Journal of Religion and Health, Vol. 24, No. 2, Summer 1985

Mary, Dogma, and Psychoanalysis

ELIZABETH H. TODD

ABSTRACT: Why does Mary hold her prominent place in Catholic theology to the extent that five specific dogmas have developed around her? Psychoanalytic theory suggests dogma arises out of the psychic needs of people and psychic needs of people are expressed in dogma. The early views of Erich Fromm, a disciple of Freud, are presented to demonstrate that Marian dogma arose from the psychic needs of the people. The views of both Catholic and Protestant thinkers are presented, as well as theological and psychiatric views.

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Introduction

The development of Christian dogma,[1] including that surrounding Mary, is interesting from a historical point of view. It is also an important theological subject. The development of dogma has yet a third attraction which this writer finds compelling and believes is worthy of examination. This element is contained in the notion that dogma arises out of the psychic needs of the people and that we can understand dogma as we understand the needs of the people. Therefore, this paper will attempt to show how those dogmas surrounding Mary developed out of the spiritual, economic, political, and social needs of the people.

This notion, that needs give rise to dogma, is by no means a new one; however, there exists only meager material. That which is available is found, quite expectedly, in the field of psychology, not theology. The specific branch of psychology that deals most thoroughly with this notion is that known as psychoanalysis, whose founder was Sigmund Freud.

In this paper I will attempt to demonstrate the development of Marian dogma, using the background of psychoanalysis[2] and specifically the theory and methodology of Erich Fromm, a disciple of Freud. His main thought regarding dogma is found in an essay entitled *The Dogma of Christ.*[3] Fromm wrote this essay in German in 1930 when he was a strict Freudian. Since that time, Fromm's views have undergone modification. In 1963, Fromm stated that for this and other reasons, he was hesitant to re-issue this early example of his thought. He decided to do so because of the persuasive arguments of those who felt the value of his notion lay in early and perhaps pure psychoanalytic thought.[4]

Owing to the tradition of early psychoanalysis that religion is an illusion and represents infantile wishes, psychoanalysis is often viewed as hostile to religion and therefore prohibited. I wish to suggest that the insights of

Elizabeth H Todd, R.N., C., M.S.N., M.A., Th., is a psychiatric-mental health clinical nurse specialist in independent practice in the Pittsburgh area.

©1985 Institutes of Religion and Health

psychoanalysis be viewed as contributions that enrich and enhance the special understanding of the human condition and should be respected as such. Further, the insights of psychology should not be feared as defamers of theology. Rather, they should support, reinforce, and complement, even clarify, the theological constructs that result in dogma. For example, if psychology can demonstrate effectively that dogma arises out of the psychic needs of people, it should not be seen as the competitor or substitute of theology to develop, interpret, and re-interpret dogma. Psychology may be thought to have something very relevant to say about human need and dogma. However, it should not be feared as precluding theological significance and accuracy and the proper place of theology in relation to dogma. Psychological insights should not be viewed as a threat to theology. At the same time, and in our psychology-oriented culture, psychology should not receive a "carte blanche" acceptance into the realm of theology. Both these extremes have their dangers and pitfalls.

I wish to make a careful and cautious suggestion which will serve to justify why the insights of psychology and other humanistic disciplines should be heard and, whenever possible, included in the task of theology. This is the suggestion that revelation of God to mankind occurs in arenas of the human condition other than theology. These include certainly human experience itself, history, art, science, and, in the case of this paper, psychology.

It is perhaps appropriate to indicate my own Protestant tradition. I strive to maintain a non-hostile and objective viewpoint, which means putting aside the Protestant tradition's claim that Roman Catholic adoration of Mary runs the risk of idolatry. I believe that both viewpoints can be respected in a mutually beneficial endeavor, whether or not these can include each other's tenets entirely. Therefore, the reader is invited to examine the psychoanalytic views of dogma, as presented in this brief paper, in a fair and objective manner.

Marian dogma: A psychoanalytic view

Freud on religion. In order to trace the development of Marian dogma psychoanalytically, a brief outline of traditional or Freudian psychoanalytic views regarding religion is offered.

1. Religion is one of the principal means of achieving the purpose of social stability through infantile bondage. Here the masses are psychically dependent on the elite classes who impose themselves upon the unconscious of the masses as father figures.
2. Religion offers the masses a measure of satisfaction that makes life tolerable to prevent the masses from attempting to change their position from obedience to rebellion.
3. Religion has a psychic function of permitting libidinal satisfactions in fantasies.
4. Religion is a narcotic bringing consolation to man in his impotence and helplessness before the forces of nature.
5. Religion has a three-fold function:

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

For all mankind, consolation for privations exacted by life;
For the great majority of men, encouragement to accept emotionally their class situation;
For the dominant minority, relief from guilt feelings caused by the suffering of those whom they oppress.

6. An illusion shared by everyone becomes a reality. The oldest is religion.

In *The Future of an Illusion*, Freud probed the question of the psychic quality of the religious attitude toward God. He believed that the adult's attitude toward God repeated the infantile attitude of the child toward his father. This is the religious situation. Freud pushes beyond this to ask why religion exists at all and why it has been necessary. In *The Future of an Illusion*, he answers by referring to religion as a narcotic bringing consolation to helpless mankind.

> For this situation is nothing new. It has an infantile prototype, of which it is in fact only the continuation. For once before one has found oneself in a similar state of helplessness: as a small child, in relation to one's parents. One has reason to fear them, and especially one's father; and yet one was sure of his protection against the dangers one knew. Thus it was natural to assimilate the two situations. Here, too, wishing played its part, as it does in dream-life. The sleeper may be seized with a presentiment of death, which threatens to place him in the grave. But the dream-work knows how to select a condition that will turn even that dreaded event into a wish-fulfillment: the dreamer sees himself in an ancient Etruscan grave which he has climbed down into, happy to find his archaeological interests satisfied.(1) In the same way, a man makes the forces of nature not simply into persons with whom he can associate as he would with equals—that would not do justice to the overpowering impression which those forces make on him—but he gives them the character of a father. He turns them into gods, following in this, as I have tried to show,(2) not only an infantile prototype but a phylogenetic one.[5]
>
> In the course of time the first observations were made of regularity and conformity to law in natural phenomena, and with this the forces of nature lost their human traits. But man's helplessness remains and along with it his longing for his father, and the gods. The gods retain their threefold task: they must exorcise the terrors of nature, they must reconcile men to the cruelty of Fate, particularly as it is shown in death, and they must compensate them for the sufferings and privations which a civilized life in common has imposed on them.[6]

Freud asks, "What constitutes the inner power of religious doctrines and to what circumstances do these doctrines owe their effectiveness independently of rational approval?" His answer:

> These, which are given out as teachings, are not precipitates of experience or end-results of thinking: they are illusions, fulfillments of the oldest, strongest and most urgent wishes of mankind. The secret of their strength lies in the strength of those wishes. As we already know, the terrifying impression of helplessness in childhood aroused the need for protection—for protection through love—which was provided by the father; and the recognition that this helplessness lasts throughout life made it necessary to cling to the existence of a father, but this time a more powerful one. Thus the benevolent rule of a divine Providence allays our fear of the dangers of life; the establishment of a moral world-order ensures the fulfillment of the demands of justice, which have so often remained unfulfilled in human civilization; and the prolongation of earthly existence in a future life provides the local and temporal framework in which these wish-fulfillments shall take place. Answers to the riddles that tempt the curiosity of man, such as how the universe began or what the relation is between body and mind, are developed in conformity with the underlying assumptions of this system. It is an enormous relief to the individual psyche if the conflicts of its childhood arising from the father-complex—conflicts which it has never wholly overcome—are removed from it and brought to a solution which is universally accepted.[7]

Why Marian dogma? There exists in Roman Catholicism abundant emphasis on Mary, some would say excessive. At any rate, it is sufficient to note that Mariology is a whole movement unto itself. Those Roman Catholic theologians and laity who place such high value on the place of Mary in belief and practice are called Mariologists. Roman Catholic literature abounds with the records of Marian stories, legends, debates, controversies, liturgies, devotions, sermons, apparitions, and observances. Roman Catholic theology includes five specific dogmas: divine maternity, perpetual virginity, freedom from sin, immaculate conception, and the assumption. That Mary occupies a major place in Roman Catholic theology is obvious. Why?

Answering the question as a psychoanalyst and not a theologian, Erich Fromm would say the "psychic surfaces" of the people, that is, the spiritual, economic, social, and political needs of the people, were those of a sheltering, protecting mother with a small, helpless child. Fromm points to the emergence of the figure of the Great Mother who became the dominating figure of medieval Christianity.

Fromm on dogma. Against this background, Fromm describes the expression of conscious theological ideas resulting from unconscious processes. He surveys the economic, social, cultural, and psychic conditions of early Christianity and describes these as the poor conditions of the lowest classes, but characterized by hope for change, psychoanalytically, for the good father to help them. An ambivalent attitude is apparent: the fantasy of the loved, good father who would help and deliver; the hated, evil father who oppresses and despises. The belief among the Christians was that Jesus was exalted after his death into a god who would return to judge, to make happy those who suffer, and to punish the rulers, the oppressors. Psychoanalytically, there is the unconscious wish to overcome the father. Also, the faithful could identify with Jesus who, after all, suffered as they suffered. Therefore, early Christian belief is born of the oppressed and suffering masses. A man is elevated to God, expressing unconscious hostility to the father. There was the identification and expectation that the suffering masses would become the rulers and be happy. The expression of the revolutionary tendency offered satisfaction for

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

their longing and, as such, it rapidly became the religion of the oppressed.

Fromm continues his argument, stating that early Christian beliefs underwent a change as Christianity became the state religion, which meant that Christians came from the upper classes as well as the lower classes. The ruling classes of the Roman Empire became Christian. A change occurred in the Christian population in both the nationality and the economic makeup. The process of gradual feudalization occurred, and the medieval order was established with absolute monarchy—an emperor—to whom the masses owed reverence and love. The masses were ruled from the top. Those ruled would be made to be content with their situation.

A transformation of the social structure of Christianity occurred. Eschatological expectations disappeared. Hope for real historical deliverance was replaced by faith in the already complete spiritual deliverance. Satisfaction of conscience was obtained through ecclesiastical grace. Cordial agreement with state rulers was established. Christianity, a communion of brothers without a hierarchy, became the Church.

As Christianity changed, so also the concept of Christ changed. The man elevated to God changed to God descending to become man. Jesus was now seen as the Son of God, begotten of the Father before all time and having one nature with the Father. Psychically, also, changes had occurred. The attitude of hostility to the father changed to one of harmony and the need for recognition of the father, of a passive subordination. Now, Christianity has a social function: a faith in the crucified Son of God. The oppressed masses could identify with Him. The fantasy satisfaction was to identify with the crucified, not to dethrone the father but to enjoy his love and grace. The theological change is an expression of the sociological one. No longer are the masses hostile to authority. It is futile to overthrow the rulers. The oppressed and poor should submit to and love the authority of the ruling class and, in doing so, receive love from the father, represented by the elite class.

But what happens to the aggressive impulses toward rulers? They could not have disappeared, since oppression by rulers still existed. The aggressive impulse is turned against the individual. There develops an identification with the suffering, crucified Jesus. Dogma stresses no longer the overthrow of the father but the self-annihilation of the Son. The aggression and hostility are turned away from the father and toward the self. This change provided an outlet that was harmless for the sake of social stability. No longer were the rulers to blame for the wretchedness. The sufferers themselves were to blame. Constant expiation and personal suffering could atone and win love and pardon.

According to Fromm,[8] the Catholic Church masterfully engineered this change which produced increasing guilt with a two-fold purpose: (1) aggression was turned away from the rulers and authority toward the suffering masses themselves; (2) the Church offered itself to the masses as a good and loving father who pardoned and expiated the guilt they themselves had induced. Fromm states the Church ingeniously cultivated the psychic condition. For

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

the rulers, this development of the fantasy of the suffering Jesus also provided a social as well as psychic function. It relieved them of guilt. After all, God's own Son suffered voluntarily. It was a grace of God, this suffering of the masses. Therefore, there was no need for self-reproach of the rulers.

It is at this point in the transformation of Christological dogma and the whole of Christianity that Fromm sees the central problem of change in the idea of the relationship of Jesus to God the Father. It is also here that Mary enters.

Fromm refers to the Arius-Athanasius debate, the Council of Nicaea in 325 and the Homoousian formula. The Son has changed. The Father has changed. Two natures become one nature. Fromm points out the logical contradiction: a duality becomes a unity. Fromm suggests the formula has a unique and ultimate unconscious meaning. While it is a contradiction in logic, this condition exists in a single human event: the child in the womb. Changes have occurred in the idea of Jesus, also the idea of the Father. The strong powerful father, states Fromm, becomes the sheltering, protecting mother. The rebellious, then suffering, passive son becomes the small child. Enter the divine figure of the Great Mother. She emerges as Mary and becomes the dominating figure of medieval Christianity.

From the fourth century on, the mother divinity is apparent in two forms. One is the role of the Church, and the other is the cult of Mary. These two represent the Great Mother through whom alone man can achieve security and blessedness.

The mother divinity, a concept of ancient cultures, is revived and introduced in Christianity in the cult of Mary and the dogmas that surround her. In the case of Christianity, Mary represents the mother divinity grown independent. She is the mother divinity who separates herself from the father-god. "In her, the motherly qualities, which had always unconsciously been a part of God the Father, were now consciously and clearly experienced and symbolically represented."[9]

According to Fromm, "In the New Testament account, Mary was in no way elevated beyond the sphere of ordinary men."[10] As Christological ideas developed, Mary assumes an ever-increasing prominence. The more the figure of the historical human Jesus faded in favor of the pre-existent Son of God, the more Mary became deified. Epiphanius, for example, would not hear any ideas indicating that Mary and Joseph continued to have children, although the New Testament would seem to indicate that this is true. In 431, in the Nestorian controversy, the decision against Nestorius was that Mary was not only the mother of Christ but also the mother of God. By the end of the fourth century, the cult of Mary had arisen. Prayers and devotions were addressed to Mary. She became a predominant theme in the arts. More and more adoration developed toward the mother of God. Mary became more and more important. Worship of Mary became more personal and enthusiastic. Altars were erected. Pictures of her were everywhere. "From a recipient of grace, she became the dispenser of grace."[11] Mary with the infant Jesus became the symbol of the Catholic Middle Ages.

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

Mary in the arts

A review of Mary in the arts would seem to illustrate Fromm's psychoanalytic views. If it can be assumed that the artist often conveys or expresses consciously through his art those contents of the unconscious of the populace, it cannot be denied that definite statements about Mary's meaning to Catholic Christianity are expressed in art and especially medieval art. Selections from the arts which have the Madonna as subject can illustrate the idea that Mary, as cult and dogma, represented unconscious wishes and needs.

Commenting on Raphael Santi's *Madonna of the Chair,* O'Dwyer stated, "The Divine child seems startled or frightened, but his Mother's arms are a refuge and a protection."[12] O'Dwyer commented on Allesandro Botticelli's *Adoration Under the Baldacchino:* " . . . child . . . seeks His exuberant Mother, who kneels to Him and with enticing gesture prepares to satisfy His needs."[13] In Franciscan art, "The child is represented without power and without glory, an image of the human condition. He will receive everyday His daily milk. He is the image of prayer, asking for everything, entitled to everything."[14] In statuary art, there is shown the composition of the Mother and Child without the Father. "The nursing Virgins constitute one of the most admirable achievements of that art. . . . "[15] In the French School, "Maternity is manifested in the gesture of Mary offering her right breast to the child, and sometimes the child seeks this breast with His greedy little hands under the cloth of stone."[16] By the end of the thirteenth century, Mary is depicted by the French tendering her breast to the Divine Child.[17] The Flemish School, particularly the art of Roger van der Weyden, portrays the full humanization of Mary. Again, the virgin tenders her breast to the Divine Child.[18]

The nursing madonna

The nursing madonna is so abundantly present in art that it cannot be ignored. The Virgin nursing the child is a frequent motif in medieval art and continues into the sixteenth century. It speaks of the humanity of Christ and the motherhood of Mary. According to Charles Banet,[19] Mary's milk is the source of Christ's blood. It is the dawn and consummation of maternal sacrifice. The giving of her milk indicates her consciousness that she was nursing the Victim of Calvary. In ancient physiology, blood, not milk, is the original product in man. Milk that nourishes the child is really the mother's blood under another form. Mary's blood is the source of Christ's blood.

Fromm refers to Sandór Radó to explain the psychoanalytic significance of the nursing madonna. Radó speaks of the fear of starvation and the happiness of oral satisfaction and the role these two elements play in the psychic life of the individual.

> The torments of hunger become a psychic foretaste of later 'punishments,' and through the school of punishment they become the primitive mechanism of a self-punishment which finally in melancholia achieves so fateful a significance. Behind the boundless fear of pauperization felt by the melancholy is hidden nothing other than the fear of starvation; this fear is the reaction of the vitality of the normal ego-residue to the life-threatening, melancholic act of expiation or penance imposed by the church. Drinking from the breast, however, remains the shining example of the unfailing, pardoning proffer of life. It is certainly no accident that the nursing Madonna with the child has become the symbol of a powerful religion and through her mediation the symbol of a whole epoch of our Western culture. In my opinion, the derivation of the meaning-complex of guilt atonement and pardon from the early infantile experience of rage, hunger, and drinking from the breast solves our riddle as to why the hope for absolution and love is perhaps the most powerful configuration we encounter in the higher levels of human psychic life.[20]

The psychoanalytic investigations of Radó facilitate a connection between the fantasy of the suffering Jesus and the fantasy of the child Jesus on the mother's breast. Both fantasies express the wish for pardon and expiation. Fromm interprets, "In the fantasy of the crucified Jesus, pardon is obtained by a passive self-castrating submission to the father. In the fantasy of the child Jesus on the breast of the Madonna, the masochistic element is lacking; in place of the father one finds the mother who, while she pacifies the child, grants pardon and expiation."[21] According to Fromm, the same happy feeling makes up the unconscious meaning of the Homoousian dogma, the fantasy of the child sheltered and protected in the womb.[22]

The great pardoning mother becomes the gratifying symbol of Catholic Christianity offered by Catholic Christianity. The masses suffered; the more they suffered, the more they identified with the suffering Jesus. The happy, suckling babe, cradled and protected by its mother, becomes more prevalent. This infantile and passive attitude meant great regression. This childlike position ruled out aggressive, rebellious, active revolt. It was the psychic attitude of medieval man, a human being who found himself dependent on rulers. He expected to get from them his sustenance. His hunger was proof of his sins.

Additional thinkers

The inclusion of views of other thinkers will serve to broaden the background against which the discussion of Mary and dogma continues.

Stressing that Mary's virginal motherhood is the archetype, Otto Semmelroth describes the view of the Fathers of the Alexandrian tradition of accepting Mary as a type of the Church.

> Christ the Lord, the Virgin's Fruit, did not regard a woman's breast as blessed—in contrast to the woman of the crowd who shouted its praise. It was not He who chose it for His nourishment. Rather, because the living and good Father sprinkled the Virgin with His Word, Christ became the spiritual food for good men. One is the Father of all. One is also the Word of all. One is the Holy Spirit and He is everywhere. And also one single one is the Virgin-Mother. But I

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

like to call her the Church. This unique Mother had no milk because she was not a woman as such. She is a virgin and a mother at the same time. She is spotless and undefiled as a virgin. She is loving as a mother. She raises her children and feeds them with holy milk, the child-like Word.[23]

This passage would seem to indicate a theological concept which includes some psychological significance, namely, the prominence of the mother and the infantilism of believers.

Giovanni Miegge, the Waldensian Protestant scholar, asks, What is the significance of the imposing Marian flowering?[24] He answers that it is related to the Church's effort to recover the masses. It appeals to simple, elemental feelings. Mary as woman, virgin, and mother gathers to herself the most potent and universal emotions. There is the subdued and nostalgic adoration of the drowsy child that is forever in us, desirous of caresses and protection. Man is subject to the attraction of the eternal feminine, a symbol of tremendous psychological power. "If there is a figure charged with psychological complexes, with the projection of repressed impulses, it is the Virgin Mary."[25] He continues by saying the theme of perpetual virginity associated in every adult, man and woman, is for maternal protection. "It is a typical projection on the religious plane of a humanity burdened with the feeling of inexplicable guilt which is in the process of losing its sense of the Gospel's message of pure grace and to which the 'arm' of the Lord has become 'too heavy.' "[26]

"The two psychological motives are potent and have great importance in Marian piety."[27] The Madonna and perpetual virgin and the dogma of Immaculate Conception proclaimed by Pius IX represent the sublime theme of victory over repressed sexual life. Mary's mission: the new Eve, "patroness" in Irenaeus, the merciful mediatrix of St. Bernard and Alfonso, the coredemptress of contemporary mariology, these are aspects of the development of the theme of benign maternity, always ready to forgive.[28]

On the Catholic side, Father Laurentin, a prominent mariologist, discusses the sublimation of the need for a woman's presence as an important element in Marian devotion. He feels this view is exaggerated and inaccurate. Referring to the Marian devotional language such as "marriage" and "union," Father Laurentin states, "The current development of psychoanalysis has made contemporary thought allergic to this type of devotion. . . . "[29] He continues, "Christians only came to consider Mary as *their* Mother in the ninth or tenth century and, above all, in the eleventh and twelfth . . . the question arises as to the degree to which the filial feeling should be taken, together with the orientation and coloration it should have, remembering that it is one of the strongest and most deeply rooted instincts in the heart of man."[30] Depth psychology has shown it to be one of the most complex and confused feelings man has. Men fight against their "maternal complex," especially the deviations in the maternal instinct, such as the possessive form resulting in infantilism. Father Laurentin suggests that "certain abuses in Marian devotion spring from the attempt to find emotional satisfaction for an infantile tendency which feels the need of refuge and security or that they project onto Mary the character and disposition of a possessive mother who demands, by a kind of emotional blackmail, a closed and undivided love."[31]

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Father Laurentin warns against certain femininity myths and maternity myths. He calls for the use of great discernment to avoid a view of Mary which is repressive and results in a refusal of life and its responsibilities:

> . . . the psychological discoveries of the present century . . . provide a purification of Marian piety. This cleansing should put right and strengthen; it should not be destructive. For the expression of filial feeling in a personal and inventive way is not something to be got rid of, it is quite normal. It must, however, be discreet and modest. . . . [32]

"Devotion to Mary," says Father Laurentin, "is usually a balancing factor in the right ordering of the emotions. By it men can peacefully get beyond many of the troubles of human emotional life, so often balanced through egoism and excess."[33]

And finally, quoting John XXIII as found in Father Laurentin's text, he advised his clergy to be on guard against a tendency

> . . . to cultivate certain excessive practices and special devotions in the cult of the Madonna . . . devotions which at times give a poor idea of the piety of our good people. . . . Certain pious practices satisfy only the emotions, but they do not suffice for the fulfilling of religious obligations, and correspond even less to the first three weighty and imperious commandments of the Decalogue.[34]

Retracing our steps back to psychology, it would be relevant to include the insight of Carl Gustav Jung. Dogmas, including those of Mary, are not peculiar to Christianity alone. Jung states:

> They occur just as often in pagan religions and, moreover, they can appear spontaneously as psychical phenomena in all kinds of variations, as they have in a remote past, originated from visions, dreams, or trances. . . . The dogma is like a dream, reflecting the spontaneous and autonomous activity of the objective psyche, the unconscious. . . . The dogma represents the soul more completely than a scientific theory, for the latter expresses and formulates the conscious mind alone. The dogma, on the contrary, expresses aptly the living process of the unconscious in the form of the drama of repentance and redemption.[35]

In 1952, Jung wrote *Answer to Job.* According to Ellenberger,[36] it was quite controversial in that he was revolted and enraged at what he called God's inferior sense of justice. It is in this discussion that Jung speaks of Mary in a rather significant way.

> The sacrifice of Christ appears as a reparation by God of an injustice he committed toward man. God perfected himself by means of His union with Divine Wisdom, the 'sophia,' the feminine counterpart of the Holy Spirit which reappears under the image of the Virgin Mary. For that reason Jung considers that the proclamation in 1950 of the Dogma of the Assumption is the most important religious event since the Reformation.[37]

Father Andrew Greeley, a sociologist, wrote *The Mary Myth* in 1977. In it,

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

he posits the thesis that " . . . Mary reveals the tender, gentle, comforting, reassuring, 'feminine' dimension of God."[38] Father Greeley infers a possible weakness in current Catholic theology about Mary in that it is unwilling to see Mary as a reflection of the feminine of God.

Another Catholic source, the beloved Jesuit priest-scientist, Father de Chardin speaks of the "biophysical necessity of the 'Marian' to counterbalance the masculinity of Yahweh." He argued that "the cult of Mary corrects a dreadfully masculinized conception of the godhead."[39]

What has Mary meant in history? What impression has she left on the culture of our civilization? Does Mary answer a psychological yearning of mankind? Has she a peculiar role in preserving monotheism, of satisfying man's desire for the maternal quality in association with divinity? These are questions raised by Father Thomas Burke.[40] These are valid questions and remain some of the questions of this writer.

Summary

I have attempted in this brief paper to ask the question, "Why does Mary hold her prominent place in Catholic theology to the extent that dogmas have developed around her?" I have attempted to provide a partial answer through the insights of psychoanalysis. The major thesis is that dogma arises out of the psychic needs of the people and that if we can understand people we can understand dogma. Hence, Marian dogma arises out of the psychic needs of the people. The psychic needs, as expressed in Marian dogma, are those that seek a sheltering and protective, nurturing and satisfying, and loving and pardoning Great Mother. The need is for a feminine side of God. The major thinker relied upon is Erich Fromm. Mary, as portrayed in medieval art, is used to illustrate that as art conveys or expresses unconscious contents, art supports the position of psychoanalytic opinion that psychic needs are expressed in dogma. Thinkers of both Protestant tradition and Roman Catholicism were surveyed. I wish to conclude with the notion that psychoanalytic views, such as those expressed in this paper, need not be viewed as challenging, defaming, or substituting for theological views. Rather, these views may be seen to support and enrich theological constructs such as dogma.

References

1. *Dogma* (Gr. dokien, "to seem"). The word ranged in meaning from "thinking" or "having an opinion" to "appearing best" or "being determined." The noun formation *dogma* is first found in early fourth-century B.C. writings of Xenophon and Plato, with an application comprehending legal or military degrees or commands, and philosophical or religious tenets or understandings. Patristic citation shows the process over three or four centuries of Christian confrontation with Judaism and with its own deviations, by which the legal weight of commandment was carried into the philosophical dimension, so that dogma came to identify fixed doctrines or the total system of creedal religion. That which has expressed opinion became the determined right opinion (*orthodoxia*). Collectively dogma is the intellectual side of Christian faith. The Nicene Church reviewed it historically; the nineteenth century subjected it to critical analysis. For further treatment of dogma, the reader is referred to the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 14. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967, pp. 947-948. Also Bauer, F., and Harnack, A In *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1974. Douglas, J. D., ed. S.v "Dogma," by Clyde Curry Smith, p. 306.
2. *Psychoanalysis.* A psychologic theory of the psychology of human development behavior, a method of research, and a system of *psychotherapy*, originally developed by *Sigmund Freud.* Through analysis of *free associations* and *interpretation* of dreams, emotions and behavior are traced to the influence of *repressed instinctual drives* and *defenses* against them in the *unconscious* Psychoanalytic treatment seeks to eliminate or diminish the undesirable effects of unconscious conflicts by making the patient aware of their existence, origin, and inappropriate expression in current emotions and behaviors. See American Psychiatric Association, *A Psychiatric Glossary*, 4th ed. Washington, American Psychiatric Association Publication Office, 1975, p. 126.
3. For the psychoanalytic views expressed in this paper, this writer depends almost entirely on Erich Fromm
4. Fromm, E , *The Dogma of Christ* New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963, pp vii-viii.
5. Freud, S., *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, James Strachey, trans., Vol. XXI, *The Future of an Illusion* London, The Hogarth Press, 1961, pp. 5-56. Footnotes 1 and 2 appear in the original source as follows: [1]This was an actual dream of Freud's, reported in Chapter VI(G) of *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900a), Standard Ed., 5, 454-5. [2]See Section 6 of the fourth essay in *Totem and Taboo* (1912-13), Standard Ed., 13, 146ff.
6. *Ibid*, pp 17-18
7. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
8. Fromm, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*, p 69.
12. O'Dwyer, D. T., *Our Lady in Art.* Washington, Salve Regina Press, 1934, p. 31.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
14. Guitton, J. *The Madonna.* New York, Tudor Publishing Co., n.d., p. 38.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
16. *Ibid*, p. 70.
17. Belivanes M , *The Madonna in Painting* Milan, The Hyperion Press, n.d., p. 6.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
19. Banet, C., *Our Lady and the Precious Blood in Art* Carthagena, Ohio, The Messenger Press, 1962, p. 10.
20. Fromm, *op. cit* , p 70, quoting Radó, S. In *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, xiii, 445.
21. *Ibid*
22. *Ibid*
23. Semmelroth, O., *Mary, Archetype of the Church*, Maria von Eroes and John Devlan, trans. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1963, p 42, quoting Paedagogus I, 6 —MG 8, 300 B.
24. Miegge, G., *The Virgin Mary*, Waldo Smith, trans. London, Lutterworth Press, 1955, p. 15
25. *Ibid*, pp. 184-185
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid*
29. Laurentin, R., *Mary's Place in the Church*, I G. Pidoux, trans. London, Burns and Oates, 1965, p. 73.
30. *Ibid*, p. 74.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
35. Jung, C. G., *Psychology and Religion.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938, p. 56.
36. Ellenberger, H., *The Discovery of the Unconscious.* New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1970, p. 725.
37. *Ibid.*
38. Greeley, A., *The Mary Myth* New York, The Seabury Press, 1977, p. 17.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
40. Burke, T J. M., *Mary and Modern Man.* New York, The American Press, 1954, p. viii.

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.

Bibliography

American Psychiatric Association., *A Psychiatric Glossary*, 8th ed. Washington, American Psychiatric Association Publications Office, 1975.

Banet, C., *Our Lady and the Precious Blood in Art.* Carthagena, Ohio, The Messenger Press, 1962.

Belivanes, M., *The Madonna in Painting.* Susan Bellamy, trans. Milan, The Hyperion Press, n.d.

Burke, T. J. M., ed., *Mary and Modern Man.* New York, The American Press, 1954.

Dempsey, P. J. R., *Freud, Psychoanalysis, Catholicism.* Chicago, Henry Regnery Co., 1956.

Ellenberger, H., *The Discovery of the Unconscious.* New York, Basic Books Inc., 1970.

Freud, S., *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud.* James Strachey, trans., Vol. XII, *The Future of an Illusion.* London, The Hogarth Press, 1961, reprint ed., 1964, 1968, and 1971.

Fromm, E., *The Dogma of Christ.* New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Greeley, A. M., *The Mary Myth.* New York, The Seabury Press, 1977.

Jameson, A. B., *Legends of the Madonna.* London, Hutchinson and Co., n.d.

Jung, C. G., *The Collected Works of C G. Jung.* Read, H.; Fordham, M.; and Adler, G., eds. R. F. C. Hull, trans., Bollingen Series XX, Vol. 11, *Psychology and Religion: West and East.* New York, Pantheon Books, 1958; *Psychology and Religion.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938.

Laurentin, R., *Mary's Place in the Church.* I. G. Pidoux, trans. London, Burns and Oates, 1965.

The Madonna, text by Jean Guitton. New York, Tudor Publishing Co., n.d.

Miegge, G., *The Virgin Mary.* Waldo Smith, trans. London, Lutterworth Press, 1955.

New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967, S.v. "Dogma," by M. E. Williams.

The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, 1974. S.v. "Dogma," by Clyde Curry Smith.

Our Lady in Art. Annotations and Descriptions by Rt. Rev. David T. O'Dwyer. Washington, Salve Regina Press, 1934.

Semmelroth, O. *Mary, Archetype of the Church.* Maria von Eroes and John Devlan, trans. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1963.

Shea, G. W., "The Development of Mariology in Catholic Theology." *Contemporary Developments in Theology*, The McAuley Lectures, 1958. West Hartford, Connecticut, Saint Joseph College, 1959.

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen – auch von Teilen – bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.
FROMM-Online

Todd, E. H., 1985: Mary, dogma and psychoanalysis, In: Journal of Religion and Health, New York Vol. 24 (Summer 1985), pp. 154-166.