

Emerging Scholars Sessions
IEC2012 Theology Symposium,
June 6-9 2012, Maynooth, Ireland

**A Lonerganian Analysis of The Marian Profile of the Church in the Theology of Hans
Urs Von Balthasar**

Dr Paul O'Hara
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago (CTU)

Professor and Chair of the Dept. of Mathematics
Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago

At the dawn of the new millennium, we notice with joy the emergence of the 'Marian profile' of the Church that summarizes the deepest contents of the conciliar renewal.¹

This essay, as the title suggests, will be a systematic analysis of who Mary is in relationship to the Church. It will try to break new ground by attempting a systematization based on a methodology suggested by Lonergan but inspired by the writings primarily of von Balthasar and Chiara Lubich. It is my hope that what will emerge will be a deeper understanding of who is Mary and what is the Church from an ontological perspective.

A Marian Principle: The word profile usually denotes an outline or a sketch of someone. Indeed, to the extent that the essay will not be exhaustive, it will only be an outline of the role of Mary in the Church. At the same time it will be a specific outline in that it will attempt to describe the ontological nature of Mary and her relationship to the Church.



In the history of the Catholicism, Mary has always had a special role; but that role has taken on different forms and expressions throughout the centuries. For example, during the Council, Mary's was "hailed as a pre-eminent and altogether singular member of the Church,"ⁱⁱ the prototype of a Christian. Also, her role as Mediatrix in the economy of salvation was affirmed.ⁱⁱⁱ Nevertheless, von Balthasar, although positively recognizing the inclusion of the role of Mary in the document *Lumen Gentium*, was of the opinion that the Council missed an opportunity to clarify "the Marian principle as an operational principle (in and with Christ) in the life of the church."^{iv} The proper role of Mary was not fully clarified.

What remains for many Catholics, even after Vatican II, is a certain respect for Mary's role as Mother of God, but no real understanding of what it means, especially within the context of Christology and ecclesiology. This too is reflected in contemporary theology. For example, in his essay on the Assumption, Karl Rahner acknowledges in the last sentence that the new dogma of the assumption has "significance not only for Mariology but also for ecclesiology."^v But apart from that statement, he appears never to have developed this "significance" in any way. Moreover, in his *Foundations of Christian Faith* precisely in the chapter entitled *Christianity as Church*, he acknowledges that Mary "assumes a quite definite and indeed unique function in this official and public history of salvation." He also acknowledges her as "the most radical instance of the realization of salvation, of the fruit of salvation, and of the reception of salvation,"^{vi} but does not develop this further. His comments do not seem to go beyond the Patristic understanding of Mary. Also when we turn to books on Christology which rely heavily on Historical Critical Method, the role of Mary is essentially ignored.^{vii} Lonergan, too, although he grasps the importance of historical causality and the law of the cross in redemption, never seems to develop Mary's role in relation to the Church^{viii}. Also in Hans Küng's book *The Church* there is the simple recognition that "there could be no Church without the fiat of Mary and the disciples,"^{ix} but nothing more is said.

One exception to the above must be seen in the thought of Leonardo Boff who suggested that Mary should be seen as "hypostatically united to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity."^x And while, I certainly do not agree with this specific language and formulation, I think that Boff's expression is a recognition that there is a profound relationship between the Church and Mary, between the Uncreated and the created that needs to be explored. In this regard, I think Kolbe's designation of the Holy Spirit as the "eternal Immaculate Conception" and Mary as the "human immaculate conception,"^{xi} is more accurate. It is also worth noting that in the modern zen Buddhist philosophical



tradition, that Geshin Tokiwa states that “the *tathagata-garbha* [the “womb of the Buddha”] not only represents the essential nature and existential potential of individuals, but all of humankind which Tokiwa identifies with Mary:^{xii}

When I have a chance to see Christian paintings called *pieta*, I am deeply moved by the eternal truth of humanity: the mother of God embracing and watching and finally collapsing at her sight of the son, who died bearing the cross of all beings. In fact, in St. Mary I see what Buddhists call the Buddha’s womb (*tathagata-garbha*).

The Protestant tradition too has a very uneasy relationship with the role of Mary within Christianity or within the context of the Church, which ironically has resulted in an “[un]satisfactory way of speaking and thinking the very sacrality of being mother or woman” as noted by Julia Kristeva a French psychologist quoted by Lois Malcolm.^{xiii} Indeed, the shift away from Mary’s motherhood to her faith as emphasized by Luther “leaves a vacuum, seen in the search undertaken by Protestants and others for traces of feminine imagery in God.”^{xiv} Also, the Protestant tradition does not accept anything other than scripture, particularly the Gospel of Luke, for interpreting the role of Mary. In that regard, it is ironic that in the entire list of eleven essays in the *Blessed One*, which is devoted to the understanding of Mary, not a single reference is made to the “woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet and on her head a crown of twelve stars”(Rev 12:1).

In contrast, it seems to me that in von Balthasar’s development of the “Marian Principle”, which later finds expression in the writings of Pope John-Paul II, we find a balanced and more complete view of Mary’s role in redemption and in the Church. Moreover, it is clear from von Balthasar’s writings that he considers Mary’s proper role to be more than an object of pious devotion whose life is to be emulated in a moral sense; her role, rather, is of someone whom Christ freely “chose to need” as Mother and Mother of the Church. In other words, without Mary (as indeed without Christ) there would be no Church, or at least the Church as we know it.

This is a great mystery which we now explore a little more.

The Nature of the Marian Principle: For von Balthasar there are five operative principles at work within the Church: the Petrine, the Pauline, the Jacobine, the Johannine, and finally the Marian principle of which all of the others are an expression. Indeed, to say something about the Marian Principle, we have to first say something about the other four.



“Peter” has always played a center role in the history of the Church, and in a visible way represents both the unity of the Church as an institution, and in its ministerial expression. In the early Church, we are presented with a Peter, who is both meek and insecure (Mt. 26: 69-75, Mk 14:66-72, Lk. 22:54-62, Jn. 18:15-27), leader of the Church (Mt 16:18) but at times overshadowed by Paul (Gal. 2:11) who is also symbol of the missionary Church (Acts 2:14). Nevertheless, regardless of his strong or weak points, he is the external sign of the unity of the Church. Since then we have had many popes, both strong and weak, who have left their mark on history: some have been papal monarchs, others simple shepherds of their flock, some have been great saints, others a cause of scandal. But regardless of who they were, they were also a visible sign of the dynamic unity of the Church:

As the “outward” principle of unity, the pope’s role is “an impossibility,” made possible only by God’s will in creating him. As the “fatherly head” of the Church, he is the one called to “love more;” his role is “excentric” in that he is to care for the periphery within the communion of the Church, he has judicial authority rooted in the office of judge that Christ received from the Father, an office exercised in order to seek reconciliation and unity. And since the Petrine office cares for the periphery, it manifests itself as infallible.^{xv}

The Pauline Principle can also be found from the beginning of the early Church. In particular, we might recognize its first real expression on the day of Pentecost, when Peter immediately ran into the street to proclaim the word of God. In fact, it is precisely at Pentecost when the concrete expression of the Petrine and Pauline principles come together in Peter (Acts 2:14-36). Later on this principle becomes more differentiated with the Apostle Paul taking on a leading role as missionary to the Gentiles.

The Jacobine Principle is the one least developed by von Balthasar. It derives its name from James the brother of John and it expresses “that dimension of the Church which affirms the historical sense of things, continuity, tradition, canon law.”^{xvi}

The fourth principle, which at times is indistinguishable from the Marian principle, is the Johannine one which expresses the fraternal love that holds the members of the Church together. In a certain way, it unites the other three principles, both in its recognition of the key role of Peter and our loving response to him, and also as a witness of the Christian faith, which mediates and gives meaning to the Pauline and Jacobine principles.



Without mutual love, there is nothing to preach or no tradition to preserve, while with this love we can understand the expression of Tertullian in his Apology (XXXIX) when he notes that Christians were identified as those who loved one another.

This leads to the Marian principle as what underlies and unifies all of the others, of which they are an expression. Edward Oakes expresses it this way:

First of all, the church as a whole is feminine (2:Cor 11:12), open and dependent on her

Bridegroom, while the male hierarchy, by contrast, is only one part, whose vocation is to serve the feminine Marian whole. The Church, von Balthasar would always want to insist, existed in a woman before a single man had been called to be an apostle: “In Mary the Church already has physical existence before it is organized in Peter.”

Furthermore, the hierarchical Church is most definitely founded and established in the wider reality of Church prior to its consent or even it’s ability to give its finite Yes, as Peter’s many denials so amply testify.

It was Mary, and not some apostle, or the Twelve assembled in a “college,” who first believed and made possible, on a human level, the incarnation. And so she has the primacy in a way no “primate” or prelate could ever have.^{xvii}

In other words, for von Balthasar the church as “the feminine Marian whole” unifies the other principles and defines the Marian Principle of which they are an expression. It predates the Petrine Principle in that he sees the Church being founded not on Pentecost Sunday but rather with Mary receiving John as her Son at the foot of the cross. It was Mary together with Jesus and John who constituted the first cell of the Church, and Mary’s role in this first cell as both Bride of Christ and Mother of Jesus, and later as Mother of John (so to speak) means that she can be identified as the Mother of the Church. The sorrow she freely accepted and embraced by not only watching her son die, but also in accepting another in his place constituted the second “fiat” of Mary, a ‘fiat’ said in blind faith. For this reason (as noted by Benedict XVI^{xviii}) the Petrine Profile is contained in the Marian Profile. Mary’s second “yes” made the Church possible, at least as we know it, also on an ontological level that can only be properly understood by analogy in terms of Trinitarian relationships or pericoresis. It is a sacramental unity as described by Paul in his letter to the Ephesians (Ep. 5: 21-33), analogous to marriage.



Both Cyril of Alexandria and Scheeben explain this through the language of pericoresis. Cyril speaks of a pericoresis between humanity as a whole and Christ. It is this pericoresis that defines the ontological unity of the Church, in the sense that Christ is the vine and we are the branches; while Scheeben speaks of a pericoresis between Mary and the Church,^{xix} which suggests an identification of Mary with the Church, as pointed out in the Catechism. It is here that the image of a marriage between Christ and Mary “becomes a rich metaphor to describe a genuine partnership,” as noted by Oakes.

In reality there was only one act (not multiple acts) of creation, also embracing space-time, in which all of creation was recapitulated in Christ through the consent of Mary. Indeed, as *Lumen Gentium* recognized, Mary was predestined prior to the Fall to be Mother of God and without her the Incarnation as we know it was not possible. Moreover, with the subsequent identification of Mary with the Church as Bride of Christ, the recapitulation of all in Christ became possible, according to divine plan, because of Mary’s “fiat,” while the Incarnation itself took place not because of our sins but in spite of them. This also reflects the Scotus understanding of creation.^{xx}

A Four-Point Hypothesis: With this in mind, we now try to integrate our understanding of this principle from a metaphysical and ontological perspective using a methodology first suggested by Bernard Lonergan and further developed by Robert Doran in his book *What Is Systematic Theology?* In particular, I will try to use this four-point hypothesis to better understand Rahner’s identification of the economic and immanent Trinity in terms of the Marian profile.

In his *De Deo Trino*, Bernard Lonergan notes that :

There are four real divine relations, really identical with the divine substance, and so four special ways of grounding an imitation or participation *ad extra* of God’s own life. And there are four absolutely supernatural created realities. They are never found in an unformed or indeterminate state. They are: the secondary act of existence of the Incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity and the light of glory.

Thus it can appropriately be maintained that the secondary act of existence of the Incarnation is a created participation of paternity, and so that it has a special relation to



the Son; that sanctifying grace is a [created] participation of active spiration, and so that it bears a special relation to the Holy Spirit; that the habit of charity is a [created] participation of passive spiration, and so that it has a special relation to the Father and the Son; and that the light of glory is a [created] participation of filiation that leads perfectly the children of adoption back to the Father.^{xxi}

Doran suggests that this four-point hypothesis should serve as the basis of a unified field theory in theology. I agree with this up to a point. The four created realities that are analogous to the four relationships in the Trinity also constitute one God. Consequently, the four supernaturally created realities take on a complete meaning in a Christian sense when they too are seen as constituting one new created reality which we can call Mary but later identify with the Church. In other words, both Doran and Lonergan have overlooked in their unified formulation the integrating Marian element that brings the other four supernaturally created realities together.

Mary too is a supernaturally created reality, but also quite different to the other four. Her existence not only presupposes the other realities but also constitutes them, in much the same way that the Marian profile presupposes and constitutes the other profiles of the Church. In terms of these profiles, the secondary acts of existence in which we all participate in paternity has its visible expression, at least from a Catholic perspective, in the Petrine profile, that is, the papacy and the college of bishops. Sanctifying grace speaks directly of the life of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the Pauline profile of mission. The habit of charity speaks of the Johannine profile and is reflected in our mutual love and service to others. The Light of Glory stemming from the beatific vision, speaks of the Jacobian profile and is reflected in the light that illuminates the tradition and the contemplative life of the Church. I will argue that none of them can exist as we know them without Mary.

She is the integrator on the side of creation of what God was accomplishing. At the same time, without the four created realities there would be no Mary as Immaculate Conception or Assumption. The two are tightly intertwined. In metaphysical language, we can say that Mary is the higher viewpoint that integrates the four realities into one created reality, and that this integration is accomplished in history through the Church. If Jesus is the mediator between God and man, Mary is the Mediatrix between Christ and humanity



and both mediations are brought about by the Holy Spirit. Her “yes” was a turning point in sacred history. God by his/her nature is Trinitarian and One. Creation in relationship to its creator is also Trinitarian (by analogy) but also one. The Trinitarian elements of this new order are Jesus, Mary-Holy Spirit and John, and the unity of these elements embraces the whole of creation in a reality constitutive of the Church.

Mary as a created participation of paternity and the Petrine Profile: Just as Jesus, the Word become flesh is a “created participation of paternity,” in an analogous way Mary as “Mother of God” is also a “created participation of paternity,” and by her designation as mother has a very “special relationship to the Son.” Indeed, the paternity of God in creation was accomplished by Mary being “theotokas.” The fact that Jesus emerged from Mary’s womb and took his humanity from her enables us to define him as a person with a human nature. Likewise, the fact that he was the Word become incarnate allows us to define him as a person with a divine nature. Moreover, her spiritual motherhood embraces the entire Trinity as noted in the Council of Ephesus. Numerous mystics have tried to explain this. St Louis Marie De Montford for example notes that while God created paradise for us, he created Mary to be his own paradise, while Chiara Lubich captures the greatness of Mary by means of a powerful but simple metaphor:

In the past, we had seen Mary in relationship to Christ and the saints -- to make a comparison – as in the heavens where there is the moon (Mary) in relationship to the sun (Christ) and the stars (the saints). Now, it was no longer so. The Mother of God embraced, like a vast blue sky the sun itself, God Himself.

Mary, in fact, is the Mother of God because she is the mother of the humanity of the one person of the Word, who is God and who wished to become man. The Word, however, can never be thought separate from the Father or the Holy Spirit. Jesus himself, the son of Mary, tells Philip when the apostle asks him to show them the Father: “Whoever has seen me has seen the Father ... I am in the Father and the Father is in me” (Jn. 14:9-11).

We had contemplated Mary as being set within the Trinity, but now, because of her Son, in her own particular way, we saw her as containing the Trinity.^{xxii}

In this respect the Petrine profile should be understood in an analogous way. Just as Mary embraces God, the Pope embraces the Church, the entire body of Christ. Just as the Father allowed Mary to participate in paternity through parenthood, by helping Christ grow in wisdom and understanding, likewise by analogy the Pope as Papa (literally Father)



participates in God's paternity through his guidance of the Church (the Body of Christ) in wisdom and understanding. If Mary contains the Creator, as Mediatrix she also contains within her all of creation and indeed, is the living symbol of the oneness of creation. In an analogous way, the Petrine profile is a concrete expression within history of the Marian profile in the process of becoming, in that his very position represents the oneness of the Church. The pope serves as a visible sign of the unity of the Church and an expression of the paternity and maternity (expressed through Mary) of God in history. This paternity will be seen as complete when the pope, bishops, priests and laity are united in charity. In terms of Mary and end-times this is already complete, in terms of history as a process of becoming, we seem to be a long way from its fulfillment.

Sanctifying Grace as a Created Participation in Active Spiration of the Holy Spirit and the Pauline Profile: The fact that Mary is called "full of grace" and also the Immaculate Conception is the quintessential expression of this active spiration. She represents the ultimate "dynamic state of being in love,"^{xxiii} with God. Indeed, as noted earlier Maximilian Kolbe refers to the Holy Spirit as the "eternal Immaculate Conception,"^{xxiv} while he refers to Mary as the created "Immaculate Conception." It is also within this context that Mary's role in history in terms of apparitions of Lourdes, Fatima, Guadalupe and others can be better understood. Working in conjunction with the Holy Spirit, she is on a mission to guide the Church towards its proper end and glorious assumption at the end of time when all will be recapitulated in Christ. She is the first to proclaim her Son's message and divinity, and to bear witness to his justice and mercy. Indeed, the missionary nature of the Church should be seen as an expression of her role in reaching out to all of humanity as mother.

It also explains perhaps, why Leonardo Boff referred to Mary as the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit. His language might not have been precise and accurate, but at the same time it is an acknowledgment of the special role of Mary with regard to the Holy Spirit within history and "her preferential option for the poor" and lowly. For example, in the "Blessed One" it is noted^{xxv} that:

Mary's Magnificat is a personal, communal, socioeconomic, and moral statement that praises God and celebrates freedom from injustice. Significantly it recognizes that God has direct interest in woman, for God meets Mary in her humiliation and helps her and her child. Interpreted through the lens of womanist wisdom, Mary proclaims a cultural revolution favoring the poor, an economic revolution where the poor can receive good things, and a political revolution where the poor can access power."



Mary's ongoing activity in history, whether visibly (through apparitions) or invisibly, represents an ongoing expression of her role as Mediatrix for her Son who himself is the only Mediator between God and creation. And like all the things of God, it is perichoretic in nature through the action of the Holy Spirit.

Habit of Charity as a created Participation in Passive Spiration and the Johnine

Profile: The Way of Mary is probably the best way to capture the habit of charity as lived by Mary. Don Mitchell in his book, speaks of the kenosis of Mary as a model for Christian charity and also as a way of dialoging with the Pure Land Buddhist tradition, in that she is the "personification of the mercy of God."^{xxvi} He points out, borrowing heavily from Chiara Lubich that the whole of Mary's life beginning with her yes at the incarnation to her "yes" at the foot of the cross, can be interpreted as a model of Christian charity. Her first "yes" was an immediate response to God's love for her. This is then followed by her journey to see Elizabeth and help her with her pregnancy. In the magnificat we are allowed to witness her magnificence in that "her soul magnifies the lord." In the birth of Jesus in a manger, in her purification in the temple, in the flight to Egypt we are presented with a strong woman but nonetheless the image of a woman who suffers much to protect her child. Indeed, Mary's motherhood is often held up as a model of who we should become as Christians.

In terms of the language of kenosis, Mitchell points out that

Through spiritual kenosis, the negative kenosis of ego-centeredness becomes less and less and Christ-centeredness becomes more and more until it is no longer the person or persons who act but Christ within and among them who acts. Not only the person, but, from a communal point of view, the community of God as its communal Center becomes an instrument of God acting in the world. Through a mutual kenosis, the ministry of Christ can be born from the womb of the community for the liberation of the world. In this way the community lives Mary collectively as it gives birth to a self-determination of the unity of God for the unity of humankind.^{xxvii}

This last quote expresses most adequately the meaning behind the Johannine profile of the Church. It is the collective self-emptying of members of community as a witness of the mutual love that binds its members together in unity (Jn 17) that proclaims the Johnine profile of the Church. The historical witness of service that the Church has given through its various congregations and religious orders that serve the sick and the poor, is one instance of this profile at work in a collective sense. Moreover, to the extent that the individual members bear witness in their own lives to love of neighbor, the Marian profile and the habit



of charity will continue to be manifested, culminating with the presence of “Jesus in the Midst” as proclaimed by the apostle Matthew (Mt 18:20).

The Light of Glory and the Jacobine Profile: “The Light of Glory that is the consequent created contingent condition of the beatific vision, is” according to Doran “a created participation in the Sonship of the divine Word.”^{xxviii} In this regard, Mary’s participation in the divine Sonship has no comparison in history, in that the incarnation can be seen

... as an *essentially* cooperative effort between Mary and God. It is impossible to conceive of the incarnation apart from either God’s or Mary’s involvement. The Word’s self-emptying (kenosis) is realized in Mary’s God-bearing (theotokos) and vice-versa; human creativity is included in the creative work of the Creator become creator.”^{xxix} In other words Mary’s designation as “full of grace,” and “Mother of God” contain within them a lot of implications in terms of her participation in the glory of her Son. She literally gave him his humanity and formed him. In that sense, it was her Son who participated in her humanity and consequently she was directly responsible for the divine Word’s participation in his own creation. This fact itself cannot but be the source of much wonder and contemplation.

Secondly, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception not only proclaims that Mary was born free of original sin but in fact that she could never sin in that she was “preserved from all stain of original sin” throughout her life. Presented from the perspective of pure logic the statement can give rise to many (unnecessary) debates about whether Mary was free to sin or not. In point of fact, it seems to me that all such discussions miss the point. Mary, as Cynthia Rigby points out, is better understood as an artist who is inseparable from her work. She is so totally in love with God that

the [divine] plan in fact quite literally presumes symbiosis with her person, since she will both physically receive into her being the person of God and contribute to the God-human her humanity.^{xxx}

In other words, she so participated in the light of glory on this earth that the idea of her not being in union with God is an absurdity. Mary, although completely free, could no more turn against God than Jesus could have succumbed to the temptations in the desert. Whether or not she merited this is not the issue! The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is an affirmation that *defacto* she could not have sinned. Moreover, the doctrine of the Assumption is a logical consequence of the Immaculate Conception. Mary as the “new Eve” was already living in end times and represented the new creation.



Finally, we might ask if Mary had the “beatific vision” while on earth thus preserving her from all sin. Indeed, the beatific vision would seem to explain why in the next life the story of Adam and Eve cannot to be repeated ad infinitum, with eternity becoming a nightmare existence like that of Sisyphus. In fact, in terms of the mystical tradition, the Spanish mystic Maria Agreda, wrote a “biography” of Mary based on her mystical visions in which she affirms that Mary did indeed have the beatific vision at certain times while on earth.^{xxx} Certainly, no one is obligated to accept the validity of her claims, but nevertheless if true it would give a deeper understanding of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Moreover, in this regard Lonergan in his first course on Christology that he taught in 1948 speaks of the unity of consciousness and its relationship to the beatific vision. Frederick Crowe explains it this way:^{xxxii}

How does this [the unity of consciousness] apply to the beatific knowledge Christ had? The different levels of consciousness do not conflict with one another, and neither does the beatific vision conflict with ordinary consciousness. It enlarges the field, and adds a new dimension, as three-dimensional geometry adds a new dimension to two-dimensional, but does not cut out the lower. In a similar way the mystics have a new dimension, the experience of a new order, an awful enlargement of consciousness which they cannot express in terms of the lower level.

Mary as the ultimate mystic, characterized by being the Immaculate Conception experienced this “awful enlargement of consciousness” in a radically different way, that would be very compatible with having the beatific vision. Her corporality did not block it, no more than Christ’s corporality blocked his, and the concupiscence of sin did not affect them directly. The beatific vision is a gift which God was free to give her.

Finally, in terms of the Jacobine profile we note the long mystical tradition in the history of the Church, beginning with the desert fathers, Deny the Areopagite, the monastic traditions exemplified by the Benedictines, the Cistercines, the Carthusians, the Carmelites, not to mention the numerous saints who have experienced deep contemplation and mystical visions related to the light of glory. All of these must be seen as an example of the Jacobine Tradition and partakers of the light of Glory given to Mary as full of grace.

The Church and The Marian Profile: At this stage a basic analysis has been completed of the four-point hypothesis as a heuristic for understanding the different aspects of the Marian Profile of the Church. All four points of the supernaturally created entities (incarnation, grace, charity and beatific vision) have been interpreted as a way of understanding Mary’s



role from the perspective of the Petrine, Pauline, Johannine and Jacobine principles. Mary participated in paternity as Mother of God, participated in active spiration as full of grace, participated in passive spiration as Spouse of the Holy Spirit, and participated in the light of Glory as the person who completely lived the Word of God, as “the beloved daughter of the Father,”^{xxxiii} and as full of grace fully experienced the life of God as light and glory within her.

Nevertheless, as pointed out previously, if the four-point hypothesis is to function as a unified field theory for systematic theology and, in this case, Mariology, it needs also to recognize that the four heuristics and the four supernaturally created realities are an expression and consequence of one unifying reality. This reality is the Church. At the same time, Mary as Immaculate Conception is also another supernaturally created reality which needs to be incorporated into this unity.

In the language of ontology, one can say that the Church is the integrator of the “four absolutely supernaturally created realities” associated with the four-point hypothesis and the four ecclesial principles. In terms of eschatology, it has both a historical and ahistorical dimension as immanent and transcendent respectively. In terms of ecclesiology, the Church can only be fully understood, based on the previous analysis, within the context of Mary as Mother of God embracing God Himself (cf Chiara Lubich), whereby the immanent (as bride of Christ) embraces the transcendent (cf von Balthasar) and the transcendent embraces the immanent. Moreover, underlying this mutual embracing of the immanent and the transcendent is a *pericoresis* between God and humanity, which we now explore more in depth.

Mary as Theotokos and as Bride of Christ:

Pope John-Paul II in his encyclical letter “Mother of the Redeemer” emphasizes Mary as a model of faith, and as Mediatrix between humankind and Jesus, with this latter point being a consequence of the Father entrusting his Son to her, and also of peoples need for a mother. Hers is a mediation of motherhood that comes from her Son allowing her to help him in his redemptive plan.^{xxxiv} He desires to need her:

Mary entered, in a way all her own, into the one mediation “between God and men” which is the mediation of the man Christ Jesus. If she was the first to experience within herself the supernatural consequences of this one mediation – in the Annunciation she had been greeted as “full of grace” – then we must say that through this fullness of grace and supernatural life she was especially predisposed to



cooperate with Christ, the one Mediator of human salvation. *And such cooperation is precisely this mediation subordinated* to the mediation of Christ.

Indeed, John-Paul II's development of Marian thought is very much in harmony with Luther's understating of Mary as "the model of faith," of a faith that comes to her through her Son and of faith in her son. Mary's role as helper to her Son and as Mediatrix stems from her being this model.

However, there is also another point. Implicit in the proclamation of Mary as "Theotokos" as stated by the Council of Ephesus is the fact that Mary is not only the mother of Jesus' human nature but also of his entire person, which embraces the hypostatic union, and consequently all of the Trinity. To repeat the words of Chiara Lubich:

In the past, we had seen Mary in relationship to Christ and the saints -- to make a comparison -- as in the heavens where there is the moon (Mary) in relationship to the sun (Christ) and the stars (the saints). Now, it was no longer so. The Mother of God embraced, like a vast blue sky the sun itself, God Himself.

Mary, in fact, is the Mother of God because she is the mother of the humanity of the one person of the Word, who is God and who wished to become man. The Word, however, can never be thought separate from the Father or the Holy Spirit. Jesus himself, the son of Mary, tells Philip when the apostle asks him to show them the Father: "Whoever has seen me has seen the Father ... I am in the Father and the Father is in me" (Jn. 14:9-11).

We had contemplated Mary as being set within the Trinity, but now, because of her Son, in her own particular way, we saw her as containing the Trinity.^{xxxv}

Lubich's metaphor of Mary as the vast blue sky that embraced the sun also has an aesthetic and allegorical quality to it. Any student of physics knows that the blueness of the sky is caused by the sun that it appears to contain. Without the sun there is no sky. At the same time without the sky something of the sun's majesty and beauty would not be seen. Mary then as creature embraces God, and reflects the beauty, the feminine qualities of God. It is a perichoretic image.

Intimately connected with Mary, as *theotokos*, is her cooperation in giving birth to the Church and her relationship to the whole of creation. In a theistic understanding of creation (in contrast to a deistic one), God is not just a prime mover who leaves everything to unfold according to the laws of physics. Rather he is immanently present in all of creation by means of a perichoretic relationship. Indeed, the specific event of the Incarnation is a



particular instance of the immanent presence of God within all of creation, a particular instance of “the fullness of him who is all in all”[Ep.1:23], a fullness which in the previous Biblical verse is identified with the Church [Ep. 1:22]. Without the Incarnation, God’s immanence would have been limited and would not have penetrated all of creation, since the human condition would have been excluded from this “fullness.”

Moreover, following the model of the Trinity, God’s immanence within creation is a particular expression of the perichoretic relationship within the Trinity. As Trinity, God embraces the entire creation, including his bride the Church, because outside of God there is nothing, while at the same time, following Lubich’s understanding, Mary contains the Trinity. This offers one explanation of Rahner’s identification of the Immanent and Economic Trinity. It is mediated by the Holy Spirit whose presence in creation culminates with Mary. Through the power of the Holy Spirit, Mary contains God just as creation contains God. Moreover, this perichoretic relationship between the Creator and creation, which has been there from the moment of creation, takes on a particular (but universal) meaning with the Incarnation and “Theotokas.” They occur simultaneously. Historically, Mary becomes the Mother of God at the moment of his conception in her womb, analogous to the co-penetration of the creator into creation through the perichoretic relationship, but also historically this perichoresis is extended to the entire humanity with Mary’s second “fiat” at the foot of the cross, where the Church is conceived.

The universe contains God incarnate, as God embraces the universe. In an analogous way Mary contains the Trinity when God created her and embraced her as “full of grace.” Seen in this light, one can better understand why Lubich and von Balthasar place the origins of the Church at the foot of the cross when Mary united in sorrow with her Son on the cross in a co-redemptive act, embraces John as her adopted son. Once again it is a perichoretic event initiated by the Creator. In his forsakenness on the cross, although Jesus embraces the abyss of darkness as a human being, it is a reality lived out within the Trinity (it is his Abba who appears to have abandoned him), while through the perichoretic relationship with her Son, Mary too experiences the divine separation as part of her embrace of the Trinity. Once again the Immanent Trinity is instantly communicated as an Economic Trinity. Mary’s experience at the foot of the cross as the Mother of Sorrows was how she lived the experience of Jesus Forsaken in union with her Son. To quote Lubich:

I think those who have received a special mission or calling from God can comprehend something of Mary’s mysterious suffering. God often tests these people with a spiritual dark night, when they feel as if they have lost the light he had granted



them, as to a prophet, for the good of his people. When this happens, these people, although they had been consistently aware of their calling, suffer indescribably and cry out at such abandonment.

This was the price, therefore, that Mary paid with Jesus for our birth.

It was here that she became Mother of the Church. It was here – we can perceive through intuition – that she also in some way earned her assumption to heaven with her glorified body. The law that loss becomes gain was at work here. She, who had been overshadowed by the Holy Spirit so that she gave birth to the God-Man, lost her divine maternity. As a result she could hope to gain bodily entrance into heaven through her Son himself.^{xxxvi}

Lubich's reference to "the law that loss becomes gain" reflects an aspect of Lonergan's "law of the cross."^{xxxvii} Mary through her own participation in the forsakenness of her Son, becomes Mother of the Church. And just as in the previous image, Mary is compared to the vast blue sky that contains God, so now she embraces the Church as Mystical Body of Christ, represented by her accepting John as her son. In becoming mother of John, she is more united than ever with her Son on the cross, and leads each one of us to him. In the words of Chiara:

Christians are thus formed by the Holy Spirit and Mary. The goal, of course, is not to remain in Mary but to become another Jesus.^{xxxviii}

Von Balthasar too links the Marian principle of the Church to the other four principles by means of the "law of the cross." In an interview he gave to one of my former teachers, Marisa Cerini, he described it this way:

As I see it – he said – just like Mary and her ecclesial dimension, the four members each represent a fundamental dimension of the Church: Peter represents "ministry," John "love," Paul "novelty" and "freedom in the Spirit," James, bishop of Jerusalem after Peter's departure, "tradition" and "fidelity to the tradition." At that point he drew a shape on the chalkboard distributing each of these in four different points in the shape of a cross –

Peter to the right, John to the left, James above and Paul below. He then traced an ellipse around them by indicating Mary who embraces everyone.^{xxxix}

The Church then as a divine reality relies both on its divine origin and the consent of the creature. It was Mary's "yes" at the annunciation that made the incarnation possible, and it was also her "yes" at the foot of the cross that allowed the Church as we know it to be



possible. Mary not only fully cooperates with the grace of the Holy Spirit but as Mediatrix of this grace (coming from God) she channels it to others, and indeed to all of creation. It is a great mystery, which we cannot fully comprehend. United to her Bridegroom, (to use the metaphor of von Balthasar) she by means of the Holy Spirit becomes the Mediatrix of the Graces mediated by Christ

At the same time, it would be a mistake in my opinion, to overlook the fact that the cross leads to the resurrection and assumption. Chiara Lubich makes this point when she speaks “of a nuptial relationship between the Uncreated and created because in becoming incarnate, the Word aligned himself with creation thereby divinizing it and recapitulating it in himself. There is a cosmic dimension, which embraces history and space-time, associated with the whole of creation, the risen Christ and the assumed Mary, and these realities cannot be separated. Creation responds to its creator in a Trinitarian relationship, through Mary’s embrace of God, which defines the underlying nuptial relationship between Christ and The Church. It is a cosmic event which “is *still* in the process of developing.”^{xi} In reference to this cosmic vision of Mary, Lubich refers to the Revelation of John^{xii}:

A great sign appeared in the sky, a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet and on her head a crown of twelve stars. She was with child and wailed aloud in pain as she labored to give birth.(Rev. 12:1-2).

In a certain sense, the Marian principle as explained by both von Balthasar and Chiara Lubich is a modern reiteration of the medieval teaching which refers to Mary as Mediatrix of all graces. All of creation is contained in her in that she is both Bride of Christ and Mother of the Church which is coextensive with all of creation [Ep. 1:22], and consequently Mother of all the faithful and unfaithful, believers and unbelievers, of you and I. Mary is the woman of the apocalypse, the great sign that appeared in the heavens clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet.

As a final comment, I think the cosmic vision of Jesus and Mary, as real symbols of the created and uncreated coming together in a dynamic way to form the Church further clarifies Doran’s observation that the four-point hypothesis should be grounded both in religiously differentiated consciousness, and by “locating everything in relation to history.”^{xiii} However, a lot more work needs to be done, and one would hope that the future of Trinitarian theology will explore this in more detail, with the four point hypothesis serving as a heuristic.



The Immaculization of the Church in History: In “Constants in Context,” Bevans and Schroeder point out that “the church, as such, is missionary by its very nature, because it itself is the result of the overflowing love of God, expressed in the mission of the Son and the mission of the Holy Spirit.”^{xliii} Moreover, this mission “is understood fundamentally as rooted in the continual self-giving and self-revelation of God within the history of creation,”^{xliiv} under the threefold aspect of “God the Father ... who freely creates the world and calls humanity in particular to share in the fullness of divine life ... by generously pouring out the divine goodness in history (the mission of the Son – AG 3) and never ceasing to do so in history (the mission of the Spirit – AG 4).”^{xliv} Adding to this, I would note that the “self-giving and self-revelation of God within the history of creation” presupposes a creation capable of receiving and reciprocating the love that it has received. This then becomes the role of Mary, and through Mary the entire Church.

It is within this context of history that the Marian profile of the Church is fulfilled and made visible. From an ontological perspective, the Marian profile was in place already at the beginning of creation, as the Immaculate one to whom the immanent life of the Trinitarian God is communicated fully to its creation through the economy of salvation. However, placed within the context of history in many ways it is the last profile to become visible and understood. As noted above, God’s mission existed from the beginning as “the continual self-giving and self-revelation within creation,” which broke into human consciousness and history with the People of Israel as heralds of this discovery. Later this mission is conceived as Church at the foot of the cross and then becomes the Church’s mission with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

With this last development, the Pauline profile comes quickly into light, with Peter proclaiming that Risen Christ to the people of Jerusalem (Acts 2:29-47). The Church then begins its mission with the Pauline Profile being expressed through Peter. Later as history progresses, the other profiles, while always existing, are further delineated. The Johnine Profile is expressed through the ongoing works of charity undertaken by the Christian community, the Jacobine Profile is more deeply understood through the contemplative tradition, and the Petrine Profile is more deeply understood with the documents of Vatican I and Vatican II.

But the mystery remains. In what way is Mary of Nazareth the icon of created reality and in what way does she contain God, and how may we anticipate the future unfolding of the Marian profile in history? Interpreted from the perspective of the Marian profile, Chiara Lubich notes that the history of creation is the history of the Immaculization of all of



creation, accomplished in some mysterious way through Mary as Immaculate Conception. Indeed, as noted earlier, Maximilian Kolbe referred to the Holy Spirit as the eternal Immaculate Conception and Mary as the created Immaculate Conception.

At the core of this mystery, are relationships and especially the relationship of the universal to the particular. Mary, the Virgin mother of God contains all of God, and yet is not God, although without her God's plan could not be realized. The final recapitulation of all of creation in Christ, will be the final act of purification of the Cosmos. The world will not only be imbued with the Immaculate One but also transformed by the eternal Immaculate One into the created Immaculate One in a union analogically perichoretic with the Incarnate Word, and through the Incarnate Word with all of the Trinity. The uncreated and created through the beatific vision will be perceived as a created *relatio subsistens* (to borrow from Aquinas^{xvii}) in which the immanent and economic trinity will be completely identified with each other. Each one of us will be present in this perichoretic relationship and yet will also be aware that we are participating in a Eucharistic way in the perichoretic relationship of Mary as Mother of God with the immanent Trinity. We will be aware that she is our Mother and that the whole of the universe has been Immaculatized through the Holy Spirit acting through her. The particular contains the universal.

Jesus in the Midst and The Future Mission of the Church : For Jesus to be fully human he had to be conceived and had to be born of woman, and by doing so, she not only contains God but all of creation in a perichoretic sense. Seen in this way the Mission of God in history is the full establishment of the reign of God in creation through its immaculatization, with the Church as his bride descending as the New Creation. This immaculatization of creation is accomplished in history and with the establishment of the Church becomes the mission of the Church. This accomplishment may be achieved on several levels. It helps explain Mary's involvement in history, in the form of apparitions which have helped to guide history (Fatima). However, Chiara Lubich has shown it can also be achieved in the present moment of history if we strive to live with the presence of Jesus in the midst, which characterizes her charism of unity. Indeed, for Lubich to speak of "Jesus in the midst" is to speak of "living churches," and it summarizes what the Church should be, both here on earth and in heaven, in that he (Jesus in the midst) brings to life "in the 'not yet' of history, the 'now' of God's design on humanity:"

To consciously live with Jesus in the midst is the spirituality of the Church and enables us to be Church. In fact, "Jesus in the midst" is a constitutive dimension of



the Church and does not represent only one aspect of Christian life, such as poverty, prayer, studies, love for the marginalized ...

To live with “Jesus in the midst” is to vivify the very essence and calling of the Church.

To live with “Jesus in the midst” is to bring to life in the “not yet” of history, the “now” of God’s design on humanity.

The originality of our charism does not lie only in being aware of this reality. The charism has been given to us so that, with Jesus among us, we may contribute to fulfilling the ultimate goal of “Jesus in the midst”: unity lived out by all Christians.^{xlvii}

Jesus in the midst as Church gives an ontological dimension to her “spirituality of communion,” anticipates Karl Rahner’s description of the church of the future^{xlviii}, and is the unifying expression of the four-point hypothesis unfolding dynamically in history:

Making ourselves one with our neighbor is a way, the way par excellence to make ourselves one with God. Because when we love in this way, the first two and most important commandments are fused into one. Making ourselves one with our neighbor for love of Jesus, with the love of Jesus, so that our neighbor, sweetly wounded by the love of God in us, will want to make himself or herself one with us, in a mutual exchange of help, of ideals, of projects, of affections. Do this to the point of establishing between the two of us those essential elements so the Lord can say, “Where two or three are gathered in my name, I am there among them” (Mt 18:20). Until, that is, as far as it depends on us, the presence of Jesus is guaranteed, so that we walk through life, always, as a little Church on the move --- Church whether we are at home, at school, in a garage or in Parliament, walking through life like the disciples of Emmaus with that Third among them, who gives divine value to all our actions.^{xlix}

In terms of kenosis, the becoming nothing for the other, for Lubich means that we in fact become like Mary. We become Jesus by becoming Mary. For in order for the word to speak it needed a background and that background is Mary. She is the nothingness upon which the Word comes forth:

And she kept silent because the two could not speak at once. The word must always rest against a silence, like a painting against a background.



She kept silent because she was a creature. For nothingness does not speak. But upon that nothingness Jesus spoke and said: himself. God, Creator and All, spoke upon the nothingness of the creature.

How then can I live Mary, how can my life be perfumed by her beauty?

By silencing the creature in me, and upon this silence letting the Spirit of the Lord speak.

In this way I live Mary and I live Jesus. I live Jesus upon Mary. I live Mary by living Jesus. I live Jesus by living Mary.¹

The above poem captures in a very beautiful way Mary's participation in paternity, through her maternity. She gives the Word through her nothingness, through her kenosis. And as a consequence of her nothingness she is full of grace, which then becomes incarnate in her through the action of the Holy Spirit. Similarly, when we silence our ego the Holy Spirit fills us with grace making us like Mary and allows the Word to speak through us. Moreover, when this reality is lived mutually our nothingness gives birth to Jesus in the midst. It is a collective kenosis, in which the mutual embracing of Jesus forsaken expressed as Mary desolate allows us to experience the Risen one in our midst. Lubich while distinguishing the two never separates them. Mary will always be the blue sky who embraces the sun.

The Church then characterized by Christ's presence among us is an ontological reality fruit of our becoming empty like Mary through the action of the Holy Spirit. With the presence of Jesus in the midst we become living churches.

The embrace of Jesus Forsaken as spouse corresponds to a participation in paternity by enabling us to become Mother and Father to others; our cooperation with the Holy Spirit enables a kenotic participation in passive spiration by allowing him to dwell in us; the reaching out to our neighbor in charity enables a cooperation with the Holy Spirit through participating in active spiration; and finally our embrace of Jesus Forsaken through our cooperation with the Holy Spirit, enables us to experience the life and light of God within us with whom we are in relationship. This light is a foretaste of the beatific vision, a sense of completeness within our lives which we identify with living the Light of Glory. It is the fullness of joy that comes from having Jesus in the midst, an intellectual understanding that comes from making the "ineffable" effable in our lives. And finally, we give birth to Jesus in the midst when we are collectively Mary.



Conclusion: At this juncture we bring the discussion about Mary to a close. The four supernaturally created realities owe their formal existence to the existence of the Church as Mystical Body, which participates in paternity (and maternity) by being the source of life for others, is sustained in existence by grace, is fount of charity through its service to all, and restores people to the Light of Glory through its offer of redemption. At the core of this Church is a created *relatio subsistens* characteristic of an analogical perichoretic relationship between Jesus and Mary, between the uncreated and the created, a relationship in which the immanent Trinity is equal to the economic Trinity.

Closely related to this is the understanding of the Church as “bride of Christ,” and consequently as full of grace. Furthermore, in affirming the Church in this way, the sacraments which are themselves supernatural gifts and sources of grace can now be subsumed under the theology of Church, and understood from the perspective of the four-point hypothesis or equivalently from the perspective of the Marian profile of the Church. Indeed they are an expression of the Church’s life, for without the Church there are no sacraments.

On a final point, we note that the Catholic understanding of Church is very different to the Protestant one. Indeed, in this sense Catholicism is closer to Pure Land Buddhism in that both have an ontological sense of the oneness of creation and also aware of the underlying role of the feminine in constituting this oneness.

In conclusion, the Marian profile serves to unify the other profiles of the Church. It recognizes that in reality the whole created universe symbolized by “a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars” (Rev 12:12) is intimately connected with the Church, through the presence of the Risen Lord. But “she kept silent because the two could not speak at once” and “upon the nothingness of the creature Jesus spoke and said: himself.” Through her “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us,” (Jn. 1:14) while at the same time “in him were created all things... all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together”(Col 1:15-17) , as the created Immaculate One.



Works Cited

- Abbott, Gallagher. *Documents of Vatican II*. Corpus Books
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologicae*.
- Agreda, Maria. *The Mystical City of God*. Hammond (IN), Conkey Co., 1912.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs. *The Theodrama III*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992.
- _____. *Theologik III*.
- Bevan, Steve and Roger Schroeder. *Constants in Context*. New York, Orbis, 2005.
- Boff, Leonardo. *The Maternal Face of God: The Feminine and Its Religious Experience*, Harper and Row (San Francisco), 1987.
- Cerini, Marisa. *Dimensione Mariana*. *Unita' e Carismi* 8(1998)/1, 2-4.
- Crowe, Frederick. *Christ and History*. Ottawa: Novalis.
- Doran, Robert. *What Is Systematic Theology?* Univ. Toronto Press, 2005.
- Focolare Movement. *Opera di Maria, statute generali*. Roma: Citta' Nuova.
- Gaventy, Beverly Roberts and Cynthia Rigby. *Blessed One, Protestant Perspectives on Mary*. John Knox Press, 2002.
- John Paul II, Pope. *Mother of the Redemmer*. Daughters of St. Paul, 1987.
- Kung, Hans. *The Church*. Sheed and Ward, New York.
- Lane, Dermot. *The Reality of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Luttenberger, Gerard. *An Introduction to Christology: In the Gospels and Early Church*.
- Lubich, Chiara. *Essential writings*. New York: New City Press, 2006.
- _____. : *Mary The Transperancy of God*: New York: New City Press, 2003.
- _____. : *Jesus in Our Midst: To Make Visible The Presence Of The Risen Lord In The Church*. *New Humanity Review* 14 (2009).
- _____. : *unpublished writings*.
- Mitchell, Donald. *Spirituality and Emptiness*. Paulist press, 1991.
- Mystic , CT: Twenty-Third Publications.
- Leahy, Brendan. *The Marian Profile: In the Ecclesiology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. New York: New City Press.
- Oakes, Edward T. *Pattern of Redemption: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. New York: Continuum, 1994.



Oakes, Edward T. and David Moss, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. New York: Crossroad, 2005.

_____ *Theological Investigations 20*. Crossroad, 1981.

_____ *Theological Investigations I*. Helicon Press, Baltimore.

_____ *The Trinity*: Crossroad, 1997.

Pope Benedict XVI., quoted by Leahy. *Carismi in Unita'*. December 06

JP II, *Catechesis on signs of hope in the Church*, 23 November, 1998, quoted by B. Leahy in *The Marian Profile*.

ⁱⁱ *Lumen Gentium*, Documents of Vatican II, 86.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid.* 91.

^{iv} Leahy, *The Marian Profile*, 37.

^v Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations 1*, 227.

^{vi} Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 387.

^{vii} See for example, *The Reality of Jesus* by Dermot Lane or *An Introduction to Christology* by Gerard Luttenger.

^{viii} Lonergan wrote only one paper on Mariology entitled *The Assumption and Theology*, written prior to 1950.

^{ix} Hans Kung, *The Church*, 129.

^x Leonardo Boff, *The Maternal Face of God* states.: “We maintain the hypothesis that *the Virgin Mary, Mother of God and of all men and women, realizes the feminine absolutely and eschatologically, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit has made her his temple, sanctuary, and tabernacle in so real and genuine a way that she is to be regarded as hypostatically [absolutely and really] united to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.*”

^{xi} Donald Mitchell, *Spirituality and Emptiness*, 192.

^{xii} *Ibid.* 186-189.

^{xiii} Gavena Roberts, Beverly and Cynthia Rigby (ed), *Blessed One*, 140.

^{xiv} *Ibid.* 141.

^{xv} Leahy, *The Marian Profile*, 137.

^{xvi} *Ibid.*, 65-66.

^{xvii} Oakes, *Pattern of Redemption*, 261.

^{xviii} Pope Benedict XVI on December 8, 2005 and again on March 25, 2006 at the installation ceremony of the new cardinals Il Vaticano II doveva esprimersi sulle componenti istituzionali della Chiesa (...). Ma questo aspetto ‘petrino’ della Chiesa e’ incluso in quello ‘mariano’. In Maria, l’Immacolata, incontriamo l’essenza della Chiesa in modo non deformato. Da lei dobbiamo imparare a diventare noi stessi ‘anime ecclesiali’, cosi’ si’ esprimevano i Padri.”

^{xix} Leahy, *Marian Profile*, 23.

^{xx} Oakes, *Pattern of Redemption*, 66.

^{xxi} *Ibid.* 65-66.

^{xxii} Chiara Lubich, *Mary, The Transparency of God* (Hyde Park, NY: NCP, 2003) 26.

^{xxiii} Doran, Robert, *What Is Systematic Theology*, 64.

^{xxiv} Mitchell, Donald, *Spirituality and Emptiness*, 192.

^{xxv} *Blessed One*, 76.

^{xxvi} *Spirituality and Emptiness*, 192

^{xxvii} *Ibid.* 200-201.



-
- ^{xxviii} Robert Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?*, 65.
- ^{xxix} Rigby, *Mary and The Artistry of God*, 146.
- ^{xxx} *Ibid.* 147
- ^{xxxi} Maria Agreda, *The Mystical City of God*. Chap XIV, 482-488.
- ^{xxxii} Frederick Crowe, *Christ and History. The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935 to 1982*, 58.
- ^{xxxiii} Cerini 74. It is a quote she uses from Chiara Lubich.
- ^{xxxiv} John-Paul II, Pope, *Mother of the Redeemer*, 56(39).
- ^{xxxv} Chiara Lubich, *Mary, The Transparency of God* (Hyde Park, NY: NCP, 2003) 26.
- ^{xxxvi} *Ibid.*, 43.
- ^{xxxvii} Frederick Crowe, *Christ and History*, 127-128: "It is the victory of suffering, of accepting the consequences of sin, the evils of the world, in the spirit that animated Christ. It is the transformation of the world that arises when evil is transformed into good by the Christian spirit."
- ^{xxxviii} Chiara Lubich, *Mary, The Transparency of God* (Hyde Park, NY: NCP, 2003) 33.
- ^{xxxix} Marisa Cerini, "Dimensione mariana" in *Unita' e Carismi* 8(1998)/1, 2-4. Also see Leahy, 138.
- ^{xl} *Ibid.*
- ^{xli} Lubich, *Mary* 39.
- ^{xlii} Doran 76.
- ^{xliii} Bevans and Schroeder, 287.
- ^{xliiv} *Ibid.*, 287.
- ^{xli v} *Ibid.*, 287.
- ^{xli vi} *Summa Theologiae*, Ia, q29, a.4.
- ^{xli vii} Chiara Lubich, "Jesus in Our Midst: To Make Visible The Presence Of The Risen Lord In The Church." *New Humanity Review* 14 (2009).
- ^{xli viii} Rahner, *The Spirituality of the Church of the Future*. In *Theological Investigations*, 20.
- ^{xli x} Lubich *Essential* 233-234.
- ^l Lubich, *Mary* 100.