

# Toward a Biblical Theology of Mary's Queenship

This chapter will set the context for our developing a biblical theology of Mary's queenship. First, we will provide a brief summary of the development of this doctrine by looking at liturgy, popular piety, magisterial teaching, and the writings of the Fathers of the Church throughout the centuries. Second, we will demonstrate how, although the Church's Tradition and Magisterium bear strong witness to this doctrine, the scriptural foundations have not always been as clear. This second section will evaluate the different ways scholarship has attempted to use the Scriptures in order to support Mary's queenship. Here, we will examine four common approaches: (1) some scholars have used the Scriptures as mere proof-texts for preconceived notions of Mary's royal office; (2) other scholars have begun with other truths revealed in the Scriptures (e.g., the divine maternity) and then have drawn out secondary logical conclusions based on those truths in order to arrive at the queenship; (3) some have viewed feminine royal figures in the Old Testament (such as Esther and Wisdom) as prefiguring Mary's queenship, but have not shown how such typological connections are grounded in the narrative presentation of Mary in the New Testament; and (4) some scholars have emphasized a salvation-historical approach, paying special attention to the presentation of Mary within the narrative context of the passages being considered. While the first three methods can be helpful, their conclusions could be strengthened if they were

supplemented by the rich insights that can be gained from studying Mary in the context of salvation history and within a narrative analysis of pertinent Marian passages. Thus, we will distinguish these first three methods from the fourth approach. Following this fourth, more holistic approach, we will see later how the biblical queen-mother theme that emerges in salvation history can not only help shed important light on our understanding of Mary's queenship, but also can help supplement the other approaches that seek to clarify the biblical basis of this doctrine.

## 1.1 Doctrinal Development of Mary's Queenship

An extensive treatment of the doctrinal development of Mary's queenship throughout the centuries would be beyond the scope of this project. This has been thoroughly investigated already in a number of works.<sup>1</sup> Here, we will simply offer a brief overview of the doctrinal development in order to provide the context for the central purpose of this book: developing a biblical theology of Mary's queenship.

### 1.1.1 Church Fathers and Theologians in Later Centuries

In his article "La Regalità di Maria nel Pensiero dei Padri," Luigi Gambero offers a synthesis of patristic teaching on our topic. Gambero shows how some of the earliest Church Fathers, although not explicitly giving Mary the title "Queen," did implicitly express the reality of her queenship and attempt to offer some theological foundations for her royal character.<sup>2</sup> He notes two basic approaches to describing Mary's royalty in this early period: one based on the meaning of Mary's name, the other based on exegetical reasons.<sup>3</sup>

First, we will consider the etymological approach. Some Fathers saw royal significance in Mary's name. For example, according to Saint Jerome, "Mary" in Syriac can be translated as *domina*,<sup>4</sup> meaning "lady" or "sovereign," indicating her great

dignity. Along a similar line, Peter Chrysologus said that Mary should be translated from the Hebrew as *domina* as well.<sup>5</sup> Although not emphasized as much in the East, this approach of stressing the etymology of Mary's name became a common way to demonstrate Mary's queenship in the West. Subsequent Western authors such as Eucher of Lyons, Isidore of Seville, and Venerable Bede would continue this line of approach when discussing Mary's royal position.<sup>6</sup>

On a more exegetical level, attention was drawn to Mary being called "the mother of my Lord" by Elizabeth in the Visitation scene (Lk. 1:43). For example, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine all emphasized Mary being the *mater domini*.<sup>7</sup> With deeper reflection on what it meant for Mary to be the mother of the Lord, there arose a deeper understanding of Mary being associated with Christ's royal lordship. It was Origen who made a significant "first step forward" along these lines by referring to Mary as "*kuria*" in his commentary on this passage.<sup>8</sup> Origen viewed Elizabeth's greeting Mary with the words "mother of my Lord" as honoring her with a royal dignity: *su\_mh/thrtou~Kuri/oumou: su\e0mh\_Kuri/a*.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Saint Ephrem referred to Mary as "the Most Holy Sovereign Lady (*Domina*), Mother of God."<sup>10</sup> Jerome and Augustine also spoke of Mary's sovereignty.<sup>11</sup>

Another line of development might be seen in patristic references to Mary as the mother of the King.<sup>12</sup> With the New Testament bestowing on Jesus the title of king, it was easy for the early Fathers to describe the mother of Jesus as the mother of the King.<sup>13</sup> Although not a direct affirmation of her queenship, viewing Mary as *mater regis* linked her even more closely to her Son's royal status and helped set the stage for the title "queen" to be used explicitly by later Church Fathers. For example, one can see Chrysippus of Jerusalem making this very move from "*mater regis*" to "*regina*" in his homily on Psalm 44. There, he says that Mary is the mother of the King and will

be changed into a heavenly queen.<sup>14</sup> Kirwin shows the line of progression: “It was in this way that the implicit became explicit. Mary was honored as ‘Mother of Christ who is King,’ then as ‘Mother of the King,’ finally as ‘Queen.’”<sup>15</sup>

As the early Church developed its understanding of basic Marian truths (especially after the Council of Ephesus), there was greater reflection on the meaning and extent of Mary’s queenship.<sup>16</sup> For example, Idelfonse of Toledo discussed Mary’s royalty in a way that surpassed anything that had come before him. Not only did he view Mary as a royal figure, but he even placed himself as a servant of the queenly mother of Jesus: “I am your servant, for your Son is my Lord. You are my Queen because you have become the handmaid of my King.”<sup>17</sup> Andrew of Crete described Mary as a queen in Old Testament prophecy, in her birth, in her entering the Temple, and in her being crowned in heaven.<sup>18</sup> He honored her as queen, calling her “*O ter regina*,” and described the great extent of her reign as the “*Regina universorum hominum*.”<sup>19</sup> In the eighth century, Saint Germain of Constantinople called Mary “Queen,” “Sovereign Lady,” and “Queen of the Universe.”<sup>20</sup> And John Damascene taught that Mary reigns with her Son and that she is queen because she is the mother of the Creator.<sup>21</sup> He even went on to ask Mary to rule over his entire life.<sup>22</sup>

Moving into the medieval period, Mary’s queenship was frequently mentioned by writers such as Peter Damian, Anselm, Eadmerus, and Bernard of Clairvaux.<sup>23</sup> The queenship was generally taken for granted and simply highlighted in sermons, prayers, and hymns. With little mention of it in strictly theological treatises, however, there seemed to be little speculative reflection on the nature and extent of her queenship. Nevertheless, a deeper understanding of its theological foundations did begin to emerge in the writings of Bernard and Eadmerus, who grounded Mary’s royalty in her divine

maternity and in her unique cooperation in Christ's work of redemption.<sup>24</sup>

This two-fold foundation was increasingly discussed in subsequent centuries. In particular, a famous medieval work, the *Mariale super missus est*, explained how Mary's queenship is based not only on her divine maternity, but also on her cooperation in Christ's redemptive work. Since she was uniquely associated with Christ's suffering on the Cross, she was uniquely associated with His triumph and royal reign in the kingdom.<sup>25</sup> In the fifteenth century, Saint Bernardine of Siena and Denis the Carthusian made similar points.<sup>26</sup>

The nature and function of Mary's queenship also was discussed in more detail in this period. Bernardine of Siena, for example, taught that Mary has royal dominion over all creatures—not only over souls on earth but even over all devils, souls in purgatory, and souls in heaven.<sup>27</sup> The function of her royal office is to direct, protect, and intercede.<sup>28</sup> A popular title for Mary in this period was "Queen of Mercy," which described her royal position in terms of her intercessory role.<sup>29</sup> At the same time, there were some suggestions that Mary is queen not only because of her intercessory influence at her Son's throne, but also in a formal and proper sense. This can be seen, for example, in the writings of Peter Canisius and the *Mariale*.<sup>30</sup>

In the seventeenth century, there was increased emphasis on Mary's queenship in the strict, formal sense. The Jesuit Scripture commentator Ferdinand de Salazar and Christopher de Vega described Mary's queenship not only as a metaphor, but also in a formal sense, with real power and a real reign over her subjects. Although subordinate to her Son, Mary truly rules with Christ the King. Both theologians also raised a key question: how does the mother of the king receive a share in his royal dignity? They offered similar answers: if a king receives his reign by natural right or by right of conquest,

the parents participate in that reign. They concluded that since Mary was mother of the King and shared in her Son's victorious work of redemption, she is queen by natural right and right of conquest, and therefore gains a share in her Son's royalty.<sup>31</sup>

Bartholomew de los Rios is another theologian of the period who stressed Mary's queenship as more than an honorary title of excellence, as having a real dominion. In scholastic fashion, he outlined the different kinds of royal authority and showed how all apply to Mary.<sup>32</sup> These notions were particularly developed in eighteenth-century reflections on the spiritual dimension of Mary's queenship, as seen in Saint Alphonsus Ligouri's *The Glories of Mary* and Saint Louis Marie de Montfort's *True Devotion to Mary*.<sup>33</sup>

### 1.1.2 Liturgy, Art, and Popular Piety

Liturgical worship in both the East and the West attests to the queenship of Mary. For example, the non-Byzantine liturgies of the East mention Mary's queenship implicitly in texts referring to her as "Lady" or "Our Lady." The Ethiopian rite expresses the universal nature of Mary's reign, calling her "The Lady of us all."<sup>34</sup> The Byzantine liturgy often calls Mary "Queen." In fact, Kirwin notes how she is given the royal title *Despoina* as often as she is called "Virgin" or "Mother."<sup>35</sup> She is called "Queen of the world" and "Queen of us all."<sup>36</sup> For the Feast of the Dormition, Mary is honored as being set upon a throne reigning with her Son.<sup>37</sup>

In the West, the Roman liturgy before the eighth century often alluded to Mary's royalty in prayers and antiphons for the Feast of the Assumption, but without giving her the explicit title of queen.<sup>38</sup> Since the eleventh century, however, the West has honored Mary as queen quite explicitly in sacred songs. The great Marian hymns *Salve Regina* and *Ave, Regina Caelorum* (eleventh century) as well as the *Regina Caeli* (twelfth–thirteenth century) all express her queenly status and

have come to be part of the Church's liturgical worship.<sup>39</sup> The clearest affirmation of Mary's queenship in the Church's liturgy came in 1954, when Pius XII instituted the Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary the Queen in his encyclical *Ad Caeli Reginam*.<sup>40</sup> Originally celebrated on May 31, Mary's queenship is celebrated in the revised liturgical calendar as a memorial on August 22, the octave day of the Assumption.<sup>41</sup>

Further witness to Mary's queenship is found in popular devotions such as the Rosary (the Fifth Glorious Mystery) and the Litany of Our Lady, which invokes Mary as "Queen" (Litany of Loreto).<sup>42</sup> Also, sacred art has commonly depicted Mary with queenly imagery (seated on a throne, crowned, wearing royal clothes, surrounded by angels and saints venerating her, and even being crowned by her Son).<sup>43</sup> Such evidence from popular piety and sacred art reflects an understanding of Mary's royal status in the believing Church.

### 1.1.3 Magisterial Teaching

Although Mary's queenship was not itself a topic of discussion in early papal teachings, a number of popes referred to Mary as a queenly figure in passing. For example, Kirwin notes how Pope Leo the Great called Mary "*Virgo Regia davidicae*" in a sermon.<sup>44</sup> The Third Council of Constantinople described Mary as Lady (*despoina*)—a queenly title. In a letter to Saint Germain, the patriarch of Constantinople, Pope Gregory II expressed the universality of Mary's queenship, calling her the ruler of all Christians who will triumph over enemies of the faith.<sup>45</sup>

One early Church council mentioned Mary's royal office in its official decrees. While defending the legitimacy of sacred images, the Second Council of Nicea referred to images of "our undefiled Lady (*dominae*), or holy Mother of God."<sup>46</sup> Although not the object of definition, this mention of Mary's royal position is significant. As Kirwin notes: "Certainly the

term ‘*domina*’ was not defined but it is equally certain that the term was used purposely. The Fathers in the council intended not only to define the legitimacy of the cult of images but also to pay tribute to Mary’s queenly status.”<sup>47</sup>

In his constitution on the Immaculate Conception (*Cum Praecelsa*), Pope Sixtus IV in 1477 referred to Mary as “the Queen of Heaven, the glorious Virgin Mother of God, raised upon her heavenly throne.”<sup>48</sup> Further, we should note the importance of Pope Benedict XIV’s (1740–1758) papal bull *Gloriosae Dominae* (1748).<sup>49</sup> This bull not only spoke of Mary as “Queen of heaven and earth,” but also discussed how Christ grants to her “nearly all his empire and power.”<sup>50</sup> As Carroll explains, “Much more than a mere title of excellence is involved by the name ‘Queen of heaven and earth,’ which the Church has always given to the Mother of the Redeemer; for her Son, the King of Kings, has in some way communicated to her His own empire and power.”<sup>51</sup>

In addition to papal teachings, a number of papal actions throughout these centuries are worth noting. For example, in the eighth and ninth centuries, popes such as John VII (705–707), Adrian I (772–795) and Saint Leo IV (847–855) commissioned frescoes and inscriptions depicting Mary as queen. Gregory IX in 1239 ordered Roman churches to recite the *Salve Regina* every Friday after compline, in order to prepare for Saturday. Sixtus V in 1587 approved the Litany of Loreto, which includes several queenly Marian titles. In the early 1800s, Pope Pius VII crowned several Marian statues.<sup>52</sup> Although not papal teachings in the form of bulls or constitutions, each of these actions at least express some degree of papal promotion of Mary’s queenship.

Turning to the nineteenth century, Pius IX’s 1854 definition of Mary’s Immaculate Conception (*Ineffabilis Deus*) described the universal extent of her queenship (“Queen of heaven and earth”) and directly linked Mary’s royal office with

her intercessory power:

And since she has been appointed by God to be the Queen of heaven and earth, and is exalted above all the choirs of angels and saints, and even stands at the right hand of her only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, she presents our petitions in a most efficacious manner. What she asks she obtains. Her pleas can never be unheard.<sup>53</sup>

Popes from the time of Leo XIII to John Paul II have continued to teach of Mary's queenship with increased frequency and precision. Leo XIII (1878–1903) referred to Mary as queen in several encyclicals and other teachings.<sup>54</sup> Pope St. Pius X (1903–1914), in his encyclical *Ad Diem Illum* (1904), based Mary's queenship on her unique participation in Christ's redemptive work.<sup>55</sup> Writing during World War I, Pope Benedict XV (1914–1922) often entrusted the world to the protection of Mary, "Queen of Peace."<sup>56</sup> Pope Pius XI (1922–1939) entrusted the Church's missionary efforts to Mary, "Queen of Apostles," and the unity of the Church was entrusted to Mary "the heavenly Queen."<sup>57</sup> This brings us to Pope Pius XII (1939–1958), who was described by one theologian as making the queenship the Marian doctrine most illuminated by all his papal teachings.<sup>58</sup> In a radio address to Fatima called "Mais de uma vez," Pius XII referred to Mary as "Queen," "Queen of Peace," and "Queen of the Most Holy Rosary." He then consecrated the entire human race to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, "Our Mother and Our Queen."<sup>59</sup> Kirwin notes the importance this consecration has for affirming Mary's queenship:

The consecration of the world to Mary's heart implies Mary's dominion over the world. Theologians speak of a strict dominion exercised by Mary by reason of her queenship. An act of consecration is an explicit recognition of real dependence upon the person towards whom such an act is made.

We recognize that we are really, though analogously, dependent upon Mary as our Queen, just as we are really dependent upon Christ as our King.<sup>60</sup>

In his encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, Pius XII speaks of Mary as the “true Queen of Martyrs” and as reigning with her Son in heaven.<sup>61</sup> In the apostolic constitution *Munificentissimus Deus*, which defines the Assumption, Pius XII mentions how preachers and theologians have followed the patristic theme of describing Mary as queen, entering the royal court of heaven to sit at the right hand of her Son.<sup>62</sup> He also notes one argument for the Assumption from Bernardine of Siena, who drew attention to the “likeness between God’s Mother and her divine Son, in the way of nobility and dignity of body and of soul—a likeness that forbids us to think of the heavenly Queen as being separated from the heavenly king.”<sup>63</sup> Finally, Pius XII turns to Mary’s cooperation with Christ’s work of redemption as support for the Assumption and mentions the queenship in this context. As the new Eve sharing in the suffering and victory of the new Adam, she “finally obtained, as the supreme culmination of her privileges that she should be preserved free from the corruption of the tomb and that, like her own Son, having overcome death, she might be taken up body and soul to the glory of heaven where, as Queen, she sits in splendor at the right hand of her Son, the immortal King of Ages.”<sup>64</sup>

The Magisterium’s most extensive treatment on Mary’s royal office came in 1954, when Pope Pius XII instituted the Feast of the Queenship of Mary in the encyclical *Ad Caeli Reginam*. Near the beginning of this document, the pope explains that he does not intend to propose Mary’s royal status as a *new* doctrine, but that he is reaffirming a truth held by the faithful for centuries and instituting a liturgical feast to promote that truth.<sup>65</sup> He proceeds to show how Mary’s queenship is expressed in the Fathers and saints of

the Church as well as in liturgical writings and popular devotions from Eastern and Western traditions.<sup>66</sup> The encyclical then discusses two theological foundations for Mary's royal office: her divine motherhood and her unique cooperation in her Son's work of salvation. The divine maternity is "the main principle" on which Mary's queenship rests (AC 34).<sup>67</sup> Pius XII writes, "It is easily concluded that she is a Queen, since she bore a son who, at the very moment of His conception, because of the hypostatic union of the human nature with the Word, was also as man King and Lord of all things (AC 34)."<sup>68</sup> However, since Christ is king not only by natural right, but also by His salvific work, in a similar way Mary is queen not only by her divine motherhood, but also by her unique cooperation in Christ's work of redemption. Describing her cooperation in redemption as a second basis for Mary's queenship, Pius XII, quoting Suárez, teaches:

For "just as Christ, because He redeemed us, is our Lord and king by a special title, so the Blessed Virgin also (is our Queen), on account of the unique manner in which she assisted in our redemption, by giving of her own substance, by freely offering Him for us, by her singular desire and petition for, and active interest in, our salvation." (AC 36)<sup>69</sup>

The encyclical then expounds on the two-fold meaning of Mary's queenship. First, Pius XII says it is a "Queenship of Excellence": "Hence, it cannot be doubted that Mary most Holy is far above all other creatures in dignity, and after her Son possesses primacy over all" (AC 40).<sup>70</sup> This unique dignity flows from Mary's Immaculate Conception. Citing Pope Pius IX's *Ineffabilis Deus*, Pius XII notes how Mary, from the first moment of her conception, was filled with every heavenly grace, and thus possessed a fullness of innocence and holiness to be found nowhere outside of God (AC 42).<sup>71</sup>

Second, her queenship is one of "efficacy." This refers

to Mary's real share in Christ's influence over humanity. As queen, Mary has "a share in that influence by which He, her Son and our Redeemer, is rightly said to reign over the minds and wills of men" (AC 42).<sup>72</sup> The encyclical explains this royal power of Mary in the context of her role in the "distribution of graces" through her motherly intercession (AC 42).<sup>73</sup>

With a heart that is truly a mother's . . . does she approach the problem of our salvation, and is solicitous for the whole human race; made Queen of heaven and earth by the Lord, exalted above all choirs of angels and saints, and standing at the right hand of her only Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, she intercedes powerfully for us with a mother's prayers, obtains what she seeks, and cannot be refused. (AC 42)<sup>74</sup>

In later papal pronouncements, Pius XII continued to reaffirm some of the basic themes treated in *Ad Caeli Reginam*.<sup>75</sup>

While preparing for the Second Vatican Council, Pope John XXIII referred to Mary as Queen of the Church in an allocution given on December 8, 1960, in which he quoted Pius IX's prayer during the opening of Vatican I.<sup>76</sup> Further, Vatican II itself, in its dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium*, explicitly refers to Mary's queenship, linking it to her Immaculate Conception and Assumption:

Finally the Immaculate Virgin preserved free from all stain of original sin, was taken up body and soul into heavenly glory when her earthly life was over, and exalted by the Lord as Queen over all things, that she might be the more fully conformed to her Son, the Lord of lords (cf. Apoc. 19:16) and conqueror of sin and death. (LG 59)<sup>77</sup>

Later, the document alludes to Mary's royal status by speaking of her being "exalted above all angels and men to a place second only to her Son, as the most holy Mother of God who was involved in the mysteries of Christ: she is rightly honored

by a special cult in the Church” (*LG* 66). Peña notes how this article alludes to the two-fold basis for the queenship (divine maternity and cooperation in redemption) as described in *Ad Caeli Reginam*.<sup>78</sup>

Pope Paul VI described Mary as the “heavenly Queen” and as “Queen of heaven” in his encyclical *Mense Maio*.<sup>79</sup> In his most extensive Mariological work, the apostolic exhortation *Marialis Cultus*, Paul VI first alludes to Mary’s royal status when speaking about the restored Solemnity of Mary the Holy Mother of God (January 1). He explains how this solemnity within the Christmas season is meant “to commemorate the part played by Mary in this mystery of salvation” and “to exalt the singular dignity which this mystery brings to the ‘holy Mother’” (*MC* 5).<sup>80</sup> He then discusses how this is a fitting occasion to implore from God “through the Queen of Peace, the supreme gift of peace” (*MC* 5).<sup>81</sup>

In article 6, Paul VI explicitly treats the Feast of Mary’s queenship, showing its link with the Solemnity of the Assumption of Mary. Here, the pope explains how in the revised liturgical calendar, the Solemnity of the Assumption is prolonged in the celebration of Mary’s queenship, which occurs seven days later: “On this occasion we contemplate her who, seated beside the King of ages, shines forth as Queen and intercedes as Mother” (*MC* 6).<sup>82</sup> Article 22 mentions Mary’s queenship when discussing how the Church’s various attitudes of devotion express the relationships that unite the Church with Mary (*MC* 22).<sup>83</sup>

A significant development of thought on Mary’s queenship can be seen in Pope John Paul II’s *Redemptoris Mater*. While reaffirming the teaching of Pius XII and Vatican II and associating Mary’s queenly position with her Assumption, the pope then expounds upon a new emphasis: he places Mary’s exalted queenship in the context of her humble service in the kingdom. Peña notes three principle ideas set forth by John Paul

II along these lines: First, the pope shows how Mary's exalted royal office must be understood in relation to Christ's *kenosis* and royal exaltation. Christ himself humbly served even to the point of death, and was therefore raised and entered into the glory of His kingdom, exalted as Lord over all (see Phil. 2:8–9). The pope discusses the Gospels' portrayal of the true disciple, who will reign in the kingdom as the one who follows Christ's example through service: "To serve means to reign!"<sup>84</sup> In this regard, the pope notes how Mary is the model disciple. At the Annunciation, she called herself the "handmaid of the Lord," and she lived out this title throughout her life. She is the first disciple who served Christ in others and led them to Him. This is the basis of her queenship: "Mary, the handmaid of the Lord, has a share in this Kingdom of the Son" (*RM* 41).<sup>85</sup>

Second, the pope shows how Mary's queenship continues to be based on her servanthood, even in heaven: "The *glory of serving* does not cease to be her royal exaltation: assumed into heaven, she does not cease her saving service, which expresses her maternal mediation 'until the eternal fulfillment of all the elect'" (*RM* 41).<sup>86</sup>

Third, John Paul II also shows the ecclesial dimension of Mary's unique royal privilege, placing it in the context of the communion of saints, who all participate in Christ's reign: "Thus in her Assumption into heaven, Mary is as it were clothed by the whole reality of the Communion of Saints, and her very union with the Son in glory is wholly oriented towards the definitive fullness of the Kingdom, *when 'God will be all in all'*" (*RM* 41).<sup>87</sup>

Finally, one of the most significant magisterial affirmations of Mary's queenship in recent years is found in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Article 966 of the *Catechism* reaffirms Mary's royal status and quotes the very text from *Lumen Gentium* 59 that we just cited above.<sup>88</sup>

## 1.2 The Biblical Foundations of Mary's Queenship

We have seen how Mary's queenship has been expressed by the Church Fathers and other theologians throughout the centuries and how it has been elaborated upon by magisterial teachings. While the Church's Tradition and Magisterium bear witness to Mary's royal office, the biblical foundations for this doctrine have remained somewhat obscure. In this next section, we will briefly examine four common ways scholars in this century have used Scripture to demonstrate the queenship. One approach builds a theology of Mary's queenship *detached from the Scriptures*. Here, biblical texts are not truly used as a guide for understanding the queenship, but are employed simply to confirm preconceived ideas about Mary's royal office. A second approach may be called *theological deduction*. Here, scholars begin with certain truths revealed in Scripture and then draw secondary logical conclusions based on those truths in order to arrive at the queenship. A third way scholars use Scripture to demonstrate Mary's queenship is to make arguments based on "*extra-biblical*" *typology*. This approach views Old Testament royal women, such as Esther or Lady Wisdom, as prefigurings of Mary and her queenly status, even though such typological connections are not demonstrated to be found in the actual New Testament portrayal of Mary (and thus can be called "extra-biblical"). Finally, a *salvation-historical* approach (the approach this study will take) more fully allows the Scriptures to animate our theology of Mary's royal office. Scholars following this line examine Mary in the context of salvation history, paying close attention to the narrative framework of Marian passages and often showing how the queen-mother tradition in the Davidic kingdom may help illuminate our understanding of Mary's royal role in the kingdom of her Son. While not intending to prove Mary's queenship explicitly in the Scriptures, this salvation-historical approach, which builds upon the biblical queen-mother theme, can offer important

scriptural support for Mary's royal office and can help shed some light on this doctrine.

### 1.2.1 A Theology Detached from the Scriptures

Before Vatican II, many scholarly treatments of the queenship failed to examine thoroughly the biblical foundations of this doctrine. For example, at the 1938 Marian congress in Boulogne-sur-Mer, which focused specifically on Mary's queenly role, no single paper was devoted to the biblical foundations of her royal office. Even more alarming, every presentation drew only from the Church's Tradition (Church Fathers, liturgy, etc.) to support the queenship. The Scriptures simply were not seriously treated.<sup>89</sup>

The problem is quite evident in the two dominant approaches to Mary's queenship found in scholarship this century before Vatican II.<sup>90</sup> One school of thought patterned Mary's queenship on the kingship of Christ, while the other school emphasized the feminine character of Mary's queenship, rooted in her unique intercessory power. According to George Kirwin and Stefano De Fiores, both approaches were inadequate because they failed to give sufficient attention to what Scripture has to say about Mary's royal office.<sup>91</sup>

Let us briefly consider the first of these schools, represented by the Dutch theologian L. De Gruyter, who in his 1934 work *De Beata Maria Regina* offered a speculative treatment on Mary's queenship. De Gruyter devoted only four pages of his 176-page work to arguments from Scripture.<sup>92</sup> He concluded that only one text (Genesis 3:15) offers some scriptural support for the queenship, and that this text in itself does not enjoy a probative sense.<sup>93</sup> For De Gruyter, Scripture itself cannot demonstrate Mary's queenship. He instead depends on Tradition with Scripture in order to make his argument for Mary's queenship.<sup>94</sup>

De Gruyter went on to offer a speculative treatment on

how Mary is queen in three senses. First, she is a queen in an “improper” and “analogous” sense because she is united to God more intimately than all other creatures. Due to her divine maternity and her exceeding all others in grace and holiness, Mary is in a sense greater than all others and holds a primacy over them.<sup>95</sup> Second, she is a queen in the sense that she is the mother of the King. Because God made Mary His mother, and because she responded to this high calling, Mary is loved more than any creature and given more gifts than anyone else.<sup>96</sup> Third, Mary is a queen in the “proper” and “formal” sense, given the task of ordering all people to their common end.<sup>97</sup> This is where De Gruyter primarily bases Mary's queenship, deducing it from her cooperation in Christ's redemptive work and placing it in likeness to Christ's kingship, but to a lesser degree. Just as Christ's kingship functions in people's interior lives by revealing truths and conferring grace, so does Mary as queen in a sense “reveal” truths by her work (as a model of holiness) and by her words (revealing to the Apostles and Gospel writers certain mysteries and incidents of Christ's life which they would not otherwise know). She also helps spread the faith by distributing graces as Mediatrix.<sup>98</sup> This latter function is the primary role of Mary's royal office: she governs all people by distributing the graces they need.<sup>99</sup>

According to De Gruyter, Mary exercises a power that is specifically Christ's, yet her royal office is subordinate to His. Christ's royal power is superior to Mary's: First, in the sense that Christ as man is a “cojoined” instrument of grace, while Mary is an instrument of grace which is separated from divinity. Second, Christ as a divine Person is a king with infinite dignity and a cult of “*latría*,” while Mary is a human person with finite dignity and a cult of “*hyperdulia*.” Third, Christ's merit is “*condigno*,” while Mary's is “*congruo*.” Christ is king by nature and conquest, while Mary is queen by grace.

Thus, Mary's queenly mission completely depends on Christ's kingly mission.<sup>100</sup>

While De Gruyter's approach likens Mary's queenship to Christ's kingship, the second dominant school of thought on this topic emphasizes the distinctively feminine character of Mary's queenship. This school is often represented by the Dominican theologian M. Nicolas, who stressed that Mary is not a king "*au feminine*."<sup>101</sup> Rather, her royal office is specifically different from Christ's.

Nicolas argues that, since royal power essentially involves the power to command, it cannot be said that Mary has royal power in a strict sense. Although she intercedes for us, she does not command us.<sup>102</sup> Only the king exercises the *imperium*—the act by which a sovereign directs his subjects to their common end. This act is proper only to the king because a true sovereignty demands that it be exercised by one person alone; otherwise, it would cease to be a monarchy.<sup>103</sup>

Thus, for Nicolas, Mary's queenship is specifically different from Christ's kingship and must be understood in its distinctively feminine character. He situates the queenship not in the "*imperium*" but in the "*consilium*," in the sense that Mary exercises her royal office through prayerful intercession as Christ's intimate companion and associate.<sup>104</sup> Although she is not the spouse of Christ in a strict sense, no other woman was so intimately associated with His royal destiny than she was.<sup>105</sup> As the "new Eve," Mary is the woman linked with the sovereignty of the "new Adam." She becomes the new Eve at the beginning of her divine maternity when Christ becomes the new Adam,<sup>106</sup> and she remains the King's companion—His "helpmate"—throughout His work on earth, culminating in His redemptive work on the Cross.<sup>107</sup>

As mother-associate, Mary reigns by exercising influence over the King's heart, interceding on our behalf. Thus, strictly speaking, Mary does not have a governmental power, but

an intercessory power. Her royal authority is found in her uniquely powerful, prayerful intervention.<sup>108</sup> She is united to the intentions of the King and embraces His royal mission,<sup>109</sup> and her prayers obtain graces for humanity.<sup>110</sup> In fact, Nicolas concludes that the unity forged between Mary and Jesus at the Incarnation and at the Cross is so great that no grace is given without the expressed will of Christ and the prayer of Mary.<sup>111</sup>

Nicolas does not even attempt to treat the biblical foundations of Mary's queenship. Instead, he builds his notion of the queenship primarily from earthly rulers and from considering the essence of royalty philosophically. In fact, in his two-part, fifty-three-page article, "La Vierge-Reine," Nicolas cites only two biblical texts.<sup>112</sup>

George Kirwin has directly critiqued these two approaches to Mary's royal office as not giving attention to the notion of queenship developed in the Sacred Scriptures. According to Kirwin, the heart of the problem with De Gruyter's work is his methodological starting points:

The ultimate root of De Gruyter's approach is the method employed—a deductive method which tends at times to become rationalistic and which does not pay sufficient attention to the founts of revelation. Instead of allowing himself to be guided by the scriptures, he uses them as a proof or confirmation of his own thesis.<sup>113</sup>

Kirwin also notes how Nicolas, although differing from De Gruyter in that he does not look for the essence of Mary's queenship in Christ's kingship, still falls into the same methodological problem: he uses "a rather abstract, deductive approach which does not sufficiently take into account the concrete facts of revelation proposed to us in scripture and developed within the living Tradition of the Church."<sup>114</sup>

Kirwin sums up the fundamental problem in these approaches to Mary's queenship: they start *a priori* with a sec-

ular-political or philosophical concept of royalty that guides their interpretation of biblical sources—sources whose notion of Christ’s kingdom, while certainly having some points in common with earthly monarchies, is ultimately quite different. “But my kingship is not of this world” (Jn. 18:36); “The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them. . . . But not so with you; rather let the greatest among you become as the youngest and the leader as one who serves” (Lk. 22:25–26).<sup>115</sup>

The fundamental difficulty encountered with the . . . more deductive approach is the fact that the a-priori concept of queen dominated the interpretation of the sources in such a way that certain elements which seemed to pertain to revelation were at times neglected while other elements were over-emphasized. At times the facts seem to have been forced to fit the concept.<sup>116</sup>

### 1.2.2 Theological Deductions Drawn from Scripture

The method of theological deduction is another way some scholars have used the Scriptures for demonstrating Mary’s queenship. This approach proceeds by way of logical deductions based on other truths revealed in the Scriptures, in order to demonstrate how one might systematically arrive at the queenship. While we affirm that such theological deductions can offer (and indeed have offered) important insights into Mary’s royal office, we simply wish to distinguish it from other approaches, which draw more fully on the rich insights that can be gained from a study of Mary in the context of salvation history within the narrative framework of related New Testament texts, and in light of the Old Testament background those texts evoke.

We can find an example of this deductive approach to the scriptural basis for Mary’s queenship in Pius XII’s encyclical *Ad Caeli Reginam*. The encyclical notes how the Church Fathers drew from the angel’s words at the Annunciation and

Elizabeth's greeting at the Visitation to expound upon Mary's royal status.<sup>117</sup> Then, at the beginning of the theological treatment of Mary's queenship, Pius XII again returns to these two passages to demonstrate the royal dignity of her divine maternity:

In Holy Writ, concerning the Son whom Mary will conceive, We read this sentence: 'He shall be called the Son of the most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end,' and in addition Mary is called 'Mother of the Lord'; *from this it is easily concluded* that she is a Queen since she bore a son who, at the very moment of His conception . . . was also as man King and Lord of all things. (AC 34, emphasis added)<sup>118</sup>

Although he does not expound upon these passages, Pius XII does offer these texts as scriptural foundations for Mary's queenship. Yet Kirwin is careful to note that *Ad Caeli Reginam* teaches only that Mary's queenship can be *deduced* from the biblical accounts of the Annunciation and Visitation. In other words, Pius XII does not affirm (or deny) that Luke explicitly portrays Mary as queen. What he does say is that since Luke portrays Mary as giving birth to the eternal, messianic King and Lord, we can deduce from these texts that Mary's unique association with such a royal Son implies that she, too, possesses a royal status. As Kirwin explains,

The most we can say with certainty regarding the encyclical's approach to the scriptural foundation for the queenship is that there is a basis in scripture for this doctrine, particularly in the texts from Luke of the Annunciation and Visitation. . . . The Pope is not speaking of an explicit, formal revelation of queenship; he is speaking rather of a *deduction*."<sup>119</sup>

Similarly, Peña notes how the encyclical does not offer an argument from Scripture in a strict sense. Rather, Pius XII

includes the biblical foundations within the argument from Tradition, showing how the Church Fathers and popular piety deduced Mary's queenship from certain biblical texts: "This already leaves a glimpse that the biblical proof is not explicit, but that tradition and the piety of the faithful have deduced certain logical consequences from some biblical facts read and understood in a comprehensive manner and in their full sense."<sup>120</sup>

We will now look at scholars who especially in the 1940s and 1950s have used the method of theological deduction in their treatment of the biblical foundations for Mary's royal office. For example, in his 1942 book on the queenship, A. Luis argues that the Annunciation scene offered support for Mary's queenship. First, he points out that Mary is clearly revealed as mother of the messianic King. This, he argues, makes her queen, exalted above all other creatures. Second, since this scene shows Mary as the spouse of the Holy Spirit, a divine Person, this also links Mary in a unique way with the royal concept.<sup>121</sup> Here we can see that Luis attempts to employ the method of theological deduction as he deduces the queenship from the two other truths that he finds revealed in the Annunciation scene: the divine maternity and bridal-like relationship with the Holy Spirit.

J. Fenton, in an article presented at the 1950 Mariological Congress in Rome, investigated the scriptural foundations for Mary's queenship as expressed in the liturgy.<sup>122</sup> Fenton first considers the Annunciation scene, in which Mary is presented as the mother of the eternal King of Israel and as one who is uniquely associated with Him and His work. Building on these related truths, Fenton goes on to deduce the queenship:

And, since the office of a queen, in the proper sense of the term, is precisely that of the woman most intimately associated with the king in the government and the direction of

his own realm, Mary's position with reference to Our Lord constitutes her as a true and perfect queen in the kingdom of her Son.<sup>123</sup>

Fenton takes a similar approach when considering how Mary's queenship was won by her sharing in Christ's sufferings throughout her life and, in particular, at the Cross.<sup>124</sup> Since the Scriptures, as Fenton argues, show us that Christ merited His kingship through suffering and that Mary participated in those sufferings, she must have some type of share in Christ's royalty herself. He concludes:

It was precisely in the function of that suffering with and for Our Lord that she may be said to have earned or merited her titles as queen and coredemptrix, in the same way that Our Lord accomplished His work of redemption and merited His kingship by means of His own sufferings.<sup>125</sup>

Thus, like Luis, we see that Fenton approaches the scriptural basis for Mary's queenship by making systematic theological deductions from other truths revealed in the New Testament. Fenton begins with the divine maternity, the fact of Mary's sufferings, and the way Christ merited His royal office through suffering on the Cross, and then draws the conclusion that Mary must be queen.

In a paper presented at the 1953 National Convention of the Mariological Society of America, F. Vandry stated in the first sentence that Mary's queenly role is not attested to in the Scriptures: "Although the Scriptures afford our faith no clear testimony of Mary's Queenship, nor of its universal nature, that dignity of the Mother of God is nevertheless acknowledged unanimously by the Christian Tradition."<sup>126</sup> Vandry rightly goes on to stress the need for the Church Fathers, liturgy, and magisterial teaching to shed light on Mary's royal office.

Still, Vandry does turn to the Scriptures—not to engage in exegesis, but to derive the queenship from other important themes found in the account of the Annunciation.<sup>127</sup> He argues that the Annunciation reveals that Mary not only consented to be the mother of Jesus, but also to share in His redemptive work. For Vandry, Luke's Annunciation scene presents Mary as accepting her Son precisely in His role as Savior and King. From this truth, he then derives the queenship:<sup>128</sup>

*Fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum.* It is in this consent . . . that the Virgin first appears as the Queen of the Kingdom of Christ. In consenting to become the Mother of the Savior-King, she has thereby accepted to share in the work of man's salvation as God has willed it, and in the eternal reign of Him who was to save the world. Again, it is not so much because of her consent to become the Mother of the divine Son that Mary is so intimately associated with the work of Redemption as such; more pertinently it is by reason of her acceptance of her Son in His role of Savior and of King. She has shared in His life of Savior and of King, so much so that it is no longer possible to conceive the Kingdom of Christ without seeing Mary by the side of her Son, the Queen seated at the right hand of the King.<sup>129</sup>

Here we can see rather clearly that Vandry is employing theological deduction. He deduces the queenship from other truths revealed in this passage (Mary's consent to become mother of the Savior and King)—truths which he argues associate Mary with her royal Son's redemptive work in such a way that she must have a share in His reign and, thus, must be queen.

At the same 1953 National Convention for the Mariological Society of America, E. Smith presented an entire paper specifically devoted to the biblical foundations for Mary's queenship. He primarily considers three passages: the protoevangelium, the woman in Revelation 12, and the Annunciation.

First, Smith supports a Marian interpretation of Genesis 3:15. He notes how the close union between “the woman” and “her seed” suggests that she will be given preeminence among women, with a possible hint of royal lineage. He also highlights how the victory of the woman and her seed “not only intimates dominative power over the devil and his seed, but implies a consequent dominion over those freed from the slavery of Satan.”<sup>130</sup> Smith concludes: “In Gen. 3:15, Our Blessed Lady is formally introduced as Christ’s intimate associate in the work of Redemption. Since it was precisely the redemptive task that won for Christ the title of King by right of conquest, it follows that Mary, too, [in] her capacity as Coredemptrix, shares Christ’s Kingship also by the right of conquest.”<sup>131</sup>

Considering the woman in Revelation 12, Smith mentions the debate among scholars as to whether the woman should be interpreted only in an ecclesial sense or whether the woman admits a Marian interpretation as well. He seems favorable to a Mariological interpretation, which would view the passage in parallel to Genesis 3:15. With the stars and moon surrounding this woman, Smith sees clear queenly prerogatives given to this woman in Revelation 12.<sup>132</sup>

As for the Annunciation account, Smith notes how Luke presents Mary’s consent as bringing about the Son whose kingdom will have no end. He concludes that Mary is made queen due to her union with the Word, who assumes the royalty of David’s throne at the moment of conception.

There is more than a theological inference here, inasmuch as the context provides a graphic picture of the intimate espousal of Our Lady with the Holy Spirit (Lk. 1:35), expressed in terminology too closely identified in Mother and Son not to have royal prerogatives correspondingly, as well as actually, present and communicated.<sup>133</sup>

During the discussion period at the convention, Smith was asked whether the queenship is formally contained in the

Annunciation account; Smith responded that it was.<sup>134</sup> He then summed up his paper by saying that the queenship is literally expressed in Genesis 3:15 and Revelation 12, and that her dominative power comes into existence at the Incarnation.<sup>135</sup>

Once again, we turn our attention to the approach taken by this scholar. Along these lines, we simply note that Smith also proceeds primarily by way of theological deduction. For example, we can see that his arguments from Genesis 3:15 (because Mary is linked to her Son's victory in this passage, she must have a share in His reign as queen) and the Annunciation (because of Mary's spousal-like relationship with the Holy Spirit and because of her intimate union with her Davidic Son, she must have a share in Christ's royal privileges) are secondary logical conclusions which remain a step removed from the actual biblical narratives that are referenced. This observation is not meant to diminish the contributions such theological deductions can offer; rather, it is meant simply to *distinguish* this method from other approaches, which will draw more fully on a consideration of Mary in the context of salvation history and remain closer to the narrative presentation of Mary in the New Testament.

In 1956, R. Peinador wrote an article specifically on the scriptural foundations for Mary's queenship.<sup>136</sup> In the beginning of this work, he argued that just because the queenship cannot be demonstrated by Scripture alone (apart from using sacred Tradition or making theological deductions), that does not mean the doctrine is not biblical. Tradition has the important role of transmitting truths revealed in Scripture and serves as an exegetical-theological criterion. Tradition does not impose an exterior meaning onto the biblical text, but can guarantee our subjective certitude of what is contained objectively in the text.<sup>137</sup> Peinador then sets out to show how the Scriptures in the literal sense offer at least some indications ("impressions")

of Mary's queenship.<sup>138</sup>

After examining the Annunciation and Visitation scenes, Peinador argues that, by accepting the message of the angel, Mary enters into the promises and reign of the new kingdom. Exegetically, one cannot say anything more than this. Still, he thinks these passages do provide some foundation for establishing the queenship. If Scripture says anything about her royal office, it will be in these texts primarily.<sup>139</sup> Since Luke 1 clearly demonstrates Christ's kingship, it is given for us to see the royalty of the woman by whom Christ became the royal Son of David and received human nature. Furthermore, since some Lukan texts also insinuate that Christ will reign as the Son of God, one can arrive at a deeper appreciation of Mary's queenship by seeing her as the mother of Him whose human kingship is rooted in divine kingship.<sup>140</sup> At the end of the article, Peinador admits that the Lukan texts do not directly express the fact of the queenship but that they do present her as the mother of Him who has come as the Messiah-King.<sup>141</sup> Thus, these texts do offer some indication of and foundation for Mary's royal office.

Considering the protoevangelium, Peinador argues that, since the woman of Genesis 3:15 appears with her seed victorious over the serpent, this victory constitutes her as a ruler in the new kingdom that has eliminated the serpent's reign.<sup>142</sup> Mary's reign can be supported by the proto-gospel if the victory over the serpent (and thus sin and death) is seen as bringing about the kingdom by Christ and Mary, and if Mary's queenship is viewed in light of her coredemptive and maternal mission.<sup>143</sup> Yet Peinador does not claim that the queenship is formally expressed in this text itself.<sup>144</sup>

As for the scene in Revelation 12, Peinador says if there is any support for Mary's queenship in this text, it depends on its relationship with the woman in Genesis 3:15.<sup>145</sup>

Peinador engages the biblical text more thoroughly than

the other scholars we have examined so far. He shows how Luke 1, Genesis 3:15, and Revelation 12 together offer some “impressions” of Mary’s queenship and some firm foundations upon which the queenship can be based.<sup>146</sup> Yet, like his predecessors who wrote on this topic, Peinador’s line of reasoning (e.g., Mary is the mother of the King; therefore, she is queen) on its own remains a step removed from what we find in the narrative presentation of Mary in the New Testament. Certainly, systematic logical deductions such as Peinador’s are valid and can be helpful for our understanding the queenship, especially in light of the subsequent tradition regarding Mary’s royal office, which has emerged over the centuries in the Church’s liturgical worship, theological reflection, and magisterial teaching. However, for the purposes of this study, we distinguish this method of theological deduction from other approaches that build their arguments even more fully from within the biblical worldview. As we will see, we can find further support for the jump from Mary as the mother of the Messiah-King to Mary as *queen* (which Peinador and others have made through a secondary theological deduction) if we consider her in light of the queen-mother theme that we find in salvation history.

In summary, we have examined a number of scholars who have approached the biblical foundations for Mary’s queenship by using secondary theological deduction. This method seeks to establish the biblical basis for the queenship first by beginning with important Mariological truths found in the Scriptures (e.g., the divine maternity, participation in Christ’s sufferings, etc.) and then by making systematic logical deductions based upon those truths which would lead to Mary’s royal office. While valid and often insightful, we simply note that this approach primarily applies logic *to* the sacred texts, instead of building more closely upon the logic found *in* the texts. In other words, it does not take advantage

of the important insights that can be gained from a more thorough investigation of Mary—both within the context of salvation history and within the narrative structures and inter-textual relationships found in the Marian passages of the New Testament. We will later see that such an investigation could in fact have the additional benefit of supplementing and strengthening some of the conclusions made through theological deduction. In particular, we will see that understanding Mary in light of the queen-mother tradition in salvation history can help shed even more light from a biblical perspective on the connection between the related Marian truths in Scripture (e.g., the fact that Mary is mother of the Messiah) and the theological conclusion that the method of theological deduction seeks to offer (i.e., that Mary has some queenly role, sharing in her royal Son's reign).

### 1.2.3 “Extra-Biblical” Typology

Now we will examine a third way the Scriptures have been used to support Mary's queenship: the use of what one scholar has called “extra scriptural” typology. This approach views certain feminine royal figures of the Old Testament as prefiguring Mary in her queenship in a typological sense. For example, some have considered how people such as Andrew of Crete, Pope Benedict XIV, Conrad of Saxony, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Richard of St. Lawrence, Bernardino of Busti, Gabriel Biel, and Saint Peter Canisius have viewed Esther as a figure of Mary.<sup>147</sup> Similarly, the royal woman in Psalm 44:10 has been considered a prefiguring of Mary in her queenship by Athanasius, Aquinas, Bonaventure, and in the ancient liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom.<sup>148</sup> It has also been pointed out that the royal Wisdom figure of the Sapiential Books has been used in the liturgy in reference to Mary in her queenship.<sup>149</sup>

After evaluating these possible typologies, however, scholars such as Luis, Iglesias, and Peinador conclude that these Old

Testament figures cannot be used as direct theological arguments in favor of Mary's queenship. These scholars argue that, for these Old Testament figures to be considered with certitude types of Mary, such a connection must be established within the Sacred Scriptures or in the Tradition of the Church.<sup>150</sup> Until such a connection is clearly shown to exist, these texts on their own cannot be given probative value for establishing the biblical foundations of Mary's queenship.

Eustice Smith seems to go even a step further. He argues that to build the strongest case for a Marian typology the connection must be made by the New Testament writers themselves. Considering Mary's queenship, Smith mentions how tradition has applied Psalm 44:10 to Mary and how the liturgy has used Wisdom texts (Wis. 8:22–36 and Sirach 24:11–25) in reference to Mary. He concludes, however, that these “types” have been established by “extra scriptural agents” (by the liturgy, the saints, and theologians in the Catholic tradition) and are not developed within the Scriptures themselves. Thus, for Smith, while these texts might be used collaboratively to support the queenship of Mary, they do not have the same force as those typologies that are actually drawn out in the New Testament.<sup>151</sup>

Types or figures foreshadowing the Blessed Virgin undoubtedly exist in the Old Testament. Difficulty with the typical sense in this regard is had in the fact that persons, events, and things have been employed as symbols by *extra scriptural agents*. . . . A mariological type must conform to all the requirements of a messianic type and above all, that *it be revealed as such in Scripture*.<sup>152</sup>

This raises an important issue. There seems to be a distinction between (1) types and figures that are developed by “extra scriptural agents,” such as the Church Fathers, the liturgy, or conciliar teaching, and (2) those that are developed in the

New Testament.

The Pontifical Biblical Commission (PBC), in its 1993 document *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*, seems to make a similar distinction. This can be seen in the document's discussion of the "*sensus plenior*," which the commission defines as "a deeper meaning of the text, intended by God but not clearly expressed by the human author."<sup>153</sup> The PBC sets forth two different ways that the fuller sense of a biblical text can be known. First, there is a level of *sensus plenior*, which comes to be known when the Scriptures are read in the light of "authentic doctrinal tradition or a conciliar definition."<sup>154</sup> For example, the PBC mentions how patristic teaching about the Trinity "expresses the fuller sense of the teaching of the New Testament regarding God the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit."<sup>155</sup> In this case, the fuller sense of the Scriptures is known by an extra-biblical source, the teaching of the Church Fathers.

This is distinguished from an inter-biblical level of *sensus plenior*, which is found in "the meaning that a subsequent biblical author attributes to an earlier biblical text, taking it up in a context which *confers upon it a new literal sense*."<sup>156</sup> Here, the fuller sense is found not in a post-biblical agent but in the literal sense of the New Testament itself.<sup>157</sup>

The PBC document makes a similar point when discussing typology.<sup>158</sup> The document states that an authentic typological sense of Scripture is found in the connections made by the New Testament writers: "The connection involved in typology is ordinarily based on the way in which *Scripture* describes the ancient reality (cf. the voice of Abel: Gen 4:10; Heb 11:4; 12:24) and not simply on the reality itself. Consequently, in such a case one can speak of *a meaning that is truly scriptural*."<sup>159</sup> Note how the document describes this typology as "truly scriptural." It is not based on the way extra-biblical sources—such as the Church Fathers, the liturgy, or Church

councils—reflect on Old Testament people, places, events, and institutions. Rather, it is based on the way subsequent *scriptural* texts describe those ancient realities. Here again, the PBC gives special attention to Scripture as the criterion for determining an authentic typological sense.<sup>160</sup>

In summary, the key difference between the two kinds of typology is this: *Extra-biblical typology* involves the creative discernment of the theologian, who perceives connections between the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Christian faith; *inter-biblical typology* can be observed in the New Testament writer's interpretation of the Old Testament. In this later case, it is the New Testament itself that points out how a particular Old Testament figure foreshadows a reality in the New. Both approaches have value, but extra-biblical typology remains a step removed from the Scriptures themselves, and therefore seems secondary to the inter-biblical typology found in the literal sense of the New Testament itself. As Raymond Brown has noted, "Advocates of typical exegesis have been more persuasive when the types they proposed could be related to patterns already supported *in the Scriptures*, e.g., Davidic typology for Jesus, exodus typology for elements of the Christian salvific mysteries."<sup>161</sup>

All of this background is helpful for a balanced consideration of the extent to which Old Testament figures such as Esther, Judith, the woman of Psalm 44, or "Lady Wisdom" may serve as biblical foundations for Mary's queenship. We would conclude that unless it can be demonstrated that the New Testament portrays Mary as the fulfillment of these figures, these typologies should be considered "extra-biblical" as opposed to "inter-biblical," since the connections do not seem to be found in the actual portrayal of Mary in the New Testament itself. This should in no way downplay the important contributions these extra-biblical typologies can make toward understanding Mary's queenship.<sup>162</sup> Rather, it is sim-

ply meant to draw attention to the fact that these typologies are not made by the New Testament writers and thus are one step removed from the New Testament presentation of Mary.

#### **1.2.4 Salvation-Historical Approach: Mary as the New Queen Mother**

We will now consider one final approach for demonstrating the biblical foundations of Mary's queenship. Especially since Vatican II, many scholars addressing this topic have taken a salvation-historical approach, using the Old Testament queen-mother tradition as the primary backdrop for understanding Mary's queenship. In the late 1950s and 1960s, scholars such as H. Cazelles,<sup>163</sup> A. Del Moral,<sup>164</sup> D. Stanley,<sup>165</sup> B. Ahern,<sup>166</sup> C. Stuhlmueller<sup>167</sup> and R. Laurentin<sup>168</sup> specifically used this theme in order to explain Mary's royal office. A number of them discussed how in several ancient Near Eastern kingdoms the queen-mother figure was given a special place ruling in the royal court.<sup>169</sup> They also examined how various biblical texts in 1 and 2 Kings and in the Book of Jeremiah show that, in the kingdom of Judah, the queen mother held an official position as queen, participating in her son's reign by serving as an advocate for the people and as a counselor to her son.<sup>170</sup> It is commonly noted how Bathsheba gained considerable power when she became queen mother after her son Solomon assumed the throne. Pointing to a scene in 1 Kings 2, many have shown how King Solomon honors his queen mother by bowing before her, having her sit at his right hand, and saying he will grant her any request she makes. Some scholars also demonstrate how the queen-mother figure plays an important role in two passages from Israel's tradition, which eventually became associated to some extent with the Messiah: Isaiah 7:14 and Genesis 3:15 closely associate a royal mother with her royal son and his work.<sup>171</sup> These scholars conclude that, with this Old Testament background in mind,

Mary should be understood as the queen mother in the new kingdom of her Son.<sup>172</sup> For example, in the New Testament, Mary and Jesus are shown as fulfilling Isaiah 7:14 (Mt. 1:22–3; Lk. 1:26–31), thus connecting Mary with the queen-mother concept.<sup>173</sup> Most of these scholars also point out how Mary is queen mother by turning to the Visitation scene, where Elizabeth calls Mary “the mother of my Lord”—words probably used in reference to the queen mother in the Old Testament.<sup>174</sup>

All these themes (and more) will be treated much more extensively in chapters two and three, in which I will draw upon the insights of these and other scholars. At this point, I only intend to underscore *the approach* taken by these scholars. Note how they do not arrive at the queenship by making abstract correlations from certain truths found in the Scriptures (theological deduction). Nor do they seek to base Mary’s queenship primarily on a typology that has not been clearly demonstrated to be found in the New Testament itself (extra-biblical typology). Rather, they place Mary in the context of salvation history, in which we find a pattern of a queenly mother being intimately associated in the reign of her royal Son. With this background in mind, they then proceed to show how the New Testament portrays Mary in ways that recall this queen-mother tradition of ancient Israel. They conclude that, because she is the mother of the messianic Davidic King, Mary can be seen as the queen mother in the kingdom of her Son. Therefore, by presenting Mary’s royal office in terms of the biblical view of queenship in the Davidic kingdom, this approach more deeply allows the Scriptures to guide our understanding of the queenship, and thus has much to offer in terms of biblical support for this doctrine.

The most extensive treatment to date on this subject has been George Kirwin’s 1973 doctoral dissertation, *The Nature of the Queenship of Mary*. Kirwin does excellent work sum-

marizing the development of this doctrine—highlighting attestations of Mary's queenship in the Church Fathers, magisterial teachings, and liturgy, as well as in theological writings, sacred art, and popular piety throughout the centuries.<sup>175</sup> He also provides an excellent overview and critique of the more rationalistic, deductive approaches of the two major schools of thought on Mary's queenship from earlier this century, represented by De Gruyter and Nicolas (which we briefly looked at above).<sup>176</sup> Following the call of Vatican II, Kirwin rightly emphasized the need for a biblical salvation-historical methodology for approaching Marian doctrine.<sup>177</sup> This is the method he seeks to employ in treating Mary's queenship. Building on the insights of some scholars before him, Kirwin attempts to trace the queen-mother tradition throughout salvation history, placing this theme at the heart of his presentation on Mary's queenship.<sup>178</sup>

In his fourth chapter (entitled "Mary: Queen Mother in Salvation History"), Kirwin summarizes the role of the queen mother in the ancient Near East<sup>179</sup> and in the monarchies of ancient Israel.<sup>180</sup> He then argues that some of Israel's key messianic prophecies (Gen. 3:15; Is. 7:14; Mic. 5:2) place the queen mother in an important role, linked with her royal son's messianic work.<sup>181</sup> However, although he gives a good treatment of the queen-mother theme throughout the Old Testament, Kirwin does not go on to demonstrate adequately the New Testament presentation of Mary in light of this background. After completing his examination of the queen-mother theme in the Davidic monarchy (by evaluating 1 and 2 Kings and Jeremiah 13 and 22) and the importance of the queen mother in key Old Testament messianic prophecies (by examining Genesis 3:15, Isaiah 7:14, and Micah 5:2), the reader would expect Kirwin to go on and evaluate specific New Testament texts, in order to show how this queen-mother background can illuminate Mary's role in the kingdom of her messianic

Son. Rather surprisingly, however, it is just at this point that he ends his study of the queen-mother theme in the Scriptures.<sup>182</sup> He does not carry it into the New Testament; instead, he simply states: “It is probable that this queen-mother [of Gen. 3:15, Is. 7:14 and Mic. 5:2] is Mary and that to appreciate her significance in salvation history one must look to the Gebirah tradition since this is the setting in which the Messiah and His Mother have been placed by God.”<sup>183</sup>

Although Kirwin thoroughly demonstrated the importance of the queen mother in the Old Testament, he did not examine New Testament texts in any extensive way in order to show how Mary should be understood in light of that background. While pertinent New Testament passages are mentioned briefly at different points throughout his thesis,<sup>184</sup> his treatment of New Testament texts is sparse and unsystematic. For example, Kirwin devotes only five pages to a specific treatment of Revelation 12.<sup>185</sup> Furthermore, pertinent Lukan,<sup>186</sup> Matthean,<sup>187</sup> and other Johannine passages<sup>188</sup> are nowhere treated on their own in order to support the queenship. These relevant New Testament texts are sometimes mentioned either in passing or in the context of reporting a history of modern scholarship on this topic. Yet this is ironic. Although Kirwin’s work calls for a biblical salvation-historical approach to Mary’s queenship, his thesis seems to give much more attention to reporting what scholars say about Mary’s queenship in the New Testament than it does to examining what the New Testament texts themselves say about this topic. This is most apparent in the first chapter, which devotes thirty-two pages to the scriptural basis of Mary’s queenship.<sup>189</sup> One would expect to find an evaluation of particular *biblical texts* (with insights from scholarship used to shed light on the meaning of those texts). Instead, it reports what *recent scholarship* has said about the scriptural foundations for the queenship, evaluating one theologian after another. Unlike Kirwin’s more thorough treatment

of the Old Testament, in which he studied how various biblical texts present the queen mother in the life of the Davidic monarchy and in Israel's prophecies, his approach to the New Testament seems to use contemporary scholarship as the primary point of departure, not the Scriptures themselves.

Over the twenty-five years since Kirwin's thesis, biblical and Mariological studies have provided a number of insights that strengthen the queen-mother theme as a primary biblical lens for viewing Mary's queenship.

For example, some scholars have contributed to a deeper understanding of the role of the queen mother in ancient Israel.<sup>190</sup> There also has been a greater appreciation for the Davidic kingdom themes in Matthew 1–2, which have led some to argue more clearly that Mary is being presented as the new queen mother in these passages.<sup>191</sup> Some works have helped strengthen positions that see queen-mother allusions in the Lukan Annunciation and Visitation scenes.<sup>192</sup> Other studies in Johannine theology have helped strengthen the Marian sense of Revelation 12, which is important for demonstrating Mary's queenship in this passage, especially in light of the queen mother.<sup>193</sup> Also, having firmly grounded Mary's royal office in the Scriptures with the queen-mother theme, a number of scholars have gone on to elaborate on the nature of the queenship<sup>194</sup> and to shed light on other Marian doctrines,<sup>195</sup> as well as other areas of theology.<sup>196</sup> These and other themes will be treated more extensively in the next three chapters. However, at this point, we simply wish to highlight that with all these new insights into our topic, there certainly is a need to synthesize the significant contributions made by scholarship in the past twenty-five years. Such an endeavor would deeply enrich our understanding of the biblical foundations of Mary's queenship.

In summary, although a number of scholars have recognized the Old Testament queen mother as a backdrop for understand-

ing Mary,<sup>197</sup> few have attempted to develop these insights fully into a biblical theology of Mary's royal office.<sup>198</sup> Kirwin's work surely stands out among the rest as the project that has offered the most extensive treatment. Yet, as we have seen, there have been many important scholarly insights since the time of Kirwin's thesis that need to be incorporated into the development of the queen-mother theme; also, Kirwin's very effort to present the biblical foundations of this doctrine in light of this theme could be significantly strengthened by a more thorough treatment of New Testament texts and by systematically demonstrating the implications of such an approach for understanding the significance of Mary's royal office.

That is why in this study, while we certainly will build upon the important work of Kirwin, we will go beyond him in three ways. First, and most significantly, this project will offer a more thorough treatment of the pertinent Lukan, Matthean, and Johannine texts, in order to clearly demonstrate how the queen-mother tradition can help illuminate the New Testament presentation of Mary. As we saw above, this was something Kirwin did not adequately demonstrate or even attempt to treat in any extensive manner. Second, we will incorporate a number of insights from recent biblical studies and Mariology that have significant bearing on our topic—insights that came after the time Kirwin's thesis was written. And thirdly, we will show how the biblical methodology employed in our treatment of Mary's queenship can help make significant contributions to our communicating the meaning of Mary's queenship in the modern world.



In closing, we have seen in this chapter how Mary's queenship is firmly rooted in the Church's Tradition and magisterial teachings, although the biblical foundations for

her royal office have not always been as clear. While evaluating the common ways scholars have used Scripture to demonstrate this doctrine, we saw that many approach the scriptural basis of Mary's queenship in terms of proof-texts, theological deduction, and extra-biblical typology. Whatever light these approaches may shed on Mary's queenship, we noted that they do not take advantage of the valuable insights that can be gained from a deeper investigation of Mary within the context of salvation history, and within the narrative structures and intertextual relationships found in the Marian passages of the New Testament. Thus, while often valid and insightful, these approaches should be distinguished from those that build their theology on a more holistic narrative reading of Marian passages in the context of salvation-history. This is the approach we will take, giving special attention to the biblical queen-mother theme, which can serve as an important backdrop for understanding Mary in the New Testament.

Our salvation-historical approach to Mary's queenship will take on the following shape: First (in chapter two), we will examine the role of the queen mother in the Davidic kingdom and then show how the queen-mother theme sheds light on the mother-son prophecies of Isaiah 7:14 and Genesis 3:15. With this background, we will then examine (in chapter three) how the New Testament portrays Mary, the mother of the Messiah-King, in ways that recall the queen-mother figure of the Old Testament. Finally (in chapter four), we will provide some summary conclusions and offer a few brief suggestions on how the biblical theological approach taken in this book can enhance our understanding of the *meaning* of Mary's queenship (highlighting the Christological and ecclesiological dimensions of this doctrine) and have some value for ecumenical dialogue as well.

This approach truly allows the Scriptures to guide our views of the queenship—not the other way around. De Fiores

argues that such a biblical theology not only will help preserve the traditional content of Mary's royal title but also will enrich it with a broader, non-culturally bound meaning that will have more significance for Christians of our time. He proposes a two-fold approach: "Return to the Bible in order to understand the queenship of Mary in the context of Christ and the people of God, and give attention to the culture of our time in order to translate in more simple terms the content and significance of Queen Mary."<sup>199</sup>

One last note: while this study focuses on a biblical theology of Mary's queenship, it is my hope that the methodology employed here will have contributions not only for Mariology, but also for systematic theology as a whole. We have seen (above) some of the problems that can arise when theology remains detached from the Scriptures, when *a priori* notions are imposed upon the biblical texts, or when the Scriptures are used more as proofs than as actual sources of revelation. Yet Vatican II has insisted that Scripture be the very soul of sacred theology.<sup>200</sup> Hence, in an age of specialization when the distance between biblical scholarship and dogmatic theology has greatly widened,<sup>201</sup> I hope the results of this study will implicitly show the profound rewards of building a dogmatic theology that gives primacy to the referential language of the Bible,<sup>202</sup> which uses salvation history to guide its systematization of doctrine,<sup>203</sup> and which allows itself to be truly animated by the Sacred Scriptures.<sup>204</sup>