

NOTES

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND APOCALYPSE XII

In a late issue of *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, Father Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., gave an interesting analysis of Cardinal Newman's interpretation of Apoc. 12. He summed up the matter as follows:

The final conclusion, then, is that Mary is found in Apocalypse 12 by way of allusion. The allusion is inherent in the particular symbol which is used to personify the Church. In view of St. John's background and association with the Mother of God, and in view of his concrete statement about the birth of the Messiah, one cannot be satisfied with a mere personification here. This goes beyond texts like Isa. 66:7 ff., Ezek. 16:8 ff., or any other biblical passage which personifies God's people. On the other hand, St. John does not teach anything definite concerning the Blessed Virgin. There is no true biblical "sense" here. However, from the way St. John alludes to Mary, we may argue to the exalted position she enjoyed, to her *dignity*, as Newman intended.¹

Having read Newman a number of times on this matter, two questions arise in my mind. First, does the learned Cardinal hold that Mary is alluded to in Apoc. 12 in a non-biblical sense? Second, does the Cardinal see in this vision an allusion merely to Mary's exalted dignity in general? If I may be so presumptuous, I shall try to show that the Cardinal holds that Mary is referred to in a true Scriptural sense; and that, as enjoying full glory of body as well as of soul. Directly I am concerned only with those two questions in Newman or in Father Murphy's interpretation of him. Further, I am here interested not so much in whether Newman was right or wrong; rather in what Newman actually held. Much less do I intend to propose my own interpretation of Apoc. 12. That I am doing currently elsewhere.²

The eminent churchman, having quoted Apoc. 12:1-6, commented thus:

I do not deny of course, that under the image of the Woman, the Church is signified; but what I would maintain is this, that the Holy Apostle would not have spoken of the Church under this particular image, unless there had existed a blessed Virgin Mary, who was exalted on high, and the object of veneration to all the faithful. No one doubts that the "man-child" spoken of is an allusion to our Lord: why then is not "the Woman" an allusion to His Mother? This surely is the obvious sense of the words; of course they have a further sense also, which is the scope of the image; doubtless the Woman represents the Church; this, I grant, is

¹ "An Allusion to Mary in the Apocalypse," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, X (1949), 571.

² Cf. "Did St. John See the Virgin Mary in Glory?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XI (1949), 249-62, 392-405; XII (1950), 75-83; to be continued.

the real or direct sense, but what is the sense of the symbol under which that real sense is conveyed? *Who* are the Woman and the Child? I answer, they are not personifications but Persons. This is true of the Child, therefore it is true of the Woman.³

Correctly does Father Murphy observe that the Cardinal is distinguishing between two senses here: the real or direct sense and the sense attached to the symbol; and he remarks: "the particular symbol of a woman was chosen because of Mary, her exalted position and her relations with St. John. It is not that this is a special 'sense' of Sacred Scripture; it is really an allusion to Mary, as Newman himself terms it."⁴ Quite right, "as Newman himself terms it"; but it is an allusion in Newman's use of that word, and that makes a little difference. Newman has his own terminology in matters Scriptural and theological, and must be interpreted by Newman.⁵

First, let me note—a point that Newman too overlooked—that John did not choose this symbol; he is describing a vision that had been revealed to him by the Word. With this modification, it is true that the Word would not have chosen such a symbol unless there had been a Virgin Mother exalted on high. Besides, against Father Murphy, Newman excludes personification here, because for him "the Woman" is a *symbol* of the Church. The term *woman* fits both Mary and the Church without a figure of speech. The Church is "the Woman" not by a mere personification; that she is a Virgin Mother is a mystic reality. So it was not without reason that Newman said there is here no personification.

Now for the "allusion." Does Newman by that term exclude a strict Scriptural sense? Does he admit, elsewhere, of an allusion as a true Scriptural sense? Yes, quite emphatically and frequently. To appreciate this, let us take a more general view of the senses of Scripture according to Newman. He, naturally, accepted the literal sense of Scripture, and that as the more important sense.⁶ He realized, too, and insisted that the Sacred Writers used

³ "Letter to Dr. Pusey," in *Difficulties of Anglicans* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), vol. II, 58.

⁴ *Art. cit.*, 566 f.

⁵ How many errors have not Catholics and Protestants found in Newman because they disregarded that fundamental principle of interpreting Newman's doctrine by his own works and mind, and not reading their own ideas into him. Cf. Jacques Seynaeve, White Father, "La Doctrine du Card. Newman sur l'inspiration d'après les articles de 1884," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XXV (1949), 356-82; and the excellent *Preface to Newman's Theology* by Rev. Edmond Darvil Benard (St. Louis: Herder, 1945), especially ch. 9, pp. 64-70.

⁶ In sermon 14 of *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1918), the Cardinal quotes a certain Hooker as saying: "I hold it for a most infallible rule

the figurative sense; namely, that they wrote in figures of speech, in which they did not formally intend the basic object, only the figurative object.⁷ "Let it be borne in mind," he writes, "that a figurative, or, what may be called a sacramental style, was the very characteristic of oriental teaching."⁸ Important as was the literal sense for Newman, he knows of, and extols very highly, another kind of "figurative" sense, which he also called spiritual, mystical, typical.⁹ In fact, he goes so far as to say, and adduces examples, that the Church's more subtle and powerful proof has been from the mystical sense.¹⁰ And in this spiritual, figurative, sense the Divine Author intended both objects, the basic and the figurative. This spiritual sense of Newman includes examples of what modern scholars call the fuller sense. See his splendid sermons on the Church as the continuation of the Jewish religion and a fulfillment of it,¹¹ which are at the same time a grand treatise on the relation between the Old and the New Testament.

The eminent Cardinal, therefore, definitely holds that the Sacred Words can, and frequently do, refer to two objects at the same time, one literal, the other spiritual or typical; and both are strictly contained in the Inspired Word. And this is true even though the human author did not cognize the further reference. As we know, Newman was insistent that the Inspired Word reveals many things implicitly, and that such doctrines are truly part of Scripture even though the human author should not have comprehended them, or even though *we* do not recognize them readily and need tradition

in expositions of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst" (p. 184). And in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), speaking of the primary sense of Scripture (pp. 60-64), he says one should look for the primary sense, whether literal or figurative, because all allegorical interpretations must be subordinate to that (p. 60 f.). In *Historical Sketches* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1917), he praises St. John Chrysostom as a special expositor of the literal sense (vol. II, 288).

⁷ Cf. *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, n. 14, pp. 184-85.

⁸ Cf. *Discussions and Arguments* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1907), p. 191; and Seynaeve, *art. cit.*, p. 366.

⁹ Cf. *Development of Christian Doctrine* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), p. 346: "The use of Scripture, then, especially its spiritual or secondary sense, as a medium of thought and deduction, is a characteristic principle of doctrinal teaching in the Church." Cf. also sermons 12-15 in *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*.

¹⁰ *Development of Doctrine*, p. 342.

¹¹ Cf. Sermons 14 and 15 in *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*. Note particularly this: "What has taken place in the Christian Church is of course no fulfilment at all of the promises made to the Jewish, unless in some very true sense they may be called one Church." So the Christian Church is not a mere antitype of the Jewish, but a fuller realization of it.

to disclose them for us.¹² His stand is not invalidated by the fact that he exaggerated the reason for such an implicit sense, namely, to find a proof in Scripture for all doctrines of faith,¹³ since in those days he followed the common tenet of his Anglican church that all doctrines of faith had to be revealed in Scripture. Through this implicit sense he thought he could save many doctrines of the church as Scriptural though they were not expressly taught in Scripture.

Now, since Father Murphy underlines the word "allusion" and thinks that Newman did not hold that Mary was alluded to in a true biblical sense, I wish to examine the use of "allusion" in Newman more thoroughly. In other words, I propose to show that Newman, without the slightest doubt, uses the terms "allude—allusion" in cases where he definitely holds that the alluded sense is truly biblical. And since that is true, it will not be possible to argue that St. John did not intend Mary in Apoc. 12 in a true Scriptural sense because Newman says it is an "allusion."

In his *Discussions and Arguments*, the Cardinal has a lengthy treatise on what he considers a fact, that Scripture contains many doctrines implicitly, namely, these doctrines are truly the inspired word of God, which can be used as solid Scriptural arguments for doctrines of faith as well as practices. Now, time and again, he speaks of these implicit doctrines and practices as being "alluded to." For instance:

They (Moses, Prophets, Job) are the writings of men who had already been introduced into a knowledge of the unseen world and society of Angels, and who reported what they had seen and heard; and they are full of allusions to a system, a course of things, which was ever before their minds, which they felt both too awful and too familiar to them to be described minutely, which we do not know, and which these allusions, such as they are, but partially disclose.¹⁴ . . . These remarks surely suffice on this subject, viz., to show that the impression we gain from Scripture need not be any criterion or any measure of its true and full sense; that solemn and important truths may be silently taken for granted, or alluded to in a half sentence, or spoken of indeed, yet in such unadorned language that we fancy we see through it, and see nothing—peculiarities of Scripture which result from what is the peculiar character of its teaching, simplicity and depth.¹⁵

So there can be no doubt according to Newman, allusions may be made to a sense that is genuinely Scriptural. Now, in what Scriptural sense can

¹² Cf. *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, 12-13; and *Discussions and Arguments*, pp. 121-92; especially pp. 135-39, 147, 174.

¹³ *Discussions and Arguments*, p. 166.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

those allusions be made? First, from one literal passage to another. Either, as is clear from the foregoing, the allusion is from an explicit literal idea to an implicit one. Or, the words literally, though obscurely, prophesy some future event. Of Is. 7:14 he writes: "The first meaning of these words seems not at all to allude to Christ, but to an event of the day. The great Gospel doctrine is glanced at (as we may say) through this minor event."¹⁶ The event alluded to here is certainly messianic, Scriptural. Whether the Cardinal means that the prophecy is only seemingly literally and exclusively messianic, or whether it is typically messianic, seems to be slightly doubtful from this passage. But in either case our point about allusions is taken care of. Or, a later passage hints, perhaps quite obviously, to identity with a former passage, and so interprets it; or the former passage interprets the latter; e.g., Apoc. 12 is said to allude to the history of the fall and identify the Woman as Mary, even as the Second Eve.¹⁷

Secondly, in a mere figurative or allegorical passage, Newman speaks of an allusion in the basic object to the figurative object which is not too apparent. A case in point is John 2:19-21, where Jesus speaks of destroying the temple, meaning His body.¹⁸ In this citation Newman does not use the term "allude" but "contained covertly," which he uses as a synonym in this whole discussion. Evidently in such a case the author does not intend the basic object at all formally; and quite obviously, this is not a parallel to Apoc. 12:1, where the allusion is from the image to the basic object. Besides, Newman himself excludes the mere allegorical sense from Apoc. 12.¹⁹

Thirdly, in a figurative passage, Newman speaks of an allusion to the basic object, namely, to an historic fact that serves as an image for the figure. The one case I found is taken from Is. 11:6: the peaceful cohabitation of the animals, which Isaias evidently uses as a figure for the peaceful messianic era, contains, according to the Cardinal, an allusion to the peaceful status of the animals, literally, prior to the fall of Adam.²⁰ Though one could perhaps make out a case that Newman holds that this basic object is referred to in a biblical sense, it would not be certain. And so Father Murphy might appeal to this as a parallel to his interpretation of Apoc. 12; namely, a figurative passage in which the basic object is alluded to but not intended formally. However, even though one could not prove with certainty that Newman held this allusion in Isaias to be a Scriptural sense, one can prove that for the Apocalypse, and so the two cases would not be parallel.

Fourthly, the Cardinal speaks of an allusion in a typical passage from the

¹⁶ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁷ Cf. *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, 58-59, 61.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²⁰ *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, n. 14, p. 187.

basic object to the typical object. This is clear from the fact that he treats the mere figurative sense practically like the typical figurative sense in the matter of pointing out the further object.²¹ Still he seems to avoid the term "allude" in connection with the typical sense, because, as I believe, there are two technical terms for that: typify and prefigure. If the case from Is. 7:14 quoted above is understood in the typical sense, we would have a passage where he speaks expressly of an allusion in a typical sense. In *Discussions and Arguments*, quoted above, where he talks of the Old Testament writers as being "full of allusions,"²² he certainly has in mind typical passages as well as literal, since he was so fond of them. Here too, the sense alluded to is definitely considered a biblical sense.

And so, it is unquestionable that the Cardinal did speak of an object as being alluded to, which was, however, intended in a true Scriptural sense. And it follows that if he speaks of Mary as being alluded to in Apoc. 12:1, he does not mean necessarily that she was formally not intended by the Holy Spirit or St. John; rather it is at least possible, if not probable because of Newman's almost consistent use of "allusion" for a true Scriptural sense, that by "allusion" in this case he means a true Scriptural sense. But if this examination of "allusion" did not beget certainty in regard to the Scriptural sense for Mary in Apoc. 12, an examination of the context and of other works of Newman will make it certain that he, without any doubt, considered Mary referred to in a strict Scriptural sense.

Now, to argue from the context of the passage we are discussing. That St. John really intends the Marian sense is certain from these reasons. First, Newman calls Mary a symbol; but technically the symbol of the symbolic sense is itself intended first at least by the sacred author. That he looks at this symbol in this way is clear from the fact that he equates symbol and type in this section;²³ but, for him as for anyone else, in the typical sense the basic object is truly intended. Further, Newman betrays his mind by calling the Christological and Mariological sense of Apoc. 12 the "obvious sense." Ordinarily the allusion is the other direction, from the basic object to the typical or symbolical, and the basic object is in the obvious sense. But here Newman speaks of the image as alluding to the basic object because the identity is not expressed, and he is interested in the basic object, not in the symbolized object. For Newman any sense that is somewhat covert, not expressed in so many words, is an allusion, as is clear from his long treatise on implicit Scriptural doctrines.²⁴

Second, Newman certainly considers the "man-child" of the Woman to

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 186-88.

²² *Discussions and Arguments*, p. 147.

²³ *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, 58 and 60.

²⁴ Cf. footnote 12.

be Christ in the literal Scriptural sense, as an image of all Christians,²⁵ but the Mother and her Child are put on a level here by him. So if the allusion to the Child is a true Scriptural sense, then the allusion to the Mother is a true Scriptural sense.

Third, that Newman thought Mary was spoken of in a true Scriptural sense is evident from his purpose in this particular section of his letter. He is trying to show Dr. Pusey the legitimacy of Catholic devotion to Mary, and he professes to find her exaltation spoken of in Scripture. He promises to find a Scriptural proof and writes of Apoc. 12 as having found it there. "I shall take what perhaps you may think a very bold step,—I shall find the doctrine of our Lady's present exaltation in Scripture. I mean to find it in the vision of the Woman and Child in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse."²⁶ He considers this as a true interpretation of Scripture, which could serve as a "proof" from Scripture, since he remarks that "Christians have never gone to Scripture for proof of their doctrines till there was actual need from the pressure of controversy."²⁷ Further, he admits that, though the doctrine of Mary's exaltation is not necessarily "in direct categorical terms" in Scripture,²⁸ it is there implicitly, namely, in the Apocalypse. But, as we saw, for Newman the implicit sense is a genuine biblical sense without any doubt. Moreover, he speaks twice of this sense as having been "held" by the Apostle, because otherwise one cannot account for his having chosen the symbol.²⁹ If the sacred writer "held" it, he certainly intended it, and it was inspired. Newman allows, too, that the Apostle *taught* about Mary in this passage, for he posits the condition: "If there is an Apostle on whom, a priori, our eyes would be fixed, as likely to teach us about the Blessed Virgin, it is St. John." But he intends to show that John does refer to Mary in the Apocalypse, and so must consider the Apostle "teaching" us something about Mary, but then the Apostle also intended it and it is inspired. Again, Newman asks: "If the Woman ought to be some real person, who can it be whom the Apostle saw, and intends, and delineates, but that same Great Mother to whom the chapters in the Proverbs are accommodated?"³⁰ Since he shows that the person is Mary, he must have held, admitting that he was logical, that "the Apostle saw, and intends, and delineates" her. Once more, Newman writes: "If it is really the Blessed Virgin whom Scripture represents as clothed with the sun, crowned with the stars of heaven, and with the moon as her footstool, what height of glory may we not attribute to her?"³¹ If "Scripture represents" Mary, the Marian sense is in Scripture and is in-

²⁵ *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, 58.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

³¹ *Loc. cit.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

²⁹ *Loc. cit.*

spired. He even speaks of the "voice of Scripture" in this respect.³² Can Newman have spoken in that manner without considering the Marian reference as inspired?

Another consideration. The Cardinal bolsters his interpretation of the Apocalyptic allusion to Mary and Christ by paralleling it with Gen. 3.

But again: not only Mother and Child, but a serpent is introduced into the vision. Such a meeting of man, woman, and serpent has not been found in Scripture, since the beginning of Scripture, and now is found in its end. Moreover, in the passage in the Apocalypse, as if to supply, before Scripture came to an end, what was wanting in its beginning, we are told, and for the first time, that the serpent was the evil spirit. If the dragon of St. John is the same as the serpent of Moses, and the man-child is 'the seed of the woman,' why is not the woman herself she, whose seed the man-child is? And if the first woman is not an allegory, why is the second? if the first woman is Eve, why is not the second Mary?³³

In regard to this passage Father Murphy remarks:

... this correlation of the Apocalypse with Genesis... is a very beautiful thought; but one feels that the Cardinal may have been carried away with the sweep of the idea. On this view, there is more than an allusion to the Blessed Virgin in the Woman symbol and there is no room for a thorough and logical interpretation of the Church-Woman throughout chapter 12. It is difficult to admit that this final touch adds any conviction to the Marian interpretation. One might maintain that St. John wrote with Gen. 3 in mind; but Newman's statement would mean more than that.³⁴

Assuredly Newman's statement means more than that, but it is still an "allusion" in Newman's use of that term. Newman comes back to this correspondence between the last and the first book of the Bible too often to have been carried away with any sweep of the idea. His mind was too keen not to notice a faulty correspondence or false identification. He argues that "the Woman" of Genesis is the same as "the Woman" of the Apocalypse, because the Serpent and the Dragon are the same, as the Apostle points out; and "her seed" and the "man-child" are the same, as is obvious. But since the first woman, Eve, was a real person, not allegorical, the second woman is real, not allegorical. And when he says, "If the first woman is Eve, why is not the second Mary?", he does not refer to Gen. 3:15 alone, as if that woman were Eve basically and Mary typically, as in the Apocalypse she is Mary basically and the Church symbolically. No, he refers to the whole story of the fall, where "the Woman" is Eve, opposed to Mary, who is the Woman

³² *Loc. cit.*

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.

³⁴ *Art. cit.*, p. 568.

of 3:15. This his interpretation is based on St. Justin and St. Irenaeus, and both of these exclude Eve from 3:15. Mary is the Second Eve of 3:15, opposed to the First Eve. This doctrine Newman describes at length prior to our present passage. He calls it "a rudimental teaching of Antiquity." He explains it thus:

In those primeval events, Eve had an integral share. . . . She cooperated, not as an irresponsible instrument, but intimately and personally in the sin: she brought it about. As the history stands, she was a *sine qua non*, a positive, active, cause of it. And she had a share in the punishment. . . . In that awful transaction there were three parties concerned—the serpent, the woman, and the man; and at the time of their sentence, an event was announced for a distant future, in which the three parties were to meet again, the serpent, the woman, and the man; but it was to be a second Adam and a second Eve, and the new Eve was to be the mother of the new Adam. 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed.' The Seed of the woman is the Word Incarnate, and the Woman, whose seed or son He is, is His Mother Mary. This interpretation and the parallelism it involves, seem to me undeniable; but at all events (and this is my point) the parallelism is the doctrine of the Fathers, from the earliest times; and, this being established, we are able, by the position and office of Eve in our fall, to determine the position and office of Mary in our restoration.³⁵

He continues by quoting the Fathers on the contrast between Eve and Mary and then deduces the Immaculate Conception and dignity of Mary from the text.³⁶ Frequently does the Cardinal use Gen. 3:15 of Mary or explicitly interpret it of her. Never does he insinuate that Eve is that woman in any way. She is the exact opposite of that Woman—Mary—always.³⁷ In his "Memorandum on the Immaculate Conception," he does speak of Mary as "a typical woman like Eve"; but he means there that Mary is the Woman of Gen. 3:15, and is similar to what Eve was in her innocence, but totally different from her in the outcome of their offices; for he adds, "that both were endued with special gifts of grace, and that Mary succeeded where Eve failed." This he then explains, according to St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, and Tertullian, for a full page.³⁸

So, according to Newman, Mary is the Woman of Gen. 3:15, though Eve, her opposite, is in the rest of the story; but Mary is intended in a true bibli-

³⁵ *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, 32.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-53.

³⁷ Cf. "Memorandum on the Immaculate Conception," *Meditations and Devotions* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1923), pp. 83-84; *Sermon Notes* (Longmans, Green and Co.), p. 300; *Discourses to Mixed Congregations* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), p. 354; *Development of Doctrine*, p. 384.

³⁸ *Meditations*, pp. 83-84.

cal sense. Mary is, then, also in the Apocalypse in a true biblical sense, because the Cardinal insists on the parallel of the scenes and the identity of the Woman. For him Mary is as real in the story of the Apocalypse as she is in Genesis. The one is the prophetic fulfilment of the other. In the "Memorandum" referred to above, he has a very similar passage, with the same comparison and identification of characters. He bolsters the Marian interpretation of Gen. 3:15 by the very ancient patristic interpretation of Mary as the opposite of Eve, in the sense that "the first prophecy ever given contrasts the Second Woman with the First—Mary with Eve."

The Cardinal deals with these ideas also in his *Development of Doctrine*:

St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, and others, had distinctly laid it down, that she not only had an office, but bore a part, and was a voluntary agent, in the actual process of redemption, as Eve had been instrumental and responsible in Adam's fall. They taught that, as the first woman might have foiled the Tempter and did not, so, if Mary had been disobedient or unbelieving on Gabriel's message, the Divine Economy would have been frustrated. And certainly the parallel between 'the Mother of all living' and the Mother of the Redeemer may be gathered from a comparison of the first chapters of Scripture with the last. It was noticed in a former place, that the only passage where the serpent is directly identified with the evil spirit occurs in the twelfth chapter of the Revelation; now it is observable that the recognition, when made, is found in the course of a vision of a 'woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet': thus two women are brought into contrast with each other. Moreover, as it is said in the Apocalypse, 'The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went about to make war with the remnant of her seed,' so it is prophesied in Genesis, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel.' Also the enmity was to exist, not only between the Serpent and the Seed of the woman, but between the serpent and the woman herself; and here too there is correspondence in the Apocalyptic vision. If then there is reason for thinking that this mystery at the close of the Scripture record answers to the mystery in the beginning of it, and that 'the Woman' mentioned in both passages is one and the same, then she can be none other than St. Mary, thus introduced prophetically to our notice immediately on the transgression of Eve.³⁹

The concluding question is not one of doubt, but rhetorical, demanding an emphatic answer that they are identical. The Woman in Genesis is definitely Mary alone, opposed to Eve; in the Apocalypse it is Mary in the "obvious sense" as a symbol of the Church.

In his *Sermon Notes* the Cardinal tells us that the parallel between Eve and Mary, begun in Gen. 3:15, was kept up through the Scripture in types.

³⁹ *Development of Doctrine*, p. 384.

Then he notes that Mary will be noticed "in prophecy, Apoc. XII., to the end of time." So here he considers Apoc. 12 a prophecy about Mary and her victory over Satan.⁴⁰ Again, when meditating on Mary's title "Maris Stella," he refers to the Apocalypse: "Therefore most assuredly, without any derogation from the honour of our Lord, is Mary His mother called the Star of the Sea, and the more so because even on her head she wears a crown of twelve stars."⁴¹ Lastly, he uses it in a discourse on Mary's glory to describe her: "If the Creator comes on earth in the form of a servant and a creature, why may not His Mother, on the other hand, rise to be the Queen of heaven, and be clothed with the sun, and have the moon under her feet?"⁴² For Newman, then, Mary was really spoken of, and intentionally, by St. John and the Holy Spirit. The "allusion" to Mary belongs to the revealed and inspired text.

And now for the second question. Does the Cardinal refer to Mary's dignity and exaltation only in general? He does say that it speaks of Mary's dignity and of the reverence in which Catholics hold her. And elsewhere the Cardinal writes of Mary as exalted by her dignity as Mother of God, by her holiness; but also because of her having left this lower scene and being Queen at her Son's right hand.⁴³ So in the term "exaltation" he does include the idea of being in heaven glorified in body and soul. That is implied in the mind of Catholics in the idea of her being on the right of her Son as Queen. So, too, in the letter to Dr. Pusey, Newman speaks of our Lady's "present exaltation in Scripture,"⁴⁴ which is an evident reference to Apoc. 12: 1, and which on the preceding page he characterised as "her present state of blessedness."⁴⁵ This is certainly the blessedness of her soul, and if anyone would want to exclude the blessedness of her body, the Cardinal comes to her defense. He speaks more precisely of "the Virgin Mary, who was exalted on high, and the object of veneration to all the faithful."⁴⁶ The full meaning of this expression includes the glory of Mary's body. For Newman, Mary was "exalted on high" through the Assumption. This he states expressly in the second sermon on her glories, given during the season of the Assumption: "As is fitting, she is, soul and body, with her Son and God in heaven, and that we are enabled to celebrate, not only her death, but her Assumption. . . . If she died, but revived, and is exalted on high; what is befitting in the children of such a Mother, but an imitation, in their measure,

⁴⁰ *Sermon Notes*, p. 300.

⁴² *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, p. 355.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 348, 350, 352, 354, 356, 357.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁴¹ *Meditations*, p. 265.

⁴⁴ *Difficulties of Anglicans*, p. 53.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

of her devotion. . . ."⁴⁷ This seems to leave no room for doubt that the Cardinal's expression "exalted on high" includes the glory of the Assumption.

Other expressions lead to the same conclusion. The Cardinal asks: "If it is really the Blessed Virgin whom Scripture represents as clothed with the sun . . . , what height of glory may we not attribute to her?"⁴⁸ In that he certainly refers to her glory in heaven, namely, as described in the Apocalyptic vision, not merely to her dignity as Mother of God. This glory includes the glory of the body; for immediately before this he wrote: "And that book does (so to say) canonize and crown her."⁴⁹ Perhaps someone will object that we use "canonize" for the saint whose body is not in heaven. The Cardinal saves the day by adding "crown" her. Catholic tradition thinks of Mary's coronation only together with, and immediately after, her Assumption to the throne of her Divine Son. That is what the Cardinal, that indefatigable pursuer of tradition, meant.

My final conclusion is that according to Newman's mind Mary is alluded to in Apoc. 12 as contained therein in a truly biblical sense, intended so by the sacred writer, namely, as the basic object of a Newman-symbolic sense; and she is pictured as living surrounded by the glory, in body and soul, of her Divine Son.

Capuchin College, Washington, D.C. DOMINIC J. UNGER, O.F.M.CAP.

⁴⁷ *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, p. 374.

⁴⁸ *Difficulties of Anglicans*, p. 61.

⁴⁹ *Loc. cit.*