

12-2022

"THE INNER FORM OF THE CHURCH:" THE MARIOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY OF ERICH PRZYWARA

Danijel Uremovic

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/aristos>



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

Recommended Citation

Uremovic, D. (2022). "THE INNER FORM OF THE CHURCH:" THE MARIOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY OF ERICH PRZYWARA," *Aristos* 6(1), 22-34. Retrieved from <https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/aristos/vol6/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you by ResearchOnline@ND. It has been accepted for inclusion in Aristos by an authorized administrator of ResearchOnline@ND. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.



“THE INNER FORM OF THE CHURCH:”

THE MARIOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY OF ERICH PRZYWARA

Danijel Uremović

1. Introduction

It is only in recent years, following the publication of an English translation of his *Analogia Entis*,¹ that Polish-German theologian Erich Przywara has gained wider attention in the Anglosphere. While this recent translation is among the few texts available to current English readership, it is arguably their best introduction to a figure whose works were so drastically shaped by the analogical principle he characterised as “the fundamental Catholic form.”² Here, we will explore but two interrelated applications of Przywara’s doctrine of analogy, namely his Mariology and ecclesiology. After introducing his understanding of analogy as the fundamental Catholic form, we will then explore his related designation of Mary as “the interior form of the Church.” From here, we will relate the various links between Mariology and ecclesiology that underpin the formal-causal role Przywara identifies in the life of Mary (specifically the passion, Mary’s motherhood, and her nuptiality). Following this, we will consider some implications of Przywara’s Mariology for ecclesiology, particularly as concerns the Church’s hierarchy and holiness. Finally, we will conclude with some reflections on what Przywara’s Marian ecclesiology might offer the Church today.

¹ Erich Przywara, *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics: Original Structure and Universal Rhythm* (= *AE*), trans. John R. Betz and David Bentley Hart (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014); original German text in Przywara, *Analogia Entis: Metaphysik: Ur-Struktur und All-Rhythmus* (= *Schriften* III) (Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag, 1996).

² Przywara, *AE*, 348-399 (*Schriften* III, 247-301). On the theme of a Catholic thought-form, see Peter Casarella, “Hans Urs von Balthasar, Erich Przywara’s *Analogia Entis*, and the Problem of a Catholic *Denkform*,” in Thomas Joseph White, ed., *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Antichrist or the Wisdom of God?*, foreword by J. Augustine Di Noia (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 192-208.

2. The *analogia entis*

As the fundamental Catholic form, the analogy of being finds various formulations throughout Przywara's writings.³ Aside from tensions, polarities, and unities-in-difference, one particular expression of the analogical principle is taken up by Przywara as the definitive articulation of the unique relationship that obtains between creatures and God, namely that of Lateran IV. In its pronouncements against Joachimism, the council affirmed the basic analogical form of a "unity-in-difference," teaching that "inter Creatorem et creaturam non potest similitudo notari, quin inter eos maior sit dissimilitudo."⁴

Setting aside the historical functions of analogy in logic and language, the council's formulation of analogy progresses beyond the static thought principles that ultimately collapse in systems of either univocity or equivocity. By contrast, Lateran IV captures the dynamic nature of the analogical principle, never resolved in terms of simple conjunction (of identity and opposition), but through a movement from *similitudo* to *dissimilitudo*. For this reason, the *analogia entis* – *qua* principle – is not rooted in the law of identity (as though it were the ground "from which" everything else could be deduced or "to which" everything else could be reduced), but in the law of non-contradiction (through which the *maior dissimilitudo* is made known).⁵

3. Mary as the Inner Form of the Church

In his *Weg zu Gott*, Przywara situates the woman of Catholic religion between the double charge of degradation and idolatry levelled against her. Either displaced by man, or herself displacing Christ, the status of woman is externally reckoned in terms of either strict identity, or absolute contradiction, with God. Through degradation, the vocation of woman is marked by her silent obedience to man as the head of family and ecclesial life; through a contrary extreme, woman is mistakenly made the object of the *latría* owed to God alone. Within this tension, Przywara is

³ Before long, the reader of *AE* is introduced to Przywara's distinct philosophical lexicon: tension, unity-in-difference, rhythm, back-and-forth, polarity, in-and-beyond, etc., all of which serve as markers for the singular concept of analogy.

⁴ Heinrich Denzinger, Peter Hünermann, Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash, eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, 43rd Edition (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), § 806.

⁵ Przywara, *AE*, 314 (*Schriften* III, 210).

– in accordance with his characteristic attention to the analogical middle – able to discern the problems that prove the apparent Marian extreme of idolatry false: despite her elevated status in Catholic religion, the *Virgo-Mater* is exempt from neither the silence nor the obedience ascribed to common woman; she had no share in the sacramental priesthood, and following a life of obedience to Joseph, continued to obey her divine Son “from Cana to Golgotha.”⁶

This fundamental analogy of Mary with God recalls the general form of analogy outlined by Przywara. For whatever likeness is drawn between Mary and God, an ever-greater dissimilarity remains, such that the Queen of heaven is first the *ancilla Domini*, whose dignified and peculiar vocation is yet preceded by a *fiat* uttered in obedience to God. This basic Mary-God analogy, however, has a necessarily Christological accent, underpinning Przywara’s designation of Mary as “the inner form of the Church.”⁷ Because there “is no division of heart between God, Christ, and Mary,”⁸ and because the basic structure of divine condescension remains “God in Christ in the Church,”⁹ Mary is seen to occupy a unique role in the formation of the Church.

Several concerns, however, arise in the proposition of these parallel analogies, particularly alongside their derivative designation of Mary as the interior form of the Church. How is it that priority is given to Mary over the Church (as her formal-causal role implies)? Likewise, how can Mary exercise any influence over the Church without interrupting the basic schema of “God in Christ in the Church?” Furthermore, what ties between Mary and the Church, beyond loose types and metaphor, can serve to secure this analogy?

The answer to these questions lies in the common Christological orientation of Mary and the Church. Both together remain *for* Christ, such that whatever link is discerned between them (man-woman analogy, nuptial imagery, etc.), is one ultimately grounded in the decisive bonds of motherhood, spousal union, and (especially for Przywara) the redemptive work of Christ’s passion. While mere metaphor may admit of a free exchange of Marian and ecclesial traits, only the definitive ties of motherhood, marriage, and the passion (in their peculiar and exemplary Christological instances) permit our question of priority, precisely because they alone admit of

⁶ Przywara, *AE*, 198-237 (*Schriften* III, 112). Cf. Aníbal Edwards, “Mariología, Espíritu Misionero y Sentir con la Iglesia: Caras Permanentes del Legado de Erich Przywara S.J. (1889-1972).” *Teología y Vida* 51 (2010): 381-382.

⁷ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?: Summula*, (San Miguel: Instituto Thomas Falkner SJ, 2016), 210 (*Was ist Gott?: Summula* (Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1947), 68).

⁸ Przywara, *Weg zu Gott in Religionsphilosophische Schriften* (= *Schriften* II) (Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag), 113.

⁹ See, for example, Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 154ff (*Was ist Gott?*, 40).

a genuine formal-causal link. As such, let us explore each of these constituent features of the Marian Church-form.

3.1. Christ's passion

For Przywara, Christ's passion remains the decisive link between Mary and the Church, while also accounting for the causal priority of the former over the latter. Furthermore, this initial link of the passion also provides for the subsequent (though more immediately apparent) links of maternity and spousal union. Because "[t]he unity of Christ and Mary is therefore this one piercing,"¹⁰ Mary "has most fully participated in Christ's passion" and so "rises to exercise the most pervasive influence over the Church born from the passion."¹¹

This grounding of the Mary-Church analogy in Christ's passion also provides for the specific interiority of the Marian Church-form, a feature overlooked by certain unrestrained Romantic tendencies towards a Mariology derived from ecclesiology, and their consequent emphasis on a "Mary" and "Church in glory."¹² United with Christ at the foot of the cross, Mary remains at the heart of the Church as its guiding principle. Thus – in keeping with the analogical principle we first discerned in the paradoxical life of Mary – it is only at the cross that we ever truly encounter a "Mary in glory," and the proper significance of her role as the "Church's noble daughter" and the "Eternal feminine" (paradoxically lost in their absolute, Romantic presentations).¹³ "Mary ... is the singular maternal womb of this glory of the cross," specifically in a "Church gloriously crucified, and through crucifixion, glorified."¹⁴

¹⁰ Przywara, *Alter und Neuer Bund*, 21. Translation from Aaron Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God: The Ecclesiology of Erich Przywara* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2020), 168-169.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹² Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 175-176.

¹³ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 176.

¹⁴ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 215 (*Was ist Gott*, 70). Cf also 159 (43): "the cross of the Church, in the Church as cross".

3.2. Mother of all the Living

Mary's motherhood likely remains the most immediate and developed aspect of her link with the Church, and the domain where the Mary-Church analogy is most evident. Through the identification of Christ's human flesh with his Mystical Body, the Church is rightly understood as a reality formed in "Mary as the womb and inner form' of all redeemed life."¹⁵ Through this primary sense of the maternal Mary-Church analogy, the causal priority of Mary over the Church (implied by the "inner form" label) is upheld, and the basic structure of "God in Christ in Church" remains unharmed (disrupted by Mary, Mother of the Church, only as much as by Mary, mother of God).¹⁶

Nevertheless, the natural bonds of motherhood are not, for Przywara, the most decisive means by which Mary shapes the Church and constitutes its inner form. The passion, as the critical intersection of the Marian vocation with the redemptive work of Christ, and the birth of his Church, is likewise the proper grounding of Mary's maternal relation to the Church as "mother of all the living."¹⁷ Mary is the "human origin of the glory of the cross,"¹⁸ that is, the mother of those who live by a "life given in Body and Blood."¹⁹ Only through the cross is Mary's motherhood ever fully realised.

Through this cruciform motherhood, alongside the analogy of Mary and God (who reveals himself "in Christ, in the Church"), we come to see the ultimate fecundity of the *Mater Dolorosa* in the Church, born of Christ's passion: "the paternity of the Father ... is fecund in the womb of mother Church, which is the maternal womb of Mary."²⁰ Through the extension of his Body, the Church, across time and place, Christ becomes "all in all."²¹ Yet as mother of the Church, Mary remains "the Mother of this 'all in all.'"²²

¹⁵ Przywara, *AE*, 569 (*Schriften* III, 493).

¹⁶ "Maria, aus der Christus, der in der Kirche". Przywara, *Weg zu Gott* (*Schriften* II, 118). Cf. Edwards, "Mariología, Espíritu Misionero y Sentir con la Iglesia," 367.

¹⁷ Przywara, *Weg zu Gott* (*Schriften* II, 112-120).

¹⁸ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 212 (*Was ist Gott?*, 69).

¹⁹ Przywara, *Ich bin in deinem Leben in Karmel: Geistliche Lieder* (Munich: Verlag Josef Kösel and Friedrich Pustet, 1932), 137.

²⁰ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 210 (*Was ist Gott?*, 68).

²¹ 1 Col. 3:11.

²² Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 210 (*Was ist Gott?*, 68).

3.3. Mary's Nuptiality

The above tensions of the Mary-Christ analogy are only further confused with the introduction of an additional spousal label. One can readily appreciate the sort of nuptial link that obtains between Christ the bridegroom, and the Church his bride, as in Przywara's understanding of Christ's Body, the Church, as a *corpus sponsale*.²³ Taken from his side on the cross, the Church likewise aligns neatly with the familiar Adam-Eve typology, only ever extended to Mary with cautious qualification. How then is the Mother of God to be brought into this nuptial imagery, without further distortion of the above analogies?

Przywara's understanding of the nuptiality between Mary and Christ recovers an idea better developed in early Patristic literature.²⁴ For Przywara, the basic analogy of Adam-Eve undergoes drastic transformation in Christ-Mary, as from a "primordial reality" to a "redemptive" one.²⁵ While the soteriological reworking of Adam-Eve as Christ-Mary nevertheless retains the basic form of "woman from the man," it also introduces a new "supernatural form of 'Mary as the [specifically nuptial] womb ...' of all redeemed life."²⁶ Thus, while the nuptial analogy of Adam-Eve to Mary-Christ retains the constituent analogy of man-woman as its basic line of comparison, there nevertheless remains an ever-greater difference, introduced by a new economy of redemption (which Przywara connects to the understanding of a new creation),²⁷ whereby the maternal and spousal are in no way confused.²⁸ As such,

[t]he original 'analogy proper to man-woman' passes, through and beyond original sin's 'contradiction between man and woman,' into a mysterious correspondence between the Christ of 'power in powerlessness, glory in shame, blessing in curse, plenitude in nothingness' and the virgin Mary, understood as the 'beatitude of the lowliness of the handmaid.'²⁹

²³ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 141 (*Was ist Gott?*, 33).

²⁴ Ignace de la Potterie, *Mary in the Mystery of the Covenant*, trans. Bertrand Buby (New York: Alba House, 1992), 205. De la Potterie notes the predominance of the Incarnation in the patristic treatment of Mary's bridehood, and how Cana, despite the perhaps more obvious site for Marian nuptiality, is relatively underdeveloped.

²⁵ Przywara, *AE*, 568 (*Schriften* III, 492).

²⁶ Przywara, *AE*, 569 (*Schriften* III, 493).

²⁷ Przywara, *AE*, 563 (*Schriften* III, 486).

²⁸ See Edwards, "Mariología, Espíritu Misionero y Sentir con la Igelsia," 377-378.

²⁹ Przywara, *AE*, 569 (*Schriften* III, 493).

Yet “Mary is the spousal encounter of God with the world,” specifically “*in the singular glory of the cross.*”³⁰ Where the passion remains, as we saw, the decisive point of Mary’s influence on the Church, and the place where her motherhood is most fully realised, it is also the moment that provides the proper form of Marian nuptiality, anticipated by the Johannine presentation of Cana. For Przywara, “Jesus and Mary emerge as a sort of personalized cross-structure,”³¹ even so as to constitute (in a carefully qualified way) a single *Logos*, a single *Imago* in analogy.³² In this regard, the fourth Gospel remains the central biblical presentation of the nuptiality of Jesus and Mary, given by John’s double beginning – (suprahistorically) *in principio*, and (intrahistorically) at Cana. Mary, “from the beginning, is so intimately present at the wedding feast and connected with the wedding that the entire miracle which is accomplished leads back to the collaboration of these two persons: Jesus and the mother of Jesus.”³³

And yet, for Przywara, Cana remains the key to the remainder of the fourth Gospel, colouring the entirety of John with its nuptial imagery. As such, Mary, who was obedient “from Cana to Golgotha,”³⁴ was also bride throughout. At the cross, the nuptiality of Mary and Jesus is most properly realised. United through the piercing that Przywara reads as “nuptial,” Mary exercises her chief influence on the Church³⁵ as “the spousal encounter ... of God with the world.”³⁶ “Des Himmels und der Erde Braut, Jungfrau, Maria!”³⁷

4. Implications for the Church

Aside from the important soteriological function of the Mary-Church analogy, the link Przywara makes between the two through his idea of a Marian “inner form” is seen to have very real consequences for his understanding of the earthly institutions in which the Church is manifested. Here, we will consider two basic implications that Przywara draws from his insistence on the Marian Church-form, namely, as concerns the analogy (precisely as a dynamic

³⁰ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 214 (*Was ist Gott?*, 70).

³¹ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 163.

³² Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 162-166; Przywara, *AE*, 560ff (*Schriften* III, 483ff).

³³ De la Potterie, *Mary in the Mystery of the Covenant*, 205.

³⁴ Przywara, *AE*, 198-237 (*Schriften* III, 112).

³⁵ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 168.

³⁶ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 214 (*Was ist Gott?*, 70).

³⁷ Przywara, *Du Blütenzart, Du Maiengrün in Karmel*, 42.

rhythm and not a static middle-ground) that obtains between a hierarchical and antinomian Church, as well as a holy and sinful one.³⁸

4.1. Tensions in Przywara

Przywara's ecclesiology – according to the themes of hierarchy and authority – admits of various readings at different points.³⁹ Przywara's understanding of hierarchy and authority is evidently conditioned by his Ignatian context.⁴⁰ For him, the obedience owed to human authorities in the Church is one ultimately directed to Christ, whereby the schema “God in Christ in the Church” takes on the specific character of a “representation-in-descent.”⁴¹ On the other hand, however, there are also strong antinomian tendencies to be found in his work, whereby the Church, beyond any “reified order,” is properly characterised by bonds of nuptial fidelity.⁴² While the “back-and-forth” of Przywara's musings on Church hierarchy may well be the fruit of development or re-assessment, it could – quite unsurprisingly – be indicative of an analogical rhythm at play in his ecclesiology.

Such an ecclesial rhythm is, of course, transposed from the Marian. We have already seen the interplay of Mary's humility and her unique election: Mary's motherhood and queenship are realised within her silence and obedience.⁴³ “The particular vitality of the Church is ... the mother of Christians, who decides vitally”⁴⁴ – a decision which only ever takes the form of a *fiat*, a whole-hearted assent to a prior ordaining. Only from the *Regina caeli* do we derive a notion of the “... Church as queen,” inasmuch as she is ‘our holy mother, the hierarchical Church.’”⁴⁵ Indeed, “[t]he unique spouse and mother exists ... solely in the vital contingency of the Church's historically living ministers.”⁴⁶

³⁸ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 178-179.

³⁹ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 177-180.

⁴⁰ Thomas F. O'Meara, *Erich Przywara: His Theology and His World*, foreword by Michael A. Fahey (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 168.

⁴¹ O'Meara, *Erich Przywara: His Theology and His World*, 169.

⁴² Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 178; Przywara, *In und Gegen*, 354.

⁴³ See Edwards' beautiful summation of the mystery and silence in Mary's vocation in “Mariología, Espíritu Misionero y Sentir con la Iglesia,” 381.

⁴⁴ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 150 (*Was ist Gott?*, 37).

⁴⁵ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 150 (*Was ist Gott?*, 37).

⁴⁶ Przywara, *¿Qué es Dios?*, 150 (*Was ist Gott?*, 37).

A parallel tension is to be found in Przywara's understanding of the Church as simultaneously holy and sinful. How is Mary as "the inner form of the Church" to be reconciled with the manifest sinfulness of the Church? Przywara, attentive to the polarity of a Church both sinful and holy, takes up the patristic conception of the Church as a *casta meretrix*, relating this paradoxical label to the figures of Mary, mother of God, and Mary Magdalene. Mary remains "the Church's sinless 'interior,'" outwardly expressed "in the sinful Mary Magdalene."⁴⁷

4.2. Contemporary Tensions

Graham McAleer, in his *Erich Przywara and Postmodern Natural Law*, relays some of the popular historical names directed to one's opponents in political discourse.⁴⁸ At least one of these – "ultramontanist" – has been well revived recently in ecclesial life, alongside its contrary – of even greater antiquity – "schismatic" (itself perhaps a fitting candidate for McAleer's catalogue). Both these extremes – regardless of where one might fall on the ecclesial spectrum – highlight a true polarity and identify (even if exclusively) either of two genuine commitments of the believing churchman: obedience to authority and adherence to the truth. Recalling Przywara's back-and-forth between the antinomical and hierarchical realities of the Church, we can immediately detect the [1] implied tension and analogical middle between the "ultramontanist" and the "schismatic" extremes, as well as [2] the underlying non-distinction that obtains between apparent contraries, on account of their common grounding in a static principle of identity. Let us consider these both.

Concerning the extremes and their middle, the caricature of both the "ultramontane" and the "schismatic" is one determined by either's implied relationship between God and the Church. For the unrestrained ultramontane, ecclesial powers are – on some level – brought into strict identity with God, whereas the "schismatic" is generally regarded as dissolving this relationship into one of pure contradiction. Because both of these labels, in their signified extremes, conform with the basic tension of unity and difference, they can seem to suggest – in

⁴⁷ Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 172; Przywara, *Christentum gemäß Johannes* (Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1954), 301.

⁴⁸ Graham James McAleer, *Erich Przywara and Postmodern Natural Law: A History of the Metaphysics of Morals* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019), 43.

Przywara's system – an analogical middle that neither collapses the Church into a wholly divine and infallible entity, nor severs her entirely from her true divine origins.⁴⁹

The second point concerns another feature of Przywara's doctrine of analogy (and one especially drawn out by McAleer),⁵⁰ namely the fundamental unity of the equivocalist (read, "schismatic") and univocalist ("ultramontane") appraisals of the Church. For Przywara, the dynamic nature of analogy is something owed to its grounding not in the law of identity (as a static principle) but in the law of non-contradiction (whence the ever-greater dissimilarity).⁵¹ Accordingly, the apparently distinct extremes of the ultramontane and schismatic are, at best, temporary, being grounded in the simple "logical"⁵² reckoning of the Church according to conjunctions of divine and human institutions, whereby the Catholic is tasked to discern the lines of continuity between God, His designated representatives, and Church life (hence the popular games of classifying magisterial actions according to their apparent weight, or the wholesale rejection of such as useless and casuistic).

According to this understanding, the "ultramontane" and the "schismatic" eventually collapse into their opposites. Where a strong identity with God was first ascribed to the ultramontane, those inclined to the selective reception of Church teaching and praxis are seen to bring (if not the Church) themselves into strict identity with the divine. Conversely, the contradiction, initially correlated to the "schismatic," eventually takes root in those who, through undiscerning obedience, simply shift the apparent contradiction of God and Church from matters of authority to ones of truth.

5. Concluding Remarks: Retrieving the Marian form

What then does Mary, as the inner form of the Church, offer to remedy these extremes of ecclesial life? In our study of Przywara's Mariology, we found the cross to be the decisive

⁴⁹ Importantly, the middle ground, as we shall see, cannot be limited to a static "evening-out" of extremes, but must necessarily take the form of a rhythmic movement in-and-beyond them.

⁵⁰ The entirety of McAleer's *Erich Przywara and Postmodern Natural Law* is essentially devoted to unveiling the fundamental unity of apparent dichotomies in differing historical contexts.

⁵¹ *Vide supra* fn. 5.

⁵² That is, not as something reasonable, but as conforming to the strict identity underpinning formal logic. The central problem for analogy concerns its presentation of the middle between univocity and equivocity, which is neither reducible to one or the other, nor so mysterious so as to be conceptually useless. Przywara achieves this true analogy through his insistence on a dynamic principle grounded in the law of non-contradiction.

moment of Mary's influence in shaping the Church, prior even to the most immediately discernible features of her bridehood, maternity, and queenship. These familiar designations are rather (in their ecclesial significance) first determined by the cross, chiefly through the unique participation of Mary in Christ's passion.

Since Mary remains the inner form of the Church, her glorification through suffering and the exercise of her rule through silent obedience together become key models for a Church suspended between heaven and earth, tending as it were, between hierarchy and antinomy, between sin and sanctity. A simple identification of the Church with either side of the picture is necessarily incomplete. By retrieving an understanding of the Marian form of the Church, one can rightly perceive the paradox that marks the life of Mary to have its natural extension in the Church, such that true obedience (proper to hierarchy) and freedom (sought by the antinomian) in the Church are tempered and driven by the "back-and-forth" rhythm proper to the Church as *casta meretrix* – not on account of any dualistic necessitation of either, but through an honest appreciation of both as part of the ecclesial reality.⁵³ True freedom and true obedience, understood against the Marian exemplar, serve to rectify the various brands of casuistry and individualism encountered in both the "ultramontane" and "schismatic" extremes, and instead help to manifest the Church's "similitude" of governance in the ever-greater "dissimilitude" of cruciform service.

⁵³ That is so say, specifically Przywara's understanding of this form. The causal priority of Mary over the Church, the centrality of the cross as the basis of the Mary-Church analogy, and the recovery of nuptial language in relation to Mary-Christ, are the key features of Przywara's Mariology which set him apart from both his contemporaries, as well as the popular piety that refrains from progressing beyond the neat analogies of motherhood. Pidel identifies some possible extension of these ideas in *Lumen Gentium*, noting, however, that the document admits of no clear reading either for or against Przywara's peculiar formulation. See Pidel, *Church of the Ever Greater God*, 176-177.

Bibliography

- De la Potterie, Ignace. *Mary in the Mystery of the Covenant*. Translated by Bertrand Buby. New York: Alba House, 1992.
- Denzinger, Heinrich, Peter Hünermann, Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash, eds. *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*. 43rd Edition. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012.
- Edwards, Aníbal. “Mariología, Espíritu Misionero y Sentir con la Iglesia: Caras Permanentes del Legado de Erich Przywara S.J. (1889-1972).” *Teología y Vida* 51 (2010): 365-385.
- McAleer, Graham James. *Erich Przywara and Postmodern Natural Law: A History of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019.
- Naumann, Isabell M. “Mariology at the Beginning of the Third Millennium.” In *Mariology at the Beginning of the Third Millennium*, edited by Kevin Wagner, Isabell M. Naumann, Peter John McGregor and Paul Morrissey, 1-31. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2017.
- O’Meara, Thomas F. *Erich Przywara: His Theology and His World*. Foreword by Michael A. Fahey. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Persidok, Andrzej. “Entre Dios y la Nada: El Destino Sobrenatural del Hombre según Erich Przywara.” *Scripta Theologica* 51 (2019): 331-365.
- Pidel, Aaron. *Church of the Ever Greater God: The Ecclesiology of Erich Przywara*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2020.
- Przywara, Erich. *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics: Original Structure and Universal Rhythm*. Translated by John R. Betz and David Bentley Hart. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- . *Analogia Entis I: Metaphysik: Ur-Struktur und All-Rhythmus*. Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag, 1996.
- . *Christentum gemäß Johannes*. Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1954.

- . *Frühe Religiöse Schriften*. Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag, 1962.
- . *Home: Verse*. Munich: Verlag Josef Kösel and Friedrich Pustet, 1933.
- . *In und Gegen: Stellungnahmen zur Zeit*. Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1955.
- . *Karmel: Geistliche Lieder*. Munich: Verlag Josef Kösel and Friedrich Pustet, 1932.
- . *¿Qué es Dios?: Summula*. San Miguel: Instituto Thomas Falkner SJ, 2016.
- . *Religionsphilosophische Schriften*. Einsiedeln, Johannes Verlag, 1962.
- . *Was ist Gott?: Summula*. Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz Verlag, 1947.
- White, Thomas Joseph, ed. *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Antichrist or the Wisdom of God?* Foreword by J. Augustine Di Noia. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.