

THE VIRGIN MARY AS THE "SECOND EVE":
A MODERN FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

A Thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

By

Florence M. Turcotte

School for Summer and Continuing Education
Georgetown University
Washington, DC
December 4, 1990

ABSTRACT

The Virgin Mary as the "Second Eve":
A Modern Feminist Perspective

Just as the Jesus Christ of the Gospels was considered the fulfillment of the New Covenant and the consummation of Old Testament prophecies, so was Mary, the most perfect of all females, a fulfillment of the promises embodied by Old Testament women. The concept of Mary as the Second Eve arose from this correlation, and influenced Christian theology and art almost from the very beginning. The visual imaging of Mary as the Second Eve both affected and reflected this theology.

This thesis examines the relationship of Mary and Eve from an iconographic perspective, and concludes that such images exalt the Virgin Mary at Eve's expense. Ordinary women, the daughters of Eve, have inherited the guilt of their ancestor through original sin. Attributes of the Virgin Mary, virgin motherhood, for instance, are beyond the ken of mortal females, making Mary an unapproachable ideal. Depicting the Virgin Mary as the "Anti-Eve" polarizes the two characterizations and highlights the inadequacies of human women.

A new approach to this iconographic dilemma must be undertaken therefore, one which begins by rejecting the

patristic interpretation of the Fall of Man with its value-laden sexual/gender significance. A stronger, yet more approachable image of the Second Eve will result, along with an opportunity for a redefinition of the role of women in the Church community and hierarchy.

Florence M. Turcotte
Georgetown University
December 4, 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my mentor Diane Apostolos-Cappadona for the inspiration and unflagging support she provided throughout the research and writing of this work. I would also like to thank the staff of Lauinger Library at Georgetown University, specifically Louis Reith of Special Collections, David Hagen of the Photography Lab, and Gail Flatness and her staff in the Reference Department, for their technical assistance. Ann Ridder of the Liberal Studies Program was very helpful, providing administrative support and advice.

Lastly, I would like to thank my fiance, C. David Hickey, for providing assistance in all of the above categories.

in memory of my grandmother
Yvette Raymond

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Jan van Eyck, Annunciation. (c. 1434-36: National Gallery of Art, Washington DC).
2. Hubert and Jan van Eyck, Ghent Altarpiece (c.1432: Church of St. Bavo, Ghent).
3. Sandro Botticelli, The Annunciation. (c.1490: Uffizi Gallery, Florence).
4. Michelangelo, Pieta (c.1498-99: St. Peter's Basilica, Rome).
5. Philippe de Champaigne, The Lamentation over the Death of Abel. (c.1650: The Kunsthistorische Museum, Vienna).
6. Michelangelo, The Temptation and the Fall. (c.1512: Sistine Chapel, Rome).
7. Master of Seeon, Enthroned Madonna and Child (c.1412-1433: Bayerischen Nationalmuseum, Munich).
8. Stephan Lochner, The Mother of God in the Rose Garden (c.1448: Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne).
9. Gottfried Bernhard Goz, Madonna Platytera - Maria Sapientia, ceiling fresco. (c.1749: Wallfahrtskirche, Birnau am Bodensee).
10. Elvira Bach, Untitled. (1984: Raab Gallery, Berlin).
11. Portal of the Madonna, bas-relief. (c. 1450: Abbey of Misericordia, Venice).
12. Eve with Child, and Mary with the Child Jesus. (1033: Bernwardstür, Hildesheim).
13. Carlo da Camerino, The Madonna of Humility with the Temptation of Eve. (late 14th century: Cleveland Museum of Art).
14. Michele di Matteo, Dream of a Saint, (15th c.: Civic Museum, Pesaro).
15. Giovanni di Paolo. The Annunciation, detail. (c.1445: National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC).

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	A DISCUSSION OF THE CONCEPT OF MARY AS THE SECOND EVE	14
III.	ICONOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS	30
IV.	CONCLUSION: A FEMINIST REINTERPRETATION OF MARY AS THE SECOND EVE	50
V.	ILLUSTRATIONS	64
VI.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	79

I: Introduction

"Love gave her a thousand names."

This observation about the Virgin Mary from a popular Flemish hymn by Augustus Cuppens refers to the appellations intoned in the litany of Mary. Countless other compliments and exalted references to the Blessed Virgin included "Mother of God", "Tower of Ivory", "Queen of Heaven", and "Bride of Christ". One of the most interesting, multi-faceted, and meaningful of these names is "Second Eve." This name links the Mother of God with her Old Testament prototype, the genealogical "mother of all the living," (Gen.3:20). The use of this term evolved from the parallels originally drawn by St. Paul between Adam and Christ, the second Adam:

For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Cor.15:21-22).

The first man Adam became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit... The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven (1 Cor.15:45-48).

Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned - sin was indeed in the world before the law was given... Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come (Rom.5:12-14).

As one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by

one man's obedience many will be made righteous (Rom. 5:18-19).

This parallel was an important and powerful one for Paul whose goal was to integrate and relate events from the life of Jesus of Nazareth into the history of the Jewish people and their covenant with God. He was anxious to polarize Jesus Christ and Adam since he believed that the end of history was imminent. He refers to Christ not only as the "second Adam," but as the "last Adam," the eschatological culmination of humankind which had originated in the first man. Adam was the antetype, Christ the type. Adam was the prophecy, Christ the fulfillment.

Although Paul is explicit in his use of exclusively masculine pronouns, the idea of Mary as the New Testament counterpart of Eve seemed to evolve naturally from the Christ-Adam analogy. In fact, John Phillips claimed that judging from the parallels in Luke 1:26-56, the idea of Mary as the second Eve could not have been very far from Luke's mind.¹

The idea of Old Testament heroines as antetypes for Mary was very popular in the early Christian period. For newly-converted Christians, such parallels served a purpose similar to those between Christ and Adam; they established a link between contemporary religious events and scriptural canon. Both visual symbols and literary devices were used to develop these links. For example, Susanna, whose name means "lily" or "purity" in Hebrew, served as an Old

Testament antetype of Mary. Several parallels in the stories of the two women were developed. Susanna's steadfast defense of her chastity against the lecherous advances of the elders prefigured Mary's own disavowal of her traditional role as a Hebrew wife and mother. Additionally, both women were silent in their own defense when accused of violating their chastity. In the case of Mary, the Lord sent an angel to Joseph to dissuade him from divorcing Mary, when she was found to be pregnant before cohabitating with him (Mt. 2:18-21). Similarly, when Susanna was wrongly accused of adultery, the Lord sent Daniel to come to her defense against the elders (Dan. 13:47-60). As a result of these links, Susanna's lily has become symbolic of the Virgin Annunciate, and is often pictured in the hand of the angel Gabriel.

Once a typological link between the Old and New Testament had been established, it was important to develop as many parallels as possible between the two events or characters, in order to tie them together neatly. Irenaeus (d. c.202), one of the earliest Fathers of the Church, even brought the animals of the Fall of Man and Annunciation stories into the analogy:

...the guile of the serpent was overcome by the simplicity of the dove and we are set free from those chains by which we had been bound to death.²

These correspondences were not just poetic analogies which captured the imagination and helped believers to understand

the significance of images and events in the life of Christ. They also demonstrated the continuity between the Old Testament and the New, and showed how Jesus's life was the fulfillment of God's will working through the history of the Jewish people and the Jewish race.

Of Sacred Scripture, Augustine said: "Its prophetic announcement has never failed from the very beginning of the human race, and we now see the prophecy fulfilled in every detail."³ This concept is foreign to modern scholarship, for whom the tradition of the New Testament itself is well established. Jane Dillenberger states:

It is difficult for those who inhabit 20th century space and time to understand the significance, the power and the comfort which this kind of symbolic allusion had for late medieval man... In searching the Old Testament the Christian saw analogies to the events in the life of Christ. The events of the Old Testament thus had a special relevance and a kind of poignancy for the Christian believer.⁴

Thus every possible link between Mary and Eve had to be particularized, especially when these corresponded to the Pauline link between Christ and Adam. John Phillips, in his book entitled Eve: The History of an Idea, points out that:

...as the first Adam gives birth to Eve not through human agency but divine intervention, Mary gives birth to the Second Adam not through human agency, but divine intervention.⁵

The image of Mary as the Second Eve not only evoked similarities between the two, but readily illuminated the antithetical aspects of their relationship. Marina Warner acknowledges the beauty of this analogy, especially for the

early Christians:

The fundamental idea that the Incarnation of the godhead had overturned the Old Covenant of sin and death found one of its loveliest images in the concept of the Virgin who gives birth to the redeemer. She is the second Eve, mother of all the living in a new, spiritual sense.⁶

The same image was imaginatively expressed by the 16th-century Jesuit martyr Robert Southwell when he observed that: "tangle by tangle, Our Lady unknotted all that Eve had knotted, and in every particular reversed her history".⁷ He further developed the apposition of roles in this poem, making use of a very popular pun on the greeting of the angel of the Annunciation and the name of the first woman:

Spell Eva back and Ave shall you find;
The first began, the last reversed our harms:
An angel's witching words did Eva blind;
An angel's Ave disenchant the charms:
Death first by woman's weakness entered in;
In woman's virtue life doth now begin.⁸

Thus the "Ave" greeting of the angel symmetrically inverts the curse of Eve.

Notwithstanding, I will demonstrate how devotion to Mary as the second Eve did not necessarily improve the legacy of Eve (or that of her "daughters", for that matter), but vilified it instead. Mary was in fact the "Anti-Eve", and Marian devotion was, and is indeed compatible with a very low view of ordinary women. "Banished children of Eve", women prayed to Mary in the Salve Regina, "To thee we sigh, groaning and weeping in this vale of tears. So... turn thy merciful eyes upon us."⁹ Mary Daly explains that

the greater the devotion to Mary, the more misogynist the believer:

...her [Eve's] role as temptress in the story of the Fall, supposedly established beyond doubt woman's immutable inferiority which was not merely physical but also intellectual and moral. So persuasive was this interpretation that through the ages the anti-feminist tradition had justified itself on the basis of the origin and activities of the "first mother" of all mankind.¹⁰

Mary came to be depicted not just as the "Second" Eve, but as Eve perfected, with all her faults erased. Intact and incorruptible, she became an impossible ideal for all believers. Augustine's bridge between the Old and New Testaments, linking the stories of the genealogical and the spiritual "mothers of all the living" was destroyed. Or was it?

Some theologians of the O felix culpa school pointed out that the role of the woman in the Fall of Man was the necessary antecedent to her role in the plan of redemption. In this scenario, Eve was the required sacrifice on the altar of salvation. The hymn "O Gloriosa Virginum" sung at lauds on Marian feasts extolled the Heavenly Eve:

O glorious Virgin ever blest
 Sublime above the starry sky,
 Who nurture from thy spotless breast
 To thy creator did supply.
 What we had lost through hapless Eve
 The Blossom sprung from thee restores
 And, granting bliss to those that grieve,
 Unbars the everlasting doors.¹¹

Mary's role in the redemptive process is difficult to characterize. If Eve was but an accessory to the Fall of

Man, then to complete the analogy, Mary can only facilitate the process of redemption, not bring it about. In a comment attributed to St. Augustine, Matthias Scheeben described how:

A woman handed the poison to the man who was to be deceived. A woman hands salvation to the man to be restored. A woman, by bringing forth Christ, compensates for the sin of the man deceived by a woman. Hence women were the first to announce to the apostles that Christ had risen.¹²

In this scenario, Eve and Mary were no more than subservient, subordinated female figures projected into a patriarchal drama written for a male audience.

After pronouncing curses on Adam and Eve and expelling them from Paradise, the Lord said to the Serpent: "I will plant enmity between you and the woman and between your offspring and hers; they shall strike at your head, and you shall strike at their heel"(Gen.3:15). An error in translation in the Vulgate Bible yielded "she shall strike at your head and you shall strike at her heel," which was taken to prophesy that a daughter of Eve would come to conquer Satan. Mary seemed the logical candidate for this position, since her offspring was the Word Incarnate, Jesus Christ. Mary was consequently pictured as trampling on the head of the serpent in many devotional images. Although this interpretative solecism was corrected at the Council of Trent, the scriptural justification for Mary's role in human redemption came in large part from this idea, and the image remained a popular one.

In his book, Mary's Part in our Redemption, George Smith demonstrated the far-reaching consequences of this interpretation of the Genesis text:

With regard to our blessed Lady, we have the highest authority short of an infallible definition for interpreting the divine promise of redemption, related in the book of Genesis as referring to our blessed Lady who, side by side with Christ, is represented as overcoming Satan in the struggle for man's salvation. And here again, Christian tradition has followed the lead of the Scriptures as hailing Mary as the Second Eve. It would be a serious error, therefore to regard the analogy as a fanciful embroidery worked upon the fringe of revealed doctrine by the imagination of rhetorical writers and preachers. We shall rightly expect it to throw an important light upon the part which Mary plays in our redemption, and it will serve as our guide in investigating the extent and nature of her co-redemptive function.¹³

Mary thus received not only the auxiliary attributes of the new Eve, but as the first human redeemed in Christ, she became the prototype of every redeemed life, the symbol of God's Church. Overall, the changing roles of women in history were reflected in the substance and intensity of Marian devotions. As Phillips indicated: "The characterizations of Eve, Mary, and the Christian life all dealt with the questions of what woman is, and what may be expected of her."¹⁴

When a typological interpretation of an Old Testament figure like Eve is applied to Mary, the antetype may evolve into a symbol of the person of the type, or it may become antithetical to it, or in this case, both may occur at the same time. The word symbol, from the Greek "fallen

together", signifies the falling together of an idea and its representation. The symbolism of Mary as the Second Eve is important because in some respects Mary "falls" with Eve, and in others she is elevated at the cost of Eve's abasement.

Christian faith, and Catholic faith in particular, has fairly consistently recognized the power of the visual modality in the devotional practices of its believers. The visual arts have played a threefold role in the Christian tradition: didactic, liturgical, and symbolic. Many different facets of the relationship of Eve and Mary have been emphasized and developed in the visual mode, with an impact in each of these areas. These images have both resulted from and shaped the theology they reflected. If indeed, as Augustine taught, pictures are the "libri idiotarum", the books of the ignorant, then we can use these images to read about their faith. St. Ephraem of Syria (d.373) described the relationship of Mary and Eve in a vivid and mystical vision:

It is clear that Mary was the Gate to Christ's heaven, by whose presence our hope revived, when by her the light revisited the world and its inhabitants, which light Eve, as origin of all evil, had banished. And if you wish to become acquainted with the mystery of each, consider the two eyes of a body, one of which lost its light by being accidentally blinded, making the other shine with a brighter light and causing the eye to take in everything. Now, take a look at the world. It received two eyes: Eve, the left eye, became plainly blinded; Mary, the right eye, became by that calamity most bright.¹⁵

Figures and events from the Old Testament as artistic subject matter were of particular importance in the early Christian period when New Testament canon had not yet been established and the letter of the Second commandment "thou shall have no other Gods before me" was being observed. In order to communicate their ideas, artists represented characters and incidents from the Gospels by their Old Testament antetypes.¹⁶

John Dixon defines the icon as "the point of agreed encounter between man and God"¹⁷. If this is so, then the Incarnation is itself an icon. Yrjo Hirn points out that "it is by this doctrine of a mystic union between the visible and the invisible that the Catholic cult achieves its characteristic quality"¹⁸. Art as expression of Catholic faith, then, is a multi-layered vision of the human-divine encounter, a microcosm of the Incarnation:

By disguising traditional religious symbols as the scrupulously observed objects of the artists own world and time, by treating the very space and light of the pictures as symbols, these painters were able to create a world that was intimate and immediate and yet saturated with divine presence and sacred significance, a world in which the physical and spiritual interpenetrated, just as God and man coexist in the person of Jesus Christ.¹⁹

It may be said, therefore, that as an example of this multi-layered symbolism, representations of Mary as the Second Eve give expression to particular experiences of faith. These images will be examined first from the standpoint of the theological beliefs which they reflect.

The cultural and moral implications of these beliefs, and their underlying values will be discussed. Next, some examples of the different artistic representations of Mary as the Second Eve will be analyzed in the context of these underlying beliefs. In conclusion, the significance of this imagery for the present day believer will be examined. In the process, another way of seeing Mary as the second Eve which transcends patriarchal limitations and is compatible with the feminist outlook and values will be proposed.

ENDNOTES

1. John A. Phillips, Eve, the History of an Idea, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984), p.132. Phillips refers to parallels extant in Luke's Annunciation and Visitation scenes. See also John de Satgé, Mary and the Christian Gospel, (London: SPCK, 1976).
2. Irenaeus (d. c.202), Adversus Haereses 5,19,I, quoted in Marina Warner, Alone of All her Sex, the Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary, (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), p.60.
3. St. Augustine, City of God, Bk. XVI, 2. quoted in Carol J. Purtle, The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982), p.94.
4. Jane Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, 2nd Ed., (New York: Crossroad, 1988), p.133.
5. Phillips, Eve: The History of an Idea, (San Francisco: Harper and Row), p.133.
6. Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.59.
7. Robert Southwell (16th century), quoted in Elizabeth Rothenstein, ed., The Virgin and the Child, an Anthology of paintings and poems, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p.59.
8. Idem, from a poem entitled "The Virgin's Salutation", quoted in Ibid., p.60.
9. Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.115.
10. Mary Daly, The Church and the Second Sex, 2nd Ed., (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p.76.
11. Purtle, The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck, ff.p.7.
12. Rev. M.J. Scheeben, Mariology, Vol. 2. Translated by Rev. T.L.M.J. Geukers, (St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1947), p.205.
13. George D. Smith, Mary's Part in our Redemption, (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1938), p. 45. Note that in 1938, Smith was still using the Vulgate translation of Gen. 3:14-15 as scriptural prooftext for his belief in Mary's victory over Satan.
14. Phillips, Eve: the History of an Idea, p.135.

15. St. Ephraem of Syria (d.373), Sermones exegetici, quoted in Scheeben, Mariology, vol.2, pp.69-70.
16. Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.30.
17. John W. Dixon, Jr. "Painting as Theological Thought: The Issues in Tuscan Theology", in Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, ed. Art, Creativity and the Sacred, (New York: Crossroad, 1986), p.278.
18. Yrjö Hirn, The Sacred Shrine, (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), p.21.
19. John Ward, "Hidden Symbolism in Jan van Eyck's Annunciations", Art Bulletin 57 (1975): 196.

II: A Discussion of the Concept of Mary as the Second Eve

An examination of the theological grounding for Mary as the Second Eve falls short of grasping the actual significance of the analogy, since such an examination ignores the influence of devotional practice. Edvard Schillebeeckx pointed out that the gap between a theological precept and popular devotion may be wide indeed:

Theology has to be critical in its attitude towards the thousand names bestowed upon the Virgin Mother by popular devotion. But theology lives and draws its sustenance from the life of faith led by the members of the Church community, and theologians should realize that this life is more powerful than all the feeble efforts made by theology.¹

John Henry Cardinal Newman (d.1890) made a similar distinction between theology and devotion. He claimed that although the actual creeds and beliefs about Mary had not changed since the Early Church, devotion to Mary had varied from "scanty" in one time and place, to "overflowing" in another.²

The magisterium of the Church with regard to Mary may be considered the veritable tip of the iceberg, compared with the enormous body of popular lore and private devotions propagated by Christians, particularly Roman Catholics, on her behalf. The Golden Legend of Jacopus de Varagine (d.1298) and the apocryphal Proto-Gospel of Mary, which chronicled her childhood, adolescence, and ministry after the death of Jesus, as well as the popularity of the rosary were but a few examples of the Roman Catholic love affair with Mary.

An examination of the writings of the Fathers of the

early Church will provide the distinction between ecclesiastical dogma and popular piety on the subject of Mary as the Second Eve. Examples of correspondences and contradistinctions between the two will establish the nature of their relationship. The thoughts and words of those who believe in the necessity of the Fall in God's plan of redemption will help to illuminate the issues raised by Eve which were considered resolved by Mary. An examination of the importance of virginity and/or motherhood in the life of the Christian woman, and an explanation of the role of Mary/Eve as "mother of all the living" and as prototype of the Church will address the possibility of one or both as a role model for modern women.

An understanding of the characterization of Eve and of the legacy of her story are prerequisites for comprehending the concept of Mary as the Second Eve. Rarely was Eve depicted as an advocate for the liberated woman, except perhaps in reference to her defiance of patriarchal law. Like Pandora, she was credited for the introduction of sin into the world. Also like Pandora, she was portrayed as gullible, disobedient, and rather slow-witted. Both were the first mortal females as depicted by males in a patriarchal society, and both have come to represent stereotypical female characterizations. Simone de Beauvoir summarized this outlook: "In the legends of Eve and Pandora, men have taken up arms against women."³ The question must be asked then, is

the vilification of women the moral of the story of the Fall?

Marina Warner proposes an alternate interpretation:

To the Christians of the New Covenant, who believed in a God who was all love, the story of the Fall provided a rich explanation for the painful discrepancy between the benevolent and omnipotent deity and the misery, disorder, and pain visible everywhere in his creation. It was man, through the precious gift of free will, who unceasingly turned against his maker from the beginning and caused evil and suffering.⁴

However, the more popular notion was that it was woman who led man to his abuse of free will. Warner admitted that for the Fathers of the Church after Augustine, it was woman who played the part of temptress, woman who was the accomplice of Satan, and woman who "drags man's soul down the spiritual ladder".⁵ She quoted Tertullian, one of these Fathers of the Church, who reproached Eve:

Do you not realize, Eve, that it is you? The curse God pronounced on your sex weighs still on the world. Guilty, you must bear its hardships. You are the devil's gateway, you desecrated the fatal tree, you first betrayed the law of God, you softened up with your cajoling words the man against whom the devil could not prevail by force. The image of God, Adam, you broke him as if he were a plaything. You deserved death, and it was the son of God who had to die.⁶

An old Irish poem from an anonymous source agreed, and had Eve pronounce her own culpability:

I am Eve, the wife of noble Adam;
 It was I who violated Jesus in the past;
 It was I who robbed my children of Heaven;
 It is I by right who should have been crucified...
 It was I who plucked the apple;...
 As long as they live in daylight women will not cease
 from folly on account of that.⁷

The ignominy of Eve, the original cause of all evil, had

descended onto all other women. One of the most notable results of this disgrace were the pains and labor of motherhood, and subordination to the male. For Eve's eternal penance was pronounced by the Lord God: "I will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you." (Gen.3:16)

The curse of Adam was external, environmental: a life of hard labor and expulsion from Paradise. The curse of Eve, however, was directly related to her interiority, i.e. her reproductive function. In The City of God, Augustine noted that after they had partaken of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, Adam and Eve did not cover their mouths or their hands in shame, but rather they covered their genitals.⁸ This indicated that the Fall was a sexual event rather than one of hubris, as described by Warner, and implied the loss of virginity, particularly for Eve. As Phillips pointed out:

It is also important to note that the crime of the first virgin is seen to be sexual in nature, and to go hand in hand with her defloration.⁹

Augustine introduced the idea that coitus was the means by which the stain of original sin was transmitted. Apparently, this sin was not carried in the male seed, but rather in the womb itself; it was transmitted from the mother even before birth took place. St. Jean Eudes (17th century) wrote:

It is a subject of humiliation of all mothers of the children of Adam to know that while they are with

child, they carry within them an infant... who is the enemy of God, the object of his hatred and malediction, and the shrine of the demon.¹⁰

There were attempts to mitigate the guilty condition of the female gender, but this did not take the form of a sharing of guilt between the sexes. Instead, Eve was "compensated for" by Mary. This tradeoff yielded the glorification of Mary, but with the qualification of her uniqueness among women. Mary Daly, in her book entitled The Church and the Second Sex, indicated that:

The sort of polemic, therefore, which attempts to cover the antifeminism of the Fathers by pointing to their glorification of Mary ignores the important point that this did not improve their doctrine about concrete, living women. In fact there is every reason to suspect that this compensation unconsciously served as a means to relieve any possible guilt feelings about injustice to the other sex.¹¹

The fact that Eve did not have as her birthright dominion over paradise as did Adam was demonstrated by the fact that it was Adam who gave names to all that he saw, including Eve herself, whom he named "mother of all the living" (Gen. 3:20). According to Warner:

The female was perceived to be a vehicle of attributed meaning at the very beginning of the world, according to myths that lie at the foundation of our lives, ever since she was made in all her allure as man's fatal partner. Eve did not have the power of naming in the garden; if she had been granted such a power, then Adam might himself have become matter and the form on to which Eve could have projected meanings as she wanted.¹²

Even as "mother of all the living", Eve's reproductive power had to be brought under patriarchal control. What

better way than to curse her with her own femininity? Phillips stated: "Sin, sexuality, and death were thus woven into the tapestry depicting Eve; obedience, virginity and eternal life became the shining attributes of Mary."¹³ He summarizes Eve's legacy of subjugation:

And it is the Natural Law of the Church, based on Eve's sentence rather than Mary's victory over it, that governs female life. As Christian wife and mother, a woman is defined in terms of her subjection to her husband...Her marriage may be fulfilling, but if it is not, she may only call to mind the obedience, humility, gentleness and forbearance of the Virgin Mother.¹⁴

Thus the example of the Virgin Mary could only be used as a reason to endure the curse of Eve which had not been lifted at all. George Smith's attempt at reversal regarding Eve's guilt exonerated God from malicious intent, but again locked women into the role of accessory, this time by emphasizing gender-based roles.

Wherefore, that we might not with just indignation detest in woman the source of our death, and deem her to be lost beyond redemption, the Lord, who came to save that which was lost, willed to honour and render dear to us both sexes, as both sexes had been lost. In neither sex, therefore, can we find complaint against the Creator. The birth of our Lord gives them both the hope of salvation. The honour of the male sex is in the humanity of Christ, the honor of womankind is in his mother.¹⁵

The logical inference from this statement was that Christ was born, suffered and died not for all, but in order to dignify the male sex, a view which even the Church did not espouse. The key to deciphering Smith's comments involves understanding their context in his perception of the role

played by Mary in the redemptive process:

Mary's function in regard to our salvation is conscious, active and universal, as was the function of Eve in regard to our fall. But again like that of Eve, it is secondary and completely subordinate.¹⁶

Rev. M.J. Scheeben had a more synergistic outlook on the process:

The fall of the human race was effected by the devil with the help of a man and a woman. The woman as well as the man, although each in a different way, can and must be regarded as the cause of the Fall. Hence the redemption had to be effected not by the new Adam alone, but with the cooperation of the new Eve, and thus a woman must become a cause of the redemption, since a woman had been a cause of the Fall. As in the cause of the Fall a woman had the initiative, so in the redemption a woman must prepare the way by her activity...Both sexes are united in grace and glory.¹⁷

Schillebeeckx echoed this more balance and egalitarian view; summarizing the views of the ordinary magisterium on the subject:

The various statements concerning our redemption by Christ as the New Adam together with Mary as the New Eve are borne out in the whole of the traditional teaching of the Church, though only on condition that Mary's co-operation be regarded as active spiritual and physical receptivity, and not as an additional principle in some way making up for a deficiency in Christ's redemption.¹⁸

When comparing Mary and Eve, many have contrasted the obedience of the former with the disobedience of the latter. While accomplishing this, St. Justin Martyr (A.D. 120-165) sidesteps the issue of Eve's accountability by blaming Satan:

We know that before all creatures, He [Jesus Christ] came forth from the Father by His power and will... and He became man, being born of the Virgin, so that the disobedience caused by the serpent might be

brought to an end in the same way that it was started. For Eve, till then an incorrupt virgin, conceived the word spoken by the serpent, and gave birth to disobedience and death; but the Virgin Mary, being filled with faith and joy (when the angel brought the good news to her, telling her that the spirit of the Lord should come upon her, and the power of the highest overshadow her, that therefore the Holy One that was born of her was the Son of God), answered, "Be it me according to thy Word".¹⁹

Like St. Justin, a number of sources, especially the earlier ones, stressed virginity as the gift lost by the first Eve. They also point out that Mary's obedience is reflected in the preservation of her virginity:

Now that a virgin has conceived in the womb and borne to us a child... now the chain of the curse has been broken. Death came through Eve, but life has come through Mary. And thus the gift of virginity has been bestowed most richly upon women, seeing that it has had its beginning from a woman.²⁰

The notion of Mary's virginity was linked to her special exemption from the curse of Eve. Mary, as virgin and mother, experienced an ideal female life cycle, freed from the constraints of female physicality, i.e. lust and labor pains. Of Mary's immunity from concupiscence, Scheeben remarked:

The result of this immunity must inevitably be, that sin not only had no dominion over her, but also that it could neither exist nor operate in her... Mary excels not only all fallen humanity but also Eve before her fall...²¹

At the scene of the Visitation, she bore her child with joy, in contrast to the first Eve who had to bear her children in pain.²² Mary was also exempt from the stain of original sin. The proof of this was her freedom from concupiscence: "The presence of the movements of concupiscence is always a sign

of contracted original sin, or in the justified person, it is a remnant of it."²³

Thus as Virgin and Mother, Mary participated in two aspects of the characteristic female life cycle, but did not share in the physical experience of human women. According to Miles, this encapsulated the "medieval ambivalence" about women: "Women were at once insistently idealized and systematically deprived of the physical ground of female experience."²⁴ This followed that since sexual knowledge had become associated with the Fall of Man, sexual abstinence became associated with purity and sinlessness. In other words, as the new "mother of all the living", Mary had eclipsed Eve by assuming this title as a virgin. The new race which she engendered was redeemed.

Another parallel which developed in the visual arts was the auditory theme in both the narrative of the Fall and that of the Annunciation. As Eve was tempted by listening to the words of the serpent, so Mary conceived Christ through the same orifice, the ear, by listening to the words of the angel. For Mary, this avenue of impregnation had the added advantage of keeping her physical virginity intact. As St. Justin pointed out: "Eve conceived the word spoken by the Serpent,"²⁵ and Mary that of the Angel. As we shall see, this link between the two was articulated vividly in the visual media.

The contrast between Eve's violability and Mary's purity was developed by St. Fulgentius (468-533):

The wife of the first man was depraved in her erring mind by the devil's wickedness. But the mother of the Second Man was preserved by the grace of God whole and perfect in mind and body... And because man was miserably damned on account of sin, for this reason the God-Man was marvelously born, without sin.

In the interest of reinforcing the bond between the Old and New Covenants, the Church undertook to complete the parallels between Eve and Mary. The way to do this was to extol the virtues of sexual self-denial.

The story of the Fall and its outcome enabled the Church--indeed, required the Church--to complete the history of Mary at those points where the New Testament falls silent or appears to contradict the perfection and beatitudes of her virginity. If Eve forfeited paradise by losing her virginity, Mary as the Second Eve must secure her victory by having her virginity preserved inviolate.²⁶

Warner pointed out that these links also testified to the truth of the doctrine of the miracle of the Incarnation:

Her [Mary's] virginity was the proof that the child's father was divine, not human, and its symbolic function was quickly interpreted by the Fathers of the early Church as the endorsement of the moral value of bodily sexual abstinence, especially for women.²⁷

Another striking link between Eve and Mary was the element of grief. Each lived to see the death of her beloved son. Clara Clement maintained: "The Bible story of Eve, brief as it is, presents her as the most grievously afflicted woman of the scriptures, with the sole exception of the Mother of Jesus."²⁸

Eve, though characterized as one of the most reprehensible of Biblical figures, had a life almost as woeful

as Mary. Clement elaborated:

Poets and artists have emphasized the temptation and too rarely pictured the sorrows of the woman who was the mother of the first murderer and of his victim; the first woman to see death in the most awful aspect, and bear such burdens as cannot be imagined by those to whom Jesus has revealed his Father.²⁹

Mary's role as Mater Dolorosa was prefigured when Jesus was 40 days old. The prophet Simeon told Mary: "Behold this child is set for the fall and for the resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be contradicted. And thy own soul a sword shall pierce" (Lk. 2:34-5). This prediction was validated as Mary stood at the foot of the cross, experiencing the heart-breaking contradiction of her faith, as her son's side was pierced by the sword of a Roman soldier.

By sacrificing her son, however, Mary became the new "mother of all the living". Of her, the crucified Jesus says to his friend John: "Behold thy Mother" (Jn.19:27). "Mors per Evam; vita per Mariam" declared St. Jerome; death from Eve, life from Mary.³⁰ Schillebeeckx claimed that from a doctrinal point of view, the Fathers of the Church before the fifth-century Nestorian heresy were primarily interested in Mary's role as the new Eve and as prototype of the Church. The substance of the Nestorian heresy was the fundamental denial of the divine motherhood of Mary. Therefore, the mystery of Mary's motherhood became paramount and had to be defined more precisely. This dispute was settled by ecumenical doctrine in 431 when Mary was declared "Theotokos" or "God-bearer" at the Council of Ephesus. As a consequence, the image of Mary

as the new "mother of all the living" was deliberated at length. St. Epiphanius (320-400) wanted to transfer the title from Eve to Mary:

It is she (Mary) whom Eve represents-Eve who, strangely, was named "Mother of all the living"... And the wonder was that after the Fall she received this title. So far as the body is concerned, Eve was certainly the mother of every man on earth; but from Mary the life itself was born in the world, so that she could bear living things, and become their mother. And so, curiously, she is called the "Mother of all the living"...But there is another marvel about these two, which must be considered; Eve became the cause of man's death.. but Mary the cause of his life... so that life might be born in place of death, life eliminating the death which came from the woman. That life is none other than He who, through the woman, has become our life.³¹

St. Peter Chrysologus (400-c.450), Bishop of Ravenna, and one of the chief authorities of the Fourth General Council reiterated:

Blessed art thou among women; because though Eve, under a curse, had brought punishment upon woman's womb, Mary, being blessed, rejoices and is honoured and revered. And now, through grace, woman does truly become "mother of all the living" woman who had been by nature mother of the dying.³²

George Smith gave yet another twist to this concept:

As Eve by her consent to Satan's suggestion gave birth to the sin of Adam, which is the sin of us all, and may thus rightly be called the mother of sin, so Mary by her consent to God's will as announced by the Angel Gabriel gave birth to Christ, the source of all grace, and may truly be called the Mother of grace.³³

The mother of grace was entrusted with the role of intercessor on behalf of sinners (including Eve) at the Last Judgement. St. Irenaeus (120-200) explained:

Though the one disobeyed God, yet the other was

drawn to obey Him, and thus the Virgin Mary became the Virgin Eve's advocate.³⁴

Interestingly, the author quoting Irenaeus in this case pointed out that the Greek word for advocate in the original was "paraclete" which became the special name and office reserved for the Holy Ghost.³⁵

In her role of advocate, Mary's faith completed the cycle of divine salvation begun by Eve's credulousness. Tertullian (A.D.160-240) wrote:

God won back His image and likeness, which the devil had seized, by an action that rivalled the devil's. The word which had established death found its way into Eve, while she was still a virgin. And this was done so that what the female sex had sent to destruction, should be brought back to salvation by the same sex. Eve believed the serpent; Mary believed Gabriel. The fault which the one committed by her belief, the other by her belief blotted out.³⁶

Thus without Eve's misstep, the Redeemer would have never come. St Ambrose's (d.397) felix culpa was reinterpreted by a 15th-century poet:

Ne had the apple taken been,
The apple taken been,
Ne hadde never our Lady
a been heaven's queen.
Blessed be the time
That apple taken was!
Therefore we may singen
"Deo Gratias!"³⁷

The happy fault of Eve enabled God's plan of redemption to be completed, with Mary as the earthly vessel of the Redeemer.

Scheeben summarizes the richest and most mystical aspect of the Eve/Mary metaphor; that of Mary as the Heavenly Eve:

The second traditional thought is the character of Mary as the heavenly Eve. She, the bride of the divine Adam and the heavenly mother of mankind, forms with Christ the beginning foundations, and the root of a new and higher creation of God, whereby the first was to be renewed and completed. Hence, in an analogous relation of resemblance and contradistinction, she stands to Eve as Christ to Adam. Obviously this thought necessarily implies that Mary, although daughter of the fallen Eve, could neither resemble her nor in any way be dependent on her. The divine action which granted her personal existence, placed her in opposition to the fallen Eve, and consequently she must be created in that state of holiness and innocence in which the first Eve was created. Otherwise the parallel would be incomplete and unnatural, and the heavenly Eve would seem less richly endowed than the first.³⁸

Without a doubt, despite exclamations to the contrary of Eve's Felix Culpa, the status of the Second Eve increased only if that of the first decreased. Furthermore, as Henry Kraus points out: "In the doctrinal opposition of Mary and Eve, common woman was uncompromisingly associated with the latter."³⁹ Phillips further claimed that:

In the Christian discipline, however impressive a believer may find the character of the Virgin Mother, emulation of her involves an acceptance of a view of women that regards certain aspects of womanliness as highly undesirable.⁴⁰

Clearly, one of the most unsavory of these aspects was female sexuality. Given the accepted, sexually-oriented interpretation of the Fall, the exacting standard of virginity became a doctrine of the Church, and remained the cornerstone of the Eve-Mary correspondence.

ENDNOTES

1. E. Schillebeeckx, O.P. Mary, Mother of Redemption, translated by N.D.Smith, (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964), p.xv.
2. John Henry Newman, The New Eve, (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1952), p.10.
3. Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, Trans. by H.M. Parshley, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1953), p.xxii.
4. Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.53.
5. Ibid., p.58.
6. Ibid.
7. Anonymous, Old Irish, quoted in Ibid., p.50.
8. St. Augustine, City of God, quoted in Warner, Alone of all her Sex, p.54.
9. Phillips, Eve: the History of an Idea, p.133.
10. St. Jean Eudes, quoted in Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.57.
11. Daly, The Church and the Second Sex, p.88.
12. Marina Warner, Monuments and Maidens, the Allegory of the Female Form, (New York: Atheneum, 1985), p.225.
13. Phillips, Eve: the History of an Idea, p.139.
14. Ibid., p.147.
15. Smith, Mary's Part in our Redemption, p.40.
16. Ibid., p.41.
17. Ibid., p.200.
18. Schillebeeckx, Mary, Mother of Redemption, p.93.
19. St. Justin (120-165), from "Dialogue with Trypho", sect.100 p.6 col.709, quoted in Newman, The New Eve, p.14.
20. St. Jerome, quoted in Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, pp.54-55.
21. Scheeben, Mariology, vol. 2, pp.114-115.
22. Phillips, Eve: The History of an Idea, p.133.

23. Scheeben, Mariology, vol. 2, p.115.
24. Miles, Image as Insight, Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989), p.83.
25. St. Justin (120-165), from "Dialogue with Trypho", sect.100 p.6 col.709, quoted in Newman, The New Eve, p.14.
26. Phillips, Eve: The History of an Idea, p.135-6.
27. Warner, Monuments and Maidens, p.124.
28. Clara Erskine Clement, Heroines of the Bible in Art, (Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1900), p.28.
29. Ibid., p.29.
30. St. Jerome, quoted in Anna Brownwell Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, as Represented in the Fine Arts, (London: Hutchinson & Co., n.d.), p.40.
31. St. Epiphanius (320-400) Haereses, 78,18. quoted in Newman, The New Eve, p.19.
32. St. Peter Chrysologus (400-c.450), quoted in Ibid., pp.20-21.
33. Smith, Mary's Part in our Redemption, p.114.
34. St. Irenaeus (120-200), Adversus Haereses, bk. 3, ch.22, sect.4 (pg.7, col. 958) and bk. 5, ch. 19, sect.1 (pg. 7, col. 1175) quoted in Newman, The New Eve, p.15.
35. Ibid., p.17.
36. Tertullian (160-240), De Carne Christi, ch. 17 p.12, col. 827., quoted in Ibid., p.15.
37. Anonymous, 15th century, quoted in Marina Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, pp. 60-61.
38. Scheeben, Mariology, vol.2, p.69.
39. Henry Kraus, "Eve and Mary: Conflicting Images of Medieval Woman," in Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany, eds. Norma Broude and Mary Garrard (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), p.84.
40. Phillips, Eve: The History of an Idea, p.146.

III: Iconographic Analysis

Modern photographers and other visual artists are well aware of the interpretive component of the visual experience. These "ways of seeing"¹ apply not only to works of art, but to everyday experience as well. In her discussion of the role of the visual during the medieval period, Margaret Miles points out that people of the fourteenth century, unlike us, did not need to be reminded of the subjective aspect of the visual experience.² Modern viewers are less inclined to actively engage or question what they see, and instead tend to categorize and literalize the objects of vision. When a modern person beholds Jan Van Eyck's Annunciation (fig.1), for instance, she may see only a re-enactment of an antiquated gospel story, wherein an angel appeared to Mary and told her of the conception of her child by the Holy Spirit. To do so greatly undermines the ability of this painting in particular and much of religious art in general to communicate symbolically on different levels. In fact, the very tiles on the floor of the church depicted on this canvas have a message for the observant viewer. For example, David's victory over Goliath, depicted on a tile in the foreground, was thought to prefigure Christ's victory over sin and death.³

A modern feminist might dismiss this painting as misogynist, pointing out Mary's that submissiveness to the Angel portrays her as yet another object, merely a "figure in a male discourse, rather than a female subject."⁴ However, a

case could be made as well for alternative interpretations, such as the one wherein Mary is depicted as the prototype of the Christian Church, justifying her role as intercessor on behalf of sinners. In this particular work, the artist tried to do visually what the theologians of the Early Church had done rhetorically; he developed the prophetic analogies between the Old and New Testaments in such a way as to show events in the Christian stories as the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Jewish scripture. Carol Purtle comments on this approach to Van Eyck's painting:

The events alluded to in the narrative iconography on the walls and floor of the church were considered historically prophetic of the Annunciation event pictured within the architectural structure. The parallel suggested within that structure could be clearly documented through the writings of medieval exegetes. The fundamental orientation to this type of prophetic exegesis, however, reaches farther back than the medieval period. It reflects a time when such writers as Ambrose and Augustine were forming attitudes toward the basic purpose and meaning contained in the Scriptures.⁵

According to Purtle, Van Eyck distinguished himself by using symbols not only for their hidden meaning, but for their "multi-level significance."⁶

What causes artists and their patrons to opt for a particular iconographic focus? Jane Dillenberger offers one explanation of the theological reasoning behind the choice of theme in a religious work of art:

The choice of subject matter by the artists and their patrons of any one period is an interesting index to the particular focus of that particular age. In the early Christian period the oft-repeated

subjects have to do with deliverance from sin and death... In the statues of the Gothic Madonnas, the natural and the supernatural blend into each other. The realms of nature and grace are not shown in contradiction to each other, but rather are intertwined.⁷

She concurs with Emile Male's comments on the transcendent quality of early 13th-century art: "unskillful in rendering individual character, [it] gave noble expression to all that there is of universal or external in the human form."⁸ It was not that the skills of draftsmanship and perspective were unknown in this period, it was that these skills were employed to convey symbolic meaning rather than graphic realism. With the advent of humanism during the Renaissance, however, worldly objects, human beings and emotions found new significance, and as a consequence their life-like representation became more important. Margaret Miles analyzes the transition in this statement:

Prior to the Renaissance the full humanity of Christ had been demonstrated and supported by reference to his birth from a human mother, the "Second Eve" who gave her flesh to the redeemer of the first Eve and her descendants. By the Renaissance the pivotal role of Mary in the Incarnation had repeatedly been visually articulated. The bare feet of the infant Christ also signified his human vulnerability....⁹

During the Renaissance, the naked body of Jesus with his genitals exposed replaced the symbol of human motherhood with the heroic male symbol of strength in weakness, while emphasizing his true humanity.¹⁰

There are three possible formats in which the concept of Mary as the Second Eve was illustrated. The first approach

was to depict Eve alone, or with Adam, introducing a reference to the Mother of Jesus, and establishing a link between the two women. The second was to visually develop the parallel with Eve in images of Mary, alone or with Jesus. The third was to represent the two together in the same work, explicitly expressing the concept of Mary as the Second Eve, and commenting on it.

Eve alone or with Adam: Reference to the Virgin Mary

One of the primordial links between Eve and Mary is their common role as "Mother of all the Living". Mary's maternity is an oft-celebrated subject in art, but depictions of Eve most often focus on the temptation or expulsion scenes. As a consequence, illustrations of Eve stress her fallen state rather than her primary role as the first Mother of all human beings. However, an example of this latter role can be found in the interior of the Ghent Altarpiece of Hubert and Jan van Eyck (fig.2), where Adam and Eve are pictured on two of the side panels. Eve's arm outlines and calls attention to her elongated and swollen belly. This emphasis on the womb from which all humans were descended prefigures the one whose womb will bear the redeemer of all humanity. In the case of Eve, however, this reference to fecundity brings with it an association with sexual desire and death. The inscription under her panel reads: "Eve by succumbing betrayed us." The

Adam and Eve panels are juxtaposed with the scenes of Annunciation on the exterior of the altarpiece, completing the parallel between the two Eves.

In the Eve of Hans Memling, she is again shown with an emphasis on her ovoid waistline, and in this case, her left ear is illuminated and painted in greater detail than are her other features. This refers to the means by which Eve encountered the occasion of sin, i.e. listening to the words of the serpent. In the same way, the medieval theological notion of "conceptio aurea" emphasized Mary's ear as the very avenue of divine conception.¹¹ In Van Eyck's Annunciation (fig.1), for example, the Virgin Annunciate was shown with her ear exposed through the break in her hair, and the rays of the Holy Ghost (depicted as a descending dove) are directed towards her exposed ear. St. Ephrem of Syria (d.378) develops this particular analogy:

In the beginning, by the sin of our first parents, death gained access to all men; but today, through Mary, we have been transported from death to life. In the beginning, the serpent infected Eve's ears, and the poison spread over the whole body. Today, Mary received through her ears the champion of our eternal happiness, and so the ears that were the instrument of death, were also the instrument of life.¹²

In Sandro Botticelli's Annunciation (fig.3), Mary inclines her head so that her ear is the highest point of her body, the point closest to heaven, and although her ear is not exposed it is covered with a white piece of cloth which contrasts with her head covering and symbolizes her purity.

Note that the angel in this work holds a lily, the flower symbolic of Susanna, another Old Testament reference which emphasizes Mary's perpetual virginity.

With his Vatican Pieta (fig.4), Michelangelo immortalized the image of the Virgin Mary grieving over the dead body of Jesus. More than any other image it conveys the despair felt by Mary when she witnessed the humiliating end of her son's life. Perhaps equally poignant, though less popular as a subject of art, is the depiction of Eve's grief over the death at his brother's hand of her second son Abel in the painting by Philippe de Champaigne entitled The Lamentation over the Death of Abel (fig.5).

In de Champaigne's painting, Eve disconsolately hides her face in her hand and leans heavily against a rock. The head of the lifeless and bleeding Abel rests in her lap, outlining her womb. His body lies on the ground in almost exactly the same position as Michelangelo's Jesus, whose weight, in contrast, is completely supported by his mother. Abel's body is uncovered except for a piece of cloth the color of Eve's dress lying across his loins. His shepherd's crook lies in a pool of blood at his feet. The lamenting figure of Adam raises his eyes and his clasped hands toward heaven, as the fleeing figure of Cain is pictured in the background.

Though the figures of Eve and Mary have the common sorrow of a mother grieving for her son, their bodies convey different messages in the two paintings. Eve is self-

absorbed, her emotions interiorized, as she turns away from her son's body and draws her legs up underneath her. Her clothing is disheveled and her hair uncombed and straggling. Her upraised left arm blocks her vision of the grieving Adam. With her right hand, Eve brushes away a blond cherubic youngster who appears to be reaching for her breast. It appears she cannot escape the painful demands of childbearing, even as she grieves.

Michelangelo's Mary, on the other hand, communicates with her body a quiet resignation, full of pathos, but in no way self-pitying. It is as if she grieves for all humanity. Her feet are pressed firmly against the ground as she supports the weight of her son. If she were to stand, the viewer would see that her legs and lower torso were much larger in proportion to the rest of her body. Her knees are spread and her left palm is open in a gesture of assent. She looks down directly at Jesus' body, making no attempt to turn away. Her right hand supports her son's right side, the folds of his lifeless flesh yielding to her firm grasp. Mary is dressed in royal robes, and her hair is completely covered by her head cloth, which falls gracefully over her shoulders.

It is obvious that de Champaigne wished to draw visual parallels between his work and that of Michelangelo. However, in comparison to the Pieta, his subject matter required much more detail in the narrative of the painting to convey the same message. In addition, the corresponding figures of Eve

and Mary convey the concept that one woman's tragedy was a significant, though singular loss, while the other's was universal.

Another iconographic device used to link the story of Eve with that of Mary is the Tree of Life/ Tree of Jesse parallel. The Tree of Life figures prominently in most artistic depictions of the Fall. It is unusual, however, for such an image to make reference to Mary. Michelangelo's version of The Temptation and the Fall (fig.6) is an exception, since pictorial reference to the Incarnation is accomplished in a symbolic way. To the right of the figure of Eve and immediately behind her, a tree stump with a pronged branch coming out of it is outlined against the sky. Jane Dillenberger suggests one possible interpretation:

It is also likely that we see here an allusion to a messianic passage in Isaiah 11:1-2, "There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him."....The presence in Eden of a stump with a shoot is a reference to the branch, Jesus Christ which shall grow out of its roots.¹³

Michelangelo's genius is revealed in this reference to the tree of Jesse in his depiction of the Fall of Mankind, which is thereby paralleled with the Redemption of Mankind. Another interesting feature of Michelangelo's work is the depiction of the serpent as female. Warner suggests that:

Because of the curse of Eve in Eden, the idea of woman's subjection was bound up in Christian thought with her role as mother and as temptress. In iconography, Satan is often female.¹⁴

In writing about Satan, St. Ignatius (d.1556) stated:

The enemy conducts himself as a woman. He is a weakling before a show of strength, and a tyrant if he has his will.¹⁵

The depiction of the serpent as female or with female characteristics conflated the image of Eve with that of the serpent, further associating the first woman and her genealogical daughters with the presence of evil in the world.

Mary Alone or with Jesus: Allusion to Eve

Many artists have found subtle and not-so-subtle ways to introduce Eve symbolically into a work which has Mary as its principal subject. Jan van Eyck, for instance, painted the story of Adam and Eve into the pier structures and capitals of the rooms in which his Madonnas stand, in the paintings Madonna with the Chancellor Rolin and the Madonna with the Canon van der Paele.¹⁶

In other cases, the reference to Eve is indirect, taking the symbolic form of an apple placed in the hand of Mary, or Jesus, or somewhere in the room. In her book entitled Sacred Symbols in Art, Elizabeth Goldsmith states that the apple in the hands of the infant Jesus symbolizes the Fall of Man, and in the hands of the Virgin it indicates that she is the Second Eve.¹⁷ Ironically, in terms of symbolic content, the interpretation of the apple is generalized in the case of the male bearer, while it is specific in the case of the female.

In the medieval wooden sculpture by the Master of Seeon (1412-1433) (fig.7), Mary appears to contemplate a bright red apple which she holds in her right hand, while Jesus leans away from the apple, and holds a copy of Scripture up to the viewer. He simultaneously points to a passage in the book and to his exposed genitals. The gestures of Mary and Jesus refer symbolically to the meaning of the Incarnation as the fulfillment of the scriptural prophecies, emphasizing the full humanity of Jesus and the role of Mary as the New Eve. The plethora of imagery of Mary depicted in a paradisiacal garden, or with the Tree of Life, testifies to the existence of another link between her image and that of Eve. In Stephan Lochner's The Mother of God in the Rose Garden (fig.8), Mary and Jesus are surrounded by angelic musicians, and are framed by a border of flowering plants and roses climbing on a trellis. One of the honorifics for Mary, "the Rose without Thorn", is another reference to her virginity and immunity from original and personal sin. According to legend, the roses in the Garden of Eden were thornless until after the Fall.

In Lochner's work, Jesus holds an apple in his hand, and Mary as the heavenly Eve, is crowned, bejewelled, and robed in royal blue. The background is gold, giving the impression that this scene takes place not on earth but in heaven. The presence of God the Father and the Holy Ghost surveying the scene from above, and the attendance of hovering angels add

to this impression. This idealized garden could also represent the "Enclosed Garden" of the Bride from the Song of Songs, another metaphor for Mary's virginity. Carol Purtle, in referring to a similar image in which Jesus again holds an apple, indicates that:

According to common medieval usage, the Child's apple would probably have come from one of two biblical gardens: the original paradise of the Book of Genesis, where Eve offered the fruit to Adam, or the enclosed garden of the Canticle of Canticles, where the bride offers an apple to her beloved (Canticles 5:1).¹⁸

The Tree of Life from the Garden of Eden can also be linked with the prophecy of Isaiah regarding the Tree of Jesse, cited above in the analysis of the ceiling imagery of the Sistine Chapel. In the stained glass window program of Chartres cathedral, Mary and Jesus are depicted as the culmination of growth of the Tree. The figure of Jesus springs directly from the head of his mother, crowning this monumental work which begins at the base with the trunk growing from the flank of the recumbent Jesse.

As stated earlier, the legends of Mary and Eve were also linked when the curse of Eve was misinterpreted as a prophecy of the Mother of God. The image of Mary as victor over Satan persisted, even after the translation error in the Vulgate was rectified. Jesus told his disciples, "Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you" (Luke 10:19). Mary as the first disciple takes on this capacity in

the ceiling fresco by Gottfried Bernhard Goz, located in the Wallfahrtskirche in Southern Germany (fig.9). With the child Jesus still in the womb and illuminated by golden rays of divine light, Mary's right foot crushes the head of a serpent/dragon which is encircling the globe. The image also found a scriptural foundation in St. John's apocalyptic vision described in the Book of Revelation:

And a great portent appeared in heaven, 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 she cried out in her pangs of birth, in anguish for delivery. And another portent appeared in heaven; behold, a red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns, and seven diadems upon his heads. His tail swept down a third of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman who was about to bear a child, that he might devour her child when she brought it forth; she brought forth a male child, one who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron, but her child was caught up to God and his throne, and the woman fled into the wilderness, where she has a place prepared by God, in which to be nourished for one thousand two hundred and sixty days (Rev.12:1-6).

As Cardinal Newman observed, the word in Greek for dragon (phylla) is the same word used for serpent, establishing a link between this and the Genesis story. Newman makes this observation with regard to this eschatological apparition: "Such a meeting of man, woman and serpent has not been found since the beginning of Scripture, and now it is found at its end."¹⁹

This image of Mary crushing the head of the serpent may be compared to the real affection shown by Eve towards the creature in the 15th-century sculptural program at Rheims

cathedral, where a smiling Eve gently strokes the head of the snake. In the more modern version by Elvira Bach (fig.10), the lines of Eve's figure are echoed in the coils of the serpent around her body, and the two are merged into a single creature. Whereas the Second Eve is empowered to destroy evil, the First Eve was not only overcome by it, but in fact made a malevolent pact with the serpent, presumably in order to victimize Adam.

The paucity of "Mother of All the Living" images of Eve, that is, when she is depicted as visibly pregnant, offer a sharp contrast to the abundance of images of Mary in this role. Such an image most often depicts the Christ Child visible in Mary's womb (fig.9). Another popular imaging of this idea is the inclusion of all humanity under the cloak of redemption worn by the Mother of God (fig.11). In the case of this sculpture found on a capital in a portal of the Abbey of Misericordia in Venice, Mary's robe is held together by the body of Christ. She strides forward, gathering both sinners and justified into her protective care, as they show their devotion to her. Mary's neck is exposed and prominent in this sculpture, emphasizing her role as intercessor, the intermediary between the Church and its head, Jesus Christ. In addition, tree imagery is again introduced in this work, with leafy branches appearing to grow from the limbs and head of Mary.

Eve with Mary: Error and Atonement

Before examining some images of Eve with Mary, a comment on the topic of anachronism is necessary. It is not "realistic" to place Eve and Mary together on the same painting or sculpture. However, the very assumption of temporal realism in this case belongs to a patriarchal linear view of history. The association of Mary and Eve is more the product of a feminine cyclical paradigm, under which it is quite natural for the two to be depicted together, since they embody parallel concepts. Jane Dillenberger has indicated that anachronism in religious art

is the artist's way of expressing that all time lies within the hand of God and the time of eternity is not the time we experience in the chronological progress from cradle to grave.²⁰

On the Virgin's Portal of the facade of the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, a crowned Madonna holds her diminutive charge on her hip. She stands atop a pillar with an arched roof over her head, a sword in her right hand. Directly underneath her left foot, a miniaturized depiction of the Fall of Man is taking place, with Adam and Eve picking the fruit from the tree in one scene, and exiting Paradise in shame in the next. In this sculpture, Mary, with her foot on top of the Tree of Life, is literally trampling out the sin introduced into the world by the first couple.

On the portal of Bernwardstür, in Hildensheim (fig.12), Eve and Mary are portrayed on opposite panels of the same

door. On the left, Eve tends to her child, presumably Abel, who straddles her hips and grasps at her breasts enthusiastically. Mary, on the other hand, rises stiffly from the other panel, her child resting across her knees. In a typical medieval iconographic pattern, she appears to be offering him to the viewer as a sacrifice, and their unrealistic posture contrasts sharply with their earthly counterparts, who appear to be interacting in a more human way.

Behind the altar of the Bordesolmer Altar, the Madonna and Child take center stage. This time they are flanked by the figures of Adam and Eve. With downcast eyes they hold their fig leaves in front of their genitalia. Eve holds an apple against her left breast. Other supplicants kneel beside them, with hands raised towards Mary, invoking her intercession on their behalf and that of Adam and Eve. Juxtaposed in this manner with Adam and Eve, Christ and Mary are exalted versions of their Old Testament counterparts.

In Carlo da Camerino's The Madonna of Humility with the Temptation of Eve (fig.13) the association of the two women is undisguised. A ponderous Madonna miraculously floats above a platform, cradling an oversized Jesus. He clutches at an unrealistic breast which appears to be coming out of Mary's right shoulder. In a pit below the platform a recumbent Eve strains to peer up at the Mother and Child. In her right hand she holds a tiny apple, and from her genital area a coiled

snake with a female head rises to peer at her, her tail encircling Eve's shapely thigh. Eve's wavy tresses are her only covering, and her well-formed right breast is silhouetted against the dark background.

The women have virtually identical facial features, and again they both have conspicuously exposed ears. Yet in every other way, they could not be more dissimilar. Mary's heavy mantle de-emphasizes her corporeal presence and emphasizes the gravity of her mission and the power of the Church she represents. Eve's nakedness and physical smallness stress her insignificance and her association with corporeality.

Mary's breast appears unnatural because in the Middle Ages it was considered indecorous to portray the breast of the Mother of God realistically. From this breast, the new Adam draws life and the promise of redemption in the milk of Mother Church, in contrast to the first Adam, who extracted nothing but the curse of death from the sustenance offered by the first Eve.

Eve, on the other hand, is no more than a patristic sex symbol. She represents the evil of the female sex and the lure of concupiscence, a reminder of the fate of the unredeemed sinner: death and entombment. While Mary is crowned with the twelve stars of heaven from St. John's apocalyptic vision, Eve is associated with the earth on which she lies. "Look to Our Lady, and live forever", the artist seems to say, and leave the world of Eve behind.

In Michele di Matteo's Dream of a Saint (fig.14), all the characters in this analogical drama are present. Mary reclines on a huge sofa to the left, covering more than half the canvas. From the foot of her bed, in the center of the painting, rises a large fruit-bearing tree, on which hangs Christ crucified. From under his feet springs the female head of a serpent, who is coiled around the trunk of the tree. She is staring straight into the eyes of Eve, who gestures to her. Adam hangs his head disconsolately behind Eve, rubbing an apple against his cheek.

From the title, one may presume that Mary is dreaming, or otherwise envisioning this entire scene, foreseeing her role as the Second Eve, and the fate that she and her son will endure. Christ hangs from the same Tree of Knowledge which figured in the demise of his Old Testament counterpart. According to medieval legend, the wood of his cross came from that very tree in Eden. On the other side of the tree, Mary sees the reason for which her son, the Second Adam has died, to abolish the sin of the first man and woman, and to usher in the new paradise of redemption.

Giovanni di Paolo's Annunciation (fig.15) is perhaps the most explicit artistic expression of the popular belief of Mary as the Second Eve. In the painting, Mary sits inside a gazebo in a prayerful pose as the angel with folded arms speaks to her. On the right, Joseph, pictured as a bald-headed old man, warms himself by the fire in the next room.

On the far left, God the Father looks down from the sun as his angel expels the naked Adam and Eve from the garden, and they look furtively back over their shoulders at the paradise they have forfeited. Medieval viewers of art, even the illiterate, knew that this painting was meant to be read from left to right, like a book. On the left, Adam and Eve are hounded from their earthly paradise, the frisky rabbits at their feet underlining the sexual nature of their sin. As a result of the Fall, the messenger of God appears to the Second Eve, announcing the advent of the Second Adam. Mary is seated while the angel and the first couple are standing, symbolizing her exalted rank. In the next room, a chaste marriage to the aged Joseph symbolically awaits her. With her hands opened and crossed over her heart, she humbly assents to her role in the redemptive process.

ENDNOTES

1. My understanding of the concept of "ways of seeing" is influenced by John Berger, Ways of Seeing, (London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1972).
2. Miles, Image as Insight, p.65.
3. Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.133.
4. Miles, Image as Insight, p.141.
5. Purtle, The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck, p.73.
6. Ibid., p.171.
7. Jane Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.17-18.
8. Emile Male, The Gothic Image, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958), p.152, quoted in Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.67.
9. Miles, Carnal Knowing, p.143.
10. Ibid., p.143.
11. See Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.37, for several poetic illustrations of this concept.
12. St. Ephrem of Syria (d.378), from Divers Sermons, No. 3, on the Praises of Mary the Mother, Vol.3, p.607, as quoted in Newman, The New Eve, p.19.
13. Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.122.
14. Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.58.
15. St. Ignatius (d.1556), Spiritual Exercises, "Rules for the Discernment of Spirits, First week, rule 12, as quoted in Ibid., p.58.
16. Detail photographs of these appear in Purtle, The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck, fig.39 and fig.41.
17. Elizabeth E. Goldsmith, Sacred Symbols in Art, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), p. 87.
18. Purtle, The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck, p.104.
19. Newman, The New Eve, p.31.

20. Dillenberger, Style and Content in Christian Art, p.43.

Conclusion:

A Feminist Reinterpretation of Mary as the Second Eve

The popularity of an image means that it carries, either literally or symbolically, significance and insight for the lives and experiences of those exposed to it. Given this assertion, the phenomenal popularity of the image of the Virgin Mary belies her unapproachable perfection for the average human female. As Bruce Malina points out:

The popes can say Mary is the ideal mother, thus urging contemporary females to stay within the role of mother. They do not say Mary is the ideal business woman, chief executive, career person, athlete, stockbroker, priest or bishop.¹

In all cases the images discussed herein, and virtually all available images of Mary, were created and distributed for and by men. As powerful as she may seem in certain contexts, Mary's power was bestowed on her by a patriarchal institution, and images of her are, almost without exception, examples of objectified male preconceptions. Additionally, these images are the product of the patriarchal culture surrounding both the artist and the subject matter.

John Pilch describes the images of Mary as circumscribed by her patriarchal Mediterranean culture:

Yet no matter what image of Mary is chosen for one's spirituality or popular devotion, it is important (1) to respect the cultural distinctiveness of Mary before attempting to universalize her virtues for world-wide imitation, and (2) to resist enculturating her in a given culture so deeply that she is no longer the Mediterranean maiden.²

Malina claims that despite a paucity of scriptural

justification, the cult of Mary and the plethora of traditional discourse about Mary thrived mostly in response to the needs and values of a gender-based Mediterranean culture. This culture was characterized by clearly delineated roles for men and women in a patriarchal society. Internal domestic and child-rearing decisions were made by the mother of the family, while the father was responsible for all external decisions, and took little or no part in the lives of his children.³

Although virginity does not seem to be the ideal liberating lifestyle for the modern feminist, this was not necessarily the case for the female members of this Mediterranean culture, as Margaret Miles suggests:

An image that to many modern women has come to carry a repressive context may have meant something very different to medieval women. The idealization of the virginal woman, for example, may have symbolized to medieval women freedom from the burden of frequent childbearing and nursing in an age in which these natural processes were highly dangerous. The power of the virgin came from her virginity as surely as it came from her motherhood.⁴

Pierre Abelard, himself a member of early 12th-century androcentrist society, made this concession to the female gender in his sermon in honor of the feast of the Assumption of Mary:

Let women consider carefully with how much glory the Lord elevated their inferior sex and how natural it must seem that both the heavenly and the earthly paradise pertain to them.⁵

This somewhat paradoxical statement reflects Abelard's belief that Mary, assumed bodily into heaven having bypassed

mortal suffering and death, reopened the gates of Paradise for humanity.

One of the scriptural foundations of a modern feminist Mariology is the element of volition implied in Mary's fiat of the Annunciation. Her statement "let it be done to me" (Lk.1:38) indicates that Mary freely consented to her role in the Incarnation and consequently in God's plan of redemption. This is further interpreted to indicate that without Mary's consent, God's plan of salvation would not have gone forth. Mary's statement, I believe, is more a testament of her faith than one of her empowerment. Given that the first part of the same verse reads: "Behold the handmaiden of the Lord", this fiat signifies no more than a scriptural account of Mary's acceptance of her ancillary role in the Incarnation.

The visual images examined in the preceding chapter illustrated how artists interpreted Mary as the Second Eve, contraposing ordinary women and Eve against Mary, their idealized counterpart. This polarization was accomplished by vilifying Eve and her daughters as the bearers of sin, and exalting Mary as the spotless Mother of Redemption. At first glance, the appropriation of such images would imply acceptance of a polarized view of female humanity, a view which is unacceptable to a modern feminist. How can the image of Mary as The Second Eve be integrated into a late 20th-century, postchristian culture? Should progressives and feminists simply dismiss the entire concept, relegating it to

the irrelevant, midrashic, obsolete texts from which it came? Surely the story of Eve has little to redeem itself in the eyes of feminists, its concern being more with the libertine than the liberating.

Obviously, the authors of Genesis did not have Mary in mind when they wrote the story of Eve. The concept of the Second Eve was the result of Christians trying to understand and justify their faith with images which had withstood the test of time. The early Christians believed that "the final part of God's plan sheds light on all that preceded"⁶, and that they were living in this final time. Eve and Mary were female gatekeepers, who along with their male counterparts, ushered in new ages. The first was the age of original sin and mortality, and the second of redemption and eternal life. As circumstances changed, the same parallels were reexamined and reinterpreted, and given other expression. Perhaps the most prevalent and damaging of these reinterpretations is the transition in the view of the Fall from a mythic illustration of human hubris to the approbation of human sexuality as evil.

Marina Warner is struck by the power which this symbol has wielded in history:

It is almost impossible to overestimate the effect that the characteristic Christian association of sex and sin and death has had on the attitudes of our civilization. Since the learned Saints Jerome and Augustine (d.430) tackled the problem of man's tendency to evil, the three separate concepts have been bound together tightly in a web that traps every Christian.⁷

We cannot see into the minds and hearts of the Genesis

authors with enough clarity to understand the intended meaning of the story. Given the traditional interpretation extant since at least the 5th century, however, the outlook for a progressive reinterpretation is bleak. Mary Daly is concerned that

as long as theology is obsessed with a conception of human nature as fallen from a state of original integrity, and considers that state to have actually existed in the past, it must be pessimistic about the present and the future. It tends to see human life chiefly in terms of reparation and expiation.⁸

The trap referred to by Warner snared Mary the mother of Jesus in the role of expiator for Eve her predecessor. Given the sexual implications of her antetype's blunder, it became necessary for Mary to transcend the sexual aspects of human existence.

In fact, most of the iniquities of human existence were, in the end, spared Mary: the disgrace of birth into original sin, the humiliation of sexuality, and the ignominy of suffering and death. Her threefold exemption from these mortal burdens took shape in the three great doctrines of Mary: the Immaculate Conception, the Perpetual Virginity, and the Assumption. Mary's transcendence was so complete, however, that in comparison, Eve's misstep as described in Genesis seemed insignificant. Thus my hypothesis that the exaltation of Mary was what really engendered the unredeemable vilification of Eve.

Could an Eve compatible with the feminist worldview be found beneath the role of the "anti-Mary" assigned to her?

Perhaps not in the Christian context. Her only hope of positive imagery came in the form of her role as the Mother of all the Living. In Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism, this role had been totally and irrevocably preempted by Mary. Eve's role was reduced to that of Pandora's. The genealogical importance of the first woman in the Judeo-Christian and ancient Greek traditions was completely subordinated to the primary role of explaining the presence of evil in a world ruled by an omnipotent, benevolent, male God. Even if she managed to bring Adam down with her, Eve was still left to shoulder this burden of guilt and could not be exonerated.

Anthony Tambasco, in his book entitled What are they saying about Mary?, provided a plausible explanation for Eve's pitiable lot. He traced the development of patriarchal values of Christianity back to the male awe of the power of the female reproductive capacity.

Because of this fear man, probably from the very beginning of civilization, sought to control these forces that could so easily overwhelm him. Sex came to be seen as evil, and woman, who was identified with the power of sex, came to be treated as inferior to the controlling and rational powers of the male.⁹

As a result of this need, the interpretation of the Fall as illustrative of human pride was subordinated to its new misogynist message. In contrast, therefore, the virginity of Mary became one of her preeminent features, since it disassociated her from negativized female sexuality. In the

process, however, it alienated her from human women. The mother goddess could not fall victim to temptation, pride, and especially seduction. Hence the Second Eve, and the polarization of her image with that of the First Eve.

Consequently, Christian women were asked to eschew their genealogical roots and abandon Eve in favor of Mary, her greatly improved but unapproachable replacement. Even though the curse of Eve governed her physical existence, the embracing of Mary as a role model became necessary, with its implied rejection of female corporeality.

Women were, and are, left with an untenable choice between virgin and whore, since Mary's example for humanity was characterized by a celebration of sexual abstinence without sexual freedom. According to Phillips:

It is fascinating to note that the notion of virgin motherhood remains as the mythical backdrop for the modern moral battles of feminists. The Roman Catholic belief is that if women have control over their own bodies and are therefore free to abort potential offspring, they have reversed the triumph of the Virgin Mary over the ancient goddess; sexual freedom is a threat to life. Mary refuses sexual freedom and is said to be truly free in her domesticity: this is the model she holds out to believers for emulation.¹⁰

The resolution of this dilemma lies in the search for transcendence, the need to overcome, accommodate, even celebrate the curse of Eve, while incorporating faith in Mary as an example of this transcendence. The question remains then, what kind of Second Eve would provide an appropriate synthesis of physicality and transcendence? Tambasco broached

the question, but fell short of resolving the matter of corporeality; at least from the perspective of the feminist:

The use of the Mary-Eve typology enables one to combine Mary's role as mother and at the same time believer of the Word. It also leads to a Mary-Church typology, for the Church is seen as the virginal mother, bringing forth Christ in her members in the new creation, while she is at the same time the faithful and obedient spouse of Christ who receives the gift of his love and his very life.¹¹

This statement defined the role of Mary as prototype of the Church, an idealized community of believers, but what of the individual Christian female herself? Tambasco chose to leave Eve and her daughters behind in this analogy.

In order to arrive at a feminist characterization of Mary as the Second Eve, we need to redefine this concept as a synthesis of the images of Mary and Eve, one which goes beyond the virgin-whore polarization. In this paradigm, Mary retains her status as Mother of Redemption, but is also a daughter of Eve, the Mother of All the Living, and not the Anti-Eve.

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. (Gal.3:28)

I believe that in order to arrive at a Mariology acceptable from a feminist point of view, the issue of gender differentiation must be de-emphasized in matters of theology. A new Mary must be forged, outside of the Second Eve role cast for her by her gender-based Mediterranean culture. Just as it is a mistake to give prior importance to the maleness of Christ over and above his humanity, so Mary's gender should

not overshadow or impact her role as prototype of the Church. Too much emphasis has been placed on Jesus as role model for the male and Mary for the female. Tambasco maintained that both Jesus and Mary should be models for all of humanity.¹² Just as Christ's role as the redeemer did not depend on his gender, nor should Mary's femininity impact her role as the prototype of the ideal Christian. This follows from the fact that Christians are not included or excluded from the dispensation of grace based on their gender. The tendency to polarize on the basis of female or male demonstrated by the Fathers of the Church clouded the issue with regard to the relationship of the New Adam to the New Eve.

The fact that Mary transcended her physicality is witness to her proactive subjectivity. The fact that she was chosen for this role is witness to the grace of God functioning in human existence. According to the medieval exegetes, Eve allowed her physicality to rule her, thus her curse was to be objectified. The Fall of Mankind was brought about under human initiative, but the first gesture of reconciliation was made by God in the form of the Incarnation, with Mary playing an integral role.

"Behold your mother" (Jn.19:27), Jesus said to his friend and disciple, John. In doing so, Jesus made possible the role of Mary as the New Mother of the Church, a title formally assigned to her by Pope Paul VI in 1964. If Mary was the mother of Jesus of Nazareth, then should she not also be the

mother of the resurrected Christ, and the community of believers he established? Tambasco maintained that Mary's divine maternity can be understood as the "highest expression of Mary as a woman of faith, the paradigm of the perfect Christian".¹³ He claimed that Luke considered Mary the first disciple, since she was the first to believe, even before Jesus performed his first miracle at Cana - in fact, she was the first to suggest it.¹⁴

Tambasco did not propose to eradicate the gender-based roles assigned to Jesus and Mary. Instead, he preferred to incorporate them into a Jungian model of reciprocal qualities to be found in both men and women, qualities which complement and complete the person of the ideal Christian.

Mary can remind us that God is not just masculine as a power over creation, but also feminine as a ground of being and as the foundation of each unique person.¹⁵

Further, Tambasco indicated that Mary can teach receptivity to men and women:

This receptivity is not to imply powerlessness or self-negation, nor is it simply a passive trait. It is rather the ability to listen to and to help others. By the same token, Mary's fiat shows that woman's receptivity includes an active element.¹⁶

This eclectic model seems to be a sound approach, as long as one does not cloud the issue by stereotyping and generalizing characteristics of each sex. For example, not all women are prone to listen to and help others, and not all men are disinclined to do so. Mary is not predisposed to intercede on behalf of sinners because she is female, nor is

Christ prone to judge them more harshly because he is male.

Hence the role of the Holy Spirit, according to Tambasco.

The Spirit is also perceived as a source of communion within the Church, so that there is neither male nor female, but a unity in Christ Jesus. The theology of Mary and the spirit leads us to another new direction for Mariology, i.e., its development within a movement which raises consciousness of the subordination of women in both society and the Church, and which seeks to redress that situation.¹⁷

Ironically, the mitigating action of the Holy Spirit enables Mariology to transcend the gender barrier, while simultaneously illuminating the gender injustices of the present.

The artistic depiction of such a synthesizing image would in some ways resemble Michele di Matteo's Dream of a Saint, in that it would portray both the Old and New Adam and Eve, and the parallels in the lives of the two pairs would be developed. However, unlike Matteo's work, evil would not be represented as a serpent with the head of a woman, and the New Eve would take a more active role in the proceedings. For instance, Michelangelo's Mary in the Vatican Pieta is not active in the sense of physical movement, but her presence is an integral part of the message which the artist wished to convey. She physically supports the slain redeemer of the world with her own body, and represents the hope of humankind in the community of believers.

In the new image of Mary as the Second Eve, the Fall would not be portrayed as sexual in nature, nor would one of

the two persons involved carry more of the burden of blame than the other. The gender of the individuals involved would not be over-emphasized, unless this somehow exposed a past or present iniquity. This image of Mary would pave the way for a new emphasis on the role of women in all areas of Church activity, from local ministry to centralized decision making. If Mary is prototype of the Church, why is it not possible for this same Church to be headed by a female? Tambasco's Jungian paradigm reenters at this point:

If Mary is a model of all persons, then her role is not to distinguish women from male, hierarchical, priestly ministry, but to show the feminine dimensions of ministry in the Church as a shared responsibility of all, men and women.¹⁸

In the post-Christian era the role of each Christian, male or female, must expand to fill the void created by the retreat of the Church as world-wide authority. Christians can ill afford to relegate more than half their numbers to an ancillary task and a role dependent on patriarchal deference.

Those aspects of the Eve/Mary relationship which emphasize their shared characteristics, along with those of Adam and Christ, rather than their antithetical ones, are more likely to bring about a liberating perspective for Christian women. If the legacy of the First Eve is not redefined, then Mary as the Second Eve will never be compatible with the feminist worldview. In order to be compelling, this reinterpretation must find expression not only in the theological milieu, but in the devotional and artistic

modalities as well.

ENDNOTES

1. Bruce J. Malina, "Mother and Son," Biblical Theology Bulletin 20, no.2 (1990) :57.
2. John Pilch, "Marian Devotion and Wellness Spirituality: Bridging Cultures," Biblical Theology Bulletin 20, no.2 (1990) :93.
3. Malina, "Mother and Son," p. 57.
4. Miles, Image as Insight, p.89.
5. Pierre Abelard, "Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina," p.543, quoted in Gold, The Lady and the Virgin: Image, Attitude and Experience in Twelfth-Century France, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), p.59.
6. Anthony Tambasco, What are they saying about Mary?, p.51.
7. Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, p.5.
8. Daly, The Church and the Second Sex, p.186.
9. Tambasco, What are they saying about Mary?, p.79.
10. Phillips, Eve: The History of an Idea, p.145.
11. Tambasco, What are they saying about Mary?, p.42.
12. Ibid., p.82.
13. Ibid., p.43.
14. Ibid., p.16.
15. Ibid., p.81.
16. Ibid., p.81.
17. Ibid., p.77.
18. Ibid., p.82.



Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3



Figure 4



Figure 5



Figure 6



Figure 7



Figure 8



Figure 9



Figure 10



Figure 11



Figure 12



Figure 13



Figure 14



Figure 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Art History Museum, Vienna Picture Gallery. New York: Newsweek, Inc., 1969.
- Askew, Pamela. Caravaggio's Death of the Virgin. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Berger, John. Ways of Seeing. London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1972.
- Braunfels-Esche, Sigrid. Adam und Eva, Sundenfall und Erlösung. Dusseldorf: Verlag L. Schwann, 1957.
- Clark, Kenneth. The Nude, a Study in Ideal Form. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Clement, Clara Erskine. Heroines of the Bible in Art. Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1900.
- Daly, Mary. The Church and the Second Sex. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. Translated by H.M. Parshley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1953.
- Dillenberger, Jane. Style and Content in Christian Art, 2nd ed. New York: Crossroad, 1988.
- Dixon, John W., Jr. "Painting as Theological Thought: The Issues in Tuscan Theology." In Art, Creativity and the Sacred, pp. 277-296. Edited by Diane Apostolos-Cappadona. New York: Crossroad, 1986.
- Gallagher, Sharon. Medieval Art. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1969.
- Gold, Penny Schine. The Lady & the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and Experience in Twelfth Century France. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Goldsmith, Elizabeth E. Sacred Symbols in Art. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- Grimme, Ernst Gunther. Deutsche Madonnen. Cologne: Verlag M. Dumont Schauberg, 1966.
- _____. Unsere Liebe Frau. Cologne: Verlag M. Dumont Schauberg, 1968.

- Hirn, Yrjo. The Sacred Shrine. London: Faber and Faber, 1958.
- Jameson, Anna Brownwell. Legends of the Madonna, as Represented in the Fine Arts. London: Hutchinson & Co., n.d.
- Kraus, Henry. "Eve and Mary: Conflicting Images of Medieval Woman". In Feminism and Art History: questioning the Litany, pp. 79-99. Edited by Norma Broude and Mary Garrard. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Male, Emile. Chartres. Translated by Sarah Wilson. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.
- _____. Religious Art from the twelfth to the eighteenth century. New York: Pantheon, 1949.
- Malina, Bruce J. "Mother and Son." Biblical Theology Bulletin 20, no.2 (1990): 54-64.
- Miles, Margaret R. Carnal Knowing, Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West. Boston, Beacon Press, 1989.
- _____. Image as Insight, Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version. Edited by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Newman, John Henry. The New Eve. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1952.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Maid and Mother in Art and Literature." Biblical Theology Bulletin 20, no.2 (1990): 65-75.
- Palais des Beaux-Arts, Paris. La Vierge dans l'art francais. Paris: Les Presses Artistiques, 1950.
- Panofsky, Erwin. Early Netherlandish Painting, its Origins and Character. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Phillips, John A. Eve, the History of an Idea. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Pilch, John. "Marian Devotion and Wellness Spirituality: Bridging Cultures." Biblical Theology Bulletin 20, no.2 (1990): 85-93.

- Purtle, Carol J. The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Rothenstein, Elizabeth, ed. The Virgin and the Child, an Anthology of paintings and poems. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Scheeben, Rev. M.J. Mariology. Vol 2. Translated by Rev. T.L.M.J. Geukers. St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1947.
- Schillebeeckx, E., O.P. Mary, Mother of Redemption. Translated by N.D. Smith. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.
- Schwebel, Horst. Die andere Eva, Wandlungen eines biblischen Frauenbildes. Menden: Trapez-Verlag, 1985.
- Smith, George D. Mary's Part in our Redemption. New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1938.
- Tambasco, Anthony J. What are they saying about Mary?. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.
- The Vienna Kunsthistorische Museum. Translated by Elsie Callander and Ilse Seldon. London: Scala/Philip Wilson, 1984.
- Vierges gothiques et de la premiere Renaissance. Translated by E. de Solms and W. Witters. n.p.: Zodiaque, 1975.
- Ward, John. "Hidden Symbolism in Jan van Eyck's Annunciations." The Art Bulletin 57 (1975): 196-220.
- Warner, Marina. Alone of All her Sex, the Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- _____. Monuments and Maidens, the Allegory of the Female Form. New York: Atheneum, 1985.
- Weis, Adolf. Die Madonna Platyttera. Konigstein im Taunus: Langewiesche, 1985.