

NOTES

MARIA PARETROS

Among the reactions of non-Catholic opinion to the definition of the dogma of the Assumption, that of Dr. Jung, the psychologist, may be considered one of the most original.¹ He acclaims the definition as a recognition of the desire, deeply implanted in the collective unconscious, for including among Christian beliefs a doctrine of the *hieros gamos* common to many religions of paganism.

The Apocalypse closes . . . with the symbol of the *hieros gamos*, the marriage of the son with the mother-bride. . . . Only in the last days will the vision of the sun-woman be fulfilled. In recognition of this truth, and evidently inspired by the workings of the Holy Ghost, the Pope has recently announced the dogma of the *Assumptio Mariae*, very much to the astonishment of all rationalists. Mary as the bride is united with the son in the heavenly bride-chamber, and, as Sophia, with the Godhead.²

That this is no mere *obiter dictum* is shown by the long passage in which Dr. Jung, describing the Assumption definition as the most important religious event since the Reformation, turns on the Protestants and points out to them how completely they are out of touch with the spirit of the age and how much they undervalue the psyche and all its works. Catholicism, on the other hand, has rightly interpreted the longings of the psyche for a bride to stand alongside the heavenly bridegroom, as a symbol of the peace that all desire. As the English version of this work of Dr. Jung was originally prepared for the use of a seminar at Los Angeles in 1952-1953, it may not be without interest to search into the patristic antecedents of these ideas of Dr. Jung and to see whether his view of the doctrine can be matched from the works of the Fathers or whether perhaps it does not come from the unguided speculations of fervent but untheological Christians.

When one looks through some of the recent theological work on the doctrine of the Assumption,³ it is possible to find here and there statements and

¹ C. G. Jung, *Answer to Job* (London, 1954), being a translation of *Antwort auf Hiob* (Zürich, 1952); the relevant passages are pp. 158-60, 165-76. Victor White, O.P., in *Blackfriars* for March, 1955, has uttered his *timeo Danaos* in respect to Jung's attitude to the Assumption but appears to welcome the book as a whole.

² *Answer to Job*, p. 158.

³ See in particular some of the extracts collected by J. Lécuyer, C.S.Sp., "Marie et l'Église comme mère et épouse du Christ," *Études mariales* (Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales) 10 (1952) 23-41; and by Clément Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., "Toute l'église en Marie," *ibid.* 11 (1953) 106-28.

extracts which, while not bearing out all that Dr. Jung claims, do at least make possible some of his misunderstandings. The simple argument that the Church is the bride of Christ and that so often in patristic literature Mary can be taken as the personification of the Church, or as the secondary figure to whom Church symbols can apply, makes one wonder if perhaps some of the Fathers, or still more some of the medieval divines, did not say outright that Mary *was* the bride of Christ. One is then not surprised to find from recent researches that this was the case. Rupert of Deutz seems to have been the chief culprit. He sets forth the principle in these terms: "Nothing is unsuitable for application to Mary of all those things which can be proclaimed or sung about the exceeding great love that is between the Church and Christ, her beloved."⁴ Even here Rupert stops short of a full acceptance of the term, *sponsa Christi*, and though he is a most untidy thinker and one who through his neglect of patristic tradition opened the way for the Lutheran dependence on Scripture alone,⁵ one is entitled to use his statements elsewhere to throw light on his principle. He says: "The Blessed Virgin, the most excellent portion of the former [Jewish] church, deserved to be the bride of God the Father, in such sort that she was also the exemplar of that younger Church that was spouse of the Son of God who was her son."⁶ Here it would seem that all idea of Mary as the heavenly bride of Christ is definitely excluded. Yet there is a passage cited by modern authors which goes directly against such a conclusion. If only there was a critical edition of the text of Rupert, one would know what to make of his contradictory views, but, failing that, one can merely record that in another place he does say: "Mary, ever virgin, was in the first place true spouse of that everlasting lover, God the Father, spouse also and mother of the Son of God the Father, and especial temple of charity, i.e., of the Holy Ghost, by whose operation she conceived Him."⁷ A single change of a comma would make this sentence bear quite another meaning, leaving the relationships of

⁴ Rupert of Deutz, *De glorificatione trinitatis* 7, 13 (PL 169, 155): "Nihil huic [Mariae] disconvenit omnium eorum quaecunque dici vel cantari possunt de magno et sancto amore dilectae et diligentis Christum ecclesiae." A generation later, in Honorius of Autun, *Sigillum b. Mariae* (PL 172, 499), this principle has become: "Cuncta quae de ecclesia scribuntur, de Maria etiam satis congrue loquuntur."

⁵ See the account of Rupert by P. Séjourné in *DTC* 14, 177.

⁶ *De trinitate et operibus eius* 1, 8 (PL 167, 1577): "Beata Virgo, prioris ecclesiae pars optima, Dei Patris sponsa esse meruit, ut exemplar quoque fuerit iunioris ecclesiae sponsae Filii Dei, filii sui."

⁷ *De glorificatione trinitatis* 7, 13 (PL 169, 155): "[Maria] vera sponsa principaliter amici est aeterni, scilicet Dei Patris, sponsa nihilominus et mater Filii eiusdem Dei Patris, templum proprium charitatis, id est Spiritus sancti de cuius operatione illum concepit."

Mary to the Trinity as those of bride of the Father, mother of the Son, and temple of the Holy Ghost, which would at least keep Rupert on the path of tradition and save him from dangerous novelty, though from all that is known of him one cannot be sure that such a proceeding would have been welcome to him.

Rupert is not quite the first to use the strange phrase, *Maria, sponsa Christi*. A passage has been found in a sermon of the eighth century which once passed for one of Augustine's. Here the subject is the doubt of St. Joseph, and he is many times called spouse of Mary. Then in the peroration one finds this:

Keep then, Joseph, with Mary thy bride a mutual virginity of body, for from a virgin body is born the might of angels. Let Mary be bride of Christ with her virginity of body intact; be thou in thy turn father of Christ with zeal for chastity and honour for virginity, and from virginal bodies may you both bring forth to the Christian centuries Him that is spouse of virgins and husband of chaste lovers.⁸

If the orator had put the one word "mother" in place of or alongside the word "bride," his thought might be deemed coherent; as it is, one is hard put to it to find what exact view of these human relationships the preacher is advocating. Again, the lack of a critical text is an embarrassment, since one cannot be sure that the scribe should not have written the word *mater* after or in place of the word *sponsa*. One cannot but regret it when such doubtful texts are gathered together and built up into a consensus of medieval theologians about a notion which strikes the ordinary theologian as at least curious.

An attempt to find a much earlier authority for the title, *sponsa Christi*, as applied to our Lady would bring into evidence certain sayings of Ephrem in his hymns and sermons.⁹ "There stands Mary, thy mother, thy sister, thy spouse, thy handmaiden." Not much can be made of this passage, as elsewhere Ephrem makes our Lady say to Christ: "I am thy sister, for we both have David for great-grandfather; I am thy mother, since I bore thee; thy spouse too, since I am sanctified by thy grace." Ephrem was not a systematic thinker and his texts are not in the best condition. He is probably

⁸ Ps.-Augustine, *Serm.* 195 (*PL* 39, 2110): "Habe ergo, Ioseph, cum Maria coniuge tua communem virginitatem membrorum, quia de virginibus membris nascitur Virtus angelorum. Sit Maria sponsa Christi carnis suae virginitate servata; sis autem et tu pater Christi cura castitatis et honorificentia virginitatis, ut de virginibus membris generetis saeculis christianis sponsum virginitatis et maritum castitatis." I notice after writing this article that the same emendation which I suggest has been conjectured by F. Filas, S.J., *The Nature of St. Joseph's Fatherhood* (West Baden, 1952) p. 59.

⁹ Lamy, *Hymni s. Ephrem* 2, 564; Assemani, *Opera Ephraemi syr.* 2, 429.

doing no more than reechoing the phrase of the Gospels about those who do the will of God being brothers, sisters, and mother to Christ, while elaborating it in his own fashion. It is, however, noteworthy that Christ in that passage (Mt 12:50) did not speak of anyone standing to Him in the relation of spouse. The common-sense attitude of the early Church to the question, why Christ when on earth did not take a wife, was shown by Clement of Alexandria,¹⁰ who pointed out that Christ was already married to the Church, that He had no need of securing a succession of descendants as other men have, and that He did not require a helper like unto Himself. This, and the common Greek estimation, which put the husband-wife relationship in the third place for affection, after those of parent-child and brother-sister, can be taken to show that it would not be natural for any of the Greek Fathers to bring in this notion of espousal to Christ for Mary in early times.

A more generalized idea that Mary was spouse of the Trinity, or more simply of God, without distinction of Persons, can be found more readily. It may underlie the saying of Victorinus of Pettau that Mary was "inundated by the Holy Ghost," but one of the earliest clear statements is found in the sermon of the pseudo-Epiphanius.¹¹ The *storiuit* of this preacher is generally put at the year 680, and both before and after that date there can be found various repetitions of the title, especially in the sermons of the Greek Fathers. Chrysippus has an attempt to work out for the espousal appropriations to the several Persons of the Trinity: "The Father takes thee as bride for Himself, the Holy Spirit joins in the preparation of the bridal, and the Son takes possession of the beauty of thy temple."¹² Here the idea of an especial appropriation of the bridal to the Son seems to be made quite impossible. Likewise in the poem of John the Geometer,¹³ where Mary is addressed as the *γαμοστόλος*, or the attendant of the bridal of her Son, there is an obvious attempt to do justice to the character of the Son as bridegroom, while not allowing it to be thought that He was to be bridegroom to His mother. Mistakenly the Latin version, in limping hexameters which Migne has procured for this poem, renders the line: "Gaude, sponsa Dei, atque tui quoque pronuba Nati."

In fact, one can claim that long before these times Christian theologians were well aware of the danger of projecting the analogies drawn from human

¹⁰ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 3, 6, 49 (GCS 15, 218).

¹¹ This is printed among the works of Epiphanius (PG 43, 492) but is generally supposed to be by the later Epiphanius of Cyprus. For the passage of Victorinus cf. *De fabrica mundi* 9 (CSEL 39, 8).

¹² Chrysippus, *In sanctam Mariam deiparam* (ed. Jugie, *Patrologia orientalis* 19, 339).

¹³ John the Geometer, *Hymnus 1 de b. virgine* (PL 106, 856).

relationships too far into the sphere of the divine. Rufinus in his denunciation of Jerome¹⁴ had pointed out how ridiculous Jerome had made himself by writing to a lady whose daughter had recently consecrated herself to God and saying that she had become God's mother-in-law. The sting of that rebuke cannot have been forgotten in the West, and even in the East, where Jerome was at the time, it must have been translated in a number of Greek or Syriac clerical conversations on festive occasions. When one comes down to the time of St. Thomas, it is noteworthy how restrainedly he uses the epithalamium psalm (Ps 44), referring it entirely to Christ and the Church, and then at verse 7 adding: "All this can be expounded as referring to the Blessed Virgin, who is a queen and mother of the King." But he does not tell us how it can.¹⁵ Thomas' exposition of the Canticle is lost, but the two printed as his by his editors both keep quite strictly to the Church as the spouse therein described and make no attempt to consider our Lady in that character. This is all the more striking as Rupert had spent his whole energies in bringing round the exegesis of that work to a Marian interpretation.¹⁶

There are not wanting modern theologians who, while putting forward this idea that our Lady personifies or stands for the Church, even in the role of bride of Christ, are conscious of its difficulty. Thus Dr. H. Köster, in a work which is a product of the apocalyptic period of German Catholicism during and after the war, has this to say:

This idea has an element of difficulty about it. That is to say, here the same person is both bride and mother at the same time to one and the same individual. One has to accept this singularity. It comes from the fact that no analogy can be transposed without some loss being incurred. The difficulty can be made easier if one recalls that we have here no right to raise objections. Instead of allowing ourselves to be alienated by this unfamiliar idea, we should rather consider ourselves to be compelled to regard all categories and analogies of this world as forever transcended and contradicted by an occurrence which, because it is a grace, bursts asunder all the regulative concepts of this world.¹⁷

One has heard the same idea put in two words: *est mysterium*. But then one comes face to face with the question: is it a mystery? That depends on a pre-

¹⁴ Rufinus, *Liber 2 contra Hieronymum* (PL 21, 593). The offending phrase which Jerome had written was: "Socrus Dei esse coepisti."

¹⁵ *Expositio in psalmum 44* (Vives edition 18, 510): "Et potest exponi totum hoc de beata Virgine, quae regina et mater regis est."

¹⁶ In the *DTC* 7, 145 E. Amann is in error in saying that "Cette exégèse est classique depuis Bède," as the commentary of Bede on the Canticle keeps strictly to the allegory of Christ and the Church. It seems to have been Rupert who was the innovator here.

¹⁷ H. M. Köster, *Die Magd des Herrn* (Limburg, 1947) p. 392.

vious decision, to the effect that tradition has given us, in such a way that we cannot refuse it, this idea that our Lady is the bride of Christ. From the evidence here produced it will be seen that the voice of tradition is by no means so clear. When texts of Scripture which refer directly to the Church are used in an applied sense to describe prerogatives of our Lady, the users have to be mindful of the warning given in *Divino afflante*: "Although, especially in preaching, a somewhat wider use of the sacred text in a metaphorical sense may be profitable, if kept within reasonable bounds, for illustrating doctrines of faith and commending moral truths, yet it must never be forgotten that such a use of the words of Scripture is, as it were, extrinsic and adventitious to Holy Writ."¹⁸ One can safely say that the application to our Lady of the well-known antiphons which speak of her bridal-chamber and which are drawn from the Canticle are instances of such a transfer; they are poetry before they are theology.¹⁹ Dr. Jung has cited one or two of these phrases in support of his strange views, but one cannot think that Catholic theologians will agree with him there.

Dr. Jung is certainly wrong in supposing that the Church derives any of her doctrines from the upsurge of the collective unconscious; that was one of the condemned notions of George Tyrrell. But it must be admitted that, in this matter of the bride of Christ, there is one piece of evidence from popular devotion which makes one wonder whether the whole idea of attributing such a position to our Lady is not an infiltration from the pagan worship of Isis. There is a fragmentary litany, written on a broken tile, where our Lady is given the title of *paredros*, a title which was used for Isis in respect of her brother and husband, Osiris. This litany was discovered in 1896 and published in 1901 and again in 1923, but has so far eluded the searches of Mariologists.²⁰ It may be useful, therefore, to give the greater part of it here.

¹⁸ English translation by Canon G. B. Smith (London: CTS, 1944), par. 32.

¹⁹ The Apostolic Constitution, *Munificentissimus Deus* (AAS 42, 762-63), speaks of theologians and orators who, to show their faith in the Assumption, have taken the liberty to apply to it ("quadam usi libertate") texts such as Ps 44:10, Ps 131:8, and Ct 3:6, putting them forward as so many pictures of the way in which the heavenly queen and bride, together with her divine Spouse, is raised aloft to the court of heaven. The writers referred to are John Damascene, *Hom. in dormit.* 2, 2, 11 (PG 96, 741), and Ps.-Modestus, *Encomium in dormit. Mariae* (PG 86, 3288). The comparison of our Lady with the Ark of the Covenant has a much better patristic pedigree than these other two; I have discussed it briefly in *Clergy Review*, May, 1951, pp. 301-11. The Constitution later (p. 765) speaks expressly of Ct 8:5 being applied to our Lady "sensu quodam accommodato." It is not the purpose of the Constitution to argue that our Lady may rightly be called Bride of Christ, but to show that authors who thus entitled her were thereby showing their faith in the Assumption.

²⁰ The litany was first published, with a facsimile, by R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religions-*

After a paraphrase of the story of the Annunciation, taken from Lk 1:32-33, the prayer continues:

Blessed among women, the Lord said to you, and He bade the good news be broken to you that by your Son all the clans of Judaea and all the races of the Gentiles would be saved. With the archangel and the angels let us too adore Him, all of us. Hail, beloved of the Lord; hail, *paredros* (of the Most High); hail, god-bearer, the sheep (that bore the Lamb?); the dove that brought (men out of destruction). Hail, maiden (womb); hail, god-bearer, received (by God in) Heaven; hail . . . ; hail, Mary

The word *paredros* is not used in this sacral sense in the Fathers of the Church.²¹ Ignatius uses it to describe the assistants of the bishop, and this usage is copied by Basil and others. The LXX use of the word as a title of Wisdom finds an echo in Irenaeus (in a Gnostic passage) and comes nearer to our litany than any Christian use, while the Gnostics and magical writers are fond of the word as an adjective to apply to familiar spirits.

It is, of course, possible that the maker of this litany has found the title

geschichtliche Fragen (Strasburg, 1901), and then by P. Viereck in Vol. 1 of *Griechische und griechisch-demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg* (Berlin, 1923). The litany is item 809 on pp. 279-80. A triangular piece at the bottom right-hand corner of the tile is missing, and so the invocations become progressively shorter. Brackets show possible restorations.

εὐλογημένη ἐν γυναιξίν, ὁ κύριος []
ἐλάλησέ σε καὶ εὐαγγελίσθαι ἐκ[έλευσεν ὅτι διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου σω]	
-θήσεται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς Ἰ[ουδαίας καὶ πάντα τὰ γένη τῶν]	
ἔθνων. μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλ[ου καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ ἡμεῖς]	
προσκυνησωμεν αὐτῷ π[άντες. χαῖρε, ἡγαπη-]	
-μένη τοῦ κυρίου, χαῖρε πάρεδ[ρε τοῦ ὑψίστου]	
χαῖρε, θεοδόκη, ἡ ἀμμά[]
ὁ περιστέρα ἡ ἀγαγῶσα ἐξ ὀλέθρου τοῦς]
ἀνθρώπων. χαίρετε, παρθένοιοι [κόλποι]
χαῖρε, θεοδόκη, θεό[δεκτε]
ἐν οὐρανοῖς. χαῖρε, συ[μφῶν(?)]
-φης. χαῖρε, Μαρία[]

The tile is dated to the sixth century by the editors. It was bought in Luxor, but its provenance is not otherwise known. It is equally possible that our Lady is here called *paredros* of Christ, for the restoration (τοῦ ὑψίστου) is not certain. The reference to the Assumption, though enigmatic, is valuable at this period.

²¹ I must thank Miss H. Graef for allowing me to consult the files of the forthcoming *Lexicon of Patristic Greek* for further evidence of the use of the title, *paredros*. Ignatius, *Ad Polyc.* 6, 1, has the word in a normal use. The title such as it occurs in Wis 9:4 is found in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 7, 5 (Harvey 1, 124). For the magical use, see *ibid.* (Harvey 1, 206).

in a semi-Gnostic Christian source, but in view of its use for Isis²² and of the popular character of the litany, evidenced by the manner of its transcription, one must incline to the view that it has been borrowed by an untheological Christian enthusiast from the worship of Isis. If this conclusion is borne out by future discoveries, e.g., in the still unpublished Gnostic treatises from Nag-Hammadi, then one will have to regard with considerable reserve any attempt to prove from tradition that the idea of our Lady as bride of Christ is truly a Christian doctrine.

The often-quoted passage of St. Thomas about the bridal character of the Church does not go as far as is sometimes thought. As his fourth reason for the tidings brought to Mary by the angel, St. Thomas assigns this: "That there might be made manifest what may be called a spiritual marriage between the Son of God and human nature. Hence at the Annunciation the consent of the Virgin was awaited in place of that of the whole human race."²³ This passage, which has thrice been quoted in letters of recent Popes,²⁴ does not make the "appearance of spiritual marriage" in any way exclusive or proper to our Lady; in fact, she seems to play in it the role of one who acts as proxy in a marriage-by-proxy. The true bride of Christ, the Church, was not yet of age at the date of the Annunciation and therefore someone had to act for her. God's prevision had provided such a proxy, for at that moment our Lady was already free from the sin of Adam and was thus in no need then to contract on her own behalf, but could freely do so for the rest of men. It is true that she needed Christ's merits for her great privilege of freedom from sin, and also that the redemption was then still in prospect, but she had been privileged to share in it by anticipation and so she was *in a manner* free to act as proxy for sinful man.

To say that our Lady is the *pronuba* or the proxy who makes possible the marriage of Christ and the Church, but is not by it herself bound in contract to her Son, is more in keeping with the earlier tradition of the Fathers, who have a constant habit of calling her not the bride but the bride-chamber or *thalamus*. Ephrem can say: "In the womb of flesh is the bridal-chamber prepared wherein the heavenly Bridegroom lay at rest."²⁵ A glance at the patristic exegesis of Ps 18:6 (He, as a Bridegroom coming out of His bride-chamber . . .) would show that it was this figure which they cherished rather than one

²² See the Hymn to Isis, *Inscr. graec.* 12(5), 739, line 139: *καὶ με καλεῖσι πάρεδρον*.

²³ *Sum. theol.* 3, 30, 1 in corp.: "Quarto, ut ostenderetur esse quoddam spirituale matrimonium inter Filium Dei et humanam naturam; et ideo per Annunciationem expectabatur consensus Virginis loco totius humanae naturae."

²⁴ It was twice quoted by Leo XIII in his Encyclicals on the Rosary (*Acta Leonis XIII* 5, 10; 6, 214), and it occurs in the epilogue to the *Mystici corporis* of Pius XII.

²⁵ Lamy, *Hymni s. Ephrem* 2, 574.

of a *hieros gamos* in heaven or on earth.²⁶ Those who habitually read the Latin side of the columns in the *Greek Patrology* of Migne will fall into a trap, as some theologians have already done, if they turn to the sermon of the pseudo-Modestus on the Dormition, where the Greek text reads: "Into the heavenly bride-chamber is gone in the all-glorious bride-chamber of that union that is hypostatic."²⁷ The Latin version renders *νυμφῶν* by *sponsa*, not seeing how Mary could be called a bride-chamber, if she was to enter into a bride-chamber; but such confusion of symbols did not disturb the Greek Fathers. Proclus would call her the workshop, *ἐργαστήριον*, of the union of the natures.²⁸ Such language is on a par with the famous text of Hippolytus which speaks of Christ as the Ark of the Covenant fashioned out of the incorruptible wood of Mary's body.²⁹ The Fathers were not deterred but rather spurred on by the fact that their comparisons came down to the level of their daily life; they had no romantic illusions about the stuff of poetry, such as have been fostered by centuries of Western culture.

It remains, then, that there is little justification, until the Middle Ages are reached, for the notion that our Lady is the spouse of Christ. French protagonists of the idea in the seventeenth century and Scheeben in the nineteenth must ultimately be dependent on Rupert of Deutz and his aiders and abettors. There is no reason for saying that the idea is deep in the *sensus fidelium*. If it was there at all in earlier centuries, it may well have come from the fact that the faithful had been carelessly acquiring the terms and notions of the worshippers of Isis. The idea has little to do with the doctrine of the Assumption, though it can be met with in contexts where that doctrine is proclaimed by medieval writers and their Byzantine predecessors. One can but suggest that it is greatly to be desired that a *regional* survey of the growth of Marian theology³⁰ in the Church be undertaken for the centuries

²⁶ It starts with a fragment ascribed to Origen (*PG* 12, 1244), and is clear in the *Breviarium in psalmos* of the school of Jerome (*PL* 26, 873), where the comment is: "Sponsus, Verbum Patris; sponsa, caro humana, cum qua de thalamo processit, id est de utero Virginis." Augustine has the same words and uses the idea many times (e.g., *PL* 32, 701; 35, 1452; 38, 1319).

²⁷ *PG* 86, 3288.

²⁸ Proclus, *Sermo 1, Laudatio Dei genitricis* (*PG* 65, 681).

²⁹ Hippolytus on Ps 22:7 (*GCS*, Hippolytus 1/2, 147).

³⁰ It would be useful, for instance, to know if Augustine's evaluation (given in Morin, *Sermones post Maurinos*, p. 163) of the position of our Lady in regard to the Church ("Melior est ecclesia quam virgo Maria. Quare? Quia Maria portio est ecclesiae, sanctum membrum, excellens membrum, supereminens membrum, sed tamen totius corporis membrum") is aimed at exaggerations in North Africa or elsewhere. It would also be helpful to know whether in the sixth century it would have been possible for monks in any other place than Bangor (Ulster) to chant the following verses about the Church

from the Council of Ephesus to the death of St. Thomas Aquinas. Then it would be possible to speak with accuracy of what Christians consciously or unconsciously wished to see defined.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

without danger of being misunderstood (cf. *Antiphonarium Benchorensis*, no. 95):

“Christo regina apta,
Solis luce amicta,
Simplex, simulque docta,
Undecunque invicta.

“Virgo valde fecunda
Haec, et mater intacta.
Laeta et tremebunda,
Verbo Dei subacta.”