

1-24-1964

Marian Theology and the Contemporary Problem of Myth

Thomas A. O'Meara

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Meara, Thomas A. (1964) "Marian Theology and the Contemporary Problem of Myth," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 15, Article 10, Pages 127-156.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol15/iss1/10

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

MARIAN THEOLOGY AND THE CONTEMPORARY PROBLEM OF MYTH

"What you are doing is dangerous. Religion is not the tax you pay in order to get rid of the woman's image, for this image cannot be gotten rid of."

These words were heard by one of Carl Gustav Jung's patients during a dream episode which the famous psychiatrist considered to be most significant.¹ Today this utterance from the psychological depths is representative of important intellectual and religious currents outside Catholicism—currents which, far from attacking Catholic Marian theology, treat it at times with respect, and yet with a respect which can be deceptively friendly. Far from admitting the supernatural and religious heart of the Christian revelation as it concerns the Mother of God, they see her as a phenomenon of psychology, culture, or comparative religion. They agree that the role of the woman-image, Mary, in religion cannot be gotten rid of, or, at least, that it can be excised only with difficulty. Considered as a phenomenon, our intellectual milieu may offer a new respect for Marian theology within Catholicism. However, as a historical and supernatural reality, it still retains a knowing skepticism expressed in the term *myth*.

The intent of this paper is to examine Marian theology as it is related to the contemporary concept of myth.² Three con-

¹ C. G. Jung, *Dogma and Natural Symbols, Psychology and Religion* (1937-1940), Collected Works, 11 (New York, Pantheon, 1958) 35-36.

² For a good survey of the various considerations of myth in the past century see J. Henninger, S.V.D., *Mythe-En Ethnologie*, in *SDBI* 6 (Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1960) 225-246. A survey of the increased prominence of myth in modern theology and philosophy is found in M. C. D'Arcy, *God and Mythology*, in *Heythrop Journal*, 1 (1960) 91-104; see the spring issue of *Daedalus*, 88 (1959). M.-J. Lagrange, O.P., *L'influence des mystères païens*, in *M. Loisy et le modernisme* (Juvisy, Cerf, 1932) 200-207; E.

temporary and influential thinkers—Jung, Paul Tillich, Rudolf Bultmann—have considered the Virgin-Mother of Christ as related to their own particular interpretation of the dialogue between myth and religion. By delineating these three streams of today's thought as they consider the Mother of Christ, we will, I hope, gain a wider understanding of how Mary is considered in the contemporary fields of history, psychology, philosophy and theology. These three scholars have explored the need, relevance, and existence of myth in the human existential situation; their prominence and influence is well known.³ All three have general and particular theories which should be considered by a contemporary apologetic for Marian theology.

Two years ago Walter Burghardt, S.J., told this theological society that theologians must confront the ecumenical concern of Mary to the non-Catholic world. "Talking to ourselves," he said, "is not adequate to the contemporary crises, to the temper

Magnin, *The Comparative History of Religions and the Revealed Religion*, in *Père Lagrange and the Scriptures* (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1946) 126-169.

³ "Jung has been generally recognized as one of the great original minds of the twentieth century . . . Jung's place in history is already assured. The concept of the collective unconscious, for instance, has been used by the writer J. B. Priestly in his book *Literature and Western Man*, by the historian Arnold Toynbee in *A Study of History*, and by the physicist W. Pauli in his work on the astronomer, Kepler. Sir Herbert Read has acknowledged his debt to Jung in his writings on art, and many creative artists have felt that Jung understood their aims in a way that no one previous writer on psychology had been able to do." A. Storr, C. G. Jung, in *The American Scholar*, 31 (1962) 403. "The most profound and far-ranging among contemporary theologians is Paul Tillich. During the later years of his teaching career he has poured forth a vigorous and full stream of theological writings. It seems likely that he and Barth will leave behind well-fashioned theological positions to represent our day; and yet Tillich, in many senses, is beyond our day—the voice of the theological ages." Nels F. S. Ferré, *Searchlights on Contemporary Theology* (New York, Harper, 1961) 113. The professional discussion on Bultmann's significance can be found in *Kerygma und Mythos: Ein theologisches Gespräch*, ed. H. W. Bartsch (Hamburg, Reich und Heidrich 1948-1955). For the influence of these three men see Franklin Baumer, *Religion and the Rise of Skepticism* (New York, Harcourt and Brace, 1960) chapters iv and v.

of our times, to the ecumenical situation. This new concentration . . . our discoveries may shake our complacencies. But the experience should be intellectually and spiritually stimulating—for ourselves and for those not of our number, to whom we say so insistently that the function of Our Lady, in the Twentieth Century as in the first, is to bring God down to men and men up to God."⁴

Jung, Tillich, and Bultmann go beyond the superficial application of myth to religion. They look into the very nature of man for the source and etiology of religious myth. Rabbi Heschel has pointed out that it is not enough to proclaim revelation to man, we must relate this revelation to modern man. "The urgent problem is not only the truth of religion, but man's capacity to sense the truth of religion, the authenticity of religious concern. Religious truth does not shine in a vacuum. It is certainly not comprehensible when the antecedents of religious insight and commitment are wasted away; when the mind is dazzled by ideologies which either obscure or misrepresent man's ultimate questions. . . . The primary issue of theology is pre-theological; it is the total situation of man and his attitudes toward life and the world."⁵

⁴ Walter Burghardt, S.J., *Mary and Reunion*, in *CMd* 60 (June, 1962) 18. This is the presidential address for The Mariological Society of America, 1962; see *MS* 13 (1962) 5-12. The following passage from von Loewenich's Protestant study of Catholicism will illustrate the importance of myth and Mary in the ecumenical dialogue. "There can be no doubt that the traditional doctrine of the person of Christ has been taken in a mythological sense for centuries. It should not therefore surprise us that it led to an outgrowth of mythological Mariology. Roman Mariology is the final outcome of a mythological doctrine of the person of Christ. The only watchword for Protestant dogmatics is: Back from mythology to history . . . Roman mythology shows how far one can go when the sober question of truth is ignored" W. von Loewenich, *Modern Catholicism* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1959) 238-239, *passim*.

⁵ Abraham Joshua Heschel, in *Depth-Theology* 10 (1960) 317. For an excellent essay on the relationship between myth and revelation in contemporary thought see Heinrich Fries, *Mythos und Offenbarung*, in *Fragen der Theologie Heute*, ed. J. Feiner *et al.* (Zurich, Benziger, 1960) 11-44.

To relate Mary to contemporary thought is to obey the request of Pope John XXIII: "The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously... Our sacred obligation is not only to take care of this precious treasure [the deposit of faith] as if we had only to worry about the past, but we must also devote ourselves with joy and without fear to the work of giving this ancient and eternal doctrine a relevancy corresponding to the conditions of our era."⁶

First of all, this essay will present Mary as she is delineated by three modern observers of the influence of myth in the contemporary scene. Then it will indicate certain general points in Marian theology which lead modern man to consider Mary linked to myth. Finally, a few areas will be indicated where theologians can work in order to set in distinct contrast the relationship between Marian theology and the mythologies, guiding our contemporary thought patterns to a more appreciative understanding of the Mother of God.

I Religion and Myth in Marian Theology; Three Men

The Church has been faced with the problem of myth since its origin. It came into existence in a world overgrown with myth. The Church adopted her usual policy of denying the content of the myth as religiously true, but employing the root and influence of the myth as an opening for Christianity. And so, St. Paul warns an early Church "not to study myths and

⁶ Pope John XXIII, *Address to the Cardinals and Prelates of the Roman Curia*, in *AAS* 55 (Dec. 23, 1962) 44. "Che questo è il Concilio, e questo lo riguarda innanzitutto: cioè la fedeltà alle basi dottrinali richiamate e intangibili del deposito sacro della fede e del rispetto alle tradizioni più pure dell'insegnamento della Chiesa. Ma subito aggiungemmo che il nostro dovere non è soltanto di custodire questo tesoro prezioso, come se ci preoccupassimo unicamente della antichità; ma di dedicarci con alacre volontà e senza timore a quell'opera di derivazione della antica e perenne dottrina, e di applicazione della medesima alle condizioni della nostra età."

endless genealogies," while St. Clement of Alexandria begins his theology with the summons: "Come, I will show you the Word and the mysteries of the Word, and I will give you understanding of them by images familiar to you."⁷

Ironically, after Christianity (a uniquely historical, rational, and balanced religion) had eliminated myth, scholars at the turn of our century announced that Christianity was basically the child of myth. The theological fad of syncretism was, nevertheless, eventually worn out. It gave some impetus to the intellectual motions of the three men we will consider, but the old theories that Mary was a new form of Diana of the Ephesians or of the *Magna Mater* have passed away.⁸

Each of the three men has a unique and personal aspect from which he views the problem as touching Mary. Jung is concerned with the structural physical patterns of man's psyche which he considers contribute to all symbolic activities such as religion and mythology; he is, therefore, concerned with the radical physical cause of all myths, all symbols, all religious figures, a cause which he places in the very structure of the human psyche. Tillich is concerned with man's basic religious need of symbols, of revelatory channels. He, too, is concerned with human ultimates, especially the deep need of man for

⁷ *Tim.* 1:4.

⁸ St. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 12; PG 8, 240.

⁹ For a discussion of the rise and fall of the excesses of syncretism and comparative religion see H. Rahner, S.J., *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery* (London, Burns and Oates, 1962) 3-46; all of the books of Mircea Eliade, especially *Images and Symbols* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1960) 9-33, 160-179; also, Henninger, *art. cit.* Unfortunately, the book on Marian theology by a Protestant which is most prominent in non-Catholic libraries is G. Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1956). Miegge still brings forward the old outmoded comparisons between Mary and pagan culture. This, combined with rhetoric and poor scholarship, are his basic weapons of attack. See the patient reviews of E. Carroll, O.Carm., *A Waldensian View of the Virgin Mary*, in *AER* 135 (1956) 380-398; V. Buffon, O.S.M., *Il problema mariano nel cattolicesimo della storia e nel presente*; *Sintesi di un libro di G. Miegge sulla Madonna*, in *Mm* 12 (1950) 313-330.

revelation and the channels of revelation which God and man employ. Bultman most resembles the older syncretists; yet his call for demythologizing the New Testament means more than ridding it of envisaged similarities to religions contemporaneous with it. Christianity was formed out of the cultural myth of its time, a necessary historical fact. Today we must try to find the kernel of religious truth behind these many "myths" and present it in a new garb of existentialist philosophy.

Now that we have seen the individual point of view, we can consider each in some detail.

Jung

It is not in passing that Jung treats of Mary.¹⁰ Mary as the Mother of mankind, as the Virgin, as the Assumed is related to the basic and original contribution of Jungian psychotherapy—the archetypes. Put very simply, Jung sees order in the various symbols and figures of man's religion. From the viewpoint of psychological phenomenological investigation, Jung places one of their causes in the very structure of the human psyche—the archetypes of the collective unconscious.

Below the personal unconsciousness of each of us, Jung deduced, there must be another impenetrable world—the collective unconscious. Within this collective unconscious are determinations of thought and image which Jung calls the archetypes; they are not innate ideas; rather they are analogous to instincts. In the cognitive order (rather than in the volitional

¹⁰ The following pages are based upon the Pantheon edition of Jung's works, *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (New York, Pantheon, 1952-1963), 12 vols.; J. Jacobi, *The Psychology of C. G. Jung* (6th rev. ed., New Haven, Yale University Press, 1962); R. Hostie, S.J., *Religion and the Psychology of Jung* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1957); Victor White, O.P., *Soul and Psyche* (New York, Harper, 1960); *God and the Unconscious* (Chicago, Regnery, 1953). See, also, Jung's recently published autobiographical reflections, *Memories, Dreams and Reflections* (New York, Pantheon, 1963).

and emotional), they are capable of determining *thought and idea*.

"They are only dispositions to the formation of images. Archetypes cannot be encountered directly but only indirectly through their manifestations, and especially through symbols."¹¹

The archetype is the common inheritance of man, the active potentiality deep in man's psyche which is capable of modifying the material of consciousness, modifying it into symbols, myths, and trans-historical realities which are important.¹² First of all, "at the bottom of every symbol is an archetype which is its form of possible prefiguration."¹³ Secondly, when archetypes are violently frustrated or misunderstood, mental sickness results.¹⁴ Jung continually claims that he is studying religious

¹¹ Victor White, O.P., *God and the Unconscious* (Chicago, Regnery, 1953) 241. Jung took the name archetype from the *Corpus Hermeticum* and from Pseudo-Denis' work, *Concerning the Divine Names*. He was also influenced by Augustine's use of the word. Jung, *Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1 (New York, Pantheon, 1959) 75. At one time Jung searched for a psychological determination in the brain—an "engram"—which would cause the archetypal products. But he gave this up; see Hostie, *op. cit.*, 62-63. Jung considers the etiology of archetypes to be the condensation of innumerable similar processes. He sees the symbols as always derived from archaic residues or imprints engraven in the very stem of the race.

¹² "Religious statements are, however, never rational in the ordinary sense of the word, for they always take into consideration that other world, the world of the archetype, of which reason in the ordinary sense is unconscious, being occupied only with externals. . . . Not that the Egyptian model could be considered the archetype of the Christian idea. The archetype *an sich*, as I have explained elsewhere, is an 'irrepresentable' factor, a 'disposition' which starts functioning at a given moment in the development of the human mind and arranges the material of consciousness into definite patterns. . . . Wherever we find it, the archetype has a compelling force which it drives from the unconscious and whenever its effect becomes conscious it has a distinctly numinous quality." Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Trinity*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 148-149.

¹³ Hostie, *op. cit.*, 69.

¹⁴ Jung, *On the Nature of the Psyche*, in *Collected Works*, 8, 218-219. "There are . . . many archetypes. . . . Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic constitution, not in the form of images filled

symbols from a purely psychological point of view, without verifying or impugning their veracity. His conclusions concern the harmony of religious symbols with psychological structure, and the need of man for these symbols to maintain psychic health. Although Jung wishes to be passed over in questions of the reality, supereminence, and historicity of the Christian revelation, he can easily appear to be a witness for it as a psychological projection. On the other hand, he can argue too for the harmony between the economy of redemption and man's human nature.

The number of the archetypes is relatively limited. We shall see that Mary is related to two of them: 1) the anima and the mother-archetype; 2) the quaternity as related to trinity.

"For Jung the archetypes taken as a whole represent the sum of the latent potentialities of the human psyche—a vast store of ancestral knowledge about the profound relations between God, man, and cosmos. To open up this store in one's own psyche, to awaken it to life and integrate it with consciousness, means nothing less than to save the individual from his isolation and gather him into the eternal cosmic process. Thus the conceptions of which we have been speaking become more than a science and more than a psychology. They have become a way of life. The archetype as the primal source of all human experience lies in the unconscious whence it reaches into our lives. Thus it becomes imperative to resolve its projections, to raise its contents to consciousness."¹⁵

And thus it is imperative for us to be aware of the influence of Jung's trans-psychotherapeutic theories.

There are several important archetypal lights under which with content, but at first only as *forms without content*, representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action. When a situation occurs which corresponds to a given archetype, that archetype becomes activated and a compulsiveness appears, which like an instinctual drive, gains its way against all reason and will, or else produces a conflict of pathological dimensions, that is to say, a neurosis." *The Concept of the Collective Unconscious*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 48.

¹⁵ J. Jacobi, *The Psychology of C. G. Jung* (New Haven, Yale, 1962) 47-48.

Jung considers Mary. The first is the anima image; the second is the mother-archetype; the third is the relationship between quaternity and trinity; and the fourth is the significance of the Assumption.

The anima is a general archetype aspect of the psyche—the feminine aspect. Men and women each possess both masculine and feminine characteristics to some degree; in the man the anima is the female counterpart to his dominating male unconscious. Mary as virgin, as sinless, as immaculately conceived, as representative of all women, as the first redeemed out of sinful humanity, as intercessor and patroness partakes of the anima archetype.

"For the son, the anima is hidden in the dominating power of the mother, and sometimes she leaves him with a sentimental attachment. . . . On the other hand, she may spur him on to the highest flights. To the men of antiquity the anima appeared as a goddess or a witch, while for the medieval man the goddess was replaced by the Queen of Heaven and Mother Church. The desymbolized world of the Protestant produced first an unhealthy sentimentality and then a sharpening of the moral conflict."¹⁶

The following is another interesting comment on Mary and the anima archetype:

"...We are dealing with the...anima-figure in four stages: ...Hawwah (Eve), Helen of Troy, the Virgin Mary and Sophia... The second stage is still dominated by the sexual Eros, but on an aesthetic and romantic level... The third stage raises

¹⁶ Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 29. "The psychologist knows how much religious ideas have to do with the parental image. History has preserved overwhelming evidence of this, quite apart from medical findings, which have even led certain people to suppose that the relationship to the parents is the real origin of religious ideas. This hypothesis is based on a poor knowledge of the facts... The only thing we know positively from psychological experience is that theistic ideas are associated with parental images and that our patients are mostly unconscious of them." Jung, *Concerning the Archetypes and the Anima Concept*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 62.

Eros to the height of religious devotion and thus spiritualizes him. . . . Finally the fourth stage illustrates something which unexpectedly goes beyond the almost unsurpassable third stage: Sapientia."¹⁷

Jung says that the special Marian aspect of the anima archetype is especially the Virgin as bringing forth the child.

A single archetype may be crystallized in many forms. The anima includes the mother-archetype. This maternal archetype brings qualities of maternal solicitude, magic authority of the feminine, wisdom and spiritual evaluation which transcends reason, fertility and rebirth.¹⁸ The passage below illustrates how Jung sees progressive evolution of the feminine archetype in Marian theology:

"Mankind is not, as before, to be destroyed, but saved. In this decision we can discern the 'philanthropic' influence of Sophia: No new human beings are to be created, but only one, the God-man. For this purpose a contrary procedure must be employed: the Second Adam shall not, like the first, proceed directly from the hand of the Creator but shall be born of a human woman. So this time priority falls to the second Eve, not only in a temporal sense but in a material sense as well. . . . Thus Mary, the virgin, is chosen as the pure vessel for the coming birth of God. Her independence of the male is emphasized by her virginity as the *sine qua non* of the process. She is a 'daughter of God' who, as a later dogma will establish, is distinguished at the outset by the privilege of an immaculate conception and is thus free from the taint of original sin. It is therefore evident that she belongs to the state before the Fall. This posits a new beginning. . . she is a mediatrix who leads the way to God and assures man of immortality. Her Assumption is therefore the prototype of man's bodily resurrection.

"Remarkable indeed are the unusual precautions which surround the making of Mary: immaculate conception, extirpation of the taint of sin, everlasting virginity. The Mother of God is obviously

¹⁷ Jung, *The Psychology of the Transference*, in *Collected Works*, 16, 174.

¹⁸ Jung, *Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 82.

being protected against Satan's tricks.... Mary is elevated, by having these special measures applied to her, to the status of a goddess and consequently loses something of her humanity: she will not conceive her child in sin, like all other mothers, and therefore he also will never be a human being, but a God... the Incarnation was only partially consummated. Both mother and son are not real human beings at all but Gods."¹⁹

The second Jungian archetype referring to Mary is the quaternity, which is one of the most basic and influential archetypes.²⁰ When Jung refers to the Trinity as related to an archetype, he means the archetype of quaternity. Through the ages, long before the explicit Christian statement of it, the trinitarian idea evolved.²¹

"The history of the Trinity presents itself as the gradual crystallization of an archetype which moulds the anthropomorphic concepts of father and son, of life, and of different persons into an archetypal and numinous figure, 'The Most Holy Three-in-One.' The Trinity as a psychological symbol denotes first the 'essential unity of a three part process, to be thought of as a process of unconscious maturation taking place within the individual.'"²²

Also it is a process of conscious realization over the centuries, and, finally, indicates the psychological permanence of the symbols of the self from the God-image.²³ But what of the quaternity and Mary?

"I cannot refrain from calling attention to the interesting fact that whereas the central Christian symbolism is a Trinity, the formula presented by the unconscious is a quaternity. In reality the orthodox Christian formula is not quite complete, because the dogmatic as-

¹⁹ Jung, *Answer to Job*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 398-399.

²⁰ A good discussion of this archetype along with its relationship to the trinity, Mary, and evil can be found in White, *op. cit.*, chapters vi through ix.

²¹ Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 109-128.

²² *Op. cit.*, 193-194.

²³ *Ibid.*

pect of the evil principle is absent from the Trinity and leads a moreover less awkward existence on its own. . . ."24

Jung raises the problem of the missing fourth. Three-in-One supplies a symbol for threefold perfection but not for integration of the fourth, the totality of completeness. The Triune Persons are all masculine—the feminine is missing; they are all good; darkness and evil are missing. Jung offers an extensive treatment of the devil as the fourth element in the archetype, but finds him wanting because of the opposition between evil and good. Acquainted with occasional medieval paintings of Mary associated with a Trinity of divine figures,²⁵ Jung deduced that the medieval mind evolved a quaternity symbol and put Mary into the Trinity.²⁶ The Assumption convinced Jung that this was the unconscious tradition and destiny of Catholicism.²⁷ After the 1950 definition of the Assumption Jung added a postscript: "Her divinity may be regarded as a tacit *conclusio probabilis*, and so too may the worship or adoration to which she is entitled."²⁸

Jung was, as we have indicated, deeply affected by Pius XII's *Munificentissimus Deus*. He saw himself as a prophet recognizing the fulfillment of one of his theoretical predictions. Several of his works had paragraphs or notes added to them to treat of the meaning of this Catholic dogma for archetypal

²⁴ Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 59; id., *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 164-200; id., *Psychology and Alchemy*, in *Collected Works*, 12, 400.

²⁵ See the frontispiece in volume 11 of the *Collected Works*; this volume contains most of Jung's writings on religion.

²⁶ "Medieval iconology, embroidering on the old speculations about the Theotokos, evolved a quaternity symbol in its representation of the coronation of the Virgin, and surreptitiously put it in place of the Trinity." Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Trinity*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 170-171.

²⁷ Although Jung in an earlier work, *Psychology and Alchemy*, feels that Mary's place in Catholic worship had not sufficiently represented the quaternity archetype, in the later work of 1948 he holds her divinity as a tacit conclusion. *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 171.

psychotherapy. In *Aion* he points out that the Assumption is—as evidenced from the words of the Apostolic Constitution—derived greatly from the universal belief of Catholics. This is an argument for the influence of the collective unconscious.²⁹

Besides the conscious projection of the quaternity, Jung sees in Mary's Assumption two classic ideas which man's unconscious has been trying to establish for centuries. The first of these is freedom from matter; the second is similar—the glorification in endless spirituality of the human being.

Man has often symbolized matter or earth by the feminine or the virginal.³⁰

"The *Assumptio Mariae* paves the way not only for the divinity of the Theotokos (i.e., her ultimate recognition as a goddess), but for the quaternity. At the same time, matter is included in the metaphysical realm, together with the corrupting principle of the cosmos. . . .

"The Queen of Heaven has obviously shed all her Olympian qualities except for her brightness, goodness, and eternity; and

²⁹ "The solemn proclamation of the *Assumptio Mariae* which we have experienced in our own day is an example of the way symbols develop through the ages. The impelling motive behind it did not come from the ecclesiastical authorities who had given clear proof of their hesitation by postponing the declaration for nearly a hundred years, but from the Catholic masses, who have insisted more and more vehemently on this development. Their insistence is, at bottom, the urge of the archetype to realize itself." Jung, *Aion* in *Collected Works*, 16, 86. Victor White, O.P., comments: "The subsequently virtual elimination of any feminine figure from religion has, in Jung's view, brought a grievous impoverishment of the Protestant world, and set it serious psychological and social problems. . . . Indeed the elimination of religious images, and it is implied, of feminine images especially, has helped to bring the whole world to the brink of disaster. Jung is particularly scathing, and certainly less than just, in his comments on the hostile reaction to papal definition of the Assumption in Anglican and Protestant circles. But it cannot be said that his own reaction is altogether satisfactory from a Catholic viewpoint. . . . he seems disappointed that the dogma does not, in fact, make Mary a fourth co-equal Person of the Godhead. . . ." White, *op. cit.*, 134-135.

³⁰ Jung, *Religion and Psychology*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 63.

even the human body, the thing most prone to gross material corruption, has put on an ethereal incorruptibility."³¹

The Assumption, however, Jung feels, is not a perfectly successful counterstroke to materialism; it is spiritualization.

"Understood concretely, the Assumption is the absolute opposite of materialism. Taken in this sense, it is a counterstroke that does nothing to diminish the tension between the opposites but drives it to extremes. . . .

"Understood symbolically, however, the Assumption of the body is a recognition and acknowledgement of matter."³²

Symbolically, therefore, the dogma is of benefit to modern man.

Tillich

Jung founded his myth-making structures in the physiology of the human psyche. Paul Tillich's foundation for similar symbols (including Mary) will be a *need* of this psyche, the religious need of man for revelation. For Tillich, Mary as a historical figure is hardly worth considering; even the Marian narrative of the Virgin Birth must be dismissed.³³ The activities

³¹ Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Trinity*, in *Collected Works*, 11, 171; id., *Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 107.

³² Jung, *Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 109. "... So, now, conversely, a heavenly figure has split off from her original chthonic realm and taken up a counter position to the titanic forces of the earth. . . . In the same way that the Mother of God was divested of all the essential qualities of materiality, matter became completely de-souled, and this at a time when physics is pushing forward to insights which, if they do not exactly 'de-materialize' matter, at least, endow it with properties of its own. . . . The psychologist inclines to see in the dogma of the Assumption a symbol which, in a sense, anticipates this whole development . . . when a figure that is conditioned by the archetype (that of the mother) is represented as having been taken up into heaven, the realm of the spirit, this indicates a union of earth and heaven or of matter and spirit." Jung, *Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype*, in *Collected Works*, 9:1, 108.

³³ "The story of the virgin birth belongs to the symbols corroborating

of Mary in the gospels, like those of Jesus, are more symbolic than historical. Mary's sole contribution to the Christ (which the man Jesus became at His terminal historical death)⁸⁴ would be, perhaps, her acceptance of this psychological metamorphosis in the Apostles after the crucifixion, and her offering of the material of those beliefs, for instance in the early chapters of St. Luke, which the primitive faith of the community attached to the dead Christ.

These observations, allied to Tillich's denial of Christ's literal divinity,⁸⁵ might seem to destroy any concern with Marian theology. Moreover, in his modern classic *Systematic Theology*,⁸⁶ Tillich has only one reference to the Mother of Jesus as a religious figure. Tillich's system, however, is not a list of dogmas which he accepts or rejects, but a total picture of Christianity, a picture he has painted from the colors of biblical criticism and existentialist philosophy. Where then does Mary enter? She enters in connection with Christian revelation itself.

Tillich's idea of revelation, of how God speaks to man and of the means by which man can encounter this message, allows his strange attitude towards Mariology. In fact, Mariology in all its Catholic splendor can be retained, or it can be completely excluded. For Tillich there is no need to list the Marian prerogatives of virginity, sanctity, the Assumption, and so forth, and then to check them off as to whether they are acceptable

the resurrection . . . It is the same motif which led to Logos Christology . . . The factual element in it is that historical destiny determined the bearer of the New Being, even before his birth. But the actual story is a myth, the symbolic value of which must be seriously questioned. It points toward the docetic-monophysitic direction of Christian thinking and is itself an important step in it." Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 2 (Chicago, University Press, 1957) 160. Reference to this work of Tillich will be abbreviated according to volume as *S.T.*, 1 or *S.T.*, 2.

⁸⁴ At His death Jesus, by accepting this destiny in face of its contradictions, became the Christ. *S.T.*, 2, 159.

⁸⁵ "What do you mean if you use the term, 'Son of God'? If one receives a literalistic answer to this question, one must reject it as superstitious." *S.T.*, 2, 110.

⁸⁶ *S.T.*, 1, 128.

or not. He accepts them all, and he accepts none of them; that is, a Christian may hold either point of view. This capacity for affirmation and negation of belief lies at the bottom of his theology just as it is at the bottom of existentialism. Everything is affirmed and yet can be denied; not in an analogical way but in a pragmatic, or better, existential way.³⁷

This simultaneous denial and affirmation happens because revelation is for the creature. It is God's gift to the creature, and so when it helps the creature, it continues; when it does not help him, it dies. Although Christ is in some sense a final revelation,³⁸ revelation occurs again and again through history. It takes place in individuals and in groups represented by individuals. "If groups of persons become transparent for the ground of being and meaning, revelation occurs."³⁹

"Original revelation is given to a group through an individual. Revelation can be received originally only in the depth of a personal life, in its struggles, decisions, and self-surrender. No individual receives revelation for himself. He receives it for his group, and implicitly for all groups, for mankind as a whole. . . . Since the correlation of revelation is transformed by every new group, and in an infinitesimal way by every new individual who enters it, the question must be asked whether this transformation can reach a point where the original revelation is exhausted and superseded. It is the question of the possible end of a revelatory correlation, either by a complete disappearance of the unchanging point of reference. . . . Both . . . have been actualized innumerable times in the history of religion. Sectarian and Protestant movements in all the great religions have attacked given religious institutions as a complete betrayal of the meaning of the original revelation, although they have still kept it as their point of reference. On the other hand, most of the gods of the past have lost even this power; they have become poetic symbols and have ceased to create a revelatory situ-

³⁷ G. Weigel, S.J., *The Theological Significance of Paul Tillich*, in *Gr.* 37 (1958) 41.

³⁸ *S.T.*, 2, 163.

³⁹ *S.T.*, 1, 120.

ation. Apollo has no revelatory significance for Christians; the Virgin Mother Mary reveals nothing to Protestants. Revelation through these two figures has come to an end.

"... Yet one might ask how a real revelation can come to an end. If it is God who stands behind every revelation, how can something divine come to an end? If it is not God who reveals himself, why should one use the term 'revelation?' But this alternative does not exist! Every revelation is mediated by one or several of the mediums of revelation. None of these mediums possesses revelatory power in itself; but under the conditions of existence these mediums claim to have it. This claim makes them idols, and the breakdown of this claim deprives them of their power. The revelatory side is not lost if a revelation comes to an end; but its idolatrous side is destroyed. That which was revelatory in it is preserved as an element in a more embracing and more purified revelation. . ."⁴⁰

This is the foundation upon which Marian theology both stands and falls; subjective appreciation. If this Marian aspect of the Christian message has revelatory significance for you, then it remains as a symbolic expression of God. If it reveals nothing of value to help you to reach God and to overcome the problems of the human condition, then it is not so much false as valueless. Tillich's theological concepts and statements are value judgments. It is not the truth or falsehood or historical and supernatural events which he seems to be treating, but their meaning for man.⁴¹ Mariology has had no meaning for a large segment of Christians since Luther and Calvin. Protestants are not helped in their existential situation by devotion to the Mother of God; rather, it obscures the Christ. As Tillich

⁴⁰ *S.T.*, 1, 127-128.

⁴¹ "This consideration radically excludes a nonexistential concept of revelation. Propositions about a past revelation give theoretical information; they have no revelatory power. Only through an autonomous use of the intellect or through a heteronomous subjection of the will could they be accepted as truth. Such acceptance would be a human work, a meritorious deed of the type against which the Reformation fought a life-and-death struggle. Revelation, whether it is original or dependent (Mary), has revelatory power only for those who participate in it, who enter into the revelatory correlation." *S.T.*, 1, 127.

eventually enunciates, this protest against the heteronomous, the absolute, the irrevocably divine, the idolatrous in revelatory medium (sacrament, priest, and bishop) is *the* Protestant principle; it is perhaps the basic reason for Protestantism's existence, i.e. to protest against these attributes when they occur in Christianity (as they do so continually in Catholicism; Catholicism emphasizes the sacramental, the symbolic, the holy in being).

"The power of the Christian symbols has decreased from decade to decade. Both churches are responsible for it; the Catholic because it has interpreted symbols in magical terms; the Protestant because it has deprived them of their mystical meaning in orthodox as well as in liberal theology. . . . It is extremely significant for Protestantism that in spite of objectionable magic, superstition and hierarchal traits, the reality of the Catholic cult and system of symbols still impresses the mind of innumerable people who experience there the sacramental spirit which has been lost in many Protestant churches."⁴²

Protestantism has as a basic function to protest against excessive symbolism, excessive supernatural activity in the creature. For this reason, Mary remains a uniquely Catholic channel in revelation. Therefore, Protestantism must protest against Marian theology; if it is dying, its revelatory significance is ending; if it is growing, it is tending away from its revelatory content and towards its idolatrous aspects. We may conclude by recalling that Mary for Tillich is not dependent upon her undistinguished life and person (Jesus who became the Christ was a man who, ultimately in history, died). Rather she is a symbol almost without relationship to history. Mary is, in the last analysis, a utilitarian religious symbol, a channel which can be used by God (but not for its intrinsic nature) for inspiring existential and religious response to man's human situation, his need of a "New Being," and his glimpse of the "God-above-God."⁴³

⁴² Tillich, *The Permanent Significance of the Catholic Church for Protestants*, in *Dialog* 1 (1962) 23-25.

⁴³ In private correspondence (June, 1962) with the author, a pupil of

Bultmann

It is to our third figure that we owe the prominence today of the word "myth." As a result of radical New Testament criticism, but much more because of his desire to make Christianity relevant to the Europe of the past two decades, Bultmann called for a rigorous "demythologizing" of the New Testament.⁴⁴

Bultmann has become almost totally identified with a word of his own making, *entmythologisierung*. Bultmann searches for a theology which will save Christianity from becoming an antique. Demythologizing is basically a theology. It has its own fundamental principles, its own particular ancillary philosophy, its own exegesis. It claims to examine and offer a total Christian religion. Bultmann believes that our world of violent evil and violent change should be met with vigorous Christianity. Yet the New Testament seems to be not of this world. A new interpretation of Christ for our times was needed.

Tillich, Dr. S. Schonborn, made the following remarks on the possibility of contact between a Marian theology and Tillich's thought. Dr. Schonborn feels that Mary, as Virgin Mother and as Mother of God, can contribute several positive elements. First, her virginity is symbolic of the longing and preparedness which all men possess before encountering the revelation of God. "Certainly this is the fundamental content of the miracle of the Virgin Birth: The expectation of transformation of the earthly through the revelation of the divine, just as the virgin was transformed through conception and birth. The point of the Virgin Birth is not a biological miracle but a spiritual birth of New Being, a conception available to all of us." Next, Mary is a symbol of earthly love being elevated to a divine level; Mary is, in a sense, a "goddess of love." The third signification of the *Marienmythos* is Mary's holiness. Holiness, for Tillich, means transparency to the Ground of Being (the deity). Mary represents the female aspect, the Sophia element. "Mary is an Incarnation of something universal." These remarks clearly exemplify what Tillich's theology means by its channels of revelation which are themselves distinct from immutable revelation.

⁴⁴ The title of the crucial essay was *Neues Testament und Mythologie*. It is available in English in R. H. Fuller's translation of selections from the first two volumes of *Kerygma und Mythos*. *Kerygma and Myth* (Long, S.P.C.K., 1953) 1, 1-45.

The view of the world which the New Testament offers is mythological. "Myth is spoken of here in the sense in which it is understood by research in the history of religions. Mythology is that manner of representation in which the unworldly and divine appear as the worldly and human—or, in short, in which the transcendent appears as the immanent."⁴⁵ Myth objectifies in human language what we do not find objectified in daily experience—the "divine." Secondly, the myth answers questions about the causes and goals of things; it explains or causes mysteries. Thirdly, the form of the myth is a narrative of some supernatural occurrence; there is always a second history alongside what we witness in the world, the mythological explanation.

The Gospels are not just tainted with mythology; they have not, unfortunately, only incorporated a few fables into their structure. The viewpoint and world picture of the New Testament is "essentially mythical in character."⁴⁶ Heaven, a localized God, the angels, hell, Satan, miracles, man in contact with good and evil spirits: this is mythology. And it is this same "mythical view of the world which the New Testament presupposes when it presents the event of redemption."⁴⁷ A pre-existent Being, birth as a man, atonement for sins, resurrection, a new order, Christ is at the right hand of God—"all this is the language of mythology, and the origin of the themes can be easily traced in the contemporary mythology of Jewish Apocalyptic and in the redemption myths of Gnosticism."⁴⁸

"To this extent the *kerygma* is incredible to modern man, for he is convinced that the mythical view of *the world is obsolete*."⁴⁹ What does modern man have about him that makes the New Testament language and narration meaningless? "On the one hand, [the is] the world-picture formed

⁴⁵ *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. cit., 10.

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, 1.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, 2.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, 3.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

by modern natural science and, on the other hand, the understanding man has of himself in accordance with which he understands himself to be a closed inner unity which does not stand open to the incursion of supernatural powers." Science offers its own explanation of the universe: empirical, universal, free of any religious overtones. This is the picture modern man is shown through life. To embrace another universal view such as the New Testament's demands that ultimately one picture must be false, it cannot be that of science. Secondly, man has had no experience with spirits—good or bad—from another metaphysical realm. He feels that he and his universe are closed to any intrusion. The explanation for all is within, and man will eventually find it. Man views himself as a unified and autonomous person, and he attributes his actions, motives, and experiences to his own agency, not to divine or demonic forces.

For the purpose of Marian theology, it is sufficient to remark that very little remains of the New Testament as it has been traditionally understood. Mary, as we have stressed before, stands or falls with a historical Jesus more fully grasped by gracious faith. There can be no Marian theology based upon a person who possesses only the subjective existence of a religious symbol. This is how Bultman sees the problem of the historical Jesus:

"The decisive question must be whether. . . these titles (e.g. Son of God, Lord) are intended to express something concerning the nature of Jesus Christ, so to say, they describe him as he is in himself, as an object presented for our observation; or whether, and if so, up to what point, they speak of his significance for men of faith. . . . Now I am convinced that it is possible to say that in the New Testament, or at least in the greater part of it, declarations of the divinity of Jesus Christ are simply declarations intended to express not his nature but his significance for faith; their purpose is to confess that what he says and what he is do not derive their

origin from anything within this world; on the contrary, in them God speaks to us, works upon us and for us."⁸⁰

We are again in the world of Tillich where Marian theology cannot exist for three reasons: first, because we are not sure of even the most basic principle of Marian theology, her maternity; secondly, Christ's divinity is controverted; and finally, theology has become a mental construct based on an unsubstantiated faith, phrased in a contemporary idiom, and marketed to a world afraid of responsibility and commitment.

The only aspect of Mary which is explicitly treated in Bultmann's theological works on demythologizing is the Virgin Birth. The Virgin Birth belongs to the group of secondary mythical events surrounding Christ. "There is for example only one occurrence of the legends of the Virgin Birth and the Ascension: St. Paul and St. John appear to be totally unaware of them."⁸¹ Bultmann sees the Virgin Birth as the product of the Hellenistic Church; the earlier Church did not know it because it did not consider Christ divine.⁸² In the New Testament we have a mythical current flowing next to a historical current in the Virgin Birth.

"We have here a unique combination of history and myth. The New Testament claims that this Jesus of history, whose father and mother were well known to his contemporaries (*John* 4:6) is at the same time the pre-existent Son of God. . . . This combination of myth and history presents a number of difficulties as can be seen from certain inconsistencies in the New Testament material. The doctrine of Christ's pre-existence as given by St. Paul and St. John is difficult to reconcile with the legend of the Virgin Birth in St. Matthew and St. Luke."⁸³

⁸⁰ Bultmann in 1951 was asked to lecture on the theme of the confession of faith adopted by the World Council of Churches as a condition for membership—Jesus Christ as God and Savior. The passage is from this address cited in G. Miegge, *Gospel and Myth* (Richmond, John Knox, 1960) 85-86.

⁸¹ Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth*, 9.

⁸² Bultmann, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1 (New York, Scribner's, 1951-1955) 50.

⁸³ *Op. cit.*, 2, 156-157.

The Virgin Birth is easily understood and forgotten. It was an attempt to explain the meaning of the Person of Jesus for faith; it is trying to say that Jesus' origin and meaning transcend both history and nature. Jesus' virginal conception has no more relevance for our personal "decisions concerning self-understanding than any other event of the same basic type" (of such objectivity, e.g. the recovery of a space ship).⁵⁴

Whereas Jung looked for the psychic cause of religious ideas and symbols, happily to a great extent refraining from judging the possible relations of these symbols to the historical, real, and divine, Tillich and Bultman have judged Mary as such a symbol and found her wanting. Tillich's judgment is absolute on the existential level, as Bultmann's is on the exegetical level. Tillich left the narrowing possibility of Mary's significance as a channel of revelation; Bultman goes farther in his judgment of revelation by his own standard of contemporary utility.⁵⁵

II *Mary and Myth: Similarities and Divergencies*

An adequate critique of these three positions would be too vast and too repetitious besides being unnecessary. Also, the intent of this study is not criticism of Jung or Tillich but rather a delineation in clearer forms of intellectual currents which are forming the minds of our society, not only towards religion and Christianity in general, but towards the Mother of Christ. This

⁵⁴ Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth*, 35.

⁵⁵ Bultmann's exegetical works touch upon Mary. Discussing passages in St. Luke is *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1931); treating St. John is *Das Evangelium Johannes* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952). By way of summary of these works we might say: The Virgin Birth and other aspects of the miraculous infancy narratives come from a more primitive sphere than Hellenistic syncretism or mysticism. Nevertheless, it was the Hellenic Church which kept alive and nourished these traditions—traditions which were for the most part present to Luke as he wrote. In John the incident at Cana contains a rebuke; the description of Mary and John at the foot of the cross is, ultimately, not historical.

is our audience and our world (*Mark* 16:16); we must know it. Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, and Methodius⁵⁶ related Christianity and the Virgin Mother to their audience. Without compromising the precisions of revelation, dogma, and theology, we also must speak in a language that is relevant.

It is not surprising that Mary be related to myth. There are three characteristics of the religious myth: 1) transcendence of the historical and the temporal and the verifiable; 2) activity in the world for good or evil; 3) association with the divine.⁵⁷ Immediately we see that Catholic Marian theology (without sacrificing Mary's gratuitous redemption and sanctification, and her infinite ontological humility as a creature) *could* be linked to these characteristics.

1) Mary's consent at Nazareth is a very real consent upon which the salvation of mankind rests. Her presence at Calvary signifies her association not only in the conception and rearing of the universal Redeemer, but in His very act of redemption. Over and above these moral acts of association with the divine, the Christological maternity makes Mary truly the Mother of God, the Mother of one of the Persons of the Trinity, the Son, related to the other Persons by affinity.⁵⁸ No one has exceeded

⁵⁶ "Come . . . I will show you the Logos and the mysteries of the Logos, and I will give you understanding of them by means of images that are familiar to you. Here is the mountain beloved by God, not, like Cithaeron, a place where tragedies befall, but sanctified to the dramas of truth. Oh, how truly holy are these mysteries and how pure this light. These are indeed the mysteries which by initiation make me holy. The Lord reveals the holy signs, for he himself is the hierophant. . . ." St. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 12; PG 8, 240. "... The Church stands upon the moon. By Selene, in my view, the Scripture seeks to indicate by means of an image the faith of those who have been cleansed by the power of baptism. . . . Thus the Church—of which Selene is the symbol and prefiguration—stands upon our faith. . . ." St. Methodius, *Symposium*, 8, 6; PG 18, 148.

⁵⁷ See Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. cit., 1-3.

⁵⁸ C. X. J. M. Friethoff, O.P., *A Complete Mariology* (Westminster, Newman, 1958) 9-14.

St. Thomas and Cajetan in awesome description of Mary's relationship to the transcendent God.

"The humanity of Christ (because it is united to God), created beatitude in the Beatific Vision (because it is the enjoyment of God) and the Blessed Virgin (because she is the Mother of God) have a certain infinite dignity flowing from the infinite good which is God."⁵⁹

Cajetan, that precise commentator, phrases it differently:

"Consanguineous union with the humainty assumed by the Word of God is called affinity to God. So the mother of God is related to God in this way. Yet not to all of those so related to God is special veneration due. . . but only the Blessed Virgin should receive great honor (hyperdulia) for she alone touches upon the boundries of the Deity by her own natural activities. She conceived, bore, and nourished God."⁶⁰

2) Mary by conceiving, bearing and rearing the Redeemer was associated closely in the causality of human salvation. Although Jesus Christ accomplished this salvation perfectly and for all men by Himself, Mary has a subordinate role to play not only at the historical moment of Calvary, but throughout history; she petitions and dispenses graces in her role as advocate and auxiliary mediatrix, totally vivified by her divine Son in this supernatural work.

3) This brings us to the third characteristic. Mary, although limited as all creatures are by space and time, does transcend

⁵⁹ "... Humanitas Christi ex hoc quod est unita Deo, et beatitudo creata ex hoc quod est fruitio Dei, et Beata Virgo ex hoc quod est Mater Dei, habent quandam dignitatem infinitam ex bono infinito quod est Deus." St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4.

⁶⁰ "Consanguinitatem ad humanitatem assumptam a Verbo Dei, vocatur in littera affinitas ad Deum. Et ideo genetrix illius affinis Deo constituta dicitur. Non omnibus tamen huiusmodi affinibus hyperdulia debetur . . . sed soli Beatae Virgini quae sola ad fines deitatis propria operatione naturali attingit dum Deum concepit, peperit ac genuit et lacte proprio pavit." Thomas de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, *Commentaria in Summam theologiae*, II-II, q. 103, a. 4; ed. Leonina, IX, 382.

history.⁶¹ Not only, as all the elect will be, is she eternally beatified in the presence of God, but she exercises causality upon and in behalf of man. As an instrument of the divine decree she is the Mother of all men—actual and potential—and in her maternal office she petitions God (not causally touching Him, but rather enacting His own will). She is the aqueduct to earth of the new life and motive power we call grace.

I have brought out these basic Marian facts to show that Mary is uniquely capable of being misunderstood as a myth, for to the superficial observer she is touched with these three characteristics.

Of course, on the other hand, the differences are total. Mary is a historical creature all of whose activity is the gratuitous gift of God. Mary is not a mere symbol, nor a creation of man's myth-making faculty. Christianity is unique because it constructs its supernatural ecclesial edifice upon a foundation of the historical and the real. Just as grace builds upon nature, so Mary's transcendent and trans-historical activities are radicated in her earthly life—she was the complete mother of a historical Man who was divine. *The Incarnation destroys myth for Christ, for His mother, for His sacraments and Church.* The true union in Christ of the divine and the created gives an affirmative answer to the religious demands for the visible, the concrete, the human, and also to the need for the divine, the merciful, the saving, the glorifying. The Incarnation is true not only of Christ but, in an analogous participation, of Mary,

⁶¹ The following remark of Cardinal Constantini with regards to depicting Mary in art as a Chinese or African woman is interesting. "In art there are historical and archaeological realities and there are liturgical realities. The latter interests the painters of the missionary churches. Every Christian whether he is white, black, or yellow knows that he participates in the redemption; the humanity of Christ and that of Mary surpass the limitations of their semitic ancestry and they represent the humanity of all times for all times and for all places." Celso Cardinal Costantini, in his preface to *Maria. Etudes sur la Sainte Vierge*, ed. H. du Manoir, 4 (Paris, Beauchesne, 1956) 33.

grace, the sacraments, the hierarchy, and the Church, all of whom unite the human with the divine. This union of human and divine is what myth tries to express but is unable to do so without sacrificing the historical and the real.

How can we make Marian theology more meaningful to an American culture which is the audience of Jung, Tillich, and Bultmann?

First we must accent the biblical study of Mary. It is there that we find the historical person who in historical events touches the divine and becomes the auxiliatrix of the Savior of men. When biblical scholarship is pursued, we find out not less but more about Mary.⁶² We discover the first generation of Christians had recorded in their writings a much greater realization of her person and mission that we had thought. As we accent the historical (the relationship between God and time and history is uniquely Judaeo-Christian), we will be simultaneously destroying the mythical,⁶³ as we are also establishing the principles of Marian theology: maternity at Nazareth, present at Calvary. Through historical reality, Alexander Jones says, Mary destroys myth:

"Mary is that historical person who is the terminus and the beginning of God's climactic 'interference' in human history. She

⁶² Examples of this are R. Laurentin, *Luc I-II* (Paris, Gabalda, 1957); F. M. Braun, O.P., *La Mère des fidèles* (Tournai, Casterman, 1953).

⁶³ "The most striking innovation [of Christianity] (apart from the message and the divinity of Christ) is its valorisation of Time—in the final reckoning, its redemption of Time and of History... From the standpoint of the history of religions, Judaeo-Christianity presents us with the supreme hierophany: *the transfiguration of the historical even into hierophany*... Here it is the historical event as such which displays the maximum of trans-historicity: God not only intervenes in history, as in the case of Judaism; He is incarnated in a historic being, in order to undergo a historically conditioned existence... In spite of the value it accords to Time, Judaeo-Christianity does not lead to historicism but to a theology of History. It is not for its own sake that an event is valued, but only for the sake of the revelation of embodies—a revelation that precedes and transcends it." Mircea Eliade, *Images and Symbols* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1961) 169-170.

stands stubbornly, a virgin with child, asserting that 'interference' in herself. There is a demythologization which is in principle legitimate and certainly fashionable. The Church has not defined the limits to which it may go, but Mary is there as the fortified place past which it must not go. She remains the guardian of the historical Christ, the witness and custodian and minister of the Word."⁶⁴

Next, I think we should accent Mary's relationship to the Church. Ecumenism is concerned with the Church and, whether we like it or not, although Mary is a way to Church unity, her "public image" may not be. It is not the Co-redemption should be toned down, but rather that it should be presented under the theological ideas current today—related to the complete redemptive act of Christ and to the role of the Church as the Body of Christ in time. Particularly, Mary should be related to the individual members of the Church. It was in this direction that *Munificentissimus Deus* pointed. Today, instead of being impersonalized by the concentration camps of totalitarianism, modern man's individuality is harmed by the materialism, conformity, and status-consciousness of contemporary a-religious society. It is in opposition to this indifferent paganism that the eschatological glory of Mary should be preached, a promise of the resurrection of every Christian.

Father Louis Beirnaert, S.J., offers a balanced study of the relationship between the Jungian archetypes, the general symbols of mankind relating to rebirth and water, and Baptism. His work, far from minimizing the uniqueness of revelation and sacrament, adds depth to both; he concludes with these words:

"[Christian realities] do not direct the believer's mind primarily to the myths and immanent archetypes, but to the intervention of the divine power in history; this new meaning [nevertheless] must not lead us to deny the permanence of the ancient meaning. By its

⁶⁴ Alexander Jones, *God's Living Word* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1961) 209.

renewal of the great figures and symbolizations of natural religion, Christianity has also renewed their vitality and their power in the depths of the psyche. . . .

"It is a question not only of setting in play archetypes as immanent psyche powers but of the intervention of absolute Love which results in dying to sin and being reborn to grace. . . . A superior rule (Faith) subordinates them moreover, so that they will designate and mediate the coming of the Son of God. . . . Faith itself implies the presence of this Spirit from on high which makes man perfect and which penetrates to within all the psychic powers of the natural man, in order to purify them and to divinize them.

"The immense interest presented today by the study of the Fathers and of liturgy originates in part on the need to discover a Christianity which knew how to address itself effectively to the unconscious of the natural religious man. The symbolic categories of the Fathers, Jung has aptly remarked, are those which depth psychology has disclosed in the structure of the psyche. They are archetypal. One understands nothing of their thought without apprehending, for example, the presence and activity of the mother, in the unity which they discover amid the primordial earth whence was drawn Adam, Eve, the Virgin Mary, etc. The return to these great categories in Christian teaching would signify an active evangelization of the pagan man of today."⁶⁵

Finally, we should be conscious of our society. We should remember that their thought patterns, intellectual formations, and pre-judgments are the doors to their souls. We should not be afraid of names and theories. Tillich is right when he says Mary is the channel of religious meaning for mankind; he is

⁶⁵Louis Beirnaert, S.J., *The Mythic Dimension in Christian Sacramentalism*, in *Cross Currents* 2 (1951) 83-84. This article is presented at length by Eliade, *op. cit.*, 160-162. Fr. Beirnaert begins his article: "Is it possible to speak of a mythic dimension in a religion which has set itself against any form of paganism and which its central affirmation in the personal intervention of a transcendent God in history? The question is addressed to the theologian. Mythologists and psychologists have demonstrated too many analogies between Christian symbols and those which form the objects of their study for it to be possible for us to ignore them. . . . It is interesting therefore to reassess the subject in the light of new data." *Loc. cit.*, 68; see Eliade, *op. cit.*, 159.

wrong when he makes these media the utilitarian creation of man rather than a permanent divine gift to man in history and beyond history. As we have already seen, some theologians have seen Jung's archetypes as a satisfactory introduction to aspects of Catholicism. Christian theology has through the centuries spoken in the context of its times. Our task is to know our own culture and, without sacrificing a single facet of the revelation of Christ, make the economy of salvation intelligible and meaningful to the world.

REV. THOMAS AQUINAS O'MEARA, O.P.

*St. Rose Priory
Dubuque, Iowa.*