

Chapter 1 : Mary, the Bride of God Part 2: Church Teaching

The words of the "espoused virgin" at this time, are not any different from those she has uttered to her beloved "Solomon," from the very beginning of the Gospel age; for they do most beautifully express her hopes—"Come quickly, Lord."

By Antonia Blumberg Laurie Malashanko is one of just a few hundred women in the United States who have vowed to remain lifelong virgins in service to the Catholic Church. It was the first time the Archdiocese of Detroit had ever performed such a ceremony. There are fewer than consecrated virgins in the U. The little-known vocation, or calling, existed in the time of the ancient church before any orders of nuns had emerged. But consecrated virgins all but disappeared around the 12th century as women began joining religious orders and living in communities. The vocation emerged again at the time of Vatican II. To have their commitments recognized by the archdiocese, Malashanko and the other women had to meet with spiritual directors, study the scriptures and pray regularly. Overall the process took several years and included an application with reference letters and personal essays. Being a consecrated virgin, and not a nun, means Malashanko lives independently, has a full-time job, and organizes her time as she sees fit. That includes attending daily Masses and praying up to several hours a day, in both spontaneous and structured moments. Nuns, by contrast, mostly live in communities of sisters where their time is highly routinized. Archdiocese of Detroit Malashanko prostrates during her consecration as a lifelong virgin in service to the church. HuffPost interviewed Malashanko about her choice to become a consecrated virgin and what that life has in store for her: What was your religious upbringing like? I was raised Catholic, and as a child I always prayed for everyone. A lot of girls like me might have chosen to become a nun. Whatever guy I was with felt like an intrusion, a third wheel. I dated throughout my teens and in college. Why did you choose to become a consecrated virgin instead? For a religious sister, where he leads her is structure and community. Her day is protected and structured. She also gives up certain freedoms. With my vocation, my freedom is wide open. I really thrive on that flexibility. It was really moving how many people came and how solemn it was. It was a serenely happy day for me. We all wore white, and we each received three things from the archbishop: Other than my funeral this is the biggest event of my life, my mystical marriage to Christ. Archdiocese of Detroit Malashanko said each women got to pick out a wedding band before the ceremony. What does it mean to you to be married to Christ? That mimics human terms too much. But remember, in the Catholic Church every priest is espoused to the church. In our theology, spouse is a much richer term. What do you imagine will be some of the challenges of your path? From the time I was a little girl I was very maternal. But when I realized this was my vocation I knew I could have a full and happy life without children. We just channel it into something else. The older I get, the more life feels very full and very busy. This interview has been edited for length and clarity.

Chapter 2 : Topical Bible: Espoused

A Virgin espoused to an husband, longeth for the wedding day. So the Church longeth for the return of the Bridegroom, when Christ will take her to himself. "the marriage of the Lamb is come," Revelation [7] Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.

E-mail By word and deed, Mary, the mother of Jesus, teaches devoted followers of her son about the significant virtues of a true disciple. Her mission had been recorded throughout ancient scripture. From the angel Gabriel, who was sent from God to declare glad tidings to her, Mary learned that she was the one to fulfill these ancient prophecies. The Lord is with thee, for thou art chosen and blessed among women. Following the announcement, Mary had a simple inquiry: Prior to the angelic visitation, Mary had become espoused to Joseph the carpenter. It was roughly analogous to being engaged to be married. From this angelic messenger, Mary learned that she was to be the mother of the Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father in the flesh. The child would inherit the physical, mental, and spiritual traits characterized by his parents—one the glorified God; the other a worthy, blessed mortal woman. In humbly accepting this opportunity of motherhood, Mary exemplifies the quality of obedience to which all disciples aspire. This glorious meeting of two chosen women is unparalleled in recorded history. As the expectant mother of John welcomed the expectant mother of the Savior of mankind into her home, Mary openly expressed her joy to Elisabeth, exclaiming: The third recorded witness God sent Mary occurred in Bethlehem. Each Jew was to be registered for taxation at his ancestral home, and so Mary and Joseph, who were of the royal house of David, set out for their ancestral home—a small pastoral and agricultural town located about six miles southwest of Jerusalem called Bethlehem. Soon thereafter, shepherds came to see the newborn infant and became witnesses of the Son of God. In doing so, the shepherds became prototypes of the Christian missionaries, witnessing to all what they had seen and heard. The fourth time the scriptures say Mary received witness and counsel concerning her chosen son occurred at the temple in Jerusalem. Mary and Joseph complied with the Mosaic purification law, which required all women to remain in retirement for forty days after childbirth. After forty days, she and Joseph brought Jesus to the temple. At the temple were two witnesses, Simeon and Anna. Simeon blessed them and specifically spoke to Mary, reaffirming to her the divine calling of her son. Included in his praise was the reminder to Mary of the difficult earthly experiences her child would have. Mary also received a visit from wise men from the East. Each of these servants, in their varying walks of life, assured Mary of her blessed state in the eyes of God. Mary lived so as to be receptive to their messages. Her life was one of faithful, obedient receptivity. However brief, these passages clearly show Mary as a follower of Jesus. For example, when Mary sought for Jesus in Jerusalem following the feast of the Passover, she found him in the temple. Mary did not reprimand or insist upon parental prerogative, for it appears she knew her son was not dishonoring her but rather honoring his divine Father. Another example of Jesus manifesting respect for his mother while glorifying God occurred at a marriage feast in Cana, a town neighboring Nazareth. And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home. The life of Jesus was one of glorifying God. He fulfilled ancient prophecies regarding his ministry, atonement, death, and resurrection. His life is worthy of emulation. His mother, too, is worthy of our acknowledgment for her righteous discipleship. Illustration by Del Parson.

Chapter 3 : HEBREW - VIRGIN

But remember, in the Catholic Church every priest is espoused to the church. In our theology, spouse is a much richer term. To be mystically espoused to Christ is to be a sign of the world to come.

What does the Gospel mean when it refers to Mary as the "espoused wife" of Joseph? An "espousal" or "betrothal" is a formal agreement to marry. In modern American terms it would be something more than an engagement, yet less than a marriage. In the Jewish culture of New Testament times, a young woman became marriageable at age twelve and a half. At a ceremony of betrothal, the bride and groom would exchange marital consent, but normally the bride would remain in the house of her father for somewhere between three months and a year. Marriage had the aspect of a man acquiring title to his bride, and only later did he acquire actual possession. We know that Mary and Joseph had completed the contract of betrothal from the testimony given by St. Verse 18 speaks of them being "betrothed" It obviously has to have followed the Annunciation Luke i: No mention is made of Joseph in the narrative of the Visitation Luke i: The Church celebrates the espousal of Mary and Joseph on January 23rd, which would put a July or August wedding celebration nicely within the three to twelve months normally observed. A Homily of St. Jerome, Priest Book 1 of the Commentary on Matthew, ch 1. Why must she who conceives the Lord be not simply a virgin, but a betrothed virgin? First, that through genealogy of Joseph the Davidic origin of Mary may be demonstrated. Second that she might not be stoned as an adulteress by the Jews. Third, that she may have a protector during the flight into Egypt. The qualification, "before they came together" does not imply that afterwards they did come together. The Scripture is merely indicating that up to this time they had not done so. The question is not to the point. What he knew was not her crime there was none to be known, but her chastity. What he did not know was the mystery of how she had conceived; and by his silence he kept hidden from the public the circumstance that was a source of wonder to him. Matins of the Vigil of Christmas.

Q&A From the August AD Our Lady of the Rosary Parish Bulletin Question: What does the Gospel mean when it refers to Mary as the "espoused wife" of Joseph? (CSG).

Previous Questions and Answers Is there a contradiction between the Book of Matthew and the Book of Luke in regard to whether Joseph and Mary were just engaged, or actually married, when Jesus was born? Luke and Matthew seem to tell different stories here. When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David: And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. Reading just the Book of Matthew, a person may assume that Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost; but after a restless night of considering divorce, and then an appearance of the angel of the Lord, Joseph got up in the morning and married her. Whereas, reading just the Book of Luke, a person may assume that Joseph and Mary are still just engaged when the baby Jesus is born. The key is putting both passages together. And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: For with God nothing shall be impossible. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her. One, was to confirm what the angel had told her, that Elisabeth was also expecting in her old age. Two, it would give her some time to know how to break the news to Joseph. So we know right now that Joseph was not immediately made aware that Mary was expecting. It would have been very difficult to explain, after she rushed right off for three months; and then when she came back after all that time, she was expecting. Humanly-speaking, it would have been very easy to assume that she was unfaithful to Joseph while she was up in the hill country. We must also remember that their clothing was much more modest back in those days, and it would have been much more difficult to tell when a woman with child began to actually show the growth of the baby in the womb. We must also understand that husbands and wives who experience unfaithful mates go through mood swings. One moment, they are in tears and confirm their love toward their erring, but repentant mates. But the next hour or day, they may fight back great feelings of anger or resentment. It is a great battle to get an immoral mate to repent, and sometimes an even greater battle to get a hurt mate to forgive. What we end up with in this situation with Joseph and Mary, is that when she arrived back home, there was about six months before the birth. As was previously stated, we do not know when Mary actually told him that she was expecting. Being this was her first baby, and the modesty of the dress, it could have been a number of months before she actually began to show. Once she did tell Joseph, he obviously went through periods of affirmation of his love for her, and periods of doubt about her faithfulness. From the Scriptures, we know that it was an extreme struggle for him, right up until days before the birth. The struggle would have become much more intense as the birth drew nigh. Instead, he decided to "put her away privily. For the reasons why, please see Marriage Bible Course, Part 5. It seems that Joseph had decided to follow through with the private divorce. It was when Joseph was thinking about all of this, that the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream. This is what Joseph needed, a confirmation from the Scriptures. Which tells us that it was on the way, or while they were there, that Joseph struggled with these decisions; the angel of the Lord appeared to him; and he obeyed and married her. The

marriage was definitely before the birth of Jesus, because it clearly states in Matthew 1: It just takes study on our part to put all of the pieces together.

Chapter 5 : Luke KJV - To a virgin espoused to a man whose - Bible Gateway

Luke King James Version (KJV). 27 To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary.

Whether Christ should have been born of an espoused virgin? It would seem that Christ should not have been born of an espoused virgin. For espousals are ordered to carnal intercourse. Therefore she should not have been espoused. Further, that Christ was born of a virgin was miraculous, whence Augustine says Ep. If we are told why this happened, it will cease to be wonderful; if another instance be alleged, it will no longer be unique. Since, therefore, by her Espousals this miracle would be less evident, it seems that it was unfitting that Christ should be born of an espoused virgin. Further, the martyr Ignatius, as Jerome says on Matthew 1: First, because by his natural cunning he knows whatever takes place in bodies. Secondly, because later on the demons, through many evident signs, knew Christ after a fashion: What have we to do with Thee, Jesus of Nazareth? Art Thou come to destroy us? Thou art the Holy one of God. Further, Jerome gives as another reason, "lest the Mother of God should be stoned by the Jews as an adulteress. Therefore it does not seem reasonable that Christ should be born of an espoused virgin. On the contrary, It is written Matthew 1: For the sake of Christ Himself, for four reasons. First, lest He should be rejected by unbelievers as illegitimate: Thus Ambrose says on Luke 3: Now for this purpose, it is the men that are required, because they represent the family in the senate and other courts. The custom of the Scriptures, too, shows that the ancestry of the men is always traced out. Hence Ignatius says that she was espoused "that the manner of His Birth might be hidden from the devil. It was also fitting for the sake of the Virgin. First, because thus she was rendered exempt from punishment; that is, "lest she should be stoned by the Jews as an adulteress," as Jerome says. Secondly, that thus she might be safeguarded from ill fame. Whence Ambrose says on Luke 1: This was fitting, again, for our sake. If she had not been espoused when pregnant, she would seem to have wished to hide her sin by a lie: Thirdly, that all excuse be removed from those virgins who, through want of caution, fall into dishonor. A fifth reason may be added: Reply to Objection 1. We must believe that the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, desired, from an intimate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to be espoused, being confident that by the help of God she would never come to have carnal intercourse: Wherefore she suffered nothing in detriment to her virginity. Reply to Objection 2. As Ambrose says on Luke 1: For he knew the delicacy of virgin modesty, and how easily the fair name of chastity is disparaged: Wherefore our Lord wished these to be more hidden, that belief in them might have greater merit. Whereas other miracles are for the strengthening of faith: Reply to Objection 3. As Augustine says De Trin. Thus it may be that by his natural power the devil could know that the Mother of God knew not man, but was a virgin; yet was prevented by God from knowing the manner of the Divine Birth. That afterwards the devil after a fashion knew that He was the Son of God, makes no difficulty: But during His infancy it behooved the malice of the devil to be withheld, lest he should persecute Him too severely: Hence Pope Leo Serm. For, after giving the above reason—namely, that the prince of the world might be deceived—he continues thus: The sentence of adulteresses according to the Law was that they should be stoned, not only if they were already espoused or married, but also if their maidenhood were still under the protection of the paternal roof, until the day when they enter the married state. Thus it is written Deuteronomy Now a virgin of the priestly tribe was condemned to death for whoredom; for we read Leviticus

Whether there was a true marriage between Mary and Joseph? It would seem that there was no true marriage between Mary and Joseph. Therefore there was no true marriage between Mary and Joseph. Further, on Matthew 1: Therefore, there was no true marriage between the Blessed Virgin and Joseph. Further, it is written Matthew 1: Catena Aurea in Matth. Therefore, it seems that, as the wedding was not yet solemnized, there was no true marriage: On the contrary, Augustine says De Consensu Evang. For by this example the faithful are taught that if after marriage they remain continent by mutual consent, their union is still and is rightly called marriage, even without intercourse of the sexes. Now perfection of anything is twofold; first, and second. The first perfection of a thing consists in its very form, from which it receives its species; while the second perfection of a thing consists in its operation, by which in some way a thing attains its end. Now the form of

matrimony consists in a certain inseparable union of souls , by which husband and wife are pledged by a bond of mutual affection that cannot be sundered. And the end of matrimony is the begetting and upbringing of children: Thus we may say, as to the first perfection, that the marriage of the Virgin Mother of God and Joseph was absolutely true: For this reason the angel calls Mary the wife of Joseph , saying to him Matthew 1: Wherefore Ambrose says on Luke 1: The fact of her marriage is declared, not to insinuate the loss of virginity , but to witness to the reality of the union. Thus Augustine says De Nup. The offspring we know to have been the Lord Jesus ; faith , for there was no adultery: Carnal intercourse alone there was none. Jerome uses the term "husband" in reference to marriage consummated. By marriage Jerome means the nuptial intercourse. As Chrysostom says Hom. Chrysostom the Blessed Virgin was so espoused to Joseph that she dwelt in his home: Wherefore the words, "not willing to take her away" are better rendered as meaning, "not willing publicly to expose her," than understood of taking her to his house. Hence the evangelist adds that "he was minded to put her away privately. Therefore, as Chrysostom says Hom. For it was the custom among the ancients for espoused maidens to enter frequently the houses of them to whom they were betrothed. But the first is more in keeping with the Gospel narrative. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis.

Chapter 6 : Mary, His Mother - ensign

The consecrated virgin living in the world, as expressed in Canon , is irrevocably "consecrated to God, mystically espoused to Christ and dedicated to the service of the Church, when the diocesan bishop consecrates [her] according to the approved liturgical rite."

Because the Lord has been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: God says that He is witness of the covenant made between a husband and wife. Vs 15 And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. Compare also Matt God at this time joins them together, this speaks of the consummation of a marriage. There are many other things that man has added to this, but they account for nothing. People all over the world have differing wedding and marriage customs, and some of these traditions do not include God. But as long as there are these two elements God will join a couple together. He is a witness of the vows made and joins them together when the marriage is consummated, unless of course the marriage is sinful in which case it is regarded as adultery. I say marriage customs, not wedding customs, because the point of our discussion is how a Jewish couple becomes married. Weddings are not necessarily a part of what binds a couple together in marriage. Customs and traditions according to the Bible and the way God looks at things can be partly or even completely made up of man-made things, so that these traditions and customs have little importance in the things of God. I am not saying that this is a bad thing, a wedding is a happy moment to be enjoyed and remembered. Until fairly recently it has been a custom not a rule , that couples would wait a long time, often a year or even more between betrothal and marriage. This waiting period has become shorter and shorter until they, as we do , have the two together. To understand this we must look to the next point. It is important for us to understand the difference between an engagement and a Jewish betrothal. We would tend to think that they are the same. In fact, they are described as the same in my dictionary, but there is a vast difference between the two. A betrothal in the past was the legal side of the marriage for Jewish people; it is, in fact, a covenant. The Jewish people call it kiddushin betrothal. There is no set way to do this, but quite commonly it was done by the payment of a bride price in the presence of two witnesses, and reciting the marriage formula, "Thou art consecrated to me according to the law of Moses and of Israel. This reserved the young woman for him until the day of the wedding ceremony after which the marriage would be consummated by the two becoming one flesh having intercourse. They know that this is done when they are betrothed, and we know this is done at the altar. This is very clear in our minds that the wedding day is the day of no turning back. Just as it is clear in the mind of the Jewish people when they are betrothed according to their customs. Although of course, some of them break these vows just as some of us. Nevertheless a traditional Jewish betrothal is taken very seriously because this is their vow. So an engagement may be called off at any time, and for any reason because no vows are made, but rather they agree to make those vows at a later date. This is why sometimes in the Bible a wife can be called a wife before she is actually married, a man may also be called a husband in the same situation, father-in-law, son-in-law, etc. The Bible may also say married when actually betrothed. Also, it may say adultery instead of fornication. But adultery cannot be called fornication. Because one takes a vow when they are betrothed it is understandable how one can be considered married. If the person fornicates it could be called adultery. All we can do is accept that fact and try to reach for the meaning of the Word. Because to call fornication adultery, is showing the strength and importance of a covenant by exaggeration. But to call adultery fornication lessens the strength and importance of the covenant. Once one has made a covenant and consummated it, to lessen the value of an extra marital affair and broken vows from adultery to fornication would be a little odd. So adultery may be fornication, but fornication cannot be adultery. So far the information I have shared with you has come from a book which can be borrowed from the library. I do not have it with me at the moment so I hope these details are correct, if not I am sure there is more out there. I think it is World of weddings by Murphy B. There is further proof of this written in the Dake Bible Matt chapter 1 top of fourth column a. Which says, Espousal among Hebrews was the only legal part of marriage,

and could not be broken off except by a bill of divorce. All legal documents were signed and contracts completed at this time. All contracts specified a time between the espousal and the actual marriage relationship. Also in the Dake, Deut 20 top of forth column a. It was customary among the Jews to contract matrimony, espouse or betroth a couple, then leave each one with the parents for a considerable time. The contract always specified conditions of dowry, the time when the contracting couple should come together as man and wife, and all other details of agreement between the parents and young people. Concluding festivities were held at the time of fulfillment or coming together of the betrothed. The bridegroom then brought his bride home. Hence, any man in Israel who had such a contract for a wife was free from military duty until he had consummated the marriage and actually taken his wife. There is more proof found in the book of Josephus. Josephus was a man who lived shortly after the time of Christ AD He was the son of a priest and became a Pharisee at the age of nineteen. He may not have been a Christian but the historic details he has compiled are of great value. And of course he had first-hand knowledge of Jewish customs at the time of Christ. Josephus speaks of Lots two daughters. But he seemed as One that mocked unto his sons in law. How can this be if they were virgins? You might say they were not the only two daughters of Lot, but later in this chapter one of them is called the first born, and it was customary for the elder to be married first, as we can see from Laban and his two daughters. He says that Lot left with his two daughters, who were virgins, and betrothed to the same two sons-in-law that Lot spoke to. But nonetheless Jewish people especially priests and Pharisees knew their Bible and their history. We may here take notice that espousals alone were of old esteemed a sufficient foundation for affinity, Hyrcanus being here called father in law to Herod, because his granddaughter Mariamne was betrothed to him, although the marriage was not completed till four years afterwards. Vs In the case where a man marries a woman, and then accuses her of not being a virgin. One of two things may happen. They find her not guilty and among other things he is not to put her away for the rest of his days. They find her guilty and she is stoned to death. What was the difference between life and death for her? Of course it was whether or not she was guilty. Vs 22 A married woman is found with another man. Both of them are killed. So thou shalt put away evil from among you. The reason I wrote these two verses is for you to note that the betrothed virgin in question was called a wife. She is betrothed to a man and she is guilty of willingly fornicating with another man and they are both killed. Vs A betrothed woman is raped which of course is not her fault. She did not sin, and only the man is killed. Vs A woman who is not betrothed is found fornicating with a man, both of them are guilty of this sin yet neither of them are punished, apart from the man having to pay the father of the girl fifty shekels of silver then having to marry her. So in the first four instances the guilty party suffered the death penalty. Yet here in the last example the guilty were let live. So what is the difference between them, who lived, being guilty, and the others who received the death penalty? All the others were either married or betrothed when they sinned, with the exception of the 1st example of the woman who was found to be not a virgin on the wedding night. It is possible for her to have committed fornication before she even met her husband to be, but this is not what it is speaking of because as we can see the couple who were not betrothed, did not receive the death penalty. But rather this no doubt refers to fornication after betrothal, either way it does not matter because as we can see the woman in example three was betrothed and she received the death penalty and our last example number five was not betrothed and did not receive the death penalty. Which demonstrates that a betrothal was of great importance. The conclusion is that all who broke the covenant either married or betrothed received the death penalty thus demonstrating that they are both of great importance. Please read Luk 2: Then in Matt 1: Which means they had a wedding ceremony. Therefore all being witnesses of the wedding would have thought them to have consummated the marriage, now believing them to be husband and wife. Had this not been the case they certainly would not have been traveling together as this was not the done thing. A couple would have to be married to travel together especially if she was great with child. But as we all know Joseph knew her not until she had brought forth her first born child. Therefore although others did not realise, they could not consummate the marriage until after Jesus was born. And therefore were still only espoused to each other.

Chapter 7 : Luke - KJV - To a virgin espoused to a man whose name

To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. Espoused " It was customary among the Jews, for persons that married to contract before witnesses some time before.

Of unknown origin; a maiden; by implication, an unmarried daughter. Anointed One; the Messiah, the Christ. From chrio; Anointed One, i. The Messiah, an epithet of Jesus. For I have espoused you. It appears in this sense in the LXX. He claims the office as the "father" of the Corinthian Church 1Corinthians 4: The underlying idea of the comparison is that the Church at large, and every separate portion of it, is as the bride of Christ. On the earlier appearances of this thought, see Notes on Matthew What the Apostle now urges is that it is as natural for him to be jealous for the purity of the Church which owes its birth to him, as it is for a father to be jealous over the chastity of the daughter whom he has betrothed as to a kingly bridegroom. Pulpit Commentary Verse 2. This gives the reason why they bore with him. It was due to a reciprocity of affection. I am jealous over you. The word implies both jealousy and zeal 2 Corinthians 7: With a godly jealousy; literally, with a jealousy of God. My jealousy is not the poor earthly vice Numbers 5: For I have espoused you; rather, for I betrothed you; at your conversion. The metaphor is found alike in the Old and New Testaments Isaiah To one husband Jeremiah 3: That I may present you. The same word as in 2 Corinthians 4: The conversion of the Church was its betrothal to Christ, brought about by St. Paul as the paranymph; and, in the same capacity, at the final marriage feast, he would present their Church as a pure bride to Christ at his coming Revelation Matthew Henry Commentary There is but one Jesus, one Spirit, and one gospel, to be preached to them, and received by them; and why should any be prejudiced, by the devices of an adversary, against him who first taught them in faith? They should not listen to men, who, without cause, would draw them away from those who were the means of their conversion.

Chapter 8 : Vol. Xiii. April 1, No. 7

First, we will look at the fact that the virgin is espoused, or betrothed, to Messiah as a chaste virgin. We will then look at the Greek word for 'chaste' to see what it means. Second, we will examine how the Bride's chaste status can be removed by corruption.

Bible in Basic English To a virgin who was to be married to a man named Joseph, of the family of David; and the name of the virgin was Mary. Contemporary English Version with a message for a virgin named Mary. She was engaged to Joseph from the family of King David. English Standard Version to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The girl was engaged to marry a man named Joseph from the family of David. Her name was Mary. George Lamsa Translation of the Peshitta To a virgin who was acquired for a price for a man named Joseph, of the house of David; and the name of the virgin was Mary. King James Version To a virgine espoused to a man whose name was Ioseph, of the house of Daud, and the virgins name was Marie. Miles Coverdale Bible vnto a virgin that was spoused vnto a man, whose name was Ioseph, of the house of Daud, and the virgins name was Mary. New Revised Standard to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. New Century Version to a virgin. She was engaged to marry a man named Joseph from the family of David. Weymouth New Testament to a maiden betrothed to a man of the name of Joseph, a descendant of David. Good News Translation He had a message for a young woman promised in marriage to a man named Joseph, who was a descendant of King David. Holman Christian Standard to a virgin engaged to a man named Joseph, of the house of David. Mace New Testament to a virgin contracted to a man; whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. New King James to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. New Living Translation to a virgin named Mary. She was engaged to be married to a man named Joseph, a descendant of King David. New International Version to a virgin pledged to be married to a man named Joseph, a descendant of David. New Life Version He went to a woman who had never had a man. She was promised in marriage to a man named Joseph. Joseph was of the family of David. Hebrew Names Version to a virgin pledged to be married to a man whose name was Yosef, of the house of David. International Standard Version to a virgin engaged to a man named Joseph, a descendant of David. John Etheridge Translation of the Peshitta unto a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was Jauseph, of the house of David, and the name of the Virgin was Mariam. Tyndale Bible to a virgin spoused to a man whose name was Ioseph of ye housse of David and ye virgins name was Mary. Updated Bible Version 1. World English Bible to a virgin pledged to be married to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The Wycliffe Bible to a maidyn, weddid to a man, whos name was Joseph, of the hous of Daud; and the name of the maidun was Marie. The Message to a virgin engaged to be married to a man descended from David. Lexham English Bible to a virgin legally promised in marriage to a man named Joseph of the house of David. And the name of the virgin was Mary.

Chapter 9 : ESPOUSAL - Definition from the KJV Dictionary

To a virgine espoused to a man whose name was Ioseph, of the house of Daudid, and the virgins name was Marie. - King James Version () - View Bible Scan to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the descendants of David; and the virgin's name was Mary.

Behold, a beautiful spouse, beautiful in justice, and in the judgment of her looks, beautiful in compassion and in mercy in the regard of her neighbors, and beautiful in faith in the sight of God" 1. The image of Mary as Bride of God originates in patristic times. In his treatise on the Assumption, he states that, "It was fitting that the spouse whom the Father had taken to himself, should live in the divine Mansions"⁵. Some medieval writers, such as Rupert of Deutz and Ubertino of Casale continued to use this image, as did Saint Lawrence of Brindisi ⁶. Jean-Jacques Olier, a member of this school, seems to have written on this topic more than any other writer ⁸. Here are some samples of his somewhat exaggerated views on this subject: God the Father, as a holy and faithful husband, wants to unite the most holy Virgin to himself and give her the perfect possession of his Person, his treasures, his glory and all his goods" ⁹. For God the Father The Father conceives for her all the affection of a spouse" ¹¹ This concept seems to derive from the fact that Mary and God the Father share the same Son - the latter eternally and the former according to the flesh. Yet we must not take this concept literally, for the following reasons: God the Father is not a Zeus-like deity who dallies with mortal women and sires offspring by them. He is pure Spirit, does not possess a body, and never engages in literal coitus with anyone. Mary is the human Mother of Jesus, Whom she bore physically in time without the help of a father. So the Father and Mary did not "become parents" of Jesus at the same time and in the same way as happens with ordinary human couples. Had Jesus been conceived by intercourse between God and Mary if that were possible, which it is not , His conception could hardly be considered virginal! So while the image of Mary-as-Wife of the Father has some limited legitimacy, we must be careful not to take it literally. It points to a spiritual mystery, not a physical relationship Bride of Christ Since Scripture portrays the Church as the Bride of Christ, this Marian image is certainly related to and appropriated from that one. Building on the biblical image of Christ as the "New Adam", early Christians spoke of a "New Eve", a feminine cooperator with Jesus in the economy of the redemption. Second century writers Saints Justin Martyr and Irenaeus of Lyons perceived Mary as this second Eve, who undid the sin of the first one: Christ became man by the Virgin that the disobedience which issued from the serpent might be destroyed in the same way it originated. Eve was still an undefiled virgin when she conceived the word of the serpent and brought forth disobedience and death. But the Virgin received faith and joy, at the announcement of the angel Gabriel So through the mediation of the Virgin he came into the world, through whom God would crush the serpent and those angels and men like him, who delivers from death those who turn from their evil ways and believe in him. For as the former was led astray by the word of an angel, so that she fled from God when she had disobeyed his word, so did the latter, by an angelic communication, receive the glad tidings that she should bear God, and obeyed his word. If the former disobeyed God, the latter obeyed, so that the Virgin Mary might become the advocate of the virgin Eve. Thus, as the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so it is rescued by a virgin; virginal disobedience is balanced in the opposite scale by virginal obedience. She is Eve, the mother of all living ¹⁴ As from Adam and his wife the whole human race is sprung, so from Christ and the Church the whole multitude of believers has been generated Some writers, such as Saint Augustine, identify both as the New Eve: The parents who generated us to death are Adam and Eve: The parents who generated us to life are Christ and the Church There is a great mystery here: The association of Mary with the Church allowed for her to take on the "Bride of God" image from Ecclesia. Her identification as the "New Eve" strengthened this image, for since the first Adam and Eve were husband and wife, any talk of a "new" Adam and Eve would seem to imply a "nuptial" relationship between them, if only symbolic. The nineteenth century theologian Matthias Joseph Scheeben tried to build a Mariology around the "bridal motherhood" of Mary toward Christ. His concept of bridal motherhood never quite caught on All in all, the Marian title Bride of Christ enjoyed only slightly more popularity than Wife of the Father. Many writers preferred to reserve the former title for the

Church. She is His physical Mother because she bore and raised Him according to the flesh, and His mystical Bride because she is the Image and preeminent Member of the Church, who is the Bride of Christ. As with the title Wife of the Father, Bride of Christ does not indicate a physical or sexual relationship with God. Spouse of the Holy Spirit This title has caught on more strongly than the first two. The list of Christians who called Mary the Spouse of the Spirit is impressive: In his encyclical *Marialis Cultus*, Pope Paul VI wrote that early Christians coined the title Spouse of the Holy Spirit because they saw in the relationship between Mary and the Spirit "an aspect redolent of marriage" Exactly what is that "aspect"? Some may point to the fact that Mary conceived Jesus by the power of the Spirit as indicating a "marital" relationship. Yet we must not take this too far, for it could lead to the belief that the Holy Spirit is the "father" of Jesus in the Incarnation. Though Mary did conceive Jesus by the power of the Spirit, the latter did not play a parental role in the conception. A parent contributes his or her own substance to the child. Saint Maximillian Kolbe presents us with a more profound solution to this mystery. The union brought about by married love is the most intimate of all. In a much more precise, more interior, more essential manner, the Holy Spirit lives in the soul of the Immaculata, in the very depths of her being 24 He goes on to say that the relationship between the Spirit of God and the Theotokos is redolent of a marriage in the following ways: As a husband and wife become "one flesh" in marriage Genesis 2: As human spouses cooperate in giving life to their children, so, analogously, the Spirit and Mary "cooperate" in communicating spiritual life to us. Interestingly, these two things actually reflect the "unitive and procreative" aspects of human conjugal love. Now the union between Mary and the Third Divine Person is spiritual, not at all sexual, for the Holy Spirit is pure Spirit like the Father, and so could not possibly have a physical relationship with Mary. None of these three titles indicate a physical or sexual relationship between God and Mary. Rather, all have a deeper, spiritual significance which transcends the flesh. Augustine, *Sermons* ; quoted by St.