

regular and prayerful study of the Bible as the source of doctrine and the food of prayer.

Children should be taught from their earliest years in its vivid concrete idiom and at an early age too should be introduced to it as the material of their thoughts and prayers, to be pondered over till it becomes part of the texture of their lives. In this way, and with full effect perhaps only in this way, will the teaching of the Church in its catechisms, creeds and dogmatic definitions, become deeply rooted in mind and heart and fully fruitful in the will.



DOGMA AND MENTAL HEALTH*

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

'*Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem*' ('Whosoever wishes to be *salvus*—"saved", "salved" or "healthy"—it is required before all else that he hold the Catholic Faith'). '*Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in aeternum peribit*' ('Which faith, unless a man keep it whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish in eternity').

THESE opening words of the *Athanasium*, and countless other pronouncements of the Church to similar effect, have been an occasion of much opprobrium and of genuine perplexity. They would indeed be detestable, even blasphemous, were they understood to mean that God arbitrarily insists that the recitation of a right password, e.g. *homoousios filioque, transubstantiatio*, ensured admission through the heavenly gates, while the utterance of an incorrect formula—*homoiousios, subordinatio, consubstantiatio*, was a meaningless guarantee of the pains of hell. Such monstrous misconceptions are not at all behind the Church's meticulous formulations of dogma or her vigorous anathemas to heresy. She knows full well that, as the Vatican Council says, 'Divine mysteries by their very nature so transcend the created mind, that even when delivered by revelation and

* A paper read to the Seventh Catholic International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology, Madrid, September 1957.

accepted by faith, they remain covered by the veils of faith itself, and are, as it were, wrapped in cloud' (Denzinger, 1796). None of her dogmatic pronouncements can be adequate to the Divine reality and mysteries which infinitely transcend them; all must in some measure be deficient. Yet the Church knows that it is no matter of indifference to the weal of human beings themselves what they think and say about these things, already in this life. She is entrusted with, not any sort of truth, but a *verbum salutis*, a message of health and wholeness, no matter how speculative and remote some of her dogmas may seem to be from the practical concerns of wholesome human living. Her concern to maintain their integrity is not just an academic concern with scientific accuracy, but with the health and integrity of human souls. Her truth is healing truth—*veritas salutifera*; and her councils and fathers have insisted that its denial or distortion (heresy) is harmful and poisonous to those souls. St Thomas Aquinas pointed out that the Christian faith is called 'catholic' because, unlike particular arts and sciences, and unlike particular revelations, it is for *all* men, and for the *whole* man: in time as well as for eternity, in soul and body as well as in spirit (*In Boeth. De Trin.* iii).

It should not then surprise a theologian that dogma, or rather its acceptance or non-acceptance, has a psychological function relatively to mental health or sickness; or that this fact should have forced itself upon the attention of those psychotherapists who are ready to take *every* factor in the personality into account. It is rather the psychotherapists themselves, sceptics or agnostics as many of them have been, who have been very surprised indeed to find themselves willy-nilly occupied with beliefs or images connected with the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Virgin-Mother, the Devil, Paradise, Redemption or Transubstantiation, in their patients' mental and emotional make-up. They have been still more surprised to observe the frequency and power of corresponding 'archetypes' in patients who certainly do not hold the dogmas, and often have never heard of them.

Indeed, it was these primary archetypal experiences that first led non-Catholic depth-psychologists to consider the function of dogma at all. It is well known that C. G. Jung has been a pioneer in this field. He observed in his patients' dreams, their phantasies and transference-images, the recurrence of such *motifs* as those

of sacrifice and rebirth, of divine-human heroes and saviours, of descent into the underworld and resurrection, of the differentiation between the archetypal Father and his Offspring, and of the 'spirit' emanating from both. He observed too, with some bewilderment, the frequently recurring images of the Threefold and the Fourfold, and the perplexing, often conflicting, interplay between them. He observed the immense influence which these symbols could exercise in a clinical picture, and in a patient's progress or regress; not least, among 'unbelieving' patients. Tertullian, long ago, had noted the presence of some of these images in the 'untutored' depths of the human soul: it was the basis of his conception of the *anima naturaliter christiana*, and of his apologetic approach to the pagan world of his time.

Jung was not concerned with apologetics, but with therapy. And he was not too well informed about Catholic dogma. But it seemed clear to him that dogmatic formulas (whatever else they might be) had to do with such images, *motifs* and symbols. This observation led him eventually to an appraisal of the psychological value of dogma which is as startling to a theologian as it must be to his scientific colleagues. 'Any scientific theory', he wrote, 'has . . . less value from the standpoint of psychological truth than the religious dogma. . . . The dogma owes its existence and form, on the one hand, to so-called "revealed" immediate experiences, such as the God-Man, the Cross, the Virgin Birth, the Immaculate Conception, the Trinity and so on; and, on the other hand, to the ceaseless collaboration of many minds and many centuries. The dogma represents the soul more completely than a scientific theory, for the latter expresses the conscious mind alone . . . a living thing in abstract notions.' A creed, on the contrary, is traditional and universal [we might say, Apostolic and Catholic] inasmuch as it 'is purified from all the oddities, shortcomings and flaws of individual experience'. (*Psychology and Religion*, pp. 56, 63.)

Thus convinced of the importance of dogma for psychology, and aware that the understanding of dogma (*intelligere quod credimus*) is the business of theology, Jung has issued many invitations for professional assistance from theologians. The response has hardly been adequate. Not altogether surprisingly or reprehensibly, theologians have tended to be suspicious of what might seem to be a gratuitous intrusion into their own territory.

and of an approach to the sacred truths of which they are the guardians which may seem so purely pragmatic and utilitarian. Or, themselves lacking acquaintance with the experiences which prompt such inquiries, they have misunderstood the questions and answered quite different ones. But nor do theologians always find it easy, at least in their dealings with Jungians, to overcome certain *idées fixes* on the other side which render mutual understanding exceedingly difficult.

Realizing, as theologians can seldom do, the urgency of the problem from the standpoint of practical depth-psychology, Jung has felt it incumbent upon him to try to fill the vacuum himself, admittedly (as he repeatedly confesses) in somewhat amateurish fashion. Four dogmas especially have engaged his attention: those of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Mass together with Transubstantiation, and the Assumption of our Lady. His treatments of these dogmas will certainly be misread if it is not clearly understood that they are primarily concerned, not with their theology, but with their psychological *function*: their salutary or unsalutary effects on the human psyche. But even if this limitation be carefully borne in mind, and notwithstanding the many profound insights which his treatments of them contain, it must be said that he has not correctly and completely grasped the Catholic Church's understanding of any one of them. It ill becomes a theologian to reproach Jung for some mistakes in his own field, especially if he himself has neglected his call for more expert assistance; but the unfortunate fact remains that Jung not seldom brands as heretical what has every appearance of orthodoxy, and as orthodox what certainly is serious heresy.

It must however be acknowledged that, though theologically misinformed, Jung is all too often clinically correct. For instance, he writes that 'theology characterizes Christ as exclusively spiritual', and that the compensating figure of Antichrist consequently constellates all psychic contents that are 'natural', material, fleshly, chthonic. Any instructed Christian would counter at once with St John's assertion that it is 'every *spirit* that confesseth *not* that Jesus Christ is come in the *flesh* . . . is the spirit of Antichrist' (1 John iv, 3). A theologian will know that Jung has here amazingly mistaken manichaeism and docetic heresy for orthodox theology. Yet experience suggests that precisely such an exclusively 'spiritual' and heretical picture of Christ, emotionally if not

intellectually assumed to be orthodox, is at the root of many a neurosis—inevitably so because of its one-sided inadequacy as an integrating symbol, and its consequent repressive effects in anyone who, consciously or unconsciously, attempts any *imitatio Christi* with such a picture in mind. Here the theologian has an opportunity to show how the dogma of the hypostatic union of the two natures, so far from impoverishing the symbol, ensures its comprehensiveness and integrity. St Thomas Aquinas pointed out, long ago, how all the Christological heresies diminished either the Godhead (Subordinationism, Arianism) or the Manhood (Docetism, Apollinarianism), or else the unity of these extreme opposites in their unmixed integrity (Nestorianism, Monophysitism). (*Summa* III, xvi, 1.)

A theologian should have a similar contribution to make regarding Jung's comments on the Trinity in its function as the central Christian belief. It is not possible, in this brief communication, to outline even the problem concerning it as it presents itself in depth-psychology, let alone to indicate all the theological resources available for its solution. But it may be remarked how the Church's dogmatic formulas precisely safeguard the faithful against those dangers which Jung believes to follow when a ternary, rather than a 'natural' quaternian, symbol reigns supreme in the psyche. For the Church's teaching insists, on the one hand, that the Triune God is utterly transcendent, *increated, immensus*, and that in him alone is complete equality and *homoousion* of Utterer and Uttered. On the other hand, that '*imago Trinitatis est in anima secundum mentem tantum*'; the image of the Trinity is in the human soul in regard only to its purely spiritual operations. The formulas thus ensure that the Three in One in its perfection is *not* to be taken as a pattern of human completeness and behaviour, but contrariwise as an object of differentiated adoration; even though it is (as St Augustine saw) the prototype of the psychological dynamism of cognition and conation. Given the presuppositions of the depth-psychologists that psychic energy or contents which fail to find symbolic expression fail to reach consciousness, and so tend to become a source of psychic disturbance, it becomes clear that orthodoxy and heresy are not irrelevant to mental hygiene, and the fierce passions which they have aroused become readily understandable.

In this short paper I can only nibble at a vast subject, and suggest

that here is a task which calls for the sympathetic collaboration of theologians as well as the interest of psychologists. In an article in *Vita e Pensiero* Father Gemelli has rebuked me for asserting that these rediscoveries of depth-psychology open up 'enormous possibilities for mutual aid and enrichment' to both professions. Such an assertion would indeed be outrageous if it were taken in the sense (which the context of the incriminated passage was at some pains to repudiate) that empirical psychology could add one jot to the faith. Nor is it to be supposed that the most precise theological exposition will cure a chronic neurosis, however much it may be embedded in heretical notions. But, for my part, I cannot doubt that depth-psychology, and especially the work of C. G. Jung, can immensely aid and enrich a theologian's work by offering him a means whereby he may better understand, not indeed the intrinsic truth, authority or content of dogma, but its relevance to the needs of the human soul. Of the urgency of the call for his own aid and enriching to the work of the psycho-therapist there can be no doubt at all. It is no matter merely of the purely academic contribution of one discipline to another, but of the deepest needs of perplexed and troubled souls.

In conclusion, I would remark that this correlation of orthodoxy and heresy with mental health and sickness has occupied not only the Jungians. It is many years since Friedrich Heiler associated scrupulosity with an implicit, often unconscious, Pelagianism; too often imbibed in the course of a supposedly Catholic education. Dr Igor Caruso, has written illuminatingly in his *Psychoanalyse und Synthese der Existenz* of the association of neurosis with what he calls *das häretische Lebensbild*—that heretical picture of life—which is certainly theological heresy also. Now Dr W. von Siebenthal, in his brilliant new book on the guilt-sense, has shown the close association of its pathological forms with implicit beliefs which are the negation of the Catholic doctrine of man.

The claim of universality for these archetypes has, I know, come as a shock to some, and with it the fear that such a claim somehow imperils the uniqueness and divine authority of Christian revelation. The validity of the claim can indeed stand or fall only with the evidence presented; but the theologian himself must be hard put to it to affirm (as he must) the availability of salvation to all men, and through faith in a Triune and Incarnate God, unless he allows some such hypothesis. But in fact the authority of Christian

revelation and the complete uniqueness and infallibility of the Church's dogma are in no way imperilled. Whatever is to be said of the universality of the archetypes and corresponding experiences, the likeness of the Church's creeds and definitions is found nowhere else, and nobody does or could maintain otherwise. As Jung himself, writing to a theologian, has put it: 'What the theologian has to show is precisely that the dogma is the hitherto most perfect answer to, and formulation of, the most relevant items in the human psyche, and that God has worked all these things in man's soul.'



THE SACRAMENTS: IV—MARRIAGE

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

IN considering this sacrament we have again to see how something natural has been transformed by the power of God acting through his Church. As in penance, where the matter of the sacrament is sorrow for sin, what is transformed is something non-human, such as oil or water, but the mutual consent of a man and a woman to give themselves to one another for the purpose of continuing the human race; something, that is to say, effectively significant even before it is given a new dignity by the action of Christ. For marriage is as old as the human race, and following the lead given by St Paul (Ephesians v, 31) we can learn its significance from the original institution in Paradise.

The account given in the book of Genesis (ii, 18-24) begins with God's action in creating a partner for Adam, because 'it is not good for man to be alone'. Eve is formed from Adam himself, they are in the closest possible relationship to one another, and yet they are distinct, opposed to each other by sexual difference. Each is incomplete without the other, and God therefore gives them the means to reunite without any loss of distinction. The words of Scripture perfectly express the meaning of marriage: 'they shall be two in one flesh' (ii, 24).

Although the fall introduced the certainty of suffering into that joyful first marriage, there is no indication in Scripture that it changed the basic meaning. Every human pair in every place