

Mary's Motherly Mediation in Christ: A Systematic Reflection*

MANFRED HAUKE
Theology Faculty of Lugano
Lugano, Switzerland

A Central Theme in Light of Christ and of the Church

PERHAPS the most discussed theme of Mariology today is the participation of the Mother of God in the universal mediation of Jesus Christ.¹ The significance of this area of research may be elucidated with reference to the work of Thomas Aquinas and of Vatican II.

* Translated by Christopher Malloy. The original German version of Fr. Hauke's article appeared in A. von Brandenstein-Zeppelin und A. von Stockhausen, eds., *Die Stellung der Gottesmutter in der Welt- und Heilsgeschichte* (Weilheim-Bierbronn, 2008), 19–50.

¹ See for example A. Amato, "Gesù, Salvatore, definitivo, universale, e la cooperazione di Maria alla salvezza: Problematiche nuove di una 'questione antica,'" in *Maria nel mistero di Cristo pienezza del tempo e compimento del regno*, ed. E. Perretto (Rome: 1999), 387–427; various authors, *Maria Corredentrice: Storia e teologia I–VIII* (Frigento: 1998–2006); various authors, *Mary at the Foot of the Cross I–VI* (New Bedford, MA: 2001–2007); J. L. Bastero de Eleizalde, *Virgen singular: La reflexión mariana en el siglo XX* (Madrid: 2001), 206–59; M. Ponce Cuéllar, *Maria: Madre del Redentor y Madre de la Iglesia*, 2nd ed. (Barcelona: 2001), 442–500; P. Haffner, *The Mystery of Mary* (Chicago: 2004), 182–207 and 254–66; M. Hauke, "Mary, 'Helpmate of the Redeemer': Mary's Cooperation in Salvation as a Research Theme," in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross III*, by various authors (New Bedford, MA: 2003), 25–53; idem, "Die mütterliche Vermittlung," in *Totus tuus: Maria in Leben und Lehre Johannes Pauls II* (Mariologische Studien 18), no. 18, ed. A. Ziegenaus (Regensburg: 2004), 125–75 (Italian translation: "La mediazione materna di Maria secondo Papa Giovanni Paolo II," in *Maria Corredentrice VII*, by various authors [Frigento: 2005], 35–91); idem, *Introduzione alla Mariologia* (Collana di Mariologia 2) (Lugano: 2008), 253–302; M. Miravalle, *"With Jesus": The Story of Mary Co-redemptrix* (Goleta, CA: 2003); Sociedad Mariológica Española, *La colaboración de María a la Redención: Problema antiguo en proyección moderna*, no. 70, Estudios Marianos (Salamanca: 2004); various

In the *Summa theologiae* of St. Thomas, the person of Jesus Christ stands at the center. While the first part of the great work treats of God as the origin and goal of all created things and the second part investigates the movement of rational creation to God, the third part concerns Jesus Christ, “Who as man is for us the way to God.”² The union of God and creation in Jesus Christ, therefore, is in some way the quintessence or central content of Christian doctrine. The expression Christ “as man is for us the way to God” refers directly to the definition of the mediation of Christ in the First Letter to Timothy: “God is one, one also the mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, who gave himself as a ransom for all . . .” (1 Tim 2:5–6).³

According to Aquinas, two elements belong to mediation: being between two extremes and having a union with each of them. Jesus Christ mediates through his human nature, which in virtue of the Incarnation is united with the eternal Word. As man, Christ is distinguished from God, but because of his dignity of grace and glory he is distinguished from the rest of men. “Insofar as he is man, it belongs to him to join men to God, bringing commands and gifts for men, offering satisfaction for men to God and interceding for them. Thus, he is most truly called mediator according as he is man.”⁴

In the architecture of the theological *Summa* the question of the mediation of Christ forms as it were the center and pivot between the person of Christ in the mystery of the Incarnation and the saving work of the Redeemer. The theme still belongs to the realm of the Incarnation, but

authors, *Maria, “unica cooperatrice alla Redenzione”*: *Atti del Simposio sul Mistero della Corredenzione Mariana* (New Bedford, MA: 2005); S.M. Perrella, *La Madre di Gesù nella coscienza ecclesiale contemporanea* (Vatican City: 2005), 407–88; H. Munsterman, *Marie corédemptrice? Débat sur un titre marial controversé* (Paris: 2006) (for reviews of this, see M. Hauke, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 101 [2006]: 1318–22 and P. D. Fehlner, “Marian Minimalism on Coredeemption,” *Immaculata Mediatrix* 6 [2006]: 397–420); A. B. Calkins, “Mary Co-redemptrix: The Beloved Associate of Christ,” in *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons*, by various authors (Goleta, CA: 2008), 349–409; A. M. Apollonio, “Mary Mediatrix of All Graces,” in *Mariology* (Goleta, CA: 2008), 411–65. A Villafiorita Monteleone, *Alma Redemptoris Socia, Maria e la Redenzione nella teologia contemporanea* (Lugano: Collana di Mariologia, 2010), 8.

² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* I, q. 2, proemium. For the structure and Christological character of the *Summa*, see Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and His Work*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 145–56; and D. Berger, *Thomas von Aquins “Summa theologiae”* (Darmstadt: 2004), 43–61.

³ See ST III, q. 26, aa. 1–2.

⁴ ST III, q. 26, a. 2.

prepares for the treatment of the Redeemer's work directly. It is an issue, therefore, of the systematic movement between the person of Christ and his work, between Christology (in the narrow sense) and soteriology, between what Christ is on the basis of his divine-human constitution and "what the Son of God, made flesh in a human nature united to himself, *did and suffered*."⁵ The mediation of Christ thus forms in a certain way the center of Christology (in the wider sense) and of the entire theological *Summa*.

Thomas Aquinas is quite aware of the uniqueness of Christ's mediation, which is emphasized in the First Letter to Timothy and in the entire New Testament. The unique mediation of Christ does not, to be sure, imply any exclusion of human mediation in the event of salvation: the relevant Pauline passage is found in a section in which the Christian is called to intercede for all men and in which the Apostle appears as a herald and apostle of the unique Mediator (1 Tim 2:1–7). Thomas sums up this cooperation with Christ as follows: even others can "in a certain respect be called mediators between God and man: insofar namely as they cooperate towards the union of man and God, dispositively or instrumentally (*ministerialiter*)."⁶ In this cooperative work and service there befits the Mother of God an eminent role, which affects all mankind.

A look at the systematic synthesis of Aquinas brings to light the significance of Marian mediation from the perspective of Christology. The complementary field of ecclesiology, on the other hand, was brought to bear on Mariology through the Second Vatican Council, which was, so to speak, the "Council of the Church Concerning the Church," the most important document of which—the theological heart of the conciliar decrees—is the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*. The eighth and final chapter of *Lumen Gentium* is entitled "On Blessed Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and of the Church." Pope Paul VI saw in this chapter the pinnacle and crowning of the entire Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.⁷ This highpoint in its turn finds its spiritual center in the teaching on the cooperation of Mary in redemption, which belongs to her participation in the mediation of Christ. A Spanish Mariologist who managed a hearing in the journal *Marianum* rightly claims, "The center of the conciliar teaching on Mary is the cooperation of the Mother of God in the work of salvation."⁸ The teaching on the mediation of Mary

⁵ ST III, q. 27, prooemium (emphasis added).

⁶ ST III, q. 26, a. 1.

⁷ See Paul VI, *Post duos menses*, an address at the close of the third session of the council (Nov. 21, 1964; AAS 56 [1964]: 1014).

⁸ A. Escudero Cabello, "Approcci attuali e proposte teologiche sul tema della cooperazione mariana," *Marianum* 61 (1999): 177f.

appears in the middle of the chapter, which in a certain way constitutes the highpoint of the entire Council. This analysis, perhaps surprising for many, is confirmed by a glance at the theological publications on the various themes treated in the Council: there are, so it appears, more publications on Marian mediation than on all other topics, although there is no lack of controversy and conflict over it.⁹

Recent Development of the Teaching on Marian Mediation

A glance at the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas and at the results of the Second Vatican Council demonstrates the intimate bond of Marian mediation with Christology and with the doctrine on the Church. This tight connection is not to be reduced simply to historical accidents; it rests rather on the reality itself, namely, on the Mother of God's being integrated into the work of redemption: "Having entered deeply into the history of salvation, Mary, in a way, unites in her person and re-echoes the most important doctrines of the faith."¹⁰

To be sure, the theological development has unfolded historically. It began in divine revelation and was further formed in the history of the Church. The contemporary discussion concerning Marian mediation was most intensely stimulated by the initiative of the Belgian Cardinal Mercier, who in 1915, together with the bishops of his country, put a request forward to the Holy See that Mary's universal mediation of grace be defined.¹¹ A step towards that definition (*Zwischenresultat*) was the optional introduction of the Feast of Mary as "Mediatrice of All Graces" in 1921, through Benedict XV.¹² Benedict's measure was a powerful jolt for Mariology, of which the movement in favor of the relevant Marian dogma would ever grow stronger, though it had its opponents. The move-

⁹ On the topic of Marian mediation in Vatican II, see the bibliographical references in Hauke, "Mütterliche Vermittlung," 127–30.

¹⁰ *Lumen Gentium*, §65 (translation from Flannery, 1998, p. 420).

¹¹ See M. Hauke, *Mary, Mediatrix of Grace: Mary's Universal Mediation of Grace in the Theological and Pastoral Works of Cardinal Mercier*, Supplement of *Mary at the Foot of the Cross IV* (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2004), 35–43. Meanwhile, I discovered in the archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith the 1915 petition of Cardinal Mercier and the other Belgian bishops, which until now was considered lost: Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, Archivio del Sant'Ufficio, *Rerum Variarum* 1916, n. 6, vol. I. A publication of this handwritten material is in preparation.

¹² See Hauke, *Mercier*, 52–60.

ment reached its highpoint just before the Council, when hundreds of bishops requested a corresponding dogmatic definition.¹³

Nevertheless, the Council did not desire to deal with any dogmatic definitions and treated the theme of Marian mediation with caution. The title "Mediatrice" was styled an expression of ecclesial piety¹⁴ and the brief formula for Marian cooperation in salvation, the title "Coredemptrix," had already been avoided, on ecumenical grounds, in the preceding schema on the Mother of God. The conciliar commission, under the influence of the Franciscan Carlo Balic, offered this statement at the time: "Certain words and expressions employed by the popes have been omitted. Although most true (*verissima*) in themselves, they can be more difficult for the separated brothers (especially the Protestants) to understand. Among these are included the following, 'Coredemptrix of the human race.'"¹⁵ Mary's universal mediation was not disavowed by the Council, but clear expressions regarding it are found only indirectly in the footnotes, if one investigates the sources cited therein.¹⁶ The Second Vatican Council propounded an impressive teaching on the Mother of God, in which also Marian cooperation in the event of salvation and her spiritual motherhood of all the saved stand out. Yet, at the same time, the clearest concepts and contents of Marian mediation were avoided, above all for ecumenical considerations, as for instance the invocation of "Coredemptrix" and "Mediatrice of all Grace."

It was no wonder that this treatment of the figure of Mary resulted in a "Marian Ice Age," during which any mention of Marian mediation itself was taboo even among Mariologists.¹⁷ While this "ice" began to melt, to a certain extent, with Paul VI's apostolic exhortation *Mariæ Cultus* (1974), John Paul brought back the theme of Marian mediation once again to the center of Mariology in his encyclical *Redemptoris Mater* (1987). The pope speaks therein of a "motherly mediation," which is not to be placed side by side that of Christ; rather, it is accomplished "in Christ."¹⁸

The most recent discussion is strongly marked by the petition for a new Marian dogma, which since 1993 has been brought before the Holy See. The petition includes the request for a dogma with three titles, which are

¹³ See A. Escudero Cabello, *La cuestión de la mediación mariana en la preparación del Vaticano II: Elementos para una evaluación de los trabajos preconiliares* (Rome, 1997), 86–92.

¹⁴ See *Lumen Gentium*, §62.

¹⁵ *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Secundi*, vol. I.4 (Vatican City, 1971), 99, note 3a.

¹⁶ *Lumen Gentium*, §62, notes 15 and 16 of the Flannery edition.

¹⁷ On the post-conciliar crisis of Mariology, see S. de Fiores, *Maria nella teologia contemporanea*, 3rd ed. (Rome: 1991), 123–36.

¹⁸ See Hauke, "Mütterliche Vermittlung," 130–33.

in harmony with the alleged Marian messages from the “Lady of all People” in Amsterdam.¹⁹ According to the messages, Mary should be addressed as “Coredemptrix, Mediatrix of All Graces, and Advocate.”²⁰ In discussion concerning this matter, the concept “Coredemptrix” especially excited offense. At the time, even Joseph Ratzinger, in a personal remark as cardinal, mentioned the concept quite critically,²¹ even though Pope John Paul II had been using the term repeatedly.²² In 2008, five cardinals sent a letter to all the Catholic bishops with the proposal to favor a Marian dogma where the three attributes (Coredemptrix, Mediatrix of All Graces, Advocate) are presented under the title of spiritual maternity.²³

A Conceptual Clarification of Our Theme²⁴

Analogous Participation in the Mediation of Christ

In order to evaluate the controversial debates rightly, a conceptual clarification is first and foremost in order. The topic to be treated under the catchword Marian “mediation” can appear in rather different “guises,” which are not always interpreted in the same way. The comprehensive concept is, in my opinion, the term “mediation” itself, which covers in the classical Christological treatises the whole area of the doctrine of salvation and is included in the doctrine of grace as well.²⁵ Mary participates in a specific way in the unique mediation of Christ. The salvific influence of the Mother of God is, according to the teaching of Vatican II, “based on the mediation of Christ, depends on it entirely, and draws from it (from Christ’s mediation) its whole power.”²⁶ To speak of Marian “mediation” or to address Mary as “Mediatrix” indicates an analogous participation in the mediation of Christ, which we find as well in many

¹⁹ An alleged apparition of Mary.

²⁰ On this and for further bibliographical references, see Hauke, “Helpmate”; idem, “Die aktive Mitwirkung Mariens an der Erlösung: Ein geschichtlicher Durchblick,” in *Die göttliche Vernunft und die inkarnierte Liebe: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag Seiner Heiligkeit Papst Benedikts XVI*, ed. A. von Brandenstein-Zeppelin, A. von Stockhausen, and J. H. Benirschke (Weilheim-Bierbronn: 2007), 45–48.

²¹ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *God and the World: A Conversation with Peter Seewald*, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002), 306.

²² See Hauke, “Mütterliche Vermittlung,” 140–46; Miravalle, “With Jesus” (Note 1), 189–212; Calkins, “Mary Co-redemptrix,” 392–398.

²³ See Hauke, “Introduzione alla Mariologia,” 277.

²⁴ See also Hauke, “Helpmate,” 47–53; and idem, “Aktive Mitwirkung,” 16–19.

²⁵ See for example F. Diekamp and K. Jüssen, *Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des hl. Thomas II* (Münster: 1959), 306–54; J. Pohle and J. Gummersbach, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik II* (Paderborn: 1956; reprint, 1968), 222–330.

²⁶ *Lumen Gentium*, §60.

other areas. The name "Christian," for example, signifies a participation in the messianic anointing of Christ as bearer of the Holy Spirit. Reference to the "common priesthood" of all believers does not obscure the mission of the only High Priest, but rather suggests a participation in the priesthood of Jesus Christ. "As in various ways both the ministers and the faithful participate in the priesthood of Christ in various ways, and as the one goodness of God is really poured forth to creatures in diverse ways, so also the unique mediation of the redeemer does not exclude, but rather gives rise to differentiated, participated cooperation among creatures from this unique source."²⁷

"Mediation" precisely taken designates the union of two extremes, in this case, God and men. "Descending" mediation can be distinguished from "ascending" mediation. The former signifies a communication of gifts, whereas the latter signifies prayer and sacrifice directed to God. Likewise, Marian mediation embraces her cooperation in the work of salvation on earth as well as her heavenly intercession. This overarching character of Marian mediation is not always sufficiently appreciated, inasmuch as one routinely calls to mind only her intercessory mediation of grace but not her cooperation in the salvific work of Christ on earth. Such a consequence can follow from the exclusive use of the title "Mediatatrix" in the formula "Mediatatrix of all graces." This tendency can even be found in the texts of the Second Vatican Council,²⁸ although the systematic discussion in the time of Cardinal Mercier issued in the conclusion that Marian mediation begins already with her cooperation in the redemption.²⁹ Placing the title "Mediatatrix" between the titles "Coredeмпtrix" and "Advocate"—as some do who are pressing for a fifth Marian dogma—creates a tension with the systematic meaning of the concept "mediation," which extends as an umbrella term over all the relevant contents of Mary's work and thereby includes even her "coredeмпtion" and heavenly intercession.³⁰

Cooperation in Salvation

The concept "redemption" can also include the entire economy of salvation, but its pith is related primarily to the work of salvation fulfilled by Christ on earth, which work began with his Incarnation and attained its highpoint at the Cross. Thus "redemption" indicates, above all, the earthly

²⁷ *Lumen Gentium*, §62.

²⁸ See *Lumen Gentium*, §62, for the use of the title "Mediatatrix" in the invocation of Mary.

²⁹ See Hauke, *Mercier*, 86–87, 127–28, and *passim*.

³⁰ See Hauke, "Aktive Mitwirkung," 47f.

life of Jesus. Only in a wider perspective does it regard the human acceptance of the fruits of redemption. In union with Scheeben, one should differentiate “objective redemption” (the saving work of Jesus on earth) from “subjective redemption” (the inclusion of the concrete subject, who participates in the grace of the redeemer). In the 1930s, the German Jesuit Heinrich Lennerz wielded this distinction in Mariology in order to exclude Mary from cooperation in the “objective redemption” and to grant her only a contribution in the “subjective redemption.”³¹

So the issue from that time until the eve of the Council was this: did Mary cooperate directly (*unmittelbar*) in the objective redemption or not? One group of theologians rejected such cooperation (for example, Heinrich Lennerz) or reduced Marian cooperation to a “reception” of the fruits of salvation (for example, Heinrich Maria Köster). These positions are now outdated in light of the statements of Vatican II, according to which “[r]ightly, therefore, the Fathers see Mary not merely as passively engaged by God, but as freely cooperating in the work of man’s salvation through faith and obedience.”³² “Now this union of the mother with her Son in the work of salvation was manifested from the virginal conception of Christ unto his death.”³³ It is thus clear that, already, God’s becoming man, with which Mary cooperated through her *fiat*, belongs to the work of redemption. In contrast, Lennerz viewed the Incarnation only as a presupposition for the redemption but not as the very beginning of the work of redemption.

Mary’s *fiat* with respect to the Incarnation and her union with Christ under the Cross display the singular character of her mediation, as the Council also stresses: “She conceived, brought forth, and nourished Christ, she presented him to the Father in the temple, shared her Son’s sufferings as he died on the cross. Thus, in a wholly singular way she cooperated by her obedience, faith, hope, and burning charity in the work of the Savior in restoring supernatural life to souls.”³⁴

The concept “Coredemptrix” appears for the first time in a church hymn in Salzburg in the fifteenth century.³⁵ “Coredemption” is, according to the common explication, an abbreviated title for “cooperation in

³¹ See Hauke, “La questione del ‘primo principio’ e l’indole della cooperazione di Maria all’opera redentrice del Figlio: due temi rilevanti nella mariologia di Gabriele M. Roschini,” *Marianum* 64 (2002): 591–97.

³² *Lumen Gentium*, §56; translation from *Vatican Council II*, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing Company, 1998) [unless noted, translations from Vatican II are mine—translator]. See Hauke, “Aktive Mitwirkung,” 41–45.

³³ *Lumen Gentium*, §57.

³⁴ *Lumen Gentium*, §61 (Flannery translation).

³⁵ See Hauke, “Aktive Mitwirkung,” 28.

redemption." The development of the concept dovetailed with medieval piety concerning the passion, which contemplated Mary under the Cross and spoke of her "co-suffering" (*compassio*). As distinguished from the concept "Redemptrix," which emphasized Mary's mission as God-bearer, the word "Coredemptrix" is more reserved, in order not to compromise the unique importance of the redemption through the Cross of Jesus Christ. "Coredemptrix" is, in any case, a powerful expression, which must address the principle objection that by this term Mary and Christ are potentially put on the same level. It therefore must be stressed that Mary's cooperation is entirely dependent upon the redemption through Jesus Christ. Since it is a matter of a unique cooperation, this stronger expression is of course legitimate.

The heart of John Paul's catechesis on Mary's participation in the event of salvation is his address of April 9, 1997, entitled "Mary: Singular Coworker in the Redemption." For men there is, as Paul avers (1 Cor 3:9), the possibility of cooperating with God in the event of salvation. With reference to Mary, the concept "co-worker"

acquires a specific meaning. The collaboration of Christians in salvation takes place after the Calvary event, whose fruits they endeavor to spread by prayer and sacrifice. Mary, instead, co-operated during the event itself and in the role of mother; thus her co-operation embraces the whole of Christ's saving work. She alone was associated in this way with the redemptive sacrifice that merited the salvation of all mankind. In union with Christ and in submission to him, she collaborated in obtaining the grace of salvation for all humanity.³⁶

The concept "coredemption" signifies precisely this unique cooperation of Mary in the saving work of Jesus on earth. Only in an extended sense can the verb "to co-redeem" be applied to the subjective redemption, according to which all Christians can be called "co-redeemers."

Participation in the Three Offices of Jesus

The mediation of Jesus Christ and his redemptive work can be described under the threefold aspect of the office of Christ: prophet or teacher, priest, and king or shepherd. Mary's participation can be articulated analogously. The Mother of God is prophetess, who in a specific way manifests the revelation of God; she is endowed with a motherly priesthood;

³⁶ John Paul II, *Marian Catechesis*, no. 48.2 (April 9, 1997); translation from www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2bvm48.htm. The seventy Marian catecheses of John Paul II have been collected together in the following volume, *Theotokos: A Catechesis on Mary Mother of God* (Pauline Books & Media, 1999).

and she stands at the side of Christ the King as Queen of the Universe. Her intercession, which is effective for all mankind, belongs especially to her royal office.

Her Union with the Mystery of Jesus' Life

A broader description of the reality of redemption traces the events of salvation, which since Francisco Suarez have been called the "Mysteries of Jesus' Life." These are to some extent the focal points of the work of Jesus, in which in each case the whole mission of the Lord can be glimpsed. Mary should be included in consideration of them: especially her fiat at the Angelic Annunciation, her presentation of Jesus in the Temple, and her standing under the Cross.

Mary as "New Eve" and Spiritual Mother

Together with the former narrative windows into the mystery of Jesus' life, we should also mention the description of Mary as "New Eve," who as motherly associate of the "New Adam" stands by his side in the work of redemption. This title first appears with the Fathers, but its roots can be traced already in Scripture. It is well suited, likewise, to present Mary's mediation in a comprehensive manner.

Finally, it is possible to consider the most varied images and concepts, which more clearly illuminate the mediating role of the Mother of God. Spiritual motherhood enjoys a special significance. "Motherhood" indicates primarily giving birth to a child, yet it also signifies care for his growth and education. The spiritual motherhood of Mary is, as it were, the organic continuation of her physical motherhood with regard to the Son of God: her motherly being (*Muttersein*) centers on our birth into divine life and our growth therein. So, we can see that Mary's spiritual motherhood comprehends the entire scope of her mediation—her cooperation in both the objective and the subjective redemption. In this sense we may invoke a passage from Augustine cited by the Council, according to which Mary is "mother of the members (of Christ) . . . since she cooperated in charity so that there would be born in the Church believers who are members of her head."³⁷ The spiritual motherhood of Mary can, however, at times be treated as a logical consequence rooted in her actions as mother and companion of the redeemer. So we have it in another conciliar text: "Having conceived, brought forth, nourished, and presented him to the Father in the temple, and having co-suffered with her Son who was dying on the cross, she cooperated in a wholly singu-

³⁷ *Lumen Gentium*, §53, citing Augustine, *On Holy Virginity*, chap. 6 (PL 40, 399).

lar way in the work of salvation . . . For this reason she is our mother in the order of grace.”³⁸

Mary's spiritual motherhood coincides in content with her mediation of grace and has already been pondered as an object of a dogmatic definition, which agrees in substance with Cardinal Mercier's request.³⁹ Mediation and spiritual motherhood are of course distinguished by their formal objects: “motherhood” signifies first of all Mary's work on our behalf (thus it involves a “descending communication”), while “mediation” belongs to her role as “being in the middle.” With respect to the latter, the Mother of God stands between Christ, the other members of the Church, and the divine Trinity. Discourse about Mary's mediation thus makes possible a comprehensive perspective.⁴⁰ Pope John Paul II interweaves both approaches to Mary's role by speaking of her “motherly mediation.”

Selected Systematic Approaches

The theme of Mary's mediation is quite multi-faceted and comprehensive. Mary's relation to Christ and the Trinity, as well as her union with the Church, is decisive for systematic reflection. The ecclesial dimension contains, in turn, important implications for anthropology. The universality of her mediation ultimately flows into eschatology.⁴¹ Taking a brief look at the theological contents of our themes, as far as possible, we can indicate only a few aspects.

The Relation of Marian Mediation to the Singular Mediation of Christ

Mary's motherly mediation in Christ is not to be construed as secretarial, as a receptionist's task of monitoring access to the boss. Her work is rather to be compared to that of a friend, who makes possible for us a conversation with a person of great honor and who is thereby present herself. The presence of the friend does not hinder the unmediated encounter with the high-ranking conversation partner, but it makes the conversation easier. In this sense, the Council stresses, Mary's motherly role on behalf of

³⁸ *Lumen Gentium*, §61.

³⁹ See for example C. Balic, *De spiritualis B. V. Mariae definibilitate*, in *Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II Apparando*, Series I (Antepreparatoria), vol. IV.1.2 (Vatican City: 1961), 55–61; and B. de Margerie, “Can the Church Define Dogmatically the Spiritual Motherhood of Mary?” in *Mary Coredemptrix, Mediatrice, Advocate*, ed. M. I. Miravalle, vol. 1 (Santa Barbara, CA: 1995), 191–214.

⁴⁰ See J. Ferrer Arellano, “Marian Coredemption in the Light of Christian Philosophy,” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross II* (New Bedford, MA: 2002), 124–32.

⁴¹ The richness of the theme finds exemplary expression in the Marian teachings of John Paul II; see Hauke, “Mütterliche Vermittlung,” 146–61.

men “in no way impedes but rather augments the unmediated union of believers with Christ.”⁴² Mary’s mediation moves towards this immediacy.

Mary’s cooperation in the event of salvation is not metaphysically necessary; rather, God by his will makes the mediation of salvation dependent upon a secondary, created cause. In distinction from the Reformation thesis, according to which God alone works in the event of everyone’s justification, the Catholic doctrine features the cooperation of men. This difference applies also to the human cooperation of Jesus, as Theobald Beer and Michael Kreuzer have shown.⁴³ For Martin Luther, the humanity of Jesus is only a “sign” of salvation, not at all a living instrument through which God himself works.⁴⁴ The German Reformer portrays Jesus’ humanity as the “bait” with which the divine fisherman outsmarts the devil: Satan “eats” the human bait and thereby encounters God himself, who is stronger than he. Christ’s being as man does not work towards salvation but rather serves as a trap for the devil. According to the classical teaching of St. Thomas, by contrast, the humanity of Christ is a living instrument for divinely bestowed salvation.⁴⁵ The active cooperation of the humanity of Christ further unfolds, organically, in the integration of created persons: Christ himself effects the union between men and God principally and perfectly, but rational creatures can cooperate with him dispositively and instrumentally (*ministerialiter*).⁴⁶

The Salvific Merit of the Mother of God

The Concept of Merit

The meaning of human cooperation appears also in the doctrine on merit. “Merit” signifies, generally, a claim to a reward on the basis of morally good action.⁴⁷ The concept of merit was already applied to Christ in antiquity, and in the Middle Ages it underwent systematic development. According

⁴² *Lumen Gentium*, §60.

⁴³ T. Beer, *Der fröhliche Wechsel und Streit: Grundzüge der Theologie Martin Luthers* (Einsiedeln: 1980); M. Kreuzer, “Und das Wort ist Fleisch geworden.” *Zur Bedeutung des Menschseins Jesu bei Johannes Driedo und Martin Luther* (Paderborn: 1998); see also Hauke, “Helpmate,” 40–47.

⁴⁴ See P. Hünermann, *Jesus Christus: Gottes Wort in die Zeit* (Münster: 1994), 231 and 234.

⁴⁵ See, for example, *ST* III, q. 62, a. 5.

⁴⁶ See *ST*, III, q. 26, a. 1, ad 2.

⁴⁷ See A. Forster, *Verdienst II: Systematisch*, in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed., vol. 10 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1965), 677–80. He writes, “Merit generally means that there exists a relation between a human act performed in freedom and, according to an established arrangement (*Ordnung*), the consequent response of the one who established the arrangement” (677).

to Aquinas, the suffering of Christ accomplishes our salvation in a fourfold way: as merit, as satisfaction, as sacrifice, and as price of redemption.⁴⁸ Since Peter Lombard, one distinguishes a twofold merit in Christ. For the members of his mystical body, the Redeemer merited liberation from sin and the coming of the Kingdom; and for himself, on the other hand, he won the glorification of his body and his soul's freedom from suffering.⁴⁹ Merit is, therefore, both personal and social. It is the latter that especially concerns our query. The Council of Trent stresses that Jesus Christ "by his most holy passion on the wood of the cross merited justification for us."⁵⁰

Thomistic and Scotistic Views of Christ's Merit

Because of the hypostatic union, it was impossible that God not accept the love of the human will of Christ for our salvation. There is, hence, a precise correspondence between the good action and its fruit. This is merit as a legal claim, called condign merit (*meritum de condigno*). This Thomistic explanation has prevailed widely. Duns Scotus, on the other hand, ascribes to Christ merely the kind of merit that Thomas would call merit of fittingness or congruous merit (*meritum de congruo*). According to this latter kind of merit, God has no compelling reasons to accept the human self-gift (*Hingabe*) of Jesus as efficacious for salvation.⁵¹ According to Scotus, Christ's merit and satisfaction have an infinite worth morally speaking, but formally these are only finite, for the human reality found therein is limited. Therefore it should be "quite clear that God was not obliged to pardon us on account of the satisfaction accomplished by Christ, since this redemption stood in need of acceptance on God's part."⁵²

Scotus distinguishes condign merit (*meritum de condigno*) and congruous merit (*meritum de congruo*) not on the level of the moral worth (of an act), but rather with an eye to the end: glorification occurs through condign merit, but the preceding grace occurs through congruous merit.⁵³ Scotus's distinction does not do justice to the hypostatic union, according to which

⁴⁸ See *ST* III, q. 48.

⁴⁹ See Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, III, d. 18, 1–2. See also J. Galot, *Gesù Liberatore: Cristologia II* (Florence: 1983), 231; and *ST* III, q. 19, a. 4, and q. 49, a. 6.

⁵⁰ *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (DS) 1529.

⁵¹ See Galot, *Cristologia II*, 232.

⁵² C. Balic, "Die Corredemptrixfrage innerhalb der franziskanischen Theologie," *Franziskanische Studien* 39 (1957): 279, referencing Duns Scotus, *Opus oxoniense* IV, d. 15, q. 1, n. 6 (ed. Vivès XVII, p. 178); III, d. 19, n. 4 (ed. Vivès XIV, p. 710f). See also C. F. De Varesio, *Promptuarium scoticum II* (Venice: 1690; reprint, Frigento: 2005), 74.

⁵³ See R. Rosini, *Mariologia del beato Giovanni Duns Scoto* (Castelpetroso: 1994), 162–80; idem, "Il pensiero del beato Giovanni Duns Scoto sulla Corredenzione

every action of Christ is borne by the person of the eternal Word and therefore does not stand in need of an additional acceptance on God's part. With Scotus, in the end, Christ's condign merit is reduced to congruous merit. It thus appears ontologically to be on the same level as the merit of created persons.⁵⁴ The Scotistic understanding of the hypostatic union approaches on this point the Antiochene Christology of antiquity and thereby the teaching of Nestorius, who introduced into Christ a double moral subject.⁵⁵ Pope Pius XII, in his 1951 encyclical *Sempiternus Rex*, intervened against the Christology of Deodat de Basly (d. 1937), a Franciscan shaped by Scotus's approach. De Basly held there to be two different subjects in Christ. According to the dogma of Chalcedon, however, there is only one single subject in Christ, that is, the divine person (DS 3905). De Basly described the Incarnation as the "acceptance" of a man (this is the theory called *homo assumptus*),⁵⁶ according to which an independent subsistence is ascribed to the humanity of Christ, while according to Thomas Aquinas the human nature of the Son of God subsists in the divine person.⁵⁷

The Congruous Merit of the Mother of God

References to Mary's merit with respect to our redemption are found already in the Fathers of the Church⁵⁸ and in the Middle Ages.⁵⁹ In the sixteenth century, Francisco Suarez applied the scholastic distinction between condign merit and congruous merit to the relation between

mariana," in *Maria Corredentrice II*, by various authors (Frigento: 1999), 108, with reference to Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, d. 2, q. 1, arg. 3 (ed. Vivès XVI, p. 248b): "In the one to whom grace is conferred, there is no condignly meritorious cause, but there can be in that person a congruous meritorious cause. There can also be an extrinsic, condignly meritorious cause."

⁵⁴ Rosini, *Mariologia*, 175, and "Il pensiero," 112: "As soon as merit depends on divine acceptance, it is intrinsically equal in everyone in its very nature: Christ, Mary and the just; it is differentiated, however, in its extension." [I would like to thank my colleague, William Brownsberger, for assistance with this translation—translator.]

⁵⁵ On Nestorianism, see A. Ziegenaus, *Jesus Christus: Die Fülle des Heils. Christologie und Erlösungslehre* (Katholische Dogmatik, vol. 4 [Aachen: 2000]), 243f.

⁵⁶ See H. M. Diepen, "Assumptus-Homo-Theologie," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1957), 948f; and A. Amato, *Gesù il Signore: Saggio di cristologia* (Bologna: 1999), 469–72.

⁵⁷ See *ST* III, q. 2, a. 6; q. 17, aa. 1–2; J.-H. Nicolas, *Sintesi dogmatica I* (Vatican City: 1991), Nn. 319–23 (in French, *Synthèse dogmatique* [Fribourg-Paris: 1985]); E.-H. Weber, *Le Christ selon saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: 1988), 229–35.

⁵⁸ See M. Hauke, "The Concept of Redemption in the Patristic Tradition," in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross VIII* (New Bedford, MA: 2008), 79–109.

⁵⁹ See J. B. Carol, *De Corredemptione Beatae Mariae Virginis: Disquisitio positiva* (Vatican City: 1950), 485f, beginning with Eadmer, *De excellentia Virginis Matris*, 11 (PL 159, 508).

Christ and Mary: the Blessed Virgin Mary merited congruously what Christ merited for us condignly.⁶⁰ The notion spread so widely that Pius X himself incorporated it into his Marian encyclical *Ad Diem Illum* (1904): "Because [Mary] ranks supreme over all in holiness and in union with Christ, and being admitted by Christ into the work of human salvation, she merits congruously (as they say) what Christ merited condignly; she is thus the leading minister of the distribution of grace."⁶¹ *Lumen Gentium* does not make use of this conventional jargon, but it asserts the upshot, for example, in its remark that Mary is mother to us in the order of grace since she cooperated in a singular way in the redemption.⁶² Even in the expressions of John Paul II, the traditional concepts scarcely come into play, with the exception, nevertheless, of an address at the Marian shrine of Guayaquil in Ecuador: Mary "united herself to the sacrifice of her Son on Calvary. . . . By suffering for the Church, Mary merited to become the mother of all the disciples of her Son, the mother of their unity."⁶³

Mary's merit has forever been correlated with the Incarnation, which unquestionably constitutes an unmerited gift of God; still, it is also a fruit of Mary's worthiness. It is in this sense, for example, that Thomas Aquinas comments on the words *quia quem meruisti portare* of the *Regina coeli*: "The Blessed Virgin is said to have merited to bear the Lord Jesus Christ, not because she merited that God become incarnate but because by the grace given to her, she merited such a level of purity and holiness that she might fittingly be the Mother of God."⁶⁴ The merit of the Mother of God is based on the theological virtue of charity and on her fullness of grace, which was present in her from the beginning—since her Immaculate Conception. The distinction between condign merit and congruous merit preserves the fundamental distinction between the saving work of the redeemer and the participation therein by the Mother of God. The work of Christ suffices all by itself in an overflowing manner to merit our salvation. This holds true already for Jesus' first act of love as man. His death on the Cross did not take place as though the foregoing (infinite) merit of Christ did not suffice. Rather, it took place in order that the obstacles existing on our part might be removed.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ See Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 195f.

⁶¹ Pius X, *Ad Diem Illum*, §14 (DS 3370).

⁶² See *Lumen Gentium*, §61.

⁶³ John Paul II, address on January 31, 1985 (*Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, vol. 8.1, pp. 318f).

⁶⁴ *ST* III, q. 2, a. 11, ad 3.

⁶⁵ *ST* III, q. 48, a. 1, ad 2. For the divine motives for the Incarnation, see *ST* III, q. 46, a. 3.

Mary's Merit as Condign?

From the Franciscan-Scotistic school of theology, there arises a proposal, which has even found its way into the contemporary discussion, according to which condign merit is ascribed to Mary, as it is to Christ. The originator of this thesis was the Spanish theologian Carlos del Moral (d. 1731), who worked in the golden age of the Scotistic school.⁶⁶ According to this Scotist, Mary is, after Christ, a second head (!) of angels and men. Dependent on the overflowing merits of her Son, she herself also merits our salvation condignly and satisfied for our sins.⁶⁷ "Condign merit" (with regard to Mary) was introduced into the discussion beginning in the 1920s and has been quite welcomed among, especially, Spanish Mariologists. In support of this, Thomas Aquinas is readily referred to, according to whom a "condign merit" may be possible even for a creature on three conditions. There must be the following in the person meriting: perfect grace, a representation of the human race, and a divine commission to draw merit. In this way, condign merit for the salvation of humankind can also be ascribed to Mary.⁶⁸

The reading of Thomas employed here is certainly incorrect.⁶⁹ The proponents of the theory appeal to the description of merit pertaining not to Aquinas's Christological observations,⁷⁰ but rather to his notion of grace, which presupposes the redemption. Regarding the question of merit in virtue of cooperating grace, Thomas remarks that there is an infinite distance between man and God, making merit on the basis of justice impossible. There is human merit before God only on the basis of a divine ordination, according to which man can attain eternal life through grace.⁷¹ In sanctifying grace, man can attain eternal life with a merit of condignity, but only for himself.⁷² Just as no one can merit the first grace for himself,⁷³ so is it impossible for anyone to merit the first grace for another condignly. Only Christ, as head of the Church and

⁶⁶ See C. del Moral, *Fons illimis theologiae scoticae marianae* (Madrid: 1970; first published, 1730).

⁶⁷ See Balic, "Die Corredemptrixfrage," 250–59, and Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 338–42.

⁶⁸ See J. Galot, *Maria la donna nell'opera della salvezza*, 3rd ed. (Rome: 2005) 290f.

⁶⁹ See B. H. Merkelbach, "Quid senserit S. Thomas de mediatione Beatae Mariae Virginis," in *Xenia Tomistica II* (Rome: 1925), 507–10, and idem, *Mariologia* (Paris: 1939), 334–36.

⁷⁰ See *ST* III, q. 48, a. 1, concerning merit.

⁷¹ *ST* I–II, q. 114, aa. 1–2.

⁷² *ST* I–II, q. 114, aa. 3 and 6.

⁷³ *ST* I–II, q. 114, a. 5.

author of human salvation, could enjoy such merit. For others, we can obtain the first grace only with congruous merit.⁷⁴

Were one to ascribe a condign merit to Mary, one would have to couple this suggestion systematically with a condign satisfaction, which would lead to further problems. Only the man Jesus Christ, who is simultaneously the Son of God, could in the strict sense render satisfaction for the sins of men. Sins are directed against God and therefore contain an infinite dimension, insofar as they involve rebellion against the infinite majesty of God. Only the satisfaction of the God-man can, therefore, achieve an infinite effect, in order to restore man's friendship with God. God could also accept the satisfaction of a mere man, but such a satisfaction would not be *de condigno*.⁷⁵

Discourse about Mary having condign merit is frequently tied up with an exaggeration regarding the connection between Christ and Mary in the event of the redemption. Undoubtedly, there is here a close connection, so much so that theologians since Arnold of Bonneval (twelfth century) have often spoken of a single, "total sacrifice": Mary offered herself with the blood of her heart, and Christ offered himself with the blood of his body.⁷⁶ On the other hand, the saving act of Christ may not be intermingled with the action of the Blessed Virgin into an undifferentiated unity. This confusion began in recent times with the Louvain theologian Joseph-Martin Lebon, who in the 1920s presented Mary and Christ as a single principle of redemption: "There are not two sacrifices, two offerings, and two merits regarding the redemption. Rather, there is a single offering of one and the same sacrifice, whereby the two—who freely renounce their rights in the acquisition of merit—are bound together," although Mary is subordinated to Christ.⁷⁷ Arnold of Bonneval is, on this point, more balanced. He does stress Mary's co-suffering in a strong manner, but he simultaneously speaks of "two altars" upon which the joint sacrifice is offered, the body of Christ and the heart of his Mother.⁷⁸

The concept of condign merit for Christ and (dependent upon his) for Mary is conceivable only in a Scotistic framework, according to which Christ's satisfaction as such possesses no infinite efficacy and therefore stands in need of an extrinsic acceptance on God's part. Thereby

⁷⁴ ST I-II, q. 114, a. 5.

⁷⁵ ST III, q. 1, a. 2, ad 2.

⁷⁶ See Arnold von Bonneval, *De laudibus B.M.V.* (PL 189, 1727 A), and Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 157 and passim.

⁷⁷ J. Lebon, "La Bienheureuse Vierge Marie Médiatrice de toutes les grâces," *La Vie diocésaine* (Malines) 10 (1921): 437 (see also 257–67 and 431–45). See Hauke, *Mercier*, 81–83.

⁷⁸ See Arnold von Bonneval, *De septem verbis Domini in cruce* (PL 189, 1694f).

consideration of the hypostatic union—according to which the human actions of Jesus in the power of the divine person obtain of themselves salvific efficacy—is disregarded. In addition, Marian merit is placed almost on the same level as that of Jesus Christ himself. A contemporary Scotist writes to this effect: “As soon as merit depends on divine acceptance, it is intrinsically equal in everyone in its very nature: Christ, Mary and the just; it is differentiated, however, in its extension.”⁷⁹ The suffering of Christ and Mary’s co-suffering would be constitutive of “two merits of the same worth.”⁸⁰ Furthermore, it is doubtful that a merit that constitutes no claim in justice should be designated “condign.” This way of describing things, with respect to Mary, does not go back to Scotus but rather to the moral teachings of neoscotism in the wake of Del Moral. Scotus himself writes rather generically: Mary “during her Son’s passion, had the highest merit by her co-suffering.”⁸¹

Some justify a merit of condignity for Mary by appeal to the need to distinguish the merit of the Mother of God from our merit on behalf of others. The question is asked, is it not too little to label our merit and Mary’s merit with the same concept, congruous merit?

A distinction between Mary and us is no doubt imperative. Mary is the Mother of God and associate of the redeemer. The “fittingness” of her merit is therefore incomparably great, so that it has already been suggested that we speak of a “superlative congruous merit” (*meritum de supercongruo*) or of a “most congruous” (*congruissimum*) merit.⁸² But it is problematic to abandon the category of congruous merit in principle. Otherwise, the singular character of Christ’s mediation, in which Mary also participates, is at stake.

A Genuine Merit

The idea of condign merit for Mary was introduced also from a concern that a merit of fittingness does not suffice to ground a genuine Marian cooperation in redemption. In the first decades of the twentieth century, a certain current of thought denied any possibility that Mary could meritoriously cooperate in the redemption. It was in this sense that the French Jesuit Maurice de la Taille expressed himself. He had the audacity to twist into its opposite the teaching of Pius X (see note 59 and text): the Blessed

⁷⁹ Rosini, “Il pensiero,” 112 (see note 52).

⁸⁰ Rosini, “Il pensiero,” 116.

⁸¹ Scotus, *Ordinatio* III, d. 3, q. 1; C. Balic, ed., *Theologiae Marianae Elementa* (Sebenico: 1933), 229, cited in Balic, “Die Corredemptrixfrage,” 233; Rosini, *Mariologia*, 158 and “Il pensiero,” 93.

⁸² See J. Stöhr, “Verdienst Mariens,” *Marienlexikon* 6 (1994): 595f; B. Gherardini, *La Corredentrice nel mistero di Cristo e della Chiesa* (Rome: 1998), 357.

Virgin merits for us congruously what Christ merited for us condignly “with the exception of the work of redemption”!⁸³ The soteriologist Jean Rivière (Strasbourg)⁸⁴ and even the Roman Dominican Alberto Lepidi held the same opinion. As consultant to the Holy Office, the latter blocked the petition of the Belgian bishops in favor of a new Marian dogma in 1916. According to Lepidi's view, the notion of Mary actively cooperating in the redemption is the fruit of a thesis of “moderns”; in his advisory report, he thus rejected the distinction formulated by Pius X.⁸⁵

The theological deficiency of both sides of this antithesis—the affirmation of condign merit and the denial of even congruous merit—consists in the confusion between metaphorical (or improper) modes of expression and analogous modes of expression. Against this confusion, congruous merit is genuine, not “improper,” merit, which, of course, falls short of the highest level of merit, condign merit.⁸⁶ At that time, another quite similar deficiency was the notion that the common priesthood of all baptized was only a “metaphorical” or “improper” priesthood. Against this it should be stressed that although the common and hierarchical priesthoods are essentially distinguished from one another, yet each participates in the priesthood of Christ in a specific way.⁸⁷ It seems questionable to introduce a third kind of merit beyond the two kinds already mentioned, as does Bonaventure, who speaks of a “merit of dignity.”⁸⁸ To Mary there belongs, in the highest measure, a merit of fittingness.

The theme of Mary's merit, so seldom treated these days, is exceedingly important, for it sheds light on the meaning of “free will,” by which, under the influence of grace, a man can cooperate in his own salvation and in that of other men. In distinction from our merit, the merit of the Mother of God obtains an effect pertaining to all mankind.

⁸³ See Hauke, *Mercier*, 108 and 121.

⁸⁴ See Hauke, *Mercier*, 121.

⁸⁵ See Hauke, “Maria, ‘Mittlerin aller Gnaden’, im Vatikanischen Geheimarchiv aus der Zeit Pius’ XI: Zwischenbericht einer Spurensicherung,” *Theologisches* 36 (2006): 383f; in Italian, “Maria, ‘Mediatrice di tutte le Grazie’ nell’Archivio Segreto Vaticano del Pontificato di Pio XI: Rapporto intermedio sulle tracce trovate,” *Immacolata Mediatrix* 7 (2007): 119–20.

⁸⁶ See Merkelbach, “Quid senserit S. Thomas,” 505, n. 4: “It should be noted that congruous merit is called merit analogically but not improperly.” See also G. Alastruey, *Tratado de la Virgen Santísima*, 3rd ed. (Madrid: 1952), 577–84.

⁸⁷ See the remarks that follow under 4.3.

⁸⁸ Bonaventure, *In Sent.* III, d. 4, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2; see C. Balic, “Die sekundäre Mittler-schaft der Gottesmutter (Hat Maria die Verdienste Christi de condigno für uns mitverdient?),” *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 4 (1937): 15 and 20; P. Parrotta, *La cooperazione di Maria alla Redenzione in Gabriele Maria Roschini* (Lugano: 2002), 97.

*The Motherly Priesthood*⁸⁹

The concept “sacrifice,” with which the priesthood is associated, most lucidly depicts the work of redemption. “Sacrifice” in a general sense is any activity through which we dedicate ourselves to God.⁹⁰ In a more precise sense, the term highlights the visible and social dimensions, which must characterize the worship of God even on the natural level. In this sense Thomas speaks of something “happening” to the sacrificial offering (*sacrum facere*).⁹¹ The external sacrifice must of course correspond to the inner sacrifice, which constitutes its foundation.⁹² In a general sense, every human act of the redeemer possesses sacrificial worth. The Letter to the Hebrews ascribes to the Son of God self-sacrifice in obedience from the very start of his human existence (Heb 10:5–7). The external sacrifice was consummated on Calvary, when Jesus offered himself to God in expiation for our sins (Heb 9:14; Eph 5:1f). So, Jesus’ sacrifice begins with the Incarnation and is completed on the Cross.⁹³ The efficacy of the sacrifice depends on his divine sonship.⁹⁴ The aim of the sacrifice consists in praise and thanks, petition and expiation.

Mary’s sacrifice arises from her union with Jesus’ own offering. Her “fiat” precedes the Incarnation of the Son of God. With the presentation of Jesus in the Temple, Mary offers her Son to God (Lk 2:22–24) and receives the prophecy of Simeon, according to which her soul will be pierced by a sword (Lk 2:35), a reference to her co-suffering under the Cross. Mary’s salvific office on Calvary has found a place in theological history ever since the Middle Ages. According to the Second Vatican Council, Mary united herself in a motherly spirit with the sacrifice of Christ.⁹⁵ Papal teachings further develop this statement. In his apostolic exhortation *Marialis Cultus*, for example, Paul VI teaches that Mary not only united herself with and lovingly consented to the sacrifice of Christ but also offered this sacrifice to the eternal Father.⁹⁶ John Paul II, as well, reads the council text as a reference to “a genuine act of love, by which

⁸⁹ On this, see M. Hauke, “Priestertum I. Dogmatik,” *Marienlexikon* 5 (1993): 314–17; S.M. Lanzetta, *Il sacerdozio di Maria nella teologia cattolica del XX secolo: Analisi storico-teologica* (Rome: 2006).

⁹⁰ See Augustine, *De civitate Dei* X, chap. 6 and *ST* III, q. 48, a. 3.

⁹¹ *ST* II–II, q. 85, a. 3.

⁹² See *ST* II–II, q. 85, aa. 2 and 4.

⁹³ See *Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC)* §606 and §616f.

⁹⁴ See CCC §616.

⁹⁵ *Lumen Gentium*, §58.

⁹⁶ Paul VI, *Marialis Cultus*, §20.

she offers her Son as a 'victim' of expiation for the sins of all humanity."⁹⁷ Pope Benedict XVI mentions that Mary, "by her complete fidelity, received Christ's sacrifice for the whole Church."⁹⁸ Yet she not only accepted the sacrifice of Christ but also offered herself with Christ for sinful humanity. In his homily in Ephesus, the Holy Father invited us to behold the "moment of the Redemption when Mary, united to her Son in the offering of his sacrifice, extended her motherhood to all men and women, and in particular to the disciples of Jesus."⁹⁹

Mary's union with the sacrifice of Christ constitutes a specific participation in the priesthood of Christ, distinguished from both the hierarchical priesthood and the common priesthood of all believers. As with the concept "sacrifice," the word "priesthood" is likewise employed with a twofold nuance: as a consecration of one's life and as the actual presentation, in the sacrifice of the Mass, of the original sacrifice on the Cross. The common priesthood of all the baptized is a genuine, not merely "metaphorical" or "improper," priesthood. Yet it is essentially distinguished from the hierarchical priesthood, in which Christ works as head of the Church in a specific manner. In Thomistic soteriology, the priesthood is practically identical with mediation: it includes not only the offering of the sacrifice but also sanctifying action.¹⁰⁰

To depict Mary's motherly priesthood accurately, one must note its distinction from the hierarchical priesthood and its union with the Church. This concern was too little heeded by the Franciscan school of spirituality, with Jean Eudes and Jean Jacques Olier. Members of that school liked to compare Mary's consent to the Incarnation and the priest's words of consecration in the Mass, for in each case, Christ becomes present. There is, nevertheless, a snag for this comparison: whereas the consecrated priest acts in the person of Christ as head of the Church, Mary represents humanity with respect to the Incarnation, insofar as she is giving herself as "Bride" to the "Bridegroom."¹⁰¹ In this event of representation, Mary's receptivity, corresponding to her feminine character, is set in relief, yet we also see her active cooperation. More fruitful than this

⁹⁷ John Paul II, 47th Catechesis on Mary (April 2, 1997), art. 2 (trans. www.vatican.va). For further references, see Hauke, "Mütterliche Vermittlung," 137f.

⁹⁸ Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §33 (trans. www.vatican.va).

⁹⁹ Benedict XVI, homily at the House of Mary in Ephesus (November 29, 2006; translation of www.vatican.va).

¹⁰⁰ See *ST* III, q. 22, a. 1: A priest is a mediator between God and the people insofar as he confers divine gifts to the people and also presents the prayers of the people to God and in a certain way makes satisfaction for the sins of the world.

¹⁰¹ *ST* III, q. 30, a. 1.

comparison between Mary's "fiat" and the words of consecration is a remark by John Paul II, in his encyclical on the Eucharist: the Blessed Virgin's acceptance of the angel's message is compared to the "Amen" of the faithful who receive holy communion.¹⁰²

According to the medieval saying of the *Mariale* attributed to Albert the Great, Mary is not a representative or "vicar" (*vicaria*) of Christ but rather a helper and associate (*coadiutrix et socia*).¹⁰³ This felicitous distinction shows the difference of her role from the ordained priesthood and from the sphere of the common priesthood of all the baptized. Mary's priesthood is indeed distinguished even from the common priesthood on account of the universal character of her motherly mediation on behalf of all the members of the Mystical Body of Christ. Her priesthood is not grounded upon the sacramental character of baptism and confirmation (as with the common priesthood); nor is it grounded upon hierarchical consecration (as with the ordained priesthood); rather, it is based on her divine motherhood or else (as Scheeben has it) on her "personal character," her specific character as Mother and associate of Christ. Her offering under the Cross compares to some extent with that of believers at the sacrifice of the Mass. The act of immolation as such is based on Christ's offering on the Cross and on its representation by the consecrated priest. The participatory offering of believers is vitally important for the reception of the fruits of the holy sacrifice. And the association of Mary with the Cross belongs to the integrity of the sacrifice, as God has willed it to be.

Mary as Representative of Mankind in the Union between Christ and the Church

With respect to the connection between Mary's mediation to Christ and to the Church, it is useful to consider a discussion between Heinrich Maria Köster and Karl Rahner. In 1947, Köster developed a theory according to which Mary was in no way a participatory cause of the redemption; rather, in the name of mankind about to be redeemed, she consented to the covenant offered by God in Jesus Christ. Mary thus appears not as the "head" but rather as the "pinnacle" of mankind. In her receptive "self-opening" to the covenant, she manifests human cooperation in the redemption, which is brought about through Christ, the Son of God,

¹⁰² John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, §55.

¹⁰³ See Albertus Magnus, *Mariale*, q. 42, in *Opera omnia*, ed. Borgnet, vol. 37 (Paris: 1898), 81. See also Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 164. [I have added to Fr. Hauke's text "helper and," since it is consonant with his thought and since it is found in the *Mariale* as cited by Carol—translator.]

who as man represented God. So Köster, depicting the covenant between God and man, portrays Mary as the representative of mankind and Jesus as the representative of God.¹⁰⁴

In contrast to this, Karl Rahner stressed one year later the significance of Jesus Christ as the God-man. "Briefly, Jesus himself in his humanity is the defining 'Yes' of mankind to God and not only the 'Yes' of God to man. He is a covenantal partner not only "in a divine role" from God's side [Köster], but also, in a similar manner, the pinnacle of *mankind* in the ratification of the covenant (*Bundesschluss*)."¹⁰⁵ In Christ, we find

humility, adoration, sacrifice, love, death. The main feature of his action is not that of God towards and for men but rather that of men towards God. Through this action (*Tat*) with this orientation [Godwards] we are redeemed. Of course, this action has its ultimate worth and greatest dignity from the fact that it is the action of a divine person. Notwithstanding, it is a human action directed towards God. If we view the "marriage" between man and God in the free "Yes" between the self-communicating God and his obedient creature, then we are not at all "misled" if we locate the "culmination" of this marriage in the figure of Christ (*Gestalt Christi*) and not primarily in Mary's "fiat".¹⁰⁶

Rahner is of course correct that the mediation of Christ takes place by means of his humanity. This is underscored already in 1 Timothy: Christ as *man* is our unique mediator (see 1 Tim 2:5). Yet Rahner does not acknowledge the fact that in redemption it is the divine "I" of the eternal Son—in whose person the human obedience of Jesus subsists—that acts. In Jesus Christ, one divine person acts, even though he operates equally (*gleichermaßen*) through a divine will and a human will.¹⁰⁷ Mary, by contrast, is a

¹⁰⁴ See H. M. Köster, *Die Magd des Herrn* (Limburg: 1947; 2nd ed., 1954); A. K. Zielinski, *Maria—Königin der Apostel: Die Bedeutung Mariens nach den Schriften des Palottiner-Theologen Heinrich Maria Köster für das Katholische Apostolat und die Neuevangelisierung in Lateinamerika* (Frankfurt am Main: 2000), 192–202. For an introduction to Köster's concerns, see also S. Hartmann, "Mariologie und Metaphysik: Zu Heinrich M. Kösters Übernahme der thomistischen 'Akt und Potenz-Lehre,'" in *Der Wahrheit verpflichtet: Festschrift für Kurt Krenn zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Kreiml et al. (Graz: 2006), 518–29.

¹⁰⁵ Karl Rahner, "Probleme heutiger Mariologie," in *Aus der Theologie der Zeit*, ed. G. Söhngen (Regensburg: 1948), 97. This has been reprinted in Karl Rahner, "Maria, Mutter des Herrn," in his *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 9 (Freiburg im Breisgau: 2004), 681–703.

¹⁰⁶ Rahner, "Probleme," 98.

¹⁰⁷ In Rahner's Christology, there is no specific "I" of the Son of God; rather, there is only the "I" of the one godhead (*Gottes im allgemeinen*), while the "I" specific to Jesus is human. Accordingly, the Johannine statement "Before Abraham was, I am"

human person who indeed faces God in utter purity and receptivity. Rahner accepts Thomas Aquinas's idea—itself repeatedly taken up in papal teachings—that Mary through her “fiat” acted in the name of all mankind. In his lengthy article, Rahner did not wish to unfold this point, keeping himself simply to a critique of Köster.¹⁰⁸

Rahner's remarks call for a number of critical questions. Is it true that the “marriage” between God and men is found in Jesus Christ? Is Christ in a certain way married to himself? Is he equally “bride” and “bridegroom”? Unquestionably, the assent of the human will and that of the divine will are bound up one with the other in him. This twofold “Yes,” however, is borne by the same person, that of the divine Son. Jesus' human nature acts as a living instrument for the redemption of men but does not itself receive redemption. The concept of a “redeemed redeemer” (if “redemption” is taken to mean deliverance from sin) would be something Gnostic.¹⁰⁹ I am not ascribing such an idea to Rahner. In the New Testament and in theological tradition we find the title “Bridegroom” applied to Jesus as an adaptation of the prophetic teaching concerning the covenant between God and his people. The name “bride” signifies the people of God or the Church, the archetype of which is Mary. Cardinal Scheffczyk, as well, maintains: “The problem with the Rahnerian critique [of Köster] lies . . . in the difficulty of assigning to the divine and human redeemer himself the ‘fiat’ pertaining to the reception of redemption. Indeed, this redeemer does not belong to the set of men needing redemption; wherefore, he by no means had to accept the redemption, nor could he accept it.”¹¹⁰

A few years later, Rahner produced a revised edition of his work in response to Köster's published rebuttal to his colleague's critique. Here, he acknowledges that Mary accepted the redemption in the name of mankind and (in contrast with his earlier piece) that the Mother of God had a genuine, direct (*unmittelbare*) cooperation in the redemption, since in the work of redemption there is continuity from the Incarnation to the Cross. Yet his denial of Mary's representation (*Stellvertretung*) for mankind becomes problematic. For Rahner, the Blessed Virgin under-

(Jn 8:58, RSV) was said not by the Son of God but by the one godhead. On Rahner's Christological concept of “person” and its problems, see F. X. Bantle, “Person und Personbegriff in der Trinitätslehre Karl Rahners,” in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 30 (1979): 11–24; Ziegenaus, *Jesus Christus*, 107–116; and H.-J. Vogels, *Rahner im Kreuzverhör* (Bonn: 2002).

¹⁰⁸ Rahner, “Probleme,” 108.

¹⁰⁹ See K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis*, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: 1990), 141f.

¹¹⁰ Leo Scheffczyk, “Mariologie und Anthropologie: Zur Marienlehre Karl Rahners,” in *Karl Rahner: Kritische Annäherungen*, ed. D. Berger (Sieburg: 2004), 302.

takes something on our behalf but not in our stead.¹¹¹ Mary's "fiat" cannot be a condition with respect to which God grants men salvation in Jesus Christ. It does not make sense that Mary has to accept redemption [*Heil*], which is already accomplished in itself, before other believers could receive it.¹¹² In other words, Rahner accepts only Mary's solidarity on our behalf, but not her representation (*Stellvertretung*) as bridal Mediatrix of mankind to the Bridegroom, the incarnate Son of God.

In these remarks of Rahner, his later Christological position already looms in the distance. He came to hold that Christ did not offer expiation by vicarious representation and did not suffer in our stead; rather, Christ simply acted in solidarity on our behalf.¹¹³ This minimizing is inadequate to the revealed contents of Christology. Even the French Jesuit Bernard Sesboüé, author of a standard work on soteriology and generally quite receptive of Rahner's legacy, has to admit that the concept of substitution (and thus a "taking upon oneself" the penalty due to us) and solidarity are as it were "the two focal points of the same ellipse," which are bound up with one another in vicarious representation.¹¹⁴

Let us stress with St. Anselm, Christ enters into the event of redemption as God and as man.¹¹⁵ Köster's critique of Anselm is inadequate. He plays the mediation of Christ in his humanity off against an alleged mediation in the divine Logos, which latter (he maintains) was typical for the Alexandrian Christology of the patristic era, in distinction from the occidental thought of Anselm.¹¹⁶ The divine Son already stands with "his eternal

¹¹¹ Fr. Hauke employs here "*unserer Stelle*," not intending some kind of Marian extension of the non-Catholic soteriological theory sometimes called "penal substitution." Rather, he intends it with respect to the vicarious role of the representative, according to the theory of vicarious satisfaction. Of course, Mary by no means offered condign satisfaction, as the author has made abundantly clear (translator's note—with author's approval).

¹¹² Karl Rahner, review of H. M. Köster, *Unus Mediator: Gedanken zur marianischen Frage* (Limburg: 1950), published in *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 74 (1952): 230 and 234. This has been newly published in Rahner, *Maria*, 733–45.

¹¹³ See the critical analysis by K.-H. Menke, *Stellvertretung: Schlüsselbegriff christlichen Lebens und theologische Grundkategorie* (Einsiedeln: 1991), 358–62; and Vogels, *Rahner im Kreuzverhör* 21–24.

¹¹⁴ B. Sesboüé, *Gesù Cristo l'unico mediatore I* (Cinisello Balsamo: 1991), 418 (French, 1988).

¹¹⁵ St. Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*.

¹¹⁶ See Köster, *Unus Mediator*, 144. For an analysis of the patristic evidence, which does not confirm Köster's thesis, see B. Studer, *Soteriologie: In der Schrift und Patristik*, with collaboration by Brian Daley, vol. 3.2a, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: 1978), passim; Sesboüé, *Gesù Cristo*, 103–10.

being ever facing the Father in a state of oblation. The historical sacrifice of the Son is but an extension thereof."¹¹⁷ In this passage there appears a certain confusion between the Trinitarian life, in which there can be no sacrifice in the strict sense of the term, and the saving work of Jesus Christ as man. Christ is our unique mediator as man, even if there are fitting grounds for the Incarnation of the Son of God (in his difference from the Father and the Holy Spirit). One fitting ground is this: the Son communicates to the Holy Spirit the divine life of the Father.

It is of course correct to stress, with Köster, Mary's salvific representation as archetype of the Church on behalf of all mankind both in the Incarnation and also under the Cross. Humanity can be found only in the twofold expression of man and woman. In his masculine character, Christ is representative of God in his commitment towards man, but as head of the Church he is representative of man with respect to God. As befits her receptive, feminine character, Mary receives salvation from God. Of course, *pace* Köster, one should also stress her active cooperation, which is not limited to her receptivity; rather, in the grace of Christ, she makes an active contribution to the salvation of men. In the covenant between Christ and the Church, Mary is not only archetype but also Mother of the Church. Consideration of the covenantal event, depicted in the image of a marriage, reveals at any rate Mary's role as bridal representative of mankind in the process of salvation.

Consideration of the Scotistic concept of perfect redemption or perfect mediation can round out this treatment of the significance of Mary as womanly representative of mankind before God. That redemption will be perfect for which there is a human person who is fully and from the beginning redeemed.¹¹⁸ Because of her Immaculate Conception, Mary is this person: since she was preserved from original sin, she was never subject to the lordship of sin. Her unique role, which began with her immaculate conception, expands to the redemption of men: the preventive redemption of Mary occurred, as John Paul II stresses, with a view to her future cooperation in the work of redemption.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Köster, *Unus Mediator*, 140f.

¹¹⁸ See Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio* I, d. 17, p. 1, qq. 1–2; *Opus Oxoniense* III, d. 3, q. 1; A. Pompei, "Giovanni Duns Scoto e la dottrina sull'Immacolata Concezione," in *La "Scuola Francescana" e l'Immacolata Concezione*, ed. S. M. Cecchin (Vatican City: 2005), 204–9.

¹¹⁹ See John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater* (1987), §39; *Marian Catechesis*, no. 21.4 (May 30, 1996).

The Intellectual Foundation of Coredeemption

Appreciation of the discussion between Rahner and Köster assists towards a comprehensive view of the question of "coredeemption." Just before the Second Vatican Council, there were three schools of interpretation of the salvific cooperation of Mary.¹²⁰ The majority championed the position that the Mother of God cooperated in the objective redemption in an immediate fashion. A minority—whose position reflected roughly that of the aforementioned Jesuit Heinrich Lennerz—ascribed to Mary only an indirect cooperation in the redemption, namely, insofar as she gave birth to the Redeemer. These reduced Mary's mediation to the subjective redemption, insofar as the Mother of God, through her intercession, contributes to the communication of the fruits of redemption to men needing salvation. The chief objection to asserting Mary's active cooperation is this: Mary herself is redeemed, and she cannot merit the principle of her merit (that is, the grace of redemption): the principle of merit does not fall under the scope of merit.

Lennerz's argument is problematic with regard to the Incarnation, which he declares to be only the presupposition of the redemption and not a part of the work itself of redemption. Whoever rightly acknowledges that the redemption begins already with the Incarnation cannot actually deny an active cooperation of the Mother of God in redemption. This claim was the common opinion at the Mariological World Congress in Lourdes in 1958.¹²¹ Rahner himself, in his critique cited above, is in agreement with this claim, stressing the continuity of the process of salvation from the Incarnation to the sacrifice on the Cross. Two years later, nevertheless, he will call this result into question in an article wherein he treats the starting point of Mariology: the first principle ought to be Mary as perfectly redeemed. To her status as redeemed there belongs as well her divine motherhood. Here one finds a Mariological minimalism, which subsumes the active cooperation of the Mother of God under her status as "being redeemed."¹²² Within this framework, Rahner alleges that Mary can perform no redeeming function, namely, undertaking at the foot of the Cross an act that has a redemptive (*erlösende*) significance for all mankind.¹²³ Granted, her fiat with respect to the Incarnation has a salvific effect for all men, but she does not participate in the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ See Hauke, "Helpmate," 32–34; "Aktive Mitwirkung," 39–41.

¹²¹ See Hauke, "Helpmate," 36, n. 58.

¹²² See Rahner, "Le principe fondamental de la théologie mariale," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 42 (1954): 509 and 513.

¹²³ See Rahner, "Principe fondamental," 497, n. 28.

¹²⁴ See Rahner, "Principe fondamental," 498.

Heinrich Maria Köster is the most important advocate of a *via media* between affirming and denying Mary's active cooperation in the objective redemption. In an effort to meet the objections of the "minimalists," Köster reduces Mary's cooperation to a reception of the grace of redemption, Mary being the receptive archetype of the Church. Granted, Köster maintains, Mary is indeed "thoroughly active" in a psychological sense, but "in the metaphysical sense" she enjoys only a "receptivity."¹²⁵ The idea of Mary cooperating actively is, on the basis of this school of thought, caricatured as "maximalism," albeit not ostensibly by Köster himself, but rather by the Swiss theologian Alois Müller, whom Rahner would later follow.¹²⁶ The inept labeling of these contrary positions as "minimalist" and "maximalist"—which appears again and again in publications¹²⁷—does injustice to the truth of the matter, for the position styled "maximalist" is nothing other than the teaching of the Church, as it is expressed, for example, in the Second Vatican Council¹²⁸ and in the doctrinal corpus of Pope John Paul II.¹²⁹ The alleged "middle path" between "minimalism" and "maximalism" is at bottom but a refined version of "minimalism," insofar as it denies Mary any salvific causality in the event of our redemption. Regarding her spiritual motherhood, this school mentions only Mary's receptivity but not her spiritual fertility grounded in her union with the sacrifice of Christ. Yet Mary is not

¹²⁵ Köster, *Magd des Herrn* (1954), xvii. Against this reductionism, see among others G. Baraúna, *De natura corredemptionis marianae in theologia hodierna (1921–1958): Disquisitio expositivo-critica* (Rome: 1960), 93–164; Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Action*, vol. 4, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic History*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994), 353–55; and A. Ziegenaus, *Maria in der Heilsgeschichte: Mariologie*, vol. 5, *Katholische Dogmatik* (Aachen: 1998), 346. On von Balthasar, see also H. Steinhauer, *Maria als dramatische Person bei Hans Urs von Balthasar* (Innsbruck: 2001), 407–09.

¹²⁶ See A. Müller, "Fragen und Aussichten der heutigen Mariologie," in *Fragen der Theologie heute*, ed. J. Feiner et al. (Einsiedeln: 1958), 301–18; K. Rahner, "Zur konziliären Mariologie," *Stimmen der Zeit* 174 (1964): 87–101. For these references, I am grateful to Rev. Stefan Hartmann, who has recently published a dissertation on Köster's Mariology: S. Hartmann, *Die Magd des Herrn. Zur heilsgeschichtlichen Mariologie Heinrich M. Kösters* (Regensburg: 2009).

¹²⁷ For example, J. Finkenzeller, "Miterlöserin," *Marienlexikon* 4 (1992): 485.

¹²⁸ See G. Philips, *La Chiesa e il suo mistero nel Concilio Vaticano II* (Milan: 1993), 549f; see also the remarks of G. Roschini, *Problematica della Corredenzione* (Rome: 1969), 72 and 82; and Hauke, "Aktive Mitwirkung," 41–45.

¹²⁹ See A. B. Calkins, "Pope John Paul's Ordinary Magisterium on Marian Core-demption: Consistent Teaching and More Recent Perspectives," in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross II* (New Bedford, MA: 2002), 1–36; and Hauke, "Mütterliche Vermittlung," 139–42.

merely the archetype of the Church but also her Mother, who exercises a saving influence on all the other members of the body of Christ.

Now, we should answer the chief objection of the opponents of Mary's active cooperation in the objective redemption: namely, the observation that Mary herself has been redeemed. "Mary's 'being redeemed' already presupposes the objective redemption as something that has been accomplished, so that Mary as redeemed was not able to be involved in the objective redemption by an immediate, active cooperation. Otherwise, the redemptive death of the Lord would be held to have taken place already and, at the same time, not yet to have taken place."¹³⁰ This objection should be answered as follows: Mary's cooperation does not pertain to the substance of the redemptive act, which is proper to the God-man; it belongs rather to the integrity of this act.¹³¹ The salvific office of Mary as Mother of God and New Eve, who stands at the side of the New Adam as his companion, is included in the perfection or integrity of the event of redemption. One should also mention the systematic relevance of the Immaculate Conception, according to which Mary already received divine grace at the beginning of her life, and in the power of this grace she was able to cooperate in the redemption. Mary already received this grace in anticipation of the saving deed of Jesus Christ.

On the supposition of these two points (namely, the distinction between the substance and the integrity of the event of redemption and also the significance of the Immaculate Conception), the 1927 proposal by the Austrian Jesuit, August Deneffe, whom many others have followed, seems to resolve the objection. In the single sacrifice of Christ there are two intentions: "In the first intention, Christ poured out the entire fullness of the redemption upon the Blessed Virgin, Our Lady and the New Eve, the Bride of Christ, Archetype of the Church; in the second intention, united with the will of the Blessed Virgin, he purchased the redemption for

¹³⁰ Diekamp and Jüssen II, *Katholische Dogmatik*, 408.

¹³¹ See G. M. Roschini, "Equivoci sulla Corredenzione," *Marianum* 10 (1948): 280f. As he argues, Eve's sin and Mary's cooperation do not in themselves constitute original sin and redemption; thus their acts do not belong to the essence of original sin and redemption. Now, without these acts, the first sin and the redemption, respectively, would not have taken place; so, these acts do have a genuine influence on them. That is Roschini's answer to the objection of Lennerz according to whom we speak of a sin in Adam (and not in Eve); with this remark, Lennerz wanted to deny the immediate cooperation of the New Eve in the redemption. See Hauke, "Roschini," 594f. Scheeben's clarification was just like this one (of Roschini). See Hauke, "Die Mariologie Scheebens—ein zukunfts-trächtiges Vermächtnis," in *Donum Veritatis*, ed. M. Hauke and M. Stickelbroeck, (Regensburg: 2006), 267.

us.”¹³² Mary was redeemed by her preservation from original sin, in view of the sacrifice of Christ, while Christ, for the salvation of all men, united to his own sacrifice the tears and anguish of his Mother. In this way, the magnificent depiction by Arnold of Bonneval (of Chartres) was systematically expounded by Pope John Paul II in his Marian Catechesis: “[Arnold] distinguishes two altars at the Cross: One in the heart of Mary and the other in the body of Christ. Christ offered his flesh; Mary, her soul. Mary offered herself spiritually in a profound communion with Christ and prayed for the salvation of the world: ‘The Son consents to what the Mother requests, and the Father grants it.’”¹³³

The Modality and Scope of Mary’s Mediation of Grace

Cardinal Mercier’s initiatives to have Mary’s universal mediation of graces proclaimed as dogma were put to a halt largely on account of the disputed points concerning her active cooperation in the redemption. Still, a certain role was played by the discussion as to whether, and if so to what extent, Mary is active in the subjective redemption by the distribution of all graces.¹³⁴

Mary’s communication of grace has two basic modalities: Mary causes the distribution of grace through her intercession, but through her merit she also provides the grounds for this distribution. As Mary herself is redeemed with a view to the merit of Christ, so the entire history of salvation, including that in the Old Testament, presupposes a similar reference to the overflowing merits of Jesus Christ. If Abraham and Moses are redeemed with a reference to the condign merit of Jesus Christ, they are redeemed also with a view to the congruous merit of the Mother of God. It is also evident that Jesus Christ did not acquire for himself the grace of Incarnation; rather, he received this grace freely in the first moment of his human life. Much less did Mary merit the grace that was communicated to her in her Immaculate Conception. The universality of Jesus’ and Mary’s mediation of grace pertains not to just one person but has a social sense.

Accordingly, Mary is in Christ the “Mediatrice of All Graces” in the sense that she has a motherly function with respect to the other members of the human race, who are called to participate in the divine life of Christ. Her universal function is realized on the basis of her merit and her motherly priesthood. To this priesthood belongs also her intercessory

¹³² A. Deneffe, “De Mariae in ipso opere redemptionis cooperatione,” *Gregorianum* 8 (1927): 19. See Hauke, *Mercier*, 123f.

¹³³ John Paul II, *Marian Catechesis*, No. 3.3 (October 25, 1995).

¹³⁴ See Hauke, *Mercier*, 112–25.

role, which of course can first attain its universal character by her Assumption into heaven. Because of her Assumption into heavenly glory, the Mother of God sees God face to face. Enjoying the beatific vision, she is thus in a condition to be aware, presently, of every human situation and to respond in each case as a spiritual mother. In the mediation of grace, Mary's intercession and merit complement one another. Her merit appeals to the will of God and can thus (like the merit of all the saints in general) be called an "interpretative prayer" (*oratio interpretativa*).¹³⁵

Mary's intercession (in this general sense, which encompasses her merit as well) towers above the intercessory impact of all the other saints. As New Eve, Mary is the spiritual mother of all mankind, which is called to enter into the Church. Since her intercession touches everyone, the limited influence of the other saints cannot be compared to it. This distinction was made quite clear during the 1920 canonization of Joan of Arc. The miracle requisite for her canonization occurred in Lourdes. The bishop of Orléans beseeched Mary for a miracle through the intercession of Joan of Arc. Cardinal Billot did not wish to admit this miracle, because it was obtained through Mary, which excluded the participation of the maid from Orléans. Against this objection, the Dominican Hugon and the Servite Lépiciér presented their professional opinions. They argued that the universal intercession of Mary and the particular prayer of other saints in no way exclude each another. In his decree recognizing this miracle, Pope Benedict XV stressed that no matter what grace and blessing is sought, it is sought through Mary. It is for this reason that Mary has been extolled from time immemorial as "Mediatrice of All Graces." The auxiliary effectiveness of the intercession of Joan of Arc is not thereby excluded.¹³⁶

"Express" (*expressa*) and "interpretative" (*interpretativa*) prayer possess a moral causality; that is, such prayer involves an appeal to the will of God, who communicates his grace with a view to the cooperation of the saints. Many Mariologists clamor for something more, insisting that the Mother of God also enjoys a so-called "physical" efficient causality, whereby she exercises an instrumental causality in the power of the principal cause. They liken this hypothetical efficient causality of the Mother of God to the Thomistic interpretation of the humanity of Christ and of the sacraments. Thomas compares the operation of the humanity of Christ in the

¹³⁵ See *ST*, Suppl., q. 72, a. 3.

¹³⁶ See Hauke, *Mercier*, 52. [The author does not mean by "auxiliary (*zusätzliche*) effectiveness" an effectiveness supplemental to Mary, as though not included virtually in Mary's own prayer, as no one (*mutatis mutandis*) should consider Mary's work "auxiliary" to Christ in the manner of an external help not included virtually in Christ's own work—translator's note.]

power of his godhead to the operation of an arm, through which a person works (the arm appears as a “conjoined instrument”). On the other hand, Aquinas likens the sacraments, as “separated instruments,” to a stick moved by the arm: “Thus, it is necessary that the power for salvation found in the sacraments be derived from the divinity of Christ through his humanity.”¹³⁷ “Physical” causality, therefore, works through itself and not simply through an appeal to the will of another person. Of course, whether such causality pertains to Mary remains a matter of dispute.¹³⁸ Such a hypothesis stands in tension with the specific efficacy of the sacramental actions, which are administered *ex opere operato* on behalf of Christ as head of the Church. John Paul II speaks of Mary’s “intercessory mediation”¹³⁹ and thus remains in the realm of moral causality.

That Mary in a certain way has a hand in the distribution of all graces, whether through express prayer or through interpretative prayer, has by now become a teaching of the ordinary Magisterium. This teaching can be gathered from the relevant papal statements referenced by the Second Vatican Council¹⁴⁰ and from the doctrinal expressions of John Paul II.¹⁴¹ Moreover, Pope Benedict XVI said something to this effect at the canonization of the Franciscan Fr. Fra Galvao on May 11, 2007 in Brazil: “There is no fruit of grace in the history of salvation that does not have as its necessary instrument the mediation of Our Lady. . . . Let us give thanks to God the Father, to God the Son, to God the Holy Spirit from whom, through the intercession of the Virgin Mary, we receive all the blessings of heaven. . . .”¹⁴²

N V

¹³⁷ ST III, q. 65, a. 5.

¹³⁸ Roschini has produced the most extensive treatment of this theme, in favor of a physical causality. See G. M. Roschini, *De natura influxus B.M. Virginis in applicatione Redemptionis*, in *Maria et Ecclesia II*, ed. Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis (Vatican City: 1959), 223–95. See also A. M. Apollonio, “Maria Santissima Mediatrice di tutte le grazie: La natura dell’influsso della Beata Vergine nell’applicazione della Redenzione,” *Immacolata Mediatrix* 7 (2007): 157–81. Against this, there is, among others, Merkelbach, *Mariologia*, 367–71.

¹³⁹ See, among others, John Paul II, *Redemptoris Mater*, §§21 and 40; Hauke, “Mütterliche Vermittlung,” 148f.

¹⁴⁰ *Lumen Gentium*, § 62 (in Flannery, n. 16); G. M. Roschini, *La Mediazione mariana oggi* (Rome: 1971), 104f; P. M. Siano, “Uno studio su Maria Santissima ‘Mediatrice di tutte le grazie’ nel magistero pontificio fino al pontificato di Giovanni Paolo II,” *Immacolata Mediatrix* 6 (2006): 321–27.

¹⁴¹ See Hauke, “Mütterliche Vermittlung,” 168–74; Siano, “Uno studio su Maria,” 341–48.

¹⁴² Benedict XVI, homily at the canonization of Fra Galvao (May 11, 2007) (translation from www.vatican.va).