

In what sense is Mary a type of the Church?

Using two models to illuminate some developments in twentieth century Roman Catholic Mario-ecclesiology.

Submitted by Sean Willis to the University of Exeter
As a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology in August 2013

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: _____

Abstract

This thesis has two aims. Firstly, in order to answer the question, ‘In what sense do people see Mary as a type of the Church?’, this thesis will set up original typological models of the relationship between Mary and the Church (chapter 1). It will then demonstrate how and why an eschatological element came to be present in these models (chapter 2). It will be a contention of this thesis that looking at the Mario-ecclesial discussions set out in chapters 3 and 4 through these typological models will allow a greater depth of analysis. The models allow one to discern differences between and nuances in various views of the relationship between Mary and the Church that would be impossible to discern if one were using just the language of ‘type’. Secondly the thesis will show how each Mario-ecclesial discussion has been affected by the socio-political context of the time.

Specifically, the thesis will analyse the Mario-ecclesial discussions of the patristic, medieval and modern periods in the light of the typological models. In chapter 1, the patristic Mario-ecclesiologies of Irenaeus and Ambrose will be considered. In chapter 2, Bernard of Clairvaux will be used to analyse the eschatological nature of the Mario-ecclesiology in the medieval period. In chapter 3, the contrasting Mario-ecclesiologies of the Second Vatican Council and Hans Urs von Balthasar will be compared. In chapter 4, it will be suggested that John Paul’s model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship was based on his eschatological vision for the Church and the role that Mary plays in that future which is both imminent and already realised.

This thesis will demonstrate that by using the typological models in these periods a greater depth of analysis can be achieved. This will be particularly true of the complex and nuanced discussions on Mary in the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century. This analysis will culminate in the particular Mariology of John Paul II.

Contents

Abstract	2
Contents	4
Introduction.....	9
What is the aim of this thesis?	9
What will this thesis cover?.....	12
What is meant by type?	21
Types of type.	24
Mary and the Maternal Femininity.....	29
Conclusion.....	32
Chapter 1: Patristic Models of Mario-ecclesiology.....	33
Genetrix	34
Recapitulation	34
St Paul and the Adam-Christ relationship.....	38
Irenaeus and the Adam-Christ relationship	43
Irenaeus and the Eve-Mary relationship.....	51
Social Recapitulation.....	57
Genetrix – An Irenaean Mario-ecclesiology?.....	63
Exemplar.....	69
Ambrose: Mary as ‘Virgin of Virgins’	71
Ambrose and Irenaeus	80
A submissive virgin?.....	86

Conclusion	91
Chapter 2: Mary in Medieval Eschatology	92
Bernard, Mary and the Church.....	94
Bernard and the Church.....	95
Bernard and Mary	100
The Church's View of Itself.....	113
Mary, the Church and the end	115
Bernard on the end	115
The No-Longer Spotless Church.....	119
Millennialism.....	122
Mary and the end	128
Mario-ecclesial eschatology.....	138
Chapter 3: Mary and the Church in the twentieth century	144
Von Balthasar and Vatican II: Contextual Significance	146
Mary, the Church and the Second Vatican Council.	151
Towards the Council	151
A New Pentecost? The Council.....	159
Lumen Gentium: Schemas on Mary and the Church	162
The Second Session: September 29 th – December 4 th 1963	162
Intersession – January – September 1964.....	170
The Third Session: September 14 th – November 21 st 1964	172
Von Balthasar and the Marian Profile of the Church.....	183

Mary in Revelation	184
Mary, Faith and Surrender	189
The Marian Profile of the Church.	194
The Johannine Profile	204
Von Balthasar and the Mario-ecclesial relationship.....	207
Conciliar not Conciliatory: The comparative Mario-ecclesiologies of Vatican II and Von Balthasar	208
The Different Ecclesiological Interpretations of the Post-Conciliar Environment	209
The Church and the Constellation: Conciliar, Not Conciliatory.....	213
Mary: Consumed by the Church?	221
Conclusion.....	230
Chapter 4: John Paul as a Case Study	232
Karol Wojtyła and Marian Devotion 1920-1962.....	235
Mary and Poland	236
Mary as a surrogate mother	239
Mary's gift of self	243
Wojtyła and the Communist state.....	246
Wojtyła and the Second Vatican Council 1962-65	250
Wojtyła at the Council.....	251
Wojtyła after the Council: Gratitude and Implementation	262
John Paul II and Communism: 1978-1989.....	266
Mary and Poland	267

John Paul II, Mary and Poland	268
Mary as the genetrix of a new Poland	273
John Paul and Catholic Social Teaching: The Culture of Death: 1989-2005	279
The Self and the Other	279
The Culture of Death	283
Mary as exemplar of the 'Gospel of Life'	285
Mary as an example of the 'genius of women'.	295
John Paul II's Eschatological Mario-ecclesiology.....	301
Mary at the end of time.....	301
Conclusion.....	309
Conclusion.....	312
Typological Models of the Mario-ecclesial Relationship.....	312
Patristic Period	315
Medieval Period	317
Modern Period.....	320
The Socio-Political Element.....	323
John Paul II's Mario-ecclesiology.....	329
Bibliography.....	334
Primary Sources	334
Patristic	334
Medieval.....	334

Church Documents before 1978	336
John Paul II: Encyclicals and Church Documents	336
John Paul II: Speeches and Homilies.....	337
John Paul II: Wednesday Addresses	338
John Paul II: Books and Other	339
John Paul II: As Karol Wojtyła	339
Secondary Sources	339
Books	339
Speeches and Addresses	346
Journal Articles.....	347

Introduction

What is the aim of this thesis?

This thesis has two aims. Firstly it wishes to answer the question: ‘in what sense do people see Mary as a type of the Church?’ In order to achieve this, this thesis will introduce original typological models of the relationship between Mary and the Church, and use them as a framework that will allow greater analysis of the question. Secondly it wishes to contend that Mario-ecclesial discussions often take place within the context of the socio-political concerns of the time.

This thesis is concerned with the relationship between the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Church of her Son. It is concerned therefore with how that relationship is envisioned by different schools of thought and by a diverse group of thinkers in Church history. The figure of Mary has been constantly reinterpreted by a succession of writers and has been placed in contexts which give her specific theological roles. For example, St Ambrose of Milan’s fourth century documents on asceticism use the figure of Mary to encourage certain kinds of behaviour. Here the figure of Mary appears as a model of the Church; Mariology is involved in the ecclesiological discussion taking place. Examples like this will form the backbone of the thesis.

The nature of the perceived relationship between Mary and the Church has been constantly evolving throughout Christian history, beginning with the words of St Ambrose when he declared that the Church was virgin but married just as

Mary was, because ‘*quia est Ecclesiae typus* (She is a type of the Church)’.¹ Of particular interest in tracking this movement are: the letters and documents of the Early Church Fathers and the great thinkers of the Patristic period; the apocalyptic worldviews of the mystics of the Middle Ages and the Marian devotion of St Bernard of Clairvaux; and the tumultuous collision of the Catholic Church with the arrival of modernity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In each of these periods the relationship between Mary and the Church is viewed through the context of the time and new ideas are read into old writings. This thesis will therefore look at each of these contexts and examine the use of Mary and the development of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in each case. I will use this historical perspective as a foundation on which to construct a study of the development of Roman Catholic Mario-ecclesiology in the modern period culminating in Pope John Paul II’s own particular Mariology. I will suggest that although individual thinkers on the subject have different thoughts and different agendas, it is possible to talk about their thoughts within the framework of two contrasting models of how Mary and the Church interact.

Therefore this thesis aims to consider the different ways in which Mary and the Church are related to one another in theological discussion. It will be necessary to talk of the typological terms in which this relationship is discussed. The thesis will set out, in the first chapter, two original typological models which will serve as a framework through which the different ideas can be seen. It will be a contention of this thesis that looking at the Mario-ecclesial discussions through the lens of these typological models will allow a greater depth of analysis of those discussions, and will allow differences in the views of the relationship

¹ Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundem Lucam*, 2.7, from http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/02m/0339-0397_Ambrosius_Expositio_Evangelii_Secundum_Lucam_Libris_X_Comprehensa_MLT.pdf, accessed 18/08/09 (Henceforth *Ex. Lucam*)

between Mary and the Church that would be impossible to discern if using just the language of ‘type’. Having set out the typological concepts and examined the nature of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, and then the eschatological aspect of that relationship, the thesis will analyse the use of those concepts in the modern period. First, in chapter 3, it will analyse the use of the model in the twentieth century, focusing on the Second Vatican Council and Hans Urs von Balthasar. Finally, in chapter 4, it will culminate its analysis in the theology of one specific thinker: Pope John Paul II. It will be suggested that John Paul’s model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship was based on his eschatological vision for the Church and the role that Mary plays in that future which is both imminent and already realised. To that end, this thesis will consider in chapter two, some of the eschatological uses of Mary and the Church through the medieval period, as this will highlight further the key Mariological, eschatological and ecclesiological concerns of John Paul. Chapter two will also outline how the eschatological context affected the Mario-ecclesial discussion.

Finally this thesis acknowledges the need to analyse the subject of Mary as a woman. As shall be seen, discussion about the relationship between Mary and the Church originates from a discussion about the relationship between Mary and Eve. This is where Irenaeus centres his focus on Mary, and where those arguing for Mary as an example of how to behave highlight exactly how it is that Mary provides that example. The debates surrounding the treatment of these two characters, in particular Eve, have built steadily and encompass a wide-ranging field of theology. The feminist critique of the way in which Mary is treated by the Church is therefore one which will be considered in the thesis. The typological models that this thesis sets out will also be appraised in this light.

What will this thesis cover?

This thesis will consider the different Mario-ecclesial models that emerge from the patristic period, the medieval period and the modern period in the twentieth century. The opening chapter will set out some of the very first concepts regarding Mary and the Church, focusing on St. Irenaeus of Lyons and St. Ambrose of Milan. These two theologians form the basis of the two major typological models that I will set out as a framework for understanding all of the other discussions of the relationship between Mary and the Church. I will suggest that there are two major ways of looking at how Mary relates to the Church. I will also suggest that although these are not models that are rigidly adhered to by other writers, they offer a framework around which to understand the sense of Mary as a type of the Church in more depth.

According to one of these models, Mary provides a theoretical example to the Church of how it should act, or how its members should act. In the other, Mary is the foundation of the Church itself. This second model interprets Mary's role as being much more prominent and much more powerful. These two models will thread throughout the thesis and will draw on a typological language that will be introduced below.

The patristic chapter will consider how these contrasting models came about and where they came from. St. Paul's discussion of Adam and Christ and Irenaeus' interpretation and development of these ideas will form the basis of the first of the two models, with Irenaeus' use of Mary in his writings against heretics being particularly important. Irenaeus extended the typological reading of Scripture to include the characters of Eve and Mary, suggesting that as with Adam and Christ, Eve and Mary are linked through their actions. In this case,

for Irenaeus ‘the knot of Eve’s disobedience was loosened by the obedience of Mary’.² This suggests a role for Mary in the wider act of salvation that Christ brings about, because the obedience of which Irenaeus spoke came from Mary’s acceptance of God’s commands at the Annunciation. Irenaeus believed that Mary, by having a role in the Incarnation, played a role in salvation. This active participation in salvation history forms the root of one of the models of Mario-ecclesiology: what I shall call the archetypal or *genetrix* model. Using Matthew Steenberg’s concept of *Social Recapitulation*,³ which suggests that Irenaeus’ use of Mary in this typological manner was related to Irenaeus’ interpretation of the social role that Eve played in Genesis, I shall link this typological relationship between Mary and Eve to the one between Mary and the Church.

In moving to consider the second model, the patristic chapter will consider the ascetic writings of St Ambrose of Milan two centuries after Irenaeus. I shall argue that the ecclesiological context had by this point altered a great deal, and that Ambrose was not fighting to maintain the Church against exterior threats, but instead was working in an environment where those threats came from within the body of the Church itself. I shall therefore suggest that Ambrose utilised Mary as an example of behaviour for the people of the Church in the fourth century. He implored the members of his church to: ‘learn of behaviour from the Virgin, learn of modesty from the Virgin, learn of the prophecy from the Virgin, learn in the mystery’.⁴ This idea of using Mary as an example of correct

² St Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus Haereses*, III, 22.4, trans. Roberts, Alexander and Rambaut, William, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* Vol. 1, from <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103322.htm>, accessed 31/10/2012 (henceforth A.H.)

³ Steenberg, M. C., ‘The Role of Mary as Co-Recapitulator in St Irenaeus of Lyons’, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 58, No.2, (May, 2004) pp.117-137

⁴ St Ambrose of Milan, *Ex Lucam*, 2.8, ‘*Disce virginem moribus, disce virginem verecundia, disce virginem oraculo, disce mysterio*’, accessed 31/10/2012

behaviour for members of the Christian Church came at a time when the character of Mary was undergoing more rigorous examination following the Council of Nicaea and the perceived rise in the importance of the Virgin's role in the Incarnation and therefore in Salvation. This idea will therefore form the root of the second Mario-ecclesial model, which I shall refer to as being prototypic in nature, and will be labelled *exemplar*. It will be necessary to outline how the use of Mary had altered in the two centuries between Irenaeus and Ambrose, and how these differences can be seen in the contrasting typological models that I will put forward to frame this thesis.

The patristic chapter, then, will serve to outline two different models of the relationship between Mary and the Church, and will set out some ideas that will be picked up later on by more modern thinkers, and in particular by John Paul II in his thinking on the matter.

When considering the Mario-ecclesiology of John Paul II, I shall argue that his distinctive take on the relationship emerges from his eschatological vision, one which sees the future of the Church as having already taken place through Mary. It will be necessary therefore to consider the eschatological developments surrounding Mariology and ecclesiology throughout the period of the Middle Ages when apocalyptic visions and visionaries were common, and when a version of the Millenarianism that would be a part of John Paul's thinking 1000 years later was also prevalent. It will be shown that ideas made popular during this period would remain so for centuries.

The second chapter will therefore be concerned with the different eschatological ideas that were present during the turn of the second millennium, and quite how Mary fitted into these visions of the future. It will focus primarily on the writing of

St. Bernard of Clairvaux who was actively involved with the papacy of the twelfth century. His Marian devotion, combined with his involvement with the Church hierarchy, means that his Mario-ecclesiology suitably portrayed the socio-political context of the time.

The chapter will also outline the conflict between the papacy in Rome and the German Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. During the medieval period, when apocalyptic concerns were present throughout Christendom, questions were asked of the suitability of the Church to guide the faithful through the end of time and into the next life. Opponents of the Church saw the papacy as damning the members of the Church through its legalistic and temporal ambitions which obscured their spiritual duties. For the Church itself, while the papacy, following the Great Reform of the eleventh century, felt that it was well placed to lead the Church to its victory in heaven, later theologians, including Hans Urs von Balthasar, would suggest that 'this was a Church that had already resigned itself to not being spotless'.⁵

Therefore in chapter 2 the typological relationship between Mary and the Church will be shown to result in the substitution of Mary for the Church in the eschatological discussion. Mary as spotless will be seen to ensure the victory of the Church by representing the Church in heaven. Popular celebration of Mary's Immaculate Conception and Assumption will be shown to have an impact on the eschatological role of Mary. The chapter will conclude by summarising the relationship of the Mario-ecclesial models to what Caroline Bynum calls

⁵ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1974, 2nd edition, trans. Andrée Emery), 209

eschatological ‘attitudes’,⁶ and outlining how the different models can illuminate some of the differences in attitude. It will be demonstrated that images reminiscent of both the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models were drawn upon in discussing Mary’s eschatological role in the Church.

The story of attitudes towards Mary and the Church throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is a story which demonstrates quite clearly how much views on the relationship between the two are subject to the immediate context . The last two centuries saw the position of Mary change repeatedly and profoundly in the eyes of those effecting the change and those affected by it. Within this period comes the work of Hans Urs von Balthasar. His writing on Mary, her role within and alongside the Church, and on eschatology will provide another key moment in the development of Mario-ecclesiology.

It is also a period marked by the holding of the Second Vatican Council, an ecumenical council that promised an *aggiornamento* (literally ‘a bringing up to date’), an opening of windows and a refreshing of the Church body. It was to be a gathering of Catholic bishops whose job it would be to ‘consider, in particular, the growth of the Catholic faith, the restoration of sound morals among the Christian flock, and appropriate adaption of Church discipline to the needs and conditions of our times’.⁷ The Second Vatican Council once again altered perceptions of Mary’s relationship with the Church. It also greatly affected those theologians who worked at the Council itself (such as Karol Wojtyła) or those,

⁶ Walker Bynum, Caroline, and Freedman, Paul, ‘Introduction’, Bynum Walker Bynum, Caroline, and Freedman, Paul (eds), *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000) pp.1-17: 7

⁷ Pope John XXIII, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, (June 29th 1959), 61, from www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xiii_enc_29061959_ad-petri_en.html, accessed 31/12/2012

such as Hans Urs von Balthasar, who were not invited to the Council but who certainly maintained an interest in the results of it.

This period is capped off with the work of Karol Wojtyła, latterly Pope John Paul II, through whom I will summarise and examine the larger Mario-ecclesiological themes raised in the thesis. This will involve considering how discussion of Mary and the Church can be illuminated and strengthened by reference to the two models that I will have set out in the preceding chapters of the thesis. John Paul will be the case study that demonstrates the relevance of these models in the wider discussions on the Mario-ecclesial relationship. This is because his Mario-ecclesiology encapsulated the different aspects of the Mario-ecclesial discussion covered in this thesis.

Given the importance of the modern period, its examination will be set out in chapter 3 before attention turns to the Mario-ecclesiology of John Paul II in chapter 4: the case study that this thesis is building towards. Firstly, in chapter 3, I will consider the contrasting Mario-ecclesial definitions of the Second Vatican Council and Hans Urs von Balthasar. In the first half of chapter three, the Mario-ecclesial divisions present at the Council will be traced back to similar contrasts in thought present in the Catholic Church during the first half of the twentieth century. Significant debates took place between the two schools of thought. On one side were those interested in the neo-scholastic school, developed out of the first Vatican Council, which looked back at the medieval scholastic thinkers, most specifically St Thomas Aquinas, in making judgements about contemporary ecclesiology. Included in this school of thought was a growing Marian movement. On the other side was the *ressourcement* movement that encapsulated the school of *Nouvelle théologie*, which wanted to

return to a more scriptural and patristic understanding of Church doctrine. This was a school that would later include, amongst others important to this thesis, von Balthasar.

The Council understood that the socio-political context involved the concerns of a global audience. There were also varying concerns and desires from within the Council. It will be demonstrated that the ecumenical concerns of a group of the Council Fathers, combined with a reaction from Protestant Christians to the promulgation of the dogma of Mary's Assumption in 1950, resulted in a desire to minimise the role of Mary in the Church. This would come into conflict with those Council Fathers who wished to see Mary properly venerated and her role within the Church maximised for greatest respect to her. Chapter 3 will demonstrate the differences in the Mario-ecclesiology of these groups by using the typological models of this thesis. These models will illuminate both the reasons why they wished for different Mario-ecclesial definitions, and the ways in which the ultimate conciliar definitions on Mary were compromises that drew mainly on the ecumenical concerns.

The second half of chapter 3 will look at the theology of von Balthasar, specifically his eschatology and his writing on Mary and the Church. Von Balthasar's thinking on the Mario-ecclesial relationship was central to his ecclesiological vision. Although it borrowed from the declarations of the Council, it differed significantly from the Marian chapter published by the Council Fathers. There are, according to von Balthasar, two distinct 'Profiles' of the Church. On one side is the ecclesiastical, institutional, hierarchical structure created through Peter and his successors. He was the rock and foundation upon which the Church was to be built. The Petrine Profile is that of

organisation and solid leadership. This aspect of the Church has been very evidently present throughout the ages of the Church.

On the other side is the ‘Marian Profile’. This is based upon the *fiat*, (the ‘Yes’ at the Annunciation) when Mary allows the Incarnation to occur through her by the grace of God. For von Balthasar, the Marian Profile consists of the Church’s continual echo of that ‘Yes’, by which it spreads throughout the world. It would later be described as the principle of discipleship within the Church: that obedience to and faith in the grace of God that Mary maintained, and that all members of the Church must share. ‘Both the Marian and Petrine principles are coextensive with the Church’,⁸ and represent two different but equal aspects of the ecclesiological structure.

By utilising the two typological models of this thesis, it will be possible to demonstrate where von Balthasar and the Council differed in their Mario-ecclesial views and also to show how they had different senses of Mary as a type of the Church. Von Balthasar’s concept of the Marian profile of the Church will demonstrate an explicit use of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, which will contrast with the Council and its ultimate parallels with the *exemplar* model as set out by this thesis. The Mario-ecclesiologies of both the Council and von Balthasar will also be seen to have a great impact on the work of John Paul II.

Finally, in the fourth chapter, the study of John Paul’s Mario-ecclesiology will bring together the aspects of the subject discussed in the earlier chapters and evaluate how they are used by the Polish Pope. It will be necessary to consider his writings, including his encyclicals and his letters, his speeches and

⁸ Von Balthasar, *The Office of Peter*, 220

addresses and his Wednesday sessions (which included many discussions on Mary) amongst other sources. The chapter will consider his influences and the way in which his thinking on the matter developed so that his thought moved somewhat from being more reminiscent of the *genetrix* model to something more in common with the *exemplar* model over the course of his papacy. Ultimately however, I will suggest that, while the two models worked together for John Paul, he focused mostly on a sense of Mary as a type of the *genetrix* model. He constructed an eschatological Mario-ecclesiology, which saw the Church set along a path that ended in heaven. Here the Church would begin its eternal victory alongside Christ as formed and demonstrated already by the Virgin Mary. For John Paul, the words of Vatican II, that ‘in the most Holy Virgin, the Church has already reached that perfection whereby she is without spot or wrinkle’,⁹ are prominent in his thinking on the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

In his Marian encyclical of 1987, *Redemptoris Mater* (Mother of the Redeemer), John Paul makes clear his position:

The Church journeys through time towards the consummation of the ages and goes to meet the Lord who comes. But on this journey – and I wish to make this point straightforward – she proceeds along the path already trodden by the Virgin Mary.¹⁰

This eschatological view of Mary’s relationship with the Church will demonstrate how John Paul’s theology was slightly different from those ideas seen previously. However by analysing it through the typological models, it will be

⁹ Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: *Lumen Gentium*, 65 (21/11/1964) www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen_gentium_en.html, accessed 31/10/2012

¹⁰ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 2, (25/03/1987), from www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0224/_P2.HTM accessed 31/10/2012

possible to see how it differs and more importantly, why it differs. In this final chapter I shall show that the two models I set up in previous sections are present in a number of Mario-ecclesial discussions, and that they can be useful as a framework from which to begin typological discussions about the relationship between Mary and the Church.

What is meant by type?

It is important before discussing the different typological ideas to ask: ‘What is a type?’ The term *typos* may be derived from *typtō*, meaning to strike or beat. ‘This word... is found in the original meaning of form, and in particular, a (hollow) mould.¹¹ The underlying sense of *typos* includes both the thing which impresses a shape into something else and the impression left behind by an object, such as a seal on a letter:

The word is found to a great extent in the abstracted sense of general form or type, such as the form of a style or doctrine. There then follows the wider abstraction of the word in both directions; signifying the mould, the form which stamps and the impress, the form which is stamped. Typos thus denotes: (a) an original, a pattern, and in two senses: the technical sense of prototype, model, and the ethical sense of example, and (b) copy.¹²

Thus the idea of imprint, both the thing which causes the imprint and the imprint which is caused, can perhaps be said to be the simplest way of considering type.

¹¹ Müller, H, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, Colin (General Ed), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Volume 3: Pri-Z* (Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1978) 903-4

¹² Müller, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 904

However, in theological discourse, ‘type’ has come to mean that which is a symbol or figure of another thing. For example, Adam is a type of Christ and Mary is a type of the Church in addition to their explicit roles as first man and Mother of Christ. In this context the term ‘antitype’ has two, more specific, definitions. On the one hand, the concept of antitype can be ‘something that is foreshadowed by a type or symbol, as a New Testament event prefigured in the Old Testament’.¹³ The Oxford English Dictionary suggests that it can be defined as ‘that which is shadowed forth or represented by the “type” or symbol: [for example] then be the priest, either Melchisidech the type, or Christ the antitype.’¹⁴ Here, in terms of priesthood, it is argued that whilst Melchisidech was the type originating from the Old Testament, Christ was the antitype. That is, in terms of being the New Testament figure foreshadowed by the Old Testament figure who typified that position or those attributes. In a similar fashion, Christ was an antitype of Moses and Moses a type of Christ. Furthermore, in Eve there is the foreshadowing of the eventual obedience of Mary. This foreshadowing comes about because Eve performs the opposite action to Mary, and therefore Mary is required to undo them through her own actions. This gives rise to the second meaning of ‘antitype’: ‘an opposite or contrasting type’. For example, the figure of Mary, seen as obedient to the commands of God, would be the antitype of Eve who directly disobeyed the command of God in Genesis. They represent the opposite ends of the spectrum in terms of their behaviour and response to God. In that sense it could be said that they are antitypical of one another.

¹³ www.dictionary.com, accessed 09/08/10

¹⁴ Müller, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 906

In the following chapter, I will argue that the origins of Mario-ecclesial typology can be traced back through the work of Irenaeus, and, through him, to the ideas set out by St Paul in his letter to the Romans. Müller notes that:

In Rom.5:14, the *typos*-concept produces a tension which basically breaks through the typological method. The figures of Adam and Christ are compared and contrasted in their significance and effectiveness for “all”. Adam is designated a “*typos* of the one who was to come”.¹⁵

The suggestion here is that the relationship between Adam and Christ that is propagated in Romans is one that in itself creates a new concept: ‘typology’. ‘Typology in Paul has obviously not yet hardened into a methodology simply requiring appropriate technical application to any situation.’¹⁶ Thus the broader ideas that I will argue emanate from this passage and from the theological context of the relationship between Adam and Christ would appear to diverge from their original, narrower scriptural purpose. Müller feels that, with regard to typology in the strict sense of the term, ‘Its degeneration in subsequent years has cast suspicion on its credibility’.¹⁷ Given that this thesis will demonstrate that there are at least two models of the Mario-ecclesial typological relationship which are used in later theological typology it is perhaps fitting to note that the very concept of typology is in itself of disputed origin.

To summarise, when this thesis talks of a typological relationship, it is talking about a relationship between two figures or characters, one of which is a type of the other (the antitype). Typology is a broader theological method which seeks

¹⁵ Müller, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 906

¹⁶ Müller, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 906

¹⁷ Müller, ‘Type, Pattern’, in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 906

to use one or more typological relationship in the interpretation of the bible or in constructive theology.

Types of type.

In addition to ‘type’ and ‘antitype’ there are two other derivatives of these terms that will form the focus of this thesis: ‘prototype’ and ‘archetype’. When looking at the terms ‘prototype’ and ‘archetype’, it can be tempting to assume that they mean ultimately the same thing. Indeed they are usually each defined by the other so that from a technical point of view they cannot be separated as different concepts. ‘Prototype’ is defined in dictionary terms as ‘the first or primary type of a person or thing; an original on which something is modelled or from which it is derived; an exemplar; an archetype’.¹⁸ An archetype is ‘the original pattern or model from which all things of the same kind are copied or on which they are based; a model or first form; prototype’,¹⁹ or ‘the original pattern or model from which copies are made’.²⁰

For the purposes of this thesis, and indeed as a foundation for the entire typological discussion that this thesis will set out and reinforce, I will demonstrate that these two terms can in fact have very different, almost contrasting definitions. They will form the basis of the two typological models for Mario-ecclesiology that this thesis will be concerned with. It is important in that context, to ensure that what I mean by prototype and archetype are set out very clearly before the discussion can begin.

So, firstly, I wish to use the term prototype to mean something that is in itself, an example or model of (in this case) the Church or of its people. It is a term used

¹⁸ www.dictionary.oed.com, accessed 22/11/2010

¹⁹ www.dictionary.com, accessed 18/01/10

²⁰ www.dictionary.oed.com, accessed 22/11/2010

for Mary when she is a role model, when she is seen as an exemplar to the people. Her relationship to the Church in this case is one of presence within it. Furthermore, the same qualities, such as obedience, can be seen in both Mary and Church.

Secondly, the concept of archetype in Mariology is one that relates to a formative, creational model of Mary. In this instance, she is a figure involved in the creation of the Church itself. This can be either in a direct, physical way, through her giving birth to Jesus, or by the use of her characteristics and behavioural patterns as an integral part of the formation of the Church in theological terms. The Mary in this Mario-ecclesial relationship is not present within the Church. Instead, she is the model to follow but not to compare oneself directly to. She does not appear alongside or within the Church because she is before it.

One possible way of looking at this differentiation between prototype and archetype is to consider the construction of a car. The prototype model in this case is the first car that was made. It is the first in the series that leads to the current car, but one that is still running on the track and is present with the current models. The prototype and the later cars form part of the same group. The archetype, on the other hand, is the blueprint for those cars. The archetype consists of the very equations and calculations that make all the cars possible. The cars would not exist in the way they do without it. So, a prototypic Mary is present with and part of the Church: she is still involved personally with the Church (and with the members of that Church) in a way which is based on fundamental equality (inasmuch as they are all human, and all members of the Church in need of being redeemed). By contrast, the archetypal Mary is a

mother of the Church in a formative or foundational way. As such is neither present with the members of the church nor involved with them in an equal relationship. She is before and above the Church that is created from her.

My definitions here suggest a finality to the concepts that is not strictly in keeping with the way in which I intend to employ them. The prototypical and archetypal models that I will suggest are intended as framework structures on which typological discussions can be based, not strict definitions. I neither claim to know what writers were thinking nearly two millennia ago, nor do I claim that the fathers precisely foreshadow my own definitions. Instead I am looking to demonstrate how it is possible to categorise their writings as fitting broadly within the framework I suggest. Furthermore, since the different writers and theologies discussed rarely use these terms consistently with my definitions, I will not refer to prototype and archetype in my discussions of the two models. Instead I have devised two simple terms to categorise the models. When talking about the model which uses prototypic language, I will call it the *exemplar* model, coming from the term meaning ‘a model or pattern to be copied or imitated’.²¹ This refers to the idea that it is Mary’s model behaviour, her obedience to God that is projected forward to all members of the Church as an example of how they should behave. This will first be seen in the work of St Ambrose, who was concerned specifically with Mary’s virginity and the important example that it set for the people of his Church. This was a part of his wider ascetic agenda, much as many of the other typological models in this thesis were vital in supporting writers’ wider theological goals. As David G Hunter begins his paper on *Hedivius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome*:

²¹ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar> accessed 02/11/2012

One of the more striking features of the ascetic movement in the West at the end of the fourth century is the manner in which it spawned a new form of devotion to the Virgin Mary. Western writers, notably Ambrose, bishop of Milan, fastened on certain ideas, such as the perpetual virginity of Mary after the birth of Jesus (*virginitas post partum*) and the virginity of Mary in the process of giving birth (*virginitas in partu*), to exhort their followers to adopt an ascetic life.²²

I shall use *exemplar* then in this context. It represents one typological model of Mary and the Church - one where the relationship between the two is ongoing, and where Mary herself is present with and part of the Church.

When discussing an archetypal model of Mary and the Church, I shall use the term *genetrix*. This comes from the Latin term meaning mother or ancestress. In the context of this thesis this term will represent a Mario-ecclesial model whereby Mary is in some way formative or foundational for the Church. It corresponds to the idea of the relationship that I will set out when discussing Irenaeus in the next chapter. There I will examine Irenaeus' idea that Mary was involved in the recapitulatory act alongside Christ and that her actions countered those of Eve. Matthew Steenberg suggest that this recapitulatory act is related to Eve's role as the helper or *adiutorium* of Adam, which brings about a social aspect to the Fall of Man. Mary recapitulates the society of believers that are fallen just as much as the individual man was recapitulated by the fall of Adam in Genesis.

²² Hunter, David G, 'Helvidius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome', from *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol 1, No 1, (Spring 1993), pp.47-71:47, from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_early_christian_studies/summary/v001/1.1.hunter.html, accessed 21/08/2013

As humanity had fallen both individually and socially, it was necessary that salvation be worked among men both individually and socially... The true balance of human existence in its largest sense is only restored when human nature, renewed by Christ, is set into its proper relational context of support and aid, which Irenaeus sees as the unique accomplishment of the Virgin Mary.²³

As part of my setting up of this typological model, I will argue that this social aspect of humanity, the group of individuals who are fallen and then saved together, becomes, post-Christ, the Christian Church. In this way, and because Mary is so deeply involved in the act that brings that Church about, I shall argue that it is possible to say that she was in a small way part of that creative act and so the Church can be said to come from her. This defines the *genetrix* model. The Mary that is described within this model is one separate from the Church, as she comes before it and it comes out of her. The relationship between the two is more distant, in the same way that the blueprint cannot drive around the track with the car because the blueprint does not need to do so: it has already achieved the perfection that the car strives to meet.

To summarise the key concepts and terms that will be used to frame this thesis: this thesis is concerned with the idea of type as meaning that which represents something or someone. It is thus possible for things to be types of one another. In the context of this thesis, the term antitype will largely mean that which is foreshadowed by its type. Finally, the concepts of prototype and archetype have been taken and adapted to the needs of this thesis. They are applied respectively to the *exemplar* and *genetrix* models of the Mary-Church

²³ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 137

relationship. The *exemplar* model is that whereby Mary, as part of the Church, provides a model for behaviour for Church members. The *genetrix* model, where Mary is separate from the Church, sees Mary as in some way involved with the very formation of the Church through her actions. They are two possible ways of looking at the Mario-ecclesial relationship, which is why one can define them distinctly in theory, even if, in practice, they sometimes are not so easily distinguished.

Regarding the two key terms, *exemplar* and *genetrix*, they can be classed as two models of the relationship between Mary and the Church. In this way I shall refer to *genetrix* and *exemplar* as models, and I shall use the terms to apply to any theology or writing that discusses the nature of the relationship between Mary and Church.

Mary and the Maternal Femininity

It is necessary as this thesis progresses to consider the importance of gender. In particular one must consider not only the way in which Mary has been used throughout history, but also how that history has been seen through the lens of feminist critique.

Any examination of the relationship between Mary and the Church necessarily involves Eve as well. This is because previously Eve was the character Mary was most related to. To that end it will also be pertinent to analyse the theological ideas that surround the two women, their respective treatment and typological relevance. Tina Beattie will provide a useful foundation upon which to build this concern, as she has written extensively on the subject of Mary and

Eve and has considered the concept of the Mary/Eve/Church relationship.

Beattie notes:

The identification between Mary and the Church was a medieval development from about the time of the tenth century, whereas patristic writers had a more complex and subtle way of understanding the motherhood of Mary, Eve and the Church.²⁴

Building on the idea that any Mario-ecclesial relationship came after the patristic period, she comments:

In patristic writings Mary is the type of the Church in so far as her particular, historical motherhood of Christ serves as the perfect model and example of the Church's universal motherhood of the faithful, but she herself is rarely referred to in universal terms. The relationship between Mary and the Church is analogical rather than identical, with Eve being a symbol common to both.²⁵

It will become clear in the discussion on patristic models of Mary and Church that Eve is explicitly and fundamentally involved in all discussions; Eve who, in one way or another, provides a contrast or parallel alongside which Mary can be viewed. The way in which these themes are interpreted by later writers is one that causes controversy amongst those writing from the perspective of a feminist theology. Beattie uses the Vatican II document *Lumen Gentium* as an example of an erroneous interpretation. Where it uses Irenaeus' phrase about Mary undoing the knot of Eve, it 'does not point out that this is in the context of

²⁴ Beattie, Tina, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate: A Marian Narrative of Women's Salvation*, (London, Continuum, 2002) 150

²⁵ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 151

Irenaeus' seeing Mary as Eve's advocate',²⁶ which fundamentally alters the impression one gets of Eve in the reading. According to Beattie, 'It therefore perpetuates the vilification of Eve in relation to Mary by offering a reductive interpretation of patristic theology'.²⁷

How Mary and Eve are used as characters is a topic that spreads far beyond just the subjective interpretations of patristic texts. Part of the problem, as is partly illustrated by the quote regarding *Lumen Gentium*, is that the Church is 'more than ever a male Church'.²⁸ In particular, in 'using' Mary, the Church, by which one can read men, is shaping not only the Church, but also the Church's concept of what it means to be a woman. This means that the debate is very much one that involves contemporary accounts of Mariology and, in this context, modern concepts of Mario-ecclesiology.

For this reason, an analysis of some feminist appraisals of the different views examined in this thesis will run through the thesis where relevant. The question of how the context of the typological model affects the character of Mary in each case is relevant to the discussion of the Mario-ecclesial relationship as it sheds further light on the exact nature of Mary's place in that relationship. Beattie is concerned with the patriarchal and androcentric tendencies of the Church and wants to be able to talk about the motherhood of the Church, 'without regressing into an anachronistic model of the Marian Church as the all-embracing phallic mother of the pre-oedipal stage'.²⁹ As this thesis progresses, I will consider these thoughts alongside the other typological questions that I am

²⁶ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 151

²⁷ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 151

²⁸ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 150, quoting Balthasar, Hans Urs von, *Elucidations*, trans. John Riches, (London, SPCK, 1975), 70

²⁹ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 150

asking. In that context, it would be useful to remember this question that Beattie puts forward:

How might we learn from patristic writers the way to a more holistic and life-giving way of understanding the relationship between the maternal-feminine symbols of Mary, Eve and the Church?³⁰

It is not a question that this thesis is equipped to try to answer, but one which is relevant in looking at how the two typological models that I set up in the following chapter can be identified in the Mario-ecclesial discussions of later chronological periods.

Conclusion

These then are the key terms that will illustrate and define the coming discussion. I will now set out the two models in more detail by looking at some of the first texts where they can be seen in the early centuries of the Christian Church. I am not claiming that these models travel seamlessly and unchangeably throughout Christian history as part of the same extended thought, rather I am setting out the case for these two models being broadly identifiable in several discussions of Mary and the Church that have taken place through the centuries.

³⁰ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 151

Chapter 1: Patristic Models of Mario-ecclesiology

This chapter will set out the two models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship introduced previously, and demonstrate early examples of Mariology in which each model can be seen. In doing this it will answer the questions ‘in what sense did Irenaeus and Ambrose see Mary as a type of the Church?’ The chapter will therefore be split into two distinct sections, setting out and analysing the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of Mario-ecclesiology as introduced above. The *genetrix* section will look at the writing of St Irenaeus of Lyon, (c.130-202AD), whilst also considering how Irenaeus’ work adapted and developed the ideas of type and recapitulation that stem from the writing of St. Paul. This model will be seen to be linked with the ecclesiological development of the Christian Church in its formative centuries, and Irenaeus’ understanding of this development. The *exemplar* section will then focus on St. Ambrose of Milan (337-397AD) and the way in which the context of the existing ecclesiological structures of the Church prompted Ambrose to develop an ideal of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that was based upon the behaviours that Mary demonstrated and the example that she set for the members of Ambrose’s Church.

Prior to these investigations, it will be necessary to trace the origins of the terms ‘type’ and ‘recapitulation’ from their Scriptural appearances to the interpretation of Irenaeus. To this end, the following section will begin with the important concepts as seen in the Pauline Corpus.

Genetrix

The genetrix model of Mario-ecclesial typology takes its name from the Latin term for mother.³¹ In this case it is representative of Mary as being in some way involved in the creation of the Church and therefore she may feasibly be called Mother or *genetrix* of the Church. The foundation for the *genetrix* model is found in the work of Matthew Steenberg. In his article for *Vigiliae Christianae* entitled: ‘The role of Mary as co-Recapitulator in St Irenaeus of Lyons’, Steenberg addresses the role of Mary in what he calls the ‘social recapitulation’ of humanity that runs alongside the recapitulation of Adam by Christ seen in the Pauline corpus. In order to assess this concept of social recapitulation properly, it is therefore necessary first to consider what recapitulation is, and what it was that Irenaeus was drawing from Paul in building his model of Mary. These developments will bring into sharp focus the beginnings of a model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

Recapitulation

This thesis aims to elucidate how the relationship between Mary and the Church has been set out by theologians. In doing so the thesis suggests that this relationship is based upon the parallel or interdependent roles that the two play. In defining the concept of type as that which is both the thing that causes an imprint and the imprint itself, such as a mould and a seal, it can be said that Mary and the Church in some way are summed up in one another. It is this idea of being summed up, a translation of the original *recapitulatio* in Irenaeus and of ἀνακεφαλαίωσις as found in the New Testament, that is described here. While there are definitions of the term ‘recapitulation’ found elsewhere in the English

³¹ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/genetrix> accessed 19/12/12

language and in other fields of study, it is only within this context that this word will be assessed.

'The idea of recapitulation dominates the theology of the second century. Adumbrated by Justin, it is expounded endlessly by Irenaeus and given decisive place in Tertullian.³² It is a complex idea that incorporates a number of aspects from other theological fields. In the context of the term's wider usage, it is an amplification of a concept from the New Testament, one which is only mentioned twice, and which is only referenced as a verb, not a noun:

The NT presents God's purpose as that of gathering up all things in Christ. This actual expression (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ) occurs only at Eph. 1.10 but the idea is expressed in many different metaphors in the NT. The original unity of things, which was disrupted on a cosmic scale by man's fall into sin, is now being restored by Christ's redeeming work; and what had hitherto existed in a state of separation or even enmity is now being unified in the new-created wholeness of Christ.³³

Richardson underlines here the basic concept of Christ 'gathering up' (the proper meaning of the term seen in Ephesians) all of mankind and in doing so bringing mankind to God. That is the intended meaning of the term in both of its New Testament appearances (the other being in Romans 13.9). Richardson notes that:

³² Osborn, Eric, 'Love of Enemies and Recapitulation', in *Vigiliae Christianae* 54, (2000), pp.12-31:12

³³ Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, (London, SCM Press, 1958) 242

The theologians of the patristic period dwell lovingly on the thought that in Christ God became what we are in order that we might become what he is.³⁴

Therefore in order that we might become what he is, we were summed up in Christ. For Osborn:

The word *recapitulare* or ἀνακεφαλαιόματι is used in NT and elsewhere in Christian literature in two distinct ways. It describes the ontological perfection of all being in Christ (Eph. 1:10). It describes the ethical perfection of all law in the love command. (Rom. 13:9f).³⁵

These two distinctive ideas of what recapitulation means, and the potential for these two ideas to come together in one theological concept, is what drives Osborn's discussion of Irenaeus' own use of the term. It centres on the idea that both a recapitulation of all things in Christ and the loving of one's enemies are vital to the act of salvation. Osborn sums this up by stating that:

Recapitulation has both ontological and ethical consequences. It changes reality with a new creation and it changes man's morality from servitude to sonship. The movement is from theology to ethics and shows that for Irenaeus the centre of each is identical: forgiving love, which redeems and perfects mankind upon the cross.³⁶

Recapitulation is a concept that is central to salvation, and it involves everything coming together in Christ. For Osborn here, there are two distinct but related aspects to the concept that both contribute to the wider idea of

³⁴ Richardson, *Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, 242

³⁵ Osborn, 'Love of Enemies and Recapitulation', 13

³⁶ Osborn, 'Love of Enemies and Recapitulation', 13

everything coming together in Christ. Recapitulation is the method of salvation.

In other words: '[For Irenaeus,] Christ is the centre and the object of God's history of salvation'.³⁷ This is true because Christ recapitulated, or summed up, all of creation in himself, and by bringing all of creation to God in this act, he redeems them. As Nielsen comments:

That which in an earlier phase of the history of salvation had the negative sign (for instance, the enmity with the serpent...; the disobedience of Adam...), through the recapitulation of Christ comes under the positive sign.³⁸

Through the act of recapitulation, Christ brings everything in human history into himself, all that was once a sign of the fall of man and the prevalence of sin becomes redeemed and therefore is now a sign of that redemption. This is what Nielsen means by the 'positive sign'. Or to put it another way: 'The new in Christ absorbs the old.'³⁹

To summarise, in this context, recapitulation is the act of summing up something in oneself in order to make it better. The concept is briefly used in the letters of St Paul and is alluded to elsewhere in the New Testament, but becomes a more fully developed idea in the second century, particularly in St Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*. Primarily, recapitulation is concerned with Christ and the history of the salvation of humanity. Most crucially for this thesis, recapitulation is often referred to in the context of the relationship between Adam and Christ, and is therefore an important part of the typological model that is formed in this instance. In order to discuss the Mario-ecclesial typological

³⁷ Nielsen, J.T., *Adam and Christ in the Theology of St Irenaeus of Lyons*, (Assen, Van Gorcum Ltd, 1968) 59

³⁸ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 59

³⁹ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 60

models, one must consider the relationships between Mary and Eve, but first between Adam and Christ. The centrality of the concept of recapitulation to these relationships will be set out in more detail as each of these three relationships is considered.

St Paul and the Adam-Christ relationship.

In talking about recapitulation, perhaps the most explicit example of this concept is to be found in the relationship between Adam and Christ, and the typological model that is constructed out of the conception of that relationship. An understanding of this relationship will allow this thesis to consider other relationships and the typological models that bind them, such as the one between Mary and the Church. For the typological model referring to Adam and Christ, the writings by St Paul and Irenaeus on the subject contain distinctions that can lead to the question 'did Irenaeus take over the opinion of the apostle Paul with regard to sin and the resurrection of the flesh, or did he alter it'?⁴⁰

For Paul, the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ were an act of acquittal for the punishment of death bestowed upon humanity as a result of the indiscretions of Adam in the garden. As Romans 5.15 states: '[if] the many died through the one man's trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many'.⁴¹ Two ideas come from Paul's assessment of Adam: one is the idea that sin, and therefore death, comes into the world through Adam; the other is that Adam represents all mankind. For Nielsen, 'Paul is speaking here from a late

⁴⁰ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 9

⁴¹ All biblical references taken from *New Revised Standard Version*.

Jewish conception'.⁴² It is worth noting that in Hebrew Adam (Adama) represents earth.⁴³ Both ideas may be found in scripture located outside of the strict canon. For instance 4Ezra 3.7, found in the Apocryphal Vulgate, discussing Adam reads: 'And you laid upon him one commandment of yours; but he transgressed it, and immediately you appointed death for him and his descendants'.⁴⁴

These texts on the relationship between Adam, his descendants and the fate that his trespasses bring upon them, help identify a starting point for discussing type and the Adam-Christ relationship in Paul. '[Since] death came through a human being,' (1Cor.15.21) so was all of humanity brought under the dominion of death through the ages. But now, 'as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ' (1Cor.15.22). Jesus, through his death and resurrection, has defeated death and destroyed its hold over humanity forever. The two figures share in this instance characteristics that mark them as similar. In using the definition of type as that which is a symbol of another, Adam's connection to Christ can be seen by their shared involvement in the dominion of death. Still further, the definition of antitype as 'something that is foreshadowed by a type or symbol, as a New Testament event prefigured in the Old Testament',⁴⁵ explicitly underlines a typological connection between Adam and Christ.

For Nielsen:

Paul looked upon Adam as the beginning of mankind. Adam's act of disobedience was determinant but not definitive. Paul sees Adam as

⁴² Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 68

⁴³ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 68

⁴⁴ www.speedbible.com/vulgate/B70C003.htm, accessed 17/06/09 - 'et huic mandasti diligere viam tuam, et praeterivit eam; et statim instituisti in eum mortem et in nationibus eius NRSV translation. The King James translation identifies this commandment as being to 'love thy way.'

⁴⁵ www.dictionary.com 09/08/10

the prefiguration of Jesus Christ, in the sense that Jesus Christ, by his obedience, annuls the disobedience of Adam and its consequences.⁴⁶

The end of Romans 5.14 calls Adam τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος⁴⁷ and as Nielsen himself again says: ‘Paul works out the Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5.15-21’.⁴⁸ This concept of ‘typus futuri’ can be seen as being made explicit in this passage, with the figures of Adam and Christ bound by the transgressions of one and the ‘gift’ of the other, or the relative disobedience and obedience of the pair, and the consequences of these on the state of humanity.

James Dunn suggests that from this passage, Adam can be denoted as ‘the pattern or “prototype” of Christ in that each begins an epoch, and the character of each epoch is established by their actions’.⁴⁹ This use of prototype corresponds well to the definition of prototype as set out in the introduction to this thesis: that of something that is in itself, a model of something else. The epoch of the dominion of death that runs through Adam’s descendants is established by his transgressions in the garden, while the epoch of human salvation is established by the complete sacrifice and obedience of Jesus Christ to his Father. In strict chronological terms, Adam is a prototype of Christ in that his epoch is a model on which the epoch of Christ builds and improves. More than this, the epoch of Christ repairs that of Adam through the actions of Christ and through the bringing of salvation that this epoch entails. In terms of Pauline scripture, the passage in Romans 5 that considers that typological relationship

⁴⁶ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 70

⁴⁷ Various readings translate this as ‘type of him who is coming’ (Young’s literal translation) or ‘who was to come’ (NRSV) Greek from *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* which translates it as ‘who is a foreshadowing of him who was to come.’

⁴⁸ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 70

⁴⁹ Dunn, James D. G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Cambridge, William B Eerdmans Publishing 1998) 200

is immediately followed in Romans 6 by a passage on Baptism. ‘Baptism has removed the faithful from the sphere of sin and death (Adam’s aeon) to the sphere of righteousness and life (the aeon of Christ).’⁵⁰ In this way the model of Christ repairing the damage wrought by Adam’s disobedience is explicitly set out. The cleansing nature of the baptismal act through and in the institution of the Church is a direct result of the salvific act of Christ, which in turn comes about through Christ’s recapitulation of Adam. As mentioned above, this recapitulation turns the negative that was Adam’s disobedience into a positive act. This is a useful summary of the relationship between Adam and Christ.

Importantly, Dunn suggests that Paul’s Adam-Christology was not purely concerned with the death and resurrection of Christ, but with Christ’s life as a whole:

It was not simply that his death and resurrection were somehow representative. It was rather that his death was the death of a representative person, a representative life. In other words, in his Adamic role Jesus first shared the actual destiny of the first Adam (death) before he achieved the intended goal for Adam (dominion over all things). In this highly symbolic Christology, Jesus first represented old Adam before he became last Adam.⁵¹

In discussing type, Christ may be seen to be the last Adam, the ‘type’ that led from the flawed original. But as is made more explicit by the comment above, by his representative realisation of the death of Adam, Christ becomes the first Adam first, and then fulfils his own actions by conquering that which the

⁵⁰ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 71

⁵¹ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 202

defeated the original type (death) and therefore becoming the last Adam. Adam and his epoch were types for that of Christ and his salvific epoch inasmuch as they demonstrated the errors of their model and provided the second epoch with the opportunity to redeem these errors and bring about the salvation that will save humanity from the actions of the first. Adam, through the grace of God, provides the means by which humanity is saved, in the very act of condemning them in the first place.

The power of sin, which in the aeon of Adam ruled over mankind as a king, through the power of death, has been broken. Over this same humanity God's redeeming mercy has come in Jesus Christ and he will rule as king through justice as the strength of the new, eternal life with Christ.⁵²

The relationship between Adam and Christ sees Christ as an antitype of Adam, inasmuch as he takes on his physical form, that of a human. Dunn's quote above suggests that this taking on of the body of Adam by Christ allows salvation. Nielsen states:

To that end Christ assumed the flesh which was taken "from the earth". The righteous flesh reconciled that flesh which been entangled in sin, to lead it to friendship with God.⁵³

The recapitulation of Adam (and through him all humanity) by Christ was a physical reality in which Christ took on Adam's flesh. The two figures are linked by their actions in bringing about epochs of salvation history, but also by their

⁵² Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 73

⁵³ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 60

physical form. As it is that form that is to be redeemed, this is a necessary act of recapitulation by Christ.

To summarise, St Paul's typological model of the relationship between Adam and Christ is based upon the recapitulation of Adam by Christ. Christ necessarily needed to take on the form of Adam, to sum Adam up within himself, in order that he might be able to redeem all of humanity who also shared the form of Adam. This was an idea that was not explicitly developed by St Paul. As was mentioned above, it is the second century theologians, predominantly St Irenaeus, who develop this concept, and this relationship, further.

Irenaeus and the Adam-Christ relationship.

This section will suggest that the differences between the typological models regarding Adam and Christ for St Paul and St Irenaeus are centred on the condition of the Christian Church at the time of each man writing. This will be the case in a great number of the examples that this thesis will use, and in this case can be seen quite explicitly. Firstly though, it is necessary to look at Irenaeus' development of this typological model.

Adversus Haereses III.18.1 states:

But when he came incarnate, and was made man, He summed up in himself* the long line of human beings and furnished us, in a brief comprehensive manner, with salvation, so that which we had lost in

Adam – to be according to the image and likeness of God – we might recover in Jesus Christ.⁵⁴

As it was for St Paul, for Irenaeus the central aspect of the relationship between Adam and Christ is the recapitulation of Adam by Christ. It is a necessary part of the salvific mission.

Adam, fallen through his disobedience, could not be made anew, could not be “remade”. Neither could he receive salvation, because he had come into a state of sin. Therefore the Son of God did both.⁵⁵

This demonstrates two separate considerations of recapitulation. One is the idea of Jesus’ bodily incarnation – the ‘remaking’ of an Adam who was otherwise unable to be remade because of his disobedience. The other was the salvation of humanity which could not be received by any because man had come into a state of sin through Adam. Only Jesus was able to bring about this salvation for all humanity.

For Irenaeus, the importance of the bodily similitude of Adam and Christ underlines Christ’s recapitulation. Adam, formed ‘from the dust of the ground,’ (Gen 2.7) when it had been newly formed and untouched by till or plough, received his *substantia* from ‘the hand of God’.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ From Nielsen, ‘*sed quando incarnatus est (Jesus), et homo factus, longam hominum expositionem in seipso recapitulavit, in compendio nobis salutem praestans, ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est, secundem imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Iesu reciperemus.*’ *The Syriac translations used on www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103318.htm and www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/anf01.ix.iv.xix read this as ‘He commenced afresh.’ Previous discussions surrounding the use of recapitulation help to identify that this alternate reading of the word also fits with the wider definition of the word in a theological context.

⁵⁵ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 11

⁵⁶ St Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus Haereses*, from <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103321.htm>, accessed 21/08/2013, III.21.10(Henceforth A.H.),

In order to save the same creature which had been created, the Word of God, ‘recapitulating’ Adam in itself, formed the second Adam of Mary while she was still a virgin. It was necessary that it be done in this fashion. The ‘recapitulation’ was to express the complete similitude.⁵⁷

The importance of the human body of Christ relates to the nature of the salvific act which necessarily entailed the taking on of flesh. Irenaeus’ writings on this subject come primarily from his work *Adversus Haereses*, and it is in his refutations of heretical concepts that Irenaeus constructs his typological model referring to Adam and Christ. Here, Irenaeus was defending accusations that Jesus had not actually assumed flesh; that he had not taken anything from Mary during his birth:

Those, therefore, who allege that He took nothing from the Virgin, do greatly err, [since,] in order that they may cast away the inheritance of the flesh, they also reject the analogy [between Him and Adam].⁵⁸

In arguing for the human nature of Christ, Irenaeus sets out his belief that the corporeality of Jesus is vital to salvation. Therefore, in terms of the Adam-Christ relationship, it is also necessary for Jesus to have assumed flesh so that he and Adam were the same. It is this similitude that allows one to be called a type of the other. Nielsen notes:

For Irenaeus, the point at issue is the salvation of the entire man, not a part of him, as the Gnostics teach. Man in his entirety is a commixture and union of the soul (*anima*), which has absorbed the

⁵⁷ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 13

⁵⁸ A.H III.22.1

Spirit of the Father, with that flesh which was created after the image of God.⁵⁹

Irenaeus was striving to maintain an orthodox concept of salvation. The belief that the human body itself was just a shell for the spark of the divine within was one that Irenaeus could not accept, and in his work to demonstrate that the whole of the human being - body and soul - was saved through Christ, he also demonstrated the importance of Christ and Adam being typologically connected. His typological model comes about from a perceived threat to the orthodoxy of the Church, and as such is more developed and more explicit than the model seen in St Paul.

In terms of salvation, Irenaeus is also arguing against those who suggest that Adam is not saved. Speaking against Tatian, Irenaeus states that 'all therefore speak falsely who disallow his (Adam's) salvation'.⁶⁰ The salvation of mankind is intended to be universal, and so 'inasmuch as man is saved, it is fitting that he who was created the original man should be saved'.⁶¹ This links with the concept of Adam as representative of humanity at this time, as seen when discussing Paul above. Adam receives the gift just as the rest of humanity does because he is a part of humanity, a type of him who will become a type for all humankind: Jesus Christ. Irenaeus states that the heretics deny the 'plasmatio Dei' in A.H V.1.2: 'Vain therefore are the disciples of Valentinus who offer this opinion, so that they may exclude the flesh from salvation, and cast aside what

⁵⁹ J.T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, quoting A.H V.6.1 – 'Perfectus autem homo, comixtio et adunitio est animae assumentis Spiritum Patris, et ad mixta ei carni, quae est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei.' (The perfect man consists in the comingling and the union of the soul receiving the spirit of the father, and the admixture of that fleshy nature which was moulded after the image of God.)

⁶⁰ A.H III.23.8

⁶¹ A.H III.23.2

God has fashioned'.⁶² It is this ‘*plasmatio Dei*’ that links Adam to humanity, and so necessarily Christ must recapitulate this same *plasmatio* so that he might bring about the salvation of both body and soul for humanity. Once again the typological model for Adam and Christ in Irenaeus is brought about by a refutation of Gnostic heresies regarding the nature of Jesus Christ.

The recapitulation by Christ of all of Adam - his soul, his death, his body - is central to Irenaeus’ typological model of the relationship between Adam and Christ. ‘For Irenaeus, the recapitulation of Christ determines the whole *oikovouía* of God.’⁶³ The *oikovouía* of God is understood as salvation history.⁶⁴ Without this summing up of the negative that had been before, Christ would have been unable to bring humanity to God and therefore redeem them. As Nielsen sums up: ‘by regarding Adam as ‘*typus future*,’ everything is received back through Christ which was lost through Adam: the incorruptibility of the flesh, immortality and perfection after the image and likeness of God’.⁶⁵

The Irenaean consideration of the relationship between Adam and Christ is, as previously mentioned, an expansion upon the ideas of St Paul. One distinction between the two is the consideration of the extent of the role of sin in the salvific actions of this typology and its effects on humanity. ‘The nexus of sin and death is very strong in Paul’,⁶⁶ to the extent where it has ‘a power bearing down upon humankind, constituting a form of slavery from which the Gospel brings

⁶² A.H V.1.2 – *Vani igitur qui a Valentino sunt, hoc dogmatizes, uti excludant salutatem carnis, et reprobent plasmationem Dei.* (This is the ‘*plasmatio Dei*’, which comes from a Latin rendering of πλαστίς which Nielsen notes, is used over 100 times by Irenaeus in various forms. In Latin these appear as *plasma* (49), *plasmatio* (27) and *plasco* (40).

⁶³ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 60, οἰκονομία = oikonomia (economy)

⁶⁴ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 57 ‘Irenaeus uses the word to indicate the space within which God encompasses the historical event of salvation.’

⁶⁵ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 66-67

⁶⁶ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 95

release'.⁶⁷ The link between sin and death is absolute for Paul: 'For the wages of sin are death' (Rom 6.23), and 'sin deceived me and killed me' (7.11). So for Nielsen:

Paul's Adam is *typus futuri* in the sense that Christ has come as second Adam to conquer and destroy sin... Through Christ, sin has been conquered for all men as a universal condition.⁶⁸

This condition creates what Nielsen calls an 'arc of tension,' whereby the realised freedom from sin and death and the continued relations with the power of sin cause difficulties for believers, difficulties and tension that will only be broken by the second coming of Christ.

The Irenaean concept of the fall removes a great deal of sin's influence in the event, instead looking at Adam's transgressions as a matter of disobedience, part of the result of Adam that was to be recapitulated by the Second Adam upon his coming. 'For strength is made perfect in weakness, rendering him a better man who by means of his infirmity becomes acquainted with the power of God',⁶⁹ says Irenaeus, suggesting that the impact of the fall was to allow humanity to become acquainted with God *through* the resultant slavery and 'infirmity'. 'For there is nothing evil in learning one's infirmities by endurance; yea, rather, it has even the beneficial effect of preventing him from forming an undue opinion of his own nature (*non aberrare in natura sua*).'⁷⁰

The fall and enslavement to death of humanity was a causal action, one that represented a setback to the growing relationship between man and God, but

⁶⁷ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 124-5

⁶⁸ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 75

⁶⁹ A.H. V.3.1

⁷⁰ A.H. V.3.1

one that allowed humanity to know God whilst remaining humble, so that man might learn of God *through* his own weaknesses. There is no sense that this curse of death was intended solely as punishment for humanity through Adam, as Irenaeus points out: ‘God detested him who had led man astray, but by degrees, and little by little, He showed compassion to him who had been beguiled’.⁷¹ The punishment meted out in Genesis 3, the curse from God, is aimed not at man but at the ground, with man forced to toil at the earth all his days. Indeed for Irenaeus, the removal of man was exactly ‘because He pitied them, [and did not desire] that he should continue a sinner for ever’.⁷² Here God is saving humanity *from sin* *by* excluding them and cursing the earth. It is an attempt in Irenaeus’ eyes to keep humanity humble so that it may come to know God. As seen in discussing St Paul, the concept of epochs can be set out, in that here the actions of the setting of one epoch by Adam direct the actions of the second epoch in Christ.

For Nielsen:

In Irenaeus we see no sign of an arc of tension. By his suffering and death upon the cross Christ destroyed death and gave immortality, which our bodies receive now already in Baptism and Eucharist.⁷³

In the Pauline examination of the subject, Paul is not concerned with a concept of the Church as an ecclesiological entity, because that form of the Church does not yet exist. For Irenaeus however, there is the sense of an embryonic understanding of ecclesiology in his connecting the death of Christ with the sacraments of the Church; an understanding that likely originates from his

⁷¹ A.H. III.23.5

⁷² A.H. III.23.6

⁷³ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ* 76

battles with the Gnostic groups about what constitutes orthodoxy and what must be considered heresy. Irenaeus is fighting a very different battle to Paul, who was writing a century earlier at the very embryonic formation of the Church when concerns of structure within the Church were much smaller in scale, as befitted the size of the Church.

The importance of the flesh and blood of humanity takes on a new level with Irenaeus, for whom the salvation of the body was considered a tenet of orthodoxy, while for Paul it is the man from heaven that provides the image for salvation: ‘the first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. As was the man of dust, so are those who are of dust; and as is the man of heaven, so are those of heaven’ (1Cor 15.47-8). But for Irenaeus, the body is what shall be raised, in the same way that in the Gospels Jesus raises Lazarus and the son of the widow in Luke 7: ‘[for] in what bodies did they rise again? In those same, no doubt, in which they had also died’.⁷⁴

Paul is concerned with the salvific actions of Christ because he cannot accept that the body is able to be saved without Christ, because of the weakness of the flesh that came about because of the fall. Irenaeus is concerned both with the ecclesiological concerns of the Church and the full bodily resurrection promised in scripture and in this embryonic ecclesiology. Therefore the following from Nielsen may ring true here when considering the relationship of Adam and Christ: ‘Paul is concerned with the *second* Adam, Irenaeus with the *second Adam*’.⁷⁵

To summarise, this section has underlined that the relationship between Adam and Christ depends largely on the recapitulation of Adam by Christ. Irenaeus

⁷⁴ A.H. V.13.1

⁷⁵ Nielsen, *Adam and Christ*, 82

sees Christ as correcting the errors of Adam and in doing so allowing humanity to be redeemed. This typological model outlined that Adam represented all of humanity because he was the seed of humanity, and Christ represented all of humanity because, for Irenaeus, he takes on all human nature. It is by both Adam and Christ representing humanity that Christ can be a type of Adam. In other words: one figure sums up into themselves the entirety of another, including their transgressions, and ultimately corrects or undoes those transgressions. This model was used by Irenaeus to consider another important relationship in salvation history, that of Mary, the mother of Christ, and Eve, the wife of Adam.

Irenaeus and the Eve-Mary relationship

This chapter intends to set out the two models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that will then be used throughout the rest of the thesis. This section in particular is setting out the first of those two models: *genetrix*. This is a model that comes from the development, by Irenaeus, of the typological models first constructed, or at least alluded to, by St Paul. Having set out this model for the relationship between Adam and Christ, Irenaeus went further and considered the relationship between Eve and Mary.

The first mention of a potential typological relationship between Eve and Mary actually came from Justin Martyr, writing perhaps half a century before Irenaeus, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. He said of Christ that:

He became man by the Virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin. For Eve, who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth

disobedience and death. But the Virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her.⁷⁶

Irenaeus was, however, the first to develop an identifiably typological model based on the relationship between Eve and Mary, designed along structural lines laid down by the Pauline Adam-Christ relationship. In discussing the two relationships, it may be all too easy to compress their similarities down to two concepts: recapitulation and obedience. The dichotomy of the Adam-Christ relationship for Irenaeus has been demonstrated above to be concerned with the recapitulation by Christ of the disobedience of Adam in Genesis, and it is easy to oversimplify the relationship of the Mary-Eve relationship by focusing on Irenaeus' statement that 'the knot of Eve's disobedience was loosened by the obedience of Mary'.⁷⁷ In order to continue looking at the development of the *genetrix* model of the Mary-Eve relationship, this oversimplification must be avoided.

It has already been identified above that Mary plays a key role in the Christocentric arguments of Irenaeus against the Gnostics. Indeed the very physical presence of Christ on earth has been repeatedly debated using the character of Mary, mostly involving her role during childbirth, but always considering what it is that she gives to Jesus. It is her humanity that Christ takes; through her that he is able to recapitulate the body of Adam and therefore the disobedience of Adam, an emphasis that is not really present with Paul. It is therefore possible to begin to consider Mary in terms of the larger relationships between Adam and Christ and those around them. In terms of Adam, there is only Eve (in human terms) to be in relationship with, and for

⁷⁶ Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho*, 100, from www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.viii.iv.c.html

⁷⁷ A.H. III.22.4

Jesus, the importance of Mary as his mother, here allows her a special relationship with him that can be said to mirror that of Adam and Eve.

That the Lord then was manifestly coming to His own things, and was sustaining them by means of that creation which is supported by Himself, and was making a recapitulation of that disobedience which had occurred in connection with a tree, through the *obedience* which was [exhibited by Himself when He hung] upon a tree, [the effects] also of that deception being done away with, by which that virgin Eve, who was already espoused to a *man*, was unhappily misled—was happily announced, through means of the *truth* [spoken] by the *angel* to the *Virgin Mary*, who was [also espoused] to a *man*.⁷⁸

Irenaeus directly links all four characters together. The importance of the death and resurrection of Christ on the cross (tree) directly recapitulates that disobedience on the tree in Genesis (represented by the apple), and in the same way, that deception or disobedience of an espoused virgin is directly recapitulated by the obedience of Mary.

[It] is clear that it is equally necessary in the creative and redemptive dispensation of God that Eve be “summed up in Mary, that a virgin should be a virgin’s intercessor, and by a virgin’s obedience undo and put away the disobedience of a virgin”. Likewise the cross is paralleled to the tree in the garden by which came the fall.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ A.H V. 19. 1

⁷⁹ Mackenzie, Iain M, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2002) 161, Commentary on Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching (Epideixis)*, 33 (Henceforth *Epid.*)

The visual imagery of the centrality of the garden in Genesis contrasted with the cross at Calvary is clear: ‘Later piety will depict both Christ and Mary in the Garden of Eden’.⁸⁰

More than this though, both Eve and Mary are spoken to by angels:

For just as the former was led astray by the word of an angel, so that she fled from God when she transgressed His word; so did the latter, by an angelic communication, receive the glad tidings that she should sustain (*portaret*) God, being obedient to His word.⁸¹

By looking at this passage, it is possible to see that Mary and Eve have much in common. Both are young, espoused virgins; innocent to the world both physically and spiritually. Both are faced with commands from God, impossible commands that would require great strength and love (of God) to carry out. Interestingly, (and seemingly of little interest to Irenaeus) both women obey the angel that talks to them – for Mary, this is analogous with obeying God - her *fiat* to the Lord - but for Eve, obeying the word of a fallen angel in Satan, this leads her away from God and leads humanity into death. The relationship of the women to the angels mirrors that of the angels and God: Eve’s disobedience to God mirrors that of Satan to God, while the opposite is true of Mary and Gabriel who both obey God’s word. The use of the angels, of the creatures of God who pre-date humanity, underlines the concept of Adam and Eve as *first* humans.

The two women are united by their presence and their involvement at the beginning of the two defining epochs in human history as mentioned above. Eve directly brings about Adam’s disobedience through her own, and through this

⁸⁰ Osborn, Eric, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2001) 100

⁸¹ A.H. V.19.1 – translation of *portaret* could also be carry or bear.

the epoch of Adam is brought about whereby humanity is enslaved to death. She becomes, with Adam, parent of the human race. Mary, by her acceptance of the command of God brings about the Incarnation literally through her actions and her body, and it is the Incarnation that allows God through Christ to bring about salvation and the second great epoch whereby all humanity is saved from death and granted eternal life. In this way Eve and Mary are connected in the same manner as Adam and Christ. The type-antitype relationship outlined above for Adam and Christ is mirrored in Eve and Mary. Irenaeus is projecting the same ideas from one pair to another. This raises its own question.

Why is it necessary for Mary to recapitulate the disobedience of Eve? As mentioned, it was an important parallel that both Mary and Eve were espoused (inasmuch as Eve had been made from Adam and was literally one with him) and that they were both virgins. ('Inasmuch as they (Adam and Eve) having been created only a short time previously, had no understanding of the procreation of children.'⁸²) For Irenaeus, this espousing to a man links the two women together because Eve's disobedience is transferred to Adam *because of their betrothal*:

On this account does the law term a *woman betrothed to a man*, the wife of him who had *betrothed* her, although she was as yet a *virgin*; thus indicating the back-reference from Mary to Eve, as what is joined together could not otherwise be put asunder than by inversion of the process by which these bonds of union had arisen; so that the

⁸² A.H. III.22.4

former ties be cancelled by the latter, that the latter may set the former again at liberty.⁸³

For Irenaeus, in the same way as it was necessary for Christ to be exactly like Adam, it was necessary here for Mary to be exactly like Eve so that she would be able to recapitulate exactly what had been done by Eve. The process of recapitulation for Irenaeus involved total recreation in order to be completed. In this way it becomes clear that Mary necessarily recapitulates the disobedience of Eve as the partner of Christ; she corresponds to Eve in the making of the new epoch in the sense that as Eve directly brings to Adam that which would lead to his disobedience (the apple,) so does Mary give to Jesus that which would bring about the salvation of mankind: his bodily form. Using the knot metaphor suggested by Irenaeus, Mary must undo the knot of Eve's disobedience in order that Jesus may be free to undo the bigger knot of Adam's that enslaved humanity in the first place.

It was necessary and proper for Adam to be recapitulated in Christ, that 'mortality might be swallowed up by immortality'; and for Eve to be recapitulated in Mary, that a virgin, become advocate for a virgin, might undo and destroy the virginal disobedience by virginal obedience.⁸⁴

From here it may be suggested that Mary takes on a role beyond that performed by anyone else in human history and becomes a more active member of the salvific act. Her role is promoted beyond the bearing of the

⁸³ A.H III, 22. 4

⁸⁴ Irenaeus, *Epilexis*. 33 – 'oportebat-et-conveniebat enim recapitulari Adam in Christum, ut absorptum-deglutiretur mortale ab immortalitate, et Eam in Mariam, ut Virgo virginis advocata facta solveret-et-evacuaret virginalem inobaudientiam per virginalem obaudientiam.' Latin taken from M. C. Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 130

Christ-child and the imparting of her human flesh onto the Godhead; she becomes *active* in the recapitulatory act, she becomes *co-recapitulator* alongside Christ. In this way it may be suggested that Irenaeus continues to attempt a balanced parallel in his Eve-Mary model inasmuch as he is attempting to bring the level of active participation on the one side of the typological boundary to that of the other. In other words could Irenaeus here be extending the parallel to the extent that Mary and Eve perform similarly central roles in the creating of their respective partners' epochs?

Is the role accorded to Mary simply an expansion of what may have already been a 'traditional' Eve-Mary parallelism, worked out by an author whose love for aesthetic balance provided the impetus for such an expansive treatment?⁸⁵

For Steenberg, such motives would render the whole recapitulative concept as questionable, but he offers a different explanation. One which 'rests upon foundational anthropological and theological beliefs',⁸⁶ and which he believes presents a greater reasoning for the massively expansive (in contemporaneous terms) Eve-Mary typological model presented in Irenaeus. It is a reasoning based on something he calls *Social Recapitulation*.

Social Recapitulation

The *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship is developed from this concept of *Social Recapitulation*. The concept comes from Matthew Steenberg asking the question of why is it necessary for Mary to recapitulate the actions of Eve when Adam, who has been equated to all humanity, has been recapitulated

⁸⁵ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 130

⁸⁶ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 130

by Christ and therefore been saved alongside *all* of humanity? Steenberg is concerned that this expansive parallel has been the act of a man seeking ‘fitting beauty in the economy’,⁸⁷ rather than for explicitly salvific reasons. Concerned further, he questions why despite this possible view, Irenaeus still maintains the necessary importance of Mary’s role in the wider salvific and recapitulative act:

Her part in the process of recapitulation is seemingly presented as both necessary and yet redundant – a dilemma which, if it holds, presents serious problems for Irenaeus’ Mariology on a larger scale.⁸⁸

The role of Eve thus comes under question – if human recapitulation has *necessarily* occurred entirely through the Adam-Christ model, then a second recapitulation by Mary of a second human being stands to face accusations of superfluity and of being decidedly *unnecessary*. This leads to either the possibility that Irenaeus is indeed guilty of over emphasising the necessity of the Eve-Mary recapitulation due to a personal aesthetic ideal, or the possibility that ‘there must exist some kind of distinction in the human roles of Adam and Eve that warrants a co-ordinate recapitulation of each’.⁸⁹ Steenberg believes the latter to be true, and from this statement can be seen the beginnings of a concept of social recapitulation in the Eve-Mary relationship.

[God] was well pleased also to make a helper for the man, for thus God said; ‘it is not good for man to be alone, let us make a helper for him (cf. Gen 2.18) since among all the animals no helper was found equal and like unto Adam... And God took one of Adam’s ribs and

⁸⁷ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 130

⁸⁸ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 131

⁸⁹ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 132

replaced it with flesh, and He built up the rib which he took into a woman, and in this way He brought her before Adam. And he, seeing her, said “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called “woman” for she was taken from her man”.⁹⁰

This passage demonstrates that Eve was made as helper (*adiutorium*) for Adam, that she was created to be *for* Adam as much as she was made *from* Adam. She was his companion, and so from this Steenberg states that:

Eve was, from her inception, a social creature, symbolically embodying not so much human *nature*, as the human society formed by God in light of the fact that “it is not good to be alone”.⁹¹

Adam and Eve therefore have separate purposes, their respective creations embody different aspects of human life. Adam is the embodiment of the human individual, in a sense the embodiment of the body itself, while by her nature and original purpose, Eve embodies the social aspect of humanity: the companionship; the support that that society gives to itself through one another. Therefore the roles of the two in the fall of man can be explained to be different as well, for while Adam fell and disobeyed because he became ashamed and turned away from God, thus condemning all of humanity to the dominion of death, Eve failed in her role as companion, as aide to Adam, by literally bringing the cause of his disobedience to him. She became the ‘cause of death, both to

⁹⁰ Irenaeus, *Epid. 13 – Beneplacitum autem fuit ei et adiutorium homini facere; sic enim dixit Deus: <<Non bonum est esse hominem solum: faciamus ei adiutorium secundem se>>: in aliis enim omnibus animalibus non inveniebatur par et aquale et simile Adae adiutorium... Et sumpsit Deus unam de costis Adae et replevit pro ea carnem, et costam quam sumpsit aedificavit in mulierem sic adduxit coram Adam. Is autem videns dixit: <<Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, caro de carne mea; haec vocabitur mulier, quoniam de viro suo sumpta est.>>*

⁹¹ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 133

herself and to the entire human race’,⁹² in failing in her ‘duty’ as aid and supporter. So, in the view of Steenberg:

There was a double fall in Paradise: the fall of man as *man* through the departure from the nature of ἀνθρώπος that Irenaeus sees most predominantly in the disobedience of Adam; and the fall of man as *men*, as a community of *adiutores*, which Irenaeus associates most directly with the disobedience of Eve.⁹³

The impact of this dual fall meant that death held dominion over all of humanity not just in a personal individualistic sense, but in an all-consuming social sense. Humanity was enslaved not just personally but collectively, so that even society itself was in need of a recapitulative salvation.

Stenberg notes that for Irenaeus there is no clean splitting of the roles in Adam and Eve, ‘nor does he (Irenaeus) speak categorically of a typological cast unique to each’.⁹⁴ Mary becomes someone who, although still in need of the recapitulation that Christ undertakes, herself plays a recapitulatory role. This is not *the same* role as Christ, Christ himself recapitulates humanity itself, but Mary is ‘one whose role in the recapitulative economy is to restore the proper character of human interrelatedness that this nature requires’.⁹⁵ Mary becomes the ‘antitype’ of Eve in that she restores the relationship that Eve damaged – where Eve was integral to the disobedience of Adam, so too is Mary a key part in the actions of Christ in redeeming this disobedience. She restores the *auditorium* model that was lost in Eve’s disobedience and re-establishes human social interaction along the lines of the aide model as first seen in Eve.

⁹² A.H. III.22.4

⁹³ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 134

⁹⁴ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 134

⁹⁵ Steenberg, ‘The Role of Mary’, 136

As humanity had fallen both individually and socially, it was necessary that salvation be worked among men both individually and socially... The true balance of human existence in its largest sense is only restored when human nature, renewed by Christ, is set into its proper relational context of support and aid, which Irenaeus sees as the unique accomplishment of the Virgin Mary.⁹⁶

While his ideas fit the aims of this thesis, Steenberg's concept of *Social Recapitulation*, and indeed his general analysis of Irenaeus' treatment of Adam and Eve in the garden, have been criticised for misinterpreting the original intent of Irenaeus. This has been levelled at him in terms of his interpretation of Adam and in terms of his treatment of the female body, an issue that will recur in this thesis. Regarding the first, in a review of Steenberg's *Irenaeus on Creation*, Michael Choi notes that 'Steenberg seems to go beyond his predecessor in his interpretation of the creation narrative and adheres to a more benign view of the culpability of Adam than Irenaeus would have had it'.⁹⁷ This suggests that Steenberg was altering Irenaeus' view of Adam in order to make the recapitulation of Adam by Christ more palatable. Choi is suggesting that Steenberg highlighted Adam as immature, or at least more innocent, in his role, in order to emphasise the difference with Christ:

Steenberg's interpretation seems to indicate a move from metaphor to history, and it is perhaps an overstatement to dismiss the change in the condition of Adam incurred by sin, as if *Adam* and all his race

⁹⁶ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 137

⁹⁷ Choi, Michael J., 'Matthew C. Steenberg, Irenaeus on Creation (Review)' in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 89 No:4 (October 2009), pp.596-598: 597

can mature and have "participation in incorruptibility" (Epideixis 31) apart from our "regeneration unto God" (Epideixis 3).⁹⁸

By making Adam more 'innocent', Choi fears that Steenberg is removing the influence of God in the redeeming of Adam and the human race. Choi appears to be concerned that Steenberg has distorted Irenaeus' view of the Fall to fit wider Christological ideas that Steenberg has. A further criticism of Steenberg, specifically centred on his concept of *Social Recapitulation*, was levelled by Benjamin Dunning. Dunning appreciates the solution that *Social Recapitulation* gives for the presence of Mary as co-recapitulator, as outlined above. However, for Dunning:

This solution, while logically coherent, cannot exhaust the function of the typology insofar as it pays no attention to the role of Eve's material specificity. By focusing only on nongendered sociality and ignoring questions of sexual difference, Steenberg effectively neuters this crucial aspect of Irenaeus' theological anthropology.⁹⁹

By removing the difference between the physical bodies, Dunning fears that Steenberg, as before, has interpreted Irenaeus in way that removes the original context and intention from the passage: 'the sexual division of Adam and Eve's respective bodies is not simply epiphenomenal. It is instead an integral and complex part of the larger recapitulative framework that drives Irenaeus' theology as a whole'.¹⁰⁰ This seeming denial of the female body, which Dunning points out was not the initial intention of Irenaeus, will be seen as an issue

⁹⁸ Choi, 'Matthew C. Steenberg, Irenaeus on Creation', 597

⁹⁹ Dunning, Benjamin H., 'Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth: Creation, Sexual Difference and Recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons' in *The Journal of Religion*, (January 2009), Vol. 89, No1 pp57-88: 60

¹⁰⁰ Dunning, 'Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth', 60

regarding the gender politics of the Mario-ecclesial models of this thesis, and will be relevant again in chapter 3.

In talking about misinterpreting Irenaeus, Tina Beattie suggests that: ‘if, following Irenaeus, we untie the knots of sin all the way back to Eve, we must begin by liberating woman’s desire and sexuality from its denigration in Eve through celebrating its restoration in Mary’.¹⁰¹ She would also interpret the removal of gender differences from Steenberg’s analysis as not following Irenaeus as she mentions here. She does on the other hand understand some difficulties in the concept of virginity for Eve and Mary. ‘The recapitulation of Eve in Mary requires that Mary, like Eve, is a virgin, but unlike Eve, Mary remains a virgin while Eve loses her virginity after the Fall.’¹⁰² For Beattie this in itself neuters the connection between the two women, as Dunning suggested of Steenberg. This leads Beattie to echo Steenberg’s comment above that suggests Irenaeus was merely looking for aesthetic balance in his theology, by asking ‘is this simply another example of the convoluted typology of patristic writings, so that the virginity of the two women offers a satisfying symmetry between the story of Eve’s temptation and Mary’s Annunciation?’¹⁰³ The aim of the rest of this section is to ensure that the typological models of this thesis avoid being what Beattie terms above as a ‘convoluted’ typology.

Genetrix – An Irenaean Mario-ecclesiology?

The concept of *Social Recapitulation* connects Mary to Eve, Adam and Christ. It does not explicitly connect Mary to the Church. Instead I will now suggest how

¹⁰¹ Beattie, *God’s Mother, Eve’s Advocate*, 174

¹⁰² Beattie, *God’s Mother, Eve’s Advocate*, 175

¹⁰³ Beattie, *God’s Mother, Eve’s Advocate*, 175

one can develop a typological model, from the models set out by Irenaeus, which encompasses the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

In the first instance, it is important to note that one must not project backwards an image of Irenaeus' concept of type distorted by hindsight and a contemporary, post Vatican II tendency to:

Divide types from allegory, [which] does not find support in Irenaeus and Justin. Indeed Types have a vertical reference linking earthly and heavenly realities rather than the horizontal/temporal application which has often been given them (AH 4.19.1 and 4.32.2). In Irenaeus, typology becomes a generic term for all symbolic representation.¹⁰⁴

Using the Irenaean models set out above, and taking Matthew Steenberg's concept of *Social Recapitulation* as a starting point, it is possible to see a sense of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. I will now set out how this is the case.

Osborn's contention that 'the final achievement of Irenaeus is that he was the first church theologian to join systematically Old Testament and New Testament through the world of typology',¹⁰⁵ alludes to the importance of a discussion of types in this context, inasmuch as the definition of antitype refers to 'a New Testament event prefigured in the Old Testament'.¹⁰⁶ The typological discussion is valid then, but is it possible to talk of an ecclesiological aspect to Irenaeus' writing about Mary?

¹⁰⁴ Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 184

¹⁰⁵ Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 184

¹⁰⁶ www.dictionary.com, accessed 09/08/10.

Irenaean theology was most likely too early to consider containing a true ecclesiology in the sense that it would later be understood. The Church structure of the time remained to some extent fluid and there was no systematic system of responsibility or of theological reflection as to the nature of the Church. However there are aspects in Irenaeus' writing that suggest an embryonic concept of ecclesiology, and further there can be identified a possible ecclesiology within his Mariology. Irenaeus stated that the Church has 'lodged in her hands... all things pertaining to the truth',¹⁰⁷ and the concept of the Church as the one holder of the truth is evident: *A.H.* I.10.1 contains a passage that could easily be an early draft of what would later be the Nicene Creed, for example. Mackenzie notes when beginning his commentary on Irenaeus' *Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching* that 'there is little, if anything, in the Nicene formulae which is not present in embryonic or directional form in the works of Irenaeus'.¹⁰⁸

Eric Osborn notes that according to Irenaeus:

New life came from God, for the power of the most high God overshadowed Mary to bring a new kind of generation which inherits not death but life, a life imparted through the Eucharist. What does Irenaeus mean when he speaks of Mary as the source of our regeneration (*AH* 4.33.4 and 11)? He claims that, in becoming the mother of the new Adam, the new source of life, Mary has conveyed life to all, who recover life in and with him.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ *A.H.* III.4.1

¹⁰⁸ Mackenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching*, 29

¹⁰⁹ Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 117-18, from Galtier, P, 'La vierge qui nous régénère,' (The Virgin regenerates Us), in *Recherches de science religieuse* (1914) vol.5, pp.136-145. Osborn notes that Rene Mausset (1666-1716) the Benedictine Patrologist, takes this as a reference to the church.

This passage demonstrates the development of Irenaeus' Mariology from a social concern into an ecclesiological statement, inasmuch as his arguments against the heretics can be seen to contain a kind of embryonic ecclesiology. The importance of the Incarnation to Irenaeus is impossible to ignore. The difference between his and Paul's concept of the Incarnation is also relevant. While Paul was more concerned with the Incarnation in a covenantal sense, Irenaeus held that there was a literal, ontological element to the event, and that all humanity was renewed through it. Salvation is available and possible to all because of the Incarnation of Christ, when Christ took on *all* of human nature through his typological relationship with Adam, and through the baptismal act undertaken *within* the structure of the Church, and through the life 'imparted by the Eucharist'. This important aspect is bound up within the ecclesiological construct of the orthodox Church of Christ. In this construction, Mary is a central formative figure.

In Irenaeus' writing, it has been demonstrated above that Mary was often used as leverage in Christological arguments with the Gnostic heresies. These arguments are categorised by Steenberg¹¹⁰ as either 'anti-docetic', whereby Mary's bodily role became key to demonstrating that Christ was indeed human, or 'anti-adoptionist,' where Mary's appearances in scripture were used to demonstrate that Christ was indeed divine and not a human 'adopted' by God for the task. Both of these categories tie Mary in with the Christological question and therefore promote the role of Mary while clearly still showing that she in no way impinges on the role of Christ in the salvific action. However the third use of Mary in Irenaeus, the recapitulative Eve-Mary model, seen through the idea of social recapitulation as demonstrated immediately above, offers something

¹¹⁰ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 119

much more meaningful in terms of a potential Mario-ecclesial reading. It is this reading that I put forward as the root of the *genetrix* model.

If Mary, through the writings of Irenaeus and the concept of *Social Recapitulation*, recapitulates society, redeems a social interaction lost since the time of Eve, then perhaps she can be said to continue this role after the salvific recapitulation undertaken by Christ; after his death and resurrection and the salvation of all humanity. Above it has been noted that Irenaeus sees the continued salvation of the physical body as taking place in the Eucharist; ‘our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity’.¹¹¹ The Church for Irenaeus is spread around the world with many peoples, but it is united ‘just as if she had but one soul, and one and the same heart’,¹¹² and it is the keeper of truth: ‘she is the entrance to life’.¹¹³

The Church then is the keeper of the truth passed down by the apostles and believed by the social communities around the world who are united in this faith. The Eucharist and Baptism are the continued promise of salvation and are the continued forward steps taken by every member of that Church. Every individual comes together in that Church as a social unit redeemed through the recapitulation of the transgressions of Adam through the death and resurrection of Christ: the same death and resurrection celebrated and shared communally in the Eucharist. In this way, as the recapitulatory agent who brings about the redemption of human social interaction, so Mary becomes increasingly linked to the Church of her son. Where Christ has saved every individual and redeemed their very nature as individuals, Mary has recapitulated the dominion of death of

¹¹¹ A.H. IV.18.5

¹¹² A.H. I.10.2

¹¹³ A.H. III.4.1

inter-human interactions and allowed the Church as a social creature to come about, and in this way, while it is still the Church of Jesus Christ, Mary could be said to archetypal in the founding and continued existence of that Church.

This then is the foundation of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. It is based upon the concept of *Social Recapitulation* and is substantiated through a continuation of the development of different typological models seen in the early centuries of the Christian Church. In setting it out for this thesis I have merely built upon Irenaeus idea that Mary is the ‘cause of salvation’,¹¹⁴ and upon what I described as his embryonic ecclesiology. The model stems from the idea that Mary was in some way involved in the actual formation of the Church, through active participation in salvation history. This has come about not just through her role in the Incarnation as the mother of Christ, but also as her role as a co-recapitulator or a social recapitulator alongside Christ who brings about universal redemption through a universal recapitulation.

In the *genetrix* model Mary is involved in the formation of the Church itself by recapitulating humanity as a social entity. This entity, following the Incarnation and the recapitulation of its members as individuals by Christ, moves forward as a believing community, and through Baptism and the Eucharist, becomes the people of Christ’s Church on earth. In terms of salvation history, they move from the damned under the dominion of death to the saved in God’s Kingdom and through Christ’s Church. In taking an active role in the events that lead to this epoch, this stage of salvation history, Mary takes an active role in the creation of the Church.

¹¹⁴ A.H. III.22.4

It is in this way that I define this model as *genetrix*. As the thesis progresses, I will demonstrate how some discussions on the Mario-ecclesial use the same model when discussing the role of Mary in that relationship. In order to understand this model more fully, it is necessary also to set out the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, in order that the context of these terms may be seen.

Exemplar

In setting out the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, it has been necessary to explain the theological context. In this case this involved the development of typological discussions surrounding Adam and Christ, as well as Eve and Mary, from St Paul to St Irenaeus. It was necessary to understand that Irenaeus developed his ideas through his interactions and arguments with various Gnostic concepts that he regarded as heretical. In defending Christian orthodoxy, Irenaeus developed various theological ideas, including typological models of the relationship between important biblical figures. In mapping this development, I was able to construct the framework for a typological relationship not explicitly mentioned by Irenaeus from his writings on the nature of the relationships between Adam and Christ, Eve and Mary.

In the same way, when setting out the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, it is necessary to consider the context. For this model in the patristic period, the writings of St Ambrose of Milan are central, as is the context in which he was writing; the reasons for his writing about Mary and the Church, and for writing about them together; and the contrast with what Irenaeus wrote on a similar subject two centuries before. This means that the focus of the

section will be on the ascetic ideals that Ambrose strove to achieve not just for himself but for his Church. This in turn will lead to a discussion on the use of Mary in this context. Why was it that Ambrose saw Mary as the figure around which to develop the *exemplar* ideal? What was his agenda in using her in this way?

To that end this section will be split into three parts. Firstly I will consider the work of Ambrose, the context in which he wrote, and the motivations for talking about Mary and the Church in a way which I will define as fitting my *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Secondly I will consider how this *exemplar* model, and how Ambrose's wider work, compare and contrast with the work of Irenaeus on the Mario-ecclesial relationship and with the *genetrix* model that I projected out of Irenaeus' work. Finally I will consider the use of Mary herself as the figure around which the *exemplar* model was set out, examine the idea that a discussion about a Mario-ecclesial relationship needs to include Eve, and consider how a fourth century interpretation of Mary affected how she was viewed.

To summarise, the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, coming from the term meaning 'a model or pattern to be copied or imitated',¹¹⁵ refers to the idea that it is Mary's model behaviour, her obedience to God, that is projected forward to all members of the Church as an example of how they should behave. In this model, there is no question of Mary having been involved in some way in the creation of the Church itself, or of its structures. Instead Mary provides the model of an individual *within* the Church structures. Using the analogy of the car, Mary is the prototypic 'first model', still a part of the Church

¹¹⁵ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar>, accessed 02/11/2012

but setting the standard for who follow in the Church. She is personally involved with the Church and its members exactly because she is a member of the Church.

Ambrose: Mary as ‘Virgin of Virgins’

One of the themes of this thesis is the way in which Mary is used at different times in Church history. It is this ‘use’ that creates the typological models being discussed here. The term ‘use’ also suggests passivity in Mary’s role, as if the ways in which she is used are influenced mostly by other factors.

The development of Mariology over the two centuries between Irenaeus and Ambrose was as much the consequence of other progressions of doctrine and orthodox ecclesiology as it was of its own making. Developments elsewhere led to parallel developments within Mariology. The fourth century’s Christological debates, beginning with the declarations of the Council of Nicaea in 325 on the *homoousios* state of Father and Son, created a vacuum behind it which was immediately filled by a parallel debate about the role, significance and identity of the Mother that brought about the bodily incarnation of that state.

The theme of Mary as being ‘used’ continues. As with Irenaeus employing the figure of Mary to refute Gnostic heresies, here Mary is an integral part of the wider discussions on the nature of Christ. Irenaeus even uses her in a similar fashion, to confirm the necessary humanity of Christ and therefore to underline the bodily similitude with Adam necessary for recapitulation and redemption. Once again the figure of Mary was being buffeted around by a theological debate not centred on her.

The particular debate to involve Mary at this time in the fourth century was a continuation of a process that had begun with early concepts of asceticism and had grown to include ideals for living that shared much with the image of the Virgin Mary. As David G. Hunter begins his paper on 'Helvidius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome':

One of the more striking features of the ascetic movement in the West at the end of the fourth century is the manner in which it spawned a new form of devotion to the Virgin Mary. Western writers, notably Ambrose, bishop of Milan, fastened on certain ideas, such as the perpetual virginity of Mary after the birth of Jesus (*virginitas post partum*) and the virginity of Mary in the process of giving birth (*virginitas in partu*), to exhort their followers to adopt an ascetic life.¹¹⁶

This passage underlines clearly the way in which Mary was used and is very useful in outlining the structure of the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that I wish to put forward. Mary is the model of the ascetic life because she was untouched by man in bringing about the Incarnation. It is this virginity that becomes Mary's most valuable asset.

It is important to note that Ambrose, like Irenaeus, was attempting to overcome a conflict that he felt threatened the orthodoxy of the Church. In the case of Irenaeus this involved combating the heretical Gnostic heresies of the Valentinians and the Ebionites, while trying to construct what is in effect an embryonic ecclesiology. For Ambrose this conflict came against the perceived Arian sympathies of the hierarchical structure of the Church whose power he so

¹¹⁶ Hunter, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome', 47

wished to define, and involved an ecclesiology developed around ascetic practices from his own ideals and experiences. Peter Brown comments,

What angered him most was cowardice on the part of the clergy... who... had allowed themselves to be browbeaten by the formidable anti-Nicene, "Arian" establishment... Ambrose saw it as his duty, as Bishop of Milan, to make plain... the uncompromising antithesis between the true, Catholic Church and its manifold enemies, which had been an integral part of the rhetoric of Latin Christians since the days of Tertullian and Cyprian.¹¹⁷

Ambrose was affected deeply by a personal 'commitment to action [that] led him to be particularly sensitive to the weakness of the "flesh".¹¹⁸ On top of this he was acutely aware of the role that virginity was playing in the upper reaches of society, the areas of most influence and control over the Church.

In the Italy of Ambrose, treatises on virginity no longer circulated as exhortations to a sheltered piety. They were written so as to change upper-class opinion... No Latin writer saw the implications of this new situation more clearly than did Ambrose. The notion of virginity served him as a sounding board. By preaching on virginity, and especially by upholding the perpetual virginity of Mary, Ambrose made resonantly clear the position that he wished the Catholic Church to occupy in the Western territories of the Empire.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Brown, Peter, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, 20th Anniversary Edition, (New York, Columbia University Press, 2008) 346-7

¹¹⁸ Brown, *Body and Society*, 349

¹¹⁹ Brown, *Body and Society*, 345

Virginity was the tool with which Ambrose would defend the Church and preserve it. In looking to advertise the ascetic ideal of virginity to the masses, Mary, with her perpetual virginity a topic of intense theological debate at the time, was the ‘cover girl’ or the exemplar that would help to push Ambrose’s message. Brown quotes *De Officiis* 1.33.170 when he states that

Like the virgin, the Catholic Church was an intact body endowed with a miraculous capacity for growth and nurture. The long lost solidarity of all humanity would be regained through the Church.¹²⁰

Mary then, as the virgin exemplar, was Ambrose’s way of popularising his personal thoughts on how the Church might be best strengthened against the threats of Arianism, and how it might gain the support of the influential elite in the upper classes. But how did Ambrose ‘use’ Mary in this context? What was his Mariology? What typological connections did he make between Eve and Mary? How then might this be projected into the Mario-ecclesial relationship and the construction of the *exemplar* model of this relationship?

[Hence] his portrait of Mary, model of virgins, may be called the moral aspect of his teaching on Mary’s virginity.¹²¹ For both the ascetic and the non-ascetic teachers, Mary’s virginity came to symbolize different notions of sin, sexuality, and the Church.¹²²

An Ambrosian Mariology can clearly be said to develop alongside and because of his ascetic ideals and the ways in which the figure of Mary is affected by

¹²⁰ Brown, *Body and Society*, 364

¹²¹ Neumann, Charles William, S.M, *The Virgin Mary in the Works of Ambrose*,(Fribourg, University Press, 1962) 4

¹²² Hunter, ‘Heldivius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome’, 48

these ideals. The following passage from *Expositio Evangelii secundem Lucam* highlights the connections between Mary, the ascetic ideal and the Church:

Fittingly is she espoused, but Virgin, because she prefigures the Church which is undefiled but wed. A Virgin conceived us of the Holy Spirit, a Virgin brings us forth without travail. And thus, perhaps Mary, wed to one, filled by another, because also the separate Churches are indeed filled by the Spirit and by Grace, and yet are joined to the appearance of a temporal priest.¹²³

The continued mention of Mary's virginity, and the relationship between this virginity and the institutional idea of the Church, underlines the typological themes that will emerge regarding the Mario-ecclesial relationship. It also demonstrates that while Ambrose can be said to have famously, and principally, expounded the idea of Mary as type of the Church, equally important in his thinking is this position as an exemplar of behaviour through her virginity. In this way a typological model that combines Mary's prefiguring of the Church with Ambrose's concerns about virginity is formed. This is the basis of the *exemplar* model.

In what way is Mary's exemplar nature used, and how might this be projected into a typological model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship? The language Ambrose employs, and the way he uses Mary is behavioural in focus and aimed at the individual actions of the people of the Church, as opposed to the formation of the body of the Church itself. Shortly after the 'famous' passage

¹²³ Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 2.7, 'Bene desparsata, sed virgo; quia est Ecclesiae typus, quae est immaculate, sed nupta. Concepit nos virgo de Spiritu, parit nos virgo sine gemitu. Et ideo fortasse sancta Maria alii nupta ab alio replete; quia et singulae Ecclesiae Spiritu quidem replentur et gratia; junguntur tamen ad temporalis speciem sacerdotis. Translation by Theodosia Tomkinson: (California, Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1998) 36

above in *The Exposition of Luke*, Ambrose tells his audience: ‘Learn of behaviour from the Virgin, learn of modesty from the Virgin, learn of the prophecy from the Virgin, learn in the mystery’.¹²⁴ These appeals to follow the lead of Mary, who is the type of virgins, or the ‘Virgin of virgins,’ demonstrate the ascetic undertone to much of the Marian discussion in Ambrose.

The Mario-ecclesial relationship in Ambrose can in some ways be said to be ‘based on the virginal motherhood of both, a motherhood that has the same supernatural fructifying principle: the Holy Spirit’.¹²⁵ The use of virginal motherhood contributes to the typological model in that it offers further parallels between Mary and the Church that continue to utilise Ambrose’s ascetic ideal. Mary and the Church are connected because of what they have brought forth. Christ, in the case of Mary, and believers, in the case of the Church.

The Holy Spirit knows its saying, nor does it ever forget, and the prophecy is not only fulfilled by miracles of acts, but also by the prophecies of the words. Who is that fruit of the womb if not Him of whom it is said: “Behold, sons are the heritage of the Lord, the reward of the Fruit of the Womb” [Ps 126.3]? That is, the heritage of the Lord are sons, who are the reward of that fruit who proceeded from Mary’s womb. He Himself is the Fruit of the Womb, the Flower of the root, of Whom Isaiah fittingly prophesised, saying, ‘There shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up

¹²⁴ Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 2.8: ‘Disce virginem moribus, disce virginem verecundia, disce virginem oraculo, disce mysterio.’

¹²⁵ Gambero, Luigi, *Mary and the Fathers of the Church*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1991, trans: Buffer, Thomas) 198

out of his root [Is. 11.1]; for the root is the family of the Jews, the rod is Mary, the Flower of Mary is Christ.¹²⁶

This extract demonstrates Ambrose's use of a combination of factors: of Scriptural tradition, from both Old and New Testaments; of ascetic ideals from more recent tradition and from his own beliefs; of a Trinitarian concept that places the works of the Holy Spirit alongside and as the cause of all that Mary experiences and represents. The use of the Holy Spirit in such a way can be said to clarify the position of Mary within salvation history as one that is largely Christologically relevant, that is, Mary is important here, and her virginity is such, because of her role as Mother of the Incarnate God. As Michael O'Carroll comments, 'many of his references to the Holy Spirit may be summarised in the pithy phrase: "The offspring of the virgin is therefore the work of the Holy Spirit".¹²⁷ The Church, as demonstrated in *The Exposition of Luke* 2.7, is also immaculate because of the relationship between Christ and the mystical body of his Church. Taking the context of the passages above, the following passage from *De institutione virginis* combines Scriptural prophecy and contemporary Trinitarian concepts and develops a connection between Mary and the Church: 'From out of Mary's womb this pure pile of wheat is spread, surrounded by the lilies, when Christ was born of her'.¹²⁸ Again, what Mary and the Church bring forth connects them.

¹²⁶ Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 2.24: *Novit sermonem suum Spiritus sanctus, nec umquam obliscitur. Et prophetia non solum rerum completur miraculis, sed etiam proprietate verborum. Quis est iste fructis ventris, nisi ille de quo dictum est: Ecce haereditas Domini filii, merces fructus ventris (Psal. CXXXVI.3)? Hoc est, haereditas Domini filii sunt, qui merces sunt fructus illius, qui de Mariae ventre processit. Ipse fructus ventris est, flos radicis, de quo bene prophetavit Esaias deicens: Exiet virga de radice Jesse, et flos ex radice ejus ascendet (Esai. XI.1); radix enim est familia Iudeorum virga Maria, flos Mariae Christus...*

¹²⁷ O'Carroll, Michael, C.S.Sp; *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopaedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 1982) 19

¹²⁸ Ambrose, *De institutione virginis*, 94, from
<http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/02m/0339->

In demonstrating scripturally that Mary can be seen (and foreseen) to be sharing a spiritual maternity with all the faithful (because Ambrose links Christ as the lily and the Church of the faithful as the grains of wheat), Ambrose highlights the connections between Mary and the Church. In certain ways, this language almost suggests something more akin to the *genetrix* model set out above, as it alludes to the Incarnation as representing Mary's active role in salvation history. However the connection between Mary and the Church here is that they share this motherhood as the result of their purity or spotlessness, through their virginity. Thus the model of Mary is behavioural, and it provides an example for members of the Church. This demonstrates that the two typological models of this thesis are not mutually exclusive.

The passage from Psalm 126 above suggests: 'sons are the heritage of the Lord, the reward of the Fruit of the Womb', and Ambrose sees Christ as that fruit. The end of the passage from *The Exposition of Luke* 2.24 referenced above states '[the flower of Mary is Christ], who, as if the fruit of a good tree, according to our progress in virtue, now blossoms, now bears fruit in us, now is reborn again in the resurrection'.¹²⁹ Christ bears fruit in the faithful, in the Church; the fruit which comes from the womb of the Virgin Mary. This forming of life can be seen in the sense of the *genetrix* model outlined above, and certainly there are elements of this model in the work of Ambrose, just as all discussions on the Mario-ecclesial relationship will contain some aspects of both models. Ambrose's role in my setting out the *exemplar* model does not preclude him from having used archetypal *genetrix* language. The relationship between Mary

[0397_Ambrosius,_De_Institutione_Virginis_Et_Sanctae_Mariae_Virginitate_Perpetua,_MLT.pdf](#), accessed 19/08/09 'Ex illo utero Mariae diffusus est in hunc mundum acervus tritici munit inter lilia; quando natus est ex ea Christus.'

¹²⁹ Ambrose, *Ex Lucam*, 2.24: 'qui veluti bona arbores fructus pro nostrae virtutis processu nunc floret, nunc fructificat in nobis, nunc rediva corporis resurrection reparatur.'

and the Church is evident from this as much as it is from the famous proclamation of prefiguring, and it is from the relationship that the typological models emerge.

Again it is important to recognise that Ambrose's discussion of this relationship is indicative of his wider thinking. As Peter Brown notes:

Ambrose was a man deeply preoccupied with the role of the Catholic Church in Roman Society. He was dominated by a need to assert the position of the Church as an inviolably holy body, possessed of unchallengeable, because divine, authority.¹³⁰

A consequence of the world in which Ambrose was raised, a world in which the ecclesiastical hierarchy was seen as weak in the face of Arian threats to orthodoxy, the desire to strengthen and defend the Church against the threats of 'admixture' with the *saeculum* that was its antithesis, found a willing and convenient companion in the discussion of Mary's virginity.

In defending the perpetual virginity of Mary, in the years around 395, Ambrose knew that he was not only elevating the mother of the Lord... In these years, it was always with the doors of the Church in mind that Ambrose ended his evocations of the perpetual virginity of Mary. The closed human person of Mary made concrete to his hearers the intangible screen that ringed the basilicas of the Catholic Church: "He of whom it was said, in relation to the Church: "He has

¹³⁰ Brown, *Body and Society*, 346

strengthened the bars of thy gates," how could He not have strengthened the bars of His own gate [the Virgins womb]"?¹³¹

The Mario-ecclesial relationship was for Ambrose a welcome method of pushing an ascetic agenda designed to combat weaknesses that he perceived in the hierarchical structure of the Church, and a way of safeguarding the future of the Church by appealing to the influential members of the upper classes. Mary became a figure whose example could help both of these foci to succeed. The *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship therefore comes out of a need for an existing ecclesia to recognise a way of behaving. Mary becomes a model for the whole Church, for all of the people of the Church, and in doing so becomes a type of the Church.

Ambrose and Irenaeus

It is worth considering the ways in which Ambrose and Irenaeus match up in their discussion of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. It is important to reiterate from the outset that Irenaeus was not explicitly discussing a Mario-ecclesial relationship because the ecclesial structures found in Ambrose's time simply did not exist. For Irenaeus and the *genetrix* model I have projected an outline based upon the rest of his typological work. For Ambrose, while it has been necessary again to project some of his work onto a Mario-ecclesial relationship, there *is* evidence of a conscious identification of a relationship between the two figures.

The relationship that comes to be between Mary and the Church starts for both men in the relationship between Eve and Mary. For Irenaeus, the Eve-Mary relationship was based on Mary atoning or recapitulating the misdemeanours and transgressions of Eve, in a similar fashion to the recapitulation of the errors

¹³¹ Brown, *Body and Society*, 355, quoting Ambrose, *De institutione virginis*. 8.56

of Adam by Christ in his crucifixion. In Ambrose, while there is still the element of Mary correcting the errors of Eve, there is much more emphasis given, unsurprisingly, to the virginity of Mary and to the role of virginity in this recapitulation: 'Folly through a woman, through the virgin wisdom',¹³² 'Through the woman came anxiety, through the virgin salvation arrived',¹³³ 'He came to give salvation to the world through a Virgin and by his birth of a virgin remedied the fault of the woman'.¹³⁴

In using virginity as a theme, Ambrose concentrated on the ideas of obedience and faith that are demonstrated by Mary at the Annunciation. However he wished also to make clear the distinction that although she was Holy ('A[mbrose] first used the Latin word *sancta*, holy, about Mary... He spoke of Mary as 'not from this earth but from heaven'¹³⁵), all that she was came from and was rooted in Christ as the Incarnate God. *The Exposition of Luke*. 10.132 stated that 'Mary was not less than became the Mother of God.' *De institutione virginis* 6 asked: 'Who was there on whom the Lord had bestowed greater merit, from whom he held a greater reward than his mother?' Christ then chose Mary as the vessel to bring him forth, as O'Carroll notes: 'she was the first beneficiary of the redemption'.¹³⁶ Here O'Carroll notes an interesting parallel with Irenaeus in the following passage from Ambrose:

Nor is it to be wondered at that when the Lord was about to redeem the world, he began his work from Mary, so that she, through whom

¹³² Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 4.7., *Patrologia Latina Vol. 15*, COL 1614B- *per mulierem stultitia, per virginem sapientia,*

¹³³ Ambrose, *Epistle* 42.3 'The Council of Milan to Pope Siricius', from Pearse, *Early Church Fathers – Additional Texts*, from

www.ccel.org/ccel/pearse/morefathers/files/ambrose_letters_05_letters41_50.htm 29/10/10

¹³⁴ Ambrose, *Exhortation virginitatis*, 26, COL.0343C, from *Patrologia Latina Database*, *Salutem mundo daturus per virginem venit, et Mulieris lapsus partu virginis solvit.*

¹³⁵ O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 19

¹³⁶ O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 19

salvation was being prepared for all, should be the first to draw salvation from her son.¹³⁷

This is compared to the ‘oft quoted phrase of Irenaeus’¹³⁸ that: (Mary)... became the cause of salvation both for herself and the whole human race.¹³⁹

Ambrose showed Mary as having the same role in salvation history as Irenaeus did: at the beginning in the Incarnation and therefore at the birth of the Body of Christ: the Church. In both cases this role was secured both by the obedience and faith of Mary herself, and her position as chosen by God to be the Mother of the Incarnation. For Irenaeus this obedience and faith echoed backwards and formed the Eve-Mary antithesis that was so central to his thinking on the subject, while for Ambrose obedience and faith to God (through the Church) was projected forwards as more of a manual for individual behaviour. In this way Irenaeus was using the Eve-Mary relationship to look back and consider Mary, while Ambrose used the same model to tell his audience how they should behave in the future.

It is also possible that Mary’s role is more independent in Irenaeus in the sense that the focus is on her actions, as a creature of free will, that undo the actions of Eve, another creature under the same conditions. In this way she ‘became the cause of salvation’, in her co-recapitulatory role alongside Christ, which cannot be sustained in the thinking of Ambrose, where she was the ‘first to draw salvation **from** her son’. In Ambrose Mary’s role becomes much more passive, much more receptive: she *accepts* the command of God because she *believes* what she is being commanded to be true. She *receives* and *draws* from the

¹³⁷ Ambrose, *Ex Lucam* 10.42

¹³⁸ O Carroll, *Theotokos*, 19

¹³⁹ A.H. III.22.4.

Godhead. In Irenaeus she *undoes* the disobedience of Eve through an active obedience and an active faith. The Mary of Ambrose's Annunciation scene becomes a far more passive participant in salvation history.

Again, O'Carroll suggests a comparison between the two, this one slightly more subtle in its construction and later realisation.

Faith shines forth especially in this all perfect one. Contrasting Mary's response to the angelic message with that of Zechariah, the great Latin doctor continues: ... "And she was truly blessed who excelled the priest, for if the priest had expressed denial, she had remedied his fault [*Exposition of Luke 2.17*]".¹⁴⁰

Although he echoed in some ways Irenaeus' idea of Mary remedying or undoing the disobedience or lack of faith of Eve in Paradise, Ambrose concentrated on promoting the faith and passive obedience of the Mother of God. This suggests a wider concept of Mary's faith, one that would later be further developed by Augustine. Ambrose saw in the unquestioning faith of Mary an important aspect of the salvific act:

See that Mary did not doubt, but believed and gathered the fruit of faith... Blessed [says Elizabeth] because thou hast believed. But you are blessed, who have heard and believed; for every soul that has believed both conceives and engenders the Word of God and recognises his works... if, according to the flesh, there is one Mother of Christ, according to faith, Christ is the fruit of all.¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰ O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 19

¹⁴¹ Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 2.26

Here the Irenaean archetypal image of the fruit that comes from Mary is again apparent in Ambrose, once again combined with the behavioural, prototypic *exemplar* aspect present in her lack of doubt. Mary is an exemplar of the concept of obedience that both Irenaeus and Ambrose are keen to promote, and in this passage can be seen in the sense of a real exemplar for the members of the Church. If the obedient Mary of the Irenaean model is a more abstract construct designed to support the orthodoxy that Irenaeus was trying to expound, then the obedient Mary of the Ambrosian model is one designed to be instantly identifiable to his audience as an exemplar and role model. It is one designed to be heard in letters and sermons, to be considered and then to be acted on. This identifies a key difference in the models of the two men: where Irenaeus was trying to work out the first principles of the theology of creation and salvation, and therefore was working with more abstract concepts, Ambrose was attempting to refine hierarchical structures already present within the Church, and thus his model was necessarily more recognisable and identifiable to the regular congregations of the latter fourth century Churches of Milan and the Northern Empire.

One further potential parallel between the two Fathers comes in a passage from Ambrose's *De Officiis*:

If the whole body is injured in one member, certainly in one man is the whole community of the human race injured. The nature of mankind is injured, as also is the society of the Holy Church, which

rises in to one united body, bound together in oneness in love and faith.¹⁴²

This idea of the unity of the Church was commented on previously by Peter Brown when he noted that: 'like the virgin, the Catholic Church was an intact body endowed with a miraculous capacity for growth and nurture. The long lost solidarity of all humanity would be regained through the Church'.¹⁴³ This idea, discussed above because it identifies Mary as a 'cover girl' for ascetic behaviour, is important here also because it echoes in one sense the concept in Irenaeus that is later identified by Matthew Steenberg as *Social Recapitulation*. Here the solidarity of the Church can be said to echo the social interaction that is condemned to the dominion of death by Eve and redeemed through the actions of Mary in Irenaean typology. However, even if this passage may demonstrate a similarity between the two in terms of the Church being a social community that brings salvation to its members as that community, it cannot be said that Ambrose holds Mary as a repairer of this situation. In *Ex Lucam* 10.132, he states that:

Jesus had no need of a helper for the redemption of all, he who said
'I am become like a man without help, free among the dead.' So he accepted indeed the love [*affectum*] of a Mother, but did not seek the help of a human being.

¹⁴² Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum Libres Tres*, III.3.19, from http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/02m/0339-0397_Ambrosius,_De_Officiis_Ministrorum_Libri_Tres,_MLT.pdf, accessed 20/08/09 *Jam si uno membro totum corpus violator, utique in uno homine communion totius humanitatis solvitur; violator natura generis humani, et Sanctae Ecclesiae congregation, quae in unum connexum corpus atque compactum unitate fidei et charitatis assurgit.*

¹⁴³ Brown, *Body and Society*, 364

In no uncertain terms, Ambrose here denies the Irenaean suggestion that Mary was in anyway involved in a co-recapitulatory action, such as is defined in Steenberg's *Social Recapitulation*. While the social interaction of humanity was in need of saving, and while the Church *is* that interaction at the time, Ambrose does not further the Mario-ecclesial model to cover this action.

It can perhaps be suggested then that the major differences between Ambrose and Irenaeus in looking at Mary and the Church came about because of the ecclesiological developments that had occurred in the two centuries separating them. The construction of, and need to defend, a hierarchical system within the Church caused similarly styled passages and ideas to be offered to wildly different audiences. The goal of Irenaeus was to create and sustain an embryonic orthodoxy in an embryonic church structure, while the aim of Ambrose was to correct an already defined structure and guide the people already committed to that kind of structure.

How and why Ambrose came to utilise an image of Mary consistent with what I have termed as the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship have been outlined. In doing so I have shown that this image is not used exclusively – elements of both the *exemplar* and *genetrix* models can often be seen in Mario-ecclesiology side by side - but that within the discussion of the relationship, Ambrose's wider agenda led him to a narrative that was reminiscent of the *exemplar* model.

A submissive virgin?

Is the *exemplar* model as used specifically by Ambrose one which encourages the subjugation of women? I will suggest in this section that while the context of the fourth century might cause this to be accurate, it is not indicative of the

wider usage of the model, and that each use of the models are subject to particular issues surrounding the times in which they are used. Before that, I will reiterate the importance of Eve in the Mario-ecclesial discussion, particularly in the patristic period.

Tina Beattie calls Irenaeus' Mary-Eve typological model one 'that recurs in numerous other patristic writings and that has profoundly shaped Marian theology and symbolism'.¹⁴⁴ On a wider scale, she believes that 'in early Christian writings, Eve, Mary and the Church are part of a prismatic vision in which each facet illuminates and depends on the other'.¹⁴⁵

As previously noted, Beattie understands that 'patristic writers had a more complex and subtle way of understanding the motherhood of Mary, Eve and the Church'¹⁴⁶ than those writers who followed. This was mentioned briefly in discussing Steenberg above. The patristic discussions that have been outlined have been approached from the point of view of the two models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that I am setting out. I have developed these models from the foundation of the wider relationship between Mary, Eve and the Church that form the discussions during the patristic period. Beattie identifies that the Mary-Eve relationship in Irenaeus is taken forward as part of an accepted perspective on Mary. This perspective is also part of the models that I am building.

By associating Mary with virginity to such an extent, Ambrose offers an image of the figure of Mary as being more passive than that shown in the typological models of Irenaeus. In discussing another fourth century document from the

¹⁴⁴ Beattie, Tina, 'Mary, Eve and the Church', in *Maria: Journal for Marian Studies*, Vol.2 (2001)pp.5-20:13

¹⁴⁵ Beattie, 'Mary, Eve and the Church', 5

¹⁴⁶ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 150

Council of Nicaea that shows Mary as a quiet, chaste girl, chosen by God exactly because of her behaviour, Hilda Graef notes that:

It is interesting to note how Mary... is portrayed not as she appears in Scripture, but as the ideal of the fourth century consecrated virgin, who always stayed at home and prayed, meticulously guarded against any masculine society, whereas the Mary of the Gospels did not hesitate to visit her cousin Elizabeth, went up to the temple for feasts and generally behaved like a normal Jewish girl of her time. But... every age unconsciously forms its image of the Virgin according to its own ideal.¹⁴⁷

It is interesting to note that Graef sees the context of the time as important in discussing the Mario-ecclesial relationship, as I have mentioned previously. Here though it is the idea that Mary is portrayed in a submissive way that is important. The model of virginity prevalent in the fourth century necessitates that the figure of Mary is compliant with this model. In order to appeal to a society familiar with the concept of female submission but perhaps not as familiar with consecrated virgins who represented virginity as a virtue and not just submission, theologians, and Ambrose in particular, saw the need to reimagine the figure of Mary in this light. This behaviour of solitude and humble passivity was one that would have fitted both with Ambrose's ecclesiological agenda and with his personal ascetic ideals. For Sally Cuneen, the Church Fathers of the fourth century

¹⁴⁷ Graef, Hilda, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, (Notre Dame, Ave Mara Press, 2009 [1963]) 40

Read into Scripture their own androcentric assumptions about human nature and the body, greatly changing the meaning of Mary's virginity and minimizing the value of her humanity... Such a portrait makes Mary an inhuman cipher with no concern in life except to bear and mourn her son.¹⁴⁸

The ascetic ideal of virginity and the behaviours expected of 'good' Christian women are projected backwards onto the image of Mary's virginity to make her actions more suitable for, and perhaps more communicable to, a fourth and fifth century audience. The *exemplar* model is focused on a figure of Mary that is seen to act in a certain way. In the context of Ambrose, this behaviour is filtered through the lens of asceticism and the greater agenda he had for defending the Church from perceived threats. Cuneen and Graef suggest that this behaviour has also been filtered through an androcentric agenda that causes the figure of Mary to appear submissive and passive because that is the way the writers expected or desired the female members of the Church to act. The personal feelings of Ambrose towards sexuality and the human body would suggest that he wanted to see a standard of behaviour more in keeping with Roman sexual mores and the consecrated virgins that he was familiar with.

The submissive Mary is depicted in later art, bowing to the Angel Gabriel at the Annunciation as the Word of God is imparted to her. However, far from demonstrating the submissive role of women, Tina Beattie feels that:

When the angel appears to Mary, we discover that God's will is not under patriarchal control, and Mary herself is liberated from the

¹⁴⁸ Cuneen, Sally, *In Search of Mary: The Woman and the Symbol*, (New York, Ballantine Books, 1996) 109-10

bondage of the Fall. She is submissive not to Joseph but only to God.¹⁴⁹

The submissive Mary is submissive only to God. This reading of the figure of Mary in a sense categorises gender identity as secondary to the idea that all humanity is secondary to God, that both men and women are submissive before God. Going further, Beattie notes that:

Only with late fourth and early fifth century writers such as Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome does Mary's virginity become widely associated with moral exhortations to imitate her example, and there is little evidence in early Marian theology of a 'highly gendered ideal' aimed at the subjugation of women. If anything, the opposite is true.¹⁵⁰

For earlier discussions of Mary's virginity, particularly in Irenaeus, Beattie dismisses a latent androcentrism that seeks to suppress women through control over their sexual identity. The fact that this is perhaps becoming more apparent by the fourth century and the time of Ambrose is potentially a further underlining of the importance of the ascetic context in setting up this image of Mary. From this image it is possible to set out the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, but, while in this context the *exemplar* model is centred on the ascetic ideal of virginity and therefore perhaps open to accusations of androcentrism, future examples of the model in action are not so ascetically minded, as will be seen in chapters 2 and 3. The use of the model in this

¹⁴⁹ Beattie, Tina, *Rediscovering Mary: Insights from the Gospels*, (Ligouri, triumph Books, 1995)

27

¹⁵⁰ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 58-59

context is, as with all uses of Mary and typological models in this thesis, determined by the prevailing political, theological and social trends of the time.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the two typological models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship as they were used in the patristic period. I have laid the foundations for an easier understanding of the models in other contexts by giving examples of the models being used.

The patristic uses of these models were motivated by the overriding theologies and ecclesiological situations of the times in which they were used. The work of Irenaeus against heretics in the second century and the ascetic ideals of Ambrose in the fourth formed the catalysts for discussions on the nature of the figure of Mary. I have been able, through analysing the writing of both men, to project a typological model for the Mario-ecclesial relationship in each of their discussions. In the case of Irenaeus this was a projection of something that did not explicitly exist at the time, and so necessarily was a combination of his work on the relationships between Adam and Christ and Eve and Mary. For Ambrose this required an examination of his own ideas about the relationship between Mary and the Church. In each instance, the theological context produced a specific model of the relationship between Mary and the Church.

Having set out these models as they were used by two writers from a similar period in history, it is now possible to consider their use in other periods, as well as how they fed into a wider, eschatological theme.

Chapter 2: Mary in Medieval Eschatology

This chapter will answer the question ‘in what sense was Mary seen as a type of the Church in the medieval period?’ There will be more than one answer, and the chapter will focus on the eschatological aspects of the Mario-ecclesial discussions, as they will be relevant in chapters 3 and 4. Specifically the apocalyptic world views that seem to have been prevalent around the turn of the year 1000 will be addressed and analysed.¹⁵¹ The other contention of the thesis, that Mary was often used in socio-political discussions, will also be relevant, and it will become evident that the perceived nature of that relationship during this period was affected by the prevailing theological and liturgical trends.

The chapter will consider therefore how it came to be that the idea of the eschaton was, for some, an indication of the impending annihilation of the hierarchy of the Roman church, whilst for others it represented that same church’s ultimate victory. It will consider what role Mary had in these different views, and also how the eschatological context affected the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

In considering the ecclesiological, Mariological and eschatological discussions of the period, this chapter will focus specifically on the writing and influence of St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153). St Bernard was a member of the Cistercian Order who was active in the Church politics and the machinations of

¹⁵¹ The question of whether there actually were any apocalyptic millennial concerns in the years surrounding 1000 has been considered at some length. Richard Landes’ *The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000: Augustinian Historiography, Medieval and Modern*, in *Speculum*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (Jan., 2000), pp. 97-145, (from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2887426>, accessed 24/08/2013) marks a useful entry point into this idea and it is developed further in Landes, Richard, (ed), *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050*, (Oxford, University Press, 2003).

the papacy in the middle of the twelfth century.¹⁵² He also ‘played a major part in developing... the devotion to the Virgin Mary’,¹⁵³ during the same period. For these reasons he is most suitable for a focus in this chapter.

This chapter will therefore be split into two parts: the first will consider the Mariology, ecclesiology and Mario-ecclesiology of Bernard and of other prominent thinkers in the Church. The second will consider Mary in the context of the eschatological concerns of the time.

In the first section, the question of Bernard’s place in the Church and his influence on popes and laity alike will be considered. Following this, Bernard’s Mario-ecclesiology will be outlined, as well as a wider consideration of his Mariology. In this section the question ‘in what sense did Bernard see Mary as a type of the Church?’ will be answered. Finally in the first section, the condition of the Church and its view of itself will be outlined and contrasted with the view of the papacy from outside the Church. This will allow a comparison with the ecclesiastical ideas of Bernard, and will help to set up the different schools of thought regarding a potential apocalypse at the time.

The second half of the chapter will pick up on this eschatological theme, with a study of Caroline Walker Bynum’s three eschatological models as the starting point for a consideration of medieval apocalyptic thought. These models will act as a framework around which to consider in more detail the apocalyptic and more general eschatological ideas of the thinkers of the time. For this section the thoughts of Bernard, while still integral to the thesis, will be appraised alongside thinkers from throughout the ‘Middle Ages’, including those from the

¹⁵² See Pranger, M.B., ‘Bernard of Clairvaux: work and self’ in Bruun, Mette Birkedal, (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013) pp. 186-198

¹⁵³ Pranger, ‘Bernard of Clairvaux: work and self’, 194

late tenth century in the build up to the year 1000; as well as the eschatologies of the later period. The question of whether there was an active fear of the year 1000, or whether this has been projected backwards onto the period by those looking to interpret apocalyptic ideas that were not present, will also be addressed.

Having set up the apocalyptic views of the time, the second half of the chapter will then consider how and when Mary became eschatologically relevant. This will allow the chapter to establish the wider context in which Mary was used. In this instance, the apocalyptic fears of the Church and its members offered a specific context in which Mario-ecclesial concepts were important in the definition of the Church's position. The chapter will demonstrate how – for some thinkers – Mary, through her traditional typological relationship represented the Church as its type and as its eschatological link with heaven. In this way the Mario-ecclesial relationship will be shown to be at the centre of the socio-political concerns of the time.

Finally, a consideration of the Mario-ecclesial models in the medieval period will demonstrate some of the different senses in which people saw Mary as a type of the Church, and exactly what roles she was deemed to perform. The final section of the chapter will also briefly outline the influences that the thinkers of this period had on those later theologians who will be considered in chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

Bernard, Mary and the Church

The first half of this chapter will consider the major ecclesiological and Mariological views of St Bernard of Clairvaux. It will outline in what sense

Bernard saw Mary as a type of the Church, and in what ways he utilised the Mario-ecclesial relationship to inform his actions in his wide role within the hierarchy of the Church. It will begin by introducing Bernard by analysing what position and what influence he had within the Church at the time, and by considering his own ecclesiology.

Bernard and the Church

Bernard was at the heart of the reforming Cistercian movement in France, and may be described as 'a sort of one-man European moral ombudsman',¹⁵⁴ or as 'a man who overshadows the whole century and far beyond'.¹⁵⁵ Anna Harrison comments that 'Bernard holds a position of pivotal importance in the twelfth century; his influence on his contemporaries was enormous'.¹⁵⁶ Bernard was close to at least five popes during the twelfth century,¹⁵⁷ and his fame across Europe at the time was such that he was tasked by Pope Eugene III with preaching the Second Crusade in 1145. But his reputation was based as much on his influence on his fellow theologians as it was on his fame throughout Christendom. Centuries later, von Balthasar praised his 'sublime rhetoric',¹⁵⁸ in talking of the Virgin Mary.

Bernard was Abbot of the Cistercian monastery in Clairvaux for most of his life. Despite his fame, he never held another position within the Church. Pranger notes that:

¹⁵⁴ Tyerman, Christopher, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, (London, Penguin Books, 2007) 27-8

¹⁵⁵ Warner, Marina, *Alone of all Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary*, (Oxford, University Press, 2012) 123

¹⁵⁶ Harrison, Anna, 'Bernard of Clairvaux's Sermons for the Feast of All Saints', in Bynum, Caroline Walker, and Freedman, Paul (eds), *Last Things* 203

¹⁵⁷ In particular, Eugenius III (1145-53), who had been his protégé, and Innocent II (1130-43) who had successfully employed Bernard as his orator and supporter against the claims of Anacletus II in 1130.

¹⁵⁸ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Theo Drama III: Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press. Trans. G. Harrison, 1992) 308

Whether attending to his duties as an abbot inside that monastery or hitting the road on Church business, he acted on the assumption that his authority did not exceed the limits of his profession, even though, unsurprisingly, his opponents took a different view on this claim.¹⁵⁹

Bernard was active throughout Europe, often spending large periods of time away from Clairvaux, which caused both himself and those brothers to whom he was abbot some concern. However he was widely: ‘celebrated for his knowledge. Most well-known for holiness, most holy without deceit, a famous writer, eminent preacher, the mirror of his order, and enlarger of the Church’.¹⁶⁰ His influence, as will be seen later in this thesis, would ultimately stretch through to the Second Vatican Council and to the theology of Pope John Paul II. His spiritual counsel and political acumen was simultaneously what made him so successful at the monastery in Clairvaux, where he remained Abbot, and kept him away from it for such large periods of time.

Bernard was concerned with the direction of papal policy in the middle of the twelfth century. Bernard ‘saw in the papacy a God-given power which could over-ride the corrupt worldliness of local bishops and priests, and which could declare the God-given direction of the Church in its search for purity and holiness’.¹⁶¹ However, ‘for Bernard, this was a spiritual not a temporal claim, and he deplored the secular pomp and the secular business with which the popes were surrounded’.¹⁶² The popes of the mid-twelfth century enjoyed the sort of temporal power that no pope ever had before. This was a result of the

¹⁵⁹ Pranger, ‘Bernard of Clairvaux: work and self’, 186

¹⁶⁰ Holdsworth, Christopher, ‘Bernard of Clairvaux: his first and greatest miracle was himself’, in Mette (ed), *Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, pp.173-185: 173, quoting Gilbert Foliot, bishop of Hereford, from Morey A., and Brooke, C.N.L., (eds), *The Letter and Charters of Gilbert Foliot* (Cambridge, University Press, 1967) 106

¹⁶¹ Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes (Third Edition)*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006) 128

¹⁶² Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 138

'Great Reform' of the eleventh century, and was part of an ongoing conflict with the secular Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

At the opening of the eleventh century the papacy was a contradictory mixture of exalted theory and squalid reality. In theory the bishops of Rome were lords of the world, exercising a unique spiritual supremacy symbolised by their exclusive right to anoint the western or 'Holy Roman' Emperor. In practice, the popes were strictly and often humiliatingly subordinated to the power of the local Roman aristocracy, or to the German ruling house.¹⁶³

The internecine squabbles and political power games of the papacy and the aristocratic families that constituted the social and political centre of Rome debilitated the papacy for the first half of the eleventh century;¹⁶⁴ but when in 1049 Pope Leo was appointed as pope by the Emperor the face of the papacy changed swiftly: 'Leo IX has been described as "the real founder of the papal monarchy over the church." He brought with him to Rome the leaders of the reform movement in the north.'¹⁶⁵ The reform movement originated in monastic communities in central France, particularly at Cluny.¹⁶⁶ The reformist movement that Cluny embodied, combined with the concepts of freedom from royal rule and allegiance to the pope in Rome, spread throughout the monastic

¹⁶³ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*: 110

¹⁶⁴ At one stage there were three claimants to the papal throne - Benedict IX (1032-1046), Sylvester III (1045-6) and Gregory VI (1045-6) - and during this period there were four popes in as many years as the German Emperor Henry III (r.1046-1056) repeatedly replaced incumbents with preferred candidates.

¹⁶⁵ Barraclough, Geoffrey, *The Medieval Papacy*, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1968) 74

¹⁶⁶ In 909 Duke William of Aquitaine founded a monastery at Cluny that he decreed 'shall be wholly freed from our power, and from that of our kindred, and from the jurisdiction of royal greatness'. Instead of tying the monastery to a royal patronage, William instead dedicated it to the Holy See and placed it under its protection. This meant that the monastery was freed from the pressures of royal rivalries and able to instead dedicate itself to a consideration of the moral side of the church. Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 112, quoting the text of Cluny's foundation charter printed in Petry, R.C (ed.), *A History of Christianity: Readings in the history of the Church*, (Grand Rapids, 1981, vol. 1) 280-81

communities of Western Europe, and its belief in the power of the papacy was to have a transformative effect on the popes themselves.

Leo IX widened his horizons, set off from Rome to synods in Germany and France, ‘issuing decrees against simony, clerical marriage, violence and moral laxity’,¹⁶⁷ and generally promoting the image of the papacy. This won him the full support of the reforming movement, which put its extensive, powerful network at the pope’s disposal, nevertheless it brought about the unseen consequence that Rome co-opted the movement to its own ends.¹⁶⁸ This increase in the stature of the papacy as a temporal force within Europe naturally brought it into direct competition with the Emperors, who held themselves as the temporal, if not spiritual, leaders of Christendom. Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) moved quickly to ensure that papal supremacy was consolidated, with his *Dictatus Papae* in 1075.¹⁶⁹ For example ‘[the Pope] alone can depose or reinstate bishops’, (Dictate 3) and ‘it may be permitted to him to depose emperors’ (Dictate 12).¹⁷⁰ The ensuing conflict between Rome and the empire lasted until 1122, when a compromise was reached at the Concordat of Worms. The impact of this conflict was to have even wider consequences:

¹⁶⁷ Barracough, *Medieval Papacy*, 74

¹⁶⁸ Barracough, *Medieval Papacy*, 75: ‘It changed... the direction and character of the reform movement. The monastic reformers of Lorraine and Burgundy, and their disciples in France and Germany and England, had thought primarily of raising the standard of clerical and secular life by precept and example; they sought moral reform within the framework of the existing law and constitution of the church. Contact with the papacy brought a change... For the Romans who joined the reformers the first consideration was not moral rejuvenation, but the reinforcement of papal authority’.

¹⁶⁹ There is some debate about whether this document was written by Gregory himself in 1075 or at some later point. Ernest F. Henderson notes that ‘there is little doubt that the principles... do express the pope’s principles.’ Henderson, Ernest F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, (London, George Bell and Sons, 1941) 366 from

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/g7-dictpap.asp>, accessed 09/04/2013

¹⁷⁰ *Dictatus Papae*, from Henderson, *Select Historical Documents*, 366

It called into question not only the theocratic dream of the Christian emperors... but also challenged the theory of history and version of the apocalyptic scenario connected with it.¹⁷¹

The repercussions of these events for the eschatological aspects of this chapter will be considered in the second half of the chapter. However these were the events that led to the state of the papacy in the time of Bernard. The papacy, at the head of the Church, had seen its own position strengthened within the wider politics of Christendom by a programme of outward looking, strongly willed popes capable of making decisive proclamations that cemented the Church's spiritual and temporal authority. Bernard saw the spiritual primacy of the popes in Rome as a result of a gift from God, and as such it was a primacy that they should utilise:

You are called to the fullness of power. The power of others is bound by definite limits; yours extends even over those who have received power over others... Why should you not be placed on high, where you can see everything, you who have been appointed watchmen over all.¹⁷²

However, the papacy of the twelfth century transformed this 'religious perception into legal reality',¹⁷³ through a massive 'collection and systematisation of the whole body of canon law'¹⁷⁴ and the increasing power of

¹⁷¹ McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the end: Apocalyptic traditions in the Middle Ages*, (Columbia, University Press, 1979) 94 from <http://0-www.humanitiesebook.org.lib.exeter.ac.uk/> accessed 09/04/2013

¹⁷² Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 132, quoting Anderson, J.D., and Kenan, K.T. (eds), *St Bernard of Clairvaux: Five Books of Consideration: Advice to a Pope*, (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1976) pp.57-68

¹⁷³ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 132

¹⁷⁴ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 132-33

the curia.¹⁷⁵ This meant that temporal aspirations became common within the curia, the popes and their advisors. This was a move of great concern to Bernard, who saw the papacy as spiritual authority but not as temporal or legal authority. ‘He angrily denounced the new role of the cardinals and grimly described how the pope’s palace resounded with legal altercation.’¹⁷⁶

This was the focus of Bernard’s relationship with the hierarchy of the Church. Bernard’s ecclesiology saw the popes as the supreme authority of the Church. Spiritually the Church was pure, the popes were the ‘doorkeepers to heaven’.¹⁷⁷ By concerning themselves with legalistic or political matters, the popes were distracting themselves from their designated roles as doorkeepers, and thus endangering the relationship that the Church had with Christ in heaven. For Bernard the popes held the fate of *all* the Church within their duties, and they were not properly meeting those duties.

Bernard and Mary

Bernard’s ecclesiology was centred on the authority of the papacy. It saw the fate of the whole Church bound up in the decisions of the pope and the curial body that surrounded him. The following section will consider his Mariology, and then address the two subjects together.

Bernard’s Mariology was derived from his personal devotion to Mary. Although Mary does not feature in a large percentage of Bernard’s writing, ‘for him love

¹⁷⁵ ‘The establishment of the curia as the pivot of the administration put the papacy on an equal footing with the rising states of federal Europe’ and ‘prepared the ground for the legal developments which contributed so much to the rise of the papal monarchy’. Barraclough, *Medieval Papacy*, 95

¹⁷⁶ Barraclough, *Medieval Papacy*, 101

¹⁷⁷ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 132

for the Mother of God was inseparable from life itself',¹⁷⁸ and Dante attributed these words to him: 'the Queen of Heaven, for whom I burn wholly with love, will grant us all grace, because I am her loyal Bernard'.¹⁷⁹ His key sermons and letters about her concerned the two events in her life that would ultimately be promulgated as dogma centuries later: the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption.

'Bernard faithfully follows the thought of the Fathers of the Church, so much so that he has been considered the last of the Fathers.'¹⁸⁰ Adherence to the thinking of the Church Fathers therefore went hand in hand with Bernard's consideration of Mary as *Theotokos*. Furthermore, von Balthasar notes that 'Bernard is only formulating explicitly what is known to tradition'¹⁸¹ when he talks of Mary as being a new Eve. However, following the thought of the Fathers of the Church meant that although Bernard held Mary in great esteem, there were certain aspects of Marian devotion that he could not accept, 'precisely because he did not want to go beyond the data of the Bible and the Fathers'.¹⁸²

What would later become the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception essentially stated that 'Mary surpassed the beatitude of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. They were capable of sin... whereas Mary was not'.¹⁸³ The feast that celebrated Mary's conception or 'The conception of St. Anne' was first seen in the Eastern Church as early as the seventh century. It took at least a further two hundred years before the feast was regularly celebrated in the West, where

¹⁷⁸ Gambero, Luigi, *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Latin Medieval Theologians*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2000) 132

¹⁷⁹ Dante, *Paradiso* (31, 101-2), from

http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Italian/DantPar29to33.htm#_Toc64100031 accessed 14/08/13

¹⁸⁰ Gambero, *Mary in the Middle Ages*, 132

¹⁸¹ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 310 fn37.

¹⁸² Graef, *Mary*, 185

¹⁸³ Warner, *Alone of All her Sex*, 241

differences in the way original sin was perceived made its presence a difficult aspect of Marian devotion to accept. For example, Bernard was opposed to a feast celebrating the Immaculate Conception not only because he did not want to go beyond the Bible, but also because ‘he subscribed to Augustine’s view of original sin’.¹⁸⁴ Centuries later von Balthasar noted of the thinking of Bernard and others at the time:

The theory that original sin was propagated by the sexual act (which is found in Ambrose) was promoted by Augustine, barring the way to a grasp of the Immaculate Conception. The fact that the same view was taken up by the Master of the Sentences¹⁸⁵ meant that the Immaculate Conception could not be entertained by High Scholasticism either.¹⁸⁶

According to Western theologians, original sin had been passed through the generations through sexual reproduction. It was ‘the state of the lack of grace, analogous to personal sinfulness’.¹⁸⁷ In the East, the concept of original sin had been seen as a punishment from God for the actions of Adam in the garden, and was therefore meted out to the whole of humanity from the beginning. Following the thought of Augustine, original sin became associated with the evil of concupiscence, and therefore the act of sexual reproduction became an necessary component of the transference of original sin from generation to generation. How was it possible for the conception of any human, including Mary, to be pure and sanctified when conception necessarily involved sex? Bernard therefore wrote to the Church in Lyon where a celebration of the feast

¹⁸⁴ Graef, *Mary*, 185

¹⁸⁵ Peter Lombard (1100-1160) was a revered scholastic theologian. His *Four Books of Sentences* was seen as a seminal work for scholastic study.

¹⁸⁶ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 321

¹⁸⁷ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 320

of the Immaculate Conception had been organised for December 8th, to emphasise his disapproval:

Perhaps, when her parents were united, holiness was mingled with the conception itself, so that she was at once conceived and sanctified. But this is not tenable in reason. For how can there be sanctity without the sanctifying Spirit, or the co-operation of the Holy Spirit with sin? Or how could there not be sin where concupiscence was not wanting?¹⁸⁸

This was the more generally accepted reason for Bernard's dismissal of the Immaculate Conception as a Church feast: it did not fit with his wider theological view that had followed from patristic thought. Marina Warner noted that: 'veneration of Mary's conception by St. Anne seemed tantamount in Bernard's eyes to worshipping the copulation of her parents'.¹⁸⁹ Indeed, in general:

By the tenth century... the Christian struggle for perfection was no longer intelligible as a struggle against the authorities without. The Church had long ago triumphed throughout the known world. Christian struggle now concentrated on the enemy within. And concupiscence, as Augustine had defined it, was the root of sin, and one of its principal manifestations was lust.¹⁹⁰

However, while the exact nature of the act of purification may have been seen as controversial by Bernard and by those in the West, the Abbot of Clairvaux was not shy to proclaim a belief that Mary herself was holy. Bernard's language

¹⁸⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174 to the Canon of Lyons*, translation from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/bernard/letters.lxviii.html>, accessed 10/04/2013. *Nec hoc quidem admittit ratio. Quomodo namque aut sanctitas absque Spiritu sanctificante, aut sancto Spiritui societas cum peccato fuit? aut certe peccatum quomodo non fuit, ubi libido non defuit?*

¹⁸⁹ Warner, *Alone of all her Sex*, 245

¹⁹⁰ Warner, *Alone of all her Sex*, 72

in talking about Mary in the same letter suggested that his personal views were not too dissimilar to those in Lyon who were celebrating the feast:

Honour indeed the purity of her flesh, the sanctity of her life, wonder at her motherhood as a virgin, adore her Divine offspring. Extol the prodigy by which she brought into the world without pain the Son, whom she had conceived without concupiscence. Proclaim her to be reverenced by the angels, to have been desired by the nations, to have been known beforehand by Patriarchs and Prophets, chosen by God out of all women and raised above them all. Magnify her as the medium by whom grace was displayed, the instrument of salvation, the restorer of the ages; and finally extol her as having been exalted above the choirs of angels to the celestial realms.¹⁹¹

Mary was a figure to be adored and to be honoured. Bernard did not have issue with such attitudes towards Mary. The following line of the letter reinforced this point:

These things the Church sings concerning her, and has taught me to repeat the same things in her praise, and what I have learnt from the Church I both hold securely myself and teach to others; what I have not received from the Church I confess I should with great difficulty admit.¹⁹²

This suggests that although the idea of the Immaculate Conception was in itself difficult for Bernard to come to terms with, part of the issue that he had with the feast itself was that it was ‘a rite which the Church knows nothing of, and which

¹⁹¹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

¹⁹² Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

reason does not prove, nor ancient tradition hand down to us'.¹⁹³ It was the disobedience to Rome that appeared to be the primary issue here: it was the first admonishment that appeared in the letter. Both Warner and von Balthasar above suggested that the cause of Bernard's concern was rooted in the Augustinian concept of the transference of original sin through concupiscence and sexual reproduction. However it is possible that the sexual legacy of Augustine for the Immaculate Conception was not the primary concern of Bernard when it came to the issue of celebrating its feast. The centrality of papal supremacy to Bernard's ecclesiological model can be seen again in his attitudes to anything that does not follow the rule of the pope in Rome.

Bernard held the word of the pope to be the ultimate authority in devotion as well as theology. His Mariology was therefore affected by this. In what way did Bernard see Mary as a type of the Church?

Bernard's main use of Mary was concerned with her qualities of virginity and humble obedience. These characteristics suggested a sense of Mary as a type of the Church in the *exemplar* model. The discussion surrounding original sin in the west had, as was shown above, become vitally linked to that of sexual morality. For Bernard, Mary had conceived without lust, and it was for that reason that she was a model for Christians to follow. She was the one whose 'virginity we praise and whose humility we admire',¹⁹⁴ and whom lay Christians should use as their example. As he mentioned explicitly: 'Honour indeed the purity of her flesh, the sanctity of her life, wonder at her motherhood as a

¹⁹³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 1

¹⁹⁴ Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Assumptione B.V.Mariae*, SERMO IV. *De quatriduo Lazari, et paeconio Virginis*, 8; PL 183: 428D-430. From, Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago, University Press, 1978) 167

virgin'.¹⁹⁵ He implored his readers that 'if you follow her, you will not go astray'.¹⁹⁶ Mary was able to maintain humility *and* virginity throughout her life, and Bernard implored his reader to 'imitate the humility of the virgin'.¹⁹⁷ Bernard acknowledged that maintaining both characteristics was challenging, and so suggested: 'if you are unable to admire the virginity of Mary, dedicate yourself to imitate her humility, and that will suffice for you'.¹⁹⁸ In this understanding of a gulf between Mary and the members of the Church of his time, Bernard demonstrated understanding of an important distinction of the *exemplar* model: that the average lay person was *not* expected to perfectly replicate the behaviour of Mary that brought about the Incarnation. Failure to appreciate this would affect later understandings of Mary as a type of the Church in the *exemplar* model, as will be seen in the following chapters.

On a similar theme, Bernard also drew on a popular motif of the time: that of the title 'rod' for Mary, linked to the prophecy that 'a rod shall come forth from the root of Jesse.' (Isaiah 11.1) This title was born out of the similarities between virgin (*virgo*) and 'rod' (*virga*). It was not untypical of Bernard's rhetorical style, as noted above by von Balthasar, that he spoke of Christ as '*Virgo virga virgine generatus*'.¹⁹⁹ The use of Mary in terms of personal behaviour is reminiscent of the *exemplar* model. Bernard notes of Mary that 'God wanted her to be a virgin'.²⁰⁰ Her virginity and her humility, evident in her obedience at the Annunciation, served as a perfect example of behaviour for all members of the Church. It was an example from which the members could draw inspiration and

¹⁹⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

¹⁹⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super Missus est*, 2, 17; PL 183, 71, from <http://www.binetti.ru/bernardus/36.shtml> accessed 15/08/2013

¹⁹⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super Missus est*, 1, 5; PL 183, 59

¹⁹⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super Missus est*, 1, 5; PL 183, 59

¹⁹⁹, Bernard of Clairvaux, *Canticle 47*, from, Pelikan, *Medieval Theology*, 163 'A virgin born of a rod that was a virgin.'

²⁰⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super missus est I*, 7.; PL 183 59D, from Gambero, *Mary in the Middle Ages*, 134

could hope to imitate. Even if virginity was too much for a person to imitate, the humility of Mary was an ample example of how an individual should behave. This demonstrates ideas reminiscent of the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

For Bernard then, as with Ambrose, the model that Mary provided was also one of humility, for this led her to live a life of piety and obedience. This was the more realistic aim for Bernard's readers. It was an aim reminiscent of monastic inspired by the ascetic model promulgated by Ambrose as seen in chapter 1.

For Bernard, Mary was truly a model of this way of life:

For she was “the standard-bearer of piety”, whose life of prayer the faithful imitated in her own. She served as a model to them because she was ‘courageous in her resolution, temperate in her silence, prudent in her questioning, and righteous in her confession.²⁰¹

Bernard, like many before and after him, used the key events of Mary's life as demonstrations of her exemplar characteristics. For Pranger: ‘Bernard played a major part in developing both the devotion to the Virgin Mary and a sensitivity for the religious importance of the major aspects of Christ's life on earth, his birth and suffering’.²⁰² In this light the Annunciation became both a vindication of Mary's exemplary characteristics and the first scene in the story of Christ's life. ‘Rather than offering the reader an explanatory reading of the text, Bernard creeps into it... he makes himself part of the biblical scene both as observer

²⁰¹ Pelikan, *Medieval theology*, 161-2, quoting Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons on Diverse Topics*, 52

²⁰² Pranger, ‘Bernard of Clairvaux’, 194

and participant-alien-vocal supporter of the angel's message and request.²⁰³

Here, Bernard applies Mary's exemplar to himself as much as to his audience.

However, for Bernard, the role that Mary played in the Annunciation scene, her *fiat*, is also vital to the future salvation of the Church, and is therefore the catalyst for the drama of Christ's life. He implores Mary to acquiesce:

The whole world is waiting, prostrate at your feet. Not without reason, since upon your word depends the consolation of the wretched, the redemption of all captives, the liberation of the condemned; in a word, the salvation of all the sons of Adam, of your whole race.²⁰⁴

This seems to indicate some aspects of the *genetrix* model of Mario-ecclesiology, to which I shall return below.

A further example of Mary as *exemplar* can be seen in another event of Christ's life that became common motif from the medieval period: that of Mary stood at the foot of the cross. If the Annunciation marked the beginning of the Incarnation and the coming to fruition of God's plan on earth, then the crucifixion marked the end point. In particular for the medieval period, this scene declared Mary as the 'Queen of Sorrows' or the *Mater Dolorosa*. This image was often placed with the prophecy of Simeon that 'a sword will pierce your own soul too' (Luke 2.35) as part of Mary's own personal challenging journey. As Bernard noted, when Jesus was pierced on the cross he had already died, so 'the cruel lance did not touch his soul at all... No, it pierced your soul instead'.²⁰⁵

²⁰³ Pranger, 'Bernard of Clairvaux', 194

²⁰⁴ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super missus est*, 4, 8; PL 183, 83D

²⁰⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo infra Octavum Assumptionis*, 14; PL 183, 437, from <http://www.binetti.ru/bernardus/69.shtml> accessed 12/04/2013. *ipsius plane non attigit animam crudelis lancea... aperuit latus, sed tuam utique animam pertransivit.*

This was a spiritual martyrdom for Mary, one that enabled Christians to speak of her as a martyr, as having suffered at the cross. Bernard continued:

Therefore, the power of grief pierced through your soul, so that not without merit we call you more than a martyr, since without doubt the effect of compassion exceeded the sensation of corporeal passion... if he could die in the body, why could she not die with him in her heart?²⁰⁶

This was important because of two ideas prevalent at the time: first, the bodily similitude between Mary and her son; secondly, the premise that suffering was good for the soul and would ultimately lead the individual closer to salvation. In reading Bonvesin da la Riva's²⁰⁷ *Book of the Three Scriptures*, Manuele Gragnolati remarks:

In Bonvesin's poem, Mary's enormous suffering in seeing Christ's passion moves closer and closer to that of her son and ends in a sort of identification with it. Their sufferings are described in the same way: Mary's compassion blends with Christ's passion and she becomes him through her pain.²⁰⁸

In living through the passion Mary suffers so greatly that it manifests itself in physical pain: 'Mary's love for Christ makes her suffering his. Through her emphatic participation in Christ's agony, she unites with him'.²⁰⁹ This is commonly seen in the art of the medieval and reformation periods where Mary

²⁰⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Assumptionis*, 14-15

²⁰⁷ Bonvesin (c.1240-c.1315) was a member of a Milanese monastic order with possible links to the Franciscans, a poet and author. *The Book of the Three Scriptures* was likely intended to be recited aloud.

²⁰⁸ Gragnolati, Manuele, 'Body and Pain in Bonvesin da la Riva', in Bynam and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, 94

²⁰⁹ Gragnolati, 'Body and Pain', 94-5

is present at, and evidently affected by, the events of the Passion.²¹⁰ This scene powerfully demonstrated to Christians that Mary is truly the Mother of Christ and therefore the Mother of the Church. When Christ gave Mary to John, the representative of the disciples, as his mother, he was giving her to the community of believers that became the Church at Pentecost.²¹¹ The pain that she feels at the foot of the cross is the pain of a mother facing the loss of her child, it is an image that any person can understand, empathise with and, most tellingly, share in.

The reality of Christ's suffering remains a central aspect to the story of salvation and that of the Church itself. De Visscher notes of the period that:

Every Christian is encouraged to envisage Christ's wounds, to imagine his pain, and to empathize with those who witness his passion. As his mother, Mary is seen as the one who feels his pain most overwhelmingly.²¹²

Thus the passage from Bernard above comes into a sharper focus. It is possible to see that the heralding of Mary as a martyr through her suffering at the foot of the cross was part of a wider Christological form of worship. Mary allowed the average Christian to be closer to Christ. If they could emulate her compassion and her empathy, then they too could become closer to him. It was a type of spiritual martyrdom that every Christian could be involved in, even if they were unable to experience the actual martyrdom that Christ endured. Invoking his own, futile, attempts at imitating the Virgin's lead, Bernard stated:

²¹⁰ See for example Correggio's *Ecce Homo*, where Mary is installed into the scene of Christ's trial by Pontius Pilate in a state of collapse through the emotional strain.

²¹¹ In chapters 3 and 4 the significance of this 'gift' will be explored further.

²¹² De Visscher, 'Marian Devotion in the Latin West, in Boss', *Mary*, 182

I would reckon myself happy if at rare moments I felt at least the prick
of the point of that sword. Even if only bearing love's slightest wound,
I could still say 'I am wounded with love' (Song 2.5). how I long not
only to be wounded in this manner but to be assailed again and
again till the colour and heat of that flesh that wars against the spirit
is overcome.²¹³

In this way then Mary can be seen as an example for behaviour, inasmuch as individual Christians aspire to experience what she has experienced and to suffer as she has suffered. By imitating Mary the Christian can achieve closeness to Christ and therefore come closer to their own salvation. The suffering is seen as a productive part of the journey towards God; the pain is a part of the soul's learning process. As Gragnolati points out: 'Mary's compassion can be viewed as the exemplar of the empathic reactions that the poet is attempting to instigate in his public'.²¹⁴ Bonvesin, connected to the Franciscan movement that would spread the *Mater Dolorosa* around Christendom more than any other order, was trying to put forward this idea. The aim was to encourage Christians to act in a manner similar to Mary because she provided a blueprint of Christian behaviour in this instance. Evidently, this is a strong example of the *exemplar* model of Mario-ecclesiology.

One of the causes of the increase in devotional activity towards Mary in the medieval period was the idea of her as a *Mediatrix*; of her being in some way an intermediary between Christ and the Church. The term mediatrix had two distinct meanings. The first referred to her role at the Annunciation, the *fiat*,

²¹³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super cantica canticorum*, 29.8, from De Visscher, 'Marian Devotion in the Latin West', in Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum Books, 2007) 183

²¹⁴ Gragnolati, 'Body and Pain', 96

mentioned above, that brought about the Incarnation and thus allowed God's plan for salvation to commence through Jesus Christ. This saw her as directly involved in salvation history as 'the sanctuary of the universal propiation, the cause of the general reconciliation, the vessel and the temple of the life and the salvation of all men'.²¹⁵ This fits with our *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. The second definition drew from the ideas seen above in her roles as *Mater Dolorosa* and as humble, virginal, merciful mother. She continued to stand between Christ and His Church, interceding on behalf of the people, mediating on behalf of the Christian body in front of the Judgement of her Son and their saviour. This is also reminiscent of the *genetrix* model, inasmuch as she represents the people of the Church because she was involved in the formation of the people of the Church. This representation is a more personal reading of the *genetrix* model. It can appear in terms of language to be similar to the *exemplar* model, in that Mary demonstrates some of her characteristics present in the *exemplar* model when she undertakes her role as *Mediatrix*.

The following two passages from Bernard's sermons on the Assumption demonstrate how the two distinct senses of the title *Mediatrix* could be used, and how they could be used almost simultaneously:

Now, O Mother of Mercy, the moon, humbly prostrate at your feet, devoutly implores you, her Mediatrix with the Sun of justice, begging you by the most sincere feeling of your heart that in your light she might see light and merit the grace of your Son by your procuring.²¹⁶

Here Bernard referred to the Church as moon, demonstrating that Mary stands above and separate from the Church. The Church begs Mary to procure for it

²¹⁵ Anselm, *Orations* 6, from Pelikan, *Medieval Theology*, 166

²¹⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Assumptionis*, 15

the grace of her Son, as if they are unable to do so without her intercession. This resonates with the idea, examined below, that the Church no longer saw itself as a pure, spotless entity, and therefore required Mary, who retained those characteristics, to intervene. This will be explored in the following section. The humble prostration also gives echoes of the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship seen above. However it was in behaving in such a way that Mary received the grace of God and ultimately was instrumental in forming the Church. The Church is saved because of Mary's actions, not because the individual members are humble. From the same series of sermons, Bernard again recognised of Mary that: 'she is our mediatrix, she is the one through whom we have received thy mercy, O God, she is the one through whom we, too, have welcomed the Lord Jesus into our homes'.²¹⁷ For Bernard, Mary procures for the people of the Church the grace of God and the mercy of her Son. She is also the one who has allowed that to happen in the first place through her actions. These readings of the *Mediatrix* model suggest that Bernard understood Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model, but with an emphasis on the personal aspect of that model.

The Church's View of Itself

As we have seen in the excerpt cited above, Marina Warner contends that 'The Church had long ago triumphed throughout the known world. Christian struggle now concentrated on the enemy within'.²¹⁸ This in one way strikes a chord with von Balthasar's assertion that in the medieval period 'this was a Church that had already resigned itself to not being spotless'.²¹⁹ Both statements suggest that the travails of the Church came from within rather than outside.

²¹⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Assumptionis*, 2

²¹⁸ Warner, *Alone of all her Sex*, 72

²¹⁹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

Christendom became split into those who saw the Church as the bringer of its own salvation and those outside the Church hierarchy (including the Holy Roman Emperors) who saw themselves as the reformers who would bring the Church back to its rightful place in time for a coming judgement. Those who thought that the Church was in control of its own destiny solved the problem of the Church not being spotless, by resting on the typological relationship of Mary with the Church. In this instance, the spotlessness of Mary directly replaces that of the Church.

With regards the Mario-ecclesial models that this thesis is expounding, this idea of Mary replacing the Church in order to guide it towards its salvation is very firmly an example of the *genetrix* model. The *genetrix* model sees Mary as in some way formative in the Church's creation; that the Church comes *from* Mary. In this case that typological relationship is so strong that Mary is able to actually step in where the Church is lacking and pick up the slack, so to speak, that will allow the Church to continue towards the Last Judgement and its ultimate victory. Von Balthasar states that:

It must be generally acknowledged that in the very period when the alleged ‘hypostasis’ of the (pure) Church is losing its previously unchallenged credibility..., the historical person of Mary begins to come into greater prominence as the *Realsymbol* of this (pure) Church.²²⁰

The modern significance of this concept of the *Realsymbol* will be considered in the next chapter, but it is clear to see that von Balthasar considered the moral gap in the Church as being plugged by Mary and by the example of virginity and

²²⁰ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209-10

humility that Bernard was extolling. Mary takes on the role of the Church through this period of history to safeguard its future. To underline this *genetrix* position, von Balthasar continues:

To the extent to which the immaculateness of Mary becomes theologically confirmed during the course of the Middle Ages, it can become the original core of that Church which remains virginal in relation to her Lord, even in wedded fruitfulness, and which has an all-embracing motherly role in relation to the Church's paternal and official sphere and in relation to the people as a whole.²²¹

So this purity of Mary not only allows her to stand in for the Church at this point, according to von Balthasar, it also creates within the Church itself a Marian profile that will resonate within the Church throughout time. For von Balthasar, the paragon of purity and humility that Bernard portrays Mary as is part of a new formation within the Church. This seems to confirm that Bernard's view was decidedly consistent with the *genetrix* model.

Bernard utilised both models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in his Mariology. Some of Mary's behavioural characteristics, notably her humility, were put forward by Bernard as behaviours to imitate. However, in referring to Mary as a *Mediatrix*, Bernard demonstrated an understanding of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model.

Mary, the Church and the end

Bernard on the end

²²¹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 210

In the medieval period, eschatological concerns were an important factor in determining the sense of the relationship between Mary and the Church. The second half of the chapter will therefore begin by considering what medieval Christians meant when they talked of ‘end times,’ or a ‘Last Judgement’? Importantly, most eschatology of the period was written with an expectation that the end times were imminent. The Millennialism that contributed to this expectation will be considered below.

In the medieval period there were different ideas as to what eschatology actually was:

Conceptions of ‘last things’ tended to oscillate along several spectra: from collective to individual, from temporal to beyond time or atemporal, from a stress on spirit to a sense of embodied or reembodied self.²²²

Bynum and Freedman suggest that there were ‘three eschatologies’ evident. These three attitudes stems from a careful consideration of the eschatological landscape of the medieval period. The rest of this chapter will use these three attitudes as a framework around which to consider the eschatological concerns surrounding Mary and the Church during this period:

It seems clear then, first, that the twelfth and thirteenth centuries do see basic shifts in eschatological assumptions – shifts that must be understood in historical context- but also that several sets of eschatological attitudes coexist and conflict throughout the western European Middle Ages. We may call these sets of attitudes the

²²² Bynum, Caroline Walker, and Freedman, Paul, ‘Introduction’, in Bynam and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, 5

eschatology of resurrection, the eschatology of immortality, and the eschatology of apocalypse.²²³

The three eschatological attitudes place different emphases on the coming judgement, and focus to different degrees on either the personal or communal concept of the ‘end’. The eschatology of resurrection, for example, is ‘a sense of last things that focuses significance in the moment at the end of time when the body is reconstituted and judged’.²²⁴ This contrasts with the eschatology of immortality: ‘in which the experience of personal death is the moment of judgement, after which the good soul... either gains glorification... or moves into the experience of growth through suffering known as purgatory’.²²⁵ In this instance, it is the focus on either the collective judgement that will take place at a future ‘end’ of time for all creatures, or personal ‘end’ that occurs at the ‘hour of our death’, that differentiates the two eschatological concepts. Where some writers would be more concerned with the fate of the individual, others would see the fate of the whole Church, at the end of time, as being the necessary focus. Below, this chapter will discuss how these eschatological models relate to the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

The eschatology of apocalypse considers the imminent arrival of the end of time. It is closely related with the other two eschatological attitudes mentioned. It considers both a shared end of time, as with the eschatology of resurrection, but it ‘shares with the eschatology of immortality a sense that what matters is the here and now, an end that looms as immediate or very soon’.²²⁶ It is this combination of an imminent, universal yet ultimately personal end of time that

²²³ Bynum and Freedman, ‘Introduction’, 7

²²⁴ Bynum and Freedman, ‘Introduction’, 7

²²⁵ Bynum and Freedman, ‘Introduction’, 7

²²⁶ Bynum and Freedman, ‘Introduction’, 8

was a catalyst for the work of Bernard of Clairvaux; which saw the crusade movement reach unprecedented levels of uptake; and which fuelled the conflict between papacy and Empire as both parties tried to position themselves as the moral guardians of Christendom during the impending judgement. For individual Christians, there was the fear that, depending on which side they were on, their soul would 'either gain glorification and beatific vision at once or move into the experience of growth through suffering known as purgatory'.²²⁷

For Bynum and Freedman, there is one important aspect of the eschatology of apocalypse that ensures it is more than just a composite of the other two attitudes:

Apocalyptic eschatology contrasts... with both the eschatology of resurrection and that of immortality in implying a political payoff. It faces towards society and coerces the here and now, although it can be reformist as well as radical and does not necessarily, as scholars in the 1950's argued, recruit the disadvantaged or the discontented.²²⁸

Because of his involvement in the political sphere of the Church at this time, this statement demonstrates why 'Bernard...was the preeminent reformist apocalyptic of the first half of the twelfth century'.²²⁹ The chapter will now briefly consider some of the socio-political eschatological considerations of the time. Firstly it will consider the idea, alluded to above, that the Church was no longer a spotless entity. Following this it will outline the millennialism that fed the apocalyptic concerns of the time.

²²⁷ Bynum and Freedman, 'Introduction', 7

²²⁸ Bynum and Freedman, 'Introduction', 8

²²⁹ Daniel Randolph, E, 'Exodus and Exile: Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario', in Bynum and Freedman (eds.), *Last Things*, 126

The No-Longer Spotless Church

In order to understand the context of the Church in this period it is also important to consider how the Church felt about itself. Centuries later, Von Balthasar, for example, saw in the Church of the Middle Ages a community that was concerned about its own condition. As the vehicle through which the perfection of Christ would ultimately be attained, the Church itself could only strive towards that perfection by targeting ‘an approximation of the “spotless” ideal which, in itself, is unattainable on earth’.²³⁰ As was demonstrated above, Bernard was concerned that the pope and the hierarchy of the Church had become distracted from its spiritual responsibilities. ‘Bernard was upset that Eugenius, instead of working for reform, was preoccupied with judicial business... and was taking the temporal sword.’²³¹ The Church, typified (alongside Mary) as the woman in the wilderness guaranteed victory in heaven following the last judgement, had, from the times of the Church Fathers, been seen as the guarantee of the same victory for all of its members.

For von Balthasar, the idea that the earthly Church was spotless, did not ring true, particularly in the medieval period Brendan Leahy notes that von Balthasar identified in the medieval Church ‘a certain discomfort in celebrating the nuptial image of the Church’,²³² an image that originated in Ephesians 2:27 and saw the Church as ‘bride without spot or wrinkle... holy and without blemish’. Von Balthasar notes that ‘we encounter this wholly loving, all-holy Church in Augustine too, who inclined more and more to locate the reality of this

²³⁰ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 208

²³¹ Randolph Daniel, ‘Exodus and Exile’, 126

²³² Leahy, Brendan, *The Marian Profile in the ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (London, New City Press, 2000), 28

immaculate Church in eschatological time'.²³³ This highlighted the contrast between the ‘pure Church... rightly called the *real*, the *true* Church [and] the falsehood and hypocrisy of the Church of sinners, whom she makes righteous'.²³⁴ Taking his lead from Augustine, von Balthasar stated of this image of perfect Church that ‘surely... in contrast to all earthly reality, the “Jerusalem which is above”, the “new Jerusalem” (Rev. 21:2) that eschatologically comes down from heaven must be without blemish'.²³⁵ For von Balthasar:

The whole of patristic literature – from the second letter of Clement through Origen to Augustine’s *City of God* – is pervaded by the yearning for this heavenly, archetypal, primitive Church... The earthly Church is merely her imperfect image... But this [earthly Church] is not the Church that Paul has in mind when he speaks of the bride cleansed with water, or of the pure bride”... the reality he is thinking of is earthly and concrete.²³⁶

Thus there is great difficulty in ascertaining what aspect of the Church on earth is the pure or spotless aspect (von Balthasar suggests but discounts faith, the martyrs and the structures of the Church as possibilities). Von Balthasar reads into the patristic writers a concession to ‘regard this perfection as being sufficiently expressed by a certain “striving” for the perfection of the Head, by an approximation of the “spotless” ideal which, in itself, is unattainable on earth’.²³⁷ Von Balthasar sees that this is the only option left to a Church that has accepted the ‘Platonic hypostatizing’ of the spotless Church existing only in an eschatological reality, while, the ‘empirically real Church is the “sinner” striving

²³³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 204

²³⁴ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 205

²³⁵ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 205-06

²³⁶ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 206

²³⁷ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 208

towards conversion'.²³⁸ It is this complex understanding of the earthly Church's condition that von Balthasar identifies as being prevalent in the medieval period:

Thus the concept of the Church's perfect holiness, upheld by the Fathers, could be abandoned from time to time in the Middle Ages in favour of mere freedom from grave sin. This was a Church that had already resigned itself to not being spotless... There could be no going back to the patristic "hypostasis" of the pure Church.²³⁹ Therefore, for von Balthasar, the vision of the Church as perfect in was becoming an unreachable fantasy for the medieval Church. As was seen above, the Church hierarchy was engaged in its own struggles, and when it did finally emerge from its self-imposed isolation it was to impose papal supremacy on the people of Christendom. This was not to go unnoticed: 'the increasingly clericalized Church of the empire provoked more and more determined opposition. In particular this was true in the middle and late medieval period'.²⁴⁰ Joachim of Fiore, a Benedictine disciple of Bernard,²⁴¹ saw that 'the struggle between the reforming pontiffs and the emperors had culminated in a Babylonian exile of the Church... The popes themselves were partly to blame... because of their vacillating policies'.²⁴² Joachim noted that:

Some of the Roman pontiffs inclined towards and agreed with the emperors on some occasions, but at other times tried to resist them with the help of various princes; some [pontiffs] decided entirely to

²³⁸ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

²³⁹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

²⁴⁰ Küng, Hans, *The Church*, (London, Burns and Oates, 2001 ed. Trans Ockenden, Ray and Rosaleen, 1967) 94

²⁴¹ Randolph Daniel, 'Exodus and Exile', 126

²⁴² Randolph Daniel, 'Exodus and Exile', 136

humble [themselves] under the [imperial] hands and to live pacifically.²⁴³

In the medieval period, there was unease about the behaviour of the Church hierarchy. Bernard and Joachim represented two voices questioning whether the popes were properly committing to their roles. Vocal opposition to the Church was not in itself new, indeed this thesis has already suggested that it is in the context of conflict that the major Mario-ecclesial models are most utilised. However during this period attacks on the Church led to more self-analysis than would have been the case previously. The major consequence of this self-doubt for this thesis will be seen in that the figure of Mary takes on the ‘spotless’ role of the Church and the Mario-ecclesial relationship is developed further. This will be looked at below. Firstly it will be necessary to outline *why* it was in the medieval period that the Church looked more closely at itself.

Millennialism

He seized... Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and threw him into a pit, and locked and sealed it over him... When the thousand years are ended, Satan will be released from his prison and will come out to deceive the nations at the four corners of the earth... (Revelation 20.2-3, 7-8)

Eschatological discussions form a central aspect of the Christian Church, because many believe that the salvation brought about by the actions of Christ will be ‘cashed in’, ‘in a climactic, God-wrought conclusion to history in which

²⁴³ Joachim of Fiore, *Liber de Concordia noui ac veteris testameni: Book 4:1:29*, E.Randolph Daniel (ed), *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol.73, part 8 (Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1983), 381

the good are rewarded and the evil suffer'.²⁴⁴ One of the eschatological discussions involved an apocalyptic reading of Revelation 20, seen above, in which the millennium of Christ's rule would come to an end with the release of Satan from his prison and the beginning of his rule on earth. millennialism, or chiliasm refers to this thousand years (or at least a significant portion of time) and the belief that the arrival of this period of time will bring 'peace, harmony and joy here on earth for those who are favoured on the Day of Judgement'.²⁴⁵

As Landes notes:

The political implications of this transformation's occurring on earth make chiliasm a dangerous, indeed revolutionary ideology that consistently attracts implacable hostility from those in power.²⁴⁶

In the light of an understanding of chiliasm, the threats and opposition from outside of the Church may have been taken more seriously by the theologians and the Church hierarchy than perhaps they would have done without the possibility of an imminent end of the world. The rhetoric of papal supremacy can also be seen as counteracting these anti-Roman hopes of a potentially imminent apocalypse. For some interpreted the coming completion of the thousand years as marking the destruction of the Roman Church.

But why were these ideas so prevalent at this time? Millennialism refers also to a series of beliefs centred on the significance of the year 1000. Calculating a millennium since the birth of Christ, and interpreting the period of Roman rule (or at least of a flourishing of the Christian Church from an illegal sect in an outpost of a polytheistic Empire to the single religion of that same Empire) as

²⁴⁴ Landes, 'The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000', 101

²⁴⁵ Landes, 'The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000', 101

²⁴⁶ Landes, 'The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000', 101

being the same thousand years of Christ's rule as seen in the book of Revelation, some people anticipated an imminent apocalypse which would mark the very end of time, with the release of Satan and then the final judgement of all humanity. This was in places dismissed as nothing but the panicked gossip of the masses:

When I was a young man I heard a sermon about the End of the world... According to this, as soon as the number of a thousand years was completed, the Antichrist would come and the Last Judgement would follow in a brief time. I opposed this sermon with what force I could... The rumour had filled almost the whole world that when the feast of the Annunciation coincided with Good Friday without any doubt the End of the world would occur.²⁴⁷

It may have been mocked, and in later centuries the idea that there was even an awareness of the importance of the year 1000 in contemporary popular thought was rejected, but it seems likely that this type of imminent millennialism was an ongoing concern in medieval Christendom. The exact year 1000 may not have been as vital. Some took it to mean the millennium from Christ's resurrection in AD33, which was seen as the beginning of the Church in its current form. Others suggested that it did not necessarily mean a precise period of time, but roughly that period of time, thereby bringing the centuries surrounding the year 1000 into the potential era of the end.

²⁴⁷ Abbo of Fleury, *Apologetic Work* (translated from P.L 139, cc, 417-72) from McGinn, *Visions of the end*, 90

For the purposes of this chapter and the discussion of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, this chiliasm (or millennialism²⁴⁸) can be seen as having an influence over the thoughts of the Church. Attacks on the papacy and the Church hierarchy from the outside made the people feel vulnerable and heightened the sense of an impending eschatological event. The very obvious faults of the Church would leave it exposed to the final judgement of Christ. In the next section it shall be demonstrated how people believed that Mary came to protect the Church from this exposure by taking on the spotless characteristics of the Church in the devotions and liturgies of the time.

Not everyone had the same sense of vulnerability of the Church in the face of the impending eschaton. The popes, as demonstrated above, had developed a greater sense of the role of the Church and of their own roles in any coming judgement. Armed with this self-confidence, the popes could consider the apocalyptic mood and use it to their advantage:

Pope Leo IX (1049-54) and Gregory VII (1073-85) launched the papal reform movement confident that God would enable them to attain their goals despite opposition from churchmen and lay rulers. Gregory, who expressed his vision of a reformed church in apocalyptic terms, was one of the first reformist apocalypists, the prophets who used language traditionally associated with the end of history to describe thoroughgoing clerical reform.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁸ While Landes acknowledges that chiliasm and millennialism are often used to describe the same concept, he wishes to use millennialism as that which occurs around a certain period (i.e. the year 1000, 2000 etc.) and chiliasm as the general term for an impending end of time.

²⁴⁹ Randolph Daniel, 'Exodus and Exile', 126

Apocalypticism and reform had combined in the rhetoric of papal supremacy on earth. This was noted briefly in talking about the context of the Great Reform above. McGinn continues:

The success of the reformers in elevating the papacy to a position of truly effective universal authority in the Western Church could not help but provoke a serious reconsideration of traditional eschatology and apocalypticism. Schemes of history based upon the succession of empires and the view of the End that stressed the role of the Last Emperor as the predecessor of Christ were called into question in an age where the sacrality of both empire and emperor was challenged by many. The rise to power of the papacy made it possible to begin to wonder what role the popes would play in the last times.²⁵⁰

The prophecy of the last Emperor had been popularised following the *Letter on the Origin and Life of the Antichrist* by a French monk called Adso in 950. The antichrist, a product of a human woman and the devil, would ‘arouse universal persecution against the Christians... then every faithful Christian... will perish’.²⁵¹ The advent of the antichrist was however not to happen ‘unless first all the kingdoms that were formerly subject shall have defected from the Roman Empire’.²⁵² The empire would then be held together by its Emperor or King, and so despite Adso’s admittance that the empire was no longer the great force it once was, it would hold so long as it was ruled over. Finally:

²⁵⁰ McGinn, *Visions of the End*, 94

²⁵¹ Adso of Montier-En-Der, *Letter on the Origin and Life of the Antichrist*, From McGinn, Bernard, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, The Franciscan Spirituals*, Savonarola, 92, (1979), from books.google.co.uk accessed 09/04/2013

²⁵² Adso, *Origin and Life of the Antichrist*, from McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 93

Some of our learned men say that one of the Kings of the Franks will possess anew the Roman Empire. He will be in the last time and will be the greatest and the last of all kings. After he has successfully governed his empire, he will finally come to Jerusalem and will lay aside his sceptre and crown on the Mount of Olives. This will be the end and the consummation of the Roman and Christian Empire.²⁵³

So the scene was set for the conflict between empire and papacy to develop into not just a battle for earthly supremacy, but also a conflict over the identity of the figure who would bring about the end times. The popes were often identified as the antichrist, not just outside the Church, by Emperors or perceived heretics, but by ‘the Spiritual Franciscans [who] read themselves into Joachim [of Fiore’s]... expansive vision for the final age ... [that] provided details of the transformation of church and society’.²⁵⁴ Joachim saw two rival popes, one the antichrist, the other ‘a godly evangelist who will recruit new religious orders to launch a mission to the Jews, Muslims and pagans’.²⁵⁵

In short, the popes were seen in some popular thinking as being the problem that needed to be overcome in order for the final judgement to come about. For these people, the coming apocalypse would see the annihilation of the Roman Church. However the success of the reform movement had manoeuvred the papacy into a much stronger position. For the papal supporters then, the Roman Church, and in particular the pope at its head, represented the coming of the End times and the victorious vehicle on which the faithful would be taken to heaven and eternal salvation. For this group the coming apocalypse would

²⁵³ Adso, *Origin and Life of the Antichrist*, from McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 93

²⁵⁴ Weber, Timothy P., ‘Millennialism’, in Walls, Jerry L., *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008) 372

²⁵⁵ Weber, ‘Millennialism’, 372

see the ultimate and infinite victory of the Roman Church. In summary, the popes of the medieval period could therefore be seen either to be fighting the antichrist, or actually be the same figure of evil.

Mary and the end

This section will consider the Marian dimensions of the eschatological discussions of the medieval period, and will outline in what way Mary became a model of the Church's eschatological victory.

In the early Middle Ages, Mary came to the fore in the consciousness of the Christian people, and her feasts and liturgies multiplied rapidly.

But the person of Mary took over the theological place formerly occupied by the (unreflectedly) 'hypostatized', pure Church.²⁵⁶

Von Balthasar identified Mary as occupying a place previously held by the Church within the eschatological conversation during the medieval period. This was in part due to the increase in Marian devotion through the period, and a simultaneous decline in the opinion of the Emperor and members of the laity towards the Church and the papacy. According to von Balthasar, the typological relationship shared by Mary and the Church allowed Mary to step into the role that the Church was unable to uphold. In the medieval period, the eschatological aspect of the Mario-ecclesial relationship was apparent in several sources.

For example, Bernard of Clairvaux honoured Mary as 'the finder of grace, the mediatrix of salvation, restorer of the ages'.²⁵⁷ As a Mediatrix, Mary was a link between Christ and his Church. By her Assumption into heaven and presence

²⁵⁶ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 215

²⁵⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

alongside the angels, Mary was able to demonstrate her compassion and love of the world to the Church. Bernard outlined a view popular amongst the Christians of the medieval period when he told the Bishop of Lyons:

I have received then from the Church that day to be reverenced with the highest veneration, when being taken up from this sinful earth, she made entry into the heavens; a festival of most honoured joy.²⁵⁸

The model of *Mediatrix*, if not the title, was not new. The idea that Mary was in heaven, and was still interceding on behalf of those still on earth, had been popular as far back as the eighth century. For example, Ambrose Autpert concluded a prayer to the virgin:

Therefore, dearest brethren, let us entrust ourselves to the intercession of the most blessed Virgin with all the ardour of our hearts. Let us all implore her patronage with our whole strength, so that while we celebrate her on earth with humble respect, she may deign to be our advocate in heaven with her constant prayers.²⁵⁹

In this chapter different aspects of the devotion to Mary seen in the medieval period have pointed towards her role as eschatological fulfilment of the Church. The association with Mary and the Church with the Woman in the wilderness in Revelation 12 allowed the Church to see its own future victory already confirmed through Mary. The faith and humility of Mary at the Annunciation and throughout the life of Christ, and her involvement through the religiously significant acts of that life, identified Mary as a part of the history of salvation, particularly in the eyes of Bernard. While all of the events of Christ's life were a

²⁵⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

²⁵⁹ Ambrose Autpert, *De Assumptione sanctae Mariae*, 12, trans. Gambero, *Mary in the Middle Ages*, 48

vital part of the history of salvation, in talking about Mary's eschatological role, the events of the foot of the cross, whereby Mary is confirmed as *Mater Dolorosa*, were especially significant in the medieval period. Mary participated in the suffering of Christ, all through his life but most explicitly on the cross, through her love for him and through her compassion. In this way: 'Mary's compassion blends with Christ's passion and she becomes him through her pain'.²⁶⁰

The act of 'becoming' Christ is an image reminiscent of the title *co-redemptrix* for Mary. *Co-redemptrix*, a title never officially recognised by the Church, attributed to Mary a co-operative role in the history of salvation. The concept arguably began with Irenaeus' claim that Mary was 'the cause of salvation, both to herself and the whole human race'.²⁶¹ In the medieval period, Bernard spoke in a similar fashion:

All generations will call you blessed because you have generated life
and glory for all generations ... Rightly do the eyes of every creature
look up to you because in you, *and by you, and of you* the benign
hand of the Almighty has re-created whatever it had created²⁶²

It is clear therefore that the image of Mary as a *co-redemptrix* is an example of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship because it attributed to Mary an active role in the circumstances which brought about the Church. Mary was a creator of the Church through her actions. It also placed her alongside Christ in heaven.

²⁶⁰ Gragnolati, Manuele, 'Body and Pain', 94

²⁶¹ Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus Haereses*, III, 22, 4, from <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103322.htm> accessed 20/08/2013

²⁶² Bernard of Clairvaux, *In festo Pentecostes*, 2.4, PL 183, 328B

The image of Mary alongside Christ became explicit in the art of the time.

Harvey Stahl notes in his essay ‘The Place of the Elect in an Illuminated Book of Hours’ that the medieval period saw a coming together of ecclesial and Marian imagery through the increase in Marian devotion. Referencing Marie-Louise Thérel’s *Le triomphe de la Vierge-Église*, he notes that:

[The] imagery of the Church as a queen or as the *sponsa* or as the embodiment of the faithful was continually in tension with that of Mary in the same guises. But with the acceptance of the bodily assumption of Mary, these meanings converged and her coronation clearly marked the glorification of all humanity within the history of salvation.²⁶³

The centrality of religious art to the devotional attitudes of the common Christian in the medieval period meant that the imagery of Mary as crowned in heaven would have appealed to, and have been seen by a large number of people. The traditionally accepted typological relationship between Mary and the Church would perhaps have allowed those observers to understand that Mary was representing the Church in those images. Stahl notes that in many of the diptychs of the time that depicted Mary in heaven: ‘Mary seems to receive the elect both before and after the Last Judgement, and humanity continually triumphs in her Coronation. The ivory accurately indicates how the elect are increasingly destined to Mary’s protection’.²⁶⁴ This image of Mary corresponds with the titles of *co-redemptrix* and *Mediatrix* identified above. It places Mary between Christ and his Church as an intercessor, but it places her *alongside*

²⁶³ Stahl, Harvey, ‘The Place of the Elect in an Illuminated Book of Hours’ in Bynam and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, pp.205-232:215. Referencing: Thérel, Marie-Louise, *Le triomphe de la Vierge-Église: sources historiques, littéraires et iconographies*, (Paris, CNRS, 1984) pp.174-82

²⁶⁴ Stahl, ‘The Place of the Elect in an Illuminated Book of Hours’ 218

Christ in heaven. This position demonstrates that Mary's compassion, which leads her to continue to guide and protect the Church, has combined with her glorification in heaven. This means that her compassion is now imbued with the power and grace of God, and that her protection is that of God as well. Thus Bernard was pre-empting the art of the following century when he said of Mary that: 'she is our mediatrix, she is the one through whom we have received thy mercy, O God, she is the one through whom we, too, have welcomed the Lord Jesus into our homes'.²⁶⁵

In these images, Mary is also present as recognisable, which has implications for what Bynum above noted as the eschatologies of immortality and resurrection. Mary was present in recognisable form before *and* after the Last Judgement. This implied the continuation of personal identity after death, which is reminiscent of the eschatology of immortality. However the presence of a post Last Judgement bodily community also pointed towards a communal eschatology that was termed as resurrection by Bynum. In the context of the medieval period, the image of Mary, as a representative of the Church, enthroned in heaven and guiding her people through an end of time felt by many to be imminent, fed into the apocalyptic feelings of the time. However belief in the Assumption of Mary would have led some to understand Mary's recognisable presence as a result of the special gift of grace she received from God in being taken bodily into heaven. The image of Mary providing solace and protection for individual members of the Church is also reminiscent of the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, as her compassion would have acted as a behavioural model for the members of the Church.

²⁶⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Assumptionis*, 2

The *genetrix* model was also reflected in the following prayer, attributed to Bernard, which called upon Mary's compassionate intercession:

Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary,
Never is it heard that anyone
Who fled your protection,
Implored your help, or
Sought your intercession was left unaided.
Inspired with this confidence, I fly to you,
O virgin of virgins, my Mother.
To you do I come, before you I stand sinful and sorrowful.
O Mother of the Word Incarnate, do not ignore my petitions
But in your mercy hear and answer me. Amen.²⁶⁶

The prayer of Bernard identified Mary as *Mediatrix*. Her role is suggested to be one of protection and guidance from a position of safety, once again echoing the Woman in the wilderness of Revelation 12 and depending on at least a tacit acceptance of the Assumption of Mary into heaven. It is reminiscent of the *exemplar* model because, in the words of Ambrose Autpert three centuries earlier:

When the blessed Mother of God looks upon us and finds us adorned with virtues, united in charity, firmly established in humility,

²⁶⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Memorare*, from Spretnak, Charlene, *Missing Mary: The Queen of Heaven and her Re-emergence in the Modern Church*, (New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), 122-23

she will more eagerly hasten to assist us in the presence of her Son and Lord, Jesus Christ.²⁶⁷

As long as the members of the Church adopted a behaviour consistent with that demanded by God and modelled by Mary, then Mary as *Mediatrix*, enthroned in heaven and gifted with the grace of God, would not fail to protect and guide those members. This gave rise in Bernard to his image of Mary as ‘star of the sea’, an image of Mary as a guide for those lost at sea or threatened by storms. This metaphor would have been popular with those who felt that the Church was travelling through difficult times.

Mary, I say, is the distinguished and bright shining star, necessarily lifted up above this great broad sea... giving light by her example. Oh, if any of you recognises that he is caught between storms and tempests, tossed about in the flood of this world, instead of walking on dry land, keep your eyes fixed on the glow of this star, unless you want to perish.²⁶⁸

In this image, Mary is a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model because she provides an example for individuals to follow in order to reach safety. However the image of a star represented something above and beyond the individual members of the Church. Mary was so far beyond reach of the members of the Church that only the light she produced provided a guide for the Church on earth. This is more reminiscent of the *genetrix* model which sees Mary as beyond the Church.

²⁶⁷ Ambrose Autpert, *De Assumptione sanctae Mariae*, 12

²⁶⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super missus est*, 2, 17

The eschatological Mario-ecclesiology of the medieval period, and specifically of Bernard, was given further status within the culture of the time by Dante Alighieri's great poem *Divina Commedia*. In particular, Bernard appeared as a mystic in *Paradiso*, the final part of the poem. Pelikan noted that: 'one of the most sublime moments in the history of devotion to Mary came in the closing cantos of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, in which Bernard of Clairvaux gives praise to the Blessed Virgin Mary'.²⁶⁹ As guide, Bernard instructed Dante to 'look now upon the face that is most like the face of Christ, for only through its brightness can you prepare your vision to see Him'.²⁷⁰ In Canto XXXIII, Bernard proclaimed his own hymn to Mary stating:

You are so high, you can intercede... in you compassion is, in you is... every goodness found in any creature... this man now pleads with you, through grace, to grant him so much virtue that he may lift his vision higher still, may lift it toward the ultimate salvation.²⁷¹

These passages of devotion occur at the end of the *Commedia*, 'after Dante has witnessed the apocalyptically charged pageant',²⁷² of the *Inferno* and *Purgatorio*. Having endured the descent and chaos of the first two parts of the poem, Dante, with Bernard, encountered Mary in *Paradiso*, identifying heaven as Mary's final and current location simultaneously. For Dante, Mary is 'Our Lady (*nostra donna*)',²⁷³ 'Our Queen (*nostra regina*)',²⁷⁴ 'the Queen of

²⁶⁹ Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1996), 139

²⁷⁰ Dante Alighieri, *Paradiso*, XXXII, 85-87, trans Allen Mandelbaum, from http://www.divinecomedy.org/divine_comedy.html accessed 20/08/13,

²⁷¹ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXXIII, 19-27

²⁷² Papka, Claudia Rattazzi, 'The Limits of Apocalypse: Eschatology, Epistemology and Textuality in the *Commedia* and *Piers Plowman*' in Bynam and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, pp.233-256: 244

²⁷³ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXI, 123

²⁷⁴ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXXII, 104

Heaven',²⁷⁵ and 'the Empress (*Agusta*)'.²⁷⁶ Pelikan adds also that Dante saw Mary as 'the fulfilment of the promise of Paradise and the archetype of all who were saved'.²⁷⁷ Dante also acknowledged the concepts of *Mediatrix* and *co-redemptrix* and their history in stating that 'the wound that Mary closed and then anointed was the wound that Eve – so lovely at Mary's feet – had opened and had pierced'.²⁷⁸ All of these exclamations demonstrate that Dante's understanding of Mary appeared broadly in line with what has been discussed here. Mary represented a realised eschatology that guaranteed the victory of the Church at the end of time because, through their typological relationship, Mary had *already* been crowned in heaven as a *result* of her victory.

The image of Mary crowned in heaven, alongside Christ, representing the Church in its future victory and present security, was thus a common theological, cultural and devotional idea. This image was reminiscent of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in that it attributed to Mary a role outside of the Church, and suggested that she was in some way responsible for salvation, as seen in Irenaeus' theology in chapter 1. The *genetrix* model saw Mary as separate from the members of the Church, analogous to a set of blue prints that the Church was formed from. However this view of Mary was one which venerated her to an extent that some saw as excessive. In the following chapters, this concern will be identified as one of the reasons why certain theologians spoke in terms more similar to the *exemplar* model. Here, Pelikan notes:

²⁷⁵ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXIII, 128

²⁷⁶ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXXII, 119

²⁷⁷ Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries*, 140

²⁷⁸ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXXII, 4-6

For Dante and for Bernard of Clairvaux, as for the entire medieval tradition, Mary stood in continuity with the human race, the same human race to which the poet and his readers belonged. Therefore the glory with which she was crowned was a special form – different in degree but finally not different in kind – of the glory in which all the saved participated, a glory that was communicated to her, as to them, by the grace and merit of Christ.²⁷⁹

This understanding of Mary as part of the Church is more reminiscent of the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, as seen in the thinking of Ambrose in chapter 1. In this model, Mary is part of a continuous line with the Church, ahead but still connected and therefore still a part of the Church. This model of Mary sees Mary as merely the first to be seating alongside Christ in heaven, and is perhaps linked with an eschatology of immortality. Mary in this model, as one of the line of the Church and therefore receiving the victory due to all Christians, has *already* received a place in heaven, without need for purgatory or waiting for the Last Judgement. In the terms of the *exemplar* model, Mary represents or foreshadows the same reward that will be given to all Christians.

As the Church of God is the Mother of Christ in his members, by virtue of grace, just so the Virgin is Mother of Christ the Head, by virtue of his human nature. And as the Church is without spot or wrinkle, even so is the glorious Virgin. And as the Church possesses

²⁷⁹ Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries*, 140

all gifts in many different individuals, so the Virgin Mary has in herself all charisms.²⁸⁰

Alanus of Lille here demonstrated a common concept of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in the medieval period. Mary and the Church shared a spotlessness, but also Mary shared in the gifts of the Church as one of its members. This has shades of both the *exemplar* and *genetrix* models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

Mario-ecclesial eschatology

Finally this chapter will summarise the relationship of the Mario-ecclesial models to the eschatological landscape of the medieval period, as has been set out above. In particular, the thoughts of Bynum, von Balthasar and Pelikan are relevant. These three scholars had slightly different assessments of attitudes to how Mary was related to the eschatological discussion in the medieval period.

Above, it was suggested by Pelikan that the natural inclination of those in the medieval period was to see Mary as a type of the Church, being a member of the Church, guiding it on its journey by journeying alongside it in the sense of the *exemplar* model. Von Balthasar saw the medieval period, on the other hand, as understanding Mary as a type of the Church more in the sense of the *genetrix* model.

The essential thing is that, in the history of the *ecclesia immaculate*, the core, i.e., the *Realsymbol*, Mary, came into prominence at the

²⁸⁰ Alanus of Lille, *Elucidatio in Cantica Canticorum*, trans. Gambero, *Mary in the Middle Ages*, 188

right time to prevent that idea of the Church from disintegrating into mediocrity and ultimately in sociology.²⁸¹

According to von Balthasar, for the medieval Christians, as *Mediatrix* and *co-redemptrix*, Mary was positioned separately from the Church, guiding it from her position in heaven as the fulfilment of the Church's eschatological victory. This image would ultimately contribute to von Balthasar's concept of the Marian Profile of the Church, which will be examined in chapter 3 and will be demonstrated to be very reminiscent of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Von Balthasar was therefore perhaps swayed by his own reading of the Mario-ecclesial relationship into reading more of the *genetrix* model into the medieval discussions than was apparent at the time. He noted that in the medieval period: 'Mary becomes more and more recognised as the one who has been given the 'fullness of grace' – *gratia plena*- an archetype of that fullness of grace that Christ has given to the Church'.²⁸²

In considering the Mario-ecclesial aspects of the medieval discussions on eschatology, von Balthasar and Pelikan understand Mary as a type of the Church in different ways. Von Balthasar saw her, and understood medieval thinkers as seeing her in the sense of the *genetrix* model, as part of the foundation of the Church. Eschatologically speaking, she was the *genetrix* of the new heavenly Church that would emerge following the end of this world, a model of Mary which appears to fit especially with an eschatology of apocalypse, in Bynum's terms. For Pelikan, he and the medieval thinkers saw Mary in terms of the *exemplar* model. She demonstrated through her compassionate, loving and humble behaviour the model for Christian behaviour.

²⁸¹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 216

²⁸² Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 215

She personified the reward for imitating the behaviour she demonstrated. Eschatologically speaking this seems to relate especially to the eschatology of immortality, in Bynum's terms, which focused on the fate of the individual, and perhaps offered more incentive to the members of the Church.

This thesis is concerned with understanding in what sense people saw Mary as a type of the Church, using the typological models outlined in the introduction to provide a framework for a deeper analysis of those different Mario-ecclesial views. The secondary contention of this thesis is that Mary was often utilised in discussions of a social-political nature when she was considered alongside the Church. In this chapter, the eschatological tensions of the time, particularly the form of millennialism that was supposedly apparent from the end of the tenth century onwards, formed the context in which the Mario-ecclesial parallels and discussions took place. This chapter has demonstrated that the eschatological questions were central to a struggle taking place between the Church and secular hierarchies of Europe, with the question of whether the pope or the Emperor would lead Christendom into the next life a source of contention between supporters of either side. The ongoing reforms of the papacy, and the shifts in power between the Church and the Empire combined with the apocalyptic language used to begin the crusades and to influence behaviour, to create a unique environment in which much of the eschatology that would be used over the coming centuries was formed. A similar dynamic will be demonstrated in chapters 3 and 4, as both von Balthasar and John Paul II use medieval eschatology in their own Mario-ecclesial discussions.

The primary contention of this thesis, that of the typological models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, was outlined in this chapter primarily through the

writing of Bernard of Clairvaux. They were used in conjunction with the models of eschatology put forward by Caroline Bynum (models of ‘immortality’, ‘resurrection’ and ‘apocalypse’). On the one hand, a link was suggested between the *genetrix* model and the eschatological model of apocalypse. The political background of this eschatology was achieved by the conflict between the Church and the Holy Roman Empire. The apocalypse model of eschatology anticipated the end of the existing order and the reformation of a new, eternal Church in heaven. This corresponded with the model of Mary as *co-redemptrix* or *Mediatrix*, in that those titles saw Mary enthroned in heaven and representing the Church, both on earth and as its archetype for eternity in heaven.

On the other hand, the *exemplar* model was seen to have a correlation with the eschatological model of immortality, which was concerned primarily with the continued existence of the individual. This judgement was primarily personal, not communal as in the apocalypse (and resurrection) models of eschatology. In this way, personal behaviour became the primary concern. It was actions undertaken by the individual that would determine the fate of the individual. This contrasted with the fears that surrounded the behaviour the papacy, and how that might doom the whole of Christendom, that would correspond to the other models of eschatology.

Bernard used ideas and pleas reminiscent of both *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of the Church depending on his audience and intention. To those who wished to venerate Mary, although he warned against excessive, unofficial celebrations such as that of the Immaculate Conception, he implored them to ‘imitate the humility of the virgin’,²⁸³ so that they might receive the same reward. This behavioural urging is reminiscent of the *exemplar* model which sees Mary

²⁸³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super Missus est*, 1, 5; PL 183, 59

as enacting the behaviours required to securing a place in the eternal Church.

This behaviour implied that Mary too was and is a member of the Church, not beyond it.

However, Bernard also upheld the title of *Mediatrix* for Mary, and used language that was similar to that used to describe Mary as a *co-redemptrix*. In speaking of Mary in these terms, Bernard was using ideas that were reminiscent of the *genetrix* model:

Now, O Mother of Mercy, the moon, humbly prostrate at your feet,
devoutly implores you, her Mediatrix with the Sun of justice, begging
you by the most sincere feeling of your heart that in your light she
might see light and merit the grace of your Son by your procuring.²⁸⁴

This declaration to Mary utilised the use of the image of the moon to represent the Church. Therefore in this passage the Church implores Mary to intercede on its behalf and pass the grace of Christ onto them. This is reminiscent of the *genetrix* model in that it identifies Mary as being outside of and above the Church itself. Mary represents, in eschatological terms the beginning of the new eternal Church. She is its co-creator, involved alongside Christ in forming the body of the Church for all eternity. She did not have to secure herself a place in that Church, as seen above, as she caused it, echoing the words of Irenaeus seen above. However this chapter has also demonstrated that the two models can be blended. Alanus of Lille, for example, portrayed Mary as having elements of both.

This chapter has outlined the different understandings of the Mario-ecclesial in the context of the eschatological discussions of the medieval period. These

²⁸⁴ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Assumptionis*, 15

eschatological ideas, and the ways in which the Mario-ecclesial models related to those ideas, will be seen in chapters 3 and 4 as having an influence on the Mario-ecclesial discussions of von Balthasar (chapter 3) and John Paul II (chapter 4). The twentieth century therefore marks the next context in which to continue the Mario-ecclesial discussion.

Chapter 3: Mary and the Church in the twentieth century

This chapter will ask the questions: 'In what sense did the Second Vatican Council consider Mary a type of the Church?' and 'In what sense did Hans Urs von Balthasar consider Mary a type of the Church?' By using the typological models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship set up by this thesis, it will be shown firstly that the Council's deliberations vacillated between two understandings of this relationship. Secondly this chapter will demonstrate that von Balthasar intended that his Mariology should define a specific understanding of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, but also asks if it had the effect von Balthasar expected.

Once again the typological models *genetrix* and *exemplar* will allow a deeper theological understanding of the arguments surrounding Mary and the Church because these models allow one to tease out the specific ways in which typological language is used of Mary - ways which are often hidden under the general assumption that Mary is a type of the church. Because the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models each carry implications for the behaviour of believers, individually and collectively, the chapter will therefore also be able to add further evidence to the contention of this thesis that discussions about Mary and the Church, regardless of the historical context, often have wider socio-political implications.

The Second Vatican Council (1962-65) was a moment of profound importance for the Roman Catholic Church in the context of the twentieth century. It was a watershed moment that saw the coming together of various interest groups within the Church, and led to a number of interpretations of how to develop the Church in the latter half of the century. The tension that the Mario-ecclesial

questions of the Council caused is evidence of how important those questions were in the wider context of the Church and its relationships with other Christian denominations, other religions, and the governments of the world, whether religious or secular.

Von Balthasar offered an analysis and critique of the Council almost immediately. His suitability for the aims of this chapter will be evident because his concept of a ‘Marian Profile’ of the Church addressed his own concerns with the conciliar Mario-ecclesiology, and offered an insight into the different interpretations of the documents and constitutions of the Council. The two models of this thesis will act as a lens through which to identify the differences that the fathers of the Council and von Balthasar saw in the ecclesiological role of Mary.

The chapter will begin by considering in more detail why the Council and von Balthasar are relevant contextual sources for a discussion of Mario-ecclesiology in the mid-twentieth century. It will demonstrate how discussions about Mary and the Church caused great interest and tension, in the lead up to, during, and after the Council.

After this initial contextualising, the chapter will consider in turn the Mario-ecclesial positions of firstly the Council, and then von Balthasar. The chapter will demonstrate that there were different interpretations of the Mario-ecclesial relationship during the Council, but that the ultimate decision was one that has more in common with the *exemplar* model of that relationship. The chapter will also suggest that it was only by presenting Mary through language more suited to the *exemplar* model, that the Council was able to make the necessary compromises on the subject of Mary. In discussing von Balthasar’s position on

Mary, the chapter suggests that his view of the Mario-ecclesial relationship was intended to be something that this thesis would describe as the *genetrix* model, but that ended up having elements of both models within it.

Having set out the two different Mario-ecclesiologies, the chapter moves on to compare them and analyse the differences, again through the lens of the typological models *genetrix* and *exemplar*. By using these models, it will be possible to see how previously subtle differences can be seen as explicit contrasts in ideology. In short, it will be possible to see why the Council voted as it did, and subsequently why von Balthasar reacted in the way he did.

Finally, the chapter will consider whether von Balthasar's typology, seen as perhaps using the *genetrix* model, affords Mary a role that carries positive consequences for the role of women in the Church, in what might be termed a 'binary gender anthropology'.²⁸⁵ It will be argued, however, that von Balthasar's understanding of gender roles prevents such equality, and accusations that his vision of Mary saw her excluded from the Church will be assessed. An appraisal of these ideas will also ask the question of whether the *genetrix* model itself falls into the trap of falsely claiming gender equality when in reality it further supports the model of Mary being consumed by the church and removed from view. Again, using the models will allow these questions to be answered in more detail than if analysing Mary as merely a 'type' of the Church.

Von Balthasar and Vatican II: Contextual Significance

Briefly, why are these two sources the focus of this chapter? Fundamentally, the answer to that question lies in their respective Mario-ecclesiologies. For both

²⁸⁵ Lösel, Steffen, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Ecclesiological synthesis of Vatican II', from *Modern Theology*, 24.1 January 2008 (Blackwell Publishing 2008) pp. 23-49: 2

the Council and von Balthasar, Mary played an important, if not central role in their respective ecclesiologies. The Council fathers were required by the ecclesiological conditions of the time to consider their own Mario-ecclesial position. This was particularly important because, as set out below, the Council was aimed at an *aggiornamento*, or an opening of the windows and a refreshing of the Church. This refreshing was to take place in coordination not just with the wider Catholic Church, but the whole Christian Church and beyond. Pope John XXIII talked of the importance of unity as something that was ‘closely connected to the pastoral mission which God has entrusted to Us: the unity of the Church’.²⁸⁶ It was an intention of the Council that it would: be ‘a necessary step to that goal’²⁸⁷ and to that end John invited the separated brethren of the wider Christian community to observe proceedings, if not actively take part:

This event will be a wonderful spectacle of truth, unity, and charity.

For those who behold it but are not one with this Apostolic See, We hope that it will be a gentle invitation to seek and find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His Father in heaven.²⁸⁸

The Council was aimed predominantly at the wider Catholic community; it would not be rewriting Catholic doctrine in such a way as to appease the non-Catholic community. It was, however, intended to entice Protestant and other non-Catholic observers to a closer relationship with Rome. Thus there were three aims: the refreshing of Catholic thought and practice, the beginning of a process of unity with the wider Christian community of Churches, and the consolidation of the Church’s position in the context of the whole modern world.

²⁸⁶ Pope John XXIII, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, June 29th 1959, 59, from www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xiii_enc_29061959_ad-petri_en.html, accessed 09/11/09

²⁸⁷ Kaiser, Robert, *Inside the Council: The Story of Vatican II*, (London. Burns & Oates, 1963) 15

²⁸⁸ John XXIII, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, 62

In the words of God our Saviour, *there will be one fold and one shepherd* (*Jn 10.16*). This fond hope compelled Us to make public Our intention to hold an Ecumenical Council. Bishops from every part of the world will gather there to consider serious religious topics. They will consider, in particular, the growth of the Catholic faith, the restoration of sound morals among the Christian flock, and appropriate adaptation of Church discipline to the needs and conditions of our times.²⁸⁹

This identification of the council as involving a wider Christian involvement is adumbrated by Anthony M. Barratt:

What is *characteristic* and *particular* with regard to the Second Vatican Council in general, is its concern with the Church's relationship to the world, the impact of the meeting of several thousand bishops from many cultures at the Council and the particular method of debate developed in the Council.²⁹⁰

It was therefore a Council of profound importance for the relationships that the Church in Rome had with those around it, from those religiously the same but geographically distant within the Catholic Church, to its separated brethren within the Christian community, and the non-religious aspects of the world, including governments and ideologies, with which the Church continued to interact.

Regarding an ecumenical discussion with the rest of the Christian community, the subject of Mary was perhaps one of the most important. Mary was, and

²⁸⁹ John XXIII, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, 60-61

²⁹⁰ Barratt, Anthony M., 'Interpreting Vatican II Forty Years on: A Case of *Caveat lector*' in *Heythrop Journal XLVII* (2006) pp 75-96: 84

remains, a point of particular tension in ecumenical dialogue. The level to which the Catholic Church had developed its veneration of Mary, particularly in light of the promulgation of the dogma on the Assumption in 1950, had led to 'a very widespread and still continuing controversy over the method',²⁹¹ through which Marian veneration was increased. Mary was part of a much larger discussion about the position of the Church amongst its Christian and non Christian contemporaries. Her importance was based not just on her own characteristics, but on the way these characteristics, typologically transferred to the Church, might affect the Church's relationships in the modern world.

The Council could either continue to develop a pro-Marian outlook, or it could bring Mary back in line with traditional models of the Church and diminish her individual role. It is by considering these two contrasting views on Mary in the light of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, that this chapter will be able to explain why these two Marian views were put forward by certain Council fathers, and why the latter of these two models more closely fits the Marian position which was ultimately seen as the best way to balance the needs of the Catholic faithful with the wider Christian community.

If the Council itself attempted to offer a single, universal view of the Mario-ecclesial relationship and indeed of ecclesiology in general, then post-conciliar thinking on this view was anything but united. Steffen Lösel suggests that 'the council itself does not present a homogeneous ecclesiological vision and therefore requires interpretation'.²⁹² This interpretation would take many forms; Hans Urs von Balthasar, who was seen as something of an outsider and had

²⁹¹ Pelikan, Jaroslav, 'An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine' (Presidential address at the American Society of Church History, San Francisco, California, December 29th 1965) from <http://www.jstor.org/view/00096407/sp040129/04x1145a/0>, accessed 11/03/08

²⁹² Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 24

therefore not been invited to the Council, was one who contributed to this variety of opinions on the matter.

Lösel's view of von Balthasar suggests that his work 'is a powerful lens into Vatican II's ecclesiology, insofar as it brings into view three significant decisions made at the council: one of these was 'the integration of ecclesiology and Mariology into a comprehensive whole'.²⁹³ That the Mario-ecclesial relationship is so central both to von Balthasar's ecclesiological outlook and to his consideration of the consequences of the Council demonstrates the level of importance attributed to this relationship. It is also apparent that an analysis of the work by von Balthasar on the subject through the lens of the Mario-ecclesial models of this thesis would illuminate the nuances of the different views of the Council and von Balthasar.

Most importantly, for von Balthasar it is the failure of the Council to adequately address his own concerns that leads to his detailed analysis of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, which he places at the heart of his ecclesiological discussion by introducing the biblical figures of Mary, John and Peter each as a Realsymbol of the Church. Each became a Profile of the Church in their own right. Von Balthasar desired, and initially believed, that the Council would consider 'the abandonment of a top-heavy rationalism in favour of the more symbolic and aesthetic approach of the patristic period... but that is not how matters turned out'.²⁹⁴ Von Balthasar was not alone in taking his disappointment at this matter and using it to develop his own Mario-ecclesial views as part of a wider ecclesiological construct in the wake of the Council. The following section will outline how the Council itself came about and developed.

²⁹³ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 25

²⁹⁴ Oakes, Edward T, *Pattern of Redemption: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (New York, Continuum 1997) 5

Mary, the Church and the Second Vatican Council.

Towards the Council

The Second Vatican Council was called in 1959, shortly after Angelo Roncalli became the 260th successor of St Peter in Rome. It was called on January 29th, and six months later in his first encyclical letter (above), Pope John spoke extensively of the need for unity under one shepherd. His biographer, Carlo Falconi, is almost hagiographical in his praise for this decision:

With the summoning of the Church to the Ecumenical Council, with the holding out of a hand alike towards the separated brethren and their persecutors, in the name of the Gospel alone, the rights of men, and the fundamental needs of justice and universal aspiration for peace, he wrenched the world out of its lethargy and compelled it to hear once more the echo of a word long forgotten: the word of faith in goodness and brotherly love, in God the Father of all.²⁹⁵

In this light, the calling of the Council is due to the singular brilliance of the theological and pastoral mind of John XXIII. However, it suggests a clarity of purpose in the Pope's mind that is not universally accepted by commentators. Did John know what he wanted from an Ecumenical Council when he called one?

We are told... that he didn't feel very sure himself. His own phrase to describe his aim was *aggiornamento*: to bring the Church up to date. But he spoke even more about Peace, and about Unity... He wanted

²⁹⁵ Falconi, Carlo, *Pope John and His Council*, (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson 1963) 31

to give a lead to the world, which was something the Council proved more reluctant to do.²⁹⁶

It was suggested above that the Council was important for a deepening of the relationship of the Church to the ‘wider world’ inasmuch as that phrase refers to a number of different groups that interacted with the Catholic Church. Pope Benedict XVI, speaking to the Roman Curia in 2005, noted that ‘the Council had to focus in particular on the theme of anthropology. It had to question the relationship between the Church and her faith on the one hand, and man and the contemporary world on the other’.²⁹⁷ The question of the role of Mary would have an impact on both of these relationships in the Council.

Other views of the Council demonstrate that while the calling of the Council was generally well received there was a note of caution in responses to it. Writing in 1961, Hans Küng noted that the announcement ‘was received with joy and in many quarters with enthusiasm; sometimes, admittedly, misdirected enthusiasm. The Pope’s decision is epoch making.’²⁹⁸ He also encapsulates a wider belief about the impending Council in saying: ‘Hopes for the Council, then, are great; but its possibilities are limited and must be assessed with extreme cool-headedness.’²⁹⁹ By stripping away much of the hyperbole that occurred in the years between the announcement and the first session in 1962, it is possible to see the underlying concern in the minds of those involved and in those observing from outside the Church. The Anglican bishop Bernard Pawley notes in 1962 that ‘it is imperative for any Christian who has dared to agree with

²⁹⁶ Hales, E.E.Y., *Pope John and his Revolution*, (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965) xi-xii

²⁹⁷ Benedict XVI, *Address of his Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering them his Christmas Greetings*, 22/12/2005, from

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html, accessed 29/07/2013

²⁹⁸ Küng, Hans, *The Council and Reunion*, trans, Cecily Hastings (London & New York, Sheed and Ward, 1961) 1

²⁹⁹ Küng, *The Council and Reunion*, 3

any hopes of renewal in the Roman Church... to turn the same light of criticism upon himself and upon his Church.³⁰⁰

It was also an important time for the theological heart of the Catholic Church, which had 'been noted for its extreme conservatism or even immobility'.³⁰¹ The Council was an opportunity to refresh its own teaching practice and models of theology in order that it might develop a dialogue with other Christian communities, and further develop its internal community. Macquarrie believes that during the Council, Roman Catholic theology 'showed itself to be the most exciting and significant theology going on anywhere in the world'.³⁰² The Council was necessary both internally and in the context of the Church's relationship with the contemporary world. For Pope Benedict, this concept of the 'contemporary world' was a cause of some confusion, and perhaps in this way contributed to some of the unease surrounding the run up to the Council:

The question becomes even clearer if, instead of the generic term "contemporary world", we opt for another that is more precise: the Council had to determine in a new way the relationship between the Church and the modern era.³⁰³

The role that Mary played in the build up to the Council was also important. By considering this role, an overview of some of the distinct splits in the Church can be set out. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, personal veneration of Mary, which had been much higher than formal Catholic doctrine would have suggested, became almost a political force in itself. In the middle of the nineteenth century the 'blossoming of the cult of Mary was intimately linked

³⁰⁰ Pawley, Bernard: *Looking at the Vatican Council*, (London, SCM Press, 1962) 127

³⁰¹ Macquarrie, John, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, (London, SCM Press, 2001 [1963])

³⁷⁴

³⁰² Macquarrie, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, 374

³⁰³ Benedict XVI, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

to growing loyalty to the papacy',³⁰⁴ and resulted in the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854.³⁰⁵ The link between the will of the people and the decision of the papacy was clear: 'The people wanted this doctrine; no one should think it was forced upon the simple people by hierarchs'.³⁰⁶ The interaction between the hierarchical nature of the Church and its members is underlined in this theological debate: 'The Church of course, is not made up only of theologians, however eminent! An indispensable basis for all sound doctrine lies also in the *Sensus Fidei*, the conviction of the faithful'.³⁰⁷ Hilda Graef notes that 'the Immaculate Conception was not only the business of theologians'.³⁰⁸

The century that passed between the Immaculate Conception and the other Marian dogma of the Catholic Church - the Assumption of Mary, defined in 1950 - saw controversies and new ways of thinking challenge the Church considerably.³⁰⁹ It also saw the theological thinking of the Church firstly narrowed and then challenged from within.³¹⁰ The declaration of the Assumption

³⁰⁴ Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes*, 3^d Edition, (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2006) 292

³⁰⁵ See Pope Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus*, 08/12/1854 at <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9ineff.htm>

³⁰⁶ Chadwick, Owen, *Oxford History of the Christian Church: A History of the Popes 1830-1914*, (Oxford, University Press, 2003) 119

³⁰⁷ Kennedy, Kieran A, 'The Immaculate Conception', in McLoughlin, William and Pinnock, Jill (eds), *Mary for Time and Eternity: Essays on Mary and Ecumenism* (Leominster, Gracewing , 2007) 310-11

³⁰⁸ Graef, Hilda, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, (Notre Dame, Ave Mara Press, 2009 [1963]) 343

³⁰⁹ For an outline of the story of the Church in these hundred years, both Chadwick's *A History of the Popes 1830-1914*, and Duffy's *Saints and Sinners*, (as referenced above) offer a depth that helps to understand the position of the Church in relation to the wider, secular world, as well as its internal condition. The fall of the Pope as a temporal power in 1869, the first Vatican Council the following year, the perceived threat of 'modernism' by Pope Leo XIII and Pius X at the beginning of the twentieth century, the First and Second World Wars, all of these events lead to the Second Vatican Council.

³¹⁰ For a theological outline of this period, there are many sources of information. Jaroslav Pelikan's *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine: Volume 5: Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (Since 1700)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1991) offers a wide description not only of Catholic theological development up to Vatican II, but places it in a context with the wider Christian development. Macquarries' *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, also referenced above, similarly but more thoroughly considers a vast array of

in 1950 was in some respects due to very similar circumstances from that of the Immaculate Conception, that is, centuries old popular devotion on the subject combined with what could perhaps be termed Papal opportunism.³¹¹ For Pius IX, the promulgation of the Immaculate Conception furthered his cause for Papal supremacy or ‘ultramontanism’; his namesake Pius XII, was more concerned to increase the popularity of the Church in the world, after the Second World War:

The month of May, sacred in a special way to the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, is approaching. We again exhort all... to humbly entreat the divine Redeemer, through the intercession of Mary, that the peoples who have been forced into discord, contention, and all kinds of misery, may be able to breathe again after their long-lasting distress and sorrow.³¹²

Speaking shortly before the end of the war in Europe, Pius called on the whole continent to ask for the intercession of Mary so that she may call on the Redeemer to end the fighting. As this ceasing of hostilities occurred and became recent history, Christian Europe seemed to look in one of two ways: ‘Those who rejected the Communist alternative looked afresh to Rome for light

religious thought across all philosophical and theological schools during the period. Karl Adam's *The Spirit of Catholicism*, (New York, Herder & Herder, McCann, Dom Justin (trans) 1997 [1927] is a detailed overview of Catholic thought at the time, while Charles Cardinal Journe's *Theology of the Church*, translated by Victor Szczerb, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1987 [1958] is a condensed version of the author's two volume *Théologie de L'Église*, and which offers an exceptionally detailed look into the Catholic Church in the middle of the twentieth century.

³¹¹ Stephen Shoemaker's 'Marian Liturgies and Devotion in Early Christianity', in Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum Books, 2007), pp.130-148: 138-39, suggests that 'the observance of Mary's Dormition and Assumption on 15 August had spread from Jerusalem to other major centres of the early Byzantine Empire by the end of the sixth century, reaching Rome and the Western Church shortly thereafter.

³¹² Pius XII, *Communion Interpretes Dolorum*, 15/04/1945, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_15041945_communium-interpretes-dolorum_en.html, accessed 22/08/2013

on how to live, and how to act in accordance with justice, liberty and charity, and how to rebuild peace'.³¹³

The news that there was coming, in 1950, a definition of faith; a new dogma for the Post-war era, provided a certain amount of interest. The Pope felt that people outside the Church were turning towards it in the hope that he, as the leader of the Church, may be able to define something for them; to provide meaning in the chaos that was post-war Europe. He empathised with them: 'Just like the present age, our pontificate is weighed down by ever so many cares, anxieties, and troubles, by reason of very severe calamities that have taken place'.³¹⁴

For Pius, the time was right for a definition of Mary's Assumption because 'it is in our own age that the privilege of the bodily Assumption into heaven of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, has certainly shone forth more clearly'.³¹⁵ But while he was certainly taking into account the wishes of a large number of the members of the Church who felt strongly about this devotional aspect of Mariology, it certainly was not to be an ecumenical declaration that capitalised on the potential interest from outside of the Catholic Church. Instead it strengthened the core of the Church itself, demonstrating recognition of the devotional movements and acting upon its interests. The consequences of this promulgation for the Council, and for the interests of this thesis on the development of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, were to be profound.

Reactions to the dogma were mixed, with a concern that this had gone too far.

Within the Church, it was more the way in which the dogma was put together

³¹³ Hales, *Pope John and his Revolution*, xii

³¹⁴ Pius XII, *Apostolic Constitution Munificentissimus Deus*, 1/11/1950, 2 from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_p-xii_apc_19501101_munificentissimus-deus_en.html, accessed 22/08/2013

³¹⁵ Pius XII, *Munificentissimus Deus* 3

and then justified which concerned theologians. Fifteen years later, addressing the American Society of Church History, the Church historian Jaroslav Pelikan, although not Catholic himself, summed up much of the controversy surrounding the dogma. ‘Unlike some earlier definitions... [this] did not provoke any widespread controversy within the Roman Catholic communion about the substance of the doctrine... But what [it] did provoke was a very widespread and still continuing controversy over the *method*.³¹⁶ By not appealing to Scripture, or even ‘Apostolic Tradition,’ Pius had ignited a furore within the Catholic Church that had more to do with the method and less to do with the content of a papal definition.

Outside of the Catholic Church, writing in the *Journal of Bible and Religion* in 1962, the American Cyrus R. Pangborn was concerned that ‘Mariology, unless quickly de-emphasised, may seriously hamper communication with non-Catholic Christians and may even isolate the Catholic Church from the world of general intellectual discourse’.³¹⁷ These ecumenical concerns were a large part of the movement that developed against the dogma of the Assumption, and in a larger context against Mary herself in the build up to the Council.

There were therefore two distinct groups or movements regarding Mary that existed in the Church in the years before the Council. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger explained and detailed these movements in describing ‘two major spiritual movements... that had – albeit in different ways – certain “charismatic features”’,³¹⁸ that dominated the decades leading to the Council. It is important

³¹⁶ Pelikan, Jaroslav, ‘An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine’

³¹⁷ Pangborn, Cyrus R, ‘Christian Theology and the Dogma of the Assumption’, in *Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 1962), pp. 93-100: 96 from <http://www.jstor.org/view/08852758/ap050101/05a00030/0?searchUrl=http%3a>, accessed 11/03/08

³¹⁸ Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal and von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Mary: The Church at the Source* (trans. Adrian Walker, San Francisco, Ignatius Press 1997) 19

to note, and will shortly be demonstrated, that these were not the dividing boundaries post-Council. In the pre-conciliar years, on one side was the Marian movement that had developed through the ‘golden Marian age’ of the nineteenth century through multiple attested sightings in places such as Lourdes, La Salette and Fatima; through the rise of the Immaculate Conception model of Mary that these apparitions in part assisted; through the Papal support of Pius IX during the middle of that golden age; and finally through decades of devotional fervour in places such as Poland. It was here that the ‘Miracle on the Vistula’ in 1920 increased Marian devotion to a previously unforeseen level. As seen, support for this movement was such that in 1950 Pius XII defined the dogma of the Assumption of Mary after centuries of lay support for the concept. However, 1950 marked a downturn in fortune for this Marian movement because of the backlash against the consequences of this definition. This backlash was one reason why the Mario-ecclesial question was to be so complex at the Council itself.

The other side of this theological divide was occupied by those who had come by the time of the Council to be known as the *ressourcement*. Theirs was a model that desired to seek out and look back at the original biblical and scriptural understandings of Church doctrine in order that a complete renewal of the Church might be rendered from its original purpose and direction. At some point in time this combined with what Ratzinger calls the liturgical movement, ‘the origins of which can be traced to the renewal of Benedictine monasticism emanating from Solesmes as well as to the Eucharistic inspiration of Pius X’.³¹⁹ The *ressourcement* became influential and powerful in the years leading up to the Council, and this influence was acknowledged by the papacy in the form of

³¹⁹ Ratzinger and von Balthasar, *Mary: The Church at the Source* 19-20

encyclicals by Pius XII that developed similar ideas about the Church and the liturgy.

These two movements do not cover the mood of the entire Catholic Church in the lead up to the Council. They do not represent two distinct blocks of voters in the debates of the Council, and they do not represent the post-conciliar divisions of thought. They do, however, handily demonstrate just some of the thinking preceding the Council, and they represent the schools of thought most concerned about the Mario-ecclesial issues that this thesis is focused on. In that context, these movements provide the historical focus for the lenses of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

A New Pentecost? The Council

The difficulties that the Council faced were apparent from the beginning. ‘The prelates who marched in procession into St Peter’s... represented a society... of status rather than of dynamic change, of fixed formulae rather than of flexible growing insights... It had a built-in tendency, in other words, towards Conservatism.’³²⁰ This raised questions about what exactly an *aggiornamento* would entail. Would it be an *aggiornamento* in the sense of an internal reorganisation ‘that was envisaged for the [Roman Catholic] Church at large,’ in which case ‘curial circles might be forgiven for thinking that an ecumenical council was altogether too large and clumsy an instrument for effecting it’.³²¹ It was Hans Küng who noted that ‘Ecumenical councils are venerable, but theologically somewhat ambiguous, institutions in the Church’,³²² which suggested that the results of the Council may not have enough effect on the

³²⁰ Butler, Christopher, *The Theology of Vatican II*, (London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1981), 9-10

³²¹ Butler, *Theology of Vatican II*, 7

³²² Butler, *Theology of Vatican II*, 1, quoting Hans Kung, *Structures of the Church*, (Strukturen der Kirche) (London, Burns and Oates, 1965, trans. Salvator Attanasio) pp. 1-25

Church to make any changes permanent. Alternatively, would it be an *aggiornamento* that necessitated fundamental changes to the Church and its structure and fundamentally challenged and changed the whole concept of the Church in the twentieth century, in which case the curial circles might find themselves challenged, even threatened?

For both of these ideas, the possibility of considerable change was very real. Different visions of how the Church should develop and progress were proposed, and debate over the different schemas that the Council was due to construct was often passionate and lengthy. This is particularly true of the schema relating to Mary, which saw its very existence debated passionately for a whole session of the Council. Even when its fate had been decided and it was moved into the larger Constitution *De Ecclesia* (later *Lumen Gentium*), the debate on Mary's position in the Church saw a great deal of interest from either side. This underlined the wider role that the Marian discussion had in the Council.

A note on methodology: the final documents that the Council produced are in themselves the result of a process that in some cases took almost the entire three years of the Council to complete. Many documents did not survive in their original format. Some, as in the case of a potential schema for Mary, did not survive as independent documents at all, but were subsumed into larger schemas that carried a message deemed more appropriate by the Council fathers.³²³ Anthony Barratt notes a keen interest that has been developing 'in what might be called the *hermeneutics* of Vatican II, most particularly in the

³²³ The commentaries on the Council by Alberigo and Vorgrimler, both referenced below, offer detailed analysis of the developments of the Council. The *Acta Synodalia* of the Council is the primary source for all voting, intervention and debate information.

study of the process by which the final texts of the Council emerged'.³²⁴ Taking this into account, and appreciating that the Council itself was a dynamic and fluid process, 'the final documents most certainly require some type of "redaction" to determine the original intention behind them'.³²⁵ Again, this is particularly true of the schema concerned with Mary and her relationship to the Church.

One last issue to raise is that of authorship of the final documents. Officially they are all products of the Magisterium, which is the single and unified teaching authority in the Church. However, the process of redacting and analysing the documents themselves exposes the cracks in the official line. So while officially the bishops that made up the various committees have usually been seen as the authors, an alternative line of opinion has the theologians who were the *periti*, or expert assistants, as being the true inspiration. Küng and Swindler note that 'theologians were the engineers of the massive reforms that were initiated at Vatican II',³²⁶ and that 'in essence the theologians wrote Vatican II documents that the bishops voted on and signed'.³²⁷

The debates of the Council itself were also a fundamental part of the process. Therefore the question of authorship cannot end merely with the *periti*. The number of bishops and other clergy who either spoke or intervened during the debates themselves makes this question of the authorship of the documents far more complex. Many more bishops and Council fathers³²⁸ were represented by those intervening. Alberigo noted that in the debate on the question of the

³²⁴ Barratt, 'Interpreting Vatican II', 75

³²⁵ Barratt, 'Interpreting Vatican II', 77

³²⁶ Küng, Hans and Swindler, Leonard, (eds), *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican betrayed Vatican II?* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987) 189

³²⁷ Küng and Swindler, *The Church in Anguish*, 190

³²⁸ All of those involved officially in the debating and constructing of the documents of the Council were referred to as 'fathers' of the Council. There were 2381 Council fathers.

Marian schema, ‘three more [fathers], speaking in the name of more than seventy other bishops, intervened on September 18th, [and that] many of the interventions, both oral and written, were made in the name of many others, sometimes hundreds of others’.³²⁹

This makes it very difficult to judge the authorship of individual Council documents. The fact that hundreds of bishops were being represented on the discussion of the place of the Marian schema also demonstrates that in a Council where many different voices were clamoured to be heard, the subject of Mary was one that engaged many of the Council fathers and observers alike.³³⁰

This chapter needs therefore to look at the process that resulted in a document on Mary becoming chapter 8 of the larger schema on the Church that became *Lumen Gentium*. Through a hermeneutically-aware consideration of the finished document, it will be possible to analyse in much more detail the differences between the two sides by applying the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models to the main aspects of the Mario-ecclesial debate.

Lumen Gentium: Schemas on Mary and the Church

The Second Session: September 29th – December 4th 1963

The discussion of the schema on the Church that took place during October 1963, at the beginning of the second session, was a long, involved process. Vorgrimler notes in his commentary on the Council that by the end ‘the draft no longer contained a chapter on Mary, to whom a special schema was

³²⁹ Alberigo, Giuseppe, (ed), *History of Vatican II: Volume IV: Church as Communion, Third Period and Intersession, September 1964-September 1965*, (Maryknoll, Orbis, 2003) 54

³³⁰ *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, (Typis Polyglotis Vaticanis MCMLXXIV), II/3 pp.677-857 lists the 103 separate interventions on the debate on whether the Blessed Virgin Mary should have her own schema: 91 by individual fathers, 12 by fathers representing national Episcopal bodies.

provisionally allotted'.³³¹ This had not always been the plan for the Marian document.

The discussion on the Marian schema was originally scheduled to take place at the end of the first session. With a week to go of the session which ended on December 8th, 1962, it was presented to the Council along with the Schema on the Church, and was due to be discussed after its companion offering. This was changed shortly after, however, when 'it became clear that the bishops preferred to dedicate the last week of the session to a debate on the schema on the Church'.³³² Bishop Butler would later describe the debate of the final week as 'an abortive attempt to submit a draft document on our Lady'.³³³ Instead it was decided that the Marian schema would be presented and discussed at the second session the following year. This had a substantial consequence. Although the text itself was not altered in the year between the sessions, Pope John himself altered its title.³³⁴ It was no longer called *De beata Maria Virgine, matre Dei et matre hominum* (Regarding the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God and Mother of Mankind,) but was now *De beata Maria Virgine, matre Ecclesiae*, (Regarding the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church.)

On the third day of the second session, on October 1st, Cardinal Silva Henriquez of Chile 'took the occasion to plead that the schema on the Virgin Mary be incorporated into the Constitution on the Church, a proposal that was

³³¹ Vorgrimler, Herbert (ed), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II: Volume I*, (London, Burns and Oates, 1967) 110

³³² Flanagan, Donal, 'The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church', in McNamara, Kevin (ed), *Vatican II: The Constitution on the Church, A Theological and Pastoral Commentary* (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1968) 320

³³³ Butler, *Theology of Vatican II*, 74

³³⁴ See Flanagan, 'The Blessed Virgin Mary', 320

aimed at reducing the danger of anti-ecumenical use of Mariology'.³³⁵ On the same day, a vote on the provisional schema on the Church saw it rejected by a majority of 2231 to 43, with 27 invalid votes. Much more work was required to assemble something that would appease all sides of the debate.

By the end of October 1963, debate on the schema *De Ecclesia*, which would ultimately become *Lumen Gentium*, had reached the point where a further discussion on Mary was required. 'The pope in private and the moderators in public had given the commission the mandate to arrange a debate between two bishops in hall, so that the assembly might proceed to a decisive and fully informed vote.'³³⁶ Having caused some consternation by deciding not to discuss the schema the year before, the second difficulty now for the Council fathers was the question of where to put any document on Mary. At this point in the Council, the question of whether Mary should be included within the wider ecclesiological schema, or should stand alone outside of it, was of fundamental importance to all involved.

'Two factions then confronted one another... One (called Christocentric) wanted to retain the traditional title of *Mater Dei*; the other (called ecclesiocentric) strongly advocated for *Mater Ecclesiae* (or *Mater Fidelium*).'³³⁷ Of these two factions, the first looked to Mary as being a part of the Church but no more. They wanted to see Mary revealed in the light of Christ, which will be described

³³⁵ Alberigo, Giuseppe, (ed), *History of Vatican II: Volume III: The Mature Council, Second Period and Intersession, September 1963 – September 1964*, (Maryknoll, Orbis, 2000) 45

³³⁶ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol.III, 95

³³⁷ De La Soujeole, Benoit-Dominique, O.P, 'The Universal Call to Holiness', in Lamb, Matthew L, and Levering, Mathew (eds), *Vatican II: Renewal Within Tradition*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008) 47. The titles of Christocentric and Ecclesiocentric are applied here by De la Soujeole. Alberigo, in *Vol III*, p.96, records Santos of Manilla using similar terminology in the opposite way, so that Santos' argument is deemed to be Christo-typical and *not* Ecclesio-typical. As is identified, these titles in themselves are not integral to the definitions of the two groups. Similarly to the overall analysis of typological language in this thesis, the terms appear to be used interchangeably. These titles will not be used in this context, rather the groups shall be termed the 'Ecumenists' and the 'Mariologists', as will be set out below.

by Steffen Lösel below as a ‘minimalist’ approach to Mary, whereby her role, or her importance, is reduced against that of the Church. As a group they may be described as the Ecumenists. On the 24th October 1963, when the debate took place, they were represented by Cardinal König of Vienna.

The other faction wanted to see Mary’s role in the Church highlighted and then correctly venerated. This might be termed, in Lösel’s language, as a ‘maximalist’ approach whereby Mary’s importance is correctly (in the view of the faction) demonstrated in light of her being a type of the Church. They may be described as ‘Mariologists’, and they were represented in the debate by Cardinal Santos of Manilla.

To summarise then, the former group, defined by their fear that excessive veneration would harm the relationship of the Catholic Church with other Christian denominations, insisted that: ‘Ecumenical considerations called for a solid, profound and sober text where the subject would be discussed in the light of the central mystery of the Church’.³³⁸ They wanted, as a group, to ensure that Mary did not in any way detract attention from Christ, who formed that central mystery. On the other side, the Mariologists were equally keen to ensure that Mary was properly venerated with the title *Mater Ecclesiae*, which they as a group felt she deserved.

Thus on the 24th of October 1963, at the fifty-fifth general congregation of the Council, the bishops debated on the question: ‘Would it please the Fathers for the schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church, to be integrated into the schema *De Ecclesia*?³³⁹

³³⁸ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 125

³³⁹ Soujeole, ‘Universal Call to Holiness’, 48

For the ecumenists, Cardinal König of Vienna argued for the integration of the schema on Mary into the schema on the church. His main arguments for this integration were as follows: firstly, the unity of all theology, so that Mary could only be considered *within* a wider ecclesiology and Christological discussion. Secondly, he described an ecumenical sensibility that would aid the cause of a movement towards a unified theology. Finally, unification would enhance Mary's personal representation of the Church as a community, which demonstrates that she is really *Mater Ecclesia*, and yet does not transcend the Church: she is within it, not greater than it. The typological relationship was a fundamental part of König's argument: 'According to ancient tradition, he said, Mary is the type of the Church, going before it on its earthly pilgrimage to the eschatological fulfilment. Today, more than in former times, the communal elements must be stressed'.³⁴⁰ As the model of the Church which its members look to in order to see their own victory, Mary must *necessarily* be within that Church, and therefore one of the 'communal elements' which König mentions here. This is true both in terms of Mary's position within the Church, and the position of the Marian document within the schema on the Church, which 'would avoid the objections against an excessively institutional conception of the Church, which is in fact the community of the saved'.³⁴¹

Mary's position as part of the community of the saved, yet still the eschatological fulfilment of that Church, in König's argument, can be identified as an amalgamation of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models that this thesis sets out: Mary is a model of the individual members of the Church because she *is* a member of that Church, as in the *exemplar* model, but she is also a model of the Church as a structure, in that through her the whole Church will be crowned

³⁴⁰ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 126

³⁴¹ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 96

in heaven, and this is similar to the *genetrix* model. Cardinal König's Mario-ecclesiological position can therefore be seen in the light of both models, but with an emphasis on the elements of the *exemplar* model that ensure that Mary remains a member of the Church, and nothing more. Using this language, it is possible to see how König's concerns related to the wider concerns of the 'Ecumenist' group of an excessive veneration of Mary leading to ecumenical tensions.

Finally for König, 'the ecumenical reason was that an ecclesio-typical Mariology made possible a convergence with both the Oriental and the Protestant traditions',³⁴² because it removed some of the tension between the Christian denominations by minimizing Mary's presence in the discussion, by incorporating her into discussions on the Church. For him, the discussion of the relationship between Mary and the Church was an integral part of the wider ecumenical issues the Council sought to address. Again, Mary, when utilised in the ecclesiological context, was involved in political, as well as theological discussions.

Presenting to the Council the arguments for a separate schema, on behalf of the 'Mariologists', Cardinal Santos of Manilla's argued that it would 'better bring out the preeminent position of Mary in the Church'.³⁴³ The pre-eminence of Mary comes from several characteristics: from her being *full of Grace*; from her full glory at the Assumption; from her 'relation to the participation in the redemption: Mary lived the objective redemption before participating in the subjective redemption';³⁴⁴ and from her intimate relationship with her Son which cannot be compared to another. All contribute to an understanding of Mary as

³⁴² Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 97

³⁴³ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 95

³⁴⁴ Soujeole, 'Universal Call to Holiness', 48

far more than just a ‘part’ of the Church. ‘In a word, Mariology was not part of ecclesiology; to reduce Mariology to ecclesiology would be to do violence to the dogmatic presentation and do detriment to its pastoral aim.’³⁴⁵

Santos’ argument hinged on the idea that if Mary is associated too strongly with the ecclesiological structure of the Church, then she becomes overwhelmed and obscured by it. This argument was an important aspect of the debate against the ecumenical stance on Mary and the Church, which would want to see the two figures linked more intimately so that to talk of the Church was to talk of Mary as well. This would have the effect of removing Mary from the discussion with other Christian Churches and therefore also remove some of the tension inherent in that discussion. However Santos argued that the pastoral responsibilities of the Church demanded that the voices of the people of the Church be heard. They were calling, he suggested, for independent veneration of Mary, so that ‘the incorporation of Mary into the schema on the Church would be interpreted by the faithful as a reduction and a loss’.³⁴⁶

This pre-eminence of Mary and her distinction from ‘the Church’ epitomises language that has much in common with the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Santos’ position has less concern with Mary as a mere *exemplar* and affords Mary a higher level of veneration because she is ‘before’ the Church and, as per the *genetrix* model, has in some way, through her pre-eminence, brought that Church about.

The historic vote of 29 October saw 1,114 bishops favour inclusion [of the schema on Mary], 1,074 reject it. Thus by 40 votes a Council of over 2,000 bishops decided that their statement on Mary would

³⁴⁵ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 125

³⁴⁶ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 96

form part of their statement on the Church. This was a procedural decision but had important theological implications.³⁴⁷

Writing shortly after the end of the Council, Bishop Butler underlined his support for inclusion:

This very closely contested decision was of the greatest importance. It ensured that Marian theology would not be viewed in isolation from the general corpus of renewed Catholic theology, but would take its place within the wider and controlling perspectives of a theology of the Church as the ‘sacrament of salvation’.³⁴⁸

For those defeated, Soujeole reported that ‘some fathers left the conciliar meeting in tears: “They have dethroned the Virgin”’.³⁴⁹ But there were also concerns about the close nature of the vote:

It gave the impression that the Council was split in half not only on the question of Mary but on the whole formation of the ongoing reform in ecclesiology. What would happen when the Blessed Virgin was left aside, and the assembly moved on to collegiality...? How would a weak majority respond to propositions much more subtle and important than the mere placement of a short schema?³⁵⁰

Mary was at the centre of concerns about the whole Council, the way it was set up and the way it was being influenced by external forces. By using the typological models of *exemplar* and *genetrix*, and considering the language of these models inherent in the arguments of the two groups, it has been possible

³⁴⁷ Flanagan, ‘The Blessed Virgin Mary’, 320-21

³⁴⁸ Butler, *Theology of Vatican II*, 74-5

³⁴⁹ Soujeole, ‘Universal Call to Holiness’, 48

³⁵⁰ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 98

to illuminate the differences between the ‘Ecumenists’ and the ‘Mariologists’ far more than if one were restricted to the language of ‘type’. It has meant that the thesis can state that the ‘Ecumenist’ group believed Mary to be a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model, more than the *genetrix* model, although to some extent it used the language of both models. The ‘Mariologists’ however, described Mary in a way that echoes the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship, and this situates their understanding of Mary as a type of the Church more firmly in the *genetrix* model than the ‘Ecumenist’ group.

Moving forward, it is important to note that although concerns about the schematic position of Mary in relation to the Church continued throughout the Council, and that roughly groups split into those who wanted to ‘minimise’ Mary against those who wanted to ‘maximise’ her role, the two groups set out here for the second session did not remain the same. Into the third session, it was to become clear that there were further divisions and controversies that would split the Council fathers in different ways. As Vorgrimler noted of the position at the end of the second session:

The desire for unanimity and justice placed both the Theological Commission and the Council itself in a very difficult situation. Between the second and the third session, much patience had to be exercised in order to reach the desired unanimity.³⁵¹

Intersession – January – September 1964

Following the result of the vote on October 29th, 1963, ‘the atmosphere did not make it easy to draft a text that would satisfy all the fathers’.³⁵² Work continued

³⁵¹ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 126

³⁵² Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 369

in the background of the second session and, following the close of the second session on December 4th 1963, into the intersession period, which lasted until the beginning of the third session on September 14th 1964. Pope Paul VI had intervened personally with his address at the end of the second session to suggest that contrary to the belief of the ‘Mariologists’, a schema that very deliberately placed Mary within the Church was not an insult to Mary or a sign of decreased veneration. The idea that Mary had her own place *within* the Church did not mean that her role within it was reduced ‘to the level of the other members of the Church’,³⁵³ and the Pope confirmed this by suggesting that Mary be given the title ‘Mother of the Church’ (*Mater Ecclesiae*).³⁵⁴

Discussions continued, as did a process of drafting, consulting and redrafting of the Marian schema throughout the first half of 1964. In June, debate in the commission on the sixth draft of the text was heightened by the inclusion for the first time of the title of *Mediatrix* for Mary. This title was ‘judged contrary to the conciliatory approach’³⁵⁵ of the Council, and so there was added another item of contention in an already difficult document. ‘The difficulty was to find a proper balance between those who wanted the title of *mediatrix* and those who did not.’³⁵⁶

This comment from Alberigo’s commentary on the Council underlines the difficulty that those working on this document faced. The controversies surrounding the titles of *mediatrix* and *mater ecclesiae* were decidedly discordant, and they were also part of a different debate to the one that took place in the second session. The divisions were not the same, and therefore

³⁵³ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 368

³⁵⁴ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 368

³⁵⁵ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 371

³⁵⁶ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 371

compromise was difficult. It is perhaps best to categorise the two groups as per Alberigo's comment, at least to begin with. However, the fact that a similar distinction was present regarding the title *Mater Ecclesiae* further complicated matters, as some of those who were for *mediatrix* were against *Mater Ecclesiae*. This produced a third group which would only become apparent as the debate wore on.

As the third session began and the fathers began to gather to recommence the debate, the newest draft of the document was released, one characterised by 'its search for formulas to harmonise the opposing currents of thought'.³⁵⁷ The ecumenical, pastoral and reforming goals of the Council, influenced not just by its own numbers, but increasingly by those on the outside, put extra pressures on a crucial part of the seminal document. 'The result was a compromise text.'³⁵⁸

The Third Session: September 14th – November 21st 1964

The Council resumed on September 14th 1964, and immediately passions began to run high again, with tensions between the two sides growing as each group began campaigns of propaganda against one another. The Spanish Mariological Society, in a letter to the Spanish episcopate, railed angrily against the schema and spread their anger in leaflets throughout the Council. 'Opponents of the titles *Mediatrix* and *Mother of the Church*, on the other hand, circulated for signatures a petition on behalf of their position.'³⁵⁹ The question of Mary's relationship to the Church was once again the dominant topic of discussion for the Council fathers, but the exact nature of the division, although

³⁵⁷ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 425

³⁵⁸ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol III, 425

³⁵⁹ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 53

similar to that of the year before, now centred on titles for Mary. The conversation may have changed, but by using the typological models of *exemplar* and *genetrix*, it will be possible to demonstrate that the reasons for the division were the same. Compromise still appeared to be a long way off, even if the document itself actively sought to find the harmony that the Council desired. The Mario-ecclesial question would now be debated again.

The debate in September 1964 lasted three days and saw 30 Council fathers speak over the 16th and 17th, and then three more intervened on the 18th, representing upwards of 70 others. ‘The discussion... gave the impression at first of a general agreement without enthusiasm. The realism of the text and its undoubted theological solidity spared the fathers the embarrassment of seeming to be divided or wanting in devotion.’³⁶⁰

The divisions following the debate were to be expected: those who accepted the draft were flanked on the one side by those who wanted to see what they considered to be a more theologically sound handling of Mary (one which would see the term *Mediatrix* removed entirely from the text), and on the other side by those who demanded the titles *Mediatrix* and *Mater ecclesiae* be included as they represented current theological trends and the overriding feeling of the Catholic faithful. These two Marian titles became the focus of the debate. ‘A certain number of fathers wished to have the chapter moved earlier in the schema to chapter II.’³⁶¹ The Polish episcopate, amongst them Archbishop Wojtyła, were among that number. It would not be the last time that they would petition the Pope directly on the subject of Mary. Chapter 4 of this thesis will consider Wojtyła’s own experiences at the Council, and his belief that as Mary

³⁶⁰ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 134

³⁶¹ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 55

is the heart of the Church, she should be considered much earlier in the constitution on the Church.

As the conversations continued into the committees and the Doctrinal Commission, the term *Mediatrix* was ultimately passed with a number of other Marian titles, such as ‘advocate, helper, [and] benefactress’,³⁶² to add context to the term and to clarify that it was in no sense detracting from the actions of Christ or claiming that Mary performed a role equivalent to that of Christ. The accompanying report of the Doctrinal Commission outlined why this option had been taken:

[It] preserves the title but not in the sense of some theological system. This is clear from the fact that the title is mentioned along with other invocations on which there is no controversy. In this way the title is also used among the Orientals who in their liturgical prayers call the Blessed Mary Helper or even Mediatrix, because she gave us Christ and all blessings with him, because she protects us, etc. But they neither construct a theological system nor think that such views need to be taught by a Council.³⁶³

So Mary was *Mediatrix* without there being a negative impact on the unique role of Christ as mediator. The title of *Mediatrix* suggests a considerable value to her role, and thus those in the Council who wished to see veneration of her increased were naturally attracted to it. However the word had connotations that the ecumenists were uneasy about. By including the term alongside a number of other titles, its effect was reduced. In the language of this thesis, it could be

³⁶² *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium*, from Flannery, Austin, (ed), *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, (New York, Costello Publishing, 1996) 63

³⁶³ *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vatican II*, III/6, translation from Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 58

said that the title *Mediatrix*, by being stated alongside other titles, was contextualised into the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

Both *Mediatrix* and *Mater Ecclesiae* have aspects of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in that they each suggest Mary had and still has a role beyond that of a member of the Church. In both cases she stands apart from the Church. This issue was of great concern for the ecumenists who were worried about excessive veneration of Mary. Therefore, to find a third way between the two paths for interpreting *Mediatrix*; in a sense to avoid some of the theological implications that we have identified with the *genetrix* model, the word needed to be removed from its theological context and essentially nullified; repackaged as one of many joyful venerations of Mary's helpful and compassionate nature, not as evidence of her active role in salvation alongside (but still subservient to) Christ. Just as with the debates of the second session, the ecumenical concern was that Mary was being given a role above that of the Church, a tendency we have identified in the *genetrix* model. It was only by bringing the language about Mary more in line with ideas we have associated with the *exemplar* model that a compromise could be reached. The title *Mater Ecclesiae* would not be so easily mediated.

The title *Mater Ecclesiae* was given as the title of the original Marian schema, and had been a generally accepted part of the schema itself during the debates of October 1963. Paul VI spoke of his own wish to see such a title conferred on Mary in his final address of the second session. However when the text was printed at the beginning of August 1964, under the new title *The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the mystery of Christ and the Church*, there were calls from the Mariologists, including, once again, the Polish episcopate, for the title

Mater Ecclesiae to be returned to the schema. During the debate on the 16th and 17th of September, these calls were opposed by Monsignor Arceo of Mexico who spoke on behalf of forty Latin bishops who did not want that title to be used. Laurentin remarked that ‘this intervention caused the polemics to rebound at the end of a debate that would have been closed without it’.³⁶⁴

Those that opposed the title *Mater Ecclesiae* were concerned that, as with *Mediatrix*, it was neither scripturally or theologically proper. Once again the question of whether Mary is a part of the Church, or above and apart from it, lay at the heart of what was debated. Again, the term was objected to as theologically incorrect in its implication that Mary enjoyed motherhood over the Church but was not actually its mother. The Church itself claimed a spiritual motherhood over its members, which in part is where the typological relationship resonated the most,

[a]nd since the Catholic mind sees the Church as this community which precedes the individual, whereas the Reformation holds instead that the Church is the sum of many individuals, one can understand the hesitations there are about calling Mary mother of the Church.³⁶⁵

Vorgrimler and Alberigo both note that opponents of the title offered slightly mischievous suggestions that since she was both the Mother of the Church and a member of the Church, and since the Church was the mother of its own

³⁶⁴ Laurentin, Rene, ‘La proclamation de Marie “Mater ecclesiae” par Paul VI’ in *Paulo VI e i problemi ecclesiologici al Concilio*, 343, translation from Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 59

³⁶⁵ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol I, 293

members, that this title in effect made Mary her own grandmother.³⁶⁶ This was one example of the incidents that led to Laurentin's exclamation above.

On October 29th 1964, the schema on the Church as a whole was voted upon and approved with a massive majority of 1559 to 10. Following this, it fell to the Doctrinal Commission to come to an arrangement regarding the two contentious titles of Mary. Paul VI had previously suggested that three new invocations to Mary be added to the Litany of Loreto. These were *Mater Ecclesiae* (or *Mater fidelium*), *Mater unitatis*, and *Mater gentium* (or *Mater populorum*).³⁶⁷ This suggestion has in turn been traced back to the requests made by the Polish episcopate in September 1964, when they suggested those titles, alongside *Mater Ecclesia*, as being suitable for application to Mary in the context of the constitution on the Church.

In the event, an agreement was made about the titles of Mary, and a finished document circulated by November 14th.

The commission refused proposals to make the last chapter the second in the schema and to restore "*Mater Ecclesiae*" to its title. Since contradictory *modi* respecting this term in the text itself (no.53) were received, the commission decided not to alter it.³⁶⁸

Despite the challenges, this marked the conclusion of the debate on the constitution on the Church: *Lumen Gentium*. It seemingly marked an end to a prolonged and passionate Mario-ecclesial debate. Mary's relationship with the Church and her role either in it or alongside it had been discussed, analysed and theorised over, and in the end a compromise was reached that appeared to

³⁶⁶ See Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 59, and Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol I, 293

³⁶⁷ Acta VI/3, 358-9

³⁶⁸ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 61-2

favour the ecumenists who wished to see Mary absorbed into the wider mystery of the Church, but which ultimately stepped too neatly down the middle path, not venerating Mary enough for the pro-Marian group, but still offering the title of *Mediatrix* which would have worried the ecumenists even with the contextualisation of the term into something less threatening. Those who desired that neither *Mediatrix* nor *Mater Ecclesiae* be included were just as unhappy as those at the other end of the scale who wanted both to be included. The controversy surrounding the title *Mater Ecclesiae*, however, had yet to come to an end.

At the end of the third session, following the close of the debate on *Lumen Gentium* and the successful conclusion of the Mario-ecclesial discussions of the previous two years, Paul VI seemingly reversed the decision of the Doctrinal Commission, and gave the title *Mater Ecclesiae* to Mary:

In a sense the proclamation of the Marian title Mother of the Church was not a conciliar act but a personal act of Paul VI during the ceremonies that closed the third period. If from one point of view, it was the culmination of a long debate on the place of Mary within the Church; from another point of view... people saw it as the Pope's decision to reassert his freedom over and above even bishops gathered in council.³⁶⁹

Paul's personal inclination towards honouring Mary with the title *Mater Ecclesiae* has been mentioned above. But despite the fact that the inclusion of Mary within the wider ecclesiological schema would have lent itself to such a title, the overarching concerns of the Council regarding the reaction of the wider

³⁶⁹ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 445

world to an excessive veneration of Mary ensured that such a title was never passed as official doctrine. As Alberigo notes, the fact that Paul ultimately decided to confer the title on Mary anyway, following a fierce and narrowly fought campaign to include it within the schema, lends credence to the possibility that his action was merely an extension of the debating process. Using Barratt's concepts of a hermeneutical approach to the Council's proclamation, the antecedents of the declaration by Paul can be seen prominently throughout the previous sessions in a sizable portion of the Council fathers. However, the proclamation of Paul was not the same as had been requested by the Polish episcopate, who had suggested that the title be conferred as an infallible proclamation by the Magisterium and the Pope:

Instead of infallibly declaring the doctrine of the spiritual maternity of Mary, Paul VI simply declared a title... Instead of having a collegial action in the Council committing the whole Church to Mary, Paul VI engaged in a personal action.³⁷⁰

In the same way that in the context of the document *Lumen Gentium* the title *Mediatrix* was given to Mary, but was removed of its full theological content and rendered merely an honorary prefix, so too did *Mater Ecclesiae* – bestowed as a title without systematic theological underpinning - become a seemingly redundant addition to the litany of Marian veneration. It could be said that the overloading of Mary with titles and honorifics nullified the effect that they had individually, because as a collection they contributed to an overall, devotionally rich image of Mary that did not serve to make the worshipper consider the theological aspect of Mary. In this sense, the idea that Mary in some way is unique within the Church became a personal and emotional issue, as if the

³⁷⁰ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 447

many beautiful titles obscured the devotee from asking questions about what it was that *Mater Ecclesiae* could potentially mean, or what Mary must have done in order to have earned that title. By using an image of Mary's relation to the Church that uses the vague language of type, commonly seen in Marian litanies, a true understanding of the Mario-ecclesial relationship is obscured. Thus the image of Mary becomes theologically obscured.

In his conclusion to the commentary on session four, Alberigo comments on the Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium*:

The final chapter (VIII) which had gone through an especially difficult drafting process located the Virgin Mary within the mystery of Christ and of his Church. This approach broke with the widespread tendency to isolate and unduly heighten Marian devotion and to place it potentially in a para-ecclesial context.³⁷¹

Alberigo notes here that while contemporary approaches to Mary had a tendency to over-venerate Mary to the point that she was viewed as being on a par with the Church in terms of importance, chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium* avoided this controversy. The Mariologists argued that such heightened devotion was only fitting, but also that it was in keeping with the wider devotional *and* theological trends of the mid-twentieth century. The dogma of the Assumption was the conclusion of a lengthy surge in popular devotion to Mary, and its promulgation saw it placed as official teaching of the Church. It was the negative reaction to that, however, which meant that the calling of a Council to clarify certain aspects of Church teaching was untimely for the Marian movement. It is certainly plausible that the declarations of the Council

³⁷¹ Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 619

were a backlash to the dogma which had been promulgated only 14 years previously.

The Mario-ecclesial relationship formed the centre of a major discussion about the future of the Church. As noted previously, that relationship was being considered not in isolation, but within the context of wider interest about the Church and how it related to the wider world, particularly other Christian denominations and secular governments from around the world, as well as the wider Catholic world. Involvement in the wider world has been a theme of all the historical contexts considered in this thesis, and the Council discussions were no exception:

In the initial phases of Vatican II, one of the characteristics that differentiated it from many preceding councils was the absence of political meddling with or pressure on the Council's work... In this third period, however, this situation changed considerably when it came to the debates on religious freedom.³⁷²

This thesis has argued that Mary is utilised in ecclesiological discussions regarding the position of the Church in the world. This was the case for Irenaeus when dealing with Gnostic attacks from outside the Church, and with Bernard as he used the Church teachings on Mary to strengthen the position of the Church in the face of apocalyptic tendencies throughout Christendom. In the context of the Council and the issues that faced the world in the twentieth century – Vietnam; the Cold War; and the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963 whilst the Council itself was debating – a theological interpretation of Mary was once again utilised as part of a bigger discussion.

³⁷² Alberigo, *History of Vatican II*, Vol IV, 622

The debates on her position in the Church mirror those about the position of the Church in the world. In discussing whether Mary should be seen within the Church or separate and superior to it, the Church asked itself how it wished to relate to the rest of the world. An ecumenical Mariology was potentially a vital part of ensuring that the Church maintained the support of its members while remembering the ecumenical mandate that the Council itself had debated.

The typological interest of this thesis has allowed this chapter to illuminate some of the differences in outlook that the Council fathers had on the Mario-ecclesial relationship. The differences between those who wished to see more veneration, or a ‘maximising’ of Mary in relation to the Church, and those who wanted her role in that relationship ‘minimised’, can be identified with more precision by using our *genetrix* and *exemplar* models, respectively. In looking to answer the question of how the different groups saw Mary as a type of the Church, it is possible to see that the first group saw Mary as a Mother of the Church (*Mater Ecclesiae*) and that they saw Mary as having a role in the formation of the Church, and having a role, above the Church, as its eschatological fulfilment. This is consistent with the *genetrix* model. For the second ‘minimising’ group, Mary was a model for individual members of the Church and as such could only be a member of the Church. Mary represents the eschatological fulfilment of the Church only because she is a member of Christ’s Church already in heaven, not because she is in any way above the Church, or more relevant than it. This is consistent with the language of the *exemplar* model.

Von Balthasar and the Marian Profile of the Church

An attempt to cover all of von Balthasar's Mariology is hindered by the lack of a systematic approach from the writer: 'Despite its centrality to his work... the Marian theme of Balthasar's theology can be difficult to follow'.³⁷³ Something similar could be said of his ecclesiological studies as well: 'one immediately encounters the obstacle: von Balthasar neither developed a systematic treatise on the Church, nor as far as one can tell did he intend to do so'.³⁷⁴

The combination of the Mariological and ecclesiological thoughts of von Balthasar can therefore be elucidated by applying the typological models of this thesis to them. By considering his Mario-ecclesiology in the light of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of that relationship, it will be possible to reveal more about the sense in which von Balthasar thought of Mary as a type of the Church. It will also be possible to offer a direct comparison of his thinking with that of the Council.

Firstly, von Balthasar's ecclesiology 'presents in new form the symbolically pregnant patristic image of the church with its central concepts of Body of Christ, bride of Christ, *communion sanctorum* (community of saints)'.³⁷⁵ Within the Church the relationship with Christ is integral to all three concepts; 'Christology can, therefore, be done only in union with ecclesiology'.³⁷⁶ For the human members of the Church the death of Christ is a distant event, but one that can be participated in if believers allow Christ to 'stamp them with his own

³⁷³ Gardner, Lucy, 'Balthasar and the Figure of Mary, in Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David, *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs Von Balthasar*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2004) pp.64-78: 65

³⁷⁴ Koerpel, Robert C, 'The Form and Drama of the Church: Hans von Balthasar on Mary, Peter and the Eucharist, in *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture*, Volume 11, Number 1, (Winter 2008), pp.70-99: 73

³⁷⁵ Kehl, S.J., Medard, 'Introduction: Hans Urs von Balthasar: A Portrait' in Kehl, S.J., Medard, and Löser, S.J., Werner *The Von Balthasar Reader*, (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1982) pp.1-55: 36-7

³⁷⁶ Kehl, 'Introduction', 37

form of existence³⁷⁷ and therefore follow him obediently and humbly. Von Balthasar suggests that:

This general ecclesial attitude of allowing oneself to be formed after Christ in an exemplarily personal way is concretized in Mary: in her, the complete 'identity' of the forming love of God and of the obedience of the human being allowing itself to be formed, as this happened in Christ, is ecclesially 'imaged'.³⁷⁸

Using the language of the typological models of this thesis, it is possible to specify how von Balthasar understands the Mario-ecclesial relationship. On the one hand, Mary is a model of the obedience and self-sacrifice necessary for the relationship between Christ and the Church to be particular and attainable. In that sense von Balthasar utilises concepts in common with what we have identified as the *exemplar* model. On the other hand, however, von Balthasar's wider Mario-ecclesiology uses ideas that echo the *genetrix* model. In particular, his 'Marian Profile' of the Church, an aspect of the very structure of the Church, sees Mary as more than just an individual member. Von Balthasar's theology therefore contains elements of more than one understanding of what is meant by Mary being a type of the Church, and viewing it through the lens of our *genetrix* and *exemplar* models will highlight these nuanced understandings. For von Balthasar, the question of what the Church is forms the basis for his discussion of Mario-ecclesiology, and his concept of the different 'profiles' of the Church will be considered below.

Mary in Revelation

³⁷⁷ Kehl, 'Introduction', 37

³⁷⁸ Kehl, 'Introduction', 37

'The best way to learn something about Mary and how she is related to our age is to start with chapter 12 of Revelation'.³⁷⁹ This eschatologically charged passage was a common starting point for discussion about Mary during the medieval period covered in chapter 2, when Mary was utilised in the context of the wider apocalyptic concerns of the laity, and the concerns over authority that fuelled the conflict between papacy and emperor. It is the association of the figure of the woman of Revelation 12 with both Mary *and* the Church that provides von Balthasar with the inspiration to begin his Mariology at this point:

In Revelation Mary becomes the Church, since it is said that in his anger against the woman the dragon "went off to make war on the rest of her offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus".³⁸⁰

For von Balthasar, Mary is a type of the Church in the sense that both she and the Church are spiritual mothers of all believers. According to von Balthasar, Mary is both an example for and mother of the Church, as was argued in the Council:

She can be both, because at the foot of the cross with the beloved disciple she became the original image and cell of the community founded by the crucified one and at the same time received the apostle and in him all Christians as children.³⁸¹

Von Balthasar also uses Revelation 12 to assert that the Church is embroiled in a battle throughout the whole of its earthly existence. It is not a war that will be won during this time, the battle will not 'go in its favour on earth; for even when

³⁷⁹ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Mary for Today* (Slough, St Paul's Publications, 1987, trans. Robert Nowell), 7

³⁸⁰ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 9

³⁸¹ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 12-13

its children are fighting [the Church] remains... until the end of time in the wilderness³⁸² that it fled to in Revelation 12:6. This is an eschatological understanding of an imperfect institution. Von Balthasar is clear that the Church itself is not perfect, instead, the ‘empirically real Church is the “sinner” striving towards conversion’.³⁸³ Von Balthasar is being critical of the patristic tendency to create the image of a perfect Church, something which then contributed to the medieval apocalyptic worldview:

Thus the concept of the Church’s perfect holiness, upheld by the Fathers, could be abandoned from time to time in the Middle Ages in favour of mere “freedom from grave sin”. This was a Church that had already resigned itself to not being spotless.³⁸⁴

Von Balthasar’s writing on the state of the Church in *The Office of Peter* identifies the medieval Church as seeing itself in the woman in the wilderness. But this is not a situation to despair of: ‘For the whole of world history the Church must remember that it receives enough nourishment from God so as not to perish in the wilderness.’³⁸⁵ Von Balthasar reminds his readers of the promises of Revelation:

The woman, the Church as virgin who gives birth... is ensconced in the ‘place prepared for her by God’... The rock of Peter is safeguarded too... and the successor of Peter can always find new strength for this witness in a Church of Mary.³⁸⁶

³⁸² Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 12

³⁸³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

³⁸⁴ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

³⁸⁵ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 17

³⁸⁶ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 19-20

Von Balthasar suggests that, as a type of the Church, Mary is its guaranteed protection through this life, and although individual members may be taken by evil forces, the Church itself, nourished by God and protected through Mary as the woman hidden in the wilderness, will see its victory at the end of time. Von Balthasar's foundational Mario-ecclesial teaching is therefore both typological and eschatological in nature. The typological models analysed in this thesis were not, when used in patristic times, intended eschatologically. Here, von Balthasar sees in Mary not just a model of Mary as the Church in the past or the present, but into the future. Mary is in the wilderness of Revelation 12:6 and 12:14, but God's protection means that she has already experienced the victory in heaven that the Church will itself one day experience. Everything she has experienced, the Church will experience in the future. Von Balthasar uses Mary as a future model, but the eschatological aspect is not limited to the future. By being 'oriented to eternity', Mary is a realised eschatological figure who has revealed the future state of the Church *to* the Church.

Using the two models of this thesis to analyse von Balthasar's sense of how Mary is a type of the Church in this context, it is possible to see that, insofar as he shows Mary to be a model for individual Christians through her behavioural example, von Balthasar's theology is representative of the *exemplar* model. However, his emphasis on Mary as the woman in the wilderness and the mother of the Church, demonstrates that von Balthasar thinks of Mary as a type of the Church as represented by the *genetrix* model. As seen before, elements of both models appear to be present in von Balthasar's thinking.

In his *Theo-Drama*, von Balthasar considers the question of what being ensconced means for both Mary and the Church during this life. If Mary is safe

from harm but still connected to the Church, is she on earth or in heaven? For von Balthasar the dramatic tension arises from Michael's battle with the dragon in the book of Daniel. The victory has already been won in heaven, 'thus the woman is oriented to eternity'.³⁸⁷ This comes about because of her connections to Christ, to the dragon, to her offspring that will become the Church, and mostly in herself 'in virtue of her heavenly attributes'.³⁸⁸ This explains how Mary is able to be a part of the Church and yet ahead of it, representing its victory in heaven at the end of time.

Von Balthasar's eschatologically oriented view of Mary can be read in the light of the *genetrix* model. Mary gave rise to the Church and then moved on ahead of it. In chapter 1 it was demonstrated that Irenaeus thought of Mary in terms of being involved in the making of the Church. Irenaeus identified Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. Here von Balthasar takes the theology of that same *genetrix* model and applies a distinctly eschatological orientation to it. Steffen Lösel notes that this 'indicates von Balthasar's preference for a (Johannine) fulfilled eschatology compared to *Lumen Gentium*'s futuristic eschatology'.³⁸⁹ By being 'oriented to eternity' Mary brings the victory of the Church to the present, allowing the Church to realise its victory through her.

If von Balthasar understands Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model with an added eschatological dimension, that is, she has begat the Church and now sits perfected in heaven, how does this fit with his concept of Mary as behavioural example, which sits with a vision of the *exemplar* model? If Mary is already perfect, how can he focus on her real humanity? How

³⁸⁷ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 336

³⁸⁸ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 336

³⁸⁹ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 31

can a saved creature, already awarded the grace of God in heaven for eternity, offer an example of itself for the imperfect members of the Church? Later in this chapter, similar issues will cause Tina Beattie to ask about Mary's disappearing bodily integrity at the foot of the cross.

Mary, Faith and Surrender

For von Balthasar, Mary's participation in the salvation narrative and her typological relationship with the Church stem from her faith in and obedience to God. It was her faith that enabled her to be obedient in the first place: it was her *fiat* at the Annunciation that allowed the earthly act of the 'Drama' to take place for von Balthasar. However her faith also allowed her to maintain strength of obedience throughout Jesus' life and his ministry, despite the pain and suffering that was foreshadowed for her in a number of incidents beginning with the prophecy of Simeon in the temple in Luke 2. This prophecy set out the whole of her life for her, signposting that which would happen to her son, and to herself: 'It is against this horizon that every day Mary begins to search for her way in obedience to God.'³⁹⁰ She was able to navigate the path of suffering that took in rejections from Jesus at Cana and afterwards, and that culminated at the foot of the cross in what von Balthasar sees as the birth of the Church.

With faith and obedience necessarily comes the humility that causes her to call herself servant of the Lord in Luke 1.38. Mary's humility is another of the characteristics that allow her to participate in von Balthasar's view, in the divine Drama. It is also a characteristic that is part of the *exemplar* model: Mary's humility gives the members of the Church an ideal for behaviour in front of God, and her humility allows those members to see this ideal. in a similar manner to

³⁹⁰ Leahy, Brendan, *The Marian Profile in the ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (London, New City Press, 2000), 88

the way von Balthasar developed the patristic view on a *genetrix* model of Mary with the addition of eschatology, here he introduces the importance of Mary's humility to the theology of Ambrose. For while Ambrose stated: 'Learn of behaviour from the Virgin, learn of modesty from the Virgin, learn of the prophecy from the Virgin, learn in the mystery',³⁹¹ and encouraged his addressees to adopt these characteristics, von Balthasar emphasises her humility in order to show that it is exactly this trait that allows Mary to participate as she does in the divine Drama:

Mary is able, precisely in a spirit of complete humility, to point to herself because she is thereby pointing to nothing other than what God's almighty grace is capable of and at the same time what we should strive after in order to become proper vessels for this grace, in order to play the real role of the Church correctly in its mission of salvation for the world.³⁹²

For von Balthasar, Mary fulfils a model of ideal Christian behaviour just as she did for Ambrose in the fourth century when he was seeking to promote that specific style of behaviour. But her humility, on top of what Ambrose sought from his Church members, enabled Mary to put herself forward as an example for individual Christians: it caused her to become a type of the Church. Her actions were a result of this humility, and thus for von Balthasar: 'The Marian *fiat*, unequalled in its perfection, is the all-inclusive, protective and directive form of all ecclesial life'.³⁹³ This language is somewhat reminiscent of the *genetrix* model, in particular it resonates with Irenaeus' assertion that Mary became the

³⁹¹ Ambrose of Milan, *Ex Lucam*, 2.8

³⁹² Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 43

³⁹³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 223

'cause of salvation'.³⁹⁴ Imitating the humility of Mary therefore is equated to a participation in the Church. To be humble is to be part of the Church, and vice versa.

Mary's humility, which comes from faith, is described by von Balthasar as a surrender. It is in the act of surrendering oneself to Christ that one is able to be distantly involved in the crucifixion and therefore to receive his grace. For Mary, her actions not just at the Annunciation, but for the whole life that she knew was leading to suffering and sorrow, amounted to a complete surrender of herself.

Von Balthasar explains: 'Faith is the surrender of the entire person: because Mary from the start surrendered everything, her memory was the unsullied tablet on which the Father, through the Spirit, could write his entire Word'.³⁹⁵

Analysed through the lens of the *exemplar* model, von Balthasar's assertion of Mary's surrender has consequences for the average Christian, who must look inside to give entirely of themselves so that they might enter into the grace of Christ. Mary's surrender does not just mean a letting go of herself; it also entails the holding of faith in Christ. Her command to 'Do whatever he tells you', (Jn 2:5) at Cana, identifies that her promise and relationship to Christ is:

Not simply a matter of submission to the will of God, still less of cluttering up the space with conventional well-wishing; rather it is the will to retreat into the background and make possible the encounter between human need and divine grace.³⁹⁶

This idea of retreating into the background will have repercussions below in considering von Balthasar's use of gender in his Mario-ecclesiology. Where Von

³⁹⁴ A.H. III.22.4

³⁹⁵ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 45

³⁹⁶ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 222-23

Balthasar considers Mary's actions as entirely based on her faith and therefore to be applauded as the actions of an exemplar, others will interpret this concept as if it suggests that Mary is simply consumed by the Church. Tina Beattie for example suggests that: 'In Mary, the woman fulfils the purpose of her bodily existence when she gives birth to Christ',³⁹⁷ and is therefore superfluous to the narrative of salvation. It also raises the question of exactly which part of the Church Mary is offering an example to. The *exemplar* model is based upon the whole Church, not just the female part of it. As Beattie contends, this way of thinking about Mary comes about because of the idea that: 'only male bodies are necessary for the enacting of the nuptial relationship between Christ and the Church'.³⁹⁸

Finally, at the foot of the Cross, Mary's surrender comes to its fitting climax. As her son dies on the cross as part of the salvific act, something that Mary had known would happen and had obediently journeyed towards, Jesus gives her over to John, his most beloved disciple. At this point her heart, broken and suffering 'remains as open as that of her son, who is continually offering his heart's blood in the Eucharistic meal'.³⁹⁹ All Christians are invited to find shelter in the gaping wound of Mary's heart, in a similar way to that call in the Middle Ages for Christians to suffer as Mary did. Von Balthasar did not just see Mary's attitude at the cross as a saintly example to imitate: rather, he implied that in that moment of surrender to Christ and his crucifixion a new ontological situation comes about. Through her behaviour Mary brings about this new state of affairs. Elements of both the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of Mary are present. This has echoes of Irenaeus' theological assertion that 'the knot of

³⁹⁷ Beattie, Tina, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama: A Feminist Critique of Hans Urs von Balthasar, in *The Way*, Vol.44 No: 4 (October 2005), pp.160-176, 167

³⁹⁸ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

³⁹⁹ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 69

Eve's disobedience was loosened by the obedience of Mary,⁴⁰⁰ in that Mary's behaviour remedies the fault of Eve and enables God's plan for salvation to come about.

According to von Balthasar, in Mary and John, a spiritual marriage is undertaken as the community of believers (John) joins with its mother and moves forward to Pentecost where the Holy Spirit will embrace the union and strengthen it further. 'From this original cell of the Church established at the cross will come everything which will form the organism of the Church: Peter, already labelled the rock, who has denied Christ, is endowed with Johannine love.'⁴⁰¹ Thus the ecclesiological profiles of the Church that von Balthasar constructs (Mary, John and Peter) come together to form the one Church of Christ. At this point 'a new life of communion has been born. John and the whole community of believers begin to fill the place prepared for them. Mary has become their mother'.⁴⁰²

For von Balthasar, this is Mary's final challenge, her final suffering and act of surrender: 'In all this, Mary shows herself to be "truly blessed" because she has believed (Lk 1:45; 11:28, cf. Jn 20:29), and thus becomes the "seat of wisdom". This is the mould in which the Church is formed'.⁴⁰³ This point marks the beginning of von Balthasar's Mario-ecclesiology, one which is based on an understanding of the events at the foot of the cross as the birth of a new Church, and the formation of what he calls a Christological

⁴⁰⁰ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III.22.4

⁴⁰¹ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 53

⁴⁰² Leahy, *The Marian Profile*, 93

⁴⁰³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 222

Constellation of characters that brings together Mary, John and Peter to form the new Church.

The Marian Profile of the Church.

The Marian Profile best represents von Balthasar's Mario-ecclesiology. It also represents an immediate response to the Mario-ecclesiology that came out of the Second Vatican Council. Von Balthasar was concerned that the documents of the Council awarded the Petrine Profile of the Church (which will be described below) a primacy over the Marian Profile that it did not merit. For these reasons, the Marian profile must be the central aspect of any study of von Balthasar's consideration of how Mary is a type of the Church.

Von Balthasar's dominant understanding of Mary's role is one that sees her as involved in the formation of the Church; this view can be aligned with what I have identified as the *genetrix* model. That is, von Balthasar considers Mary as a type of the Church to the extent that the Church has an entire, distinct profile of itself that is Marian in form and nature. As will be noted below, it is not just Mary that becomes what von Balthasar describes as a *Realsymbol* of the Church, but Peter and John as well. The roles of the three complement each other, with John in particular binding the different aspects of the Church together with the characteristic of love. These three are brought together by two separate gifts: 'Christ's declaration of Peter as the *petros*, the rock upon which he will build his Church is juxtaposed to a second gift at the foot of the cross when Jesus gives Mary to John'.⁴⁰⁴

⁴⁰⁴ Dadosky, John D., 'The Official Church and the Church of Love in von Balthasar's Reading of John: An Exploration in Post-Vatican II Ecclesiology', in *Studia Canonica*, Vol. 41(2008) pp.453-471: 461-62

Von Balthasar's formula for the Marian Profile of the Church is therefore an excellent example of the *genetrix* model, since it explicitly asserts that Mary was fundamentally involved in the formation of the Church because of her actions: a complete surrendering of herself to God that was, in turn, brought about by her complete faith (and vice versa). She is Mother of the Church: it is her offspring, not just spiritually, but actually. For this concept, von Balthasar draws from patristic influences which, he claims, 'will always speak... of Mary as the *typos* of the Church'. Therefore, he continues:

The principle is established here that Mary is more than simply a symbolic, anticipatory embodiment of something that takes place spiritually in the Church: first and foremost what Irenaeus sees in Mary is the spiritual power of her obedient consent, which has archetypal efficacy for salvation.⁴⁰⁵

For von Balthasar, it is the *actions* of Mary that establish the Marian Profile of the Church. As we have seen, he emphasises that her faith and her surrender brought about her actions. It is evident from this passage that von Balthasar's Mario-ecclesiology has aspects of both the *exemplar* and *genetrix* models within it. As seen above, the importance of the actions of Mary adds an element of the *exemplar* model to von Balthasar's Marian Profile, as she provides a model of behaviour for those wishes to participate in the Church. However, the end point of these actions – the formation of the Church – suggests that von Balthasar has an overall sense of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that resonates far more with the *genetrix* model.

⁴⁰⁵ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 213

What then is the function of the Marian Profile compared to the Petrine and Johannine Profiles in von Balthasar's theology? How do the three relate to one another?

Mary is our "door" to heaven and this far more than Peter, who is simply the door keeper; she is the help we need so that our birth into heaven may be successful. But there is also something more. In considering what the final form of our sharing in the life of paradise will be like, echoing Dante, von Balthasar writes that it will be Marian.⁴⁰⁶

For von Balthasar, the differences between the different Profiles are based on the eschatological reality of the Church and its ultimate victory in heaven. Mary is the doorway to that victory and the embodiment of that victory because she is 'oriented to eternity' as indicated by Revelation 12, and thus the Church can see in her the victory already played out by the Archangel Michael in the book of Daniel, which is ultimately their own. Mary is the future of the Church. Peter, the keeper of that doorway, ensures that by guarding and nurturing the Church as a group of individual members in this life, will travel to judgement and the Marian crowning in heaven.

For von Balthasar, 'both the Marian and Petrine principles are coextensive with the Church';⁴⁰⁷ that is, the whole Church is both entirely Marian *and* Petrine. The two profiles are characterised by different aspects which characterise the Church. The Marian aspect of the Church is based upon the figure of Mary, 'the theological person from whom the Church receives its form of "subjective"

⁴⁰⁶ Leahy, *The Marian Profile*, 158, referencing von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 30; *Theo Drama III*, 338; *New Elucidations*, 103; *Glory of the Lord III*, 82

⁴⁰⁷ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 220

holiness'.⁴⁰⁸ The subjective, personal nature of the Church is found in the individual members of that Church who look towards Mary as an *exemplar* of behaviour. In this way Mary represents the *charism* – the love of God for his Church as a group of individuals. But the Marian Profile of the Church is possible because of Mary's *fiat*. Her acceptance of the command of God, given freely, with humility and in complete surrender of herself to God, as described by von Balthasar above, is what enables the Church itself to be formed. The act that brings about the Church then becomes a part of the Church's fabric, because Mary as a part of the formative action brings part of herself with her: her behavioural example. Mary as the *exemplar* model brings about the Church and therefore can be related to the *genetrix* model.

How then does von Balthasar define a Marian Profile that, using the language of the *genetrix* model, can be seen as part of the structure of the Church? It is spiritual, firstly, because it 'is the all-inclusive, protective and directive form of all ecclesial life. It is the interior form of *communio*, insofar as this is an unlimited mutual acceptance, far more than a human "getting along together" or fraternization'.⁴⁰⁹ It is the definition of personal experience and devotion within the Church. It is also spiritual in a sense related to the Spirit who enters the Church alongside Mary at Pentecost:

In the midst of the Church in prayer, Mary receives the Holy Spirit for all. At the event of Pentecost, as innumerable medieval representations portray, she becomes the centre and focus of the Spirit-enlightened Church.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁸ Koerpel, 'Form and Drama', 85

⁴⁰⁹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 223

⁴¹⁰ Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 112, quoting *Mary for Today*, 38-39

The Church, created on the cross with Mary and John beneath Christ, is strengthened by the Spirit at Pentecost, fully received, says von Balthasar, by Mary in order that the Marian characteristics that first created the Church were able to become part of that Church. In other words, the Church might be able to take on the humility and faith of Mary in its own character. The relationship between Mary and the Spirit, which is permanently present also in the Church, is laid out by von Balthasar, who again uses the language of type:

When Mary, filled with the Spirit, becomes the archetype of the Church, she appears as the temple of the Holy Spirit who breathes through her whole being and who, without drawing attention to himself, initiates her into the truth of the Father and the Son – which [again] he *is*.⁴¹¹

Reading this passage and the one above, it is tempting to suggest that von Balthasar is speaking of Mary as a ‘type’ of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model of that relationship. Mary’s characteristics of faith and humility are brought into the Church through the Spirit. However, as Mary’s actions at Pentecost are pointed towards the formation of the Christian Church and her characteristics become the founding characteristics of the Church, this makes Mary’s actions consistent with the *genetrix* model. The Marian Profile is the aspect of the Church that is in each individual. It is a way of being in the Church that applies to each member of the Church in a spiritual sense. But the Church cannot function merely as a number of subjective experiences held by individual members; it requires a form of objective holiness through which to guide the individual believers. This objectivity comes through the model of the Church formed by Peter:

⁴¹¹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 223

This objective dimension of the Church is linked to the theological person Peter, whose existence (embodied in the hierarchical, the sacramental, and the institutional form of the Church), exists in tension with Mary, constituting the polarity of “objective-subjective” holiness of the Church.⁴¹²

The Petrine Profile holds within it the line of succession that begins with Christ’s words to Peter in Matthew 16:18, ‘Upon this rock I will build my Church’. The Popes that succeed Peter in Rome are therefore guardians and representatives of the Petrine Profile on earth. From this also comes the Magisterium, which holds the teaching authority of the Church, and the sacramental element which ‘unifies the relationship between Christ and the Church, such that the Church becomes, St. Augustine tells us, “Christ himself”’.⁴¹³ Thus the Petrine Profile of the Church represents a different aspect of the Church as a whole.

The two profiles are, for von Balthasar, coexistent in the Church. One cannot function properly without the other. The Marian Profile is concerned with the interior spirituality of the Church, but in Mary it holds within it the realised victory of the Church in heaven. The role of the Petrine aspect of the Church is to ensure that the encounter between God and his creature remains intact in this world, and therefore it is tasked with ensuring the safety of the Church until it is able to receive its glory at the end of time. Von Balthasar is concerned that ‘the chief stumbling block against which non-Catholics come up against in the Church is authority, the impersonal institution’.⁴¹⁴ These structures, defined by

⁴¹² Koepler, ‘Form and Drama’, 85-6

⁴¹³ Koepler, ‘Form and Drama’, 88, quoting St Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus*, 21:8: PL 1-2, 216

⁴¹⁴ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs; *Explorations in Theology II: Spouse of the Word* (San Francisco, Ignatius, 1991 [1961]) 81

the Petrine principle, represent the earthly hierarchical nature of the Church on earth, and as such will fall away ‘when fulfilment is reached in the next world’.⁴¹⁵

What never falls away is the nuptial encounter between God and the creature, for whose sake the framework of the structures is now set up and will later be dismantled. This encounter, therefore, must be the real core of the Church. The structure and the graces they impart are what raise the created subjects up to what they should be in God’s design: a humanity formed as a bride to the Son, become the Church.⁴¹⁶

In this way it is possible to see von Balthasar’s ecclesiological position. He is suggesting that the Petrine office is necessarily present on earth to guide the Marian Profile to the end of time and its eventual victory in heaven. Von Balthasar’s is a Mario-ecclesial model of ecclesiology. Using the typological models of this thesis, it is possible to see than von Balthasar draws on more than one understanding of Mary as a type of the Church. She is both a type in the sense of a personal example, as per the *exemplar* model, and in the sense that she is involved in the formation of the Church and sits before it in heaven, as per an eschatological reading of the *genetrix* model.

For von Balthasar there is also the element of gender in the ecclesiological Profiles. Peter represents the masculine aspect of the Church, Mary the feminine. The masculine aspect contains the objective, sacramental holiness of the Church, while the feminine represents the personal, spiritual and behavioural nature of the members of the Church. For von Balthasar, the bride is feminine in the sense of being receptive to the seed that is God’s Word. In

⁴¹⁵ Von Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 158

⁴¹⁶ Von Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 158

this way Mary is representative of the feminine by her *fiat*; she becomes the type of humanity formed as a bride to the Son. This feminine aspect of the Church forms, through Mary, that aspect which is victorious in heaven. As such, von Balthasar sees the role of the masculine as that of guardian to the feminine aspect:

It is to such a Christian womanly role that the creature is educated by the structural, sacramental Church: the office and the Sacrament are forms of communicating the seed; they belong to the male aspect, but their end is to lead the bride to her womanly function and fortify her in it.⁴¹⁷

The bride, the feminine aspect of the Church as typified by Mary, contributes that which the masculine, Petrine Profile, the hierarchical structure of the Church, carries to the glorious end of time and victory in heaven. The feminine, Marian, aspect of the Church can be seen as superior to the masculine, Petrine aspect. As the virginal archetype, Mary represents perfection, a spotlessness as recognised by the Council, that the Church as an objective body cannot have independently. The Church as institution:

Participates in the Church's member's transformation into the perfect love of Christ, by functioning as a pedagogical instrument that forms an *anima ecclesiastica* with them, which in turn, allows them to share in the wisdom of the *anima ecclesiastica*, Mary, the 'Seat of Wisdom'.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁷ Von Balthasar, *Explorations II*, 158

⁴¹⁸ Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 87

This is an important aspect of von Balthasar's ecclesiology. As aspects of the Church, the masculine is subject to the feminine. It is the Marian Profile that represents the future Church and the Church for all eternity after this life: 'The form of the Marian faith is offered to the *Catholica* as the model of all being and acting, while the catholicity of Peter's pastoral care, though all-embracing, is not communicable in its specific uniqueness.'⁴¹⁹ For this reason von Balthasar places the Marian Profile above the Petrine. It is because, as Koepler mentions here, Mary is the representative of Wisdom:

Perfect holiness is also wisdom; it is Mary, not Peter, who is called 'Seat of Wisdom'. The Church is the 'Bride' of Christ, and at the same time is equipped with an official and institutional side: in this intertwining relationship lies the Church's inner, dramatic constitution.⁴²⁰

The tension between the two figures is what allows the Church to be 'the "body" of Christ as well as the "Bride" of Christ'.⁴²¹ The two exist side by side without any interference between them: 'The Marian dimension of the Church enfolds the Petrine dimension without claiming the latter for the former's own.'⁴²² The Marian precedes the Petrine throughout its journey on earth, but remains joined to it within the Church. They are interdependent, each reliant on the other. Von Balthasar notes that 'Mary, the (*ecclesia*) *immaculate*, is on the scene prior to the call of the Apostles, yet the concrete community is built on the "rock".'⁴²³

Finally:

⁴¹⁹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 221

⁴²⁰ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 357-8

⁴²¹ Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 88

⁴²² Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 88

⁴²³ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 358-59

The realised Idea of the Church comes at the beginning; everything subsequent, even ecclesiastical office with its sacred functions, is secondary... In Mary, the Church is embodied even before being organised in Peter. The Church is first – and this first is permanent – feminine before she receives a complementary male counterpart in the form of an ecclesial office.⁴²⁴

The language of masculine and feminine underlines that the discussion of Mary here is rooted in issues of gender and of gender roles. Below, this chapter will analyse the implications of what Lösel calls von Balthasar's 'binary gender anthropology',⁴²⁵ whereby both masculine and feminine aspects are vital to the eschatological ecclesiology that von Balthasar is constructing.

Von Balthasar was concerned that the Council had unnecessarily promoted the primacy of the Petrine Profile over the Marian Profile. By utilising the typological models of this thesis, this section has demonstrated that while it is tempting to read into von Balthasar's Marian Profile a sense of the *exemplar* model, whereby Mary provides an example of proper behaviour which applies to the individual members of the Church, the Marian Profile itself is actually consistent with the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship because it is a fundamental, ever present aspect of the Church. The behavioural aspects of Mary which might be seen in the light of the *exemplar* model are part of what allows her to be a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. Mary brings to the formation of the Church a way of acting and behaving. This is why von Balthasar's Marian Profile can be said to have primacy over the Petrine, not

⁴²⁴ Von Balthasar, and Ratzinger, *Mary: The Church at the Source*, 140

⁴²⁵ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 2

the other way round. This is why von Balthasar was dissatisfied with the decisions of the Council.

The Johannine Profile

This section will outline the way in which von Balthasar saw the Marian and Petrine profiles, the feminine and masculine aspects of the Church, as interacting and working as one Church. In order to fully understand the role which von Balthasar saw the Marian Profile as having, and as such in order to fully understand his Mario-ecclesiology, it is necessary to consider the role of the Johannine Profile of the Church that von Balthasar set out.

The dichotomy between the Marian and Petrine Profiles is made possible by John, the third *Realsymbol* of von Balthasar's Christological Constellation. For von Balthasar: 'In his Gospel of love John is a paradigm of being in touch with the (Petrine) Church'.⁴²⁶ John, as the beloved disciple, is a witness to the love Christ had for all people, and, by being present at the foot of the cross, he became a 'privileged witness of the decisive event of God's love that none of the others among the Twelve had seen',⁴²⁷ including, most importantly, Peter. Mary, present at the scene and given to John in a mutual, spiritual relationship by Christ who loved them both, and whom they both loved in return, therefore becomes intimately linked with John in a similar manner to that in which Peter and John were linked as fellow disciples of Christ.

There is no specific contact between Mary and Peter in the Gospels, although they are definitely both present at Cana and at Pentecost. In von Balthasar's

⁴²⁶ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 241

⁴²⁷ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 241

theology, the two are linked by their intimacy with John —through the two gifts of Christ mentioned by Koepler above. John's intermediary role is vital:

John... understands this bond as something laid upon him. It is important to recognise that neither Mary nor Peter is the sole representative and *Realsymbol* of Church unity. It is John who actually has the mediating role that prevents the Church from falling into two separate parts.⁴²⁸

John has relationships individually with both Mary and Peter: 'From the first chapter of the Gospel to the twentieth... one can follow the unbroken symbolism that links the Beloved Disciple with Peter, the man in office'.⁴²⁹ The link between John and Mary is based upon the mutual relationship that they enter into at the foot of the cross, one which ensures that 'the two figures cannot be separated'.⁴³⁰ All three are linked through a shared discipleship of Christ. The relationship between the Johannine and Marian Profiles is connected to and supportive of the Marian-Petrine relationship. The Petrine is tasked with guarding and supporting the Marian Profile. In the context of the twentieth century, von Balthasar was looking to encourage a revival in this support of the Marian. In his eyes, the Council had failed in its duty, as representatives of the Petrine office, to uphold the Marian Profile of the Church. It could have done this by ensuring the Petrine Profile did not appear to dominate the Marian, this could have been achieved through an understanding of the principles that the Johannine Profile brings to the Church. In his discussion on the ecclesiological Profiles, Dadosky identifies

⁴²⁸ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 241

⁴²⁹ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 240

⁴³⁰ Dadosky, 'The Official Church and the Church of Love', 462

[a] tendency in the Mariology of the official church, especially when functioning in terms of what Avery Dulles identifies as the institutional model of church, to view her in terms that are one-dimensional, i.e. to emphasise her obedience to God and to set her up as a paragon of virtue to which human beings cannot relate.⁴³¹

It is possible to suggest that this was how von Balthasar too saw the decisions of the Council regarding Mary. It is also possible to summarise this kind of critique as an accusation that the institutional church has too often interpreted Mary as a type of the church merely in the *exemplar* sense. In this light the nature of the *exemplar* model for gender politics is illuminated, demonstrating that a model that promotes the virginal obedience of Mary could be accused of limiting her role to such subordinate actions. However von Balthasar's own Mario-ecclesiology, as will be seen, did not necessarily offer the equality of roles to Mary and the feminine aspect that she represented, despite his own focus on the *genetrix* aspect of Mary's being a type of the Church.

Von Balthasar felt that the patristic ideal of a spotless Church had not been an achievable goal in the medieval period,⁴³² nor was it when he was writing. He felt that any desire of the Church in this time to make itself appear spotless was misplaced. Conversely, he acknowledged that the Church was aware of its own shortcomings and this was what led to the increase in veneration of Mary. It also raised Mary to that position which guaranteed the Church's victory in heaven. This led, felt von Balthasar, 'to the incautious developments of unenlightened devotion',⁴³³ whereby Mary's example became unattainable. However, despite these concerns, von Balthasar was convinced that the

⁴³¹ Dadosky, 'The Official Church and the Church of Love', 462

⁴³² See Chapter 2 and Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 209

⁴³³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 216

increase in stature that Mary enjoyed through the Middle Ages was of redemptive, eschatological importance:

The essential thing is that, in the history of the *ecclesia immaculate*, the core, i.e., the *Realsymbol*, Mary, came into prominence at the right time to prevent that idea of the Church from disintegrating into mediocrity and ultimately in sociology.⁴³⁴

For von Balthasar then, although Marian devotion can be excessive in certain circumstances, it is her eschatological role that is important here. In turn, it is the mutual relationship with John that allows both Mary and Peter to collaborate within the structures of the Church. Mary's role was to ensure that the Church knew it was destined to be victorious. Peter's role is therefore to maintain the correct level of devotional activity towards Mary. Understood in the context of a relationship of mutual self-giving, of spiritual marriage between John and Mary, such devotional activities are guided through the Church to the one whom they both loved: Christ. So John can be seen thus as von Balthasar's key

RealSymbol:

The truly Johannine Church is not a "third", spiritual Church, supplanting the Petrine and the Pauline, but the one that stands under the Cross in place of Peter and on his behalf receives the Marian Church.⁴³⁵

Von Balthasar and the Mario-ecclesial relationship

Having come to an understanding of the role of the Marian Profile in von Balthasar's ecclesiology, it is possible to see that he holds Mary as having a

⁴³⁴ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 216

⁴³⁵ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 242

central, formative role. This can be elucidated further by utilising the typological models. Von Balthasar saw Mary as a type of the Church primarily in the sense of the *genetrix* model. He saw Mary as being formatively involved in the creation of the Church through her actions in accepting the command of God. Her *fiat* led directly to the events at the foot of the cross in which she was present and active in the birth of the Church. This birth was finalised at Pentecost when, through the Holy Spirit, Mary passed on her ‘Profile’ to the Church and became its mother.

The Marian Profile itself, however, contains comments on the behaviour of Mary in bringing about the birth of the Church: her humility, her obedience and surrender. This is a language which has more in common with the *exemplar* model. Von Balthasar is seeing Mary as a type of the Church primarily in the sense of the *genetrix* model, but von Balthasar also sees Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model. While she provides a formative model of the whole Church, her actions provide a model for the individual members of that Church. In this way the language of the typological models allow von Balthasar’s Mario-ecclesiology to be unpacked and understood in greater detail.

The question to consider next is how, and why, von Balthasar’s Mario-ecclesiology differs to that declared by the Second Vatican Council.

Conciliar not Conciliatory: The comparative Mario-ecclesiologies of Vatican II and Von Balthasar

This section of the chapter will consider how the Mario-ecclesiologies of the Council and von Balthasar related to one another, and in what sense each saw Mary as a type of the Church.

The Different Ecclesiological Interpretations of the Post-Conciliar Environment.

It is perhaps not surprising, given the nature of the division on the subject of the Church apparent during the Council itself, that there appeared contrasting interpretations as to how to continue the work of the Council after the event. The post-conciliar landscape contained some markedly different ideas about how the Church should use the declarations of the Council.

At Christmas 2005, Pope Benedict asked: ‘Why has the implementation of the Council, in large parts of the Church, thus far been so difficult?’⁴³⁶ For Benedict, the answer was down to a question of the hermeneutical approaches that followed the Council: ‘The problems in its implementation arose from the fact that two contrary hermeneutics came face to face and quarrelled with each other’.⁴³⁷ He classified these contrasting approaches as the ‘hermeneutic of discontinuity’,⁴³⁸ and the ‘hermeneutic of reform’.⁴³⁹

For Benedict the hermeneutic of discontinuity:

Asserts that the texts... do not yet express the true spirit of the Council. It claims that they are the result of compromises in which, to

⁴³⁶ Benedict XVI, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005,

⁴³⁷ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

⁴³⁸ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

⁴³⁹ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

reach unanimity, it was found necessary to keep and reconfirm many old things that are now pointless.⁴⁴⁰

In this view, Benedict suggested that those who follow this hermeneutical approach to the Council treated the Council documents as not accurately declaring the new thinking of the Church because they held on too tightly to the old thinking. Until such a remedy, they would not see the documents as properly representing the Council. For Benedict, this view means that any treatment of the conciliar documents was incompatible or not continuous with theological and doctrinal developments from the pre-conciliar period. He was concerned that it ‘risks ending in a split between the pre-conciliar church and the post-conciliar Church’.⁴⁴¹

Benedict believed that the best way to carry forward the message of the Council was with what he called a hermeneutic of reform. He utilised the speech of Pope John XXIII at the beginning of the Council to suggest that this was the intention of the Council all along. He noted John as saying that ‘the Council wishes to “transmit the doctrine, pure and integral, without any attenuation or distortion”’.⁴⁴² This was the definition of the hermeneutic of reform for Benedict. It underlined the continuity between the pre and post-conciliar theology of the Church, and it highlighted Benedict’s belief that the Council was part of the organically developing tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. The hermeneutic of reform wanted to ‘express a specific truth in a new way... [but] new words can only develop if they come from an informed understanding of

⁴⁴⁰ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

⁴⁴¹ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

⁴⁴² John XXIII quote from Speech Inaugurating VCII 11/10/1962, from Benedict XVI, ‘A Proper hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council’, in Lamb & Levering (eds) *Renewal Within Tradition*, pp.ix-xv: xi

the truth expressed'.⁴⁴³ The truth that Benedict thought essential to any development of thought came from the tradition of the Church, and therefore he could not accept any hermeneutic that did not accept the conciliar or post-conciliar developments as part of this tradition.

In his consideration of the post-conciliar interpretations of the Council, Steffen Lösel adopts Benedict's hermeneutical contrast, with some slight differences: 'We can describe the two hermeneutical approaches to the Council, which Benedict alludes to, as *aggiornamento* and *ressourcement*'.⁴⁴⁴ In this example the term *aggiornamento* applies to Benedict's hermeneutic of discontinuity, as it interprets the concept of *aggiornamento* to mean an overhaul of the Church through 'the Council's main objective of bringing the Church into the present, by reconciling it with the modern world'.⁴⁴⁵ This is the origin of Benedict's critique of this hermeneutic. The *ressourcement*, a group who looked to return to the original sources (as the term suggests) of the patristic fathers and the Middle Ages, give their name to Lösel's other approach, which he identifies with what Benedict calls a 'hermeneutic of reform'. Lösel notes some similarities between the groups in his discussion of the group that followed a hermeneutic of reform:

To be sure, these theologians similarly welcome the council's break with the preconciliar, anti-modernist tradition of nineteenth and twentieth century Neo-Scholasticism... Nonetheless... these theologians thus favour interpreting the conciliar documents in continuity with early and medieval church teachings.⁴⁴⁶

⁴⁴³ Benedict, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 22/12/2005

⁴⁴⁴ Lösel, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory', 23

⁴⁴⁵ Lösel, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory', 23

⁴⁴⁶ Lösel, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory', 24

It is important to note than in using the term *ressourcement*, Lösel is not specifying that the group associated with that name before the Council remained as such after it. As was seen earlier in the chapter, the controversies over the construction of the Council documents were long fought and fluidly divided. The group which had previously been considered the *ressourcement* movement began, following the Council, to have serious disagreements about how they should interpret the findings of the Council. Within a decade, a major split had occurred in what had become the major group of theologians in the Catholic Church. While the *Concilium* journal was established in 1965 by, amongst others, Congar, Küng and Rahner, to continue the spirit and the work of the Council, others who disagreed with the more modernist approach, such as von Balthasar and Ratzinger, sought their own way and formed the *Communio* journal seven years later in an attempt to continue their own hermeneutic of the Council.

Finally, when considering the divisions in interpretation of the Council, and in talking about the pre-conciliar *ressourcement* movement, Kevin Mongrain suggests that while ‘the teachings of Vatican II were in large part inspired by this project in theological retrieval’,⁴⁴⁷ there is a danger of focusing too heavily on the different groups, because it is ‘impossible to interpret the teachings of the Second Vatican Council exclusively in terms of one particularly theological school’.⁴⁴⁸

Because there is no decisive line on who wrote various documents, it is redundant to assign arbitrary schools to various arguments. The *ressourcement* movement is an example of this, as in the post-conciliar environment that

⁴⁴⁷ Mongrain, Kevin, *The Systematic Thought of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (New York, Crossroad, 2002) 1

⁴⁴⁸ Mongrain, *Systematic Thought of von Balthasar*, 18, fn.1

movement no longer existed in the same way. Even so, Mongrain argues that ‘nevertheless, a strong case can be made that the proposals of thinkers such as de Lubac, Rahner, Daniélou, Congar and Bouyer were generally ratified by the Council and integrated into its teachings’⁴⁴⁹ but that assessment itself could be regarded as only one possible way of ‘reading’ the Council.

The question of how the Church should act in the modern world continued from the Council itself and into the post-conciliar debates over how best to implement the Council. The divides that arose from this question are directly linked to the Mario-ecclesiology that this thesis is concerned with, and it is by utilising the typological models of this thesis, that the position of von Balthasar in this post-conciliar landscape can be determined.

*The Church and the Constellation: Conciliar, Not Conciliatory*⁴⁵⁰

As Pope Benedict’s and Steffen Lösel’s comments show, the Catholic Church suffered from interpretational, theological and devotional divisions in the post-conciliar landscape. It is against this background that one must understand von Balthasar’s engagement with the Council, and in particular with its Mario-ecclesiology.

In this period von Balthasar worked to develop his own ecclesiological output. He did this with an eye to the deliberations and the decisions of the Council, to which he had not been invited, in part due to the suspicion under which he was held by certain members of the Curia in Rome:

The great irony in this, of course, is that the Council represented the complete vindication of all that he was struggling for... Finally, just as

⁴⁴⁹ Mongrain, *Systematic Thought of von Balthasar*, 18, fn.1

⁴⁵⁰ Lösel, ‘Conciliar not Conciliatory’, 37

Balthasar had long been hoping for, the most authoritative teaching body of the Catholic Church was solemnly calling for a dismantling of the bastions of a fortress Church. Moreover that same Council appealed to the Church Fathers as a collective fount of wisdom.⁴⁵¹

Nevertheless, Von Balthasar did not see in the Mario-ecclesiology of the Council his own understanding of Mary as a type of the Church. His Marian Profile was a response to that. Von Balthasar was concerned with ensuring that the documents of the Council were properly read and then utilised in the light of the Spirit of the Council. His relationship with the Council was therefore troubled and slightly contradictory, showing that the concern about proper interpretation drove his thinking. His Mario-ecclesial work reflected this.

Some of von Balthasar's concern about the Council itself stems from the Council's adopting of what we have termed a 'minimalist' or ecclesiotypical view of Mary. This is illustrated, for example, by the passage in *Lumen Gentium* 60 where the faithful are warned that 'there is but one mediator... Mary's function in no way obscures or diminishes this unique mediation of Christ'.⁴⁵² This is opposed to the 'maximalist' or 'christotypical' view of Mary which wanted to call Mary a mediatrix and 'mother of humanity',⁴⁵³ and which increased the veneration of Mary, something which worried the Ecumenists or 'minimalists' but which fitted with von Balthasar's Marian profile. These two views correspond to the views of those who wished to see Mary incorporated into the schema on the Church, and those who desired a separate schema, respectively. Von Balthasar sees

⁴⁵¹ Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David , 'Introduction', in Oakes, and Moss, *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs Von Balthasar*, 6

⁴⁵² *Lumen Gentium* 60, from Flannery, *Documents of Vatican II*, 85

⁴⁵³ *Lumen Gentium* 54, from Flannery, *Documents of Vatican II*, 81

[t]he Second Vatican Council's approach to Mary as a form of minimalism that envisions Mary's relationship to the Church predominantly in moral terms. Von Balthasar laments the Council's ambiguity even while he applauds a number of other points in this area made by the Council.⁴⁵⁴

By talking of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in 'moral terms, Koepler points to the Council having an understanding of the Mario-ecclesial relationship that this thesis would identify as reminiscent of the *exemplar* model. In effect Koepler is accusing the Council of reducing Mary's role to that of someone who did as they were told. For von Balthasar, the Council took some steps to strengthen the relationship between Mary and the Church, and as part of this, between Mary and Christ. The decision of the Council to incorporate Mary into a wider ecclesiological discussion is something that he supports, as it makes Mary more than just 'woman': 'The way in which the Council adumbrates the relationship between Christ and Mary transcends the Son-Mother relationship toward the "paradisal man-woman" relationship',⁴⁵⁵ in effect bringing Mary into the Adam-Christ relationship through her own typological relationship with Eve. However, von Balthasar is concerned that from the Council documents it is 'by no means clear how this relationship is ultimately realised'.⁴⁵⁶

In part, it is this vagueness alone that causes von Balthasar to have concerns: 'The questions the Council's Mariology raise but leave unanswered lurk in the background of von Balthasar's own Mariology.'⁴⁵⁷ This is particularly true of the question of how Mary can be both an archetype of the Church as the physical

⁴⁵⁴ Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 92

⁴⁵⁵ Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 92

⁴⁵⁶ Von Balthasar, *Theo Drama III*, 317-18

⁴⁵⁷ Koepler, 'Form and Drama', 93

Mother of Christ but also the spiritual Mother of all Christians. In the same way, the question of how she can be both the Bride and the Mother of Christ causes tension. Von Balthasar attempts to reconcile these differences in discussing the events at the foot of the cross, as discussed above, ‘but his response never clearly articulates, in the lucid manner he desires of the Council, how this relation can coexist in Mary’.⁴⁵⁸ Von Balthasar is on occasion as guilty as the council of not clarifying his position. In this way, although their outlooks are dissimilar, the Council and von Balthasar share similar failings.

The further concern that von Balthasar has with the Council’s treatment of Mary, is rooted in the troublesome relationship of papal primacy and Episcopal collegiality. It is the Marian profile that von Balthasar believes has primacy within the formative structures of the Church. The role of the Petrine Profile is to protect and carry the Marian to the victory of the Church at the end of time. The Council, for von Balthasar, employs the ‘minimalist’ tendency and effectively consumes Mary, taking away those aspects of the Church that ensure its victory, and raising the Office of Peter to a position he does not believe that it is due:

[Von Balthasar] thus calls upon the papacy to embed itself in the larger context of the church by making itself subordinate to the all-embracing Marian principle, by balancing itself with the principal of Episcopal collegiality as heir to the institution of the Twelve, and – perhaps most importantly – by relating itself to the Johannine charisma of love.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁸ Koepler, ‘Form and Drama’, 93

⁴⁵⁹ Lösel, ‘Conciliar not Conciliatory’, 37

Here lies the fundamental difference between the Mario-ecclesiologies of von Balthasar and the Council. Potentially guided and influenced by political and ecumenical issues, von Balthasar thought that the Council had absorbed the Marian principles into the Office of Peter and the wider mysteries of the Church. In doing so it moved away from a *genetrix* model of Mario-ecclesial typology. The Petrine Profile of the Church was thus elevated to the centre and the heart of the Church, authority and now keeper of the victory of the Church yet to come. This was a corruption of what von Balthasar saw as the correct roles of the Profiles of the Church. Mary had been consumed by the Petrine office that was meant to protect her. Using the language of our typological models, the Council had promoted Mary as solely an *exemplar* model of the Church. In von Balthasar's view this had the effect of reducing or minimising Mary's deserved veneration and role in the Church.

Von Balthasar argued that the Council had allowed Mary to be consumed by the Petrine hierarchy Church. This can be understood as a removal of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. The implication of this might be taken to be that in some way the *genetrix* model offers Mary a substantial, possible equal role in the Church. A further implication might be that, on its own, the *exemplar* model too readily reduces Mary to a subordinate, passive role. Given von Balthasar's insistence on Mary's importance in the Church, this characterisation of the gender implications of the two typological models has some merit. However, for some thinkers, the binary gender anthropology that Lösel has outlined, whereby the masculine and feminine aspects of the Church have equal value, is not in fact evident in von Balthasar's theology. This chapter will conclude by analysing what von Balthasar's Mario-ecclesiology says about his approach to gender politics. Is it possible to see von Balthasar as potentially

guilty of the same shortcomings which he finds with the Council? Perhaps the accusation of allowing Mary to be eclipsed or consumed by the Church (or the structure of the Church) can as easily be levelled at von Balthasar as at the Council.

In talking of von Balthasar's theology, Steffen Lösel uses the phrase 'Conciliar not Conciliatory' to represent an ecclesiology that agrees with that of the Council but which does not fulfil the ecumenical promise the Council offered: 'In other words, it reflects many of Vatican II's ecclesiological insights, yet does not easily further ecumenical understanding on ecclesiological issues'⁴⁶⁰. As a Protestant, Lösel is concerned with the over-veneration, or perhaps the 'maximising' of Mary's role within the Church, and this is what focuses his discussion.

For Lösel, von Balthasar's ecclesiology is very similar to that of the Council, but is of less ecumenical value. This shares parallels with the idea that von Balthasar uses the *genetrix* model of Mary as a type of the Church more in his theology than the Council does. In talking about the Council, this thesis suggested that it required Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model to make her character and the level of devotion to her more suitable for ecumenical discussions. It is possible to suggest then that the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship has value in ecumenical ecclesiological discussion because it does not allow Mary to become more than a member of the Church. Von Balthasar, in leaning more toward the *genetrix* model, is moving the Mario-ecclesiology away from an ecumenical position to one which places Mary far higher in the Catholic hierarchy. By using the typological language, it is possible to see how Lösel's phrase is accurate.

⁴⁶⁰ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 26

Taking the typological language further, however, suggests that the differences are in fact quite profound. When analysed through the lens of the typological models, the Council and von Balthasar declare Mario-ecclesial views that occupy separate models of that relationship. Again, by analysing the imagery more closely, it is possible to interpret minor differences in language or rhetoric as being indicative of substantial theological differences.

To summarise, although von Balthasar's own Mario-ecclesiology appeared outwardly similar to that of the Council, I suggest that fundamentally it was oriented in the opposite direction to that of the Council, with Mary placed first, not last, in the discussion. Wider discussions on the subject, such as those seen above, outline some of the differences but are unable to elucidate those differences sufficiently because the image of Mary as a type of the Church does not provide the nuanced language with which to do so. This is an issue that the typological models of this thesis address. Therefore von Balthasar's vision was one that saw Mary predominantly as a *genetrix* model of the Church. This model was not conducive to ecumenical dialogue, and it was for that reason that the Council was unable to speak of Mary in similar terms. The *exemplar* model made Mary more ecumenically valuable and therefore it was in the sense of this model that the Council Fathers presented Mary.

Finally, there is a tension between the eschatological outlooks of the Council and von Balthasar: Lösel comments that while the Council's constitution on ecclesiology ends with Mary, von Balthasar begins with her: 'This is no accident. It indicates von Balthasar's preference for a (Johannine) fulfilled eschatology compared to *Lumen Gentium*'s futuristic eschatology'⁴⁶¹. Thus von Balthasar emphasises 'the earthly church's vertical relationship to the heavenly

⁴⁶¹ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 31

*ecclesia immaculata*⁴⁶² while the Council's concern is 'with the horizontal relationship to the Kingdom of God'.⁴⁶³ In talking of von Balthasar's eschatology, Nicholas Healy sees von Balthasar as identifying a tension in the relationship between realised and future eschatology:

If the 'end' for which Christians hope is already present in history... what remains of the 'end' which lies in the future? Conversely, if the 'end' lies in the future, what significance does this future event have for the present moment of history?⁴⁶⁴

The answer lies in von Balthasar's theology, in the fact that the Marian Church, oriented to eternity through the woman of Revelation 12, understands that the battle has *already been won* in heaven and that Mary, as the type of the Church in the figure of the woman, represents that victory in the present. In von Balthasar's reading of the conciliar view, Mary is contained within the Church and no more than a current member of it, so that victory is *still to come* and as such not yet realised. However, the character of Mary becomes immediately more central to the Church in von Balthasar's own theology. She is viewed very much through the lens of the *genetrix* model which sees her as a formative part of the very structure of the Church. In this case, she represents its salvation. Von Balthasar therefore identifies a solution to the tension between realised and future eschatology:

However, insofar as the end is consummated in the form of a life-giving vow, the future history of the Church and the world can be

⁴⁶² Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 37

⁴⁶³ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 37

⁴⁶⁴ Healy, Nicholas, *The Eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar: Being as Communion*, (Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2005), 10

given their full scope as a new and dramatic unveiling or apocalypse of the end that has already been consummated.⁴⁶⁵

This chapter has suggested that the typological models of this thesis can be used to illuminate the different Mario-ecclesial views of the Second Vatican Council and Hans Urs von Balthasar. It has concluded that the Council, after a lengthy debate and due to the ecumenical pressures it was under, developed a sense of Mary as a type of the Church that was more akin to the *exemplar* model, although with certain aspects of the *genetrix* model. Similarly, while von Balthasar saw Mary's typological relationship to the Church mostly in language that relates to the *genetrix* model, he also had cause to reflect on both typological models. Von Balthasar also used the *genetrix* model with a heavier emphasis on eschatology, so that the Marian role was something ongoing into the future. This contrasted with the view of Irenaeus in chapter 1, which concentrated on Mary's actions at the beginning of the Church.

This thesis contends that it is through the typological models that these nuances have been revealed. Contextually, it is also necessary to consider the issue of gender politics that von Balthasar in particular raised, and to view them through a similar typological lens.

Mary: Consumed by the Church?

The discussions of von Balthasar and the Council on the position of Mary within or outside of the Church were affected by wider political and theological interests and prevailing trends. The subject of Mary as a woman, and the role of women within the Church was therefore another aspect of the Mario-ecclesial debates that must be touched upon here. This is particularly true in light of von

⁴⁶⁵ Healy, *The Eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, 214-15

Balthasar's claims to bring the feminine into an equal, if not superior position within the eschatological context of the Church through his Marian Profile. Is this a correct claim, or does von Balthasar's 'binary gender anthropology', as per Steffen Lösel's phrase, accentuate a tendency to minimise and sideline women within the larger, masculine, structures of the Church? At the same time, does von Balthasar's sense of Mary as a *genetrix* model of the Church provide evidence of gender equality, or does it too contribute to an image of Mary that promotes the submissiveness of the feminine?

For von Balthasar, the events at the foot of the cross see Mary reach the culmination of her self-sacrifice, at which point she becomes the 'unsullied tablet on which the Father, through the Spirit, could write his entire Word'.⁴⁶⁶ This corresponds with Mary demonstrating at Cana 'the will to retreat into the background and make possible the encounter between human need and divine grace'.⁴⁶⁷ It is, for von Balthasar, a sign of Mary's humility and grace that she chooses the passive role: 'Mary is not a feminist: she remains the "handmaid of the Lord", even when she can become the "all-powerful intercessor" with her son'.⁴⁶⁸ As such, even when von Balthasar uses Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model, he assumes that it is behaviour consistent with the *exemplar* model though which Mary becomes the *genetrix* of the church. However, it is possible to read the humility that Mary consistently demonstrates as an unwitting or passive role in the events going on around her, which would reduce Mary's role, again, to that of someone 'behaving', in the sense of a child or subordinate.

⁴⁶⁶ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 45

⁴⁶⁷ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 222-23

⁴⁶⁸ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 55

For von Balthasar, Mary exemplifies ‘a feminine element... that makes a person secure in nature’,⁴⁶⁹ something that von Balthasar contrasts with a masculine element that is aggressively dedicated to change and imposition. Ultimately, she is making the sacrifice of her own, personal identity to enable the Church, and specifically its feminine attributes, to come about:

The Mother must increasingly renounce everything vitally personal to her for the sake of the Church, in the end to be left like a plundered tree with nothing but her naked faith... Progressively, every shade of personal intimacy is taken from her, to be increasingly applied to the good of the Church and of Christians.⁴⁷⁰

For von Balthasar, the events at the foot of the cross defined Mary and marked her for eternity as mother. She lost her son as was foretold, and she suffered for it. Her heart is pierced as Simeon predicted in Luke 2:35, ‘the heart that offers itself to all the poor as one yet poorer’.⁴⁷¹ At the foot of the cross she became a model of suffering; she became the *Mater Dolorosa* that was popular in medieval piety. Von Balthasar suggested that she lost everything except her motherhood. As he concludes his consideration of *Mary for Today*, he states:

What she has borne is snatched away from her... while she remains behind in the wilderness. But she remains what she was and will be for all eternity: mother. And what child, even if it were God, would

⁴⁶⁹ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, ‘Retrieving the tradition: Women priests? A Marian Church in a fatherless and motherless culture,’ *Communio* 22 (Spring 1995) pp. 164-170: 165

⁴⁷⁰ Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics: Volume I: Seeing the Form*, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1982ed) 341

⁴⁷¹ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 69-70

forget the part played by his or her mother and his or her position with regard to her?⁴⁷²

Despite losing everything about her bodily self, von Balthasar claims that Mary, oriented to eternity as the woman in the wilderness, is fixed in her position as mother through the grace of God who recognises Mary as the mother of Christ. In this way, Mary is forever mother and thus becomes eternally a type of the Church seen by the *genetrix* model. She has performed the actions required of her, and has given birth to the Church which will carry within it her Profile. Through the lens of the *genetrix* model, it is possible to suggest that von Balthasar truly was offering an equality in the roles of Mary and Peter, despite Mary's bodily presence no longer being apparent. Her bodily presence for von Balthasar was no longer necessary, as she was already oriented to eternity.

Tina Beattie disagrees with the contention that von Balthasar was creating an equality of role. She suggests rather that the events of the foot of the cross result in 'the female body's elimination, not its redemption',⁴⁷³ as 'only male bodies are necessary for the enacting of the nuptial relationship between Christ and the Church'.⁴⁷⁴ Beattie relates von Balthasar's account of Mary at the foot of the cross to his reception of the story of Genesis, in which the man lives alone first. 'The woman comes into being as secondary and contingent, for he can exist without her.'⁴⁷⁵

According to Beattie, far from the female body having a fundamental, formative role in ecclesiological structure, it is consumed by the Church as it is born. One

⁴⁷² Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 72

⁴⁷³ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

⁴⁷⁴ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

⁴⁷⁵ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

might almost say that the female body is destroyed by that which she gives birth. Beattie's imagery, however, is not so violent:

In Mary, the woman fulfils the purpose of her bodily existence when she gives birth to Christ. On Calvary, her bodily mission complete, the mother of Christ surrenders her identity to that of the Church, so that the female body no longer has any theological function or significance.⁴⁷⁶

Von Balthasar's claim of the vital role of Mary in the Church is dismissed by Beattie. 'Rather, in Christ the male body has become complete through the bringing into being of his feminine other, the Church.'⁴⁷⁷ The male aspect of the Church takes from Mary and the feminine what it needs for union with Christ as his bride, a role previously taken up by the feminine aspect of Mary. For Beattie, von Balthasar is presenting an apparent gender equality in the Church, but is then denying the same equality for the bodily identity of the feminine. Essentially, she is suggesting that von Balthasar is offering equality except in that aspect of a woman that defines her as a woman: her bodily form.

As for von Balthasar's claims that Mary retains the role of mother for all eternity, Beattie claims the opposite. Beattie argues that von Balthasar's ecclesiology highlights 'a vision that was all but lost with the Second Vatican Council... the vision of the Church as mother'.⁴⁷⁸ According to Beattie, von Balthasar's understanding of the events of the cross strips Mary of her identity not only as Mary, but also as Mother. Using the typological models of this thesis, Beattie seems to be suggesting that although von Balthasar appeared to

⁴⁷⁶ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

⁴⁷⁷ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 167

⁴⁷⁸ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 150

be using the *genetrix* model and attributing equal value to Mary, he was actually reducing Mary to a submissive and obedient figure whose role for eternity is to sit out of the way. This has more in common with a negative *exemplar* model of Mario-ecclesial typology. It also suggests either that von Balthasar had not considered Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model, but was utilising similar imagery to give the impression of equality; or that actually he saw Mary in the sense of the *exemplar* model, and was unable to remove the language of this model from his ecclesiology. For either possibility, Beattie maintains that von Balthasar is not presenting an ecclesial model of gender equality.

Von Balthasar maintains, however, that the position of the feminine far surpasses that of the masculine in the Church and in the light of God's grace. Following the events at the cross, the twelve 'receive masculine tasks of leadership and representation within the comprehensive feminine, Marian Church'.⁴⁷⁹ For von Balthasar, Mary has received so much more than Peter and the other characters of the Christological Constellation. 'What Peter will receive as "infallibility" for his office of governing will be a partial share in the flawlessness of the feminine, Marian Church.'⁴⁸⁰ However, von Balthasar's claims of the superiority of the Marian Profile do not stand up to the accusations that in fact he is restricting the role of the feminine. Steffen Lösel too notes:

Regrettably, von Balthasar does not explain why and how Mary's feminine presence should and could dwell in the exclusively male hierarchy. Given the significant role that von Balthasar's binary gendered anthropology plays in his ecclesiology, the gender

⁴⁷⁹ Von Balthasar, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 167

⁴⁸⁰ Von Balthasar, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 167

transgression entailed in Mary's disappearance into Peter and the Twelve seems at the very least incongruous.⁴⁸¹

Von Balthasar is once again guilty of not justifying his argument clearly. In this instance, Lösel argues that the disappearance of Mary into the Church contradicts von Balthasar's claim of Marian ecclesiological primacy. Von Balthasar is unable to explain why Mary necessarily must lose her bodily identity to the Church. The typological *genetrix* model, in which Mary is part of the formation of the Church, appears to be negatively affected by the eschatological element of von Balthasar's personal Mario-ecclesiology. His vision of Mary at the end of all things serves, it could be argued, to push her back from the Church and to suggest that she serves no role at the present time.

The consequences for actual women of von Balthasar's theology are made clear when von Balthasar discusses women priests in the light of what he terms the absence of the feminine. He believes that 'we are living in a time both fatherless and motherless',⁴⁸² which manifests as a lost understanding of what it means to be male or female as expressed above: 'A woman who would aspire to this office would be aspiring to specifically masculine functions, while forgetting the precedence of the feminine aspect of the Church over the masculine'.⁴⁸³

To this suggestion, and in light of the binary gender roles that von Balthasar seeks to claim for his ecclesiology, Corrine Crammer states:

⁴⁸¹ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 34

⁴⁸² Von Balthasar, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 165

⁴⁸³ Von Balthasar, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 168

I believe that despite his attempt to construct a two-sex theological anthropology..., ultimately von Balthasar reproduces the one sex model in which the normative human being is implicitly male and Woman's definition is based around Man, particularly around what Man is seen to need Women to be.⁴⁸⁴

Thus, according to Crammer, the contention of von Balthasar that a woman should not aspire to the masculine aspects of the Church, namely the office of Peter and the priesthood, is exposed as part of a single gender theology based around the male. Von Balthasar's apparent nod to binary gender roles is exposed as being in fact thoroughly patriarchal. Crammer implies that binary gender roles exist only as part of the control of the masculine, as opposed to being part of a striving towards an equal gender ecclesiology and a more visible role within the Church for women in reality, not just for the abstract concept of 'feminine'. Beattie agrees with this suggestion, stating both that 'von Balthasar repeatedly forgets himself, and most of what he writes takes a non-gendered view of humanity',⁴⁸⁵ and that for von Balthasar 'man is the normative human being, and woman is his other in such a way that she is not authentically other at all'.⁴⁸⁶

Just as von Balthasar teases out the practical implications of his theology (in his case, with reference to women priests), so Tina Beattie explores what she sees as the practical consequences of the surrender of Mary in von Balthasar's ecclesiology: 'Like Mary, "woman" must surrender her identity, her personhood and her sexual body, in order to become one with the Church, and in order to let

⁴⁸⁴ Crammer, Corinne, 'One sex or two? Balthasar's theology of the sexes, in Oakes and Moss (eds) *the Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs von Balthasar*, pp.93-112: 102

⁴⁸⁵ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 161

⁴⁸⁶ Beattie, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama', 162

“him” become “her” in his suprasexual love affair with Christ’.⁴⁸⁷ For Beattie, not only does the woman become reduced almost to nothing in von Balthasar’s theology, she also sacrificed herself so that the masculine may utilise her femininity in his relationship with Christ. The Church rips the femininity from the woman, and uses it for itself; an aberration of the relationship that Mary, Christ and the Church are said to share in von Balthasar’s Mario-ecclesiology: ‘In Christ the male body has become complete through the bringing into being of his feminine other, the Church’.⁴⁸⁸ Beattie underlines her concern about a lack of a truly gender-equal ecclesiology when she notes that:

The challenge for women is to redefine what we mean by the motherhood of the Church, without regressing into an anachronistic model of the Marian Church as the all-embracing phallic mother of the pre-oedipal stage.⁴⁸⁹

The typological models of this thesis allow a more nuanced reading of von Balthasar’s Mario-ecclesiology in the light of the gender politics with which he attempted to engage. Firstly one needs to understand the *genetrix* model to infer a formative role on the part of Mary, one that comes about through her actions but which is *focused* on the consequences. This is contrasted with the *exemplar* model that places emphasis on the *actions themselves*. Von Balthasar speaks of the faith and humility of Mary, and how that allows her to become the ‘unsullied tablet on which the Father, through the Spirit, could write

⁴⁸⁷ Beattie, ‘Sex, Death and Melodrama’, 170

⁴⁸⁸ Beattie, ‘Sex, Death and Melodrama’, 167

⁴⁸⁹ Beattie, *God’s Mother, Eve’s Advocate*, 150

his entire Word'.⁴⁹⁰ This model of Mary is passive and her rewards are based upon the submissive nature of her actions in the first place.

Von Balthasar believes, however, that 'the entire Church is Marian'.⁴⁹¹ The model of Mary that his theology appears to present is that of the *genetrix* model. Mary is the mother of the Church and her Profile constitutes a part of the very existence of the ecclesial body. However, by emphasising the behaviour of Mary over the results of her actions, von Balthasar is emphasising a model of Mary that is more closely connected to the *exemplar* model. This diminishes the results that Mary achieves and puts focus on the submissive actions she performed to achieve them. In this light it can be argued that although von Balthasar appeared to set out a Mario-ecclesiology that offered equality in gender roles, his emphasis on the actions of Mary, and not those of Peter or John, expose the unbalanced gender politics that he applied to his theology.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the Mario-ecclesiologies of the Second Vatican Council and of Hans Urs von Balthasar. It has used the typological models of this thesis to demonstrate that the differences between the theological outlooks of the two are complex: they appear small from some perspectives, but are in fact quite pronounced. It has demonstrated that the context of the time, the ecumenical pressures of the Council and the disagreements over how to implement the declarations of the Council, all contributed to create a very specific environment. Von Balthasar was shown to disagree with the Marian declarations of the Council because he felt they catered too much to the ecumenical concerns of the Church. In many ways this has been demonstrated

⁴⁹⁰ Von Balthasar, *Mary for Today*, 45

⁴⁹¹ Von Balthasar, *The Office of Peter*, 220

to be accurate. Von Balthasar's analysis of the Council's Mario-ecclesiology, and the development of his own, was described by Steffen Lösel as 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory'. This suggested that von Balthasar took his Mario-ecclesiology towards a more traditional, and what he felt was a proper view of Mary.

By reading through the lens of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models, it has been suggested that the Council utilised an understanding of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model in order to make Mary more ecumenically valuable. Von Balthasar moved towards a sense of Mary in the *genetrix* model in an attempt to raise Mary and the Marian Profile back to the centre of the Church, where he felt she belonged. However, in attempting to raise Mary, his emphasis on her actions exposed his sense of Mary as a type of the Church as having some aspects of the *exemplar* model. This undermined his suggestion that there was an equality of gender roles in the hierarchical structure of the Church.

The importance of this period of Catholic history has been made apparent. The typological models of this thesis have been demonstrated to offer extra depth to analysis of Mario-ecclesial debate. The role of Mary and her typological relationship to the Church in discussions that are relevant for wider, socio-political situations, has also been outlined in this thesis. The final chapter therefore will consider all of these issues through a case study of Karol Wojtyła.

Chapter 4: John Paul as a Case Study

This final chapter will apply the Mario-ecclesial discussions of this thesis to Karol Wojtyła, latterly Pope John Paul II. The chapter will ask the question ‘in what sense does John Paul II see Mary as a type of the Church?’ It will use the typological models of this thesis to illuminate the answers to this question, for this chapter will establish that John Paul saw Mary as a type of the Church in different ways in different contexts. This thesis has established the importance of the context of the ecclesiological and political environment in any Mario-ecclesial discussion. It will be the contention of this chapter that, as Pope, John Paul faced two different contextual situations which required him to focus on the Mario-ecclesial relationship in two slightly different ways. It will be by using the lens of the typological models *genetrix* and *exemplar*, that these differences can be highlighted.

The chapter will focus on different aspects of the life of Karol Wojtyła, taking in chronological order, his early years, his experiences at the Second Vatican Council, and his papacy (split into two halves that mark the contextual differences spoken of above). For each stage of his life, the question will be asked ‘how does Wojtyła/John Paul see Mary as a type of the Church?’

Karol Wojtyła makes a suitable case study for this thesis precisely because the question of how he sees Mary as a type of the Church needs to be asked more than once in his theology, and because there is more than one answer depending on the context. The contention of this thesis is that John Paul considers the Mario-ecclesial relationship in his theology more consistently than any other theologian discussed in this thesis. This is in part due to the high level

of personal devotion that Wojtyła had towards Mary from a young age and continued to show throughout his life. His papal motto, for example, was *Totus Tuus*, meaning ‘totally yours’, which is professed to Mary and which is:

inspired by the teaching of Saint Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort, who explained in the following words Mary's role in the process of our configuration to Christ: “*Our entire perfection consists in being conformed, united and consecrated to Jesus Christ.* Hence the most perfect of all devotions is undoubtedly that which conforms, unites and consecrates us most perfectly to Jesus Christ. Now, since Mary is of all creatures the one most conformed to Jesus Christ, it follows that among all devotions that which most consecrates and conforms a soul to our Lord is devotion to Mary, his Holy Mother, and that the more a soul is consecrated to her the more will it be consecrated to Jesus Christ”.⁴⁹²

The personal devotion of Wojtyła to Mary, enhanced by his knowledge of the great Mariologists of the past such as de Montfort, was given a theological grounding by his experiences at the Second Vatican Council, with which he was heavily involved, and then given an opportunity to be built on by his time as Pope John Paul II. As Pope, he utilised his personal Mario-ecclesiology firstly when opposing the Communist rulers of his native Poland, and then again, in a different fashion, against what he perceived as a ‘Culture of Death’. These opposing ideologies were to occupy much of John Paul’s thought during his time as Pope.

⁴⁹² Pope John Paul II, Apostolic Letter *Rosarum Virgins Mariae*, 16/10/2002, 15, quoting De Montfort, Louis, *Treatise on True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary*. from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20021016_rosarium-virginis-mariae_en.html, accessed 02/08/2013

To this end, the first section of the chapter will consider John Paul's personal devotion to Mary, particularly during his childhood. It will consider the ways in which the Polish culture of the time influenced Wojtyła to such a degree of devotion, and will ask in what way Mary could be considered a type of the Church in such a context. The section will consider the image of Mary as a disciple prone to acts of love, which provided the young Wojtyła with the emphasis on which to build his faith. It will be possible to identify this emphasis by considering the typological model of *exemplar*.

The second section will demonstrate how the Second Vatican Council gave Wojtyła the language with which to elucidate his Marian devotion in more theological terms. The Mario-ecclesiology of the Council, outlined in chapter 3, will be shown to have influenced the future Pope. However it will equally be shown that Wojtyła was influential in the declarations of the Council, with an analysis of some of Wojtyła's many interventions on different topics at the Council. The outcomes of the Council, both for Wojtyła and for the Church itself, will be shown to be heavily influential for the Mario-ecclesiology of John Paul II.

The Mario-ecclesiology of John Paul will be set out in two chronological and typological halves. Firstly the Mario-ecclesiology of the 1980's, when the fate of Poland and Eastern Europe was at the front of John Paul's mind, will be considered using the typological models. The Mario-ecclesiology will be shown predominantly to echo the *genetrix* model. Following the fall of the Communist bloc, the 1990's offered a different ideological struggle for John Paul, as one unhelpful societal ideology was replaced by another. It will be explained how John Paul's philosophy of the individual made him see the liberalism of the

western world as equally dangerous to society as the communism of the east. The danger from the west was focused on individual behaviours, and so John Paul's understanding of Mary as a type of the Church will be shown to be in the sense of the *exemplar* model predominantly. John Paul called on Mary as the ultimate realisation of the 'genius of women',⁴⁹³ and so the way in which he considered women in general will also be focused on.

In both instances, the Mario-ecclesial understanding of John Paul will be shown to have eschatological aspects, and so the chapter will conclude by outlining how John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology was based around an eschatological understanding of the 'pilgrim Church' and its relationship to Mary.

To summarise, this chapter will outline in Karol Wojtyła/John Paul the main contentions of this thesis: firstly that the Mario-ecclesial debates of the Church often take place within wider, often socio-political discussions with potential repercussions beyond the Church itself. Secondly, that by utilising the typological models of *genetrix* and *exemplar* that this thesis has set out, it is possible to illuminate the sense in which John Paul saw Mary as a type of the Church. It will be possible to glean more information about this sense than if one was merely using the terminology of 'type'.

Karol Wojtyła and Marian Devotion 1920-1962

This section will consider the early years of Karol Wojtyła's life, from the cultural context into which he was born, through his childhood and time in Wadowice and Krakow, the beginning of his priestly vocation and his ordained ministry up to the beginning of the Second Vatican Council. The Mariological and

⁴⁹³ Pope John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 29/06/1995, 10, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/1995/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_29061995_women_en.html accessed 02/08/2013

devotional experiences which he was exposed will be shown to have heavily influenced his later Mario-ecclesiology as Pope.

Mary and Poland

Karol Wojtyła was born on May 18th 1920, into a cultural environment of heightened emotion. The history of the Polish state had been fraught, and the state itself had not officially existed for the previous 125 years. For the whole of the nineteenth century ‘Poland’ had in fact been peripheral territories of the Russian, Prussian and Austrian (later Austro-Hungarian) empires.⁴⁹⁴ Cut off from the rest of Europe and stripped of any contemporary identity with the other sections of former Poland, there was a move towards the one familiar institution that remained:

Historically, the nineteenth century was a period in which the Catholic Church gradually grew into a political carrier of modern Polish nationalism and Catholicism became linked to those ideas... No institution was left that would be a reminder of the glorious Polish past, except the Catholic Church.⁴⁹⁵

However the Church in Rome faced a difficult situation. It could not directly criticise the powers that had partitioned Poland because it could not afford to

⁴⁹⁴ For a detailed consideration of Polish history in the nineteenth century: Gildea, Robert, *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914, 3^d edition* (Short Oxford History of the World, Oxford, University Press, 2003); Davies, Norman, *God’s Playground: A History of Poland Volume II; 1795 to the Present*, (Oxford, University Press, 2005); Bartlett, C.J, *European History in Perspective: Peace, War and the European Powers, 1814-1914*, (Oxford, Macmillan, 1996); Lukowski, Jerzy and Zawadzki, Hubert, *A Concise History of Poland*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2001) 109

⁴⁹⁵ Jakelic, Slavica, *Collectivistic Religions: Religion, Choice, and Identity in Late Modernity*, (Farnham, Ashgate Publishing, 2010) 168. This is one of many excellent overviews of the relationship between the Polish nation and the Catholic Church. Others include: Wolff, Lawrence, *Poland and the Vatican in the age of the partitions: Diplomatic and Cultural Encounters at the Warsaw Nunciature* (New York and Boulder: Columbia Univ. Press, East European Monographs, 1988); Kloczowski, Jerzy, *A History of Polish Christianity*, (Cambridge, University Press, 200).

upset them. In the event, silence and even a reproachful attitude towards the Polish revolutions that occurred through the nineteenth century led to the Polish people's sense of betrayal by and detachment from the Vatican. This caused an isolated Catholic identity to emerge in the former Polish lands.⁴⁹⁶

Within this Catholic identity, Mary was an important figure. The nineteenth century saw a number of Marian apparitions across Europe. 'It does seem safe to say that for many millions of people no form of Marian devotion or doctrine has carried more momentous significance than her miraculous apparitions.'⁴⁹⁷ Popular tradition in Poland maintained that there were at least two visitations within Poland, although neither of these were ratified by the Vatican. One of these, in Plock in 1893, led to the creation of the 'Mariavite' order of monks and nuns that was condemned by the Vatican in 1903 following rumours of so called mystical marriages within the order. 'The Mariavites were the biggest single disaster generated by the conflict between the age with its State repression of monks and the revival of the monastic ideal among a people growing educated and aware.'⁴⁹⁸ What the fate of the Order demonstrates here is that the Polish understanding of the Church had been affected by a century in which they were distanced from Rome, and that Mary had become a symbol of Polish devotion beyond what was set out by the teaching of the Catholic Church.

⁴⁹⁶ As well as the books mentioned, Kelly, J.N.N, *Oxford Dictionary of the Popes*, (Oxford University Press, 2005); Chadwick, Owen, *A History of the Popes: 1830-1914* (*Oxford History of the Christian Church*, Oxford, University Press, 1998) and Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners* (referenced above) all offer a general overview of the specific issues the Vatican faced in this situation.

⁴⁹⁷ Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries*, 187

⁴⁹⁸ Chadwick; *A History of the Popes 1830-1914*, 531

Following this century of uncertainty and of isolation in the wilderness of statehood, Poland was resurrected by the Treaty of Versailles. Point 13 of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points after the First World War stated:

An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.⁴⁹⁹

The treaty of Versailles was ratified on January 10 1920, at which point lands were returned to Polish self-governance. However there was a danger to face from the new Russian regime and its grand vision of a Russified Europe. From the Polish perspective, 'over "the corpse" of Poland the Red Army was to bring the proletarian revolution into the heart of Europe'.⁵⁰⁰ The strength of the Red Army in comparison to the Polish army under General Piłsudski suggested that the new Polish Republic would be short-lived. However, the Battle of Warsaw, on August 16-18, saw the defeat of the Soviet army and the so called *Cud nad Wisłą* (*Miracle on the Vistula*⁵⁰¹), which soon became attributed not to Piłsudski and his valiant army, but to a more divine origin:

In a Catholic Country, the phrase was irresistible... it suggested what every pious Catholic wanted to believe – that the chosen land had been delivered by Divine Intervention; it inspired a whole series of visions whereby the Black Madonna of Częstochowa, Holy Mother of

⁴⁹⁹ Wilson, Woodrow, *Address to Congress, January 8 1918*, from http://ww1.lib.byu.edu/index.php/President_Wilson's_Fourteen_Points , accessed 05/08/2013

⁵⁰⁰ Lukowski, and Zawadzki, *A Concise History of Poland*, 200

⁵⁰¹ The original use of this term may in fact have been an ironic slur on Piłsudski's use of religious rhetoric on his campaign in the Ukraine earlier in the year, rather than a heralding of a religious victory.

Poland, had been seen to descend from a fiery cloud above the trenches at Radzymin and smite the Bolshevik hosts with confusion.⁵⁰²

'Patriotism and religious fervour, piety and violence, were at fever pitch.'⁵⁰³ The new, Second, Republic of Poland had been born and then successfully defended in the space of a year. In the eyes of the Polish people, this defence had been at least in part due to the intervention of Mary, who was their Queen and now, seemingly, their protector.

Mary as a surrogate mother.

The young Wojtyła lived in a time and place saturated with devotion to Mary and with an understanding of her as an active participant in the world. Visions of her would have bolstered this belief, and the 'Miracle on the Vistula', once it had gained enough traction in the consciousness of the society, would have been a natural example of her continuing presence and protection. It is in this context that Wojtyła's exposure to Mary in his early years must be understood.

As pope, the early life of Karol Wojtyła was to be probed and analysed for signs of future greatness. Each of the different sources covers different angles and attempts to unearth new snippets of personal information to validate its particular argument. These key sources include Weigel (official biography, almost hagiographical in nature),⁵⁰⁴ Kwitny (an unofficial biography focused on

⁵⁰² Davies, Norman, *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War 1919-1920 and 'The Miracle on the Vistula.'* (London, Pimlico Books, 2003 [1972]) 223

⁵⁰³ Cornwell, John, *The Pope in Winter: The Dark Face of John Paul II's Papacy*, (London, Penguin Books, 2005) 10

⁵⁰⁴ Weigel, George, *Witness to Hope: The Biography of John Paul II, 1920-2005* (New York, Harper Perennial, 2005 'Perennial' edition[1995])

the personal life of Wojtyła);⁵⁰⁵ Craig (the account of a supposedly close friend, written hurriedly immediately following the election of John Paul II and therefore occasionally inaccurate);⁵⁰⁶ and Cornwell (a critical appraisal of John Paul, written during the last days of his papacy). Following John Paul's death, there were also a number of anthologies and collections of essays commenting on his legacy and on his life. All of the above sources will be utilised during this section in particular, and it is important to note the context of the source itself when analysing what it has to say about the life of Wojtyła.

This critical attention is particularly necessary with regard to the death of Wojtyła's mother in 1929. It was once common practice to go back to this family tragedy in order to identify the reasons behind John Paul's strength of devotion to the Virgin Mary throughout his life and his papacy. John Paul himself remained quiet on the subject of his mother. However there are many articles and books written that suggest that his mother's death influenced not only his Marian attitude, but also his teachings towards women when he was Pope. The fact may well be that he simply had little memory of a woman who was sick for much of his life and who died when he was only nine. But as Weigel points out; 'In a post-Freudian world, simple explanations can seem like evasions'.⁵⁰⁷

A potentially more fruitful aspect of Wojtyła's early life for those looking to connect his Marian devotion to his biography may be the day to day life that he experienced. Three years after the death of his mother, Wojtyła also lost his elder brother to scarlet fever. Wojtyła noted that '[My mother's death made a deep impression...] and my brother's perhaps a still deeper one because of the

⁵⁰⁵ Kwitny, Jonathan, *Man of the Century: The Life and Times of Pope John Paul II*, (New York, Little Brown Books, 1997)

⁵⁰⁶ Craig, Mary, *Man from a Far Country; A Portrait of John Paul II* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979)

⁵⁰⁷ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 29

dramatic circumstances in which it occurred and because I was more mature. Thus quite soon I became a motherless only child'.⁵⁰⁸ As an only child, and with his father working hard to feed his only son, Wojtyła was fed by a friend of the family every day. Deprived of the traditional model of a family, young Karol would have experienced the charity of others through these meals, and would have known the power of such charitable love. Cornwell identifies the lure of the Virgin in these actions: 'her heart, too, had been pierced with sorrows. She too had died, but she would not allow death to separate her from her children'.⁵⁰⁹

It is the idea of charity and of acts of love that may more accurately demonstrate the appeal of Mary for Wojtyła, particularly later in his life when speaking of Mary as the first disciple, and very specifically so in John Paul's battles against what he perceived as the 'Culture of Death'. For a young boy in Poland in the 1920's and 30's, having lost his mother and a big brother, the image of Mary as a loving, caring, protective mother of the Church as a whole, but also of Poland as a new state, may have provided comfort. It may also have provided Wojtyła with hope that he would remain protected in the future. One can argue, therefore, that Wojtyła would have been looking at Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of her protecting the Church and Poland from the outside. This would have been more linked to the *genetrix* model, inasmuch as the *genetrix* model offers an image of Mary intimately involved in the redemptive narrative as what Irenaeus termed as the 'cause of salvation',⁵¹⁰

As a teenager, Wojtyła became more involved in a group whose name is translated as the 'Solidarity of Mary' in certain documents, or the 'Sodality' and

⁵⁰⁸ Kwitny, *Man of the Century*, 39 and Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 13

⁵⁰⁹ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 13

⁵¹⁰ A.H., III.22.4

'Society of Mary' on the Vatican website.⁵¹¹ That same website records that between he was admitted into the society in 1935, and was the president of the group in his school by 1938.

Such Marian groups were not uncommon. Following the development of the relationship between the Church and the Polish people throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and particularly in the light of the surge in Marian devotion in the 1920's, the 1930's 'witnessed the revitalization of Polish Catholicism and the rise of the Church's moral prestige... The growth of lay Catholic organisations, such as Catholic Action and the so-called "rosary brotherhoods", involved many millions of faithful, mostly in the rural areas'.⁵¹²

Sodalities can be considered similar to fraternities within the Catholic Church: 'a confraternity or sodality is a voluntary association of the faithful, established and guided by competent ecclesiastical authority for the promotion of special works of Christian charity or piety'.⁵¹³ Moreover, the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* notes the difference between Sodalities and other 'pious unions' (religious orders for instance) 'inasmuch as they need not be canonically erected and they regard rather the good of the neighbour than the personal sanctification of the members'.⁵¹⁴ Wojtyła's devotional attitude towards Mary can be understood as relating to his understanding of how an individual can be a disciple of Jesus, but also how one can relate to another in such a way as to love and support that individual. This idea of relationships with others would become a central aspect of Wojtyła's philosophical and theological work. In terms of his sense of Mary as a type of the Church, it resonates with the *exemplar* model, inasmuch as the

⁵¹¹ http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/documentazione/documents/santopadre_biografie/giovanni_paolo_ii_biografia_prepontificato_en.html for a biographical timeline of Wojtyła's life.

⁵¹² Lukowski and Zawadzki, *A Concise History of Poland*, 218

⁵¹³ <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04223a.htm>

⁵¹⁴ <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04223a.htm>

definition of the word *exemplar*: ‘a model or pattern to be copied or imitated’,⁵¹⁵ when applied to the compassion of Mary and her love for others, can be seen as an integral aspect of the Marian Sodality that Wojtyła was involved with.

Mary’s gift of self

After his schooling finished, Wojtyła moved, with his father, to Krakow to attend the Jagiellonian University in 1938. He continued to pursue an interest in the theatre that had been apparent since a young age, and over the next few years he began to write his own plays. He continued to pilgrimage to the Marian shrine at Czestochowa. As the Second World War began, Wojtyła split his time between work in a quarry (intellectual Poles were being deported at the time, so Wojtyła needed manual employment), and a group inspired by a mystical reading of the Carmelite tradition that became known as the ‘Living Rosary’. The group was led by a man named Jan Tyranowski, whom Wojtyła soon joined as co-leader. The ‘Living Rosary’ taught ‘both the fundamentals of the spiritual life and methods for systematically examining and improving their daily lives’.⁵¹⁶ It was a group that talked of how the post-war Poland could be revived as a Christian country.

George Weigel sees the role of leader of one of these ‘Living Rosary’ groups as central to Wojtyła’s ‘rapid maturation’,⁵¹⁷ but Tyranowski’s influence on Wojtyła is debatable. On the one hand, he deepened the young man’s understanding and experience of his own prayer-life - his own relationship with God. He was also the man who introduced Wojtyła to the work of the Carmelite St John of the Cross, especially his spirituality of abandonment, and to the

⁵¹⁵ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar>, accessed 02/11/2012

⁵¹⁶ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 60

⁵¹⁷ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 60

theology of St Louis De Montfort, the seventeenth century French founder of the company of Mary (to be discussed further below). On the other hand, ‘to some, Tyranowski came across as mentally unstable’.⁵¹⁸ However I would contend that Tyranowski’s influence was not directed at Wojtyła’s own thought, so much as he introduced Wojtyła to certain aspects of Marian tradition that would become central to Wojtyła’s Mario-ecclesiology.

Wojtyła’s introduction to St Louis De Montfort was crucial. De Montfort’s books *True Devotion to Mary* and *The Secret of Mary* turned Wojtyła back towards the figure of Christ’s mother, and helped Wojtyła to come to terms with a crisis in his Marian devotion: ‘would Mary detract from the place due to Jesus in his life?’⁵¹⁹ This crisis of faith for Wojtyła had led him to slowly diminish his own Marian devotion for fear of causing detriment to his relationship with Christ. Through de Montfort, however, ‘he discovered a Marian devotion that was based completely on Jesus Christ, the Incarnation and Redemption’.⁵²⁰ As Cornwell notes:

From de Montfort, Wojtyła would one day borrow his papal motto, ‘Totus Tuus... indicating the gift of his entire self, not to the people of God, but to the Virgin in emulation of her gift of self to her children. For it was Mary, always Mary, Wojtyła came to trust.⁵²¹

This period of Wojtyła’s Marian devotion can be said to be central to his wider Mariology and, as such, to his Mario-ecclesiology. Speaking as John Paul II decades later, he confirmed this:

⁵¹⁸ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 17

⁵¹⁹ Leahy, Brendan, ‘Totus Tuus: The Mariology of John Paul II’ in *John Paul the Great: Maker of the post-conciliar Church*, Oddie, William (ed.), (London, Catholic Truth Society & The Catholic Herald, 2003) pp.69-93: 72

⁵²⁰ Leahy, ‘Totus Tuus’, 72

⁵²¹ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 19

During the Second World War, while I was employed as a factory worker, I came to be attracted to Marian devotion... Thanks to St Louis of Montfort, I came to understand that *true devotion to the Mother of God is actually Christocentric*... And so, I rediscovered Marian piety, this time with a deeper understanding. This mature devotion to the Mother of God has stayed with me over the years, bearing fruit in the encyclicals *Redemptoris Mater* and *Mulieris Dignitatem*.⁵²²

This understanding of Mary as being fundamentally a part of the mysteries of the Church corresponds to a sense of Mary as a type of the Church as per the *genetrix* model. As seen previously, it presents an image of Mary that seems more reminiscent of the *exemplar* model, inasmuch as Mary is put forward as an example of right behaviour. However for John Paul the key truth of Marian devotion that lends itself to a sense as per the *genetrix* model:

In regard to Marian devotion, each of us must understand that such devotion not only addresses a need of the heart, a sentimental inclination, but that it also corresponds to the objective truth about the Mother of God... the Mother of Christ the Redeemer is the Mother of the Church.⁵²³

For Wojtyła/John Paul, devotion to Mary remains centred on Jesus, but she also remains the mother of the Church and therefore worthy of the devotion that he shows her. This suggests that John Paul's Mario-ecclesial understanding is more rooted in the *genetrix* model, an argument that will be further developed later on in this chapter.

⁵²² John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, (New York, Alfred A.Knopf, 2005) 212-13

⁵²³ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 213

Wojtyła and the Communist state.

Following his ordination to the priesthood on November 1st 1946 and a period of a year and a half in Rome during which he completed his doctorate, Wojtyła returned to Poland to the village of Niegowic just outside Krakow. While he had been gone, the Soviets had established control over the Polish state and had enforced Communist rule over the Polish peoples. This was to be the background of Wojtyła's time as priest. His first pastoral assignment as curate saw him heavily involved in local life. As part of his ministry he introduced into the area a 'Living Rosary' group and he did the same in his next parish, the University Chaplaincy surrogate parish of St Florian's in Krakow, where he was sent in March 1949.

During his years at St Florian's, Father Wojtyła initiated a series of intellectual, liturgical, cultural, and pastoral innovations that changed the character of student chaplaincy in the Archdiocese of Krakow while rebutting, point for point, the effort by Poland's Stalinist rulers to reinvent the country's history and culture.⁵²⁴

The time Wojtyła had spent away had seen a concerted effort from the Soviet rulers to quash the threat that the Catholic Church posed to their authority. The *Stowarzyszenie PAX* association (PAX), created in 1947, was a Soviet led branch of the local Catholic Church that aimed to undermine the Polish Church from the very ground up. It even took control of the Polish *Caritas* organisation. Five months after Wojtyła's arrival in Krakow, the Polish government issued a decree that supposedly offered greater religious freedom but essentially tightened the control that the Soviets had started to gain. In 1950 they went

⁵²⁴ Weigel, *Witness To Hope*, 95

further, declaring all Catholic schools and Catholic organizations, including the influential Catholic Action, to be illegal and seizing control over hundreds of institutions. In the same year ‘Cardinal Wyszyński signed an “Understanding” with the Polish government on 14 April... This [was] the first accord with a communist regime reached independently of the Vatican’.⁵²⁵ Understandably this did not go down well in Rome, but it was deemed necessary at the time to provide a breathing space for the Church. It was able to exist under these conditions, where full rebellion against the government may have led to its wounding or even destruction.

The Understanding embodied a simple bargain: the State would protect the Church’s rights, while the Church would recognise the State’s secular competence... Church leaders knew the regime would see the Understanding as no more than a stage in its *realpolitik*, enabling it to exploit the Church’s authority before finally crushing it once communist power was secure. But they believed the risk was worth taking.⁵²⁶

The Communist leadership recognised the threat that the Church presented, particularly in the shape of the family unit. The regime saw the family, and the support structure that a happy and successfully family unit created, as a threat to its authority. It recognised how these support structures could strengthen the people and the work system it developed reflected this recognition, keeping family members apart as much as possible with organised work shifts and state-run schools. People were dissuaded from having children; one method included small and cramped apartments, making children a physical (as well as

⁵²⁵ Luxmore, Johnathan and Babiuch, Jolanta, *The Vatican and The Red Flag: The Struggle for the Soul of Eastern Europe*, (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1999) 74

⁵²⁶ Luxmore and Babiuch, *The Vatican and the Red Flag*, 75

economic) nuisance. Looking back at this period, Weigel, a supporter of Wojtyła, alleged that ‘as payback for its 1956 concessions to the Church, the Gomułka regime instituted a permissive abortion law... Youngsters on state-sponsored summer outings were encouraged to experiment with sex’.⁵²⁷ This was a considerable and considered threat to the Christian model of the family, as well as a threat to the dignity of the human person. Later, Weigel suggested that when John Paul argued ‘that society would benefit when mothers are primarily engaged in child rearing... it was based on the experience of the communist attempt to erode family life’.⁵²⁸

In response, Weigel suggests that Wojtyła ‘used the ordinary structures of parish life to combat this assault’.⁵²⁹ Meetings with altar boys, for instance, took place with the whole family. Thus instruction could be given to the family as a whole without rousing suspicion. The marriage preparation class that Wojtyła set up was the first in the entire Archdiocese, and through it he was able to educate couples about the importance of family life. Cornwell, a more critical observer, noted that ‘Archbishop Wojtyła began a careful balancing act. While avoiding provocative confrontation... he found ways of raising the morale of the people, engendering an indignation based on human rights and freedom’.⁵³⁰ A more historical approach to the time notes:

No one could accuse Wojtyła of “fighting communism”... [he had not] spoken directly against communist institutions. What he *had* said was

⁵²⁷ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 140-41

⁵²⁸ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 420-21

⁵²⁹ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 97

⁵³⁰ Cornwell, *Pope in Winter*, 46

that Christians had a duty to be active in defending truths and values.

The “Person” went with the “Act”.⁵³¹

For Wojtyła, although he accepted that some of his thinking, writing and activities ‘represented an unsettling element in [the Marxist] polemic against religion and the Church’,⁵³² the Communist regime was not solely responsible for his development.

I must say that my concern for “the acting person” did not arise from the disputes with Marxism or, at least, not as a direct response to those disputes. I had long been interested in *man as person*... when I discovered my priestly vocation, man became the *central theme of my pastoral work*.⁵³³

The role of Communism in Wojtyła’s philosophical concept of the family is thus debatable. The tendency to reflect the events of the 1980’s on to Wojtyła in the middle of the century naturally invites suggestions that he was always fighting the regime. What is clear however is that Wojtyła saw the importance of the family as part of the value of the individual. He noted that ‘every society’s formation takes place in and through the family’,⁵³⁴ Later, John Paul II would relate the Marian aspect of all families when he quoted Paul VI as stating that Mary ‘carries on in heaven her maternal role with regard to the members of Christ, cooperating in the birth and development of divine life in the souls of the redeemed’.⁵³⁵

⁵³¹ Luxmore and Babiuch, *The Vatican and the Red Flag*, 149

⁵³² John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 199

⁵³³ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 199

⁵³⁴ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity: Personal Reflections*, (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005) 75

⁵³⁵ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 47, quoting Pope Paul VI, Solemn Profession of Faith (30 June 1968), 15

Mary played an important role in Wojtyła's personal devotion and in his pastoral ministry during the first four decades of his life. He saw Mary as Mother of the Church, and a protector of Poland, which can be said to follow the language of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Wojtyła also saw Mary as a model of loving support for others and as a part of the Church focused on Christ. This may be interpreted in the light of the *exemplar* model. However this chapter will argue that John Paul's ultimate Mario-ecclesiology was intended predominantly in the sense of the *genetrix* model, and the early years of Wojtyła appear to demonstrate this.

Wojtyła and the Second Vatican Council 1962-65

I had the particular fortune of being able to take part in the Council from the first day to the last... The Council contained something of Pentecost – it set the bishops of the world, and hence the whole Church, upon the paths that needed to be taken at the end of the second millennium... The Council was a unique occasion for listening to others, but also for creative thinking.⁵³⁶

Karol Wojtyła's experience at the Second Vatican Council would alter the way he considered Mary and the Church. It would give him the theological vocabulary to elucidate his Mario-ecclesial beliefs and the opportunity to share these beliefs with the rest of the Catholic Church. This section will demonstrate how this experience can be analysed using the Mario-ecclesial models of this thesis. It will draw on the conclusions of chapter 3, which suggested that the Mario-ecclesial views of the whole Council were influenced by the ecumenical tensions that the subject of Mary produced. It also suggested that the image of

⁵³⁶ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 157-58

Mary that the Council produced was consistent with the *exemplar* model and that this was the case because the *exemplar* model presented Mary as a part of the Church as opposed to a creator. This chapter will suggest that although Wojtyła accepted the decisions of the Council (because they were in part his own) he, like von Balthasar, perhaps had some personal reservations. By using the specific *exemplar* and *genetrix* models of this thesis, the differences between Wojtyła's own views and those of the Council can be highlighted more effectively than by using the more general language of "type" or by focussing on specific Marian titles (which, as the previous chapter showed, are open to multiple and sometimes conflicting theological interpretations).

The previous chapter outlined the process that culminated in the document *Lumen Gentium*, specifically the final chapter on the Blessed Virgin Mary. It was demonstrated that the various controversies surrounding the subject of Mary split the Council in different ways. Using the typological models of the thesis it was possible to see why the opposing sides were arguing for their particular interpretation of the Mario-ecclesial relationship to be set down as the word of the Council. Those that were seen as 'Mariologists' or 'maximalists', in that they were supportive of moves to increase the official veneration of Mary, were seen to have a sense of Mary as a type of the Church that resonated with the *genetrix* model. Those seen as 'Ecumenists' or 'minimalists', who impressed upon the debate the need to see Mary contained within the mystery of the Church and thus less ostentatiously venerated, saw Mary as a type of the Church more through the *exemplar* model.

Wojtyła at the Council

First as auxiliary bishop and vicar capitular, then as Archbishop of Krakow, Karol Wojtyła is to be counted amongst those who during the Council offered a unique contribution that was abundant in terms of quantity and particularly rich and many-faceted from the doctrinal perspective.⁵³⁷

This quote highlights two important aspects of Wojtyła's experience of the Council. Firstly it demonstrates his personal development, in that during the time the Council was in session he was appointed first auxiliary bishop and then Archbishop of Krakow. This meant that his status within the Council rose as the sessions progressed. Secondly Scola draws attention to Wojtyła's theological development during the period of the Council. The number and quality of Wojtyła's interventions marked him out as an erudite theological thinker within the Church, but also helped Wojtyła to elucidate his own theological understanding, particularly in the context of his Mariological and Mario-ecclesiological beliefs.

It is possible to identify Wojtyła's main Mariological concerns from three interventions made during the Council, one in each of the first three sessions. The *Acta Synodalia* of the Council records Wojtyła as making 22 interventions in total, 8 of which were classed as *Allocutiones* (speeches given in one of the General Congregations). The other interventions were classed as *Animadversiones scriptae* (written remarks). For Scola, these written interventions 'reveal a systematic and proactive attention to the conciliar

⁵³⁷ Scola, Angelo Cardinal, 'Retrieving the Tradition: The Interventions of Karol Wojtyła at the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: Exposition and Theological Interpretation' in *Communio, "Keeping the World Awake to God" The Challenge of Vatican II*, Vol XXXIX, No.1-2 (Spring-Summer 2012) pp.314-339: 314

proceedings'.⁵³⁸ They also lend credence to the argument that Wojtyła influenced, and was greatly influenced by, the Second Vatican Council. The three interventions of Wojtyła of interest here were all *Animadversiones scriptae*, although Scola suggests that the first of these is one of 'three of the 14 *Animadversiones scriptae* [which] can be considered practically as *Allocutiones* since they referred to General Congregations in which Wojtyła was slated to speak but was not able to or did not think that he had to take the podium'.⁵³⁹

The second intervention was part of an intervention from the Polish episcopate but can be identified as containing Wojtyła's thought on the Mario-ecclesial subject.⁵⁴⁰

During the final week of the first session of the Council, when Butler suggests there was 'an abortive attempt to submit a draft document on our Lady',⁵⁴¹ Bishop Wojtyła argued for the central role of Mary within the Church, noting 'that Most Blessed Mary is in the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, as it were the Mother of the Head and the Mother of all the members and cells of the Body'.⁵⁴² Scola recognises in Wojtyła's words 'an emphasis on the necessity of not sacrificing the importance of Mariology for an understanding of the mystery of the Church by relegating it to the end of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church'.⁵⁴³ Wojtyła states explicitly that 'therefore the fitting place, in which the doctrine of the Virgin Mother of God might be suited to the doctrine of the Church, seems to be after the first and before the second chapter of the

⁵³⁸ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 315, fn.1

⁵³⁹ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 316

⁵⁴⁰ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 316 Scola notes that Wojtyła was one of the bishops presenting the Polish intervention.

⁵⁴¹ Butler, *Theology of Vatican II*, 74

⁵⁴² *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970-78) vol.I pars.IV, 598 (Henceforth *Acta. Syn.*)

⁵⁴³ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 325

scheme'.⁵⁴⁴ For Wojtyła, Mary's motherhood 'constitutes an intimate articulation of the Mystical Body of Christ',⁵⁴⁵ which means that it is intrinsically linked to the maternal aspect of the Church. Scola interprets this phrase by suggesting that for Wojtyła,

the maternity of the Church thus constitutes an intimate juncture or "joint" of the Mystical Body of Christ, but it is also an appropriate gateway leading to the new people of God, since it is the archetype of its members.⁵⁴⁶

The relationship between Mary (and the Church represented by Mary as its type) on the one hand, and the people of the Church (or what Wojtyła referred to as the people of God) on the other, is central to Wojtyła's understanding of the Church. By understanding Mary's motherhood, one is able to comprehend the Church's motherhood through the typological relationship between Mary and the Church. Therefore, in Scola's view:

Wojtyła proposes having recourse to Mariology in order to achieve a profound connection between the idea of the Mystical Body of Christ, on which the mystery of the Church is centred, and the idea of the people of God, which expresses the whole dynamism thereof.⁵⁴⁷

Wojtyła thought that one should concentrate on the model of the Church as the people of God. For him all members of the Church, whether ordained or laity, were the people of God, and therefore 'the hierarchical Constitution of the Church presupposes the constitution of the people of God'.⁵⁴⁸ Thus the role of

⁵⁴⁴ *Acta. Syn.*, vol.III pars.II, 178

⁵⁴⁵ *Acta. Syn.*, Vol.I, pars IV, 599

⁵⁴⁶ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 325

⁵⁴⁷ Scola, 'Retrieving the Tradition', 324

⁵⁴⁸ *Acta. Syn.*, Vol. II, pars III, 154

Mary, specifically her motherhood of the people of God who constitute the Church as its primary model, is demonstrated to be central to Wojtyła's ecclesiological vision. Scola appears here to suggest that Wojtyła wished to highlight the difference between Mary as the Mother of the corporate Church and as the Mother of the individual members of the Church. In talking of the Church as people of God, Wojtyła was underlining, according to Scola, a contrast in the concept of Mary's motherhood. In the context of this thesis it would appear to highlight a contrast in two ways of interpreting the *genetrix* model, inasmuch as it suggests Mary as a mother in two distinct ways. Firstly as a mother of individuals, who brought her love and self-giving to her children, represented in Wojtyła's thinking by the 'people of God'. Secondly she was the abstract, ontological mother of the whole Church structure, represented as the 'Body of Christ'.

Marian involvement in the people of God could also suggest an aspect similar to that of the Marian dimension that John Paul would later discuss as primary in the Church structure. It is also reminiscent of von Balthasar's Marian Profile, which would develop following the Council and which was discussed in chapter 3, in that it saw Mary, or the principle that originated from Mary, as a fundamental part of the Church's structure.

As the Council went on, Wojtyła grew in confidence and in stature. 'By 1964 Wojtyła had become an important figure in his own right, when he [became] archbishop of his own diocese... his voice was now heard at the Council with attention'.⁵⁴⁹ Thus, when, during the debate on the Marian chapter of *De Ecclesia* on September 18th 1964, Wojtyła's intervention was read his words carried an authority far greater than they would have done just two years

⁵⁴⁹ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 41-42

previously. This intervention on the positioning of the Marian chapter in *De Ecclesia* therefore should be read as the best source of Wojtyła's sense of Mary as a type of the Church at the Council.

Wojtyła believed that Mary was an important aspect of any ecclesiological discussion. For him, the content of chapter 8 went some way to demonstrating this. However, he argued,

since that chapter is the last in the scheme, the doctrine contained in it seems more added-on than put together from the doctrine of the whole scheme, it appears more as some corollary than as a part of it.

And this seems to be neither right nor in keeping with its object.⁵⁵⁰

Wojtyła was concerned that the role of Mary would be diminished by the Council if they only considered it at the end of the document about the Church: 'for the appropriate function of the Virgin Mother of God consists in building the mystical Body of Christ just as earlier it consisted in producing his physical Body. One cannot be without the other'.⁵⁵¹ From these words it is clear that Wojtyła saw Mary as a type of the Church in a way consistent with a reading of the *genetrix* model, that is, he saw Mary as formatively involved in the Church as its mother. By reading his intervention through the lens of the *genetrix* model it is possible to see that Wojtyła's Mario-ecclesiology was at least partially different from what ultimately was produced in the document, which was identified in chapter 3 as being more consistent with the *exemplar* model. Later in his intervention, Wojtyła

⁵⁵⁰ *Acta. Syn.*, vol.III pars.II, 178

⁵⁵¹ *Acta. Syn.*, vol.III pars.II, 178

expressed his understanding of the Mario-ecclesial relationship in language even more reminiscent of the *genetrix* model:

Mary, in giving birth to the Son of God, gave a beginning to the works of Redemption and Salvation carried out by her Son. For at the same time she participated most fully as a Mother in the deeds of her Son and in the works carried out by Him.⁵⁵²

It is through Mary's *fiat* and then through the birth of Christ that the plan for salvation came about and therefore through Mary that the people of God, the Church, was brought into being. In appealing for a better position for the Marian chapter within *De Ecclesia*, Wojtyła explicitly connected the salvific acts of God to the Church through Mary; this is similar to a view expressed in his intervention in the first session:

The saving will of God, which is manifest in the mission of the son, was related to no other creature in such a way as it was to the Mother of God. For from this arises her relation to the church, for this continues the works of Redemption and Salvation carried out by Christ into the generations – and it permanently demonstrates to men the saving will of God itself.⁵⁵³

For Wojtyła, the Church continues the work of Christ that began with Mary. This work involves broadcasting the saving will of God to every member of the people of God. As Buttiglione notes: 'the human person is the point on which the Church and world converge, and the mission of the Church toward the world

⁵⁵² *Acta. Syn.*, vol.III pars.II, 178

⁵⁵³ *Acta. Syn.*, Vol.III pars.II, 179

consists above all in helping it to attain that integral truth about man'.⁵⁵⁴ It is possible to read into his theology that for Wojtyła, Mary is the one human person through whom God in Jesus Christ works out his salvation for all human people.

The truth, the news of God's saving will, was discussed by Wojtyła in a further intervention in the fourth session. In a discussion of the constitution *Gaudium et Spes* (The Role of the Church in the Modern World), Wojtyła commented on the section entitled 'The Dignity of the Human Person'. He noted that for the Church: 'all pastoral care... intends for the human person, because of his integral vocation, to know and concretely express the truth in every relation: with himself, with other persons, and with the world'.⁵⁵⁵ Here the truth of God's saving will generated from the actions of Mary was combined with the dignity of each individual person of God, and their duty to spread this truth to *every one* of the people of God. Wojtyła's Mario-ecclesiology is linked in this way to the political and social teachings of John Paul II in the 1980's and 1990's respectively, which will be seen below. This is because, as mentioned above, Mary continues to assist the faithful in the spreading of the truth, what would come to be known as the 'Gospel of Life', through her compassion and love for all of the Church.

During the Council Wojtyła developed in stature, in reputation and in his own theological understanding of the Church. The centrality of the Mario-ecclesial relationship to his ecclesiological view can be demonstrated in the interventions he made that underlined the importance of Mary within any discussion of the

⁵⁵⁴ Buttiglione, Rocco, *Karol Wojtyła: The Thought of the Man who Became Pope John Paul II*, (trans Guietti, Paolo and Murphy, Francesca, Cambridge, William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997) 194

⁵⁵⁵ *Acta. Syn.*, Vol. IV, pars II, 660

Church and its role in the world. These interventions also demonstrated his desire to interpret Mary's motherhood in ways which stress her personal, not just ontological, relationship to the church. In addressing the ecumenical and reforming concerns of the Council itself, Wojtyła turned, as he had done as a younger man, to Mary. Yet where he had previously turned to her in a personal and devotional sense, Wojtyła's experiences at the Council led him to consider her in the role of *Mater Ecclesiae* in a theological sense. Wojtyła's understanding of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model can be seen to have developed considerably during the Council, with the intervention of September 18th 1964 performing a consolidating role for his thoughts. His emphasis on the Church as the 'people of God', read as one interpretation of the *genetrix* model as suggested in talking about Scola above, saw him understand Mary as the mother of all members of the Church as well as the mother of the Church itself. It is the contention here, therefore, that despite the positivity that Wojtyła felt towards the Council and its declarations, where the Council saw Mary in terms of the *exemplar* model, Wojtyła saw her very much in terms of the *genetrix* model. John Paul II's Mario-ecclesiology would further demonstrate this, and the following sections of this chapter will outline this theology.

Following the Council, Wojtyła drew on his experiences to write a retrospective analysis on his time as a Council Father. In doing so he outlined his own Mariological thought in a way that can be analysed using the typological models of this thesis.

The mysterious union of motherhood and virginity, which Vatican II sees as the basis of the resemblance between Our Lady and the

Church, profoundly penetrates the historical and eschatological consciousness of the Church... it is in [Mary] alone that the Church sees the fulfilment of that for which it was prepared by the Bridegroom and Redeemer... Mary's role as a Mother and Bride makes her an archetype of the Church and, by the same token, of the People of God.⁵⁵⁶

This extract underlines Wojtyła's basic retrospective overview of what the Council had to say about Mary. In referring to the eschatological consciousness of the Church, Wojtyła demonstrates that the Council saw in Mary certain elements of the *genetrix* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. However in using the phrase 'people of God' Wojtyła identifies the Council's understanding of the *exemplar* model. In essence, Mary is a type of the Church for the people within it, as well as for the Church itself. The idea of the Church as the people of God will be referred to again below, as it was Wojtyła who introduced that concept into the vocabulary of the Council.

Having established in the previous chapter that the Council's declaration on Mary resonated more with the *exemplar* model, it is possible to see passages from *Sources of Renewal* how Wojtyła's personal Mario-ecclesial understanding was potentially more rooted in the *genetrix* model. Firstly the idea that in Mary alone is the ultimate eschatological fulfilment of the Church to be found. As a concept this was discussed by von Balthasar in the previous chapter, and Wojtyła (and later John Paul) also sees the eschatological significance of Mary, alluded to by the Council, as a central aspect to his Mario-ecclesiology. It is also important here that Wojtyła underlines that it is through Mary *alone* that this

⁵⁵⁶ Wojtyła, Cardinal Karol, *Sources of Renewal: The Implementation of the Second Vatican Council*, (London, Collins, 1980[1979] trans. P.S.Falla), 198-99

fulfilment is foreshadowed. This is an addition he brings to the Council's declaration. Compare for example the statement of the Council in *Lumen Gentium* 68 that Mary 'is the image and beginning of the Church as it is to be perfected in the world to come... she [is] a sign of certain hope and comfort to the pilgrim People of God'. For Wojtyła: 'it is in Mary that we see revealed in all its fullness the way that leads to Christ'.⁵⁵⁷ By adding 'fullness' to the sentence, Wojtyła demonstrates the importance of Mary's position in heaven. In the context of the Council's statement, the language is toned down: Mary is the hope and comfort of the Church; she is a sign or an image. For Wojtyła, she is alone the *fullness* of the Church's victory in heaven. The pilgrim Church, the People of God, follow her to fulfilment.

Another aspect of Wojtyła's interpretation of the Council that exemplifies his sense of Mary as a type of the Church more in the *genetrix* model comes in his analysis of *Lumen Gentium* 56, which reads: 'the Mother of Jesus, who gave to the world the Life that renews all things'. Wojtyła understands this passage through the lens of someone looking to possibly 'maximise' the Marian devotion of the text:

This passage underlines the aspect of "contribution", the fact that Mary not only contributed to life but first of all gave her assent in doing so. In this way the Mother of Christ belongs to the content of our faith and is connected in a special way with the consciousness of redemption.⁵⁵⁸

The phrase 'contributed to life' in this passage underlines Wojtyła's understanding of Mary that, read through the lens of the *genetrix* model, sees

⁵⁵⁷ Wojtyła, *Sources of Renewal*, 199

⁵⁵⁸ Wojtyła, *Sources of Renewal*, 103

Mary as fundamentally involved in the formation of Christ's Church. Wojtyła does not forget that Mary is rooted in the Christological reality of that Church, but she is involved, through her assent, in the 'consciousness of redemption' that continues its work through the Church. Reading this through the lens of the *genetrix* model, it is possible to see the nuances of Wojtyła's Mario-ecclesial vision, and how it differs slightly from the Council's view. It is possible to see the parallels with the slight differences seen in von Balthasar's Mario-ecclesial reaction to the Council, as outlined in chapter 3.

This brief analysis serves to demonstrate that, by reading through the lens of the typological models of this thesis, the Mario-ecclesiology of Wojtyła/John Paul was slightly more rooted in a *genetrix* model reading than the Council's was.

Wojtyła after the Council: Gratitude and Implementation

The Second Vatican Council was a great gift to the Church, to all those who took part in it, to the entire human family, and to each of us individually... [It] is linked to a new era in the history of humanity and in the history of the Church.⁵⁵⁹

As pope, John Paul II looked back at the Council as a watershed moment for himself and for the whole Church. In his first encyclical letter *Redemptoris Hominis*, the Pope mentions the Council 90 times, setting out his vision for his pontificate through the lens of the Council teachings. In his first *Urbi et Orbi* message as Pope, on October 17th 1978, he states: 'First of all, we wish to point out the unceasing importance of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, and

⁵⁵⁹ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 157-160

we accept the definite duty of assiduously bringing it into affect'.⁵⁶⁰ Jaroslaw Kupczak identifies this duty as a key aspect of John Paul's papacy:

He always speaks of it in the most elevated terms, e.g., as the new Pentecost, the event of the Holy Spirit, etc. His relation to Vatican II can be expressed in two terms: gratitude and implementation. The earliest speeches and homilies of the newly elected pope reveal that from the beginning he had a clear awareness that the primary goal of his pontificate would consist in the implementation of Vatican II.⁵⁶¹

The message that John Paul gave was clear: Vatican II had been a major positive force in Catholic history; his own presence at the event filled him with gratitude. However he knew that his responsibility as pope now meant that it was his responsibility to implement the Council correctly. How did this affect the sense in which he saw Mary as a type of the Church? Buttiglione notes that:

Wojtyła understood from the beginning that the problem of the Council was eminently cultural and he took care before starting the concrete pastoral implementation, to achieve a unitary grasp of the conciliar event and of the tasks which were the result of it.⁵⁶²

Of the post-conciliar projects and differences of interpretation, Wojtyła, and then John Paul, was most associated with the *Communio* movement which gave its name to the journal started by, amongst others, von Balthasar. Tracy Rowland describes the *Communio* project as one that is guided by the post-conciliar interpretation of John Paul II:

⁵⁶⁰ John Paul II, *First Radio Message "Urbi et Orbi"* (17th October 1978) from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1978/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19781017_primo-radiomessaggio_en.html, accessed 06/08/2013

⁵⁶¹ Kupczak, Jaroslaw, 'John Paul II's Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council', in *Communio*, "Keeping the World Awake to God" Volume 39.1/2 (Spring 2012) pp.152-168: 158

⁵⁶² Buttiglione, *Karol Wojtyła*, 200

The project is thus one of working within the broad contours of John Paul II's interpretation of the Council to develop the Church's intellectual resources for understanding such problems as modernity, post-modernity, the culture of death and the meaning of masculinity and femininity.⁵⁶³

John Paul's concerns with the latter two of these problems will be seen below.

In talking of Mary, John Paul utilised the language of the Council consistently throughout his pontificate, in encyclical letters, homilies and throughout his Wednesday sessions on Mary in the mid 1990's that helped him to define his Mariology in a concrete manner. These more personal addresses will underline, through their similarities to the Mariology present in John Paul's more official writings, such as the encyclical letters, that a consistent Mario-ecclesiology was present in all of John Paul's documents. They also demonstrate John Paul's depth of input into the encyclical letters that carried his name. Kupczak notes that 'dozens of thousands of pages of Pope John Paul II's teaching can serve as an authoritative commentary on the conciliar documents'.⁵⁶⁴ In particular Kupczak argues that for John Paul: 'An extraordinary Marian tone actually marked the Council from its induction'.⁵⁶⁵ Throughout his papacy he maintained the authenticity and aptness of the decisions of the Council, noting that: 'even if it avoided using the title "Mother of the Church", the text of *Lumen gentium* clearly underscores the Church's veneration for Mary as a most loving Mother'.⁵⁶⁶ As a result: 'they have afforded the faith and devotion of the Christian people a more complete and balanced

⁵⁶³ Rowland, Tracy, 'Reclaiming the tradition: 'John Paul II as the Authentic Interpreter of Vatican II' in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.27-48: 42

⁵⁶⁴ Kupczak, 'John Paul II's Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council', 159

⁵⁶⁵ John Paul II, 'Council's Teaching on Mary', 1, 13/12/1995, from

<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm9.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

⁵⁶⁶ John Paul II, Council's Teaching on Mary', 4

presentation of the marvellous identity of the Lord's Mother and of her exceptional role in the work of Redemption'.⁵⁶⁷

Despite the Council being reluctant to separate the discussion of Mary from the schema on the Church, John Paul read into their decisions a desire to see Mary properly venerated. Chapter 3 suggested that in fact Mary was 'minimised' in order to allow ecumenical discussions with non-Catholic Christians to go ahead without the tension that Mary created at the forefront. It was also suggested that the title *Mediatrix* was given to Mary as part of the Litany of Loreto and therefore was hewn of its theological context; and that *Mater ecclesiae* was applied to her only through the personal whim of Paul VI as a sign of personal devotion. Neither of these outlined, it was suggested, a Marian role in redemption beyond her bearing of Christ in the Incarnation.

Despite the Council *not* promulgating a title on Mary doctrinally, John Paul still uses the title in his official documents. They appear within his encyclicals, homilies and speeches. His response to his election in 1978 was to accept: 'with obedience in faith to Christ, my Lord, and with trust in the Mother of Christ and of the Church'.⁵⁶⁸ John Paul saw Mary as a mother of the Church. In the following section of the chapter, it will be demonstrated using the typological models of this thesis that the rhetoric used by the Pope in talking about Mary was similar to that used by the 'maximalists' of the Council. In other words, John Paul saw Mary as a type of the Church more in the sense of the *genetrix* model. This contrasts with the declarations of the Council which were suggested to be more in the sense of the *exemplar* model. John Paul's outward dedication to the Council had not deterred his spiritual devotion to Mary. His reading of Mary as a

⁵⁶⁷ John Paul II, Council's Teaching on Mary', 4

⁵⁶⁸ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Hominis*, 2

type of the Church as more reminiscent of the *genetrix* model ultimately would cause his Mario-ecclesiology to be slightly removed from that of the Council. This would be similar to the Mario-ecclesiology of von Balthasar, but because John Paul was far less critical of the Council than von Balthasar, his variation from the Council's declarations on Mary can only be illuminated using the theological models of *genetrix* and *exemplar*.

John Cornwell alludes to John Paul having a similarly different approach to the role of the pope: 'Few suspected the extent to which he would disappoint the progressive side of the growing Church divide; few suspected how this man... would assume absolutist, centrist papal authority'.⁵⁶⁹ This thesis is not suggesting that John Paul applied his own Mariology to the official teaching of the Church in an absolutist sense. Rather as the chapter progresses it is perhaps worth bearing in mind that when John Paul praised the work of the Council in declarations about Mary, his own Mario-ecclesial image was slightly different. It has been possible to see this subtle difference by considering the contrasting Mario-ecclesial views through the lens of the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models. The chapter will now consider in turn the two different ways in which John Paul understood Mary as a type of the Church. It will be demonstrated that John Paul had an overall eschatological conception to his Mario-ecclesiology later in the chapter, but that the Mario-ecclesiology itself was subtly different in the 1980's and the 1990's.

John Paul II and Communism: 1978-1989

This section will consider the Mario-ecclesiology of John Paul II for the first decade of his pontificate. His time as pope has been split in half because the

⁵⁶⁹ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 62

main focus of John Paul changed following the events of 1989. With this change in his general focus, it will be argued that there was also a change in John Paul's Mario-ecclesial focus. That change in focus, and the consequences for John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology, will be considered in the next section. Firstly it is necessary to consider the focus on John Paul on the Communist government in his native Poland during the 1980's and the role that Mary played in John Paul's polemic against that rule. It will be demonstrated that once again, Mary was utilised in a socio-political sense.

Mary and Poland

In this chapter the relationship between Mary and the people of Poland has been outlined. The isolation from the Church in Rome during the nineteenth century, coupled with an increase in Marian visions and the level of devotion to Mary through the same period all across Europe, led the Polish people to have a very specific relationship with the Mother of Christ. As a result she began to be known as the 'Queen of Poland', guiding and protecting the people and the Polish nation itself.

Mary, the Queen of Poland, has been offered to the faithful as a model for conceptualizing the feminine within the nation, a model that is flexible enough to endure because it rests on a basic dichotomy: on the one hand, Mary is a powerful, sometimes militant protector of Poland; on the other hand, she is an exemplar of feminine domesticity. She guides the nation to victory even as she demonstrates how to sustain the national hearth and home.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁷⁰ Porter-Szucs, Brian, *Faith and Fatherland: Catholicism, Modernity and Poland*, (Oxford, University Press, 2011) 361

This excerpt neatly encapsulates two possible ways of understanding Mary as a Queen of Poland. The question about Mary as a model for the feminine will be considered in the next section, but here the use of language that is similar to that employed by the typological models of this thesis is useful. This language helps to encapsulate the different visions of Mary that people tend to have in Mario-ecclesial discussions, and is why the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models are useful in adding depth to these discussions. This excerpt also helps to answer the question ‘in what sense do the Polish people see Mary as a type of the Church?’ In the context of this thesis they see her in the sense of *both models at the same time*. This dichotomy, a combination of popular tradition regarding visions of Mary and the personal devotion of the Polish people *towards* Mary (as seen with Karol Wojtyła), enables them to see Mary as national and personal protector. For Wojtyła, this dichotomy would allow him to see Mary both as an individual exemplar for the people of Poland, and as a model of a Marian ideology that could replace that of the Communist regime.

John Paul II, Mary and Poland

Mary was at the centre of John Paul’s spiritual life. As he entered the papacy, he reported that it was her example that he followed.

It was to Christ the Redeemer that my feelings and my thoughts were directed on 16 October of last year when, after the Canonical election, I was asked “Do you accept?” I then replied: “With obedience in faith to Christ my Lord, and with trust in the Mother of Christ and of the Church, in spite of the great difficulties, I accept.⁵⁷¹

⁵⁷¹ John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis*, 204/03/1979 from www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0218/_P3.HTM, accessed 25/01/10

This passage from the very beginning of his first Encyclical: *Redemptoris Hominis* can be said to represent something of a declaration of faith from the Pope. Just as Mary herself knew that her vocation, accepted without hesitation at the Annunciation, was to be difficult without knowing explicitly of the events of the Passion, so, although John Paul did not explicitly know of the events to come in Poland, he was aware that the time to come was to be a very personal trial. In that one statement can be seen faith in Christ the redeemer as well as in the woman who is Mother of both Christ and the Church. The willingness to obey, as Mary did, the command of God, despite the challenges it would bring, can be clearly seen in this early Papal statement. The sense of trepidation can be seen in words from one of his first homilies: ‘While I am frightened by what I am for you, I am consoled by what I am with you. For you, in fact, I am a bishop, with you I am a Christian’.⁵⁷²

In June of 1979, John Paul II embarked on his second ‘Apostolic Voyage’⁵⁷³ to a foreign country. While his first had been to Mexico for the conference of Latin bishops, this second foreign trip was actually a return home for the new Pope. On June 2nd, in front of hundreds of thousands of people in Victory Square in Warsaw, John Paul told his gathered countrymen that ‘without Christ it is impossible to understand the history of Poland... Christ will not cease to be for us an open book of life for the future, for our Polish future’.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁷² John Paul II, *Homily at the Eucharistic Celebration in the Parish of St Anne in the Vatican*, 10/12/1978. ‘Ubi me terret quod vobis sum, ibi me consolatur quod vobiscum sum. Vobis enim sum episcopus, vobiscum sum christianus.’ – From Augustine, *Sermo 340* Latin and translation from www.vatican.va 25/01/10 *Sum christianus/ christianus eimi* was also the confession of the martyrs before their Roman accusers in the first century of the Church.

⁵⁷³ http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/documentazione/documents/santopadre.biografie/giovanni_paolo_ii.biografia.pontificato_en.html for John Paul’s Papal biography. Apostolic Voyage refers to foreign trips

⁵⁷⁴ John Paul II, *Homily: Mass in Victory Square, Warsaw*, (02/06/1979), from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1979/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_19790602_polonia-varsavia_en.html

His nine day pilgrimage, timed to coincide with the 900th anniversary of the death of St Stanislaw, was in many ways a statement of intent, and his message given at the opening mass of the pilgrimage was one of hope and support to his Polish brethren. The beginning of his role as leader of the Catholic Church had not, it appeared, diminished in any way his lifelong love for his country and his attempts to undermine the Communist regime in Poland. It has been seen above that he worked hard to maintain Christian values despite the opposition of the ruling regime, by use of personal contact with families and the spread of family morals and values through the teachings of the Church at a ground level. Now though, he was able to attempt to effect a change from the very top of the Church hierarchy. As leader he could rally millions to the cause of freeing Poland from the grip of Communism. His appearances alone would go a long way to securing that support.

He made return visits to the country in June of 1983 and 1987, and met with the leaders of the Polish workers union *Solidarność* (Solidarity) including Lech Wałęsa on January 15th 1981. His continued involvement with his homeland, not just through the eighties but regularly throughout his pontificate⁵⁷⁵, and his relationship with the *Solidarity* movement itself, would be a major factor of his time as Pope. As John Paul noted years later, Poland was also in his heart from the moment he became Pope, and it would remain a source of inspiration for him: ‘Everything I said in the encyclical *Redemptor Hominis* I brought with me from Poland’.⁵⁷⁶

The relationship between John Paul, Poland and Mary was both a personal, spiritual one, and a source of guidance for John Paul in his political

⁵⁷⁵ He would visit eight times between 1979 and 2002.

⁵⁷⁶ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 5

considerations as Pope. However the importance of this relationship was to be increased by an assassination attempt on the new Pope.

On May 13th 1981, while being driven through St Peter's square in his 'pope-mobile' to begin a service, John Paul was shot by Turkish 'hitman'⁵⁷⁷ Mehmet Ali Agca from a distance of nine feet. He was hit by two bullets: one passed through his abdomen, the other grazed his elbow as he fell. John Paul spent four days and nights in intensive care, but the bullet had missed all vital organs, and so, despite four months spent in and out of hospital with various complications, by the end of the year John Paul was back at work, albeit with a slightly reduced work load. There have been many questions about the shooting, most obviously Agca's intentions and his motivations. Given that he was found with the phone number of the local Bulgarian embassy on him and with an escape supposedly planned by the Bulgarians, the involvement of Bulgarian agents working for the Soviet KGB in Moscow was frequently mooted by Western European media. 'Having blamed the Pope for events in Poland, communist leaders would have shed few tears for him; but evidence of Soviet and Bulgarian responsibility was sketchy... If communist agents were involved at all, they had uncharacteristically botched the job.'⁵⁷⁸

Of more immediate and personal interest to the Pope, however, was the question of just how Agca managed not to kill the Pope from such a close position.⁵⁷⁹ As John Cornwell notes, there were many theories abounding, including one where:

⁵⁷⁷ John Cornwell describes him as 'mentally disturbed but nonetheless effective.' *Pope in Winter 84*

⁵⁷⁸ Luxmore and Babiuch, *The Vatican and The Red Flag*, 234

⁵⁷⁹ This fact was used both towards the theory that Agca was in fact a patsy for the event, as alluded to immediately above, but also to suggest that he was just a disturbed man working to his own personal agenda.

A nun saw Agca raising the pistol and pulled his jacket, disturbing his arm. Another has it that at the moment of the first shot John Paul leaned down to kiss a girl who was wearing a badge of Our Lady of Fatima. The date, 13 May, was the Feast of Our Lady of Fatima.⁵⁸⁰

For John Paul himself the role of Mary was vital, but also foreseen. The ‘third secret’ of Fatima, seemingly revealed (after the event) that the pope would be targeted in an assassination attempt, and John Paul read in this that Mary herself had predicted the event some 60 years earlier, and was in fact involved in the missing of the bullet. When asked later, John Paul noted that ‘Agca knew how to shoot, and he certainly shot to kill. Yet it was as if someone was guiding and deflecting that bullet’.⁵⁸¹ Having returned to St Peters some five months after the event he told the gathered pilgrims that

Again, I have become indebted to the Blessed Virgin and to all the Patron Saints. Could I forget that the event in Saint Peters Square took place on the day and at the hour when the first appearance of the Mother of Christ to the poor little peasants has been remembered for over 60 years at Fatima in Portugal? For, in everything that happened to me on that very day, I felt that extraordinary motherly protection and care, which turned out to be stronger than the deadly bullet.⁵⁸²

John Paul’s close links with Poland had made him a target. His relationship with Mary, as far as he was concerned, protected him from such threats. This is a specific understanding of Mary as a personal protector, one that came from an

⁵⁸⁰ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 85

⁵⁸¹ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 179

⁵⁸² John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 184

individual devotion to the Mother of God. On its own, it does not represent a Mario-ecclesial model of Mary. However it renewed and invigorated within John Paul a sense that Mary would continue to protect the people of Poland alongside himself. For Wojtyła, she was ‘Mary, Queen of Poland, “[working] for all those for whom truth has become strength” – the truth that triumphed over lies’.⁵⁸³ For Cornwell: ‘John Paul gazed upon the world and history in terms of faith: his sense of Poland’s history, and his own destiny, was imbued with the Marian traditions of protection and intervention’.⁵⁸⁴ It is in this light that one can analyse the role that Mary played for John Paul II in the collapse of the Communist regime, and the role that he saw for her in the future. This role would see her as a type of the Church very consistently in the sense of the *genetrix* model.

Mary as the genetrix of a new Poland

This section will outline how John Paul linked Mary and Poland in his Mario-ecclesiology. It will demonstrate that John Paul took the *genetrix* model as exemplified by von Balthasar’s Marian Profile and applied it not only to the concept of Mary as the mother of the Church, but also the concept of Mary as mother of the Polish Church and therefore a new Polish nation.

The inter-dependence of Mary, Poland and the Church that had developed and grown throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in popular thought became even closer in the thinking of John Paul in the 1980’s. As a Pole, the young Wojtyła took with him into the Holy See, the devotion of his nation to Mary:

⁵⁸³ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 610, from John Paul II; *Truth has Triumphed*, Krakow, 02/04/1990
⁵⁸⁴ Cornwell, *Pope in Winter*, 99

When I inherited the ministry of Peter in Rome, more than anything else, it was this experience and devotion to Mary in my native land which I carried with me... Mary's participation in the victory of Christ became clear to me above all from the experience of my people.⁵⁸⁵

But his position as Pope, and his new universal viewpoint, caused John Paul to believe even more that the victory of his homeland could be shared amongst the whole Church: 'On this universal level, if victory comes it will be brought by Mary. Christ will conquer through her, because He wants the Church's victories now and in the future to be linked to her'.⁵⁸⁶ As a Pole, John Paul believed that the 'Queen of Poland' would bring the Church to victory in heaven through Christ. The eschatological relevance of this will be discussed below, but he believed that she was also involved with the people at that very moment, not just as a guarantor of their future. 'Her maternal concern extends to the personal and social aspects of people's life on earth',⁵⁸⁷ and as such John Paul saw Mary as directly involved in the events that occurred in the 1980's and the subsequent fall of Communism in his home country. He saw Mary as involved on both the personal level and as mother of the entire Polish Church.

The image of Mary that John Paul cultivated at this time, the image of the Queen of Poland protecting her country and guiding it to a freedom not known for more than half a century, suggests a sense of Mary as a type of the Church very much along the lines of the *genetrix* model: that is, in bringing about the Church Mary in some way mediates God's salvation in his church – and, by extension, to the people of Poland as a whole. This came about for John Paul

⁵⁸⁵ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 220

⁵⁸⁶ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 221

⁵⁸⁷ John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 49, (30/12/1987), From www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0223/_P8.HTM accessed 16/08/10

because he saw Mary as a fundamental part of the type of Poland that he envisioned as emerging after Communism. Mary was a part of the ‘Gospel of Life’ that the Church offered, and the people of Poland, as the people of God that made up the Church were protected and guided by Mary’s motherhood of them. Poland’s future was with the Church, and Mary was the mother of that Church. As mother of both Poland and the Church, Mary was the perfect guide for the Polish people. For John Paul, it would firstly be the Virgin who would assist the Polish people in ‘this difficult moment of the modern world, and the efforts that are being made and will be made, often with great suffering, in order to contribute to the true development of peoples’.⁵⁸⁸ Following this, it would be a Marian model of the Church that would take the newly liberated Polish nation forward and would solve the ills of:

social situations and the international crisis itself, in their worrying aspects or poverty, unemployment, shortage of food, the arms race, contempt for human rights, and situations or dangers of conflict, partial or total. In a filial spirit we wish to place all this before her “eyes of mercy”, repeating once more with faith and hope the ancient antiphon: “Holy Mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us always from all dangers, O glorious and blessed Virgin”.⁵⁸⁹

For John Paul it was important for the Church to remember this centrality of Mary:

The Church is called not only to remember everything that testifies to the special maternal cooperation of the Mother of God in the work of

⁵⁸⁸ John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 49

⁵⁸⁹ John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 49

salvation in Christ the Lord, but also, on her own part, to prepare for the future paths of cooperation. For the end of the second Christian Millennium opens up as a new prospect.⁵⁹⁰

This language is reminiscent of the Marian title of *co-redemptrix*, discussed in Chapter 1 and linked to an idea of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. This is because it attributes to Mary a cooperative role in the plan for salvation that Christ initiates. In 1986, addressing the Bishop of Lyon, John Paul made mention of Irenaeus and the specific role that the second century theologian attributed to Mary:

The Christocentrism of the bishop of Lyon drives him to develop a theology of the “recapitulation” of all things in Christ... Irenaeus considers even the unique role of Mary which is ordered in the mystery of Christ, compared with the disobedient Eve, of whom she is an advocate.⁵⁹¹

In outlining Mary's role as central to salvation, John Paul highlighted for his readers or listeners the role that Mary played *for them*.

Mary, as the Queen of Poland, was the one who ‘uttered the first words of the New Covenant’,⁵⁹² and therefore was formative in the original Church through her *fiat*. For John Paul, this formative involvement clarifies his Mario-ecclesiology in this context. He refers both to von Balthasar and to the Second

⁵⁹⁰ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 49

⁵⁹¹ John Paul II, *Discours du Saint-Père au corps académique de l'université Catholique, Lyon (France,)* (07/10/1986), 6, from

www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paulii/speeches/1986/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19861007_universita-lione-francia_fr.html, accessed 10/06/10: ‘Le christocentrisme de L'Évêque de Lyon pousse à développer une théologie de la “recapitulation” de toutes choses dans le Christ... Irénée considère même le rôle unique de Marie ordonné au mystère du Christ: compare à Ève désobéissante, dont elle est l'avocate.’

⁵⁹² John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 1

Vatican Council when he speaks of Mary as she who ‘precedes everyone on the path to holiness; in her person “the Church has already reached that perfection whereby she exists without spot or wrinkle”. In this sense, one can say that the Church is *both* “Marian” and “Apostolic Petrine”⁵⁹³. This represents the eschatological aspect of John Paul’s Mario-ecclesiology that I will argue below was a focus of his general Mario-ecclesial understanding. Mary, having through her Assumption already passed into heaven and having been crowned as Queen of heaven, through her role in the Incarnation and therefore the plan for salvation, *is* the new Church in heaven. Because of this the Church knows that it is saved and that Mary represents it in its saved state.

Having outlined some of the connections between Mary and the Polish people that John Paul put forward in the 1980’s, I will now suggest that he used a similar understanding of the *genetrix* model to von Balthasar in order to demonstrate the role of Mary to the Polish. However I will suggest that his understanding of the model extended von Balthasar’s ideas of Mary as an abstract *genetrix* model of the Church so that she became a more personal model of the new Polish nation.

John Paul utilises von Balthasar’s language of ‘Profiles’ in the Church, as well as the concept of the Marian Profile being fundamental within the structure of the Church. In 1987 he spoke of the subject to the Roman Curia:

This Marian profile is also – even perhaps more so – fundamental and characteristic for the Church as is the apostolic and Petrine profile to which it is profoundly united... The Church lives in this

⁵⁹³ John Paul II, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, 27, (15/08/1988), from [www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_15081988_mulieris-dignitatem_en.html 16/08/10](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_15081988_mulieris-dignitatem_en.html), accessed 23/08/2013, quoting *Lumen Gentium* 63 (in itself quoting Ephesians 5.27) and von Balthasar *New Elucidations*, 196

authentic “Marian profile”, this “Marian dimension”... Mary... precedes all others, including obviously Peter himself and the Apostles... The link between the two profiles of the Church, the Marian and the Petrine is profound and complementary.⁵⁹⁴

John Paul’s Marian Profile of the Church appears here to be very similar to that of von Balthasar, to the point where the pope quotes von Balthasar’s *New Elucidations* within the same address to the Curia. Brenda Leahy suggests that ‘Future years may credit [John Paul] with having directed our attention to a rediscovery and a new appreciation of the Marian dimension as a key aspect of the Church’.⁵⁹⁵ This might seem odd, bearing in mind that Brendan Leahy is also the author of *The Marian Profile*, which outlines how von Balthasar sets out the concept of the Marian profile before John Paul himself. However, the hyperbole of his suggestion might be explained by its context – that is, a book aimed at promoting the legacy of John Paul. However, the argument of this thesis also gives some support to Leahy’s suggestion: viewing the Mario-ecclesiologies of von Balthasar and John Paul respectively through the lens of our two models highlights the differences between the two and gives some weight to the idea that John Paul’s Mario-ecclesiology is unique and not simply a repetition of von Balthasar. In particular, although John Paul may have utilised that language of Profile that von Balthasar originally promoted, the Pope utilised it specifically with an eye on the real world and the political realities that he faced. John Paul saw the Marian dimension, as he put it, as continuing to create and produce new life in Christ’s name within the Church. In the case of Poland

⁵⁹⁴ John Paul II, *Address to Cardinals and the Roman Curia*, 22/12/1987, in Italian at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1987/december/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19871222_curia-romana_it.html, accessed 06/08/2013, translation from Leahy, ‘Totus Tuus’, 84

⁵⁹⁵ Leahy, ‘Totus Tuus’ 84

John Paul believed that the Marian dimension would create a new model of the Polish nation shaped around the Marian ideology.

John Paul had used Mary in a politically delicate situation. For him, Mary, as a type of the Church, became the archetype of a new Poland as well as the protector of the current oppressed state. A very specific series of events, spanning back two centuries, had led to this situation whereby Mary was seen as an almost militant protector of Poland. Mary, as 'Queen of Poland', became a symbol for new birth and for a new way of life without the oppressive ideology of Communism. John Paul's Marian language almost became a propaganda tool, designed to unite the Polish people more closely under a banner to which they already owed some allegiance. As a formative part of the new Poland, Mary was seen as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model: that is, John Paul saw Mary not just as an example of appropriate behaviour under trial, but staked his faith in her actually bring a new Poland about. It is by looking at how John Paul used Mary through the lens of this model that one is able to identify John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology. However the typological models will also be of use in helping to identify exactly how John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology developed *after* the fall of the Communist regime in Poland in 1989.

John Paul and Catholic Social Teaching: The Culture of Death: 1989-2005

The Self and the Other

In order to understand why John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology changed focus in the 1990's, it is important to understand that John Paul disagreed with the prevalent ideologies of the time, Communism and then Liberalism, because, in his view, neither ideology focused correctly on the individual. John Paul had developed an understanding of the person that focused on the relationship of the individual

'I' to the 'other'. Individuals are interdependent and therefore cannot exist independently. It is the 'other' that determines and defines the 'I'.

Wojtyła developed this concept of human relationships from a combination of sources: phenomenology, Thomistic Personalism, and the mysticism of St John of the Cross. This latter thinker also contributed to Wojtyła's concept of the *divine-human* relationship. For example, Buttiglione argues that for Wojtyła

St. John's phenomenology of mystical experience takes man towards the irreducible core of the person, and shows the necessity of transcending this core toward the truth who is God himself, by responding to the initiative of God toward human beings. This divine initiative, which traverses natural human structures, illuminates, and in a certain sense, makes the irreducible core of the human person experienceable.... The engagement with St. John of the Cross strengthened Wojtyła in the conviction of the eminently personal character of Christian certainty. This was not born from an omnicomprehensive theory but by penetrating the heart of the person.⁵⁹⁶

Thus Wojtyła was able to elucidate the very nature of a person's existence. He was concerned with the actual life of the person:

'Wojtyła made it abundantly clear that he was mainly concerned with the "concreteness of the existence of man, that is... the reality of the

⁵⁹⁶ Buttiglione, *Karol Wojtyła*, 48 and 53

conscious subject" which he understood as the *irreducible* element in man.⁵⁹⁷

Wojtyła's concept of Personalism came from a movement of Thomistic Personalism, popular at the time. This movement contributed an important defining characteristic of Wojtyła's understanding of the self:

Personalists delve into the ontological and ethical repercussions of the person's nature as a social being. The person never exists in isolation, and moreover finds his human perfection only in communion with other persons. Interpersonal relationships, consequently, are never superfluous or optional to the person, but are constitutive of his inherent make up and vocation.⁵⁹⁸

The defining aspect of an individual is his or her relationship with other individuals. The 'I' only achieves proper definition in terms of its relationship to other 'I's' and in terms of how they are perceived. This definition of community as being a group of interdependent individuals, who are only properly defined as that group, was a driving factor in John Paul's understanding of the person. What enabled this community to exist, however, was the way in which these interactions took place. John Paul quotes *Gaudium et Spes* when he asserts that 'man, who is the only creature on earth that God wanted for his own sake, can fully discover himself only by the sincere giving of himself'.⁵⁹⁹ By using the words of the Council John Paul elucidates his ideas and uses the Council's declarations to further root his own philosophy and theology in the tradition of

⁵⁹⁷ Köchler, Hans, *Karol Wojtyła's Notion of the Irreducible in Man and the Quest for a Just World Order*, Keynote Speech, International Conference on *Karol Wojtyła's Philosophical Legacy*, (22/03/2006), 11. From www.hanskoehler.com/koechler-wojtyla-SaintJosephCollege-March2006-V5.pdf 12/02/2010

⁵⁹⁸ Williams, Thomas D, 'What is Thomistic Personalism?' *Alpha Omega*, Vol. VII, No. 2, (2004) pp. 163-197: 192 from www.upra.org/archivio_pdf/ao42_williams1.pdf accessed 19/05/10

⁵⁹⁹ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 201, quoting *Gaudium et Spes*, 24

the Church. John Paul is able then to encapsulate the importance of the relationship that individuals have with one another in this way:

Therefore, these two aspects – the affirmation of the person as a person and the sincere gift of self – not only do not exclude each other, they mutually confirm and complete each other. Man affirms himself most completely by giving of himself.⁶⁰⁰

The relationship between individuals is predicated for John Paul on a mutual self giving. Each person has worth only inasmuch as they define other individuals, but then are defined and given worth *by* those others. A balance must be maintained between each member of the society, as to limit the freedom of one member would be to limit their self-giving to the rest of the society and thus damage the society as a whole. It would also severely damage the individual who is denied freedom. Too much freedom, however, can also be detrimental to the society, which would find itself dismissed in favour of the rights of the individual. John Paul identified these ideological extremes in the following way:

On the one hand, persons may easily place their own individual good above the common good of the collectivity, attempting to subordinate the collectivity to themselves and use it for their individual good. This is the error of individualism, which gave rise to liberalism in modern history and to capitalism in economics. On the other hand, society, in aiming at the alleged good of the whole, may attempt to subordinate persons to itself in such a way that the true good of persons is excluded and they themselves fall prey to the collectivity. This is the

⁶⁰⁰ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 202

error of totalitarianism, which in modern times has borne the worst possible fruit.⁶⁰¹

John Paul recognised that a common good needed to be maintained without undue cost to either the individual or to the society as a whole. In the 1980's, John Paul saw the Communist regime as damaging the individual for the sake of the collective. He had hoped that the fall of the regime would lead to a society, based upon a Marian model of discipleship that maintained this balance. However he discovered that one ideological extreme was to be replaced, in his eyes, with the other, whereby the rights of the individual would outweigh concern about the society as a whole.

The Culture of Death

Even before the fall of the Communist regime, John Paul identified these two ideological extremes in the world around him. 'From this perspective... we must question certain legislative choices made by the parliaments of today's democratic regimes. The most immediate example concerns abortion laws.'⁶⁰²

John Paul also noted:

For man, the right to life is the fundamental right. And yet, a part of contemporary culture has wanted to deny that right, turning it into an "uncomfortable" right, one that has to be defended. But there is no other right that so closely affects the very existence of the person!⁶⁰³

⁶⁰¹ Wojtyła, Karol, 'Thomistic Personalism', in Woznicki, Andrew N. (ed), *Catholic Thought from Lublin: Vol. 4 Person and Community: Selected Essays*, (New York, Peter Lang, 1993) pp.165-75: 174

The English version was translated from the Polish 'Personalizm tomistyczny' (*Znak 13[1961]: 165-75*) by Teresa Sandok

⁶⁰² John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 152

⁶⁰³ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 204-5

John Paul described this culture, in which, he felt, life was an uncomfortable right, a ‘Culture of Death’. The phrase was first coined in his 1995 encyclical letter: *Evangelium Vitae*: ‘The Gospel of Life’. He saw the ‘culture of death’ taking over society, with decisions on topics such as euthanasia, contraception and abortion being made by mankind in the place of God. These final two are different, but equally severe, sins since ‘the former is opposed to the virtue of chastity in marriage; the latter is opposed to the virtue of justice and directly violates the divine commandment “You shall not kill”’.⁶⁰⁴ This commandment underlines everything that John Paul said in *Evangelium Vitae*: mankind is unable arbitrarily to decide who lives and who dies. ‘With regard to life, man is not the absolute master and final judge, but rather – and this is where his incomparable greatness lies – he is the “minister of God’s plan”’.⁶⁰⁵

The idea of the Culture of Death was based on John Paul’s concern that having gained individual freedoms, people were encouraged to pursue their own rights to the detriment of others, in effect denying others their own rights.

Consequently, the biblical concept of the sanctity of life, whereby life is a gift from God and therefore controlled by God, is lost to concepts such as ‘quality of life’ whereby the individual is free to determine what constitutes an adequate existence. In this case, the control over aspects of a persons’ life, such as birth control or the choice of sexual partners, becomes an individual issue, not one for Church teachings. In the most extreme cases this control includes decisions about death, with euthanasia and suicide becoming permissible options for an individual – which would not have been the case under Church teaching. John

⁶⁰⁴ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 13, (25/03/1995) from www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0141/_P12.HTM, accessed 09/03/10

⁶⁰⁵ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae* 52, quoting Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, 25/07/1968, 13

Paul was in effect arguing that: ‘democracy becomes totalitarian if it is not based on objective moral values’.⁶⁰⁶

A change in the political landscape had caused John Paul to focus on a different aspect of society, one no less threatening to the freedom of the individual than Communism had been in Poland. For John Paul, the objective moral values needed to maintain the value of democracy would come from the teaching of the Catholic Church. In particular, he would focus once again on the figure of Mary as a model for the correct way, which he termed a ‘Gospel of Life’. Once again, Mary was used in a political dimension as John Paul fought against what he saw as another destructive ideology. His focus moved from one extreme to the other, as his concern moved from individuals who had no freedom to those whom he regarded as having too much. In this way John Paul was forced to turn around in what he saw as his ‘middle way’ which maintained the balance of individual and society. As his perspective altered, so would his use of Mary. It is by considering the difference in his use of Mary in the 1990’s through the lens of the typological models of this thesis, that this altered perspective will come to light.

Mary as exemplar of the ‘Gospel of Life’

At the end of the second millennium, we need, perhaps more than ever, the words of the Risen Christ: “Be not afraid!” Man who, even after the fall of Communism, has not stopped being afraid and who

⁶⁰⁶ Charles SJ Rodger, ‘The Social Teaching of John Paul II and its Implications for Catholic Education for Life’, in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.151-168: 162

truly has many reasons for feeling this way, needs to hear these words.⁶⁰⁷

The ‘Culture of Death’ was so called by John Paul because it brought about a return of the immediacy of death. Fear was the natural consequence of such a culture. It was by embracing life that people could embrace the phrase “Do not be afraid!”, and it was by following the Gospel which brings life that this could come about. Accepting the Gospel is to accept life. ‘The Gospel of life is not for believers alone: it is for everyone. The issue of life and its defence and promotion is not a concern of Christians alone... [it is] for the whole of human society.’⁶⁰⁸ This Gospel could only be brought about through complete respect for all life and all people. Indeed ‘only respect for life can be the foundation and guarantee of the most precious and essential goods of society, such as democracy and peace’.⁶⁰⁹ John Paul found this respect for life in the Gospel above all: ‘the Gospel is the fullest confirmation of all human rights. Without it we can easily find ourselves far from the truth about man’.⁶¹⁰

Antoine Nacher has emphasised the way in which Mary was a model of that balance between ideologies that John Paul wished to promote. ‘Investigation of the theology of Pope John Paul II of Mary makes one realise the unity in his thought. His philosophical approach to the human person was essentially tied to his understanding of Mary.’⁶¹¹ In the words of *Evangelium Vitae*: ‘The one who accepted “Life” in the name of all and for the sake of all was Mary, the Virgin Mother; she is thus most closely and personally associated with the Gospel of

⁶⁰⁷ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 221-22

⁶⁰⁸ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 101

⁶⁰⁹ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 101

⁶¹⁰ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 197

⁶¹¹ Nacher, Antoine, *Mary’s Pope: John Paul II, Mary, and the Church since Vatican II*, (Franklin, Wisconsin, Sheed and Ward, 2000) 131

life'.⁶¹² Thus Mary became a figurehead in John Paul's social campaign. She was put forward as a model of behaviour which the Church (and thus by implication the members of that Church) needed to acknowledge and follow. '[Mary] is the woman of glory in whom God's plan could be carried out with supreme perfection... thus Mary becomes the model of the Church, called to be the "New Eve", the mother of believers, the mother of the "living" (Gen.3:20).'⁶¹³ While this language suggests a sense of the *genetrix* model, in fact I would argue that John Paul saw Mary here as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model. The language used talks of Mary as mother again, but in doing so it is promoting Mary's behaviour and example as the one who accepted and the *lived out* the 'Gospel of Life'. The theological implications of this quote emphasise Mary as the person who *first and best* exemplified the correct behaviour for members of the Church. By using the typological models of this thesis, it is possible to illuminate the underlying concepts hidden by the vague and generic language of 'type'.

Encyclical letters, so called because they originated as 'a circular letter sent by the bishop of Rome to the whole Church concerning doctrinal, moral, pastoral, or disciplinary matters',⁶¹⁴ have been used by Popes since Benedict XIV released *Ubi Primum* in 1740.⁶¹⁵ 'Before the First Vatican Council, encyclicals were largely admonitory, warning against this or that deviant teaching.'⁶¹⁶ Following the Council and the debate over Papal infallibility, up to the Second Vatican Council, encyclical letters did not carry the full weight of Papal authority, as Pius XII said in *Humani Generis* in 1952: 'in writing such Letters the Popes

⁶¹² John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 102

⁶¹³ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 103

⁶¹⁴ McBrien, Richard P., *Lives of the Pontiffs – Reissue: The Pontiffs from St Peter to Benedict XVI* (San Francisco, Harper Collins 2013 [1997]) 460

⁶¹⁵ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 287, and McBrien, *Lives of the Pontiffs*, 460

⁶¹⁶ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 287

do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority'.⁶¹⁷ McBrien notes that today 'the authority of an encyclical depends upon its content, the audience intended, and the magisterial force with which its central teachings are presented'.⁶¹⁸ Regarding the authorship and content of the encyclical letters of John Paul, it is important to appreciate that as Pope, he would not have written in isolation, either from the influence of others or from the teaching authority of the Church. He could not, for example, have written a letter that went against any teaching of the Church already in place. However it is likely that John Paul retained a certain amount of editorial control. There are also similarities in the themes of his encyclicals compared to those themes that were important to him; in particular the Mariology of *Redemptoris Mater* reappears in a more developed form in his talks of the mid 1990's. Similarly, *Laborem Exercens*, written in 1981, addressed the rights of the worker and the individual, a common theme in John Paul's opposition to the Communist regime throughout the first part of his papacy. Weigel notes that:

John Paul II has said that he began work on a letter addressed to the entire Church and to all men and women of good will "immediately" after his election. Like Paul VI, he wanted to announce and explain the great theme of his pontificate through a major teaching document with doctrinal authority.⁶¹⁹

This letter would become *Redemptoris Hominis*, an encyclical letter that John Paul brought great personal experience to. We have already noted his claim:

⁶¹⁷ Pius XII, *Humanis Generis*, (12/08/1950), 20, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_12081950_humani-generis_en.html, accessed 07/08/2013. See also McBrien, Richard P., *Catholicism: Volume Two*, (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1980) 826

⁶¹⁸ McBrien, *Lives of the Pontiffs*, 460

⁶¹⁹ Weigel, *Witness to Hope*, 288

'Everything I said in the encyclical *Redemptor Hominis* I brought with me from Poland'.⁶²⁰ This comment underlines continuity in theology and in belief from the man Karol Wojtyła to the Pope John Paul II. It suggests that even if papal encyclical letters are written as formal documents of the papacy as an institution, the encyclicals of John Paul II carry with them the philosophical and theological teachings of Karol Wojtyła as well.

I would argue that a similar argument applies to the theology of *Evangelium Vitae*. During the time that John Paul was focusing his encyclical letters on the contemporary issues affected society, he was also using his weekly sessions to discuss at length the role of Mary in the world. These sessions included a lot of material that either began life in an encyclical, or ended there. As they took place shortly after *Evangelium Vitae* was circulated in March 1995, they offer a unique insight into the Marian ideas that Wojtyła included in the encyclical letter. By reading his thoughts with reference to the two Mario-ecclesiological models of this thesis, it is possible to see how his concept of Mary as a type of the Church had altered.

In his very first session on Mary, on September 6th 1995, John Paul stated his intent and his influence for the sessions:

I now feel the need to turn our gaze to the Blessed Virgin, she who is the perfect realization of the Church's holiness and its model. This is exactly what the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council did... In fact, the purpose of chapter eight of the conciliar Constitution *Lumen Gentium* is to emphasize the ecclesiological significance of Marian doctrine, but likewise to shed light on the contribution that the figure

⁶²⁰ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 5

of the Blessed Virgin offers to our understanding of the Church's mystery.⁶²¹

John Paul set out his discussions on Mary within a post-conciliar Mario-ecclesial framework. The importance of the relationship between Mary and the Church for John Paul was underlined, as was the influence that the Council continued to have on his theology thirty years later. Although it will be seen that a lot of his discussions about Mary during these sessions saw her as a type of the Church in line with the *exemplar* model, within his first session he reminds his listeners of a key aspect to the Mario-ecclesial relationship that is in line with von Balthasar's concept of the Marian Profile, which was outlined in the thesis above as reminiscent of the *genetrix* model. 'She represents one face of the Church, different from and complementary to the ministerial or hierarchical aspect.'⁶²² By alluding to the separate but linked Marian and Petrine Profiles or 'dimensions' of the Church, he sets out at the beginning of this lengthy discussion a marker for how he sees Mary as a type of the Church.

While aspects of the *genetrix* model of Mario-ecclesiology were always present in any of John Paul's discussions on the subject, it is to the people of the Church that he addressed these sessions, and to liberate them from his 'Culture of Death'. Therefore, in discussing Mary in the context of issues regarding personal behaviours, even if those behaviours encompassed all of society, it is not surprising that John Paul used a Mario-ecclesial model that is similar to the *exemplar* model of this thesis.

⁶²¹ John Paul II, 'Mary is Pattern of Church's Holiness' 1, 06/09/1995, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm1.htm>, accessed 08/08/13. All sessions reproduced from: L'Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English.

⁶²² John Paul II, 'Mary is Pattern of Church's Holiness' 2

John Paul identified within Liberal ideology a tendency that, despite the apparent focus on the individual over the collective, caused individuals to feel less valued and worthwhile. This would appear contrary to the aims of the ideology, but John Paul saw in the arbitrary decisions over life and death that people were encouraged to take a dehumanising aspect that reduced the individual to a disposable commodity. Mary becomes a model for regaining self worth through Jesus:

To all those who often feel the burden of a seemingly insignificant life, Mary reveals how valuable life can be if it is lived for love of Christ and one's brothers and sisters. Mary, moreover, witnesses to the value of a life that is pure and full of tenderness for all men.⁶²³

For John Paul, Mary began her role as an *exemplar* model of the Church by returning dignity to the individual through her love and tenderness. "Blessed among women" (Lk 1:42)... Who better than Mary can encourage all believers to persevere in prayer? Who better than she can promote harmony and love?⁶²⁴ Mary's mission of love was at the centre of the *exemplar* model for the Church, and fundamental to overcoming the 'Culture of Death'. Later in his sessions, John Paul again referred back to the Council to emphasise the recognition of this role that Mary has always played:

The Council expressly underscores Mary's exemplary role for the Church's apostolic mission, "In her life the Virgin has been a model of

⁶²³ John Paul II, Mary is Model of Persevering Silence, 4, 22/11/1995, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm6.htm>, accessed 08/08/13

⁶²⁴ John Paul II, 'Mary is Pattern of Church's Holiness', 3

that motherly love with which all who join in the Church's apostolic mission for the regeneration of mankind should be animated"⁶²⁵

Regaining the dignity and self worth of the individual was not, for John Paul, a passive act on the part of the individual. In demonstrating a model of an apostolic mission of love, 'Mary teaches Christians to live their faith as a demanding and engaging journey, which, in every age and situation of life, requires courage and constant perseverance'.⁶²⁶ John Paul also utilised Mary in a specific way so that she appealed to all members of the Church: 'The mystery of Mary commits every Christian, in communion with the Church, "to pondering in his heart" what the Gospel revelation affirms about the Mother of Christ'.⁶²⁷ Furthermore, he challenged Christians to try to understand Mary fully: 'the people of God are also urged by the same Spirit to understand deeply all that has been said about Mary, in order to progress in the knowledge of her mission, intimately linked to the mystery of Christ'.⁶²⁸ The importance of Mary rested then, both on people following the example that she set through her behaviour, but also on fully understanding the mysteries of Mary present in the Gospel. This was partly to encourage an understanding of the model that individuals were trying to reproduce, but also because in reading the mysteries in the Gospel they would be engaging with and absorbing the wider messages that the Gospel gives, and would thus be opened to Christ.

Another aspect of John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology at this stage in papacy is common to other discussions of the subject in this thesis: obedience through

⁶²⁵ John Paul II, 'Mary: Model of Faith, Hope and Charity', 4, 03/09/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm61.htm>, accessed 08/08/13

⁶²⁶ John Paul II, Mary is Model of Persevering Silence, 1

⁶²⁷ John Paul II, 'Church Grew in Understanding of Mary's Role', 4

⁶²⁸ John Paul II, 'Church Grew in Understanding of Mary's Role', 4, 18/11/1995, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm4.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

faith. Through her *fiat* at the Annunciation, Mary became the first to believe in Christ. 'The words: "Let it be to me according to your word" (Lk 1:38), show in her who declared herself handmaid of the Lord, a total obedience to God's will.'⁶²⁹ She became the first disciple and was revealed as such by her visit to her cousin Elizabeth:

In the Gospel account of the Visitation, Elizabeth, "filled with the Holy Spirit", welcomes Mary to her home and exclaims: "Blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfilment of what was spoken to her from the Lord" (Lk 1:45). This beatitude, the first reported in Luke's Gospel, presents Mary as the one who, by her faith, precedes the Church in fulfilling the spirit of the beatitudes.⁶³⁰

The faith of Mary continued to be demonstrated throughout her life. She knew from the Annunciation that she would suffer, and that her son would suffer, but she assented nonetheless. John Paul notes that:

At the end of the second century, St Irenaeus... understood the value of Mary's consent at the time of the Annunciation, recognizing in the Virgin of Nazareth's obedience to and faith in the angel's message the perfect antithesis of Eve's disobedience and disbelief, with a beneficial effect on humanity's destiny.⁶³¹

According to John Paul, the focus on Mary's faith and obedience continues both through the story of Mary in the Gospels and through the developing tradition of the Church through history:

⁶²⁹ John Paul II, Mary Offers a Sublime Model of Service, 3, 04/09/1996, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm32.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

⁶³⁰ John Paul II, Mary Freely Co-operated in God's Plan', 1, 03/07/1996, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm25.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

⁶³¹ John Paul II, Mary was United to Jesus on the Cross, 2, 25/10/1995, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm3.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

In the West St Bernard, who died in 1153, turns to Mary and comments on the presentation of Jesus in the temple: "Offer your Son, sacrosanct Virgin, and present the fruit of your womb to the Lord. For our reconciliation with all, offer the heavenly victim pleasing to God".⁶³²

Mary's faith continued. At Cana, through her command to the servants at the wedding to: 'do whatever he tells you' (Jn. 2:5), she demonstrated the faith in her son that brought about his first miracle. For John Paul: 'At Cana, Mary begins the Church's journey of faith, preceding the disciples and directing the servants' attention to Christ'.⁶³³ This journey for Mary culminated at the foot of the cross:

The Blessed Virgin's 'standing erect' at the foot of the Cross recalls her unfailing constancy and extraordinary courage in facing suffering. In the tragic events of Calvary, Mary is sustained by faith, strengthened during the events of her life and especially during Jesus' public life. The Council recalls that "the Blessed Virgin advanced in her pilgrimage of faith and faithfully persevered in her union with her Son unto the Cross".⁶³⁴

According to John Paul, Mary's faith in God's promise at the Annunciation, and in her son throughout his ministry and his death on the cross, allowed her to be involved in God's plan for salvation. She was a model for the relationship that was possible between God and his creation. It was faith that allowed this, a faith

⁶³² John Paul II, 'Mary was United to Jesus on the Cross', 3, quoting Bernard of Clairvaux, *Serm. 3 in Purif.*, 2: *PL* 183, 370

⁶³³ John Paul II, 'Mary is Active in Her Son's Mission', 4, 05/03/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm45.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

⁶³⁴ John Paul II, 'Mary United Herself to Jesus' Offering', 3, 02/04/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm47.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013, quoting *Lumen Gentium*, 58.

that engendered obedience to the Word of God. The way in which John Paul focused on her faith in these addresses shows that he considered Mary to be a type of the Church in the sense that she was an *exemplar* of Christian faith to all people. That is, he was using what we have termed the *exemplar* model. John Paul explicitly used such an understanding of Mary as a type of the church to counter specific societal threats against the dignity and freedoms of the individual person. He was careful, however, not to paint an unrealistic picture of such faith. According to Nacheff, by demonstrating the sorrows that Mary endured during his life, ‘John Paul avoids projecting an idealistic concept of faith in Mary, a concept that eliminates the human process of trusting and renewing the relationship of believing in God’.⁶³⁵ In this way, John Paul continued to use Mary because she modelled so perfectly for the people of the Church a relationship with God which those people needed to follow. ‘That is why John Paul proposes a Marian spirituality that centres on imitation of her “yes” to God.’⁶³⁶

Mary as an example of the 'genius of women'.

In looking at John Paul’s use of Mary as a type of the church in the sense of being an *exemplar* and bearing in mind the potential negative connotations of the *exemplar* model for gender politics, it is useful at this point to consider how John Paul’s Mario-ecclesiology impacts on questions of gender.

In his ‘Letter to Women’, John Paul stated that ‘the Church sees in Mary the highest expression of the “female genius” and she finds in her a source of inspiration’.⁶³⁷ For Elizabeth Johnson, ‘John Paul teaches in no uncertain terms

⁶³⁵ Nacheff, *Mary’s Pope*, 123

⁶³⁶ Leahy, ‘The Mariology of John Paul II’ 80

⁶³⁷ John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 10

that women and men are equal as persons before God'.⁶³⁸ This position could be understood in John Paul's phrase that 'each person has been created in the "image" of the One who is Lord of heaven and earth and called to be his adopted son or daughter in Christ'.⁶³⁹ For those who supported him, 'Pope John Paul's respect and concern (indeed love) for women is evident in almost everything he writes, and many women respond to him with equal respect and affection'.⁶⁴⁰

However, his position is complex and the above assessments are open to challenge. For example, John Paul asserted the equality of male and female even in reiterating that only men could be called to the priesthood. For he saw that: 'this in no way detracts from the role of women... since all share equally in the dignity proper to the "common priesthood" based on baptism'.⁶⁴¹

Differentiating between male and female roles was not helpful to John Paul: 'These role distinctions should not be viewed in accordance with the criteria of functionality typical in human societies. Rather they must be understood according to the particular criteria of the *sacramental economy*'.⁶⁴² In effect then, according to Elizabeth Johnson, while 'he declares the two sides of the masculine-feminine divide to be of equal value in the eyes of God... this equality of essence as persons... does not mean that man abandons his leadership position'.⁶⁴³

Consequently, in a similar manner to von Balthasar who wished to describe equality in gender roles within the Church and within the relationship with God,

⁶³⁸ Johnson, Elizabeth A., *Truly our Sister: A Theology of Mary in the Communion of Saints*, (New York, Continuum, 2006) 61

⁶³⁹ John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 10

⁶⁴⁰ Caldecott, Léonie, 'Sincere Gift: The New Feminism of John Paul II' in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.109-129: 112

⁶⁴¹ John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 11

⁶⁴² John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 11

⁶⁴³ Johnson, *Truly Our Sister*, 61-2

John Paul extols the virtues of the feminine to such an extent that they are meant to replace the need to be part of the priesthood for women. In other words, for John Paul II as for von Balthasar, the feminine principle, represented by the Marian dimension of the Church, is ‘Queen of the Apostles without any pretensions to apostolic powers: she has other and greater powers’.⁶⁴⁴

John Paul’s theology exemplifies a concept of the two genders as being equal but different, similar in a manner the concept that von Balthasar attempted to construct. In *Evangelium Vitae*, one of John Paul’s concerns about issues such as abortion and euthanasia is that they objectify women, causing them to be consumed by a masculine aggression present in the culture. This view reflects phrases by von Balthasar on the masculine nature of society. John Paul sees women, inspired by Mary, as the only ones who can rectify this issue:

In transforming culture so that it supports life, women occupy a place, in thought and action, which is unique and decisive. It depends on them to promote a ‘new feminism’ which rejects the temptation of imitating models of ‘male domination’, in order to acknowledge and affirm the true genius of women in every aspect of the life of society, and overcome all discrimination, violence and exploitation.⁶⁴⁵

As a supporter of John Paul’s ‘feminist’ goals, Léonie Caldecott notes that: ‘It is this new feminism which he envisages as the force which will enable women to resist the contemporary trend of regarding human life as just another factor to be eliminated or engineered to our own satisfaction’.⁶⁴⁶ The influence of von

⁶⁴⁴ Caldecott, ‘Sincere Gift’, 115

⁶⁴⁵ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 99

⁶⁴⁶ Caldecott, ‘Sincere Gift’, 110

Balthasar's gender politics upon John Paul's own work here is underlined by

Tina Beattie:

Both von Balthasar and John Paul II see a world increasingly controlled by technological forces and masculine values of aggression, competition and power, and both of them see the restoration of maternal feminine values to culture as an urgent imperative to halt the decline into violence and exploitation that marks the extreme masculinisation of culture.⁶⁴⁷

For both Beattie and Johnson, however, what von Balthasar and John Paul also have in common is an underlying gender politics that renders their attempts at gender equality misguided. In their view, in talking about the feminine elements of the Church, John Paul, like von Balthasar, is promoting the feminine but suppressing the feminine in its bodily particularity. For Beattie, in John Paul's writing, ' "woman" bears no necessary relationship to the female body'.⁶⁴⁸ She argues that the insistence that the feminine aspect is something that can be in men or women renders the female body superfluous in the relationship between Christ and the Church 'because all the Church's maternal and feminine roles can be performed by men'.⁶⁴⁹ Further to this, and considering the idea that motherhood involves the whole woman, and not just the physical aspect of the act, she argues: 'if all the qualities associated with the woman's bridal and maternal vocation to love also include men, all that remains exclusive to women is reproduction'.⁶⁵⁰ Using the lens of the typological models presented in this thesis, it is possible to argue that the *exemplar* model is used to promote

⁶⁴⁷ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eves Advocate*, 79

⁶⁴⁸ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eves Advocate*, 76

⁶⁴⁹ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eves Advocate*, 77

⁶⁵⁰ Beattie, *God's Mother, Eves Advocate*, 77

obedience in women, but *only* in the role of motherhood (as here) or virginity (as in Ambrose). Despite John Paul's attempt to assert gender equality, his use of a model of Mario-ecclesiology typical of the *exemplar* model ultimately restricted the role of women. In Johnson's words,

John Paul II's genuine desire to promote the dignity of women is subverted by the unrelenting dualism of his thought. It holds women in such idealised regard that they are judged to be too good to get involved in the messiness of the public realm, being relegated to a discreet if influential vocation.⁶⁵¹

The criticism of idealising women to the point of limiting their involvement in the public sphere of the Church is reminiscent of criticisms of Mariology whereby Mary is seen as being eschatologically or 'eventually' important but publically invisible. This was the accusation in discussing von Balthasar's Marian Profile of the Church, which, being oriented to eternity, was not present in the contemporary Church represented by the Petrine ministry. A popular accusation against John Paul, as noted at the beginning of this chapter, was that Mary replaced his mother after her death when he was a child, and that this was the overriding image of Mary that he held in his mind. In this context, the motherhood of Mary could be said to supplant in his mind all other roles for women. Indeed, John Paul extols the virtue of such a role repeatedly in *Evangelium Vitae* and in his 'Letter to Women', both from 1995. Given the discussions in chapter three regarding the *genetrix* model of Mario-ecclesiology, therefore, it is obvious that, regardless of whether one sees Mary as a type of the Church as an *exemplar* or a *genetrix*, there remains the potential for the suppression of women, even when the importance of the 'feminine' is asserted.

⁶⁵¹ Johnson, *Truly Our Sister*, 64

Beattie identifies the very structures of the Church as being to blame and she cites John Paul in her assertion that

Catholicism has within its resources a symbolic of motherhood that might well constitute a collective space in which women could come together to mount a maternal counter-offensive against male power while at the same time rejuvenating the traditional understanding of the Church as mother, but the very men who seem to recommend such a move insist that women cannot occupy this symbolic space.⁶⁵²

So, despite the fact that John Paul offered more vocal support for the role of women in society than his predecessors, the accusation of actually limiting or suppressing the role of women was still levelled strongly against him. As in the theology of von Balthasar, the differences between the feminine aspect of the Church and the female body seem to create a tension in John Paul's discussion of gender politics within the Church. In his heavy emphasis – in this context – on what this thesis has termed the *exemplar* model of Mary's relation to the Church, John Paul appeared to limit his own ability to talk about equal gender roles. Faith, obedience and motherhood (or virginity as an alternative), which are the desired behaviours and actions of the *exemplar* model, appear to be the only options for women in such a typological reading. As a type of the Church, Mary, as a woman herself, appeared to be utilised to model the female half of the Church, and not the whole Church which, in a proper reading of *typos*, she should have been.

⁶⁵² Beattie, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate*, 79

John Paul II's Eschatological Mario-ecclesiology

This thesis has analysed different ways in which theologians have understood Mary as a type of the Church. It has constructed and utilised specific models to illuminate the differences in these Mario-ecclesial understandings, and in doing so has enabled a greater level of detail to be seen in apparently similar concepts of Mary as a type of the Church.

In studying John Paul, it has been possible to identify how he considered Mary as a type of the church in slightly different ways in different circumstances.

Again, this was made possible by using the *genetrix* and *exemplar* models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Studying John Paul also underlined another of the contentions of this thesis: that Mary is often used in discussions that have political repercussions. In demonstrating that John Paul utilised Mary when talking about the future of the Polish state, and also in talking about combating ideologies dangerous to his perception of the individual, this thesis has strengthened that claim. Finally the thesis has also contended that the context of the discussion affected the way in which Mary as a type of the Church was utilised. In studying John Paul it has been possible to see that he developed a very specific Mario-ecclesiology based on personal devotion, theological and philosophical learning, and the tradition of the Church most specifically taken from the Second Vatican Council, of which he was part. It is the final contention of this thesis that the context in which John Paul wrote his Mario-ecclesiology was – for him - eschatological. It is to this contention that the chapter will now turn.

Mary at the end of time

“Mary has gone before”, becoming “a model of the Church in the matter of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ.”⁶⁵³

The Church journeys through time towards the consummation of the ages and goes to meet the Lord who comes. But on this journey – and I wish to make this point straightforward – she proceeds along the path already trodden by the Virgin Mary.⁶⁵⁴

Writing in 1987 through an instrument of papal authority (the Encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*), John Paul set out his eschatological understanding of Mary as a type of the Church. For him, Mary has gone before on the journey undertaken by the Church. Speaking in 1997, the Pope reiterated his position:

Looking at the mystery of the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, we can understand the plan of divine Providence for humanity: after Christ, the Incarnate Word, Mary is the first human being to achieve the eschatological ideal, anticipating the fullness of happiness promised to the elect through the resurrection of the body.⁶⁵⁵

Despite the change of focus in his Mario-ecclesial theology, John Paul retained a foundational understanding of Mary's position at the end of time as being an important sign for the Church. Mary's Assumption represents the future of the Church and therefore the future of each individual member of the Church.

For John Paul's pre-1989 Mario-ecclesiology, the eschatological aspect of Mary's role shone through as the model for a new Poland. Looking forward towards Mary therefore had dual meanings for the Polish people of the time. On

⁶⁵³ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater* 5, Quoting *Lumen Gentium* 63, from Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam* II, 7 and *De Institutione Virginis*, XIV, 88-89

⁶⁵⁴ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 2

⁶⁵⁵ John Paul II, ‘Mary is First Creature to Enjoy Eternal Life’, 4, 09/07/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm55.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

the one hand it continued to represent the ultimate victory of the Church, and therefore of all the people in it, over Satan. John Paul underlines that 'until the end of time this struggle between good and evil will continue'.⁶⁵⁶ As such: 'Mary... helps the Church to realize that life is always at the centre of a great struggle between good and evil, between light and darkness'.⁶⁵⁷ On the other hand, Mary was presented as an imminent model for a reconstructed Poland. For John Paul, this was part of Mary's plan of protection for Poland: 'Holy Mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us always from all dangers, O glorious and blessed Virgin'.⁶⁵⁸ Mary therefore was a sign of eschatological fulfilment for Poland and for the whole of the Church:

Thus, throughout her life, the Church maintains with the Mother of God a link which embraces, in the saving mystery, the past, the present and the future, and venerates her as the spiritual mother of humanity and the advocate of grace.⁶⁵⁹

After 1989, the eschatological vision that John Paul had for Mary widened to include all those affected by the ideologies of evil that he had spoken about. The people of Poland had not reacted to the fall of the Communist regime by embracing the Church and the Marian model of a new Poland set out for them:

[They] were inclined to see their triumph over Communism as a victory not for the Church but for the union Solidarity. Solidarity had become the rallying point for national unity rather than the Virgin Mary, the Catholic Church or John Paul II.⁶⁶⁰

⁶⁵⁶ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 175

⁶⁵⁷ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 104

⁶⁵⁸ John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 49

⁶⁵⁹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 47

⁶⁶⁰ Cornwell, *Pope in Winter*, 113

The Polish people had instead embraced the Western nations' ideologies of Liberalism and Capitalism, which John Paul saw as promoting the cause of the individual over that of the collective, as discussed above. In identifying Mary as an eschatological model for the people of the Church, he returned to the scriptural origins of this model in Revelation 12, which: 'invites us more particularly to recognize the ecclesial dimension of Mary's personality: the woman clothed with the sun represents the Church's holiness, which is fully realized in the Holy Virgin by virtue of a singular grace'.⁶⁶¹ John Paul reflected the reading of Revelation 12 shared by the Council and by von Balthasar, and identified within the 'Woman' firstly the figure of Mary and then, by way of the typological relationship, the Church:

The whole of the Virgin Mother's life is in fact pervaded by the certainty that God is near to her and that he accompanies her with his providential care. The same is true of the Church, which finds "a place prepared by God" (Rev 12:6) in the desert, the place of trial but also of the manifestation of God's love for his people (cf. Hos 2:16).⁶⁶²

The 'ideologies of evil',⁶⁶³ that John Paul identified throughout the twentieth century were to be understood as part of the struggle between the Church as Mary's offspring and Satan and his followers, as set out in Revelation 12. In this way Mary was focused upon as the guarantee of the victory over these evils.

For John Paul:

In the light of the New Testament and the Church's tradition, we know that the new woman announced by the Protogospel is Mary,

⁶⁶¹ John Paul II, 'Mary's Emnity Towards Satan Was Absolute', 3, 29/05/1996, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm21.htm> accessed 09/08/2013

⁶⁶² John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 105

⁶⁶³ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 5

and in "her seed" we recognize her Son, Jesus, who triumphed over Satan's power in the paschal mystery.⁶⁶⁴

John Paul also saw relevance in the Annunciation, where the plan for salvation began on earth with Mary as the human dimension. Nacheff notes that '[John Paul] draws his concept from the Mariology of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux'.⁶⁶⁵ In his Apostolic Letter *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, John Paul noted of Mary's role at the Annunciation that 'never in human history did so much depend, as it did then, on the consent of a human creature'.⁶⁶⁶ In drawing on Bernard, John Paul was seeking to emphasise the centrality of Mary's role and to promote it as the millennium approached.

John Paul saw Mary as: 'a living word of comfort for the Church in her struggle against death'.⁶⁶⁷ In her role as the woman that first accepted and lived the Gospel of Life, Mary was maintaining a link with the Church throughout history despite her Assumption and glory in heaven. For John Paul: 'the Assumption is therefore the culmination of the struggle which involved Mary's generous love in the redemption of humanity and is the fruit of her unique sharing in the victory of the Cross'.⁶⁶⁸ But despite it representing a culmination: 'one can conclude that the Assumption favours Mary's full communion not only with Christ, but with each one of us: she is beside us, because her glorious state enables her to

⁶⁶⁴ John Paul II, 'Victory Over Sin Comes Through A Woman', 4, 24/01/1996, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm12.htm> accessed 09/0/2013 John Paul referred to the Protogospel, which he defined as the Lord's proclamation to the serpent in Genesis 3:15 that "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel"

⁶⁶⁵ Nacheff, *Mary's Pope*, 166

⁶⁶⁶ John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, (10/11/1994), 2, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_10111994_tertio-millennio-adveniente_en.html, accessed 23/08/2013, quoting, Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Laudibus Virginis Matris, Homilia IV*, 8,

⁶⁶⁷ John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 105

⁶⁶⁸ John Paul II, 'Church Believes in Mary's Assumption', 4, 02/07/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm54.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

follow us in our daily earthly journey'.⁶⁶⁹ The concept of Mary being already crowned in heaven and yet guiding the pilgrim Church on its journey in her footsteps, is reminiscent of von Balthasar's idea of Mary being 'oriented to eternity'. It also intentionally paralleled with the 'woman' of Revelation who is kept safely in isolation from the war between her offspring and those of Satan. In this instance, it allowed Mary to be a model of behaviour that promoted the Gospel of Life and encouraged a middle way between the dangerous ideologies that John Paul was concerned with.

For John Paul the eschatological aspect of his Mario-ecclesiology underpinned his consistent appeals to Mary:

As she goes forward with the whole of humanity towards the frontier between the two Millennia, the Church, for her part... will take up the great challenge contained in these words of the Marian antiphon: "the people who have fallen yet strive to rise again", and she addresses both the Redeemer and his Mother with the plea: "Assist us".⁶⁷⁰

John Paul had a deep sense of the coming Millennium representing a time of renewal in the Church. In 1976, he was asked to lead the Lenten retreat for Pope Paul VI and the senior Curia in the Vatican, during which he spoke of the new Millennium heralding

"A new Advent for the Church and for humanity", and it would be marked by two great signs. There would be the Christ himself "the Sign of Contradiction", and there would be the Virgin Mary, clothed in

⁶⁶⁹ John Paul II, Christians Look to Mary Queen', 5, 23/07/1197, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm56.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

⁶⁷⁰ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 52

the sun, “a great sign in the heavens”, the Second Eve who would crush the head of the Serpent.⁶⁷¹

The millennialism that John Paul spoke of related to the Mario-ecclesial relationship: ‘Mary led the way because hers is the most faithful memory, or rather, her memory is the most faithful reflection of the mystery of God, transmitted in her to the Church and through the Church to humanity’.⁶⁷² The memory of Mary linked to what John Paul called the ‘maternal memory of the Church’,⁶⁷³ which began with Mary’s memories of the life of Christ, and was passed on to John following the events at the foot of the cross and also to ‘Saint Luke, who was particularly close to her’.⁶⁷⁴

It could be said that the memory of the new People of God is intimately linked associated with Mary’s memory, and that the celebration of the Eucharist relives events and teachings of Christ learned from the lips of his mother... The Church, in her turn, safeguards what was present in Mary’s memories.⁶⁷⁵

With the impending millennium, John Paul saw the Church as the holder of Mary’s memories, which in turn contained the experience and the wisdom of Christ. This was how he saw the Church as being the only way to the ‘Gospel of Life’. Within Mary’s memories were the truths needed for an individual to discover the true meaning of the word freedom. This is what John Paul meant when he said: ‘on this universal level, if victory comes it will be brought by Mary. Christ will conquer through her, because He wants the Church’s victories now

⁶⁷¹ Cornwell, *The Pope in Winter*, 56

⁶⁷² John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 169

⁶⁷³ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 165

⁶⁷⁴ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 166

⁶⁷⁵ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 167

and in the future to be linked to her'.⁶⁷⁶ The year 2000 was a moment at which the impact of Christ through the Church as modelled on Mary could be seen in the world:

It could be said that the Great Jubilee of the Year 2000 was the jubilee both of Christ's birth and of the answer to the question about the meaning and sense of being human. And it is linked to the dimension of memory. Mary's memory and the Church's memory enable man to rediscover his true identity at the dawn of the new millennium.⁶⁷⁷

Mary is therefore representative of John Paul's desire to navigate a safe path between the errors of society. Again he used the words of Bernard of Clairvaux to emphasise the role of Mary. Nacheff notes that, for John Paul highlights this role for the people by 'using Saint Bernard's *Maris Stella*, which explains what Mary truly is for all those who are still on the journey of faith'.⁶⁷⁸ The image of a guiding star might have seemed particularly apt for John Paul as he described the journey of the Church as a pilgrimage. Mary as a source of comfort and protection, as well as a permanent guide, fit with John Paul's concern for the 'people of God' to remain on the correct path. He notes:

Take away this star of the sun which illuminates the world: where does the day go? Take away Mary, this star of the Sea, of the great and boundless sea: what is left but a vast obscurity and the shadow of death and deepest darkness.⁶⁷⁹

⁶⁷⁶ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 221

⁶⁷⁷ John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*, 171

⁶⁷⁸ Nacheff, *Mary's Pope*, 112

⁶⁷⁹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 6, quoting Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Nativitate Beatae Mariae Sermo, De Aquaeductu*, 6

Mary is the guide that the Church follows: she precedes the Church (as its type) and so the Church cannot help *but* follow Mary on this safe path. Mary is the realisation of John Paul's philosophical examinations of the social person following this safe path. In John Paul's wider Mario-ecclesial thought, as the woman 'oriented in eternity' who guides and assists the Church, Mary appeared as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model, . The concept of Mary's memory having a formative role in the Church and its development could also be reminiscent of the *genetrix* model because the Church was formed *out* of those memories and out of the events that they contain. However, although the language may suggest a sense of the *genetrix* model, in the context of the social ideological dangers of the late twentieth century, John Paul utilised an ecclesial model of Mary that appealed to the behaviours of individuals within the Church. This was a model that shared much with the *exemplar* model of Mario-ecclesiology. By utilising these typological models, it is possible to identify the different ways that John Paul presented Mary as a type of the Church. In using her for socio-political goals, John Paul refined and focused Mary's typological model to fit the task he had for her.

Conclusion

This chapter has answered the question 'in what sense does John Paul II see Mary as a type of the Church?' in two parts. Firstly it was demonstrated that John Paul's overall vision of Mary as a type of the Church could be defined in line with a reading of the *genetrix* model. This was evident through his writing and speeches on the subject of the Communist oppression of the Polish nation and the use of Mary to represent a model for a 'New Poland'. Secondly however, it was suggested that John Paul slightly altered the focus of his sense

of Mary as a type of the Church as his concerns changed and the context of the Mario-ecclesial discussion changed with it. In the second phase of his papacy, John Paul's writing saw Mary as a type of the Church more in the sense of the *exemplar* model, as Mary portrayed a model of behaviour for those individuals whose freedom was being subversively restricted by an ideology of Liberalism.

This second point demonstrated explicitly the second contention of this chapter, which was that the discussions of the Mario-ecclesial relationship often happened within the context of political or social issues affecting the world and not just the Church. In the case of John Paul, the first half of his papacy saw him concerned with the Communist regime. Mary was used to rally the Polish cause, her role as Queen of Poland and 'Queen of Heaven' combined and tradition Polish devotion to the Virgin roused to cause a patriotic surge.

Following the fall of the regime and the failure of the Polish people to take on board a Marian model of the Church or of a 'New Poland', John Paul's attention drew back to encompass the western world and the opposing ideology to the one faced in Poland. In the context of John Paul's 'Culture of Death', the Pope used Mary as the exemplar of the 'Gospel of Life', the only cure to the culture's insidious restriction of freedoms. Mary was once again a socio-political tool, this time in relation to the *exemplar* model of the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology has been demonstrated to have been an important part of his whole life. The segmenting of the chapter into chronological portions has allowed it to demonstrate the development of the Pope's Mariology alongside the changes and challenges in his life. Finally the chapter outlined the eschatological aspect which ran through his Mario-ecclesiology. Regardless of the Mario-ecclesial models that best described his

thinking at any given time, John Paul was shown to relate to Mary as a person already crowned in heaven and representative as the type of the Church, of the ultimate victory that the Church had already won, but had to journey through this life to witness.

Conclusion

This thesis had two aims. Firstly it wished to answer the question: ‘In what sense do people see Mary as a type of the Church?’ In order to achieve this, the thesis introduced original typological models of the relationship between Mary and the Church, and used them as a framework to allow deeper analysis of the question. Secondly it showed, in relation to a selection of key thinkers, how Mario-ecclesial discussion were affected by the context of the socio-political concerns of the time. Some of those socio-political concerns involved questions of gender and the church, so the thesis also briefly analysed some of the questions of gender which surrounded discussions involving Mary and Eve, in particular. The gender politics of some of the thinkers in the thesis was outlined as part of the wider socio-political context of the patristic and modern eras.

This concluding chapter will outline the typological models of this thesis, and then demonstrate how they allowed a more detailed analysis of the Mario-ecclesial discussions that this thesis covered. It will reiterate how these typological models can be used to allow deeper analysis of different views about Mary and her relationship to the Church as its type. Then the chapter will demonstrate how Mario-ecclesiology has often been part of a wider socio-political context, including conversations about the role of gender in the Church, and the feminist critiques that arose from this discussion.

Typological Models of the Mario-ecclesial Relationship.

The typological models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship set out in chapter 1 emerged from an understanding of the concept of *typos*, meaning ‘an original, a

pattern, and in two senses: the technical sense of prototype, model, and the ethical sense of example, and [a] copy'.⁶⁸⁰ This term *typos* (or *typus* in Latin) was first used to describe a relationship between Mary and the Church in the writing of Ambrose of Milan in the fourth century when he declared that the Church was virgin but married just as Mary was, because 'est *Ecclesiae typus* (She is a type of the Church)'.⁶⁸¹ Theological interpretations of this relationship were then shown to have developed over the centuries, causing Mary to be imbued with an eschatological significance for the Church through the medieval period. Changes in how people understood the relationship also caused increased Marian devotion, which became an issue of importance for the role of the Catholic Church in the world by the twentieth century and the Second Vatican Council.

What this thesis has demonstrated and attempted to rectify is the tendency to use the singular term 'type' to represent more than one Mario-ecclesial viewpoint. Although the field of typology has other terms that can be utilised, in the introduction it was suggested that the terms 'archetype' and 'prototype' were commonly confused in talking about the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Each of the two terms was also used in defining the other, further confusing the distinction between the two. There has been little consistency in the use of these terms, making a proper understanding of what is meant by them difficult to observe. The term 'antitype' has also been shown to have two *contrasting* definitions and uses. It can be 'something that is foreshadowed by a type or

⁶⁸⁰ Müller, 'Type, Pattern', in Brown, *New Dictionary of New Testament*, 904

⁶⁸¹ Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundem Lucam*, 2.7, from

http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/02m/0339-0397_Ambrosius_Expositio_Evangelii_Secundum_Lucam_Libris_X_Comprehensa_MLT.pdf,

accessed 18/08/09

symbol, as a New Testament event prefigured in the Old Testament’,⁶⁸² which is the commonly used theological use of the term. However it is also defined as ‘an opposite type’.⁶⁸³ This was used particularly in describing the relationship between Mary and Eve, for example: where the figure of Mary, seen as obedient to the commands of God, would be the antitype of Eve who directly disobeyed the command of God in Genesis.

In an attempt to allow the language of type to be used in a more flexible and detailed sense when talking about the Mario-ecclesial relationship, the thesis used prototype and archetype as the basis for two typological models. These models could then be used as a framework around which to base the discussion about that relationship. One of these models was named *genetrix* and was formed around an interpretation of archetype as a blueprint or perfect ideal from which something came into being. This model saw Mary as a type of the Church in the sense that Mary was involved in the very formation of the Church, and so she put into the Church an aspect of herself. The other model, named *exemplar*, was formed around an interpretation of prototype as being the first model in a series, or a model which was built upon but which was still created itself in the first place as part of the series. This model saw Mary as a type of the Church in the sense that she was the first member ‘of’ the Church, and her characteristics and behaviour provided an example for all future members of the Church to try to imitate. This model of Mary tended to see her as a member of the Church, as opposed to the *genetrix* model of Mary which tended to see her as separate from the Church.

⁶⁸² <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/antitype?s=t> accessed 09/08/10

⁶⁸³ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/antitype?s=t>, accessed 26/08/2013

These different models allow the Mario-ecclesial relationship to be explored in more depth. They also enable the reader to understand the motivations behind a specific Mario-ecclesial vision, because they illuminate the sense in which a writer sees Mary as a type of the Church. I will now outline the ways in which this was demonstrated in each of the different periods covered in this thesis.

Patristic Period

The patristic period was used to demonstrate some of the very first Mario-ecclesial debates, and the ways in which Mary was seen as a type of the Church in those centuries. Irenaeus and Ambrose served therefore as examples of how the two typological models functioned within the context of actual Mario-ecclesial debates, showing that the models are more than an abstract theory.

Firstly, Irenaeus of Lyons outlined an understanding of Mary having a role that in certain respects paralleled that of Christ.

It was necessary and proper for Adam to be recapitulated in Christ, that “mortality might be swallowed up by immortality”; and for Eve to be recapitulated in Mary, that a virgin, become advocate for a virgin, might undo and destroy the virginal disobedience by virginal obedience.⁶⁸⁴

The act of recapitulating in herself the disobedience of Eve allowed Mary to become, in Irenaeus’ words, the ‘cause of salvation’.⁶⁸⁵ This role would be referred to in the modern period by the title *co-redemptrix*. This title alluded to the cooperative actions that Mary performed in God’s plan for redemption, but it

⁶⁸⁴ Irenaeus, *Epid.* 33

⁶⁸⁵ A.H., III.22.4

was never officially recognised by the Catholic Church. Irenaeus' concept of Mary in relation to the Church is the basis for our *genetrix* model. However it was not truly a Mario-ecclesiology in the sense that is seen elsewhere in the thesis, even with Ambrose. The structures of the Church that would later be referred to by ecclesiological discussion had not yet matured nor been set down in detail in orthodox doctrine. This is why consideration was made of Matthew Steenberg's concept of *Social Recapitulation* to tease out some of the Mario-ecclesiological implications of Irenaeus' concept of Mary. According to Steenberg's reading of Irenaeus:

As humanity had fallen both individually and socially, it was necessary that salvation be worked among men both individually and socially... The true balance of human existence in its largest sense is only restored when human nature, renewed by Christ, is set into its proper relational context of support and aid, which Irenaeus sees as the unique accomplishment of the Virgin Mary.⁶⁸⁶

In considering Irenaeus' theology through the concept of *Social Recapitulation* by using the typological models it is possible to clarify his sense of Mary as a type of the Church. Furthermore, it is possible to analyse the way Irenaeus saw the relationship of Mary to the Church, as a *particular kind* of typological relationship, which we have called *genetrix*.

Two centuries later, Ambrose of Milan considered Mary when discussing the virtue of virgins, and while promoting an ascetic mode of behaviour. It was recognised that at the time: 'for both the ascetic and the non-ascetic teachers, Mary's virginity came to symbolize

⁶⁸⁶ Steenberg, 'The Role of Mary', 137

different notions of sin, sexuality, and the Church'.⁶⁸⁷ Ambrose implored his readers to 'learn of behaviour from the Virgin, learn of modesty from the Virgin, learn of the prophecy from the Virgin, learn in the mystery'.⁶⁸⁸ By using Mary as a model of virginity and right behaviour, it was clear that Ambrose was referring back to his ascetic principles. For him, Mary provided an example for behaviour for individual members of the Church, behavioural characteristics that she had demonstrated as *the first member of the Church*. This was an image of Mary as an individual, part of the Church and in need of being redeemed. It is distinct from the idea of Mary as a cooperative creator of the Church which we identified as the *genetrix* model. We have termed the model of Mary's relationship to the church as its example and first member, the *exemplar* model.

The patristic examples set out some of the contrasts between the two models. They were demonstrated to have very different views of the role of Mary in relation to the Church; of her position either within or separate from the Church, and of her personal position as either a recipient or co-operator of God's plan of redemption. By using the typological models alongside an already existing analysis of the theology of the two writers, it was possible to compare and contrast the two Mario-ecclesial views, and to understand *why* they used Mary in the sense that they did.

Medieval Period

⁶⁸⁷ Hunter, 'Heldivius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome', 48

⁶⁸⁸ Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam*, 2.8: 'Disce virginem moribus, disce virginem verecundia, disce virginem oraculo, disce mysterio.'

In talking of the Mario-ecclesial relationship during the medieval period it was demonstrated that there was an eschatological dimension to the discussion. This was more the case during the medieval period than had been during the patristic. This had a profound impact on later Mario-ecclesial discussions in the modern period, when von Balthasar and John Paul II used extensive eschatological aspects in their thinking, as was demonstrated in chapters 3 and 4. In using the typological models, it was possible to analyse how the eschatological aspects of the Mario-ecclesial relationship related to particular conceptions of the way in which Mary was thought to be a type of the Church. The chapter also took into account Caroline Walker Bynum's three different eschatologies. 'We may call these sets of attitudes the eschatology of resurrection, the eschatology of immortality, and the eschatology of apocalypse.'⁶⁸⁹

The three different eschatological attitudes were suggested to be consistent with, respectively, the *genetrix* model, the *exemplar* model, and the socio-political context of the period (which will be discussed below). The eschatology of resurrection concerned the 'new Church' in heaven and the raising of *all* members of the Church after the final judgement. The way in which Mary represented the whole Church in this eschatology suggests that Mary was thought to be a type of the church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. The eschatology of immortality was about individual continuity following death and immediate judgement. This second eschatology was therefore more associated with individual members of the Church who could affect their own fate through their behaviour, for which Mary provided a virtuous example. That is, in this

⁶⁸⁹ Bynum and Freedman 'Introduction', 7

vision of eschatology, Mary was thought of as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model.

Chapter 2 also examined how Bernard of Clairvaux honoured Mary as ‘the finder of grace, the mediatrix of salvation, restorer of the ages’.⁶⁹⁰ This idea was found to be reminiscent of the *genetrix* model. Bernard talked of Mary’s role as Queen of heaven, which had come about as a result of her Assumption into heaven. The Assumption in turn had come about from Mary’s being ‘Full of Grace’, which had come from God. The Assumption placed Mary in heaven, specifically as a type or representation of the Church. In this way Mary, in heaven, demonstrated the future of the *whole* Church. As this particular kind of ‘type’, Mary demonstrated that the Church would ultimately be crowned in heaven. Bernard proclaimed:

All generations will call you blessed because you have generated life and glory for all generations ... Rightly do the eyes of every creature look up to you because in you, *and by you, and of you* the benign hand of the Almighty has re-created whatever it had created.⁶⁹¹

Thus it is possible to see in Bernard’s profession to Mary a theology which suggests the *genetrix* model. On the one hand, Mary has cooperated in God’s plan for salvation and in doing so has brought about the whole historical Church and all its members. On the other hand, now in heaven, Mary already represents the beginning of the new eschatological Church that will last for all eternity. In both cases she appears to have been credited with (co-)creating the Church.

⁶⁹⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174*, 2

⁶⁹¹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *In festo Pentecostes*, 2.4, PL 183, 328B

Chapter 2 also examined some other examples of the way in which Mary was viewed as a type of the Church by medieval thinkers. For example, three centuries earlier, Ambrose Autpert had written about Mary in such a way as to suggest an understanding of Mary in the sense of the *exemplar* model:

When the blessed Mother of God looks upon us and finds us adorned with virtues, united in charity, firmly established in humility, she will more eagerly hasten to assist us in the presence of her Son and Lord, Jesus Christ.⁶⁹²

The theology here is reminiscent of both the *exemplar* model of Mario-ecclesiology *and* the eschatology of immortality, whereby the individual is responsible for a fate that will befall only them. The chapter on the medieval period demonstrated that the typological models shed light on more than just the immediate Mario-ecclesial context. They also provide the language with which to probe and analyse the wider socio-political context, which will be considered below.

Modern Period

The modern period, in particular the mid to late twentieth century, provides the richest example of how the typological models of this thesis can lead to a greater depth of analysis regarding the Mario-ecclesial relationship.

In taking about the Mario-ecclesial discussions of the Second Vatican Council, it was possible to see why there were conflicts in the debates over the place of Mary within the Church by employing the two models. It became apparent using this method that the group who wished to minimise the level of devotion to

⁶⁹² Ambrose Autpert, *De Assumptione sanctae Mariae*, 12

Mary, primarily through integrating a chapter on Mary *into* a larger schema on the Church, understood Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model. Arguing for this integration, Cardinal König argued that, 'Mary is the type of the Church, going before it on its earthly pilgrimage to the eschatological fulfilment. Today, more than in former times, the communal elements must be stressed'.⁶⁹³ By emphasising the communal element of the relationship, König was portraying Mary as a member of the Church, which exposes a sense of Mary as a type of the Church reminiscent of the *exemplar* model.

The group who argued that Mary should be more highly venerated and her position properly noted by the Council, on the other hand, expressed a view of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. This was demonstrated when Cardinal Santos appealed to her position as Full of Grace and to her 'participation in the redemption: Mary lived the objective redemption before participating in the subjective redemption'.⁶⁹⁴ The emphasis on Mary's participation in redemption, as opposed to an emphasis on her *being* redeemed, suggests a sense of Mary in terms of the *genetrix* model. Those who wished to venerate Mary more highly also argued for the inclusion of the title *Mater ecclesiae* to the litany of Marian titles. By understanding Mary as being the Mother of the whole Church, this thesis argue that they again understood her relationship to the church in terms of the *genetrix* model.

The Mario-ecclesiology of von Balthasar was described by Steffen Lösel as being 'Conciliar, not conciliatory'.⁶⁹⁵ By this Lösel meant that while von Balthasar followed a Mario-ecclesial view that roughly matched that of the

⁶⁹³ Vorgrimler, *Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 126

⁶⁹⁴ Soujeole, 'Universal Call to Holiness', 48

⁶⁹⁵ Lösel, 'Conciliar not Conciliatory', 37

Council, he ultimately held a sense of Mary that did not adhere to the Council's ecumenical aims. I argued in chapter 3 that von Balthasar actually held a sense of Mary as a type of the Church reminiscent of the *genetrix* model. This was in contrast with the *exemplar* model that was inherent in the documents produced ad released by the Council Fathers. By utilising the typological models it was possible to analyse what, for Lösel, were similar viewpoints and to demonstrate that in fact the two views differed quite substantially. That is, the sense of Mary as a type of the Church was different for the Council's final declaration and for von Balthasar. Thus while it may appear that von Balthasar shared a common Mario-ecclesial theology with the Council, I would suggest that he started from a very different sense of Mary as a type of the Church.

Finally, and in a similar vein to the analysis of von Balthasar, the typological models of this thesis helped to demonstrate that although John Paul II claimed to remain faithful to the Council's decisions on Mary; his Mario-ecclesial vision also differed significantly from that of the Council. Chapter 4 demonstrated that John Paul's sense of Mary as a type of the Church was rooted in the *genetrix* model. However he saw her on occasion as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model, in particular when concerned with the liberalism of the west that encouraged a rising of the rights of the individual above those of the collective. By considering John Paul's Mario-ecclesiology through the lens of the typological models it was possible to see that he shifted the emphasis of his sense of Mary as a type of the Church when facing different challenges. In the next section of these conclusions, the importance of the socio-political situation for Mario-ecclesial discussions (and vice versa) will be considered. The eschatological aspect of the medieval and modern discussions will be of specific interest.

This thesis has, through setting up two typological models that can be used as frameworks for the analysis of Mario-ecclesial discussions, demonstrated that the usual field of typological language (i.e. ‘type’) is insufficient to allow a proper analysis of differing Mario-ecclesial positions. By using the two models, it has been possible to analyse different Mario-ecclesial views and to illuminate the influences and the specific theologies that differentiate them.

The Socio-Political Element

The other concern of this thesis was centred on the importance of Mario-ecclesial discussions within wider socio-political debates. In each period that the thesis covered, the Mario-ecclesial discussions were either a part of, or a result of, issues that did not just concern the ecclesial body of the Church. They also had importance with regard to the role of the Church in the world, and the defence of the Church against attack. A concerted analysis was made of the role of gender politics in some of these instances. The feminine role of Mary was thus one of the socio-political aspects mentioned here.

In the patristic period, both Irenaeus and Ambrose undertook their Mario-ecclesial considerations in the context of reflecting on the place of the Church in the wider world. Irenaeus used Mary as a defence against the Gnostic heresies of Valentinus and Tatian:

Those, therefore, who allege that He took nothing from the Virgin, do greatly err, [since,] in order that they may cast away the inheritance of the flesh, they also reject the analogy [between Him and Adam].⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹⁶ A.H III.22.1

For Irenaeus, Mary was an integral part of proving Jesus' humanity, because he felt that she could not have given birth to Jesus without passing on some of herself. This was a necessary argument against the Gnostics because it maintained the *bodily* similitude of Jesus and Adam that, according to Irenaeus', allowed the former to recapitulate the latter and therefore save all of humanity. Irenaeus' theology of Mary- and in particular his vision of her relationship to the Church as the cause of salvation - was crucial to upholding the identity of the Church at a time when there was no agreed written creed or set orthodoxy.

Two centuries later, Ambrose utilised Mary as a type of the Church to encourage the members of the Church to behave in a way that was both fitting to the label Christian and advantageous to Ambrose's desire to increase the role of asceticism within the Roman Church and therefore the Roman Empire. Asceticism, and Mary as its paragon, were excellent models for behaviour, because 'Ambrose saw it as his duty, as Bishop of Milan, to make plain... the uncompromising antithesis between the true, Catholic Church and its manifold enemies'.⁶⁹⁷ In this light:

By preaching on virginity, and especially by upholding the perpetual virginity of Mary, Ambrose made resonantly clear the position that he wished the Catholic Church to occupy in the Western territories of the Empire.⁶⁹⁸

Ambrose, linked to the aristocracy of the Roman world, saw his opportunity to impress upon that world the virtues that he thought the Church should aspire to. Mary was his model of that virtue for all Christians, particularly women who could be persuaded to become dedicated virgins. This was a profitable way of

⁶⁹⁷ Brown, *Body and Society*, 346-7

⁶⁹⁸ Brown, *Body and Society*, 345

spreading Christianity as a ritual virgin could bring money into a religious convent by being sponsored by her family. It was a method of encouraging the rich to buy into the idea of the Church by ‘selling’ its values effectively.

Ambrose’s use of Mary could therefore be construed as intentionally subduing the role of women in the Church and in society. It is unsurprising therefore that the discussion of gender roles in the Church is an issue in this context.

Throughout the thesis, it has become clear that one criticism of the *exemplar* model might be that too often it either suppresses the role of women, reducing them to well behaved yet silent members of the Church, or that it presents Mary as just being a model for women, as opposed to *all* members of the Church.

Certainly, although Ambrose was promoting virginity as a virtue for *all* Christians, his emphasis was on the ritual virgins and the purity of women. The Mario-ecclesial discussion in this case was therefore *both* an important response to contemporary socio-political concerns (general behaviour of Christians and the threat of Arianism) *and* it became the source of criticism itself in later centuries.

In the medieval period, the overriding socio-political concern was eschatology and the state of the Church. Whether they feared the turn of the year 1000, or the rising of an antichrist within Christendom, or merely their own destiny, the members of the Church were surrounded by theology, prayer, art and poetry that depicted or predicted the last things. In Dante’s *Commedia Divina*, Bernard proclaims to Mary:

You are so high, you can intercede... in you compassion is, in you
is... every goodness found in any creature... this man now pleads

with you, through grace, to grant him so much virtue that he may lift his vision higher still, may lift it toward the ultimate salvation.⁶⁹⁹

For Bernard, Mary was the eschatological realisation of the Church revealed for all to see. She showed the Church that it was guaranteed victory in heaven. Dante saw Mary as ‘the fulfilment of the promise of Paradise and the archetype of all who were saved’.⁷⁰⁰ Amongst these concerns were issues surrounding the papacy. Bernard had a vision of the role of the papacy and the cardinals that, following the Great Reform of the eleventh century, they were not upholding. ‘He angrily denounced the new role of the cardinals and grimly described how the pope’s palace resounded with legal altercation.’⁷⁰¹ He saw the upper hierarchy of the Church structure as not acting in a manner that would secure the Church’s heavenly victory.

In this context, Mary was of supreme importance. Her typological relationship with the Church became, in the eyes of those who saw fault at the pinnacle of the Church structure, an integral aspect of the future victory of the Church. Both Mary and the Church were seen as the ‘bride without spot or wrinkle... holy and without blemish’, from Ephesians 2.27. Having obviously failed to remain spotless, the Church could turn to Mary to represent it in heaven, because Mary was still the spotless bride. Devotional activity at the time contributed to this belief. This thesis demonstrated that a combination of eschatological fear and Marian devotion caused Mary to be awarded the ultimate position in heaven in the eyes of believers.

⁶⁹⁹ Dante, *Paradiso*, XXXIII, 19-27

⁷⁰⁰ Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries*, 140

⁷⁰¹ Barraclough, *Medieval Papacy*, 101

In the modern period, the context in which the Mario-discussion was held was more expansive and perhaps complex than it had been in previous periods. The lead up to the Second Vatican Council saw concern from different groups. There were those who wished to see the Church look outwards at the rest of the world, particularly the rest of the Christian community .They wanted the Council to be a great ecumenical gathering that confirmed the Catholic Church as a central figure in the Christian world. Others wished to take this further, so that the Church fully engaged with non-Christian groups: other faiths, secular governments or atheist groups. On the other side, a large traditional movement rose to ensure that the Council did not stray too far from its own doctrine and the Church did not forget its own members.

Mary had been a factor in ecclesial and socio-political discussions for some time prior to the Council. A renewed interest in Mary and in Marian devotion during the nineteenth century had been seized upon by Pius IX as he fought his own battles within the Vatican and dealt with the political implications of the formation of the new Italian state. The promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 was part of Pius' attempt to win support among the laity. A century later, the promulgation of the Assumption in 1950 drew criticism from those who wished to see more ecumenical dialogue. Mary was at the centre of the ecumenical discussion, because the Assumption was seen by some as unnecessarily venerating Mary to the point where it began to appear that she was being worshipped *alongside* Christ. This was unacceptable to non-Catholic denominations of the Christian church who felt that only Christ should be worshipped. This was the context in which the Mario-ecclesial discussion took place before, during and after the Council. The question of how Mary

related to the Church, and in what sense she was its type, was a central aspect of how the Council dealt with some ecumenical issues.

Following the Council, von Balthasar's consideration of the Council's Mario-ecclesiology criticised the Council for reducing the Marian role in the face of external, ecumenical pressures. He saw Mary as a far more important aspect of the Church than the Council had. His Mario-ecclesiology was a direct result of the socio-political context, but it also contributed to that discussion. However von Balthasar would face criticism of his own ideas because of his interpretation of human gender relationships, that is, because of what Steffen Lösel described as his 'binary gender anthropology'.⁷⁰² Von Balthasar considered that the feminine and masculine aspects of the Church each contributed to the Church. For von Balthasar 'both the Marian and Petrine principles are coextensive with the Church'.⁷⁰³ However the Marian Profile is the primary aspect of the Church:

In Mary, the Church is embodied even before being organised in Peter. The Church is first – and this first is permanent – feminine before she receives a complementary male counterpart in the form of an ecclesial office.⁷⁰⁴

Criticisms of von Balthasar's idea of gender equality suggest that the Marian Profile based on Mary 'the theological person from whom the Church receives its form of "subjective" holiness',⁷⁰⁵ in fact removes the feminine aspect from sight. Instead Mary is placed at the end of time ready to receive the Church, but in the meantime entirely absent from the relationship between God and the Church. In chapter 3, it was suggested that although the typological model of

⁷⁰² Lösel, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory', 2

⁷⁰³ Von Balthasar, *Office of Peter*, 220

⁷⁰⁴ Von Balthasar, and Ratzinger, *Mary: The Church at the Source*, 140

⁷⁰⁵ Koerpel, 'Form and Drama', 85

genetrix appears on the face of it to offer a far more active and visible role for the feminine in the Church, in fact von Balthasar has used it in a way which further removed the feminine from the equation.

John Paul II's Mario-ecclesiology

John Paul II was used in this thesis as a particularly study of twentieth century Mariology because he encapsulated all the different aspects of the Mario-ecclesial discussion covered in this thesis. In terms of the socio-political context in which his Mario-ecclesiology was revealed, there were two distinct aspects which affected his thinking. It was possible in the thesis therefore to analyse how his thinking altered slightly to reflect new challenges without deviating from his foundational understanding of Mary as a type of the Church. This final part of the conclusion will demonstrate why John Paul II was an excellent culmination for the analysis of this thesis. It will also outline how a study of his Mario-ecclesiology through the lens of the typological models of this thesis can provide a template for a wider survey of the Mario-ecclesial discussion.

Mary, the Queen of Poland, has been offered to the faithful as a model for conceptualizing the feminine within the nation, a model that is flexible enough to endure because it rests on a basic dichotomy: on the one hand, Mary is a powerful, sometimes militant protector of Poland; on the other hand, she is an exemplar of feminine domesticity. She guides the nation to victory even as she demonstrates how to sustain the national hearth and home.⁷⁰⁶

When I inherited the ministry of Peter in Rome, more than anything else, it was this experience and devotion to Mary in my native land

⁷⁰⁶ Porter-Szucs, *Faith and Fatherland: Catholicism, Modernity and Poland*, 361

which I carried with me... Mary's participation in the victory of Christ became clear to me above all from the experience of my people.⁷⁰⁷

This thesis has been concerned with understanding in what sense key thinkers see Mary as a type of the Church. It has argued that this discussion has been part of a wider socio-political debate. These wide ranging thinkers have been used to show that the Mario-ecclesial relationship does not have implications for the Church alone. Various conceptions of the relationship of Mary to the Church have been used, for example, to defend the Church against heretical Christian groups (Irenaeus against Gnostics and Ambrose against Arians), against secular attacks on the spiritual authority of the Church (Bernard, Wojtyła), and against accusations of insularity (Vatican II, Von Balthasar, John Paul II). In studying John Paul II's Mario-ecclesiology through the typological models of this thesis, it has been possible to demonstrate two things in particular: firstly, how the socio-political context affects his Mario-ecclesiology; secondly, how he uses the Mario-ecclesiology to try and affect his socio-political context.

Chapter 4 of this thesis demonstrated that John Paul challenged, firstly, the Communist regime in his native Poland and then, when that regime had been overthrown, the liberalism that rose up in its place. In both cases he utilised an understanding of Mary as a type of the Church to offer hope and guidance to those affected. In the 1980's Mary, already considered as Queen of Poland by many in the country, was attributed with the power to protect Poland and to guide it into the future. This thesis has argued that this was an understanding of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *genetrix* model. In the 1990's, when John Paul was concerned with the behaviour of individuals in the Church,

⁷⁰⁷ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 220

Mary was promoted as a model of virtue. This was an understanding of Mary as a type of the Church in the sense of the *exemplar* model.

In both of these cases, it was possible, through the use of our models, to determine the precise way in which John Paul was utilising the concept of Mary as a type of the Church and what his underlying theological understanding of Mary's role was. John Paul was able to focus on the aspects of Mary's relationship to the Church that most suited the challenges he faced. So, firstly, Mary represented the whole Church, specifically in Poland, and demonstrated what lay beyond the seemingly unending oppression of Communism. Secondly, Mary represented a type of individual behaviour that would rescue Christians from the 'Culture of Death'. Both times, John Paul reacted to the socio-political context and refocused his sense of Mary as a type of the Church in order that she might be effectively utilised as a model for the people of the Church. More specifically, he did so with an understanding of Mary that was always eschatological.

"Mary has gone before", becoming "a model of the Church in the matter of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ".⁷⁰⁸

The Church journeys through time towards the consummation of the ages and goes to meet the Lord who comes. But on this journey – and I wish to make this point straightaway – she proceeds along the path already trodden by the Virgin Mary.⁷⁰⁹

⁷⁰⁸ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater* 5, Quoting *Lumen Gentium* 63, from Ambrose, *Ex. Lucam* II, 7 and *De Institutione Virginis*, XIV, 88-89

⁷⁰⁹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, 2

Mary is the first human being to achieve the eschatological ideal, anticipating the fullness of happiness promised to the elect through the resurrection of the body.⁷¹⁰

Whether considering Mary in terms of the *genetrix* or *exemplar* models, then, John Paul always saw Mary as representing the eschatological realisation of the Church. Thus John Paul added a specific aspect to his Mario-ecclesiology that transcended even the socio-political debates in which he was involved. John Paul's very specific Mario-ecclesiology makes him a perfect case study for this thesis. This is because in the different facets of his theology, developed throughout his life and from a number of different sources, he encapsulates all that this thesis has been concerned with, from the patristic period through to the modern.

The case study of John Paul also demonstrates that one needs to analyse the context of a person's writing or beliefs in order to their Mariology. For John Paul this involved historical and socio-political aspects that began some time before he was born. It was a unique confluence of personal, national and spiritual influences that led John Paul to his particular understanding of Mary as a type of the Church.

This thesis has wished to answer the question: 'In what sense do people see Mary as a type of the Church?' It has done this by suggesting that the current language of 'type' as a term with vague and varied meanings needs to be developed further. To that end it introduced two typological models of the Mario-ecclesial relationship. Using examples throughout history, but specifically John Paul II, it has demonstrated that a greater understanding of individual

⁷¹⁰ John Paul II, 'Mary is First Creature to Enjoy Eternal Life', 4, 09/07/1997, from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm55.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

interpretations of the Mario-ecclesial relationship can be illuminating using these models. In doing so, it has enabled a greater analysis of past and future discussions of Mary's relationship to the Church to be undertaken.

Applying these models to other individual or collective understandings of Mary as a type of the Church would enable a better understanding of the motivations behind different view. For example, the different views of the Council regarding Mary's relationship to the Church. Further depth could be added to current eschatological debates within the Catholic Church. Understanding the motivations behind an individuals' understanding of Mary's role would enable a greater understanding of their eschatological position. For a Catholic understanding of the future of the Church therefore, these models demonstrated through John Paul, could be a useful tool of analysis.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Patristic

Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*, in Patrologia Latina (P.L.) 15

Ambrose, *De institutione virginis*, P.L. 16

Ambrose, *Epistula ‘The Council of Milan to Pope Siricius’* from Roger Pearse, *Early Church Fathers – Additional Texts*, trans. Anon, www.ccel.org/ccel/pearse/morefathers/files/ambrose_letters_05_letters41_50.htm, accessed 29/10/10

Ambrose, *Exhortatio virginitatis*, P.L. 16

Ambrose, *De officiis ministrorum libri tres*, P.L. 16

Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, P.L. 1-2

Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, trans. Roberts, Alexander and Rambaut, William, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* Vol. 1, (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885)

Irenaeus, *Epideixis*, trans. Robinson, Joseph Armitage, in Mackenzie, Iain M., *Irenaeus’s Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2002)

Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho*, trans. Dods, Marcus and Reith, George *Ante-Nicene Fathers* Vol. 1, (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885)

Medieval

Abbo of Fleury, *Apologetic Work* trans. McGinn, Bernard, from P.L. 139, in McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the end: Apocalyptic traditions in the Middle Ages*, (Columbia, University Press, 1979) from <http://0-www.humanitiesebook.org.lib.exeter.ac.uk/> accessed 09/04/2013

Adso of Montier-en-Der, *Letter on the origin and life of the Antichrist*, trans, McGinn, Bernard, in McGinn, Bernard, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, The Franciscan Spirituals*, Savonarola, (New Jersey, Paulist Press, 1979)

Alanus of Lille, *Elucidatio in Cantica Canticorum*, trans. Gambero, Luigi, in Gambero, Luigi, *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Latin Medieval Theologians*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2000)

Ambrose Autpert, *De assumptione sanctae Mariae*, trans. Gambero, Luigi, in Gambero, Luigi, *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Latin Medieval Theologians*, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2000)

Anselm, *Orations*, trans Pelikan, Jaroslav, in Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 174 to the Canon of Lyons*, trans, Eales, Samuel J., from Eales, Samuel J. (ed), *Some Letters of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*, (London, John Hodges, 1904)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *In assumptione B.V.Mariae*, SERMO IV: *De quatriduo Lazari et praeconio Virginis*, PL183, trans. Pelikan, Jaroslav, in Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *In festo Pentecostes*, P.L. 183

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super missus est*, P.L. 183

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Canticle 47*, trans. Pelikan, Jaroslav, in Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo infra octavum assumptionis*, PL 183

Bernard of Clairvaux (attrib.), *Memorare*, trans. Spretnak, Charlene, in Spretnak, Charlene *Missing Mary: The Queen of Heaven and her Re-emergence in the Modern Church*, (New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2004)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super cantica canticorum*, PL 183, trans. De Visscher, Eva, in De Visscher, Eva, *Marian Devotion in the Latin West*, in Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum Books, 2007), pp.177-201

Bernard of Clairvaux, *In laudibus virginis matris*, *Homilia IV*, in John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, (10/11/1994)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *In nativitate beatae Mariae sermo, de aqueductu*, in John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, (25/03/1987)

Dante Alighieri, *Paradiso*, trans. Mandelbaum, Allen, from *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri : a verse translation with introductions & commentary* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980-1984)

Joachim of Fiore, *Liber de concordia noui ac veteris testamenti* trans. Daniel, E.Randolph in, Daniel, E.Randolph (ed), *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol.73, part 8 (Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1983)

Church Documents before 1978

Pope Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus*, (08/12/1854), from
<http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9ineff.htm>, accessed 22/08/2013

Pius XII, *Communium Interpretes Dolorum*, (15/04/1945), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_15041945_communium-interpretes-dolorum_en.html, accessed 22/08/2013

Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, (12/08/1950), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_12081950_humani-generis_en.html, accessed 07/08/2013

Pius XII, *Apostolic Constitution: Munificentissimus Deus*, (1/11/1950) from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_p-xii_apc_19501101_munificentissimus-deus_en.html, accessed 22/08/2013

Pope John XXIII, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, (June 29th 1959), from
www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_29061959_ad-petri_en.html, accessed 31/12/2012

John XXIII quote from Speech Inaugurating VCII (11/10/1962), from Benedict XVI, 'A Proper hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council', Lamb, Matthew L, and Levering, Mathew (eds), *Vatican II: Renewal Within Tradition*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008) pp.ix-xv

Second Vatican Council, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium*, (21/11/1964)
www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen_gentium_en.html, accessed 31/10/2012

Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II, (Typis Polyglotis Vaticanis MCMLXXIV-MCMLXXIX)

Pope Paul VI, *Solemn Profession of Faith* (30 June 1968), from John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, (25/03/1987)

Benedict XVI, *Address of his Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering them his Christmas Greetings*, (22/12/2005), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html, accessed 29/07/2013

John Paul II: Encyclicals and Church Documents

John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis*, 04/03/1979 from
www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0218/_P3.HTM, accessed 25/01/10

John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, (25/03/1987), from
www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0224/_P2.HTM accessed 31/10/2012

John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, (30/12/1987), from
www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0223/_P8.HTM accessed 16/08/10

John Paul II, *Apostolic Letter: Mulieris Dignitatem*, (15/08/1988), from
www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_15081988_mulieris-dignitatem_en.html 16/08/10, accessed 23/08/2013,

John Paul II, *Apostolic Letter: Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, (10/11/1994), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_10111994_tertio-millennio-adveniente_en.html, accessed 23/08/2013

John Paul II, *Letter to Women*, 29/06/1995, 10, from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/1995/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_29061995_women_en.html accessed 02/08/2013

John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, (25/03/1995) from
www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0141/_P12.HTM, accessed 09/03/10

John Paul II, *Apostolic Letter: Rosarium Virginis Mariae*, 16/10/2002, quoting De Montfort, Louis, *Treatise on True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary*, from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20021016_rosarium-virginis-mariae_en.html, accessed 02/08/2013

John Paul II: Speeches and Homilies

John Paul II, *First Radio Message “Urbi et Orbi”* (17th October 1978) from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1978/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19781017_primo-radiomessaggio_en.html, accessed 06/08/2013

John Paul II, *Homily at the Eucharistic Celebration in the Parish of St Anne in the Vatican*, (10/12/1978), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1978/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_19781210_sant-anna_en.html, accessed 29/08/2013

John Paul II, *Homily: Mass in Victory Square, Warsaw*, (02/06/1979), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1979/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_19790602_polonia-varsavia_en.html

John Paul II; *Truth has Triumphed*, Krakow, 02/04/1990, from Weigel, George, *Witness to Hope: The Biography of John Paul II, 1920-2005* (New York, Harper Perennial, 2005 ‘Perennial’ edition[1995])

John Paul II, *Discours du Saint-Père au corps académique de l'université Catholique, Lyon (France)* (07/10/1986), from

www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paulii/speeches/1986/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19861007_universita-lione-francia_fr.html, accessed 10/06/10

John Paul II, *Address to Cardinals and the Roman Curia* (22/12/1987), from
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1987/december/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19871222_curia-romana_it.html, accessed 06/08/2013

John Paul II: Wednesday Addresses

[Note: the titles below, which are abbreviated in style, are taken verbatim from the English versions on the web-sites listed below.]

John Paul II, 'Council's Teaching on Mary', (13/12/1995), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm9.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary is First Creature to Enjoy Eternal Life', (09/07/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm55.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary's Emnity Towards Satan Was Absolute', (29/05/1996), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm21.htm> accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Victory Over Sin Comes Through A Woman', (24/01/1996), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm12.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Church Believes in Mary's Assumption', (02/07/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm54.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Christians Look to Mary Queen', (23/07/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm56.htm>, accessed 09/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary is Active in Her Son's Mission', (05/03/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm45.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary United Herself to Jesus' Offering', (02/04/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm47.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary is Pattern of Church's Holiness', (06/09/1995), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm1.htm>, accessed 08/08/13

John Paul II, 'Mary is Model of Persevering Silence', (22/11/1995), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm6.htm>, accessed 08/08/13

John Paul II, 'Mary: Model of Faith, Hope and Charity', (03/09/1997), from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm61.htm>, accessed 08/08/13

John Paul II, 'Church Grew in Understanding of Mary's Role', (18/11/1995, from
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm4.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary Offers a Sublime Model of Service, (04/09/1996), from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm32.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary Freely Co-operated in God's Plan', (03/07/1996), from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm25.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II, 'Mary was United to Jesus on the Cross', (25/10/1995), from <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm3.htm>, accessed 08/08/2013

John Paul II: Books and Other

John Paul II, *Memory and Identity: Personal Reflections*, (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005)

John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, (New York, Alfred A.Knopf, 2005)

John Paul II: As Karol Wojtyła

Wojtyła, Karol, 'Thomistic Personalism', in Woznicki, Andrew N. (ed), *Catholic Thought from Lublin: Vol. 4 Person and Community: Selected Essays*, (New York, Peter Lang, 1993) pp.165-75

Wojtyła, Cardinal Karol, *Sources of Renewal: The Implementation of the Second Vatican Council*, (London, Collins, 1980[1979] trans. P.S.Falla)

Secondary Sources

Books

Adam, Karl, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, (New York, Herder & Herder, McCann, Dom Justin (trans) 1997 [1927])

Alberigo, Giuseppe, (ed), *History of Vatican II: Volume III: The Mature Council, Second Period and Intersession, September 1963 – September 1964*, (Maryknoll, Orbis, 2000)

Alberigo, Giuseppe, (ed), *History of Vatican II: Volume IV: Church as Communion, Third Period and Intersession, September 1964-September 1965*, (Maryknoll, Orbis, 2003)

Anderson, J.D., and Kenan, K.T. (eds), *St Bernard of Clairvaux: Five Books of Consideration: Advice to a Pope*, (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1976)

Barracough, Geoffrey, *The Medieval Papacy*, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1968)

Bartlett, C.J, *European History in Perspective: Peace, War and the European Powers, 1814-1914*, (Oxford, Macmillan, 1996)

Beattie, Tina, *Rediscovering Mary: Insights from the Gospels*, (Ligouri, Triumph Books, 1995)

Beattie, Tina, *God's Mother, Eve's Advocate: A Marian Narrative of Women's Salvation*, (London, Continuum, 2002)

Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum, 2007)

Brown, Colin (General Ed), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Volume 3: Pri-Z* (Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1978)

Brown, Peter, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity, 20th Anniversary Edition*, (New York, Columbia University Press, 2008)

Bruun, Mette Birkedal, (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Butler, Christopher, *The Theology of Vatican II*, (London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1981)

Buttiglione, Rocco, *Karol Wojtyła: The Thought of the Man who Became Pope John Paul II*, trans Guietti, Paolo and Murphy, Francesca, (Cambridge, William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997)

Bynum, Caroline Walker, and Freedman, Paul (eds), *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Bynum, Caroline Walker, and Freedman, Paul, 'Introduction', Bynum Walker, Caroline, and Freedman, Paul (eds), *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Caldecott, Léonie, 'Sincere Gift: The New Feminism of John Paul II' in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.109-129

Chadwick, Owen, *Oxford History of the Christian Church: A History of the Popes 1830-1914*, (Oxford, University Press, 2003)

Cornwell, John, *The Pope in Winter: The Dark Face of John Paul II's Papacy*, (London, Penguin Books, 2005)

Charles, SJ, Rodger, 'The Social Teaching of John Paul II and its Implications for Catholic Education for Life', in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.151-168

Craig, Mary, *Man from a Far Country; A Portrait of John Paul II* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979)

Crammer, Corinne, 'One sex or two? Balthasar's theology of the sexes, in Oakes and Moss (eds) *the Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs von Balthasar*, pp.93-112

Cuneen, Sally, *In Search of Mary: The Woman and the Symbol*, (New York, Ballantine Books, 1996)

Daniel, E.Randolph (ed), *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol.73, part 8 (Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1983)

Daniel, E. Randolph, 'Exodus and Exile: Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario', in Bynum and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, pp.124-139

Davies, Norman, *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War 1919-1920 and 'The Miracle on the Vistula.'* (London, Pimlico Books, 2003 [1972])

Davies, Norman, *God's Playground: A History of Poland Volume II; 1795 to the Present*, (Oxford, University Press, 2005)

De La Soujeole, Benoit-Dominique, O.P, 'The Universal Call to Holiness', in Lamb, Matthew L, and Levering, Mathew (eds), *Vatican II: Renewal Within Tradition*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008)

De Visscher, Eva, *Marian Devotion in the Latin West*, in Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum Books, 2007), pp.177-201

Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes (Third Edition)*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006)

Dunn, James D. G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Cambridge, William B Eerdmans Publishing 1998)

Falconi, Carlo, *Pope John and His Council*, (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson 1963)

Flanagan, Donal, 'The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church', in McNamara, Kevin (ed), *Vatican II: The Constitution on the Church, A Theological and Pastoral Commentary* (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1968)

Flannery, Austin, (ed), *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, (New York, Costello Publishing, 1996)

Gambero, Luigi, *Mary and the Fathers of the Church*, trans. Buffer, Thomas (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1991,)

Gambero, Luigi, *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Latin Medieval Theologians*, trans. Buffer, Thomas (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2000)

Gardner, Lucy, 'Balthasar and the Figure of Mary', in Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David, *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs Von Balthasar*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2004) pp.64-78

Gildea, Robert, *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914, 3rd edition* (Short Oxford History of the World, Oxford, University Press, 2003)

Graef, Hilda, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, (Notre Dame, Ave Mara Press, 2009 [1963])

Gragnolati, Manuele, *Body and Pain in Bonvesin da la Riva*, in Bynum and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, pp.83-97

Hales, E.E.Y., *Pope John and his Revolution*, (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965)

Harrison, Anna, 'Bernard of Clairvaux's Sermons for the Feast of All Saints', in Bynum and Freedman (eds), *Last Things*,

Healy, Nicholas, *The Eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar: Being as Communion*, (Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2005),

Henderson, Ernest F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, (London, George Bell and Sons, 1941) from
<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/g7-dictpap.asp>, accessed 09/04/2013

Holdsworth, Christopher, 'Bernard of Clairvaux: his first and greatest miracle was himself', in Mette (ed), *Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, pp.173-185:

Jakelic, Slavica, *Collectivistic Religions: Religion, Choice, and Identity in Late Modernity*, (Farnham, Ashgate Publishing, 2010)

Johnson, Elizabeth A., *Truly our Sister: A Theology of Mary in the Communion of Saints*, (New York, Continuum, 2006)

Journet, Charles Cardinal, *Theology of the Church*, trans. Szczerb, Victor, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1987 [1958])

Kaiser, Robert, *Inside the Council: The Story of Vatican II*, (London. Burns & Oates, 1963)

Kehl, S.J., Medard, and Löser, S.J., Werner *The Von Balthasar Reader*, (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1982)

Kehl, S.J., Medard, 'Introduction: Hans Urs von Balthasar: A Portrait' in Kehl, S.J., Medard, and Löser, S.J., Werner *The Von Balthasar Reader*, (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1982) pp.1-55

Kelly, J.N.N, *Oxford Dictionary of the Popes*, (Oxford University Press, 2005)

Kennedy, Kieran A, 'The Immaculate Conception', in McLoughlin, William and Pinnock, Jill (eds), *Mary for Time and Eternity: Essays on Mary and Ecumenism* (Leominster, Gracewing , 2007)

Kłoczowski, Jerzy, *A History of Polish Christianity*, (Cambridge, University Press, 200)

Küng, Hans, *The Council and Reunion*, trans. Hastings, Cecily (London & New York, Sheed and Ward, 1961)

Küng, Hans, *Structures of the Church,(Strukturen der kirche)* trans. Attanasio, Salvator (London, Burns and Oates, 1965)

Küng, Hans, *The Church*, (London, Burns and Oates, 2001 [1967])

Küng, Hans and Swindler, Leonard, (eds), *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican betrayed Vatican II?* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987)

Kwitny, Jonathan, *Man of the Century: The Life and Times of Pope John Paul II*, (New York, Little Brown Books, 1997)

Lamb, Matthew L, and Levering, Mathew (eds), *Vatican II: Renewal Within Tradition*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008)

Landes, Richard, (ed), *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050*, (Oxford, University Press, 2003).

Laurentin, Rene, 'La proclamation de Marie "Mater ecclesiae" par Paul VI' in *Paulo VI e I problemi ecclesiologici al Concilio* (Rome, Istituto Paolo VI, 1989)

Leahy, Brendan, *The Marian Profile in the ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (London, New City Press, 2000)

Leahy, Brendan, 'Totus Tuus: The Mariology of John Paul II' in *John Paul the Great: Maker of the post-conciliar Church*, Oddie, William (ed.), (London, Catholic Truth Society & The Catholic Herald, 2003) pp.69-93

Lukowski, Jerzy and Zawadzki, Hubert, *A Concise History of Poland*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2001)

Luxmore, Johnathan and Babiuch, Jolanta, *The Vatican and The Red Flag: The Struggle for the Soul of Eastern Europe*, (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1999)

Mackenzie, Iain M, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*, (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2002)

Macquarrie, John, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, (London, SCM Press, 2001 [1963])

McBrien, Richard P., *Catholicism: Volume Two*, (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1980)

McBrien, Richard P., *Lives of the Pontiffs – Reissue: The Pontiffs from St Peter to Benedict XVI* (San Francisco, Harper Collins 2013 [1997])

McGinn, Bernard, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, The Franciscan Spirituals, Savonarola*, (New Jersey, Paulist Press, 1979)

McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the end: Apocalyptic traditions in the Middle Ages*, (Columbia, University Press, 1979) from <http://0-www.humanitiesebook.org.lib.exeter.ac.uk/> accessed 09/04/2013

McLoughlin, William and Pinnock, Jill (eds), *Mary for Time and Eternity: Essays on Mary and Ecumenism* (Leominster, Gracewing, 2007)

McNamara, Kevin (ed), *Vatican II: The Constitution on the Church, A Theological and Pastoral Commentary* (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1968)

Mongrain, Kevin, *The Systematic Thought of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (New York, Crossroad, 2002)

Morey A., and Brooke, C.N.L., (eds), *The Letter and Charters of Gilbert Foliot* (Cambridge, University Press, 1967)

Müller, H, 'Type, Pattern', in Brown, Colin (General Ed), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Volume 3: Pri-Z* (Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1978) pp.903-4

Nachef, Antoine, *Mary's Pope: John Paul II, Mary, and the Church since Vatican II*, (Franklin, Wisconsin, Sheed and Ward, 2000)

Neumann, Charles William, S.M, *The Virgin Mary in the Works of Ambrose*, (Fribourg, University Press, 1962)

Nielsen, J.T., *Adam and Christ in the Theology of St Irenaeus of Lyons*, (Assen, Van Gorcum Ltd, 1968)

O'Carroll, Michael, C.S.Sp; *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopaedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 1982)

Oakes, Edward T, *Pattern of Redemption: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, (New York, Continuum 1997)

Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David, *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs Von Balthasar*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2004)

Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David , 'Introduction', in Oakes, Edward T and Moss, David, *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs Von Balthasar*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2004) pp.1-8

Oddie, William (ed.), *John Paul the Great: Maker of the post-conciliar Church*, (London, Catholic Truth Society & The Catholic Herald, 2003)

Osborn, Eric, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, (Cambridge, University Press, 2001)

Papka, Claudia Rattazzi, 'The Limits of Apocalypse: Eschatology, Epistemology and Textuality in the *Commedia* and *Piers Plowman*' in Bynum and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*,

Pawley, Bernard: *Looking at the Vatican Council*, (London, SCM Press, 1962)

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978)

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine: Volume 5: Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (Since 1700)*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1991)

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1996)

Petry, R.C (ed.), *A History of Christianity: Readings in the history of the Church*, (Grand Rapids, 1981, vol. 1)

Pope Benedict XVI, 'A Proper hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council', in Lamb & Levering (eds) *Renewal Within Tradition*, pp.ix-xv:

Porter-Szucs, Brian, *Faith and Fatherland: Catholicism, Modernity and Poland*, (Oxford, University Press, 2011)

Pranger, M.B., 'Bernard of Clairvaux: work and self' in Bruun, Mette Birkedal, (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal and von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Mary: The Church at the Source* trans. Walker, Adrian , (San Francisco, Ignatius Press 1997)

Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, (London, SCM Press, 1958)

Rowland, Tracy, 'Reclaiming the tradition: John Paul II as the Authentic Interpreter of Vatican II' in Oddie (ed), *John Paul the Great*, pp.27-48

Shoemaker, Stephen, 'Marian Liturgies and Devotion in Early Christianity', in Boss, Sarah Jane (ed), *Mary: The Complete Resource*, (London and New York, Continuum Books, 2007), pp.130-148

Spretnak, Charlene, *Missing Mary: The Queen of Heaven and her Re-emergence in the Modern Church*, (New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2004),

Stahl, Harvey, 'The Place of the Elect in an Illuminated Book of Hours' in Bynum and Freedman (eds.) *Last Things*, pp.205-232

Thérel, Marie-Louise, *Le triomphe de la Vierge-Église: sources historiques, littérarries et iconographies*, (Paris, CNRS, 1984)

Tyerman, Christopher, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, (London, Penguin Books, 2007)

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church*, trans. Emery, Andrée, (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1974)

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Elucidations*, trans. John Riches, (London, SPCK, 1975)

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics: Volume I: Seeing the Form*, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1982)

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Mary for Today* trans. Nowell, Robert, (Slough, St Paul's Publications, 1987,)

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs; *Explorations in Theology II: Spouse of the Word* (San Francisco, Ignatius, 1991 [1961])

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *Theo Drama III: Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ*, trans. Harrison, G., (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1992)

Vorgrimler, Herbert (ed), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II: Volume I*, (London, Burns and Oates, 1967)

Walls, Jerry L., *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008)

Warner, Marina, *Alone of all Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary*, (Oxford, University Press, 2012 edition)

Weber, Timothy P, 'Millennialism', in Walls, Jerry L., *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, (Oxford, University Press, 2008)

Weigel, George, *Witness to Hope: The Biography of John Paul II, 1920-2005* (New York, Harper Perennial, 2005 'Perennial' edition[1995])

Wolff, Lawrence, *Poland and the Vatican in the age of the partitions: Diplomatic and Cultural Encounters at the Warsaw Nunciature*, (New York and Boulder: Columbia Univ. Press, East European Monographs, 1988)

Speeches and Addresses

Köchler, Hans, *Karol Wojtyła's Notion of the Irreducible in Man and the Quest for a Just World Order*, Keynote Speech, International Conference on *Karol Wojtyła's Philosophical Legacy*, (22/03/2006), From www.hanskoechler.com/koechler-wojtyla-SaintJosephCollege-March2006-V5.pdf, accessed 12/02/2010

Pelikan, Jaroslav, 'An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine' (Presidential address at the American Society of Church History, San Francisco, California, December 29th 1965) from, <http://www.jstor.org/view/00096407/sp040129/04x1145a/0>, accessed 11/03/08

Wilson, Woodrow, *Address to Congress, January 8 1918*, from http://ww1.lib.byu.edu/index.php/President_Wilson's_Fourteen_Points , accessed 05/08/2013

Journal Articles

Barratt, Anthony M., 'Interpreting Vatican II Forty Years on: A Case of *Caveat lector*' in *Heythrop Journal XLVII* (2006) pp.75-96

Beattie, Tina, 'Mary, Eve and the Church', in *Maria: Journal for Marian Studies*, Vol 2, (2001) pp.5-20

Beattie, Tina, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama: A Feminist Critique of Hans Urs von Balthasar', in *The Way*, Vol.44 No. 4 (October 2005), pp.160-176

Choi, Michael J., 'Matthew C. Steenberg, Irenaeus on Creation (Review)' in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 89 No.4, (October 2009), pp.596-598

Dadosky, John D., 'The Official Church and the Church of Love in von Balthasar's Reading of John: An Exploration in Post-Vatican II Ecclesiology', in *Studia Canonica*, Vol. 41(2008) pp.453-471

Dunning, Benjamin H., 'Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth: Creation, Sexual Difference and Recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons' in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 89, No.1 (January 2009), pp.57-88:

Hunter, David G, 'Helvidius, Jovinian and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth Century Rome', from *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol.1, No.1, (Spring 1993), pp.47-71 from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_early_christian_studies/summary/v001/1.1.hunter.html, accessed 21/08/2013

Koerpel, Robert C, 'The Form and Drama of the Church: Hans von Balthasar on Mary, Peter and the Eucharist, in *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture*, Vol. 11, No.1, (Winter 2008), pp.70-99

Kupczak, Jaroslaw, 'John Paul II's Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council', in *Communio, "Keeping the World Awake to God"* Volume 39.1/2 (Spring 2012) pp.152-168

Landes, Richard, *The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000: Augustinian Historiography, Medieval and Modern*, in *Speculum*, Vol. 75, No.1 (Jan., 2000), pp. 97-145, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2887426>, accessed 24/08/2013

Lösel, Steffen, 'Conciliar, not Conciliatory: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Ecclesiological synthesis of Vatican II', in *Modern Theology*, Vol. 24. No.1 (January 2008) pp. 23-49

Osborn, Eric, 'Love of Enemies and Recapitulation', in *Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. 54, No.1 (2000), pp.12-31

Pangborn, Cyrus R, 'Christian Theology and the Dogma of the Assumption', in *Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 1962), pp. 93-100: from <http://www.jstor.org/view/08852758/ap050101/05a00030/0?searchUrl=http%3a> , accessed 11/03/08

Scola, Angelo Cardinal, 'Retrieving the Tradition: The Interventions of Karol Wojtyła at the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: Exposition and Theological Interpretation' in *Communio, "Keeping the World Awake to God" The Challenge of Vatican II*, Vol XXXIX, No.1-2 (Spring-Summer 2012) pp.314-339: 314

Steenberg, M. C, 'The Role of Mary as Co-Recapitulator in St Irenaeus of Lyons', in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 58, No.2, (May, 2004) pp.117-137

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs, 'Retrieving the tradition: Women priests? A Marian Church in a fatherless and motherless culture,' in *Communio* Vol. 22 (Spring 1995) pp.164-170

Williams, Thomas D, 'What is Thomistic Personalism?' *Alpha Omega*, Vol. VII, No. 2, (2004) pp. 163-197, from www.upra.org/archivio_pdf/ao42_williams1.pdf accessed 19/05/10