fox» of John 10: 1-16. However, Magrassi considers that this may be of doubtful or spurious authorship. But because it was written by a monk of St. Lawrence, who possessed a good knowledge of the classical authors, as Rupert did, it is probable that Rupert may be the real author. p. 31.

52 Libellum De Diversis Scripturarum Sententiis, mentioned by Ranier, and was listed in the Catalogue of the Library of St. Lawrence in the 12th. century, Magrassi, op. cit., p. 24.
Writings after Ordination

2) Writings after his ordination, but before he was made Abbot:

- Commentary on the Divine Office - *Liber de Divinis Officiis (PL 170,9-332)*
- Moralia on Job - *In Job Commentarium (PL 168,961-1196)*
- The Trinity - *De Sancta Trin. Et Operibus Ejus (PL 167)*
- Commentary on John's Gospel - *In Evang. Sancti Johannis (PL 169,201-826)*

---

53 A work in 12 books, completed either in 1111 or early in 1112. It was one of the most widely read works in the twelfth-century, and its popularity was attested to by the presence of over seventy preserved manuscripts, half of which date back to the twelfth-century. The *De Divinis Officiis*, was very well received, because for over two hundred years no one had attempted such a needed task. Prior to Rupert's *De Divinis Officiis*, monks relied on the works of the Carolingian authors such as Rhabanus Maurus (+856).

54 A Scriptural Commentary on the Triune God, which he started in 1112 and completed in 1117. Rupert's aim was to produce an exposition on the Trinity that was different from the speculative and dialectical approach current in his time, especially the views of the School of Laon, and of Roscellin ("Tritheism"), which were condemned at the Council of Soissons in 1092. Rupert's *De Trinitate* was the lengthiest account of Salvation history since Augustine's *City Of God* and perhaps the first to carry the story down to the present age, the earliest theological *summa* extant from the twelfth-century, an attempted new approach to Trinitarian Theology, and the first attempt ever to prepare a meditation upon all of Scripture in a single work (Van Engen, p. 94).

55 No one had attempted such a lengthy work since St. Augustine had written his *Sermons on John* 700 hundred years prior to Rupert's Commentary on John. In this Commentary, Rupert addressed the theology of the Incarnation and Christology, Sacramental Grace, the Eucharist, and Predestination. This Johannine work of Rupert came under heavy attack and criticism, and eventually led to Rupert being put on trial for his beliefs.

The Commentary on John was completed in 1116. However, Magrassi notes that although the *De Sancta Trinitate* was begun one year earlier (1114) than the Commentary on John's Gospel, this Commentary was indeed written prior to *De Trinitate*. This fact, he says, is confirmed by an alluding to John's Commentary in the final part of the *De Trinitate* (111, 25: PL. 167, 1667A), and Rupert's listing in his catalogue the writing of the Commentary on John's Gospel (1115-1116) before
• The Will of God - *De Voluntate Dei* (PL 170, 437-454)\(^{56}\)
• The Omnipotence of God - *De Omnipotentia Dei* (PL 170, 453-478)\(^{57}\)
• Life of Abbot Heribert - *Vita Heribiti*\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{56}\)Written in response to views he considered outrageous from an anonymous fellow monk who claimed it could be said that God willed the fall of man (Adam). In stead of personally confronting this anonymous monk Rupert challenged his teachers, Anselm and Bishop William, and asked them to take back this *horrendous teaching* (namely *Deus vult malum*), which rested now neither on Scripture, nor on reason, but solely on the authority of their teaching (Van Engen, p. 200). Relying on Scripture for his position, Rupert was confident that the masters of dialectic could not find any arguments or evidence in the Bible to prove that God willed evil. Rupert's main objection to his confrère was that God did not will the evil which He allowed to happen (Vol 1: PL 170. 437). Much of the *De Voluntate Dei* were ideas borrowed and summarized from his Commentary of John's Gospel (Van Engen, P. 191). Also verbatim sections were also borrowed from his Commentary on the Book of Genesis (ibid, p. 197).

\(^{57}\)In this apologetic work on the Omnipotence of God, using Ps. 25.10, «All the paths of the Lord are mercy and justice», and by citing St. Augustine's *City Of God* (*Omnip.* 12.6: CM. 48. 359-360, 361), Rupert reaffirmed the Omnipotence of God, and placed the responsibility for evil on man's shoulders. God was not to be blamed for evil (*Omnip.* c 8: PL. 170. 455-456).

\(^{58}\)The Abbey of Deutz was built around the year 1103 by Archbishop Heribert of Cologne (999-1021). A biography on Heribert was written by Lambert, a monk and later Abbot of St. Lawrence in Liège, when Lambert was a scholastic at Deutz (1045-1056)). About a hundred years later, following the reform of this Abbey by Abbot Markward (1110-1120), with the support both of Archbishop Frederick of Cologne and Abbot Cuno, Rupert was asked to rewrite the life of Heribert. In the new "Life Of Heribert" (*Vita Heriberti*), which Rupert reluctantly wrote, the author embellished Heribert's life with some "novelties", and used this as an opportunity to restate some of his familiar themes (*Herib*. 17., ed. Dinter 59-60). In a sermon which Rupert placed in Heribert's mouth, Rupert lashed out against unworthy and simoniac clergy. Heribert stressed that the office of Bishop was a spiritual one of preaching the Word of God, and of being in communion with the Bishop of Rome. According to Magrassi, this is a spurious work doubtfully attributed to Rupert. However, because the author is a monk of the Abbey of St. Lawrence, it is not improbable that Rupert may have written it (Magrassi, *op. cit.*, p. 32).
Writings as Abbot of Deutz

3) The writings while he was the Abbot of Deutz (1120-1130):

- Commentary on the Apocalypse - *In Apocalypsim Johannis Apostoli Commentarium* (PL 169, 825-1214)*
- On the Victory of the Word of God - *De Victoria Verbi Dei* (PL 169, 1215-1502)*

---

*Rupert's theology of the Church can best be gleaned from this Commentary on the Apocalypse which he completed in 1121. He interpreted the Apocalypse more in terms of ecclesiology than eschatology. His primary concern was with the history of the Church within the history of salvation. Rupert's ecclesiology is also portrayed in the *De Victoria Verbi Dei*, completed in 1124. Rupert's theology of the Church can also be found scattered throughout the pages of his Commentary on Leviticus which formed part of his major work *De Sancta Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus*. For a full treatment of Rupert's Ecclesiology see M. Magrassi, *Teologia*, pp. 87-124.*

A notable aspect of the Commentary was the reference to historical sources outside the Bible. Rupert had insisted that the Apocalypse be read as a concretely historical picture of the Church's tribulations. Consequently, he filled the Commentary with real historical people of the past and the present day who were the anti-Christ (*Apoc. 12: PL. 169. 1193*). The encouraging note was that in the battles with the figures of darkness, i.e., with the immoral and corrupt secular and clerical leaders of his day, the Abbot attempted to show where in the larger course of the history of salvation the persecuted faithful of the Church stood. They stood relatively close to the prophets, the martyrs, and the Lord Jesus Himself, all of whom had fought the battle before them (*idem*).*

The *Victoria Verbi Dei*, completed at the end of the year 1124, was a very dramatic account of salvation-history. The history of salvation had not been the subject of a literary work such as Rupert's fascinating account since St. Augustine's *City Of God* (M. Magrassi, *Teologia*, pp. 142-171). It could be said that what Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* was for the fourth-century, Rupert's *De Victoria Verbi Dei* was for the twelfth-century (Arduini, "Contributo alla biografia di Rupert di Deutz, *Studi Medievali* 3rd ser. 16 (1975), p. 538). Rupert called the whole Book, "The Book of the Wars of the Lord" (*Vikt. 2.18*, Ed. Haacke, 66). It narrated, in the language of a battle epic, a cosmic-historical war between the Kingdom of God guided by the Word, and the kingdom of evil guided by the devil. Rupert completed the *Victoria Verbi Dei* in 1124, and turned his attention to completing a work already...
in progress on the Minor Prophets, which he had started during the year 1122.

61 Free from the «theological or ecclesiastical polemic» of previous commentaries this was Rupert's most «contemplative». In this Commentary on the Minor Prophets Rupert's aim was to uncover the mysteries of Christ hidden in the Scripture. Much of his efforts were directed at discovering the Christological meanings of the Old Testament. He believed that Christ's advent was foretold, not just generally but specifically and in the correct chronological sequence, in each of the minor prophets (Van Engen, p. 240).

62 In A Dialogue between Christians and Jews, which Rupert wrote in 1126, an "imaginary Christian" invited an "imaginary Jew" to become a Christian. The Jew rejected and argued with all the evidence he could muster from the letter of the Law and his understanding of it (Van Engen, p. 246). The full title of this dialogue was Anulus Sive Dialogus Inter Christianum Et Judaeum (PL. 170. 561-610). The title was derived from the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:22) where the father places the ring (anulus) upon the finger of his repentant son who had returned home. In the same manner God the Father awaited with the anulus the return home and the conversion of the repentant Jews. That Rupert entered into dispute and debate with Jewish exegetes and business men in the Rhineland area is no secret. Maria Arduini («Ruperto di Deutz e la Controversia tra Cristiani ed Ebrei nel Secolo XI»), Studi Storici, (Roma, 1979), 50-57), cites a debate between Rupert and a Jewish adversary, Herman, who later converted to Christianity, and became a Premonstratensian Abbot. In the Commentary on the Minor Prophets, he referred to daily encounters with the Jews («quoties cum illis sermonem conferemus»: PL. 168. 366). In this and other writings Rupert portrayed the Jews as people who, having heard the Word of God, the words of the prophets, chose to reject it and interpret the message to suit their own needs (Trin. Spir. 8.14: CM. 24. 2091-2092). Van Engen points out that in spite of Rupert's hostile tone when referring to the Jews and Judaism in his Commentaries written for Christian readers, Rupert in personal debate with Jews was just the opposite. He «would adopt a friendly attitude and debate on common grounds» (p. 244). He wrote of the Jews as «the enemies of Christ and His Church,» as people who still «curse Christ in their synagogues,» and would forever be responsible for and guilty of the blood of Christ. Christian-Jewish relations went from bad to worse during the twelfth-century. The Jews were to carry the blame and the guilt for the death of Christ, and, as a consequence, they were badly treated and
• Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel - *De Gloria Filii Hominis* (PL 168,1307-1634)\(^63\)
• A Debate between a Monk and a Cleric - *Altercatio*\(^64\)
• Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict - *...Capitula Regulae Divi Benedicti Abbatis* (PL 170,357-390)\(^65\)
• Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles - *De Incarnatione* (CCCM 26. PL. 168. 837-962).
• Commentary on the Books of Kings - *De Glorioso Rege David*\(^66\)
• The Glory of the Trinity and the Procession of the Holy Spirit - *De Glorificatione Trinitatis et processione Spiritus Sancti* (PL 169, 11-202)\(^67\)
• The Fire at Deutz in 1128 - *De Incendio*

oppressed (by Christians) with heavy taxation as a sign of "pious torture", so that they could be brought to do penance, and eventually acknowledge Christ (*Trin. (Gen)*. 9.4: CM. 21. 536). Van Engen notes that this Dialogue written by Rupert was noteworthy because it was the only such work to come out of the critically affected Rhineland soon after the massacres and forced conversions of the later 1090's (Van Engen, p. 247.) This Dialogue, which contrasted baptism with circumcision, faith in Christ as opposed to the Law, and other themes where Christianity conflicted with Judaism, concluded with the Christian inviting the Jew to convert, that is, to receive the ring which the Father extended to his prodigal, but now penitent son (Van Engen, pp. 247-248). Rupert saw this written Dialogue as a work to be studied by young monks preparing them with the right armour to do battle against anti-Christian teachings (*ibid*, p. 247).

\(^68\)This lengthy work was spread over thirteen books, and was completed around 1127 after several interruptions. Rupert interrupted this work on three occasions to begin work on other projects: The Rule of St. Benedict; The Canticle of Canticles; The Books of Kings.

\(^69\)See footnote 82, chapter 1.

\(^65\)Written in 1125, this was Rupert's most exhaustive writing in defence of Benedictine monasticism, and also his most autobiographical.

\(^66\)Unfortunately this work in fifteen books has been lost.

\(^67\)This work, a sort of "Summa", a summary of his previous works addressed to Pope Honorius 11 (1124-1130), was finished just before the fire at Deutz on the 28th. day of August, 1128. It was Rupert's final major theological work.
Meditation on Death - *De Meditatione Mortis* (PL 170,357 390).

Spurious Works

- *In Ecclesiasten*\(^{68}\)
- *De Vera Vita Apostolica*\(^{69}\)

The Spirituality of a Reform-minded Monk

As a monk-priest, Rupert had a passion for the reform of the Church from the hands of corrupted and unworthy clergy among whom simony was rampant. This passion for the reform of the Church was matched with an intense intolerance and aversion for immoral and unworthy priests and monks. He was firm and rigid in denouncing all clergy who taught heresy, lived immorally, and who were guilty of simony.\(^{70}\) Rupert was so opposed to the presence and the unworthy episcopal leadership of

---

\(^{68}\) A five books work, date of writing unknown. This was to be a Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes, which the author left uncompleted. Magrassi lists this work as of doubtful authorship because the contents and style differ from most of Rupert's other works. Where most of the genuine writings of the Abbot of Deutz tended towards a more mystical interpretation, *In Ecclesiasten* favoured a more moral interpretation, and contained many doctrinal abstractions not typical of Rupert's works. This work also lacked Rupert's allegorizing (Magrassi, p. 34-45).

\(^{69}\) *PL.* 170. 611-664. Five books on the apostolic life (Magrassi, p. 33).

\(^{70}\) Rupert was very active in spearheading a revolt of lay people against unworthy clergy. He affirmed that the laity could rightly condemn priests who proved to be unworthy in their ministry (*RegBen.* 2.15: CM. 22.1259; *Trin.* (*Exod*). 3.22: CM. 22. 714), and «like Balaam's ass (Nun. 22.22ff), the laity should reproach its rider, the prelate, for simony, and should rightly and forcibly keep him from carrying out his avaricious desires» (*Trin.* (*Num*). 2.17: CM. 22.986-987; Van Engen, p. 37).
Otbert, that he refused ordination to the priesthood from the hands of the excommunicated Bishop of Liège.71

This zeal for reform both of the Church and of Benedictine monasticism shed much light on the spirituality of Rupert of Deutz.72 The writings that reveal much of this reforming spirituality were his Commentaries on the Divine Office and on the Rule of St. Benedict. The Divine Office formed the basis of Rupert's spirituality. It was his conviction that fidelity to the chanting of the Divine Office and constant meditation on Sacred Scripture were the zenith of all penitential practices.73 To this he added the challenge to monks to go beyond the mere praying of the Divine Office, and to come to a prophetic understanding, and

---

71The Diocese of Liège was an Imperial See. Henry the «Peaceful» became Imperial Bishop of Liège in 1075, the supposed year that Rupert was born. Henry repossessed the Abbey of St. Lawrence from corrupt leadership, and appointed the capable and reform minded Berengar as Abbot (1077-1116). Under Abbot Berengar, the Abbey of St. Lawrence prospered as a centre for spirituality and learning. After the death of Henry the Peaceful (1091), the good and competent Imperial Bishop of Liège, the diocese fell into the hands of Otbert, who, through simony, was appointed Bishop of Liège (1091-1119) by the equally corrupt King Henry IV.

72As a "black monk", Rupert was intent on the reform and renewal not only of the Church, but also of the monastic life; a movement of reform begun by Pope Gregory VII, Hildebrand (1073-1085).

73Matt. 5: CM. 29. 156; Trin. [Spir]. 8.1-3: CM. 24. 2074-2077; RegBen. 3.13: PL. 170. 520-522. In his Rule of St. Benedict, writes Leclercq, «Rupert took occasion to express his great sense of the value of the traditional monastic ascesis, but his scriptural writings are themselves a witness to the fruitfulness of the lectio divina» Jean Leclercq et al., The Spirituality Of The Middle Ages, (London: Burns & Oates, 1968), p. 171. The Abbot of Deutz is not known to have practised any strict form of ascetical practices during his life time over and above what was required of a monk. He regarded the whole religious life of a monk, even the wearing of the black gown of a monk, to be sufficiently penitential in nature. Rupert would fast and perform penitential practices only on days prescribed by the Church or by the Rule of St. Benedict. His penitential practices included frequent confessions and the mutual censure among his brother Benedictines (Trin. [Levit]. 2.40-45: CM. 22. 905-913; Trin. (Spir). 8.20-21: CM. 24. 2097-2100).
inward experience of the mysteries, the images, and the works of God known from the Scripture and the Office. This required a greater intensity and personal commitment on the part of the "black monks", something he pleaded for throughout his works.\textsuperscript{75}

The timing of the Commentary on the Divine Office was also welcomed by the reform-minded leaders in the Church. Reform of the Liturgy and the renewal of the Divine Office went hand in hand with the reform of the clergy, and were all part of the new blood infused into the reform of the Church.

A characteristic of all of Rupert's writings was the emphasis that he solidly placed upon the scriptural contents of the prayers, the readings, and the homiletic components of the Office. The Divine Office provided the framework for the monks' daily meditations on Scripture.

In addition to helping to improve the quality of the priesthood, and to teach monk-priests the deeper meaning of the Church's prayer, Rupert saw the commentary on the Divine Office as providing opportunities for the monks to join in major theological discussions of the day.\textsuperscript{76} In fact, nearly all of Rupert's pronounced theological views were at least adumbrated in the devotional setting of the \textit{De Divinis Officiis}.\textsuperscript{77} Also, it was Rupert's «instinctive presupposition that theology should be done only in the context of worship.»\textsuperscript{78}

Another of Rupert's writings that showed his monastic spirituality and reforming zeal was his Commentary on the Rule of his monastic founder, St. Benedict. In reforming Benedictine

\textsuperscript{74} A «black monk» referred to Benedictine Monks, so called because they wore black gowns, unlike Cistercians, known as «white monks» because of their white habits.

\textsuperscript{75} Van Engen, p. 304.

\textsuperscript{76} For example, the feast of the Incarnation of the Lord was the ideal time and setting for a theological discussion of \textit{Cur Deus Homo}?

\textsuperscript{77} Van Engen, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 66.
monasticism, Rupert focused his efforts at the reform of the religious life by concentrating more upon the renewal of fervour, dedication, and commitment by individual monks. Being a reform-minded monk-priest, Rupert stressed the superiority of the religious life and the role of the monks in the reform of the Church. Rupert was convinced that his personal lifestyle, a celibate monk-priest living chastely and committed to seeking a vision of God, was the highest form of life and the one best suited to spiritual growth. He considered Benedictine monk-priests, who lived the strictest form of life, and who celebrated the Eucharist every day, to be the ideal of the whole Church.

The «black monks» felt themselves superior to and often conflicted with other religious orders, especially the new orders of monks that were coming into being at that time. One such order was the Cistercian monks of the strict observance of the Rule of St. Benedict. Rupert was particularly distressed that the

---

79In addition to chastity, the spiritual life of a "black monk" involved evangelical poverty. Rupert was adamant against those who possessed and used the material things of the world for their own purposes. Nevertheless, he took it for granted that wealthy people should donate their money and properties to the Abbeys in return for the spiritual intercession of the monks (RegBen. 3.11: PL. 170. 519-520; Matt. 2: CM. 29. 40; Trin. (Spir). 9.17: CM. 24. 2118-2119). Poverty for Rupert also included the idea of obedience. The submission of one's will in humble servitude was to be «poor in spirit» as Jesus called for in the Beatitudes, Mt. 5:3 (M.L. Arduini, «Il problema della Paupertas nella vita Sancti Heribiti Archepiscopi Coloniensis di Ruperto di Deutz>, Studi Medievali, 3rd. Ser. 20, (1979), 106-107, 109). The «black monks» placed more emphasis on being poor in spirit than upon being absolutely poor in material goods.» (Van Engen, p. 303). In the Commentary on Matthew's Gospel, Rupert illustrated the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) as the Guideline for the more intensive living of the Benedictine monastic way of life. After highlighting the Beatitudes, and the need for the monks to be the «salt of the earth», and the «light of the world», he divided the rest of the Sermon into four parts corresponding to the four virtues of justice, temperance, fortitude, and prudence (Matt. 4: CM. 29. 104-107, 133-134, 140-142).
Cistercians, the «white monks»\textsuperscript{80}, placed more importance on manual labour than on the celebration of the Divine Office and the daily Mass.\textsuperscript{81}

These Cistercians did not pose as great a threat and a challenge to Rupert as did the Augustinian Canons Regular, who felt that monks should center their energies within the walls of their monasteries, and not be concerned with the pastoral care in the parishes. Rupert insisted upon a monk's right not only to preach and teach, but also to provide pastoral care in parishes.\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{80}See footnote 74 of this chapter re: the distinction between «white monks», and the «black monks».

\textsuperscript{81}These new monks argued that Benedict spoke more of the need for manual labour than for the intercessory religious practices of the monk-priests. Manual labour was for them «apostolic» (Rule c48. \textit{RegBen.} 3.5: PL. 170. 513). On the contrary, Rupert argued, citing Acts 6:3 where Peter declared that it was not right for them to abandon God's Word in order to wait on tables, that daily chanting of the prayer of the Office and intercession at the altar should not be given second place to manual labour in the fields, and he wanted to make sure that his own monks were not misguided by the false apostolic life of these new «white monks».

Another point of contention between Rupert and the «white monks» was their rejection of money, land, and properties, to which intercessory service was attached. Rupert felt that so long as monks were faithful to prayerful intercession for their benefactors, they were free to accept lavish gifts from the wealthy (\textit{Matt.} 8: CM. 29. 239-240, 247-248).

\textsuperscript{82}During his early years in Cologne, sometime between 1119-1122, Rupert wrote a treatise, a debate between a monk and a cleric as to whether a monk is permitted to preach, \textit{Altercatio Monachi Et Clerici Quod Liceat Monacho Praedicari}. The Canons denied the monks any right to preach, to be involved in the pastoral care of souls in parishes and to receive income as a consequence. For Rupert this was a denial to monks of the right and privilege of the priesthood which they had enjoyed from the ninth-century (Van Engen p. 327). Another heavily debated issue of this time, addressed in the \textit{Altercatio}, was the question of status in religious life concerning which form of religious life (monk or parish clergy was superior or inferior. In Rupert's mind the monastic life of a «black monk» was a «higher form of life» to that of the secular clergy. Consequently a monk vowed to the «higher form of life» could not transfer «down» to the secular clergy, a «lower form of life». Although this issue was not addressed in Canon Law, in Rupert's mind one could move «up», but definitely not be permitted to move «down» (\textit{RegBen.} 4.7: PL. 170.
Preaching the Word of God

Rupert placed a premium upon preaching the Word of God in Sacred Scripture. He made preaching a priority for himself and consistently and repeatedly placed preaching as first among the responsibilities of all priests and bishops, making it the central requirement of their ministry. He was convinced that his vocation to interpret Sacred Scripture extended beyond writing to actual preaching of the Word of God, and he took his preaching responsibilities very seriously. He believed that preaching the Word of God was the best way to educate, reform, and to edify the clergy. Sermons were preached from the Scriptures and the Biblical Commentaries. Preaching was also the way to communicate the teachings of the Church, and to combat heresy, and other evils, particularly the simony and greed of unworthy priests. Rupert was convinced through preaching and improved learning, the whole Church would be reformed. Preaching of the Word was the Church's chief reforming weapon. In his *De Victoria Verbi Dei*, Rupert criticized the priests and monks who...

---

530-531). The Canon-clerics, followers of St. Augustine's rule, contended that since their founder was a Bishop, and not an ordinary monk, their form of religious life was higher and superior to that of a Benedictine monk. Consequently a monk could "move up" and become a Canon-cleric.

Another problem was that Canons in the Diocese of Liège had begun to call their leader "Abbot" with the appropriate investiture ceremony of the two staffs of authority. They were doing so with the approval of Albero 1, the Bishop of Liège, who was a suffragan to the Archbishop of Cologne. This displeased Frederick also, and he wrote a letter reprimanding Albero, and reminding him that Canons owed their allegiance to the Bishop, and monks were subject to their Abbot. Rupert felt that with the Archbishop on his side in this matter, this problem would be successfully resolved. Such was not to be the case because the practice of Canons investing their leaders as Abbots continued to spread.

---


84Trin. (Levit). 2.27: CM. 22. 889.

85Vict. 4.8, Ed. Haacke, 66.
carried a «material sword» and forgot the «spiritual sword» of preaching. There was no justification for any clerical use of the material sword. The only sword that priests and monks should carry was the spiritual sword of preaching, teaching, and meditating upon the Word of God. His Biblical Commentaries and his preaching were his spiritual sword in the renewal and reform of the Church and of Religious Life.

Controversy, Suspicion and Heresy

In addition to his passion for the reform of the Church and Benedictine monasticism, Rupert's passion for orthodoxy and its defence, brought him into conflict with other theological schools. As a theological writer he was never totally free from, suspicion of novelty, and heresy. Controversy seemed to follow him, and

86 Van Engen notes that precedent for this terminology of the two swords (material and spiritual) can be found in Origen (+253), in his Homiliae In Libro Judicum 6:2. op. cit., p. 289. The superiority of the spiritual sword over the material sword was one of Rupert's favourite themes found throughout his writings, in particular, the De Victoria Verbi Dei. The history of salvation in the Bible was shown as a series of victories which the Incarnate Word obtained by means of His messengers, the prominent people, the forerunners of Mary in Israel's history (Peinador, p. 29).


88 Van Engen, p. 301.

89 While many charges against him came from anonymous adversaries and critics. Rupert thought that it was out of envy that these critics, ever ready to charge him with heresy, scrutinized his writings. Mabillon identified Norbert of Xanten, one of Rupert's strongest critics, as the anonymous adversary (Guntram Bischoff, The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and his Anonymous Adversary, doctoral dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, (1965), pp. 10-11). Norbert, who had read and reread the De Divinis Officiis, charged Rupert with teaching that the Holy Spirit became incarnate in the Virgin Mary. Rupert responded saying that Norbert had misread or misunderstood a word «animatur» from a passage from St. Gregory (Off. 3.11: CM. 7. 77, taken from Gregory's Hom. Evang. 7.3: PL. 76. 1101). He used this opportunity to clarify the distinction between the person and work of the Holy Spirit, by emphasizing that prior to the conceptions of Jesus and
he never shied away from the ensuing debates. It was particularly his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John that opened him up to suspicion and criticism. Rupert was not known to take attacks on his theological orthodoxy passively. He became embroiled in a controversy over the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist.

of John the Baptist, the Spirit was known in the Scriptures simply as the «Spirit of God» or the «Spirit of the Lord». However, in the New Testament the Spirit came to be known as the «Holy Spirit». Thus the Spirit of God assumed a new role as the bearer of saving grace. Van Engen reflects the conclusion to Rupert's argument thus: «While it is sheer foolishness to say that Norbert charged that the Spirit was incarnate or brought to life (animatur) in the Blessed Virgin's miraculous conception, it is scripturally sound to argue that the Holy Spirit then assumed a new task and a new name. Rupert's argument here identified almost totally the person and work of the Holy Spirit with what later scholastic theologians would call sanctifying grace» (Van Engen, p. 340).

90In his Commentary on St. John's Gospel, in addition to addressing the theology of the Incarnation, Christology, and Sacramental Grace, Rupert discussed the Eucharist, and Predestination. This Johannine work of Rupert came under heavy attack and criticism, and eventually led to Rupert being put on trial for his beliefs. In this work, Rupert took upon himself the task of addressing the still unresolved, lengthy, and divisive disputes on the Incarnation, the Eucharist and Predestination of the ninth-century Carolingian reformers.

91Rupert could not sit back passively while the real presence was questioned or compromised in popular debate. In his view, any opinion which threatened to empty the sacrament of Christ's full and real presence required instant rebuttal. In his zeal to uphold the doctrine of the real presence, Rupert expressed his belief that the Body of Christ on the altar was the Incarnate Christ of the Gospel, and to show how this was so, he chose to emphasize the unity rather than the identity of the two bodies, and to develop a strong parallel between the Eucharist and the Incarnation. He was charged with heresy for his position on the Eucharist. Rupert was put on trial in the Fall of 1116. Without going into details about the Eucharistic Controversy, suffice it to say that Rupert was saved from condemnation and silencing by the timely intervention of Abbot Cuno of Siegburg, who was to become Rupert's patron and protector.

Cardinal Bellarmine, four hundred years later, accused Rupert of the heresy of «impanation»; charges in which Rupert was to be later strongly defended by his brother-monks Gerberon [circa 1669] and Mabillon [circa 1745] (G. Gerberon, Apologia Pro Ruperto Abbetae. PL 167. 29-44, 99ff.; J. Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti 76.83: ed. E. Martène [Lucca 1745], 240-243). In his De Scriptoribus
and a controversy over the question of Predestination.\footnote{33} Another charge of heresy levelled at Rupert, and one he made a vague reference to in his Commentary 'De Gloria Et Honore Filii Hominis'\footnote{92} concerned his innovative Marian interpretation of the entire Canticle Of Canticles. Rupert did not mention the source of the criticism, but they were monks. They were critical of Rupert's attribution to Mary of particular qualities (specialitati) that have been generally (generalitati) ascribed to the whole Church.\footnote{94} Responding to this criticism, Rupert strongly objected

\begin{thefootnotes}
\footnote{92}{Of all the theological controversies that embroiled Rupert, none was as prominent and more spoken about than the Predestination controversy with the leading French Masters: Anselm of Laon (+1117); Roscelin of Compiegne (about 1050-1120); William of Champeaux (1070-1120), and their disciples. Unlike the Eucharistic controversy, which in many ways was a local affair, this controversy on Predestination involving renowned teachers of Logic and Scripture, can be called the first major collision in the twelfth-century between monastic and scholastic theology (Van Engen, p. 181). Again without delving into the complexities of the Predestination Controversy, which is not within the scope of this work, Rupert, although charged with heresy, was found to be not guilty of denying God's omnipotence, both by Alger of Liège and Master Stephen of the Cathedral Chapter, two influential teachers in Liège.}

\footnote{93}{Glor. 7.13: PL 169. 155.}

\footnote{94}{This terminology, with its derivatives speciatim-generatim and specialitati-generalitati, was widely used up to the twelfth-century. H. de Lubac draws on H. Barré, who pointed out that this terminology goes back to the fourth rule for the interpretation of Scripture of the Rules of Typology of Tyconius, a fourth-century African exegete (PL. 18.33-46). He says: «de specie et genere was taken up by St.}

\end{thefootnotes}
to their language which spoke of Mary as a «species», and the Church as a «genus». Nevertheless, he refused to enter into a verbal battle with them because a letter probably written by Pseudo-Jerome (possibly by Paschasius Radbertus, 780-865), the Cogitis Me, had already anticipated this interpretation.

Augustine and commented upon by the whole Latin tradition. «Scripture», said Tychonius, «is in the habit of concealing the species under the genus—for example, the whole body under a member» This principle may be applied to the relation of the Church to Our Lady. In the Gospel texts where she is mentioned we may see, performed in specie, what was to be realized in genere, and the genus anticipatorily concentrated, so to speak, in the species» (H. de Lubac, *The Splendour Of The Church*, London & New York: Sheed & Ward, 1955, p. 264). Also writing on this, Noel O'Donoghue in an article: *Our Lady And The Church*, points out that «the species-genus couple is not used here in the scholastic sense. Neither is there question primarily of the relation of a special or privileged case to the group of which it is a member; there is a question rather of two modes of existing and acting, the individual mode and the community or collective mode. Mary has lived personally, individually, what the Church lives socially, communally.» He goes on to say: «It was seen as part of Mary's vocation that she should prefigure the Church, living in the individual mode the mysteries which the Church would live in the community mode. The Fathers and early latin theologians expressed this by saying that Mary prefigured in specie what the Church would accomplish in genere, in the way that, for example, the City of Jerusalem prefigured the whole human race» (Mother Of The Redeemer, Edited by Kevin McNamara, New York: Sheed & Ward, Inc., 1960, pp. 229-230). Also: H. Barré, «Marie et l'Église du Ven. Bède a Saint Albert le Grand», printed in *Études Mariales*, 9, 1951, pp. 121ff). For a study on Exegetical Rules of Tychonius, see Pamela Bright, *The Book of Rules of Tychonius, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity*, Vol. 2, (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988). This book is a rewriting of her doctoral dissertation, *Liber Regularum Tyconii: A Study of the Hermeneutical Theory of Tychonius, Theologian and Exegete of the North African tradition*, (Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1987).

The *Cogitis Me* was a letter which had a widespread influence in the Middle Ages. It is not known for sure who the author of the *Cogitis me* is. It had been attributed to St. Jerome, and there have been unproven claims that it was probably composed by Paschase Radbert (+865), the Benedictine Abbot of Corbie. The author had applied several texts of the Canticle of Canticles to the Virgin Mary. The *Cogitis Me*, with its terminology of *specialis* or *specialiter*, applicable to Mary, and its terminology of *generalis* or *generaliter*, applicable to the Church, had an
Of all the charges levelled against him perhaps the one that pained Rupert the most was the personal attack against him for going beyond what the Fathers had said, especially after he had completed his Commentary on the whole of Scripture, the *De Sancta Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus*, something not attempted by any of the Fathers of the Church. Rupert saw it as a direct and a personal attack upon his divine calling to interpret Sacred Scripture. Being saddened and hurt, and perhaps fearful of further criticism, his response was total silence. From August 1117 to April 1119 Rupert is not known to have written anything.

**Abbot of Deutz**

Following the death of Abbot Markward, Rupert became the Abbot of Deutz in 1120. He felt that it was both his enormous influence upon Medieval Mariology, especially on Rupert's ecclesiotypical Mariology. According to the author of the *Cogitis me*, whatever was specifically attributable to Mary was in a general way attributable to the Church. Paschase Radbert in his Exposition on the nuptial Ps. 44 (45) showed that the words virgin (*virgo*) and spouse (*sponsa*), used by Scripture in a general way for the whole Church apply also to all Christian souls. Henri de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church*, p. 265. In portraying Mary as a type of the Church Rupert made use of this same language when speaking about Mary and the Church. Rupert wrote: «Nothing is unfittingly applied to her (Mary) which can be said or sung of the great and holy Church which loves Christ and is loved by Him. (*Quia nihil huic disconvenit omnium eorum quaecumque dici velcantari de magno et sancto amore dilectae et diligentis Christum ecclesiae* PL. 169. 155D).

96Initially Rupert was neither well received nor accepted as Abbot by the monks at Deutz. They (the «local men») were jealous that they were overlooked and side-stepped in favour of a «foreigner». Rupert likened himself to Joseph, the «foreign hired servant» who had to rule over subjects, whose language he did not understand well. However, in time, the new Abbot of Deutz was to master the German language and gradually win acceptance, but Rupert still felt himself to be in exile, a home-sick man dislocated from his homeland and his Mother Abbey, St. Lawrence in Liège (Van Engen, p. 234).
expertise in Scripture and his divine calling to interpret Scripture that qualified him to become the Abbot of Deutz.

During his tenure as the Abbot of Deutz, Rupert devoted himself to a more intensive study of Benedictine Monasticism, and it was during that period of time that he produced the majority of his theological writings. Of the nine major works written during that time, at least four\(^7\) were written at the request of his patron Abbot Cuno of Siegburg,\(^8\) who later became the Bishop of Regensburg (1119-1126). He wrote a lot because much was demanded of him. He was torn between two patrons, Cuno and Frederick, who were not requesting; they were demanding that Rupert write Biblical Commentaries.\(^9\) Both of these men had come to his rescue when he was in difficulties, and he felt deeply indebted to them. Rupert would pray for divine assistance on how to meet the demands of his patrons, and with God's help, he was able to complete the task.\(^10\) In addition to demands from Cuno and Frederick, Rupert's fame as a writer brought requests for other writings from other people.\(^11\)


\(^8\)Abbot Cuno, who had become Rupert's patron and protector, introduced Rupert to Archbishop Frederick of Cologne, whose additional patronage Rupert came to enjoy. To enjoy the favour of a prominent Archbishop was a breath of fresh air for Rupert. It was «liberating» for him to find himself under the protection of a pro-papacy minded Archbishop who supported his works, in sharp contrast to the previous tension-filled thirty years with Bishop Otbert.

\(^9\)Following the completion of the Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, and returning to continue the Commentary on Matthew's Gospel, Rupert was forcefully commanded by Archbishop Frederick to write a Commentary on the Books of Kings. (\(^10\)CM. 29. 229-230.

\(^11\)1. Rudolph of St. Trond requested a work entitled *De Glorificatione Trinitatis Et Processione Sancti Spiritus*.

2. The Abbot of St. Martin The Great, Albanus (1110-1138) asked Rupert to rewrite the *Passio* of St. Eliphius martyred during the persecution of Julian the Apostate (361-363) (*Eliph. Prol. PL. 170. 427. Magrassi considers this to be another
Along with all of these requests and demands, the Abbot also had to cope with the aftermath of a fire at Deutz. Shortly after the fire in 1128, Rupert wrote the *De Incendio*, a short work which has been lost. In the *De Incendio*, Rupert exhorted his monks to a deeper sense of contemplative solitude, free from the noise and distractions of city and business life.

With all of this Rupert was getting tired from the demands upon him to write, and from the added burdens of his confrontations with his «patron» Archbishop Frederick. These were difficult and stressful times for the Abbot of Deutz, who was also beginning to feel the burdens of his Abbatial Office, that he spurious work, *op. cit.*, p. 32).

3. Another Abbot, Gerard of St. Pantaleon (1123-1147), asked Rupert to write the homily to be used annually on the feast of St. Pantaleon. In his customary manner, Rupert included several of his favourite themes in this *Sermo De S. Pantaleone*, and even compared St. Pantaleon to his own patron Saint Lawrence.

4. In response to questions raised by Wibald of Stavelot on the fall of man, issues arising from his work on Predestination, Rupert wrote a short treatise on sexual morality and the loss of virginity, *De Laesione Virginitatis* (*PL.* 170. 543-560).

The fire destroyed the castle at Deutz, but spared the monastery and Church. The fire came as a welcomed relief and a blessing for Rupert who saw in the fire God's Providential intervention on behalf of the monastery. Rupert saw the fire as God's intervention and judgement against the powerful episcopal lords, Frederick and his successor, Bruno. Although recognizing the title deed as belonging to the monks, there were strong land claims to Deutz, especially to the nearby castle, because its location and elevation made it of crucial importance for the defence of Cologne. Needless to say, Rupert found all of these political and secular matters to be foreign and very distracting to the contemplative silence of a monastery.


Rupert was firm about this, and in the closing chapter, he issued this warning to the monks, «If anyone of you should perhaps think otherwise (about the need for solitude), that person clearly has not yet washed away all the dust of the world from the eyes of his mind.» (Taken from Van Engen, p. 257).

*Matt. Prol.: CM.* 29. 3
seriously more than once thought about resigning as Abbot. However, as much as he wished to resign, he did not abandon his abbatial post.

De Meditatione Mortis

Rupert fell sick with a high fever and died on March, 4th., 1129 in his mid-fifties or there about. The Abbot's written words in his Meditation on Death which he was writing when he died were: "mori potest, silere non potest", and even in death he would continue to speak out in defence of the truth revealed in Sacred Scripture.

By the time of his death, his theological output, a monumental legacy of writings, placed him second only to the great St. Augustine, whose thought also had a great influence on the Abbot of Deutz. Van Engen claims that Rupert had become...
the leading Benedictine theologian in the Archdiocese of Cologne, and probably the foremost theologian during the 1120s anywhere in the northern and western part of Europe.\textsuperscript{111} Jean Leclercq referred to Rupert "as the best representative of the ancient spirituality."\textsuperscript{112} Henri de Lubac singled out Rupert as a "giant" among the men of his time; "a giant on the threshold of the twelfth-century."\textsuperscript{113} E. Hubert Silvestre remarked that it would be inexcusable to think about western medieval theology and exegesis without reserving a most honourable place for Rupert of Deutz.\textsuperscript{114}

Marian Writer

Not only was he the most prolific Scriptural theological writer and commentator of his century, the Abbot of Deutz was particularly devoted to Mary. References to the Blessed Virgin Mother of God pervade the pages of his writings. However, it was in his Commentary on the Canticles that he focused maximum attention on Mary. It was also in this Commentary that he referred to Mary as\textit{ Magistra Apostolorum}, the focus of this study, and the topic of chapter three. The following chapter, Chapter

\textsuperscript{111}Van Engen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 261.


\textsuperscript{113}..., \textit{au seuil du xii siècle, comme un géant"}, Henri de Lubac, \textit{Exégèse Médiévale}, Seconde Partie I, pp. 219, 232.

\textsuperscript{114}Silvestre: "Désormais il sera inexcusable de concevoir l'histoire de la théologie et de l'exégèse en occident au moyen âge sans réserver à Rupert de Deutz la place très honorable qui lui revient." «M. Magrassi: Ruperto di Deutz (Comptes Rendus), \textit{RHE} 56, (1961), 523.
Two, will consider the Canticle of Canticles, the Biblical Book also known as the Song of Songs, one of the most popular Scripture Books in medieval monasteries, and the context and setting of most of Rupert's Mariology.
CHAPTER TWO
CANTICLE OF CANTICLES

Traces of Rupert's Biblical Mariology can be found scattered throughout his writings. However, it is in his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, the *De Incarnatione* that the Marian doctrine of the Abbot of Deutz finds its principal expression.

The Old Testament Book of the Canticle of Canticles was a poetic work. It was an allegorical poem depicting the love relation between a husband (God) and his bride (the people). It symbolically reflected the love of Yahweh for Israel. The varied symbolism employed in the Canticle of Canticles has been interpreted allegorically, and even very differently by various commentators.

Christian exegesis of the Canticle of Canticles was able to identify the messianic links connecting Christ with the Spouse

---

1 Although it was catalogued for liturgical purposes among the Wisdom Literature, Peinador says it was not strictly speaking Wisdom Literature; it was neither historical nor prophetic (M. Peinador, «El Comentario de Ruperto de Deutz al Cantar de los Cantares», *Marianum* 31 [1969], p. 3). Hereafter cited as Peinador, *Cantar*.

2 George A. Maloney, S.J., in his book *Singers Of New Song, A Mystical Interpretation of the Song of Songs*, (Notre Dame, Ind.: Ave Maria Press, 1985), said, «when we approach a writing of Scripture such as the Song of Songs, we become easily confused as to the "correct" interpretation.» He went on to quote the great Jewish scholar Sardia, who began his commentary on the Song of Songs with these words, «Know, my brother, that you will find great differences in interpretation of the Song of Songs. In truth they differ because the Song of Songs resembles locks to which the keys have been lost» (Taken from Marvin H. Pope, *Song of Songs*, The Anchor Bible, [Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1977], p. 89). Maloney went on to point out that «allegorists divide into many schools». He cited examples of Christian allegorists such as Hippolytus, Origen, St. Bernard, and Rupert of Deutz, and the differences in their allegorical interpretations to the Canticle, and pointed to «the danger of such allegorizing of the Song,» and the real possibility of producing «strange and very artificial ways of interpreting this beautiful book of the Bible» (pp. 13-15).
loving his Bride the Church, the New People of God. Christian exegesis and the traditional interpretation of the Fathers interpreted the bride not only in a collective sense, i.e., ecclesially, but also in an individual sense, i.e. mystically. In the first case the bride was the Church, and in the second example the bride was a holy and faithful person, one well advanced in spiritual growth and perfection.

St. Bernard

This was also the way that St. Bernard of Clairvaux (+1153) interpreted the bride of the Canticle of Canticles, i.e., both ecclesially and mystically. Bernard did not interpret the Canticle bride as Mary, as did Rupert, rather he saw the bride as a pious soul journeying towards perfection, and desiring to be

---

3St. Paul writes of Christ's love for the Church as a husband's love for his bride (2 Cor.11:2; Eph.5:25). Origen, in the first known Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, cited the Epistle to the Ephesians to show that the bride spoken of in the Canticle was the Church, spotless and without stain or wrinkle (St. Jerome's translation of Origen's Commentary: ...Ecclesiam sponsam sine macula et ruga...). In Cantica Canticorum, Homilia prima: PL. 23. 1177).


5St. Gregory the Great, Hom. 17. In Evang.: PL. 76. 1138. Also: This is the interpretation that seems to have originated with St. Ambrose. According to Spilker, "The most significant interpretation among the Latin Fathers was St. Ambrose's interpretation. Ambrose understood the Bride to be not only the Church, but also a pious (individual) believer; but above all Mary." Spilker further points out that until Rupert gave his Commentary an exclusively Marian interpretation, "almost all the Commentaries after Ambrose interpreted the Bride to be the Church or the individual soul, and they paid little or no heed to Mary" (Reginhard Spilker, «Maria-Kirche nach dem Hoheliedkommentar des Rupertus von Deutz», printed in Maria Et Ecclesia, Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariani in civitate Lourdes anno 1958 celebrati, Vol. III, Roma: Academia Mariana Internationalis, [1959], 294).

6Peinador, Cantar, p. 5.
united with the Spouse (Christ). Ever solicitous about heavenly things, the bride (pious soul) looked to the bridegroom (Christ) for His help and graces. Bernard's interpretation of the bride as a pious soul was also more in line with St. Gregory the Great's understanding of the Canticle bride which primarily was the Church, and secondarily a pious person in the Church. The Cistercian Abbot of Clairvaux, the "Mellifluous Doctor", in his great work on the Song of Songs, neither gave the Canticle of Canticles a Marian interpretation, not did he write a Marian Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. Instead in extending «the application of the symbolism it contains to the whole Church and to each of its members», he wrote eighty-six sermons on a section of the Canticles. Jean Leclercq maintains that these Canticle Sermons of St. Bernard (PL. 183. 85-1198) were doctrinal. They were not exegetical. The Abbot of Clairvaux's sermons did not cover the entire Canticle of Canticles; in fact, he did not go beyond the opening verses of the third chapter.

7Doctor Mellifluus is the name of an Encyclical by Pope Pius XII, (AAS 45, May 24, 1953, commemorating the eighth centenary of the death of St. Bernard). St Bernard was sometimes called the last of the Fathers (Hilda Graef, op. cit., p. 235), and «sometimes considered the special Medieval Doctor of Our Lady,» (Michael O'Carroll, Theotokos, A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary: Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc. 1982, p. 75. The popularity of St. Bernard has been well attested to by the numerous references to his works in the writings of Popes through the ages, in Mariological treatises by theologians, and in recognition for devotional prayers such as the Memorare and the Salve Regina which have been spuriously attributed to him. Despite his popularity and fame, Bernard's total Mariological output was comparatively small. O'Carroll gives it as about three and one-half percent of the total corpus [sixty columns out of 2200 in PL] (ibid).


9Writing in Saint Bernard Mystique, (Desclée (1948) p. 485), Leclercq regarded St. Bernard neither an exegete nor a theologian, although he had good insight into dogma. As a contemplative, he was an expert on the word of God in Scripture which he was able to articulate with passion and sensitivity (Peinador, Cantar, pp. 13-14).
Ecclesial, Mystical, and Marian

Rupert, in his Canticle Commentary, also embraced these two tendencies, ecclesial and mystical, but with a Marian addition, thereby giving his exegesis of the Canticle a triple tendency: ecclesial, mystical, and Marian. This triple dimension in the exegesis of the De Incarnatione Domini was not mutually exclusive. The three complemented one another as one complete reality; the covenantal loving nuptial between God and His People, Christ and the Church; the spotless bride. As the spotless bride, Mary was a personification embodiment of the Church. This was such a rich and highly traditional doctrine, says Magrassi, and was so significant that the Abbot of Deutz felt himself called to a development of the traditional ecclesiological interpretation. This ecclesiotypical dimension was integral to Rupert's Marian doctrine, and more of it will be seen later on. It was Rupert's love for Mary and his love for the Church that led him to see each one as the beautiful spotless bride. No doubt it was the image of the spotless beauty of Mary, that propelled Rupert's passion for the reform of the Church to be indeed the spotless bride of Christ. This image of the spotless bride reflected in Mary's virginal superiority and perfection, higher than that of

10 The Abbot of Deutz went one step further than his contemporary from Clairvaux. For Rupert, in whichever sense, ecclesial or mystical, the bride could well be Mary because she was both an eminent member of the Church, and one who excelled in all virtues and perfection.


12Peinador, op. cit. pp. 5-6.

13Magrassi: "Il raccordo tra la classica interpretazione ecclesiologica e la nuova interpretazione Mariologica si fonda sull'identità di Maria con la Chiesa: una dottrina feconda e altamente tradizionale..." (p. 63).

14"Egli si appella piuttosto esplicitamente a uno sviluppo della tradizionale interpretazione ecclesiologica." (op. cit., p. 62).
any creature, was ever present in Rupert's contemplation as he wrote his Commentary on the Incarnation of the Lord, the *De Incarnatione Domini.*

The *De Incarnatione Domini* was among several other Commentaries on the Canticle Of Canticles that were written in the twelfth-century. No other Scripture Book had so many Commentaries written about it in the twelfth-century, as did the Canticle of Canticles, a love song which was very popular in the twelfth-century.

This period was particularly known for its emphasis on the theme of love, especially its chivalry and celebration of courtly love. The influence of the courtly love of the medieval troubadours, with its emphasis on romance and eroticism was seen echoed in the ecstatic language of love which permeated the

---

15 In spite of the Marian character and interpretation of Rupert's Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, this Commentary was at least in Rupert's intention meant to be a hymn to the Incarnation. The very title makes this clear: *In Cantica Canticorum De Incarnatione Domini.* John Gorman points out that Rupert's precise purpose was to apply the Canticle of Canticles not to Mary, but to the mystery of the Incarnation. This is evident in the title he gives his commentary... (John Gorman, S.M., *William Of Newburgh's Explanatio Sacri Epithalami in Matrem Sponsi, A Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles,* Fribourg: The University Press, 1960, p. 44. Rupert's intention writes De Lubac, was "to celebrate the first union of the Word with the human nature in the womb of Our Lady—the first kiss of the Word which is the pledge of final union" (*op. cit.*, p. 279).

16 V.I.J. Flint, *The Commentaries Of Honorius Augustodunensis On The Song Of Songs,* *RB* 84, (1974), p. 174 notes that thirty-three Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles were written in the twelfth-century. With so many written, these Commentaries can today be looked at for a good glimpse of twelfth century life. As Flint puts it: "The Commentaries on the Song of Songs are a vital source for the understanding of twelfth-century thought." (*op. cit.*, p. 197). According to Spilker, "people today can hardly appreciate the significance that the Song of Songs had for the Middle Ages. "Wir Heutigen können kaum mehr die Bedeutung des Hohenliedes für das Mittelalter ermessena" (*op. cit.*, p. 293).

Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles; especially the twelfth-century Canticle Commentaries with a Marian interpretation.

Five Other Marian Canticle Commentaries

Of the thirty-three medieval Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles, in addition to Rupert's Marian Commentary, there were five other noteworthy Canticle Commentaries that were applied almost entirely to Mary. They were the Commentaries of contemporaries of Rupert: Honorius of Autun (+1135), Philip of Harvengt (+1183), William of Weyarn (+circa 1177), Alain of Lille (+1202 or 1203, and William of Newburgh (+1200). A brief look will now be taken at these five other Marian Canticle Commentaries, to note any similarities or differences, and also to survey to what extent their authors were aware of, or referred to Rupert's *De Incarnatione Domini*.

1. Honorius of Autun

Honorius, a Benedictine contemporary of Rupert, gave the Canticle of Canticles a Marian interpretation. The difference between Rupert's work and Honorius' Commentary was that while Rupert clearly gave his entire Commentary a Marian interpretation, Honorius saw the Church as the Bride, and at the end of the Commentary he said that all that he had said concerning the Church as the bride could be applied to Mary, a type of the Church. He said: « that everything said of the Church may be understood of the Virgin, who is Spouse and Mother of the
Bridegroom.» 18 Honorius regarded the Church as Mother and Virgin like Mary.

His Marian Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, generally referred to as the Sigillum, short for Sigillum Sanctae Mariae, 19 was a brief work, shorter than the sacred text of the Canticle of Canticles, and only eighteen and a half columns of Migne. The Sigillum was not divided into books, as Rupert's was, but divisions were «indicated by twenty two titles which appear quite irregularly throughout the Commentary....(He used) these titles to change the person speaking, the nature of the discourse, and the person or persons spoken to.» 20 Honorius wrote the Sigillum as a response to concerns by his monks of why certain passages of the Canticles had been applied to the Blessed Virgin on some of her feast days, especially on the feast of the Assumption. 21 As a consequence, it was very liturgically oriented because it applied to Mary passages used in the Liturgy. 22

Flint points out that in addition to writing the Sigillum, Honorius also wrote another Commentary on the Song of Songs which he called In Cantica Canticorum. However, unlike the Sigillum which was a Marian Commentary, in the In Cantica Canticorum, which was a lengthy Commentary concerned with

---

18 Honorius: Omnia quae de ecclesia dicta sunt, possunt etiam de ipsa Virgine sponsa et Matre Sponsi intellegi (PL. 172. 494).
19 PL. 172. 495-518.
20 Gorman, op. cit., p. 48.
21 Cur Evangelium: Intravit Jesus in quoddam castellum (Luc.x, 38), et cantica canticorum de sancta Maria legatur, cum nihil penitus ad eam pertinere videatur? See Gorman, p. 47.
22 Gorman, op. cit., p. 56. Flint writes that the Sigillum "was a contribution made by him (Honorius) at an early, and at, perhaps a particularly sensitive point in his career, to an established liturgy. It was built upon orthodox sources. He uses Paschiasius (Cogitis me), Paul the Deacon, Bede and Haimo" (ibid, p. 200).
the marriage of Christ and His Church, Mary is hardly mentioned. 23

Both Rupert and Honorius worked on their Commentaries independently of each other. The Sigillum showed no dependence on or similarities with the De Incarnatione Domini. It is also not known precisely which was written first. Peinador sees this as a matter of no importance. 24 Gorman treated Rupert's work before Honorius' «only because it was necessary to treat one of the two first.» 25 Ohly holds that Honorius followed Rupert in this Marian emphasis. 26 Nevertheless, Rupert did influence Honorius' later works. 27 «What is certain», says Peinador, «is that later writers followed Honorius' approach as more feasible and more traditional (than Rupert's).» 28

Where Rupert correlated the Canticle of Canticles with the realities of the Gospel in order to highlight Mary's privileges and virtues, Honorius concentrated on the eminence of Mary within the Church and above the rest of the faithful. Nowhere in the Sigillum are found themes which Rupert developed in the De Incarnatione Domini such as Mary's contemplative life, her active apostolate in the Church, and the Eve/Mary antithesis.

---

23 Flint, ibid, p. 204. This second Commentary is found in Migne, PL 172. 347-496.
24 Peinador, op. cit., p. 17.
25 Gorman, op. cit., pg. 44, also p. 46.
28 Peinador, ibid.
2. Philip of Harvengt

Philip of Harvengt, a Premonstratensian Abbot, wrote his Marian Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, as a dramatic dialogue expressing the mutual love between the Incarnate Word and Mary. This Commentary was a «whole allegory of the Virgin» in which Philip envisioned Christ with an entourage of angels, while Mary's company was made up of the Apostles and the faithful.29

This was a very long Commentary. It took up three hundred and eighty columns of Migne's Patrologia Latina.30 Philip might have been familiar with the Commentaries of Rupert and of Honorius. He stated that, with the circulation of other Commentaries, copying from the works of others was almost inevitable.31

Philip's personal love for Mary was in no way diminished, even though he attributed faults and actual sins to her. However, like Rupert, he believed that Mary was purified of original sin and sanctified before the Incarnation. Mary was inferior only to Christ. The influence of medieval courtly love was not lacking from this Commentary. Philip expressed the mutual love between Christ and Mary in very romantic terms touching on the sensuous, if not erotic. In fact he was the first medieval writer to use erotic language to describe the love between bridegroom and bride in the Canticle as a type of the love between Christ and Mary.32

---

29H. de Lubac, The Splendour of the Church, p. 280.
30PL. 203. 181-490. Philip did not appear to have given this Commentary any special title. It appeared in Migne simply under the title of Commentaria in Canticum Canticorum.
31PL 203. 182b.
32Others are: Amadeus of Lausanne (+1159); Aelred of Rievaulx (+1167). Amadeus' use of sensuous language "was far less restraint than in the Commentaries of Rupert of Deutz and Honorius of Autun" (Hilda Graef, op. cit., p. 245).
In becoming the Mother of the Word Incarnate, Mary became the Empress Bride mediating between Christ and the faithful. Philip used the metaphor of the neck, whereby Mary made intercession with her Son for the faithful, whose prayers cannot reach heaven without the help of the Virgin Mother.33

3. William of Weyarn

In the epilogue to Book II of this unpublished Commentary, the author identified himself as «Guilelmus Vivaria». He was probably the abbot of a monastery of Augustinian Canons from 1159-1177.34 William's commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, Carmen ad gratiam dilectae dilecti, was the only one of the six to be written as a poem, which makes it the first poetical commentary applied to Mary.35 John Gorman notes that William of Weyarn's commentary was quite dependent on Rupert's for its Marian interpretation. More specifically notes Gorman, «William is said first to cite a verse of the Canticle, then to add a Marian interpretation, with thoughts frequently taken from Rupert. Rupert is cited twice as "Pater Robertus".»36

4. Alain of Lille

A Cistercian monk, known as the «Universal Doctor», Alain also gave a Marian interpretation to the Canticle. He said that «although the Canticle of love, i.e. the Song of Solomon, referred to the Church in a special and spiritual manner, it

33Taken from Hilda Graef, op. cit., p. 255.
34John Gorman, op. cit., p. 52.
35John Gorman, idem.
36idem.
however referred to Mary in a more special and spiritual way.\(^{37}\)
In the Prologue he stated that his sole reason for writing this Commentary, his *Compendiosa*, was his wish to praise and honour Mary.\(^{38}\) Unlike Philip's lengthy work, Alain's *Compendiosa* was very short; taking up only fifty nine columns of Migne. Nevertheless, it was still longer than Honorius' *Sigillum*.

Alain's Commentary, written in poetic style, was, like Rupert's, characterized by a scene-by-scene presentation of events in Mary's life from the time of the Annunciation. Both Rupert and Alain spoke of God's love for Mary in language of sexual intimacy, particularly when the Holy Spirit overshadowed her at the conception of Jesus, but they both feel that «God's special love for Mary preserved her from sexual arousal at the time of Christ's conception.»\(^{39}\) Alain spoke of the Overshadowing of the Holy Spirit as a tent or umbrella protecting Mary from sexual pleasure.\(^{40}\) Rupert writes that Mary's encounter with the divine Lover at the Annunciation was characterized not by sexual desire but by something sweeter, stronger, and more vehement, the voluptuous ardor of God.\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{37}\) "Unde cunctum canticum amoris, scilicet epitalamium Salomonis, specialiter et spiritualiter ad Ecclesiam referatur, tamen specialissime et spiritualissime ad gloriosam Virginem reductur..." (*PL* 210. 53b). Hilda Graef pointed out that in spite of Alain attributing to Mary all that could be said about the Church, it was strange, she thinks, that Alain did "not identify Mary with the Church but rather with the Synagogue." The Synagogue was called "the Mother of the Virgin, from whom Christ descended. Hence to suck at the breasts of the Virgin Mother was to suck the breasts of the Synagogue" (*PL*. 210. 103c); quoted in Graef, *op. cit.*, p. 257).


\(^{40}\) "...tabernaculum vel umbraculum...contra concupiscentiae incentivum (*PL*. 210. 65c).

\(^{41}\) "...quam melior aut vehementer, dulcior atque fortior esset voluptas sive amor Dei in quo concepisti..." (*Cant. I*: *CM*. XXVI. 12. 69-71; Astell, *ibid*).
The language of ecstasy is present throughout the Commentaries of Rupert and Alain, and in many ways it was a reflection of the self of the writers, their own souls rapt in contemplation. Ann Astell writes:

«In the writings of both Rupert and Alain, the Virgin's knowledge of God is frequently described in the language of prophetic seizure. Rupert speaks of the descent of the Holy Spirit as an afflatus. Alain uses the whole vocabulary of ecstatic transport.» 42

Astell gives an example of this in these lines from Alain's Commentary:

«Through the wine cellar is understood the flight of the mind, which is also called "ecstasy", by which the Virgin was taken up to celestial contemplation, which is also termed "apotheosis" - that is, a deification or theophany, a divine apparition - into which the Virgin, lifted up, was carried away from the love of earthly things.» 43

The same «fusion of plot and poetry, action and affect, which marked the Annunciation scene, also characterized the presentation of other episodes in Mary's life» 44 in the Marian Compendiosa of Alain of Lille.

Comparing Alain's Commentary with other Marian Commentaries of this time, Gorman observes that «except for his

---

42 Ann Astell, op. cit., p. 66.
43 "Per cellam vinarium intelligitur mentis excessus, qui et extatis dicitur, quo Virgo ad coelestium contemplationis rapiebatur, quae et apotheosis, id est deificatio vel theophania divina apparitio nuncupatur, in hanc Virgo ab amore terrenorum suspensa rapiebatur" (PL. 210. 66c; Ann Astell, ibid).
44 Ann Astell, op. cit., p. 63.
explanation of Mary's relation to the Church, Alain's doctrine on Mary seems less fully developed.» Further, comparing Alain's and Rupert's works, Gorman says, «like Rupert, he (Alain) applies the text of the Canticle to Mary's role in this life but he lacks Rupert's force and originality.»

5. William of Newburgh

An Augustinian Canon, William of Newburgh wrote a Marian Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles entitled: *Explanatio Sacri Epithalamii in Matrem Sponsi*. Although it was written after the Commentaries of Rupert, Honorius and Philip, there is no indication that William knew of the existence of any other Marian Commentary. He claimed that his Marian interpretation of the Canticle was something new, and he cited no precedents. According to John Gorman, the only precedent in applying texts from the Canticle of Canticles to Mary that William of Newburgh cited in the *Proemium* to his Commentary was Pseudo-Jerome's *Cogit is Me.*

William's work was twice as long as Rupert's, and like the Abbot of Deutz, he commented upon individual verses. Both of these Marian Commentators on the Canticle showed their deep knowledge of Scripture, by making extensive use of it in their Commentaries. Although they differed in style, William's was closer to that of Rupert than any other twelfth-century Marian Commentator on the Canticle of Canticles.

William placed particular emphasis on Mary's consent at the Annunciation to become the Mother of the Word Incarnate,

---

46 Gorman, *ibid*.
47 See footnote 97, chapter 1.
because God would not have taken flesh from her unless she had consented freely. In addition to the Incarnation, William portrayed Mary as having played a very active part also in the Redemption. She cooperated at the conception and birth of Jesus by being awake and conscious of all what was taking place; unlike the creation of Eve who was formed from the side of the sleeping and unconscious Adam. 49 About her own cooperation in the Redemption, William has Mary say to Jesus:

«Drink therefore (the chalice) and I will drink it with you, willingly dying with you, that as I once by believing, cooperated so much as was possible for me with the Mystery of your Incarnation, so now by suffering with you I may as far as I can devoutly cooperate in the Redemption of mankind.» 50

Later William had Jesus confirm His Mother's cooperation in the Redemption in these words:

«Come... thou shalt be crowned...for my passion has strongly overflowed into you, my compassionate Mother....Since, therefore, by your maternal affection you have drank with me the chalice that I have drunk, come and be crowned with me.» 51

William reaffirmed Mary's spiritual motherhood, and her maternal care of the weaker members of her Son's Mystical Body. According to William, Mary did not care much for superficial devotions. She would help repentant sinners and those who were most sincere in their devotion. She would also grant requests

---

49 Cant. 1:1.
51 idem.
made in fervent prayer, provided they were not requests for insignificant matters such as riches and honours.\textsuperscript{52}

In all of the above mentioned Marian Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles of Rupert's contemporaries: Honorius of Autun, Philip of Harvengt, William of Weyarn, Alain of Lille, and William of Newburgh all reflected upon the prayerful pondering of Mary in her heart, but it was only in Rupert's Commentary that the pondering of Mary became the basis for the Marian title of \textit{Magistra Apostolorum}. The following chapter will examine Rupert's Mariology gleaned from the pages of his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles.

\textsuperscript{52}idem.
CHAPTER THREE
MARIOLOGY OF RUPERT OF DEUTZ

Rupert's Entirely Marian Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles

In his biblically based Mariology, Rupert elaborated on the Scripture passages wherever texts alluded "prophetically" to Mary in the Old Testament, or referred "historically" to her in the New Testament. Whenever possible Rupert related the Canticle of Canticles to "historical" events in Mary's life recorded in Sacred Scripture. In the Prologue he made it clear that he intended to relate this _expositio mystica_ to historical facts, because in his words: «this mystical exposition would be more solid and not be permitted to be expressed vaguely if it were grounded in solid and certain history.»¹

The _De Incarnatione Domini_, as Rupert called his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, was his shortest Commentary, and perhaps the one most read; judging from the forty extant manuscripts. This Commentary was also the most written about of all of his works,² and the most frequently quoted. The exact date of the writing of the _De Incarnatione Domini_ is not known.³ Magrassi recognized that it was impossible

---

¹ Tunc enim expositio mystica firmius stat, neque fluitare permittitur, si super historiam certi temporis vel Rei demonstrabilis rationabiliter superaedificata continentur (Cant. Pro/.: CM. XXII, 8. 123-125).
³ Il est difficile de fixer le temps auquel Rupert de Deutz a composé cet ouvrage, _Dissertatio Chronologico-Historica De Vita Et Scriptis Ruperti, Histoire littéraire de la France par des Religieux Bénédictins de la Congregation de Saint-Maur_, published in PL. 130. 748.
to determine the exact date of the composition of this work.⁴ John Gorman, on the other hand, says that Rupert's Commentary can be dated to a certain extent. He also used Gerberon as his source for arriving at a possible date. Accordingly, he dated the Commentary as being written after the *De Trinitate* in 1117, and before Rupert was named Abbot of Deutz in 1120.⁵ Séjourné and Gerberon also agreed with the dates between 1117 and 1120.⁶

Before beginning this Commentary on the seventh Canticle in the Old Testament⁷, Rupert appealed to the Blessed Virgin Mary to help him write it to the praise and glory of God, to her blessed honour and praise.⁸ He wrote this Commentary on the Incarnation as a Canticle of love in which God descended upon the Blessed Virgin so that she would give birth to His Son, Christ

---

⁴Following Gerberon's *Apologia Pro Ruperto*, he placed this Marian Commentary between the writing of the Commentary on the Book of the Apocalypse, and the Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets, and supposed that Rupert wrote this work before the year 1126. This conclusion was reached based on the Prologue in which the dedication of this Commentary to Cuno was made, while Rupert's patron was still the Abbot of Sieburg. Cuno was elected Bishop of Ratisbonne (Regensburg) in 1126 (Magrassi, *op. cit.*, p. 27).

⁵John Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 44.


⁷Rupert listed the seven O.T. Canticles: The first two were Canticles of Moses (Exodus 15:1-9 and Deut. 32:1-43). The third was the Canticle of Hanna (1 Kings 2:1-10). The fourth was that of Isaiah (Is. 12:1-6). The fifth was the Canticle of King Hezekiah (Is. 38:10-20). The sixth was of that of Habakkuk (Hab.3:2-19.), *Cant. Pro/.: CM. XXVI*, 7-8, 81-98. The seventh was Solomon's Song of Songs. This Canticle of Solomon, on the theme of the Incarnation of the Lord, was, according to Rupert, the most excellent of all Canticles. It was for this reason, Rupert said, that it was not simply called a canticle, but the Canticle of Canticles (*recte igitur dicitur Canticum Canticorum, quia in eo canitur, beneficium est omnium Dei beneficiorum*), *Prol.: CM. XXVI*, 8. 102-104.

⁸«...cum Verbo Dei, cupio luctari, ut de Canticis Canticorum opus extorqueam quod non dedeceat vocari de Incarnatione Domini ad laudem et gloriam ejusdem Domini, ad laudem et honorem tuae beatitudinis» (*CM XXVI, Prologus* 6:27-31.
Jesus, true God and man, blessed above all things. In a letter to Bishop Thietmar of Verden (1116-48), at the start of the Commentary, Rupert declared that he had written this work «in holy and perpetual contemplation of the face of Our Lady the Virgin Mary.»

In much of this Commentary, Rupert either addressed Mary directly in the second person, or has her speak for herself in the first person.

In the Prologue Rupert says that his idea to write this Commentary on the Canticle came as the result of a dream or vision he had in which the theme was revealed to him. In this dream/vision he spent the entire night wrestling with the text in the same way that Jacob struggled all night long with an angel (Gen. 32:27), and like Jacob who would not give up the struggle until he obtained a blessing from the angel, Rupert, too, asked for a blessing that he would have the true and proper understanding of this mystery hidden in the Scriptures. He said that writing this

---

9... canticum amoris, quo Deus in beatam Virginem descendit, ita ut filium ex ea generat, qui est Christus Jesus, homo verus et Deus super omnia benedictus" (Cant. Pro/.: CM. 8. 98-101).

10... in contemplatione faciei Dominae nostra Mariae sanctae et perpetue Virginis» (Cant. Epist. ad Thietmarum: CM. XXVI, 4. 54-56). Van Engen adds in a footnote (footnote 108): «Since the Abbey Church at Deutz was dedicated to the Virgin, the likelihood is very great that Rupert studied a painted or sculptured image (in contemplatione faciei) while preparing his meditation (p. 293).

11Rupert related in the Prologue that a certain Brother Monk (whom he does not name) had told him that he too in a vision had seen Jesus sitting on the altar, surrounded by a gathering of saints. Rupert too was there in their midst holding in his hands the Canticle of Canticles (Frater qui dam ... se vidisse Filium... Jesum Christum sedentem super altare suum, et circa eum collegium sanctorum, me que (Rupertus) assidentem cum quiete et tenentem Cantica Canticorum. Cant. Pro/. CM. XXVI, 6. 49-53). Rupert also remembered another time when in a dream a woman's voice told him that he would celebrate Easter with the Trinity. He did not know whom it was he was speaking with, but then he realized it was the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of Mercy (Pascha cum beata Trinitate facies... Loquebar enim tecum, nesciens quod ipsa esses. Sed postquam... teipsam esse misericordiae Matrem... ibid, 7. 60-68).
Commentary was not easy, and in the Prologue he spoke of it as a big and difficult task (labor magnus et difficilis). Rupert described himself as wrestling with the Word of God to bring about this work which would celebrate the Incarnate Word. One of the outcomes of the immediacy and directness of his personal struggle with the meaning of the Word of God in the Scripture was the separation of Rupert from the earlier exegesis, and its traditional interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles, resulting in a novel interpretation that was entirely Marian. While individual verses of the Canticle of Canticles had been applied to Mary by other Marian writers from early times in the liturgy, Rupert was


13 His mystical experiences in the dream/vision of wrestling with the Word of God confirmed in Rupert's mind that he was specially called and entrusted with a divine mandate to bring out the true meaning hidden in the Canticle of Canticles. Consequently, he did not refer back to the authority of the Fathers when he was writing this Commentary, but instead, depended upon what was immediately entrusted to him in the vision. Spilker notes that under the influence of Bede and Gregory the Great, the interpretations of the Canticle of Canticles became very rigidly fixed and traditional, and did not allow for a personal or individual interpretation. This was to change with Rupert's Commentary, by which the rigidity of interpretation was dismantled, opening up the door to more mystical traits (op. cit., p. 294).

14 Citing J. Beumer's article on the Marian interpretation of the Canticle, «Die marianische Deutung des Hohen Liedes in der Frühscholastik», Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (ZKT), 76 (1954), 411-439, H. de Lubac writes: The Marian interpretation was, as we know, to be of later origin, though some scattered traces of it are already to be found in the age of the Fathers. St. Paschasius Radbert gives it as normal in the ninth-century, and it was exploited by men such as Ambrose Autpert in the eighth-century and St. Peter Damian in the eleventh in their sermons for the feasts of Our Lady, while the liturgy also contains certain anticipations of it; but all the same it is not until the twelfth-century that it becomes systematized in the West, beginning with Rupert of Deutz» (Henri de Lubac, op. cit., pp. 277-288). Some other Fathers listed by de Lubac (footnote 5, p. 277), in whose writings can be found scattered traces of a Marian interpretation of the Canticles are: "Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Andrew of Crete, Theodore of Studium, George of Nicomedia, Ephrem, St. Jerome, Epist. ad Paulum et Eust. [PL. 30. 134-5], St. Ambrose, De Inst. Virginis. 87-9 [PL. 16. 326-7]"). Gorman and Graef point out that between the
the first to have given the entire Song of Songs a Marian interpretation, with Mary as the bride.

**Rupert's Division of his Commentary**

Rupert's Commentary on the eight chapters of the Canticles was spread over seven books in this manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cant. 1,1 - 2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Cant. 2,7 - 3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Cant. 3,5 - 4,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Cant. 4,12 - 5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Cant. 5,2 - 6,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Cant. 6,2 - 7,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Cant. 7,11 - 8,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contents of the books reveal a Marian doctrine which would have resulted in a more cohesive work had the author, the Abbot of Deutz, maintained a thematic approach. Such was not Rupert's style. In the seven books of the Commentary he commented sequentially, i.e., chapter by chapter, verse by verse. This approach lent itself to the many repetitions as are evident throughout the *De Incarnatione*. It was characteristic of Rupert to repeat his favourite themes not only in this Commentary, but in all of his writings. To say that Rupert's Commentary was more sequential does not imply that there was no thematic structure in

ninth and the eleventh-centuries the feast of the Assumption had lessons taken from the Canticle of Canticles. These liturgical readings brought Mary into close connection with the Canticle, which led to the Marian exegesis (John G. Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 39; also Hilda Graef, *op. cit.*, p. 236). Dom Célestin Charlier writes in his *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* that «the liturgy "made the Canticle of Canticles into the source of its Marian inspiration..."» (p. 278). Magrassi thinks that these Marian themes in the liturgy may have influenced Rupert's Marian interpretation.
the De Incarnatione. It is quite possible that Rupert might have intended a separate theme for each book, but it is neither clear what these themes are, nor is it the purpose of this study to determine the themes, if any, of these books. However it probable that Rupert attempted a division of this Commentary into four unequal parts, with the division lines drawn around the repeated lines: "I warn you, daughters of Jerusalem..." (adjuro vos filiae Hierusalem...).\textsuperscript{15} Reality is that this fourfold division gets obscured in a sequential approach, which also seems more in keeping with Rupert's own penchant for the historical, as he might have hoped to relate the Canticle to events in the lives of Jesus and Mary in the Gospel.\textsuperscript{16} Now, while it would be more consistent with Rupert's style to follow his sequential approach here in the exposition of his Mariology, the many repetitions in the Commentary make this to be neither practical nor necessary. Consequently, the Mariology emerging from the De Incarnatione in this work will be thematic.

**Marian Themes in De Incarnatione**

Rupert's Marian doctrine has been thematically grouped in various ways by some modern authors.\textsuperscript{17} The approach of this

\textsuperscript{15}Cant of Cant. 2:7, 3:5, 8:4.

\textsuperscript{16}Although Rupert had intended to maintain a strict chronology, Ann Astell in her book on the Song of Song in the Middle Ages, points out that Rupert was only partly successful in doing so in Book One, where, as she says, «he actually skips over the Nativity, and he virtually abandons the effort after the second book» (p. 61).

\textsuperscript{17}Reginhard Spilker, in an article on Rupert's Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles (op. cit., pp. 297-307), highlighted the parallelism between Mary and the Church, and outlined Rupert's Mariology from the De Incarnatione Domini, under these six headings: (1) The Motherhood of Mary; (2) The Virginity of Mary; (3) Mary full of Grace; (4) The Humility of Mary; (5) The New Eve; (6) Mary the Queen. In addition to Spilker, Jean-Marie Salgado, O.M.I. in his study on Rupert's Commentary, Les Considérations Mariales de Rupert de Deutz dans ses
work is to depict the Mariology of the Rupert of Deutz under the following six themes:

1) Mother of the Incarnate Word of God,
2) The Joys and Sorrows of Mary's Maternal Heart,
3) Mary's Beauty and Perfection: Her Purity, Chastity, Virginity, Humility,
4) Mary and Eve,
5) Mary: Prophetess and Teacher (Magistra Apostolorum),
6) Mary and the Church.

These six themes reveal a Mariology which essentially appears to be Christocentric and Ecclesiotypical. Christocentric is so far as every privilege, grace, attribute, and perfection of the Virgin Mary was directed to her being the Mother of Jesus Christ. Ecclesiotypical in so far as every role and function of the Mother of Christ was related to her participation in the mission of Her Divine Son, and the continuation of this mission in the Church entrusted to her as its Spiritual Mother. The Mother of the Apostolic Community, Magistra Apostolorum, as well as being an eminent member, was indeed a personification and an embodiment of the Church.

«Commentaria in Canticum Canticorum», Rome: Divinitas, V.3 (1988), 692-709, divided the study under two headings: (1) Mary's Privileges; (2) Mary's Role. Maximo Peinador, C.M.F. divided his study of the Mariology emerging from Rupert's Commentary under these four headings: (1) The excellence and holiness of Mary; (2) The Eve/Mary antithesis; (3) Mary's contemplative life and her active ministry in the Church; (4) Mary's intense love for her Son and her persistent desire to be always in his company (op. cit., p. 40).
1. Mother of the Incarnate Word of God

Beginning the Prologue, Rupert recalled that in this dream, two verses came to him as a gentle breeze, whispering very quickly in both his ears these words:

«Femina mente Deum concepit corpore Christum; integra fudit eum nil cooperante viro.»\(^{18}\)

A literal translation of the above is: *A woman conceived God in her mind (and) Christ in her body; intact she bore him without the cooperation of a man.* This was reminiscent of «Prius mente quam ventre», i.e. Mary conceived Jesus first in her heart, and then in her womb.\(^{19}\) This expression or similar ones occurred frequently in Rupert's writings.\(^{20}\) However, instead of «prius mente», Rupert sometimes used «prius corde».\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{18}\)"Sedebam quasi solitarius per visum noctis, et ecce quasi sibilus auræ tenuis per utramque auræm transcurrans, velocius quam dici possit, istos in me versiculos deposit..." (Cant. Prologus: CM. XXVI. 6. 36-41).

\(^{19}\)St. Leo, Serm. I De Nativitate: PL. 54. 191b. Also St. Augustine, Serm. 215. 4: PL. 38. 1074; and: De Virginitate, 3: PL. 40. 398.

\(^{20}\)A few examples: From the *De Trinitate*, RegBen. 111.14: PL. 167. 1157b.; CM. XXII. 1312.; Is. II. 31: PL. 167. 1361-1362; CM. XXIII. 1569-1570. Other examples are «...fidem per quam concepit», Off. II, 22: PL. 170. 49; «...aure cordis credendo concepit», John II: PL. 169. 280c. Peinador points out that although this was one of Rupert's favourite themes and also one of significance to his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, he failed to develop it in the *De Incarnatione Domini* (Peinador, op. cit., p. 7).

In the Annunciation scene, Rupert considered the happiness brought about by the «kiss» of the bride by her spouse to be a sign of joyful love and union. The «kiss» of the spouse for the bride represented the moment when Mary conceived the Word of God in her mind and heart. The infusion of His Word into the Virgin's heart was the cause of the wonderful joy that Mary experienced. He identified the words of the bride in the Canticle: «Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth» with Mary's words in the Gospel: «Behold I am the handmaid of the Lord. May it be done to me according to your word.»

Rupert saw in verse three of the Canticle, «Your name spoken is a spreading perfume» an equation of the «name» and «Word». The word «name» (nomen) was an appellative of the «Word» (Verbum) which was infused into Mary's heart and womb. The Word manifested and declared the nature of God just as every name manifests the nature of things. The «name» of the spouse and the «Word» of God were the same person of Christ. The name of the spouse was a perfumed oil spreading all about, and Mary

peperit et lactavit, ipsa secundum fidem prius et corde concepit...» Pintard goes on to mention Rupert's admiration for Mary's openness to the Holy Spirit, her Fiat at the Annunciation to the Word of God, and in his Commentary on Matthew's Gospel, Rupert likens Mary to two doors of heaven which the Lord opens: the first door was that of the spirit and the other was that of the flesh. Rupert asks: «How many and what are the doors of heaven which the Lord opens? There are two of them, one spiritual, the other of the flesh. God opened the door of the spirit because of the faith of this Blessed Virgin, and God opened the door of the flesh when as a virgin she conceived, without a man, gave birth as a virgin, and remained a virgin after giving birth. (Quot autem vel quae sunt januae hujus coeli quas Dominus aperuit? Duae, altera mentis altera ventris. Januam mentis Deus aperuit quia beata haec credidit quae dicta sunt ei: januam ventris aperuit, quia sine viro virgo concepit, virgo peperit et post partum virgo permansit PL. 168. 1327).

22 Cant. I, CM. XXVI, 11. 32-42.
23 Canticle of Canticles 1:1.
25 Peinador, Cantar, p. 21.
wanted to be drawn close to the sweet aroma radiating from her spouse. The Word was compared to «oil», and Mary received the sweetness and gentleness of its unction within her heart and womb at the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{26} This was the prophetic call to Mary announcing to her the arrival of her beloved Son, the Word Incarnate. He would come, as the Canticle said, leaping and jumping as «a gazelle or a young stag over the mountains».\textsuperscript{27} Peinador says that «tradition had seen in these leaps and jumps the phases or moments preparatory to the mystery of the Incarnation,»\textsuperscript{28} in which the expectation of the people was kept alive through the announcements made by the Prophets. When the time came for these expectations to be fulfilled, Mary, through her consent in faith to the message of the Angel, would become the bearer of God, unlike Eve whose sin alienated mankind from God.\textsuperscript{29}

2. Joys and Sorrows of Mary's Maternal Heart

Mary went to visit her cousin Elizabeth to rejoice with her and to share her joy.\textsuperscript{30} The words of the Canticle: «Draw me - we will follow you easily» indicated the haste with which Mary departed to see Elizabeth when she learnt that her cousin was to have a son. The fragrance of the perfumed oil of the spouse

\textsuperscript{26}Ferdinand Salazar, S.J. (1575-1646), commenting on the Canticle of Canticles, saw Cant. 1:3 "ungen tum effusum nomen tuum" to signify Christ, Teacher and prophet (\textit{Maitre et prophète}), transferring to Mary the full meaning of His name, thereby making Mary forever holy, a queen, a priest, and a teacher («...Marie, la fit sainte, reine, prêtre et maîtresse...») Taken from René Laurentin, \textit{Maria, Ecclesia, Sacerdotium}. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1952, p. 252).

\textsuperscript{27}Cant. 2:8-9.

\textsuperscript{28}Peinador, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{29}Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 47-48. 215-237.

signified the graces and the blessings of the Incarnate Word which Mary brought with her to bestow upon the household of Zachariah.

Now, although Mary went to share her joy (the love and «kiss» of her spouse) with Elizabeth, she would not reveal it. Instead she jealously guarded it, conserving it in her heart.\(^{31}\) However, the Holy Spirit revealed it to Elizabeth, causing the mother of the Baptist to remark how the child John jumped for joy in her womb at the sound of Mary's greeting. Elizabeth's words to Mary were: «Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb. And how does this happen to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me?»\(^{32}\) indicate that which only the Holy Spirit could have made known to her. The joyful leap of John the Baptist on meeting Jesus while they were both still in their mothers' wombs anticipated the joy that Mary would bring to the world with the birth of her Son.\(^{33}\)

At the Incarnation Mary brought the Word of God to the world. The becoming «Emmanuel» of the Word of God was not just God with us, but also God with Mary. The love between Christ and Mary was expressed in the mutual giving of one to the other, and the belonging of one to the other.\(^{34}\) This image of the sharing and enjoyment of mutual love between Mother and Divine Son, Mary and Emmanuel, blended well with Canticle 2:16: «My lover belongs to me and I to him; he browses among the lilies». The Son of God, Emmanuel, resided in Nazareth among two lilies, Mary and Joseph; two lilies living chastely together in a virginal marriage.\(^{35}\)

\(^{31}\) As will be seen throughout this work, Mary conserving the Word within her heart (Luke 2:19, 51) is foundational to Mary's image and role of *Magistra Apostolorum*.

\(^{32}\) Luke 1:42-44.

\(^{33}\) Peinador, p. 22.

\(^{34}\) Peinador, p. 27.

\(^{35}\) Quaenam sunt lilia, nisi amicus dilecti Joseph et ego dilecta... Vere ambo lilia,
Mary's joy was always disturbed through sorrow. Her feelings fluctuated between joy and sorrow: joy when her beloved (Christ) was present, and sadness when He was away from her. Mary's joys and especially her sorrows were because of her intense love for her beloved Son, Jesus, whom Rupert spoke of as the lily of the valley that grew among thorns. Thus the life of Jesus unfolded for Mary between persecutions, pain, and sorrows, in keeping with the Prophesy of Simeon (Luke 2:34-35) of the sword that would pierce her heart. This wounding by the sword was deeply felt and shared in the hearts of the two lovers (Mary and Jesus). Within the ambivalence of joy and sorrow, Rupert gave a brief overview of the life of Jesus highlighting those places in the Gospel where the presence and absence of Jesus affected Mary's maternal feelings of joy and sorrow. Just as the bride in this chapter of the Canticle could not stop thinking of her beloved as she lay in bed at night, Rupert portrayed Mary as happy in their life at Nazareth because she knew that when she woke up every morning her beloved (Christ) would be with her. However the time would come, and it did come, following His baptism by John the Baptist, and His temptations in the wilderness, for Jesus to leave His mother to begin His public ministry of proclaiming the kingdom of Heaven.

Like the bride in the Canticle, Mary, went out to the cities and towns in search of her Son, but she could not find him. One day she and His brothers came to a place where Jesus was surrounded by a crowd listening to Him. Rupert recalled the Gospel scene (Mark 3:31-35) when Mary and Jesus' brothers arrived and asked to see Him. Painful as it sounded to her ears, what Mary heard from Jesus' mouth (verses 34-35) might have sounded like a rejection of her, but she knew that He had to leave

videlicet pro virginalibus nuptiis et cohabitatione castissima” (Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 53, 442-445).

36idem.
her in order to accomplish His mission of preaching the Kingdom of Heaven. These words, about who constituted His mother and father, were to Mary like a sword piercing through her heart, which would again be pierced at Calvary, when by His death on the cross, he would leave her once again in the most painful of ways.\textsuperscript{37} At the wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11), during the reception the hosts ran out of wine.\textsuperscript{38} Mary told Jesus about the lack of wine, but His words in reply to His Mother\textsuperscript{39}: «What is this to me and you, Woman. My hour has not yet come» indicated a separation point between Jesus and Mary. Their quiet intimate life together in Nazareth would now be over.\textsuperscript{40} This separation would be painful for Mary who would feel this pain in her heart intensely especially because of her longing to be with Him forever.\textsuperscript{41}

During the years that Jesus lived with His Mother Mary, the perspective of the passion and resurrection was ever present. Thus, Rupert concluded his commentary of chapter two of the Canticle with Mary contemplating the scene of Jesus already crucified and lying in the sepulchre. As the sorrowing Mother anxiously awaited the resurrection, Rupert placed these words in her mouth speaking to her dead Son: «Arise and appear to the leaders of the house of God, namely to your Apostles and to me

\textsuperscript{37} Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 56. 551ff.

\textsuperscript{38} Having no more wine signified for the Abbot of Deutz what was lacking in all earthly marriages on account of the sin of Adam and Eve. He explained that having good wine meant the possession of an incorruptible soul and bodily immortality. Adam and Eve lost both incorruptibility of soul and bodily immortality through their sin ("...Sed quia defecerat in omnibus nuptiis huius saeculi per peccatum primi hominis vinum verum scilicet incorruptio animarum et in immortalitas corporum" (Cant. I: CM. XXVI, 39. 1053-1057).

\textsuperscript{39} «My hour has not yet come» signified, according to Rupert, that the time for Redemption, for repairing and restoring incorruptibility to souls and immortality to bodies through his death and resurrection had not yet come (ibid. 1058-1061).

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid. 57. 586-588.

\textsuperscript{41} John. 2:1s: PL. 169. 217s.
Commenting on «My lover is for me a sachet of myrrh to rest in my bosom; my lover is for me a cluster of henna from the vineyards of Engedi,» Rupert sees the myrrh as representing bitterness and pain. Mary's suffering was represented by the sachet of myrrh. The use of myrrh and henna, in the embalming of the dead, brought to mind the mystery of the death of Christ. In the mind of the bride this was sufficient cause for bitter suffering. On the other hand, the henna (sweet smelling flowers) symbolized the joy of the resurrection of her beloved Son. Mary's joy would return at the Resurrection, and she would find him as he was absenting himself again in his Ascension into heaven. The Ascension ended the stage of the visible life of Jesus on earth, but in spite of the many sorrows, it was a time of great joy for Mary. Her mission now would be to make her Son known to the Synagogue, to the Jews, in the hope that they would be converted to Christ and have faith in Him. 

3. Mary's Beauty and Perfection: Purity, Virginity, Humility

The Canticle's selection of one specially chosen maiden from many women, with these words: «One alone is my dove, my perfect one»... the fortunate one, whose praises the other women sang, indicated the uniqueness of Mary in everything, in all virtues, graces, and gifts.

---

42 "Resurge et appare principibus domus Dei, scilicet apostolis tuis et mihi." (Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 56. 542-543).
43 Canticle 1:13.
44 Cant. I: CM. XXVI, 32. 800-805).
45 Cant. II: CM XXVI, 59. 638.
46 Peinador, p. 34.
Purification of Mary

Mary was the first of all creatures to receive the Holy Spirit's gift of purification from original sin and the remission of sin. In Rupert's mind, Mary, a daughter of Adam, was tainted by original sin at her conception by her parents. Nevertheless, at the Annunciation, she was specifically chosen to become the Mother of the Word Incarnate, and she was purified when the Holy Spirit descended upon her, and endowed her with His gifts to prepare her to accomplish her great vocation and mission of being the Mother of the Son of God. Mary's purification was reflected in her spotless beauty. Mary's beauty was her humility,47 and her virginity.

Humility

God the Father so respected her humility that in the Magnificat, Mary could say: «Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae» (Luke 1:48). Mary proclaimed and magnified the goodness of the Lord with a very sweet voice (voce suavissima).48 The beauty of Mary's humility was further seen at the start of Book Three which began with the exclamation from the Canticle: «Who is this coming up from the desert like a column of smoke laden with myrrh, with frankincense, and with the perfume of every exotic dust?»49 The bride here was seen to rise up in a column of smoke. Rupert saw this as Mary who was graced to be elevated on high, and who was resplendent because of her humility.

48 Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 74. 518.
Virginity

In addition to the beauty of her humility, Mary was adorned with the beauty of her virginity and her chastity; a beauty which no one else possessed. This beauty was reflected in the words of the bride in the Canticle addressed to the daughters of Jerusalem: «I am black, but beautiful». This reflected the external appearance of the pregnant Virgin, and what this might represent in the minds of people who did not know and understand the truth. All that they would see is an unmarried yet pregnant young woman, and would judge her from appearances as a woman of ill-repute. So before people would wrongly judge her from appearances only («I am black»), the virgin would depart and carry «her beauty», the secret, (the mystery) within her. Rupert painted this picture of the seemingly embarrassed virgin, because he could identify well, in a personal manner, with this image. He was reminded of the times in his life when his adversaries falsely accused him of errors based on unfounded rumours and on mere appearances only. He was not too happy with people who judged from externals only, and were ignorant of the truth, the internal reality. In this case the external appearance was the «I am black» of the Canticle, and the true internal reality was the bride's «I am beautiful». Applying this to Mary, her being «black» was her pregnancy and seeming loss of virginity in the eyes of people. Her «beauty» was the fact and reality of her virginity preserved by the Holy Spirit.

The beauty of her virginity made her beautiful to her Son (pulchra unigenito filio). The Incarnation was the context for Rupert's reflections on Mary's beauty in the Canticle Commentary. He alluded to Isaiah 7:14 and 11:1-10 as he contemplated the

---

50 Epistola Ad Cunonen: PL. 169. 201.
52 Cant. I: CM. XXVI, 33. 840-842.
beauty of the Incarnate Word conceived in the equally beautiful Virgin. The Incarnate Word possessed beauty to an immense degree. However, He received additional beauty from His Virgin Mother, who herself had received her beauty from the Father.53

Mary's virginity is also symbolized as an «enclosed garden» and a «fountain sealed» in the heavenly paradise.54 The Canticle referred twice to the bride as an «enclosed garden», and this signified for Rupert Mary's virginity. According to Rupert, Mary first made a vow of virginity to God,55 and accordingly, she was a virgin at the conception. Mary remained a virgin even in giving birth.56 In addition to being an «enclosed garden», the bride was a «fountain sealed». The sealed fountain symbolized Mary's perpetual virginity.57

53 In Isaiah 11, just as the shoot sprouted from the roots, and the flower bud blossomed from its roots, so too the roots of the beauty of Mary came from the Father, and the additional beauty of her Son, the Incarnate Word, sprouted from Mary's beauty.

54 In the concluding sections of chapter four, verses 12-16, Rupert had set the scene in the garden of the bridegroom (Christ) in paradise, and he contrasted this garden, as a heavenly paradise, with the earthly paradise of Adam. The serpent had no access to this heavenly paradise. It was clear from the text that the garden belonged to the bridegroom (Christ) and not to Mary. Mary owed everything to her Son; even her divine maternity. Moreover Mary had been enriched by her Son with countless gifts because of the mission entrusted to her by Him (Peinador, p. 32).

55 quia votum egregium Deo prima vovisti, votum virginitatis (Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 80. 754-755).

56 Et quare bis dicere hortus conclusus? Videlicet propter conceptum et propter partum...quod neque corrupta es conceptu neque violata partu in utroque (Cant. IV: CM. XXVI, 87. 88-91).

57 Rupert also considered Mary's perpetual virginity in his De Divinis Officiis, where based on Ezekiel 44.2, he likened Mary to a door, that is the gate of heaven through which Our Lord appeared as a small crying baby. In Rupert's own words: "Per portam inquam, caeli, id est per beatam Virginem egressum Domini nostrum parvum et vagientem." (PL. 170. 77). This was based on the above mentioned text from Ezekiel, where the prophet said: "This gate is to remain closed; it is not to be opened for anyone to enter by it; since the Lord, the God of Israel entered by it, it shall remain closed." This text was also the inscription arching the twelfth-century
From the enclosed garden and the sealed fountain could come forth the choicest of fruits, and the most fragrant spices. This meant that from Mary, in her maternal role in the Church (mater ecclesiarum), and in her capacity of secretarium omnium Scripturarum Sanctarum, would come forth the preaching and teaching about Christ. As a «garden fountain, a well of water flowing forth from Lebanon» (verse 15) the bride (Mary) by her preaching would irrigate the garden of Christ (the Church) with living water.

Tota Pulchra Es

In chapter four, the author of the Canticles concentrated on the beauty of the different parts of the bride's body: her beautiful eyes, hair, teeth, lips, cheeks, and breasts. Rupert saw in all of stone sculpture known as La Vierge de Dom Rupert. Chapter XXXII of Rupert's De Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus, is another exegetical commentary on Ezekiel 44:1-3, emphasizing Mary's virginity as a closed door (PL.167. 1493-1494).

Rupert highlighted the eating of the fruits of the garden of Christ, as none other than the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus in the Eucharist. Just as Jesus invited all to eat his Body and to drink his Blood, all are invited to the Eucharistic banquet. Meanwhile, the bride (Mary) would concern herself with the affairs of her Beloved, i.e., the preaching of the Gospel and the spreading of the faith of which she is the Teacher (Peinador, p. 32).

Tota Pulchra Es

In chapter four, the author of the Canticles concentrated on the beauty of the different parts of the bride's body: her beautiful eyes, hair, teeth, lips, cheeks, and breasts. Rupert saw in all of stone sculpture known as La Vierge de Dom Rupert. Chapter XXXII of Rupert's De Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus, is another exegetical commentary on Ezekiel 44:1-3, emphasizing Mary's virginity as a closed door (PL.167. 1493-1494).

Rupert highlighted the eating of the fruits of the garden of Christ, as none other than the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus in the Eucharist. Just as Jesus invited all to eat his Body and to drink his Blood, all are invited to the Eucharistic banquet. Meanwhile, the bride (Mary) would concern herself with the affairs of her Beloved, i.e., the preaching of the Gospel and the spreading of the faith of which she is the Teacher (Peinador, p. 32).

Rupert identified this «living water» as the mysteries of the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension, four principal mysteries (principalia sacramenta), necessary for the salvation of the world, and to which the whole of Scripture tended (Cant IV: CM. XXVI, 91. 227-234). The course of the History of Salvation was the restoration of all things in Christ who accomplished this by being born, by dying on a cross, by rising again to life, and by ascending into heaven (Cant IV: CM. XXVI, 95. 373-378).

Canticle Of Canticles 4:1-6. Also: Peinador points out that the Christian exegesis recognized all this as metaphorical and related it to the strictly spiritual
this beauty of the bride's body the praises of Mary for her unique and excellent privileges. In Chapter Five of the Commentary, Rupert continued to address Mary as the all beautiful one (*tota pulchra es*). In chapter Six the Abbot emphasized the inexhaustible beauty of Mary through elaborations on the symbolism and the imagery of the Scripture text. Her lover looked beyond her external beauty and into the inner beauty of her bride's heart and soul. In Chapter seven of the Canticle Rupert continued to delight in Mary's beauty through the image of the beautiful Shulammite princess called to turn around so that her beauty may be admired.63 This Shulammite, a symbol of Mary, was a symbol of the synagogue or the people of the Old Covenant, invited to return to her true home and to serve her true king, just as others had served David. This image of the Shulammite alluded back to the first Book of Kings where Abishag, a young Shulammite virgin, was brought to King David to nurse him and to keep him warm. «The maiden, who was very beautiful, nursed the King and cared for him, but the King did not have relations with her.»64 The remainder of this section on the Shulammite princess was a litany of love praises about her beauty, with special attention paid to the beauty of various parts of her body. This was reminiscent of the praises of the beautiful body of the bride in chapter four of the Canticles. Applied to Mary, the beauty and perfection of her body were the result of and the reflection of the

order of the beautiful soul of the bride (Peinador, p. 30).

63*Shulammite: so called either because the girl is considered to be from Shulam in the plain of Esdraelon (cf 1 Kgs. 1:3) or because the name may mean "the peaceful one", and thus recall the name of Solomon" (Footnote 7.1, *Song of Songs, The New American Bible*). John L. Mckenzie adds that "Shulammite" should be read as "Shunemite". He goes on to say that «it is supposed that "Shunemite" came to mean "a beauty". Shulammite is a feminized form of Solomon and is equivalent to "queen".» (*Dictionary Of The Bible*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1965, p. 810).

641 Kings 1: 2-4; *Cant. VI: CM. XXVI*, 143-144. 410-418.
perfection of her virtues, especially her chastity and her freedom from all carnal desires. The many and diverse ways that the Canticle extolled the beauty of the bride only served to underscore, in Rupert's mind, the importance of dwelling upon her purity, her virginity, and humility. Thus the Abbot lavished praises upon Mary for her simplicity, her purity, her innocence, her knowledge, her modesty, her humility, her integrity of mind and body, in particular, for her inviolate virginity.

Continuing to extol Mary's perfection, Rupert depicted the Virgin Mary as the dawn, the moon, the sun, an army. «Who is this that comes forth like the dawn, as beautiful as the moon, as resplendent as the sun, as awe-inspiring as bannered troops?» The first three symbols of light depicted light «coming forth» in a progressive manner from dawn to the light of the moon, to the light of the sun. This progression represented the significant stages of the life of the Virgin Mary. Her birth was seen as the light of the dawn that announced a new day, i.e., Christ. Her Annunciation, and her Conception of Jesus through the Holy Spirit shone in her with the beautiful light of the moon. To put it in Rupert's own words: «Just as the light of the moon illuminates not by its own light, but is derived from the sun, thus, the fullness of the light in you, O most Blessed (Virgin), does not come from you, but from divine grace (because you are) full of grace.»

---

65 "Perfecta est in te virtus castitatis, et liberata es ab omni carnalis appetitu voluptatis" (Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 147. 534-535).
66 Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 133. 11-14.
67 "Laudatur simplicitas, munditia, innocentia, doctrina, verecundia, humilitas, mentis et carnis integritas, sive incorrupta virginitas" (Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 70. 365-369).
68 Canticle 6:10.
69 Quando nata es, o virgo beata, tunc vera nobis aurora surrexit (Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 140. 265-266).
70 "Sicut enim luna lucet et illuminat luce non sua, sed ex sole concepta, sic tu, o beatissima, hoc ipsum, quod tam lucida es, non ex te habes, sed ex gratia divina,
Mary, who had received the light of her sanctity from Christ, would be called, like her Son, to fight against the dark shadows which would try to extinguish her light. They would not be able to do so because the bride (Mary) was strong like an invincible and warlike squadron. The fourth symbol depicting Mary, in the words of the Canticle, was «awe-inspiring as bannered troops», ever ready for battle against the forces of evil. Mary would reach the height of her spiritual perfection at her glorification in heaven, then she would be chosen to shine as the sun.

4. Mary and Eve

Whenever Rupert in his Mariology had an occasion to contrast Eve with Mary, he did not hesitate to do so. He compared and contrasted the beauty of Mary, with Eve's lack of beauty. Mary's eyes were like the eyes of a dove, while Eve had the eyes of a scavenging raven. Mary's good hair was like a flock of goats, and Eve's bad hair represented her pride and greed. Mary's teeth were white and clean like a flock of fertile sheep. Eve's were like the teeth of a biting lion. Eve was the cause of human sorrow and shame, and Mary was the bearer of joy and happiness into the world. In his own words: «Eve made us cry, (and) Mary made us rejoice.» While Mary preached the Gospel, Eve became tongue-tied and could not speak because of her sin. Unlike the former Eve, who had given a bad example, Mary was

gratia plena." (Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 140. 275-278).

71 Peinador, p. 34.

72 Canticle Of Canticles 6:10.

73 "Quando autem de hoc mundo assumpta...tunc tu et ex tunc electa ut sol." (Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 140. 278-280).

74 Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 72-73. 460-506.

75 "Eva nos fecit plorare, Maria nos fecit exultare" (Cant. I. CM. XXVI, 17. 242).
a Teacher of innocence (*innocentiae magistra*); a Teacher whose example was to be imitated by the flock, the Church. Again, in contrast to Eve, Mary, the Teacher of holy religion, was a doer of virtuous deeds. She never saw or did anything wrong in thought, word, or deed; she flourished in sweetness, honour, and honesty.

In another place, Rupert likened the apple tree, growing and bearing fruit in the midst of other fruit trees, to Mary's beloved Son, Christ. Coming into the world He brought with Him abundant fruits and blessings of eternal life to replace the bad fruits of the diabolical tree that produced the apple which Adam ate. The bad fruit given to Adam by Eve took away eternal life and brought about death. The good fruit, Christ, brought forth by Mary, destroyed death and brought about eternal life.

Carrying the Eve/Mary antithesis a bit further, Rupert included the Canticle reference to winter and spring and compared Eve to the winter, symbol of infertility and death. Mary, on the contrary, was spring, symbol of fertility and life. Her maternal breasts formed by the hands of the Almighty were symbols of virginity and virginity and fecundity. Rupert saw the entire body of the bride as beautiful, but in a special way he praised the unique beauty of her breasts. Mary fed her Son with the milk of

---

76 "innocentia magistra sis" (Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 73. 500).

77 *ibid*

78 "... tu, inquam, virtutum operatrix ac totius sanctae magistra religionis, qualem nunquam oculus vidit, quals ab initio, quando Heva facta est, non fuit nec est nec erit in cogitationibus suis, in verbis suis, in factis suis, in omni odore suavitatis, in omni flore et fructu honoris et honestatis (Cant. IV: CM. XXVI. 698-704).

79 Canticle 2:3.

80 *Cant. 1:CM. XXVI, 38.1014-1016.

81 Verses 11-12.

82 *Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 48.241-253.

83 "duo ubera manu Altissimi formata. Haec sunt virginitas et fecunditas..." (Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 76.621-622).

84 The *La Vierge de Dom Rupert*, mentioned in chapter one, has special
her virtues, especially her humility and virginity. According to the Abbot of Deutz, Mary's breasts were more beautiful than wine. Rupert went on to compare the perfection and beauty of the man (Christ) born from a Woman and nourished at her maternal breasts, with the woman (Eve) formed from the side of a man (Adam), nourished with the wine of iniquity. Citing Ephesians 5:18, Rupert understood wine to be the symbol of debauchery (luxuria), the state in which Eve found herself because of her sin.

The mention of the synagogue and of the Shulammite princess reminded Rupert of the parallelism between the two economies: the old one of servitude, and the new one of freedom and liberty, paralleling the Eve/Mary antithesis. Eve was featured under the old dispensation as a servant, while Mary was depicted under the new, as a free lady, a mistress. At this point Rupert elaborated upon the themes of servitude and freedom, and brought in the comparison between Abraham's concubine and servant Hagar, and Sarah, his freeborn wife. Hagar bore a son according to the flesh, while Sarah's son was born according to a promise. Quoting from Galatians 4:22-24, Rupert spoke of Abraham having two sons, one by a slave woman, and the other by a freeborn woman. The son of the slave woman (Hagar) was born naturally (secundum carnem). The son of the freeborn woman (Sarah) was born through a promise (secundum fidem).

Jacques Stiennon notes that, in celebrating the sanctity of the Blessed Virgin, Rupert frequently alluded to sensuous images in his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. Stiennon regarded Rupert's Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles as «a veritable hymn which he (Rupert) dedicated to the maternal breasts of the Virgin Mary feeding her child» («C'est un véritable hymne qu'il consacre aux seins de la Vierge et à la lactation par l'Enfant.» La Vierge de Dom Rupert, in Saint-Laurent, p. 87).

85...lactatione filiorum, quorum initium est, id est luxuria, quae in vino est (Cant. IV: CM. XVII, 81-82. 800-827).

86Cant. VI: CM. XXVI, 145. 464-467.
A freeborn woman usually wore sandals on her feet, while a slave woman went about barefoot. Consequently, the passage in the Canticle: «How beautiful are your feet in sandals, O prince's daughter» was significant enough for Rupert to point out that Sarah wore sandals while Hagar went about barefoot. In the same way the Shulammite princess, daughter of a prince, would be appropriately dressed and wearing shoes on her feet. Mary too would be adorned like a princess and her shoes would be necessary because with it she as the "New Eve" who would crush the serpent's head.

87 Canticle 7:2.

88 Bene calceata caput serpentis contruisti (Cant. V1: CM. XXVI, 147. 491-492). Rupert identified Mary with "the Woman" of Gen. 3:15, the "New Eve". In his De Divinis Officiis Rupert spoke of the victory of the Redemption of man which had been promised. Through the seed of the woman, enmity would be exercised over the old serpent, and she would crush his head and take away his power. The sense of the oracle indicated a battle between the Redeemer and the old serpent (Apoc. 12). The Redeemer would emerge victorious, crushing the serpent's head, and destroying all its power (In Gen. 3:14-15: PL. 170. 915; CM. V11. 107-108). Crushing the serpent's head was the victory of the Redeemer. However Rupert used the St. Jerome Latin Vulgate text which said that she (ipsa) would crush the serpent's head (Peinador, "La Maternidad Messiánica de María en el Antiguo Testamento, según Ruperto de Deutz", Marianum, vol. 32, [1972], p. 526).

In De Sancta Trinitate, Rupert acknowledged the messianic and soteriological character inherent in the Divine Plan which was accomplished when Mary gave birth to the Saviour of the world (CM. XXI. 255-257).

In De Victoria Verbi Dei, Rupert included Mary into the oracle, and identified the Mother of the Saviour as the "Woman", the enemy of the serpent. The promise of future salvation was not addressed to the woman, who was to bear children in pain. Rupert gave two reasons for this. One, because of her sin Eve made herself unworthy to receive this promise. Two, because God did not have Eve in mind. He was thinking of another woman, the Virgin Mary. In considering the Gen. 3:15 Oracle in his Commentary on the Prophet Nahum, Rupert showed that the words «He will strike at your head while you strike at his heel» clearly referred to the woman as being the Virgin Mary. However he refers also to her descendent, Christ, who suffered disgrace in his passion and death, thereby triumphantly and definitively crushing the head of the devil.
5. Mary: Prophetess and Teacher (Magistra Apostolorum)
Tempus Tacendi, Tempus Loquendi

In the *De Incarnatione*, there were two significant aspects to Mary's role as *Magistra Apostolorum*; two significant moments in Mary's life: the contemplative and the active. Rupert referred to the contemplative moment as Mary's «tempus tacendi», and to the active, as her «tempus loquendi». His inspiration for depicting the moments of Mary's silent and contemplative life, and her active ministry of teaching and preaching in the infant Church came from his reflection on Ecclesiastes 3:7, «a time to be silent, and a time to speak.» In the Abbot's words:

«The wise and prudent virgin was fully aware of the saying of Solomon that there was "a time to be silent and a time to speak" (Eccl 3:7). For as long as the Son of man deigned to remain on earth in human form she remained in silence just as an enclosed garden. When however the Son of man was crowned with glory and honour after His Resurrection, and the Ascension into heaven to sit at the right hand of the Father, then began the Blessed Virgin's time to speak to his friends, that is, the holy apostles, of things they were not able to bear at first, because knowing that the Son of man had once said to them: "I have much more to tell you, but you cannot bear it now" (Jn. 16:12). When the Spirit of truth comes, He will teach you all truth. The Blessed Virgin herself adhered to this testimony by her voice, and spoke such to all the faithful...»

---

89 «Tempus tacendi, ait Salomon (Eccl. 3,7), et tempus loquendi: discretionem huiusmodi Virgo sapiens et prudens non ignoravit. Quamdiu Filius hominis manere decuit minoratus paulo minus ab angelis, fere tandem in silentio fuit, velut hortus conclusus: ubi autem gloria et honore coronatus est Filius hominis resurgendo, et in caelum, ubi sedet ad dexteram Patris, ex tunc eidem beatae Virgini fuit tempus
Commenting and expanding on this section from Rupert's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, Marracci echoed the tradition that Jesus had left His Mother on earth for the sake of the apostles, for their continued formation and education (eruditione), and also that they would not lack any maternal consolation.\textsuperscript{90}

\textbf{Pondering in her Heart (Tempus Tacendi)}

Mary received from God many and varied gifts, particularly the gift of prophecy. Rupert referred to Mary as a great prophetess who led all prophets to her,\textsuperscript{91} because with the coming of the Holy Spirit upon her, all prophecies and all of Scripture would be fulfilled in her.\textsuperscript{92} Rupert could not admit any ignorance on Mary's part, because, for him, she was the great prophetess with knowledge of all mysteries; even when she and Joseph, not knowing where Jesus was, went looking for him.

\begin{flushright}
loquendi, et hoc amicis, id est sanctis apostolis; et talia loquendi, qualia prius portare non potuissent: quod sciens ipse Filius hominis, dixerat quodam loco: Adhuc multa habeo vobis dicere, sed non potestis portare modo (Jo.16:12). Ubi venit Spiritus veritatis, primus quidem et princeps, ipse illos omnem veritatem docuit; sed ipsa beata Virgo testimonium suae vocis adhibuit, et taliter locuta est omnibus fidelibus...” (Matt. 2, 577. PL. 168. 1340).
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{90}Ex quo patet, cur Dominus Jesus, in regnum suae gloriae redditurus, dulcissiman Matrem suam in miseris huius mundi reliquerit, et non eam statim sequuntur assumperit. Hoc enim praesertim ob apostolos fecit, nimirum, ne materno solatio atque "eruditione" privarentur (H. Marracci, Apostoli Mariani, in Bourassé J., Summa Aurea, XIII, Parisiis 1866, 556).

\textsuperscript{91}prophetissima magna, et capax omnium prophetarum sive prophetiarum (Cant. V: CM. XXVI, 117. 472-473).

\textsuperscript{92}”Nunquid...o prophetissa fidelis? Immo prophetae omnes ad te accesserunt, quia prophetiae omnium et Scripturae omnes in tuum sensum cum supervenient in te Spiritu Sancto convenerunt (Cant. I. CM. XXVI, 12. 94-98). Also: "Tu es illa prophetissa ad quam accessit omnis sanctus et fidelis propheta, ad quam tendebat et in qua completa est omnis sancta et fidelis prophetia" (Cant. VI: CM. XXVI. 147. 561-563).
Verse 7 of the first chapter of the Canticle coincided, in Rupert's mind, with Mary and Joseph wandering about the temple looking for their Son. The words of the Canticle: «Tell me you whom my heart loves, where you pasture your flock, where you give them rest at midday, lest I be found wandering after the flocks of your companions», clearly showed that the bride was looking for her loved one, but did not know where to find him. The shepherds taking care of their flock of sheep, reminded Rupert of the teachers in the temple to whom Jesus was listening and asking questions. Mary was looking for Jesus and she too did not know where to find him. Rupert was concerned about the Gospel's portrayal of Mary's seeming lack of knowledge about the whereabouts of her Son, especially when she and Joseph found Jesus in the temple with the teachers, and her question to him: «Son, why have you done this to us?» (vs 48) indicating her not knowing about Jesus' motives. Did she really not know what Jesus meant when he said to her: «Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?» (vs 49). Luke further states in vs 50 that "they did not understand what He said to them." According to Rupert:

«This great prophetess was not ignorant of what was happening because she was full of grace. The divine plan was being fulfilled through her silence. She searched with those who were searching, and respecting her time to be silent (Eccl. 3:7), she associated herself with the pain of others who were suffering.»


54"Magna haec prophetissa, quid ageretur, non ignorabat, quoniam gratia plena erat, et tamen dolens quaerebat, quoniam dispensationi divinae ipsa suo silentio serviens, quamvis cum illis quaerentibus quaerebat, tempus tacendi custodiebat, et dolentibus condolebat" (Cant. I. CM. XXVI, 25. 531-535, also: PL. 168. 850d-851). Peinador reflects Rupert's views on this matter: «Rupert, neither here nor in other
Rupert thought that Mary knew the meaning of the child Jesus' answer, but, as Scripture says, she silently kept and passages, admits in the Virgin a true ignorance. She knew where He (Jesus) was, but because of her meekness and humility she had to seem, at least in outward fashion, to be like the rest of mothers. She had to ask about that which seemed hidden, and she had to really feel the absence of her Son. The whole thing was not fiction. (Peinador, p. 23).

Magna haec prophetissa quid ageretur, non ignorabat, quoniam gratia plena erat... (Cant. I: CM. XXVI, 25. 531-533. Disagreeing with this idea that Mary had full understanding in this particular event, René Laurentin points out that following verse 50 «but they did not understand», the next verse, «his mother kept all these things (words-events) in her heart (2:51)» signified a meditation which implied a long term growth in knowledge on Mary's part. (Laurentin, The Truth Of Christmas, Beyond the Myths, (Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede's Publications, 1982), p. 213, (hereafter cited as The Truth). He further pointed out that the words employed by Luke exeplagenan indicated their astonishment (vs 48), and odynomenoi (vs 49) signified their suffering, and even torture.» According to Laurentin, «the translation "anxiously" fits here because it describes an uncertain search.» (ibid, p. 212.; also, in Jésus au Temple, Mystère de Paques et Foi de Marie en Luc 2:48-50, (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), pp. 33-34, hereafter cited as Laurentin, Jésus). Also, in pages 11-32 of this same work, Laurentin presents a survey of the diversity of interpretations of Luke 2:50. The main areas range from those whose interpretation showed that Mary did understand, to those who held that she did not understand fully, and admitted a growth in knowledge on Mary's part, to those who believed that Mary understood only in a partial manner. In the first category, among those who held that Mary did understand were Rupert of Deutz and Aelred of Rievaulx. On the other hand, other interpreters were mentioned who, following Bede the Venerable, contended that Mary did not understand. Included here are some medieval writers like Haymon of Auxerre, Zacharias of Besançon (xii cent), and St. Bernard. This survey by Laurentin also makes mention of interpretations where Mary had somewhat of a qualified or partial understanding. According to Laurentin, the majority of such people held that in a very general way Mary did not understand the full sense (sens plein) or the deep sense (sens profond) of Jesus' words (p. 27). Some of the interpreters along this line of thought, listed in Laurentin, pp. 27-28, are: Origen, Juvenicus, and Lagrange.

Raymond Brown also disagrees with those who hold that Mary had full understanding of what Jesus said. Contrary to several hypotheses that have been advanced to support the view that because Mary had received a revelatory announcement from the angel, she did not lack understanding of what Jesus said, Brown lists some of these hypotheses accordingly: «(a) the "they" is a synecdoche
pondered all these things in her heart. In Rupert's own words: «If she (Mary) did not know, how or what would she ponder in her heart?»\(^96\) The pondering of Mary, whereby the Mother of Jesus silently contemplated all things in her heart concerning her divine Son (Luke 2:19, 51), was a much repeated motif throughout the entire Commentary. In this silent and contemplative moment in her life, her *tempus tacendi*, Mary stored up in her heart, and prayerfully reflected on all the things she had seen and heard concerning Jesus. Mary's contemplating in silence was likened by Rupert to the sleep of the bride in the Canticle. Mary's guarding in her heart the secrets of the mystery of her Son also symbolized the silence she had to maintain about her Son, for example, to protect His whereabouts from King Herod who wanted to kill Him.\(^97\) She would secretly keep guard in her heart about her Son right up to the time of His Ascension into heaven. In another place, Rupert shows that Mary even knew what lay in the future for her Son. Mary had foreseen that the child she carried in her arms and nursed at her breasts was to be the future victim of the sins of humanity. Rupert here has Mary saying:

«For I was a prophetess, and because I was his mother, I knew he was going to suffer these things. When, therefore, I fondled him in my arms, nursed him at my breasts, and had always before my eyes such a death as

with the whole used for the part, so that only Joseph is meant. This view was mentioned by Cardinal Cajetan in *Quattuor Evangelia*, (Paris: Guillard, 1540), 218v. (b) The "they" refers to the bystanders of vs 47, not to the parents of vss 48-49...» (*The Birth of the Messiah*, [hereafter cited as *The Birth*], Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1977 p. 477). Brown supports Laurentin here by saying: «Laurentin is correct when he says that surely the "they" means the parents, that theirs is a real (not a simulated) lack of understanding, and that this understanding concerns Jesus' remarks in vs 49» (Brown, *idem*. See also: Laurentin, *Jésus*, p. 77).

\(^96\)«Si autem nesciebat, quomodo vel quibus in corde suo conferebat?» (*Cant.* I: *CM.* XXVI, 25. 529-530).

\(^97\) *Cant.* II: *CM.* XXVI, 42. 30-34.
was destined for him, and foresaw everything with a prophetic-nay, more than prophetic-mind, what kind of passion of maternal grief, how much and how extensive, do you imagine me to have endured? This is what I mean when I say: "My beloved is for me a bundle of myrrh; he will dwell between my breasts".»

Keeping her Beloved within her breasts was another way that Rupert spoke of Mary guarding the sacred mystery of her divine Son within her, as she silently pondered these things in her maternal heart.

Mary's Time to Speak (Tempus Loquendi)

Rupert kept the perspective of the passion, death, and resurrection as always being present to Jesus and Mary. Consequently, he placed these words in Jesus' mouth telling His Mother, «the time will come when these things that are now secret (in your heart) should be preached to the glory of God.» It seemed as if Jesus was telling Mary that after His Resurrection and Ascension her time to speak would begin, and as Magistra Apostolorum, she would have to make known to the infant Church all that she had guarded and pondered upon in the silence of her heart. However, before that happens, «I shall go to the mountain

98 "Prophetissa namque eram et ex quo mater ejus facta sum, scivi eum ista passurum. Cum igitur carne mea taliter progenitum, talem filium sino meo foverem, ulnas gestarem, uberibus lactarem, et talem ejus futuram mortem semper prae oculis haberem, et prophetica, imo plusquam prophetica, qualem, quantum, quam prolixam me putatis materni doloris pertulisse passionem? Hoc est quod dico: "fasciculus myrrhae dilectus meus mihi, inter ubera mea commorabitur"» (Cant. I: CM. XXVI. 32. 785-793. English translation above was taken from Ann Astell, op. cit., p. 64).

of myrrh, to the hill of incense." These words of the bridegroom became the words of Jesus. Going to the mountain of myrrh was the crucifixion, and the hill of incense was the resurrection.

Rupert described the time for Mary to begin her active ministry among the Apostles as a call to the bride to wake up from sleep. Mary's call to awaken from sleep, from the silent life of contemplation to the active apostolate and the exercise of her ministry in the early Church was her time for preaching and teaching; her *tempus loquendi*. The spouse's call had the effect of awakening his bride, (Mary) to leave her room to follow Him (Christ) who had already visibly and definitely ascended to His Father. The bride, anxious to join the one she loved so much, ran about everywhere looking for him, but could not find him. It was nighttime, and there was no one to ask, except for the watchmen, the "guardians of the wall". Rupert identified these watchmen as the Apostles and those appointed by them, viz. the seven helpers spoken of in Acts 6:1-7. The bride, Mary, questioned them about the whereabouts of her lover, Christ, and they too in turn asked her so much about Christ, that she revealed to them the secrets hidden in her heart. This was Rupert's interpretation of verse 7: "the watchmen struck me and wounded me. They took my mantle from me." In addition to the guards, the bride met up with the "daughters of Jerusalem" - the pious women who

---

100 Canticle 4:6.

101 Canticle 2:10. This reminded Rupert of the case of a young pious woman of his time who one night experienced a mysterious call in her heart (*Cant. V: CM. XXVI. 110. 196-216*). She was awakened by an invisible yet loving and caressing touch. Although he did not compare this as similar to what he attributed to Mary in the Canticle, he saw the touch of the lover as having the effect of calling his bride, to leave her bedroom, and to follow him.

102 The watchmen making their rounds of the city (verse 3) were the disciples. The "daughters of Jerusalem" (verse 5) represented the women who had come with oil and spices to anoint the body of Jesus for burial (*Cant. II: CM. XXVI, 58. 610-621*).
numbered among the first disciples. She asked them whether they had seen her lover, and told them to tell him, should they see him, that she was weak with love-sickness for him. In response to the women about what the lover looked like and where he might have gone, so that they might help her find him, she described her husband to them in terms glowing with love and admiration. Mary could not refrain from speaking about her beloved Son, and Rupert placed these words of the Canticle in Mary's mouth as she spoke about her Son:

«My lover is radiant and ruddy; he stands out among the thousands.
His head is pure gold; his looks are palm fronds, black as the raven.
His eyes are like doves besides running waters, his teeth would seem bathed in milk, and are set like jewels....
....His mouth is sweetness itself; he is all delight.
Such is my lover, and such is my friend,
O daughters of Jerusalem.»

She spoke so lovingly of her Beloved as «totus desiderabilis» that the pious women also began to burn with love for Him, and like her they wanted to be faithful imitators of Him. The memories that Mary began to uncover and reveal from her heart only served to inflame her with a more ardent desire to be with Christ in heaven. Consequently, she entreated the women of Jerusalem that should any one of them precede her into heaven, not to refrain themselves from telling her Loved One about her

---

103 Canticle Of Canticles 5:10-16; 6:1-3.
104 Canticle Of Canticles 5:10-16.
105 Verse 16.
love-sickness for him, and her ardent desire to be with him in heaven.\textsuperscript{106}

Commenting on this section, Rupert spoke of Mary as the necessary teacher and a most qualified and suitable witness of the Gospel of her Loved One who was present to her, and whom she carried in her body. Now everyone will begin to hear what Mary had long pondered in her heart about her divine Son, not only the blaspheming Jews, but also the many different heretics who call themselves Christians, and who labour to corrupt true Christianity.\textsuperscript{107}

\textit{Magistra Apostolorum}

Of the nine times in his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles that the Abbot referred to Mary as \textit{magistra}, one was a specific reference to her as «the Teacher of Teachers, that is, the Teacher of the Apostles. \textit{(Magistra Magistrorum, id est Apostolorum).}»\textsuperscript{108} In calling Mary the \textit{Magistra Apostolorum}, the Abbot of Deutz was probably highlighting Mary's eminent position in the infant Church, a position of leadership, but in a maternal and nurturing sense, whereby Mary guided and taught

\textsuperscript{106}The lengthy commentary on the above verses from the Song of Songs was transcribed in the \textit{Continuatio Medievalis} in no less than 14 pages (CM. XXVI, pp. 118-132). It was a Christological exposition within the context of salvation history, where the Abbot of Deutz extolled Christ, the Word Of God, the Incarnate Son of God, true God and true man, born from the Virgin Mary to proclaim the Gospel and to suffer and die for the Redemption of mankind. Peinador sees this as an «authentic sermon - a fiery panegyric about the lover». Peinador goes on to say that although it cannot be properly be called a doctrinal exposition, it nevertheless began with the divinity and the eternal preexistence of the Lover. It was more of a remembrance based on the Gospel of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ\textsuperscript{ } (\textit{Cantar}, p. 33).

\textsuperscript{107}Magistra necessaria, testis valda idonea... (\textit{Cant.} V: CM. XXVI, 117. 461-465).

\textsuperscript{108}\textit{Cant.} I. CM. XXVI, 24. 494-495.
the hierarchical leaders of the Church, the Apostles, by opening up her maternal heart to them, and revealing all the mysteries about her divine Son that she had kept and pondered in the silence of her heart. In this context Rupert likened Mary to «a garden fountain, a well of water flowing fresh from Lebanon,»\textsuperscript{109} from which would flow the knowledge of the mysteries of her Son, the Incarnate Word of God; knowledge that was stored up in her heart. Rupert further referred to Mary as the teacher of religion and of faith (\textit{religionis et fidei magistra}),\textsuperscript{110} who rather than keeping her precious treasures hidden in the silence and contemplation of her heart, was seen conversing in public with the blessed apostles and with other people.\textsuperscript{111} Speaking to Mary, Rupert asked her to let the light of her life which had adorned countless churches shine on him, so that he would learn something about this most holy conversation.\textsuperscript{112}

Mary was the Teacher of true modesty.\textsuperscript{113} She was the Teacher of necessary religion;\textsuperscript{114} the Teacher of holy religion.\textsuperscript{115} In another place, he spoke of Mary as a necessary Teacher (\textit{magistra necessaria}), a worthy witness of the Gospel of her beloved Son, the Gospel contained within her body.\textsuperscript{116} The entire

\textsuperscript{110}Quia tu religionis et fidei magistra cum beatis apostolis conversata es, cum hominibus et fere inter turbas visa es (\textit{Cant.} V: \textit{CM. XXVI}, 105. 7-8).
\textsuperscript{111}idem.
\textsuperscript{112}Sublucet vita tua, vita inclita... cunctas illustrat ecclesias..., ut saltem aliqua ex parte cognoscamus sanctissimam conversationem tuam (\textit{Cant.} V: \textit{CM. XXVI}, 106. 41-48).
\textsuperscript{113}magistra competentis verecundiae" (\textit{Cant.} III: \textit{CM. XXVI}, 75. 578-579).
\textsuperscript{114}magistra competentis verecundiae sive religionis necessariae (\textit{Cant.} III: \textit{CM. XXVI}. 75. 579).
\textsuperscript{115}sanctae magistra religionis... (\textit{Cant.} IV: \textit{CM. XXVI}. 698-704).
\textsuperscript{116}quando tu, o dilecta, propter evangelium dilecti praesens aderas, et in corpore detinebaris, magistra necessaria, testis valde idonea (\textit{Cant.} V: \textit{CM. XXVI}. 117. 459-461).
flock (apostles and pious women) looked to Mary as their humble leader and teacher (*magistram*)\(^{117}\), and they followed and imitated her in her humility. She proclaimed truth and preached the Gospel which confirmed the faith of the apostles.\(^ {118}\) The truth that Mary proclaimed had long been pondered in the silence of her maternal heart.

In addition to motherly nurturing, Rupert's portrayed Mary playing a vital magisterial role among the apostles. However, although *Magistra Apostolorum* implied a leadership role, and emphasized the preeminence of Mary over the apostles, she did not assume or usurp the hierarchical authority of the Apostles in the Church. Mary was not commissioned with the leadership of the Church, as were Peter and the Apostles. Nevertheless, she was present at their meetings, even if Sacred Scripture did not say that Mary was present. Rupert mentioned the presence of Mary at the Meeting in Jerusalem (Acts 15:4-6) when the Apostles gathered to solve the question of the circumcision of non-Jewish converts to the faith of the early Church.\(^ {119}\) Mary was there, and at other meetings, as the principal solver of problems and as the destroyer of all evil heresies.\(^ {120}\)

**Destroyer of Heresies**

The destruction of heresy was an important magisterial function of Mary in the infant Church. Through the integrity of

\(^{117}\) *idem*.

\(^ {118}\) *ibid.* 74. 529-531.

\(^ {119}\) Rupert spoke of Mary's strong aversion to the uselessness of the external ceremonials of the Jews (*Cant. I: CM.* XXVI, 23. 471-483; also: Peinador, *Cantar*, p. 23).

\(^ {120}\) *Immo et illic et in ceteris agendis tu princeps omnem solusi quaeestionem... tu sola es Virgo, quae universam haereticam pravitatem interemisti* (*Cant. I: CM.* XXVI, 24. 509-513).
her teaching and preaching, she would wipe out all heresies from the Church. Rupert referred on three occasions in the Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles to Mary's role in the extirpation of heresy. His remarks were in conjunction with Mary's role as «Magistra Apostolorum», and as «totius sanctae magistra religionis». The context of the first example was also the setting for him to elaborate on the fact that the Teacher of the Apostles, by the authority of her voice, the voice of the Holy Spirit... she alone, the Virgin, would eradicate the whole world of evil heresies. The second reference of Rupert to Mary's role in the destruction of heresy was when Rupert suggested that Jesus had asked his Mother to linger a bit longer on earth until all heresies, present and future, would be destroyed by her most faithful teaching. The Abbot of Deutz went on to identify the heresies created by the Carpocrates, Valentinus, Apollinarius, Paulinus, Jovinian, and all others who had been seduced by heresy or were doing the heretical seducing. The destruction of heresies was also akin to Mary's maternal role in the history of salvation as the New Eve. The third reference to Mary's

---

121 The Church has always recognized Mary's role in the eradication of heresy, and in the first antiphon of the third nocturn of the Common Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the liturgy celebrated Mary for her single-handed destruction of all heresies in the world (Gaude, Maria Virgo: cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo). St. Anselm of Lucca in the eleventh-century gave a brief but illuminating explanation of this antiphon from the liturgical text, in a meditation on the Salve Regina. Addressing himself to Mary, he praises her because «you alone have destroyed all heretical evil (tu sola interemisti universam haereticam pravitatem)». This meditation has been printed among the works of St. Bernard (Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Clarae-Vallensis Opera Omnia, curis D. Joannis Mabillon, editio quarta [Paris, 1839], II, Joseph Fenton, "Our Lady and the Extirpation of Heresy", Amer. Eccl. Rev. 114, [1946], p. 443).

122 idcirco tuae vocis magisterio... vox tua vox fuit Spiritus Sancti... tu sola es Virgo, quae universam haereticam pravitatem interemisti (Cant. I: CM. XXVI. 24. 488-513).

123 Cant. IV: CM. XXVI. 103-104. 699-718.

124 ...tu, inquam, virtutum operatrix ac totius sanctorum magistra religionis qualem
eradication of heresies was when Rupert compared her to the staff of Aaron, the staff which destroyed the evil in Egypt by swallowing the staffs of Pharaoh’s magicians. In this sense, Mary the Mother of Christ would destroy all evil teachings, and cast down the devil. \(^{125}\) Thus the New Eve, the Mother of the Redeemer, the woman whose heel crushed the head of the serpent, was now very active in the Church among the Apostles as their Spiritual Mother and Teacher.

6. Mary And The Church

The final part of the Commentary frequently qualified the infant Church as the gentile Church, particularly to show the rejection of Christ and His Church by the Jews. Rupert was not known to speak kindly of the Jews, and he seems to have delighted in speaking of the rejections of the Jews in favour of the gentiles. His disregard and aversion for the Jews, were not hidden in this Commentary.\(^{126}\) Expanding on this verse from the Canticle: «My brothers have been angry with me, they charged me with the care of the vineyards. My own vineyards I have not cared for.» \(^{127}\) Rupert interpreted the brothers of the bride here to represent the Jews, the sons of the synagogue. He preferred to call them the satans of the synagogue.\(^ {128}\) These unbelieving Jews, who

\(^{125}\) ZSSicut enim virga illa virga maleficiorum et incantatorum devoravit, et omnem superbiam aegyptiacam obtriuit... sic tu pulcherrima mulierum, amica mea, cunctam pravitatem haereticam interemisti, superbiam diaboli deiecisti... (Cant. I: CM. XXVI. 27-28. 631-637).

\(^{126}\) See footnote 62, chapter 1.

\(^{127}\) Canticle 1:6.

\(^{128}\) “Filii Matris meae Judaei sunt, filii synagoge... non sunt sed sunt synagoga satanae” (Cant. I. CM. XXVI. 21. 409-410). Rupert further pointed out that the
rejected Christ, lost what should have been theirs because of their lack of faith, and it was given to the gentiles. Quoting Acts 13:46-47 Rupert showed that when Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly and said to the Jews: «It was necessary that the Word of God be spoken to you first, but since you rejected it and condemn yourselves and became unworthy of eternal life, we now turn to the gentiles». The gentiles took the place of the Jews.\(^{129}\)

The «apple tree» of Canticle 8:5 represented the cross on which the gentile Church was redeemed and chosen. It was this same cross which brought about the reproach against the synagogue.\(^{130}\) In Peinador's words, «The gentile Church (the bride), fortunate to have been chosen, was sustained by Christ (the bridegroom), and even in its persecutions, it was able to appear before the world as a real sign (seal) on the arms and in the heart of its beloved spouse. The words of the Canticle: «Set me as a seal on your heart, as a seal on your arm»\(^{131}\) illustrated the intense love of the bride for her Loved One, of Mary for Christ, of the Church for Christ. It indicated the love and the longing in the heart of the bride to be permanently united to her Loved One, and her desire to be upheld and supported in his strong arms. Such was Mary's desire to be with her Son in heaven. The Church too wanted to be sealed to the heart of Christ, and to enjoy the anger of the bride's brothers at her for not taking care of their vineyards indicated the suspicion and calumny of people against Mary's honour for thinking that she had compromised herself by acting in a dishonourable manner. Taking this a bit further into the early Church, the Jews were angry with Mary for her care for the gentile Church (\textit{Cant. I. CM. XXVI. 21. 411-438}).

\(^{129}\)This rejection of the Jews in favour of the gentiles who accepted the Gospel and converted is also seen in the Canticle where the bride invited her beloved spouse to leave the countryside field and go to the village outside of the city (Canticle 7:12), commented on in \textit{De Incarnatione}, \textit{CM XXVI. 160ff}.

\(^{130}\)«Sub arbore malo, ubi te suscitavi, sub ligno crucis, ubi te redemi... Sed mater tua synagoga, genitrix tua, gens iudica ibi corrupta est...» (\textit{Cant. V11: CM. XXVI, 162. 196-201}).

\(^{131}\)Canticle 8:6.
strength of His protection especially in these early days of persecutions especially from within (the Jews). Rupert reflected that the love which Christ had for Mary and for the Church recalled the image of the «strong woman» of Proverbs 31:11 in whom her husband placed his trust and confidence.\textsuperscript{132}

\textbf{Mary as Bride - Church as Bride}

In the final section of \textit{De Incarnatione}, Rupert advanced a change of emphasis from Mary as the bride, to the Church as the bride.\textsuperscript{133} This should not come as a surprise because it was Rupert's intention to attribute this love poem to Mary, but also in an ecclesial sense. Further, the final parts of the Canticle adapt better to the Church than personally to Mary\textsuperscript{134} According to Peinador: «if throughout the Commentary Rupert seemed to consider Mary instead of the Church, this was not the case in this final Book of the Commentary. It was the Church that appeared as the spouse. However, as far as Rupert was concerned, Mary and the Church were one and the same.\textsuperscript{135} Both She and the

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Cant.} V11: \textit{CM. XXVI}, 164. 216; 299-305.
\textsuperscript{133} Peinador, p. 35
\textsuperscript{134} Peinador, \textit{idem}.
\textsuperscript{135} Pope John Paul II echoes this sentiment when he says that «the Church is both Marian and Apostolic-Petrine» («...Ecclesia dici potest esse simul mariana et apostolico-petrina» \textit{AAS}, 80, 1718). The footnote to this passage from \textit{Mulieris Dignitatem}, says: This Marian profile is also-even perhaps more so-fundamental and characteristic for the Church as is the apostolic and Petrine profile to which it is profoundly united... The Marian dimension of the Church is antecedent to that of the Petrine, without in any way being divided from it or being less complementary. Mary Immaculate precedes all others, including obviously Peter himself and the Apostles... (Hic marianus aspectus est tantundem - si non magis - fundamentalis ac praecipius Ecclesiae quantum aspectus apostolicus et Petrinus, cum quo arctissime coniungitur... mariana ratio Ecclesiæ petrinæ praecedid rationem, etiam si sit cum ea penitus coniuncta et complementaris. Maria Immaculata, omnem alium praecedid, et, ut patet, ipsum Petrum et apostolos.... \textit{AAS}, 80. p. 1718).
Church were the bride of Christ. Mary was the bride who embodied and personified the Church. Rupert summed up Mary's interconnectedness with the Church in these words: «The blessed Virgin Mary was the greatest and the best aspect of the whole Church.»

Mary's ecclesial role in salvation history extended from what Rupert called the «old church» of the Patriarchs to the «new Church» of the Apostles. In his *De Victoria Verbi Dei*, Rupert said that Mary, the bride of God the Father, was the best part of the earlier (the old) church, the synagogue, so that she would become the exemplar of the younger (the new) Church, the bride of God the Son, her own Son.

The bride then was the infant Church, still young, yet undergoing the growing pains of persecutions. As a child grows and develops into full maturity, Rupert contemplated the growth and development of the Church from its humble beginnings. She must be protected. She must remain close to her beloved spouse in contemplation of his Word, just as Martha's sister Mary had chosen the «better part» by staying close to Jesus. Under the protection of her beloved spouse (Christ), the Church grew under persecution as it imitated its Mother (Mary) in her humility and her supportive love for her spouse (Christ).

**Mother and Type of the Church**

Mary was the Mother of Christ. She was also the Mother of the Church. The words of the Canticle: «Oh, that you were my brother nursed at my mother's breast, if I met you out of doors, I

---

136 *Ecclesiae totius, cujus beata Virgo Maria portio maxima, portio est optima...* (Apoc. VII, c. xii: PL. 169. 1043a).

137 "*Maria Sponsa Dei Patris erat prioris Ecclesiae pars optima, ut exemplar fieret iunioris Ecclesiae, sponsae filii Dei, filii sui*" (*Vict.*: PL. 167. 1577).

138 *Cant.* V11: CM. XXVI, 160. 137-139.
would kiss you... I would lead you into the home of my mother»\textsuperscript{139} indicated that Christ and the Church were offspring from the same mother. They both shared in Mary's humanity. Just as Jesus looked up to Mary as His Mother, the infant Church looked to Mary as its Mother. Just as the Word of God became physically human and fed upon Mary's breasts so too the infant Church was fed from the knowledge about Christ that came from Mary's breasts as she revealed the mysteries she had pondered in her heart. Consequently, the infant Church («daughter» of Mary) also shared in this kiss of joy, as it contemplated «its brother», Christ, the Word of God made human through Mary.

Rupert's Mariology presented Mary in an inseparable union with the Church, which she personified and embodied with her holiness and perfection. The \textit{Magistra Apostolorum} was an image, type, model and exemplar of the Church. As a prototype of the Church, Mary modelled the virtues to be imitated by all men and women. In looking up to Mary, the Apostles did not just see and hear her as a Mother and Teacher, they saw the Church exemplified before their eyes for their imitation.

Mary personified and represented the Church. She was "the Woman" of Apoc. 12,\textsuperscript{140} bearing the person of the Church.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{139}Canticle 8:1-2.

\textsuperscript{140}Peinador, M., («\textit{María y la Iglesia según Ruperto di Deutz}», \textit{Ephemerides Mariologicae}, Vol XVIII, 1968, p. 342. [Hereafter cited as Peinador, \textit{Maria}]), points out that Rupert came to the understanding that the "woman" was Mary through an evolution of thought. In earlier works like the \textit{De Trinitate} and the \textit{De Divinis Officiis} and the Commentary on John's Gospel (\textit{John. XII: CM. IX. 684-685; PL. 743}). He maintained an ecclesiological sense, or collective sense whereby he understood the woman to be the People of God, or the Church. He also made application to particular persons, in so far as they were a part of the Church, persons such as Daniel, the Apostles, and martyrs. In the \textit{De Divinis Officiis}, he understood the woman to be the Christian Church, clothed with the sun, i.e., with Christ, and crowned with twelve stars, i.e., the twelve Apostles. The moon beneath her feet signified her dominion over the whole world. Her loud wailing in labour pains was an expression of the faith she professed from the bottom of her heart. (\textit{CM. VII. 34.}
The whole history of the People of God in the Old Testament was summed up in the vision of Apoc. chapter 12, the *mulier in utero habens* in which the people, at a decisive time, in the process of their history, turned their attention to Mary, the woman about to give birth to a Son, the Saviour. In Rupert's words: «The Church produced a Saviour born of the Virgin Mary.»¹⁴² This historic moment signalled the end of the "old" and the beginning of the "new" economy of salvation.

Mary was also the physical link and the spiritual bond of love between Christ and the Church. She was a "type" of the Church,¹⁴³ and although Rupert did not call Mary a type of the Church in the Canticle Commentary, he did so in another work.

---

¹⁴² Commenting on Apoc. 12 in *De Victoria Verbi Dei*, Rupert clearly identified the woman as Mary, who was to hold a very eminent position in the Church. At the Incarnation she played a decisive, a unique and unrepeatable role in the history of salvation. In giving birth to the Redeemer, Mary fulfilled a function which no other woman was able to do. In this same work, the Abbot of Deutz contemplated this vision as spanning the entire history of the People of God, beginning with the promise to Abraham, which was climaxed in the woman. Mary, according to a divine promise, conceived and gave birth to the Messiah, Christ, through whom all the nations would be blessed; the nations represented by the twelve stars, i.e., the twelve Patriarchs of the Old Testament, and the twelve Apostles of the New Testament Church. Rupert saw this coming of the Saviour born of the woman Mary as the greatest moment in the history of salvation. As Messiah, he would rule the nations with an iron rod, and would triumphantly sit on his throne after his complete victory over the devil.

¹⁴³ In a successive work Rupert identified Mary ever more completely with the «woman in labour», the figure of the whole Church. (*Vicr. 12.1*, Ed. Haacke, 373).

¹⁴² "Ecclesia edidit Salvatorem, pariente Virgine Maria" (*De Trin.: PL. 167. 1157, 1363*).

¹⁴³ The expression "type" of the Church is used in the same threefold sense that Semmelroth uses it. According to Otto Semmelroth, "the essential content of type can be three fold if taken in its fullest sense. First, it can mean the personification or representation of a spiritual entity through some sort of image. Secondly, it can mean a real bond between one entity and another as the objective foundation of this relationship. And finally, it can be a moral example as a result of this relationship" (*Mary Archetype Of The Church*, [New York: Sheed & Ward, 1963], p. 28).
De Victoria Verbi Dei. In the De Incarnatione the passages linking Mary with the Church, while explicitly not referring to Mary as a type of the Church, implicitly regard her as a type of Mother Church. Some of the following passages speak of Mary as a Mother Church, with several offspring (local Churches):

1. «They charged me with the care of the vineyards.»
Using this text to show the many Churches entrusted to Mary’s care, Rupert placed the following words in Mary’s mouth:

«Instead of one vineyard, which should have been mine, i.e., my own people, my flesh and blood, I have acquired many vineyards, many churches, among the gentiles. They all have my protection and my intercession, and because of this protection, they constantly call upon me.»

2. In another text linking Mary with the Church, Rupert, commenting on Canticle 1:15-16, depicted Mary saying to Jesus: «We will not be driven out into the desert like the tents of Cedar, because we have houses in our own city. We will have many precious riches, i.e., churches.» Rupert here presented Mary together with Christ as proprietors of many churches. In one

144 PL. 167. 1577; Spilker, p. 315.
145 Spilker, ibid. p. 310.
146 Cant. of Canticles 1:5.
147 "Pro una vinea, quae debuit essa mea, utpote gens mea, sanguis meus et caro mea, multas vineas acquisivi, multas ecclesias in gentibus dilatavi, quae omnes custodiam meam habent, et habere desiderant, de meritis meis praesumentes, de intercessionibus meis confidentes et pro huiusmodi custodia clamantes ad me iugiter" (Cant. I: CM. 22. 433-438).
148 "Nec iam in desertum eiciemur, sicut tabernacula Cedar, immo in civitate nostra domos habebimus diutinas multas et praeclaras, scilicet, ecclesias" (Cant. I: CM. 35. 903-905).
passage he shows Mary speaking as a co-proprietor with her Son, when she referred to the apostles as «our domestics.»

3. Commenting on Cant. 4:12-15, Rupert this time has Jesus speaking to Mary about her many offspring, the churches. She is the Mother of churches (*mater ecclesiarum*). The Abbot of Deutz referred to the Churches as offspring, as children of Mary. Rupert has Jesus address these words to his Mother:

«Through your many offspring, the one Church has spread throughout the whole world, and they will always look to you and to us, and will shout about us, extolling loudly that you are a faithful woman, and they will say to me: *Blessed is the womb that bore you, and the breasts that fed you.* You are a garden fountain, a source of living water; a garden stream, that is, you are the mother of churches.»

Rupert also very specifically referred to Mary representing the Church, when in his Commentary on John's Gospel, he, described the Cana wedding hall as the Church. The Mother of

---

149 "domestici nostri apostoli" (*ibid*, 911).

150 *Cant.* IV: CM. XXVI, 89. 165. In calling Mary the Mother of the Church, Rupert in the *De Incarnatione Domini* had referred (in the plural) to Mary as *Mater Ecclesiarum*, i.e., she was the Mother of the primitive Christian communities founded through Mary's "magisterium" as *Magistra Apostolorum*.

151 "...ecclesia una de multis emissionibus tuis, quae per orbem terrarum diffusa semper...mater ecclesiarum (*ibid*)*.

152 "Ibi dabo tibi ubera mea, scilicet nutriendo multitudinem filiorum (*Cant.* VI: CM. XXVI. 155. 851-852).

153 "...ecclesia una de multis emissionibus tuis, quae per orbem terrarum diffusa semper in te respiciet, et ad nos clamabit de nobisipsis vocem extollens de turba mulier fidelis dicens mihi: 'Beatus venter qui te portavit, et ubera quae suxisti.' Tu fons hortorum, puteus aquarum viventium; fons, inquam, hortorum, id est, mater ecclesiarum" (*Cant.* IV: CM. 89. 160-165).
Jesus was present. He went on to say that a true wedding can only be celebrated when Mary, the Mother of Jesus, meaning the Mother Church, is present.\textsuperscript{154} This mode of thinking clearly situated Rupert's Marian doctrine within his Ecclesiology. Mary was the best part (\textit{maxima pars}) of the Church. She was the Bride of the Father. At the Incarnation she became the Bride of the Son. Because of her close love and union with her beloved Son, she was closely linked to the Church as its Mother. In this sense Mary was a type and model of the Church, the Bride of Christ.

4. Rupert took the following reference to Mary's role and position in the Church from Cant. 6:9. «One alone is my dove, my perfect one, her mother's chosen, the dear one of her parent...» For the Abbot of Deutz, this mother, referred to in Cant. 6:9, was the heavenly Jerusalem. Rupert identified Mary with the heavenly Jerusalem. She was the mother of all of us, even mother of her ancestors, the ancient church, the church of the Patriarchs and Prophets, and of the just Kings. Mary is the Mother of all those who gave birth to this (Old Testament) church, the only one, the chosen one.\textsuperscript{155} According to Spilker, «Rupert wants to say that Mary had a unique position in the synagogue as well as in the Church.»\textsuperscript{156}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{154}Illic tantummodo harum caelestium nuptiarum solemnitas celebratur, ubi est mater Jesu, id est ubi est mater Ecclesia (\textit{John: PL.} 169. 285).
\textsuperscript{155}Matri suae Hierusalem una est, illi Hierusalem quae sursum est, quae est mater omnium nostrum et genitrici suae scilicet antiquae ecclesiae electa est, ecclesiae patriarchiarum et prophetarum ac regnum justorum, quorum... et illi matri et huic genitrici una est electa est (\textit{Cant. VI: CM.} 139. 233-239).
\textsuperscript{156}Spilker, \textit{op. cit.} p. 309. An essential question in Rupert's Mariology regarding Mary and the Church centered on Mary's position in the Church. Was she above the Church, or was she, as St. Augustine held, an excellent and eminent member of the Church? (St. Augustine: "Sancta Maria, beata Maria, sed melior est Ecclesia quam Virgo Maria. Quare? Quia Maria portio est Ecclesiae, sanctum membrum, excellens membrum, supereminens membrum, sed tamen totius corporis membrum. Si totius corporis, plus est profecto corpus quam membrum.", \textit{Sermones}, ed., Morin [1931],
\end{flushright}
5. Rupert continued to show the close links between Mary and the Church in chapter 7:13 of the Canticle of Canticles: «There I will give you my love (breasts).» This signified for Rupert, Mary feeding the masses of her children (churches), so that they would be given fruitful graces to give new birth to more children (churches).\textsuperscript{157} Just as a mother presents her husband with more children, and nourishes them with her breasts, Mother Church, too, gives birth to additional Churches for her Bridegroom (Christ), and nourishes them through the sacraments. A few lines lower, Rupert expresses the same thought when he continued to speak of Mary feeding the Church. He said that as long as new-born children need milk, Mary gives them her breast, but once they have grown older she feeds them with solid food.\textsuperscript{158} The solid food that the \textit{Magistra Apostolorum} fed the infant Church was the treasured memories of Jesus that she had guarded in her maternal heart. Rupert wrote that Mary had stored up in her heart all her treasures like wheat is stored up in a barn. This same wheat, when converted to flour becomes a nutritious bread which is eaten. Likewise, the treasures stored up in Mary's heart, became the spiritual food of the knowledge and the teachings about the

\textsuperscript{163} Taken from Spilker, \textit{op. cit.} p. 307). Or, was she somewhere between Christ and the Church, as St. Bernard alluded to when he spoke of Mary standing between Christ and the Church? (St. Bernard: "mulier inter solem et lunam: Maria inter Christum et Ecclesiam constituta". \textit{Serm. in Dom. infra Octavam Assumpt. B. V. M.}, n. 5, taken from Spilker, \textit{idem}). For Rupert, Mary enjoyed a unique and exalted position in the Church, and although the Abbot of Deutz makes it sound as if Mary were above the Church, it is clear that the Abbot never placed Mary above the Church. Her magisterial role in the Christ was a maternal one of nurturing and guidance within the Church; not above it. She was not the head. Christ alone is the Head of the Mystical Body. Mary was, to use St. Augustine's words, an excellent member in the Church.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibi dabo tibi ubera mea, scilicet nutriendo multitudinem filiorum, quos in novam infantiam fecunda tibi pariet gratia (\textit{Cant. VI: CM. XXVI.} 155. 851-853).

\textsuperscript{158} Quamdiu parvuli fuerint hi...lacte opus erit, non solido cibo, tamdiu dabo ubera mea cum autem perfecti fuerint tunc cibum solidum dabo (\textit{Cant. VI: CM.} 156. 884-889).
Word of God, which she shared this with the Apostles gathered around her as their spiritual Mother.\footnote{Cant. Ill. CM. XXVI. 70. 390-396.}
CHAPTER FOUR
FOUNDATIONS OF "MAGISTRA APOSTOLORUM"

The rarely used Marian title, *Magistra Apostolorum* first appeared in the twelfth-century, in Rupert’s Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles.\(^1\) It is quite probable that *Magistra Apostolorum* was a special ecclesial title through which Rupert honoured Mary, because through this title the Abbot affirmed her eminent role in the infant Apostolic Church as Mother and Teacher, guiding the Apostles and steering the Church towards Christ. Following the Ascension, Mary saw herself filling the void created by the physical absence of Jesus among the Apostles. So as the Spiritual Mother of all of the disciples of her divine Son, she nurtured, guided and sustained them with her maternal love and teaching. She opened up her heart to them and revealed all the mysteries she had stored up and pondered in silence.\(^2\) This

\(^1\) *Cant.* I: *CM.* XXVI, 24. 495. In 1895 it was used by Pope Leo XIII in an Encyclical Letter on the Rosary, when he referred to Mary as the «Teacher and Queen of the Apostles» (*Magistra et Regina Apostolorum*). Leo XIII wrote: «With a generous heart Mary undertook and discharged the duties of her high but laborious office, the beginnings of which were consecrated in the Cenacle. With wonderful care she nurtured the first Christians by her holy example, her authoritative counsel, her sweet consolation, her prayerful prayers. She was in very truth, the Mother of the Church, the Teacher and Queen of the Apostles, to whom, besides, she confided no small part of the divine mysteries which she kept in her heart.» (Encycl.: *Adjutricem Populi: ASS,* XXVIII, [1895], p. 130, English translation taken from *The Papal Encyclicals*, McGrath Publishing Co., [1981], 6, p. 376). Pope Leo called Mary the «voice of the Apostles, forever eloquent (Os perpetuo eloquens Apostolorum.»), and showed that the maternal influence of Mary as Teacher of the Apostles was extended down to the Fathers, Doctors and Pontiffs of the Church (*ibid*, pp. 130-131; English translation, p. 377).

H. Marracci identified the use of this Marian title also in the writings of Richard of St. Lawrence [+1230], James of Voragine [+1298], St. Bridgit of Sweden [+1373] St. Antoninus [+ 1459], and St. Thomas of Villanova. [+1555]. (Hippolytus Marracci, *Polyanthea Mariana*, Liber XI. Roma (1694), pp. 266-267).

\(^2\) Jean Leclercq, in an article: "Mary's Reading of Christ", contends that "there is
idea, developed from homiletic commentaries on Luke 2:19,51, and also on Acts 1:14, was prevalent among the Marian writers of the twelfth-century, and prior to that time, who upheld the tradition that Jesus left his Mother on earth for the maternal care and guidance of the Apostles. Some of these writers, to name just a few, in addition to Rupert were: Bede the Venerable (+735), Haymon of Auxerre (+855), Eadmer (+1124), Bruno of Segni (+1123), Amadeus of Lausanne (+1159), and Aelred of Rievaulx (+1167).

**Haymon of Auxerre**

Commenting on Luke 2:51, Haymon notes that Mary, not wanting to throw her pearls to swine and to give what is sacred to dogs, when the right time had come, made known what she had heard from the angels, from the wise men, from Simeon and Anna, and had stored up and pondered in her heart. 3

---

3Haymon: Et mater ejus conservabat...conferens in corde suo. Omnia scilicet quae de illo audivit sive ab angelis, sive a pastoribus, sive a magis, sive a Simone, vel ab Anna prophetissa, vel etiam quae ab illo fieri videbat, quasi mundum animal ruminans, in corde suo conservabat, nolens mittere margaritas suas ante porcos, neque dare sanctum canibus, sed expectans tempus illius perfectae aetatis quo miracula faciendo Deus ostenderetur, et quo haec scribendo erant, ut per ordinem
Eadmer

Eadmer, a fellow monk and friend of St. Anselm of Canterbury, also made mention of Mary teaching the Apostles, and further explaining to them what already had been taught to them directly by the Holy Spirit. He wrote:

«Mary's presence, after the Ascension of her Son, was most helpful; in fact her instruction was necessary for a better understanding of our faith. Undoubtedly the Apostles received adequate knowledge of all truth from the Holy Spirit, but Mary, the Spouse of the Holy Spirit, had a much deeper, clearer, and personal knowledge of this truth. Therefore she could explain to the Apostles the "mysteries known to her alone. The knowledge of Mary was not only speculative but practical, acquired from participation and experience".»

Bruno of Asti or Segni.

St. Bruno of Segni stated that the Mother of Jesus kept in her heart all that she had heard about her Son so that she could...
teach it to the apostles for the evangelization of the world. According to the Abbot of Segni, «...and his mother kept all these words in her heart (Lk 2:51). If she had not kept them we would not have known them. For we received them from her treasury.»

In another place, reflecting on Mary's pondering in her heart, St. Bruno said:

«The most wise Mother, the only one worthy of such a Son, pondered all these words in her heart, and kept them for us in her memory, so that later on, through her teaching, her narration, and proclamation, they would be written down and preached in the whole world, and proclaimed among countless nations. The apostles heard these words from (Mary) herself. The evangelists learnt these things in her school, and wrote at her dictation, for us to read. Who will not believe the evangelists? Who will dare to contradict them? All that the apostles and evangelists heard from the mother of the Lord, are the very same things and others that were written about the infancy of the Saviour.»

Bruno saw the pondering of Mary in her heart, as the basis of what she would teach the infant Church about her divine Son.

---

5 Bruni: "Et mater ejus conservabat omnia haec verba in corde suo (Lc 2,51). Nisi enim ipsa ea conservasset, nos ea non haberemus. De ejus namque thesauro nos ista suscepusimus" (In Lc. 2:51: PL. 165. 265c).

He also saw the pondering of Mary as the source of the infancy narrative, especially Luke's.

Bruno also addressed the theme of the contemplative life and the active ministry when reflecting on the roles assumed in the third Gospel by the women of Bethany, Mary and Martha. He did this to show that Mary the Mother of Jesus surpassed Mary and Martha, and excelled all others in both the contemplative and active life. Martha exemplified the active life, and her sister, Mary of Bethany, exemplified the contemplative life. Bruno pointed that Mary of Bethany stayed close to Jesus, thereby choosing the better part, but Mary of Nazareth had chosen the best part because no one was closer to Jesus than his Mother. Not only did she listen to God's Word, she kept and pondered it in her heart. In the words of the Abbot of Segni:

"For this virgin, the most blessed among creatures, kept more than all others the privileges of both lives: active and contemplative. She also, like Martha, and even better than Martha, received Christ not only in her house but even into the gates of her womb. She conceived him, she begot him, she brought him forth, she carried him, and more than Martha, and more frequently, she served him. Therefore as did Mary of Bethany, she listened to his word, and not only listened but also meditated about it in her heart, and kept it for us to read, to be heard. For it is written, "Mary kept all these words pondering them in her heart" (Lk 2:19). She deserves to contemplate and to know Jesus more, not only according to his humanity but even according to his divinity. Therefore she has chosen the best part that will not be taken away from her."

---

8 "Ipsa enim inter omnes creaturas beatissima Virgo utriusque vitae, activae
Amadeus

St. Amadeus of Lausanne, a novice trained by St. Bernard, asked himself «why Christ allowed Mary to remain on earth after the Ascension,» and he answered that Christ did so for the «consolation and education of the infant Church, for although the apostles were taught by the Holy Spirit, they still had much to learn from her (Mary's maternal comfort and instruction), who gave them access to her charisms.»

Aelred of Rievaulx

The Cistercian Abbot Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167) in his Commentary on the Infancy Narratives wrote:

videlicet et contemplativae plus caeteris omnibus privilegia custodivit. Ipsa quoque sicut Martha, imo melius, quam Martha suscepit Christum, non solum in domum suam, verum etiam infra claustra uteri sui. Ipsa eum concepit, ipsa eum genuit, ipsa eum peperit, et portavit et plusquam Martha, et frequentius ei ministravit. Ipsa denique, sicut Martha, ejus verbum non solum audiebat, verum etiam in corde suo conferebat, nobisque ad legendum, et audiendum custodiebat. Sic enim scriptum est: "Maria autem conservabat omnia verba haec, conferens in corde suo (Luc 2:19). Ipsa eum non solum secundum humanitatem, verum etiam secundum divinitatem et contemplari, et plus cognoscere meruit. Ipsa igitur optimam partem eligit, quae non auferetur ab ea" (Serm. 117, In Ass.: PL. 165. 839d-840a).

Amadeus, PL, 188, also Sources Chrétiennes, ed., G. Bavaud, J. Deshusses, A. Dumas, (Paris, 1960), p. 184. Also, a similar view was held by the Pseudo-Jerome, an eleventh-century monk, who wrote that «after the Resurrection, Mary remained with the Apostles until her Assumption, long enough to instruct them about the Incarnate Word, for she herself had been fully instructed by the Holy Spirit» (Quoted in Nicholas of Lyra (1369), In Lucam 2:10-51, ed., Biblia Sacra Cum Glossa Ordinaria, Vol 5, [Antwerpiae 1634] ed 713 and 726, taken from Jean Leclercq, Mary's Reading of Christ, op. cit., pp. 105-106).
"Mary (after) keeping all these words (in her heart), meditating upon them, shared with others what she had seen and heard... All that the most prudent virgin faithfully conserved, and kept secret, when the right time came, she imparted to the holy apostles and disciples, to be preached by them."

Although Aelred did not specifically refer to Mary as *Magistra Apostolorum*, he nevertheless implied it when he said: "sanctis apostolis praedicanda commissit".

The Pondering of Mary.

The pondering of Mary appears to be the scriptural basis for the Marian title of *Magistra Apostolorum*. All the above mentioned medieval theological writers, from Aelred to Haymon,

---


Two other writers of this period who upheld the Magisterial role of Mary based on *conferens in corde suo* were: Randolf Ardentis. He wrote: "Maria...conferens in corde suo... Non minus enim castitate oris quam corporis imitabilis, omnia quae de Domino, vel a Domino, facta dictare cognoscebat, sive intelligeret sub silentio in memoria recondiebat, ut, quando tempus adesset, universa, prout gesta dictare fuerant, quaerentibus et scribentibus explicaret..." (*Hom. XIX, pars I. PL. 155. 1739 C-D*).

Zacharias of Besançon's contribution to Mary's pondering was similar to the above: "Mary, whether she understood or not, stored up in her memory everything that was said and done by and about the Lord, so that when the time came she would explain it to those who wanted to know. (Omnia quae de Domino vel a Domino dicta vel facta cognovit, sive intellecta, sive non intellecta, in memoriam recondiebat, ut tempore suo universa prout gesta erant, intelligeret, et quaerentibus explicaret" *PL. 186. 88*).
who support the tradition of Mary being left on earth by her Son for the instruction of the Apostles, point to the pondering of Mary in Luke 2:19,51 as the scriptural basis for the tradition of Mary being a Teacher of the Apostles. Consequently, the exegesis of Luke 2:19,51 might aid in shedding light on the pondering of Mary as the basis for Mary's magisterial role among the Apostles.

Rupert stated eleven times in the *De Incarnatione* that Mary, during her silent contemplative ministry, stored up and pondered in her heart whatever she heard and saw of her divine Son. Three of these eleven references were specific to Luke 2:19,\(^{11}\) about Mary's pondering on the mysteries of God (*secreta Dei*).\(^{12}\) These were the passages where Luke used the verb «synterein» for «keeping (conservabat)». Rupert also made eight specific mentions of verse 51,\(^{13}\) where the Greek word used in the Gospel for «conservabat» was «diaterein». Pondering (conferens) was expressed by the distinctly Lucan word «symballousa».\(^{14}\) Synterein and diaterein meaning «keep», or «retain» are synonymous. Symballousa from symballein, usually translated as «ponder» is a verb which occurs only in Luke/Acts. The context of *diaterein* in 2:51 suggests

«that more than mere memory retention is meant, and that is made specific in the first statement (synterein 2:19) by the presence of a participle from symballein

\(^{11}\) *Cant.* I. 209; II. 27; III. 395.

\(^{12}\) *Cant.* III: *CM*. XXVI. 70. 396.

\(^{13}\) *Ibid.*, I. 209; I. 526; I. 880; II. 28. III. 396; V. 416; VI. 566; VI. 891.

\(^{14}\) «Symballousa» is a distinctly Lucan word which Luke has also used in other places to mean other things, such as converse, speak together (Acts 4:15; 17:18), or come together, meet (Acts 4:15; 17:18). Ben Meyer says that where its sense is at all analogous to Luke 2:19, it means «to confer» or «to discuss» (Acts 4:15) and to «debate» (Acts 17:18) But Mary Kept These Things, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 26, (1964), 44.
indicating that in Mary's heart she did something with what she retained."^{15}

The word *symballein* comes from the composition «of *sym* meaning "with" and *ballein", "throw". Literally it could mean that Mary combined the various things that she had heard, seen, and remembered... In this interpretation Mary is responsible for the consecutive narrative in 2:1-20."^{16}

Mary's pondering was a prayerful meditative activity. This prayerful pondering is the translation of *symballousa* used in the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. In the LXX Greek, Mary pondered *remata*, i.e., «things». In the Latin translation she pondered *verba*; i.e., «words». Consequently English translations of the New Testament depict Mary either as pondering all the «things» or all the «words». Although it is not known with certainty how Luke interpreted the word *remata*, its complex meaning can extend to words like «things», «actions», «words». Mary's pondering was continuous and one of duration, as indicated by the imperfect tense or continuous past tense of the verb *symballousa* or *conservabat*. Mary was pondering and processing all these things/words in her thoughts, prayer, and storing them up in her memory. Her reflection was «not a purely material recording, but a dynamic and vibrant preservation in the heart (2:19, and 51), accompanied by steady growth in

---


^{16}ibid., p. 149.

^{17}Ben Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 45. The Greek word *kardia* (heart) «has the same extension as the Hebrew *leb*, the seat of thought, memory, and affectivity» (ibid).
understanding (cf 2:50), growth which takes place by way of a confrontation (of things/words).»

Mary's pondering in her heart also included much remembering. Bede the Venerable's Commentary on Luke 2:19,51 indicated that Mary remembered all that she had read and had heard (legerat and audierat: pluperfect tense). She remembered (conservabat: imperfect tense). This shows that Mary kept all that she had heard or read continuously in her heart and memory. It was a form of active remembering.

While modern exegesis may help clarify the meaning of «synterein», «diaterein», and symbolloasa in Luke 2:19,51, and be instrumental in showing that the pondering of Mary to be the Scriptural foundation for Magistra Apostolorum, this exegetical method was anachronistic to Rupert's medieval allegorizing in his Scripture Commentaries. Further, even if this form of literary criticism in exegesis were the norm in the twelfth-century, which it was not, The Abbot of Deutz perhaps would not have subscribed to it in order to understand Luke 2:19,51, because he was convinced that God had called him and had graced him with the ability to interpret Sacred Scripture.

Mary, the source of Luke's Gospel?

Closely connected with the pondering of Mary is the question of whether Mary was the source of the Gospel.
particularly the Infancy Narratives? Did what she have to say to
the Apostles concerning her reminiscences of her Son provide the
information recorded in Luke's Infancy Narrative? In Rupert's
mind there was no doubt that Mary was the source of the Gospel, especially of the Infancy Narratives. The Abbot spoke of Mary as
the *Secretarium omnium Scripturarum sanctarum*. She was the
source of the Gospel which the Apostles preached. It was first
taught to them by her. In Rupert's mind, not only did the *Magistra Apostolorum* proclaim the Gospel, but the Gospel itself
came from Mary. Following the descent of the Holy Spirit at
Pentecost, as the voice of the Holy Spirit, Mary, the Mother of
the Word of God, revealed the mysteries of the Incarnate Word to
the Apostles. «All of Scripture», Rupert says «came together in
Mary forming in her a fountain or spring and arising out of her as
a source.» Mary embodied in herself both the Old and the New
Testaments. At the end of Book Six, Rupert placed these words
in Mary's mouth as she spoke to her divine Spouse: «I have
preserved for you all the mysteries of the Old and the New
Testaments, pondering them in my heart, to be later on proclaimed
at the right time.»

---

22 *Id est cum omnibus Scripturis veritatis veniens in te et aeternae sapientiae fontem sive puteum faciens in te atque hoc modo ascendit ex te* (*Cant.* IV: *CM.* XXVI. 90. 217-220). Note also: Similiter aquae Scripturarum ex te, soror mea sponsa, dulcescunt ex utero tuo... (*ibid.*, 92. 269-271).

23 *Cant.* IV: *CM.* XXVI, 89. 165-167.

24 *Cant.* III: *CM.* XXVI, 74. 529-531.


27 *Id est cum omnibus Scripturis veritatis veniens in te aeternae sapientiae fontem sive puteum faciens in te atque hoc modo ascendit ex te* (*Cant.* IV: *CM.* XXVI. 90. 217-220).


29 *...omnia veteris ac novi Testamenti sacramenta servavi tibi, conferens in corde meo, preferendo in tempore suo, in tempore opportuno* (*Cant.* VI: *CM.* XXVI. 156. 890-892).
As far as Rupert was concerned, Mary in bringing Jesus, the Word of God into the world at the Incarnation, brought God's written Word in Scripture, the Gospel she had pondered upon in her heart, and which she taught to the Apostles.30

The Mother of the Incarnate Word was also the Mother of the written Word in Sacred Scripture. In other words, it was through Mary that there was continuity from the Incarnate Word of God to the written word of God in the Gospel. Mary is the only one who constituted a bridge from the infancy to the adult ministry of Jesus, and she is also the only one to extend this bridge from Jesus' infancy to the early days of the Church.31 Rupert called Mary the Mother of churches, the fountain of living waters, of all the mysteries of Sacred Scripture.32 More specifically he has Jesus address Mary in the Commentary on the Canticles in these words: «In the same way, the waters of Scripture flow out of your womb, my sister, my bride.»33 Mary, the prophetess, as Rupert liked to call her, carried the Word of God in her heart and proclaimed it with her mouth. Not only did she proclaim the Gospel, but the Gospel itself came from her.34

Rupert's conviction that Mary was the source of the Gospel, especially the infancy narratives, is not original to Rupert, nor is it one that has been shared widely by theological writers,
and still remains a divisive issue among some scholars, having sparked a lively debate in recent times.35

35 Among the proponents, Jean Daniélou points to the "exceptional place occupied by the relatives of Jesus in the primitive community," and thinks it likely that Luke obtained information from this community which it might have already received from Mary (Jean Daniélou, taken from: André Feuillet, Jesus And His Mother, from the French: Jésus et sa Mère, [Gabalda et Cie, 1974], translated by Leonard Maluf, [Still River, Mass.: St. Bede's Publications, 1984], p. 66). The other proponents hold that because of the affinities between the Gospels of Luke and John (Laurentin, The Truth, p. 459, and John McHugh, The Mother Of Jesus In The New Testament, [Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1975], pp. 147-148; F. M. Braun, Mother of God's People, [Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1967]) pp. 29-31), and since there is no conclusive evidence that Luke did have direct contact with Mary herself (Laurentin, pp. 461-462), it seems likely that the source of Luke 1 and 2, based on the remembrances of persons in the Baptist's circle and from Mary's pondering and memory, came to the evangelist of the Third Gospel via an intermediary. This intermediary has been identified as the Johannine tradition (Feuillet p. 73). Also, it should be remembered that Luke mentions at the start of his Gospel "that he was informed by people who «were from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word» which makes one think above all of the Apostle St. John" (ibid, p. 75).

Opposing the view that Mary was the source of information for Luke, Raymond Brown, says: «We do not know what relationship Mary had to the apostolic preachers who preserved the tradition. Some imagine Mary recounting to them the stories of the birth; but there is no suggestion of that in the New Testament and indeed in the earliest centuries» (Responses To 101 Questions On The Bible, [Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1990], p. 77). Brown points to the total differences between the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke, to disprove the Marian influence of Luke's Gospel (ibid. See also The Birth, p. 33). On the question of the Marian source of Luke's Gospel, while not ready to admit a Marian source for Luke's Gospel, because there is no conclusive evidence of that in the New Testament, Brown, however, does not see a Marian source as impossible or implausible, but as unlikely (The Birth, ibid). Brown also casts doubt on the Luke-John dependency and maintains that "the main features shared by the two Gospels appear so differently that...attempts to appeal to Lucan-Johannine parallelism as support for the infancy narrative are very dubious" (ibid, p. 238). Another point that Brown disagreed with was the view that regarded as conclusive the contents of the Prologue of Luke's Gospel (1:1-4) regarding the accuracy and the historicity of eyewitnesses, as sources, of the third Gospel, in particular the infancy narrative. (p. 239).
Mary at Pentecost (Acts 1:14)

The active dimension (*tempus loquendi*) of *Magistra Apostolorum* is also scripturally based in Acts 1:14, where Mary is seen in the company of the Apostles and disciples, including pious women, and relatives of Jesus prayerfully awaiting the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Tradition has it that after Pentecost Mary later shared with the infant Apostolic Church all that she prayerfully remembered from the silent pondering in her heart. Through her voice the Holy Spirit spoke to the apostles and guided them. As the voice of the Holy Spirit, Mary would supplement with her teachings what her Son had already taught the Apostles, and what the Holy Spirit had taught them at Pentecost.  

*Ecce Mater tua*: Spiritual Motherhood

In addition to Luke 2:19,51 and Acts 1:14, another Scriptural foundation, John 19: 25-27, positions Mary in a maternal role of nurturing, guiding, forming, and leading the infant Apostolic Church. The dying Jesus entrusted His Mother to John (and to all His disciples), and gave John to his Mother (*Ecce Mater tua*), thereby making Mary their Spiritual Mother.

This passage from John's Gospel is significant in Rupert's Mariology because it points to Mary's spiritual Motherhood of the Apostles and her subsequent maternal ministry of nurturing and guidance in the infant Church.

The doctrine of the spiritual motherhood of Mary based on *Ecce Mater tua* (Jn. 19:25-27) has been associated with the name

---

36 An quia Spiritus Sanctus illos docuit, id circo tuae vocis magisterio...Immo vox tua illis fuit Spiritus Sancti... (Cant. I: CM. XXVI. 24. 497-499).

37 See Theodore Koehler, Les principales interprétations traditionelles de Jn 19:25-
of Rupert of Deutz, but it predated Rupert to St. Anselm of Lucca (+1086). However, it was through Rupert's efforts with regard to the Calvary scene that the Spiritual Motherhood


Also, G. Philips: «Ici le grand initiateur est l'abbé Rupert de Deutz connu pour avoir renforcé l'exégèse mariale tant du protovangile que de l'épouse du Cantique et de la Femme de la vision de l'Apocalypse. C'est lui aussi qui est dégagé de la parole du Christ en croix Ecce Mater tua! la maternité spirituelle de Marie envers nous tous. Sans perdre de vue dans son commentaire de Jean 19,25 ni la scène de l'Apocalypse, ni la prophétie de Simeon (Lc. 2,25) ni la parole du Seigneur sur la tristesse de la femme sur le point d'accoucher (Jn. 16,21) il nous expose que Marie enfanta son premier-né sans douleurs, mais souffrit une immense peine lorsque, debout sous la croix, elle nous mit au monde. A cette heure même en vue de laquelle elle avait conçu du Saint Esprit, elle achevait le plan divin de l'incarnation rédemptrice lors de la passion de son Aîné, et ainsi elle divint véritablement notre mère à tous. This also was based on Rupert's Comm. in Joh., 13; PL. 169. 789 CD-790AB., Marie et l'Église, printed in: Hubert du Manoir. S.J., Maria. Tome VII, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1964), p. 393.

Th. Koehler, also referring to the above cited text from Rupert of Deutz's Commentary on John, speaks of the dual maternity of Mary: joyfully at the birth of Christ in Bethlehem, and painfully when she became the Spiritual Mother of all the disciples at Calvary. He concludes with these words: «Et Rupert en conclut que l'Ecce mater tua, dit à Jean, aurait pu être dit à n'importe quel autre disciple, mais qu'il convenait de recommander la Vierge au disciple vierge» ("Marie, Mère de l'Église", Études Mariales Vol 10, [1953]) p. 148).

39 The pioneer in the West for the spiritual interpretation of John 19:25-27 was St. Anselm of Lucca. The Spiritual Motherhood of Mary from this Johannine text was later defended by Rupert of Deutz and thereafter it became common teaching. (Theotokos, p. 34). O'Carroll continues: «Anselm of Lucca's views were not known until his prayers were published by Dom Wilmart. He interpreted the Saviour's words in the sense of spiritual motherhood: "Mary", he said, "here is your son; apostle, here is your mother" - so that the glorious Mother would intercede for all true believers in her great loving clemency, that she should watch over with special protection those whom she has adopted as children, redeemed captives" (Rivue d'Ascétique et Mystique, Toulouse, 1938, p. 53. 62, taken from Theotokos p. 373). Anselm says that Christ substituted us "in the person of his favourite disciple" for himself so that Mary would have the greatest maternal love for us» (idem, p. 373).
imparted to the Beloved Disciple was seen to be an extension of Mary's Spiritual Motherhood of all the disciples of her Son. Braun makes it clear that as far as it is known, Rupert of Deutz was the first to have developed the notion of the spiritual maternity of Mary and the Church-Mary relationship based on the words of Christ to Mary and to John in John 19:25-27. In Rupert's words:

«Since during the passion of her Son the Blessed Virgin brought forth our salvation, she is our Mother in the strict sense of the word. That is why what is said of the Disciple could have been said with good reason of every other disciple who might have been present. She is mother of all. However there was a certain propriety in this that as Virgin she was entrusted to one who was also a virgin. And this all the more as this disciple had received the grace of describing in his Gospel - in a more comprehensive way and better than anyone else - the Word Himself, whom this Mother brought forth when He became flesh.»

It should be noted that, Braun, in pointing out that while Rupert attributed to Mary a kind of spiritual maternity with regard to all the disciples of Jesus, there is still the echo of Origen's thought that «what Jesus said of John He could have said of many others if they had been at the foot of the Cross.» Braun points out that Origen had made mention of Mary's spiritual maternity in his Commentary on John 19:25-27. However Origen cannot be quoted for the spiritual maternity of Mary, because this text has been misinterpreted in relation to Mary's spiritual maternity of the Church. Braun also recognizes that Origen's text has been

\[\text{ibid.}\]
\[\text{John.: PL. 169. 790. Translation taken from Braun, ibid.}\]
disputed. Nevertheless, he adds that «as inexact as the passage remains, it contains a first indication of the spiritual maternity of Mary and the Church-Mary relationship based on the words of Christ.» More specifically Braun says that Origen and Rupert did not draw their teaching from the text of John itself, but they limited themselves «to hinting that the spiritual motherhood being supposed, the words of the dying Jesus could have been addressed to others besides John.»

Feuillet rightly points out that the basis for Rupert's Johannine interpretation of the Spiritual Motherhood of Mary was John 16:21, the woman in labour. He writes that Rupert used this text:

«to explain Mary's sufferings as oriented to a new motherhood, different from the painless one when she gave birth the "cause of salvation for all, when she

---

42 Origen (+254) in his Comm. on the Fourth Gospel (Comm. in Joan., I: 4-23) saw in John's account a reference to Mary's spiritual motherhood. He wrote: "The flower of all Scriptures is the four Gospels, and the flower of all these is that of John. None can understand its meaning unless he too leans on the breast of Jesus and receives Mary as his Mother. But to do this one must become another John who is pointed out by Jesus as being Jesus. If we share the correct opinion of Mary, we know she had no other Son besides Jesus, and if He said to His Mother, Behold your son, and not, Behold one who is also your son, it is as though he said, Behold Jesus whom you have brought forth. Whoever is perfect, it is no longer he that lives but Jesus lives in him. Because Jesus lives in him then Jesus said to Mary of him, Behold your son, Jesus." According to F. M. Braun, this text is much disputed. Did Origen use Mary in this text as an accessory to give him an opportunity to advance his theory about the assimilation of the perfect to the person of Christ? If that is the case, then it does appear that Origen did not take the words of the fourth Gospel in their literal sense. Nevertheless, says Braun, "It appears that Origen was at least admitting a certain maternity in Mary towards John and those like him....It is more probable however that Origen was thinking of all Christians belonging to the Church, and that Mary's Motherhood with regard to the posterity represented by John coincided with that of the Church" (F. M. Braun, op. cit., pp.99-100).

43 Braun, p. 100.
brought forth of her flesh God made man....Thus suffering here truly the pains of childbirth (Ps. 47), in the Passion of her only Son, the Blessed Virgin brought forth our universal salvation; that is why she is mother to us all. He was, therefore, rightly attentive to his Mother in what he said about the disciple: "Woman, behold your son." And the word to the disciple, "here is your mother", could have been said properly of any disciple who would be present.45

Thus Mary became the Spiritual Mother of all the disciples of her Son. For their part, the Apostles, whom Rupert called the friends (amici)46 of Jesus, looked up to Mary, their Spiritual Mother, for leadership, and guidance, and they learnt from her what their role and mission should be as a Church.

---

45Taken from O'Carroll citing John. XIII, PL. 169. 789C-790C. Theotokos, pp. 373-374.
46Cant. 1: CM. XXVI. 36. 941.
CHAPTER FIVE

MAGISTRA APOSTOLORUM: ETYMOLOGY AND IMPLICATIONS

The Christocentric and Ecclesiotypical Mariology emerging from Rupert’s Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles indicates that Mary was intimately united with Christ and with the Church as Mother and Teacher. Mary as *Magistra* was first and foremost a mother. In Rupert’s Commentary on the Canticle of Canticle, Mary is depicted as the Bride (*Sponsa*), thereby making her a "Queen", the regal bride of the King. Thus the *Magistra Apostolorum* of the *De Incarnacione Domini*, is portrayed as the Mother, Teacher, and spousal Queen of Christ, and the Mother, Teacher, and "Queen" of the Apostles.

The three titles, *Mater*, *Magistra*, and *Regina*, as presented in the *De Incarnacione Domini*, are distinct yet complementary. They pervade Mary’s entire life, from her contemplative *tempus tacendi* to her active *tempus loquendi*.

*Magistra*

So far, the word "*magistra*" has been translated as "teacher", and *Magistra Apostolorum*, in reference to Mary, has been understood as Teacher of the Apostles. While this is a correct translation of *Magistra Apostolorum*, is it complete, and does it adequately convey the intent of a medieval writer? Did *Magistra* imply more than a teacher? The word *magistra* translated into English is «a mistress, a superior, a conductress, a directress,...a school mistress, an instructress,...a high priestess.»

---

In addition to mistress and instructress, Jacobus Bailey translated *magistra* as «tutoress»,² thereby highlighting the educative or teaching role of *magistra*. The word *magistra* meant far more than a teacher. It implied that the person with that title was one who exercised a leadership role with incumbent authority. *Magistra* is the feminine form of the noun *magister*, and all that can be said of a *magister*, e.g., presider over a religious association, manager, shepherd, expert, teacher, demonstrator, exemplar or model to be imitated,³ might also be applied to the feminine form of *magistra*. These titles clearly show that *magister/magistra* was a person in charge, one in a leadership position of authority, a person whose expertise stood out as a model and an exemplar to be imitated by others. Such a person was a teacher charged with the instruction and guidance of others.

If what is said of *magister* in the twelfth-century can also be applied to *magistra*, then based on what Marie-Dominique Chenu says about *magister*, some further insight can be arrived at about Rupert's usage of the word *magistra* which he applied to Mary's role in the infant apostolic Church. According to Chenu, the word *magister* was a standard name, used in the twelfth-century, to designate the leader of a group of itinerant preachers. *Magister*, he says, «was a common name among preachers, school teachers, and the head of an apostolic team, applied to those totally dedicated to the Word of God, through the three means, i.e., reading, discussion, and preaching (*legere, disputare [elaborer des quaestiones], praedicare)*.⁴ Chenu further pointed out that, in the twelfth-century, the preaching of the Gospel was considered to be the epitome of the true apostolic life. It has

already been pointed out that preaching was a priority for Rupert, who considered it to be one of the best means of instructing and reforming the clergy. The Masters of the Sacred Page, were expected not only to lecture on Scripture, but also to preach from it. With this twelfth-century emphasis on preaching as a very high expression of the true apostolic life, it is no surprise that Rupert depicted Mary expressing her ministry as fundamentally one of preaching to the Apostles in the infant Church. As *Magistra Apostolorum*, totally dedicated to the preaching of the Word of God, Mary was, in an eminent manner, all that Chenu described a twelfth-century magister to be.

In calling Mary, the *Magistra Apostolorum*, Rupert must have been conscious of all of these connotations of magistra, because the *Magistra Apostolorum* was a teacher and an instructress of the Apostles. More than that, she was looked up to by the Apostles, the friends (*amici*) of her Son, as a leader, a guide, and an expert in matters concerning her divine Son, Christ.

**Regina**

The title "magistra" can also be extended to a queen, and this was the case in medieval Latin. The *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* indicates that regina can also refer to magistra. Etymologically, magistra implies the concepts of regina and domina. Did Rupert understand the term magistra to

---

5 Anselm of Laon (+1117) was known as the first Master of the Sacred Page. This title was associated with the Masters of the schools of the 12th. century who lectured on the Scripture and made extensive use of dialectical (logical) language to express the doctrine they advanced from the Scripture.


7 Magistra... interdum regina eadem notione... (Carlo du Fresne, *Glossarium Mediae et infimae Latinitatis, tomus quintus, editio nova*, a Leopold Favre, Paris: Librairie des Sciences et des Arts, 1938, p. 174; also in *tomus septimus*, p. 94).
be a term equivalent with *regina*? While there is no evidence of this, in calling Mary the *Magistra Apostolorum*, was Rupert also hinting at *Regina Apostolorum*? There is also no evidence of this other than to affirm that while he made a very definite reference to Mary as *Magistra Apostolorum*, Rupert never referred to her as the *Regina Apostolorum*. However this does not mean that the Abbot did not make references to Mary as Queen in the *De Incarnatione*. Rupert used the word *Regina* for Mary five times in the Commentary. Of these five, she was addressed as *regina caelorum* three times, as *regina regnorum* once, and once as *regina sanctorum*.

Rupert liked to call Mary the Queen of heaven. In fact, at the beginning of the Commentary, he said that in writing this work on the Incarnation, he was speaking in the presence of the Queen of Heaven. The Abbot reserved his references to Mary as Queen to the end of her earthly life. Jesus told his Mother that after his resurrection she would be crowned as queen of the saints in heaven and of all earthly kingdoms.

---

8 An equivalent use of *magistra* and *regina*, was also evident in the writings of contemporaries of Rupert, Bruno of Segni (+1123), and of Aelred of Rievaulx (+1167). In his exegesis on Psalm 44:10ff, Bruno referred to Mary as the Queen and Mistress of the Church (*Reginam et dominam...* PL. 165. 1028). Using the medieval language of chivalry and courtly love, Aelred, the Cistercian Abbot of Rievaulx, after speaking of Mary as our Mother, and our duty to serve her as our Mistress, added, «The spouse of Our Lord is our mistress, the Spouse of our King is our Queen, let us therefore serve her» (PL. 195. 324A).

9 *ibid:* also: 71. 41; 79. 711.

10 *ibid.* 79. 706.

11 *ibid.*

12 "Coram regina caelorum loquor" (*Cant. Prol.: CM. XXVI. 6. 35*).

13 *Cant. III: CM. XXVI, 78. 672-673.*

Although Rupert believed and spoke of Mary's glorification and her heavenly Queenship, he made no explicit mention of any bodily glorification through the Assumption of Mary into heaven before being crowned as Queen of Heaven. Like some of his contemporaries, (St. Bernard +1153), he was prepared to remain silent where the Scriptures were silent. I hasten to add that in spite of Rupert's silence about the Assumption, officially proclaimed a dogma of faith in 1950, it was


16While the Assumption was a fully accepted belief in the East by the eighth-century, in the west this doctrinal progress was irregular and there was reluctance in accepting the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary. This silence about a bodily Assumption came from the authority of Pseudo-Jerome (PL 30:122-42) which negatively influenced the development of doctrine about the Assumption in the west. The doubts and hesitancy of the author of the Cogitis me perhaps arrested development of thought on the Assumption for about 250 years. Another delaying factor was the influence of Usuard of Paris' ninth century Martyrology, which favoured silence and restraint about the Assumption which he considered to be apocryphal if not frivolous (Taken from Michael O'Carroll, C.S.Sp., Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia Of The Blessed Virgin Mary, Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1982, pp. 57-58). This was changed under the influence of another treatise on the assumption attributed to Pseudo-Augustine (PL 40:1140-48). This late eleventh-century or early twelfth-century treatise, in noting the silence about Mary in Scripture after Pentecost, began to rely less on the apocrypha and more on human reason's ability to discover religious truths. Without clear leadership and guidance coming first from Sacred Scripture on Mary's bodily assumption, Rupert opted for silence on this matter.

17Peinador, p. 30. Rupert also remained silent about the Immaculate Conception. However, like many of his contemporaries who were also silent on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, his and their expressed ideas helped in the final formulation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Such notable theological writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries such as St. Anselm, St. Bernard, Rupert, St. Bonaventure, St. Albert the Great, and St. Thomas Aquinas, while not grasping how Mary, a daughter of Adam, could be conceived without original sin, nevertheless spoke of her holiness and her purification and sanctification which occurred after her conception (by her parents) thus setting her apart to be the Mother of the Incarnate Word of God.
not a reflection of the Abbot's personal faith. There are traces of
the Assumption evident in his writings, especially those
connected with the Queenship of Mary. Rupert, without
speaking of a physical assumption into heaven, affirmed Mary's
maternal coronation as Queen of Heaven, and her glorious reign
in her Son's kingdom, reigning by His decree. This way, the
Abbot of Deutz acknowledged Mary's position in heaven after
accomplishing her mission on earth in the infant Church as its
Mother and Teacher.

Psalm 44 (45)

Mary was Queen because she was the much beloved bride
of the King. Rupert drew from the regal imagery of the love and
nuptial setting, as in Ps. 44 (45), between a King and his Bride, the
Queen. This royal nuptial psalm may have influenced Rupert and
other writers of Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles.


Psalm 45, especially verse 10, "the queen takes her place at your right hand..." was widely used in the Liturgy for feasts honouring the Queenship of Mary. To cite just one example: In the medieval liturgy for the feast of the Holy Rosary there was a "Response" «Signum Magnum», including this verse from Ps. 45 in reference to
Mary wearing a crown of twelve stars [Apoc. 12] (Frénaud, op. cit., p. 76).
44 (45) was a very old royal wedding song, with a long established tradition, and liturgical usage.

The time and place of composition are not known with any certainty. «Some favour the Northern Kingdom with its ivory elegance at Samaria (v.9; 1 Kings 22:39; Amos 3:15; 6:4) and its


23 In Jewish tradition it had messianic implications warranting a messianic interpretation of the relationship between the Messiah and the community of Israel. In the New Testament, The Letter to the Hebrews, chapters 1 and 8, echoes the brief messianic allusion to Christ, in the opening verses of the Psalm. In the Gospel of St. Matthew (25:1-13) the eschatological parable of the 10 maidens, waiting to accompany the groom into the wedding celebration, the five wise maidens have been interpreted to be the Church community the vigilant attendants of Christ the bridegroom. Through out the Synoptic Gospels, statements such as: «Can the wedding guests mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?» (Mt. 9:15); and the account of the parable of the wedding feast (Mt. 22:1-14) show that Jesus had designated himself as the Bridegroom. In the Fourth Gospel, John the Baptist points to Jesus, the voice of the bridegroom, the one who should now increase while John himself decreases (Jn. 3:29-30). In the Apocalypse of John, the wedding day of the Lord is joyfully anticipated because the bride is ready (Rev. 19:7). These New Testament nuptial themes relate analogically to the nuptial motif of Ps. 44 (45), in which Christ is the bridegroom of the Church, paralleling the Old Testament figure of the Messianic nuptial union with the community of Israel. In the Patristic era, the Fathers generally interpreted this Psalm in light of the marriage between Christ and the Church, e.g., St. Justin, Dialogues 63.4 the daughter is the Church (v.11); Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 6,92,1; Cyprien of Carthage: «The Queen is the Catholic Church, the unique Spouse» (Epistle 75,14); Origen: «The daughter is the Church of the nations...» (Hom. on Ex. 8:6). The royal bride of Ps. 44 (45) verses 11-12 was seen to be the Blessed Virgin Mary in: (Pseudo Athanase, Hom. on the Annunciation, PG 28,938); St. Germain of Constantinople, Hom. on the Presentation of Mary, PG 98,297). St. Andrew of Crete identified Mary as the Queen with the Church as bride (PG 97,862). The above was taken from André Rose, Les Psaumes 44 et 131 dans la Liturgie Marielle, as printed in eds. A. Triacca and A. Pistoia, La Mère de Jésus et la communion des saints dans la Liturgie, Conf. S. Serge, Paris, 1985, pp. 255-261, and André Rose, Psaumes et Prière Chrétienne, Biblica, Publications de Saint-André, 1965, pp. 65-81.
contacts with Tyre and Sidon (Ps.45:13; 1 Kings 16:31).”

24 A non-religious marriage song, it was the only such example in the Psalter, and as such, was capable of comparison with the Song of Songs. This Psalm may be viewed as the epitome of the Canticle of Canticles. What the Canticle presents in six songs is epitomized in a few verses in this Psalm. It was sung at the King's marriage to a princess of Phoenicia. This Psalm came to be applied to the future anointed King, the Messiah. Central to this Psalm is the call to the princess to forget the royal house she came from, her father's house, and to become the bride of the King (verse 11). This presupposes the call of the Princess to submit her life and her love in total dedication and obedience to the King, whose bride and Queen she was to become at the royal wedding. Applied to Mary, the royal bride of the Canticle of Canticles, her life was one of fidelity, obedience, and inseparable union with Christ, her divine Spouse. Thus after her "fiat" to

---


25 ibid.


27 Edmund Valt, ed., Herder's Commentary On The Psalms, translated by Bernard Fritz, O.S.B., Maryland: Newman Press, 1961, p. 166. It should be noted that a contrary view is maintained by André Feuillet. In his study on the Canticle of Canticles, Feuillet, while admitting to resemblances between the Canticles and Psalm 45, is very hesitant to show any dependence or influence. He says in his exegesis of Ps. 45: «Nous nous sommes gardé, dans notre exégèse, de faire appel au Cantique des Cantiques, ce qui eût proprement vouloir expliquer "obscurum per obscursius"....» Le Cantique des Cantiques, (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953), pp. 219-220.

become the Mother of the Incarnate Word of God, Mary never looked back, but remained obedient and faithful to her vocation and mission to be the Mother, Teacher and Queen of Christ, the *Mater, Magistra et Regina Apostolorum*.

Commenting very briefly on Ps. 45 in his Commentary on the Psalms, which was contained with his *magnum opus*, the *De Sancta Trinitate Et Operibus Ejus XXV*, the Abbot of Deutz recognized this Psalm as an *epithalamium*, a nuptial song celebrating the marriage of the son of the king with his bride, but it was the marriage of the Word of God with humanity through the Incarnation. Rupert associated the opening words of the Psalm, «My heart overflows with a goodly theme (*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*)» with the Incarnation theme of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel (*In principio erat Verbum...Et verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis...*). According to Rupert, God the Father himself lovingly intoned the opening words of the Psalm, «*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum...* God the Father uttered his Word, and it became flesh and was born of the Virgin Mary. The Word of God, the only good word (*verbum bonum*) dwelt among us, and we saw his Glory.» In the words of the Psalmist, the Word of God, Christ, «was fairer in beauty than all the sons of men, and grace was poured out on his lips.» Rupert applied this song celebrating the marriage of the Word of God with humanity in the Incarnation to express the love, intimacy, and union between God and Mary, the Mother and Spouse of Christ. Throughout the Commentary Mary was the Spouse in the Canticle. She was the Bride of Christ.

---

29 In *Librum Psalmorum 5*: CM. XXII. 1361-1362.
30 John 1:14.
31 Verse 3.
32 Cyril Vollert writes: «Apparently Rupert of Deutz, that "untidy thinker", is the chief innovator in this matter (concerning Mary as the Spouse of Christ [italics mine]), and passed his fancy on to French divines of the seventeenth century and to Scheeben two centuries later» (Mary And The Church, printed in Mariology, Vol 2,
In his Commentary on the Canticles, Rupert made four references to Ps 44 (45). In the first reference, he linked verses 11 and 12 of the Psalm to Cant. 2:13-14 to bring out the love of the Groom, the King (Christ) for his beautiful Bride (Mary) to whom He wanted to be united.33 In his second mention of this royal nuptial Psalm, emphasis was placed on the beauty of the Groom (Christ), on whose lips grace was poured forth (Ps. 44:3). Rupert related this line from the Psalmist to Cant. 4:1-6, in which the Bride was singing the praises of her husband, and in the Commentary, he highlighted this as Mary, the Magistra Apostolorum, eloquently preaching and teaching the Apostles.34 The third mention of Psalm 44 in the Commentary was Verse 8, also in praise of the King (Christ) who was anointed above all other Kings, with the oil of gladness, ready for his bridal Queen (Mary) to take her place at his side.35 Finally, in placing in Mary's mouth these words of the Canticle: "I am a wall, and my breasts are like towers (8:10), Rupert was indicating Mary's stature and prominence in the infant Apostolic Church. The Church was strong (like a wall and tall towers), and could not be overcome by

---

33 Cant. II: CM. XXVI. 51. 345-348.
34 Cant. III: CM. XXVI. 74. 529-537.
35 Cant. VI: CM. XXVI. 137. 139.
adversaries («pagans and heretical Jews»)\textsuperscript{36}, because of Mary's teaching and explanation of the Scriptures to the Apostles, in her role as the \textit{Magistra Apostolorum}.

Psalm 44 (45), when applied to Mary sums up all that Rupert depicted Mary to be in the Canticle of Canticles. She was the Bride, who in marrying the King, and becoming the Queen took her place at his side in the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{36}... quia nihil contra possunt pagani, judaei, haeretici (\textit{Cant.} VII: \textit{CM.} XXVI. 166-167, 372-394).

\textsuperscript{37}Rupert's contemporary, Bruno of Asti/Segni (+1123) also applied his exegesis on Psalm 45:10ff to Mary, although he admitted that it was also applicable to the Church. He referred to Mary as our Queen and Mistress whom we must imitate. (Reginam et dominan nostram imitari debemus, \textit{PL.} 165. 1028). Also, Firmin M. Schmidt writes: This Psalm is clearly Messianic. And even though the word "Queen" would readily lend itself to direct application to Mary, nevertheless, the context argues directly in favour of the Church. Tradition has used this passage to express the glorious dignity of Mary., "The Universal Queenship of Mary", \textit{Mariology}, Vol. 2, ed. Juniper B. Carol, (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., [1957], p. 523).
The Siegburg Madonna, c 1160
Schnutgen Museum, Cologne.
AFTERWORD

Rupert's Mariology, although innovative in the way he portrayed Mary as the bride of the Canticle of Canticles, and expressed her magisterial role in the Infant Church, as Spiritual Mother, was quite traditional. His Marian interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles, did not contain anything new by way of doctrine. On the whole, Rupert's writings did not present any constructed synthesis of Marian doctrine, but that does not mean that there is no central focus to his Mariology. His Marian doctrine, already "carved in stone", with traces of it appearing in the Mariology of Vatican II, was a reflection of his personal love for Mary and his devotion to her.

Carved in Stone: The Siegburg Madonna

Rupert's Christocentric and Ecclesiotypical Mariology as expressed in his writings, in particular his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, especially from the fourth book of the Commentary, has been carved in stone and expressed artistically in a stone carved Madonna in the Abbot's Chair of the Abbey of St. Michael in Siegburg.¹ This chair found during revovations to the Choir in 1919, is known today as the Siegburg Madonna.²

Not only is Rupert's Mariology embossed into this romanesque sculpture, but it should be mentioned that the theology of the Abbot of Deutz had a big influence on artists, and under his influence some of the principal accomplishments of the

¹Reginhard Spilker, op. cit p. 291.
²The dimensions are 41cm. x 41cm; located at Schnutgen Museum, Cologne. According to Andreas Petzold, the Siegburg Madonna (c. 1160) probably originally formed part of a gable for a stone sarcophagus or canopy of a tomb (Romanesque Art, New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc. 1995, p. 125).
romanesque period were realized."³ Other Marian art works that show Rupert's influence are the Lütticher Madonna, and the Madonna of St. Mary in Cologne.⁴

«According to the romanesque tradition», as Spilker points out, «religious art depicting mother and child, portrays the child as the more important person. The child sits on his mother's lap, as on a throne, like one who rules and judges. His right hand in raised in the sign of a blessing.» Spilker contrasted this with gothic art by indicating that «in gothic Madonnas, the mother is the more prominent person. The child is merely a supplement to bring out the idea that the mother, Mary is the Mother of God.»⁵

In his Commentaries on Ezekiel and the Canticle of Canticles, Rupert «painted a sort of intermediary picture between the romanesque and the gothic madonnas, where mother and child appear to be of equal value, as in the Siegburg Madonna.»⁶

A study of the symbolism of the Madonna on the Abbot's chair will show that the eagle on the chair represents the evangelist John. This eagle will carry John into the heavenly realm, and towards Mary, who is centrally located on the chair.


⁴A fifteenth-century Gothic work by Konrad Borgertenik, erected behind the main altar in *der Minoritenkirc* in Cologne.

⁵Spilker: Bei den romanischen Madonnen ist eigentlich nicht die Mutter die Hauptsache, sondern das Kind, das voll Herrscher- und Richterwürde auf dem Schoss der Mutter thront und die Rechte zum Segen erhoben hat. Im Genensatz dazu ist bei den gotischen Madonnen Maria die Hauppperson, das Kind ist nur Zugabe und macht sie als Mutter Gottes deutlich (*op. cit.*, p. 315).

⁶idem.
Also present are the three other evangelists. To the left of Mary is the symbol of the lion (Mark), and to her right is the ox (Luke). The human symbol (Matthew) represents the Child Jesus himself. Rupert regarded Mary as the starting point of the Gospel. This is why in this art work the Gospel is depicted as coming from Mary. This can be seen in the imagery of the lion and the ox emerging from the sides of her lap.

Further inspection of the Siegburg Madonna will show that the child Jesus holds a scroll in his left hand, while his right hand is not raised in benediction, but is held out-stretched flat in a gesture of speech. Mary does not carry the globe of the world, but instead she shows the child an apple which she holds in her right hand; the apple of the new paradise, to which the bride leads her groom. This apple identifies Mary as the new Eve.7

Contemplation of this sculpture will create the indelibly carved image of the intimate love binding the union between the Mary and Jesus, the love that bound Rupert both to Jesus and Mary. It was this love that propelled him to write about the Incarnate Word of God as he lovingly contemplated the face of the Mother of the Incarnate Word, and his Spiritual Mother. This union between Jesus and Mary, the basis of Rupert's Christocentric Mariology, was also the union binding Christ and the Church which Mary embodied and personified in The Abbot's Ecclesiotypical Mariology.

Vatican II

Rupert's Christ-Church Mariological structure is reflected in our day, seven hundred years after Rupert's time in Vatican II's Lumen Gentium, Chapter 8, on the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother

---

7Andreas Petzold, op. cit., p. 123.
of God in the Mystery of Christ and the Church. Throughout this document, the Fathers of Vatican II affirmed the unique connection of Mary with Christ the Redeemer and her close connection with the Church and with all the Redeemed in the communion of saints. Shades of Rupert’s Mariological thought pervade Vatican II’s principal statement on Mary, and although there are no explicit references to Rupert in Lumen Gentium. The very title of the chapter 8, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the mystery of Christ and of the Church, shows great affinity with Rupert’s Christocentric and Ecclesiotypical Mariology. To go into a study on Rupert’s thought and the Marian chapter in Lumen Gentium would far exceed the scope of this thesis, but suffice it to say that chapter 8 of Lumen Gentium, especially verses 52-65 will sound familiar to anyone who has read Rupert’s De Incarnatione Domini.

**Marialis Cultus**

Pope Paul VI, in his Apostolic Exhortation Marialis Cultus, directed that in addition to being Trinitarian all expressions of devotion to Mary should be Christological and Ecclesial. Further, in recognizing “that in the expressions of devotion to the Virgin the Christological aspect should have particular prominence,” Pope Paul VI emphasized the

---

8*De Ecclesia*, AAS, Vol. 58, (1965), No. 1.

9Paul VI, *Marialis Cultus*, AAS., Vol. 66, (1974). Also, in his address on the feast of the Purification, Feb 2nd. 1964, Pope Paul VI in inviting many to attend the upcoming Marian Congress in Santo Domingo to pay tribute to Mary, and to impress upon the devotion and piety with which we want to honour her that Christocentric and Ecclesiological orientation that the Council has wanted to give to our Marian doctrine and devotion. (La vogliamo onorare quell’indirizzo cristocentrico ed ecclesiologico, che il Concilio, ha inteso dare alla nostra dottrina e alla nostra devozione verso la Madonna* AAS., Vol. 57. (1965), p. 351).
Christocentric nature of Mary's life, whereby «everything in the Virgin Mary was relative to Christ and dependent upon Him.» Also, in saying that exercises of piety with which the faithful honour the Mother of the Lord should clearly show the place she occupies in the Church, Paul VI solemnly proclaimed Mary to be the Mother of the Church.\(^{10}\) Mary directed the Apostles and

\(^{10}\) Paul VI: «Igitur ad Beatae Virginis gloriam ad nostram solacium, Mariam Sanctissimam declaramus Matrem Ecclesiae.» Closing address of Session, III, Vatican Council, Nov. 21st., 1964. AAS., Vol. 56, (1964), p. 1015. In calling Mary the Mother of the Church, it should be remembered that Rupert in the De Incarnatione Domini had referred to Mary as Mater Ecclesiarum, i.e., Mother of the primitive christian communities founded through Mary's "magisterium" as Magistra Apostolorum. In this context, notes Peinador, Pope Paul VI's address has a reference to Rupert (AAS., 56. p.1014), to his mention of Mary as portio maxima, portio optima, portio praecipua, portio electissima of the Church. What Rupert said in In Apoc: PL. 169. 1043 was, «mulier illa sole amicta signum erat Ecclesiae totius, cuius beata virgo Maria portio maxima et portio est optima, pro felicitate uteri proprii.» Portio praecipua and portio electissima were a development of this thought, and a repetition of the same things according to this schema. Davide Montagna, A proposito di una citazione da Ruperto di Deutz, Marianum XXVII, (1965), pp.219-220. These two last titles are not Rupert's, but they come from Gerhoh of Reichersberg (1093-1169), a disciple of Rupert. See also Peinador, Maria, pp. 376-377.
steered the Church towards Christ. Mary's life was totally focused upon Jesus, and totally dedicated to the Church left to her maternal care and direction. Pope Paul VI's reminder that true devotion to Mary should be rooted in Christ and in the Church, seems a fitting tribute and acknowledgement to Rupert's Christocentric and Ecclesial Mariology.

**Congregation for the Faith**

Also, the conclusion of a Letter of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith recognizes and echoes Rupert of Deutz, in upholding the belief that "the Blessed Virgin Mary is the model of ecclesial communion in faith, in charity, and in union with Christ." This Letter goes on to say that "we cannot speak of the Church unless Mary, the Mother of the Lord, is present there with the Lord's brethren." The Sacred Congregation for the Faith thus gratuitously provides a fitting conclusion and tribute to Rupert's Christocentric and ecclesiotypical Mariology.

Rupert concluded his Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles with a prayer to Mary the «most holy virgin of virgins and mountain of all mountains.» This thesis, too, is being

---


12 Ibid.

13 Imitating the title of the Sacred Book «Cantica Canticorum», Rupert delighted in applying similar titles to Mary throughout his Commentary. He called her, as above, the *Virgo Virginum, Mons montium, Dilecta delictarum, Pulchra pulcherrimatarum, Sancta sanctorum*, etc. (cfr. Cant. VII: CM. XXVI, 171.569-570; Peinador, *op. cit.*, p. 40). He asked her through the sacrament of her womb, the sword that pierced her heart (*sanctum uteri tui sacramentum, et illum qui animam tuam pertransivit gladium*), to lead him to the brightly lit mountain, where he, too, would be able to see her love for her divine Spouse: the love of the Father, the Son,
concluded with a prayer that through Mary's intercession this work will be instrumental in furthering reflection on Mary as a woman of dignity and high esteem, whose maternal vocation found a vital role and expression both in her Nazareth home and in the apostolic Church Community as *Magistra Apostolorum*. This prayer is also offered that in her exalted role as *Magistra Apostolorum*, Mary, the woman of the Bible, the most complete expression of (feminine) dignity and vocation, the "new beginning" of the dignity and vocation of all women, of each and every woman, will be a ray of hope and an exemplary beacon for all who today are seeking their true role and mission in the Church, particularly women who may be concerned about their place in today's Church. The portrait of Mary exercising a maternal yet vitally feminine role in the early Church is both heartening and encouraging. Reflection on Mary's prominence and preeminence in the infant Apostolic Church, as expressed in Rupert's twelfth-century Mariology, and in Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter, should be a source of encouragement and hope for women who struggle to determine their identity, dignity and vocation in today's Church.


14Pope John Paul II: «Maria - biblica mulier - est huius dignitatis et vocationis perfectissimum exemplar» (Mulieris Dignitatem, AAS, 80, p.1662).

15«Maria est "novum principium" dignitatis et vocationis mulieris, omnium mulierum et eiusque mulieris.» AAS, 80, p. 1680. In his Marian Year Apostolic Letter on the dignity and vocation of women, Pope John Paul II upheld Mary as model and exemplar to be imitated. Mary is the embodiment of feminine fidelity and perfection. She is the "woman" of Nazareth, a "figure" of the Church, a model of holiness, surpassing all others in holiness, and preceding everyone on the path to holiness («..."mulierem" ipsam , Mariam Nazaretanam Ecclesiae esse "figuram" eamque reliquis in via ad sanctimoniam "praecedere"» AAS. idem).
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