

MARY'S COREDEMPTION: A DIFFERENT APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

E. J. CUSKELLY, M.S.C.

Croydon, Vic., Australia

IN A RECENT review of the published lectures of the Maynooth Union Summer School of 1958,¹ the reviewer writes of "the very live problem of Mary's role in Redemption":

... Some readers will be a little disappointed with the extreme conservatism of the view taken here—however, this will please others and the position is quite defensible. It would be well for everyone to supplement this aspect with a reading of a member of the more "advanced" school before committing himself to a position, e.g., Carol, *Mariology*, Vol. 2. . . .²

I like the implications of what is said here, viz., that possibly the ultimate solution to this particular theological problem will not necessarily be the taking of one or other of two seemingly opposite opinions, but the supplementing of one by something of the other.

The general supposition has been that the question can be phrased thus: Did Mary, on Calvary, co-operate immediately in the objective redemption of mankind? Either you answer "Yes" and take up your position in the "advanced school"; or you throw in your lot with the "conservative school" and reply "No," maintaining that Mary's immediate co-operation is only in the field of subjective redemption.³

Briefly, the main points of the conservative school are these. Scripture and tradition tell us that we are redeemed by the merit and satisfaction of Christ on Calvary. He alone paid the price of our redemption; His position is unique as the one Redeemer of the world. In this work of objective redemption, of the reconciliation of the human race with God, no one else—not even Mary—can have any part. Mary herself was redeemed. If she receives redemption from Christ, the first cause of all redemption, she could not have merited it. *Principium meriti non cadit sub merito*. She merited only to become the dispenser of graces—to have her part in the subjective redemption.

¹ K. McNamara (ed.), *Mother of the Redeemer* (Dublin, 1959).

² *Australasian Catholic Record* 36 (1959) 347.

³ For a representative list of authors of both "schools," cf. J. Carol, O.F.M., "Our Lady's Coredeemption," in J. Carol (ed.), *Mariology* 2 (Milwaukee, 1957) 377 ff.

The members of the advanced school rely much on the documents of the Supreme Pontiffs. Many papal pronouncements, they say, cannot be interpreted merely as describing Mary's part in the subjective redemption. She must be assigned a part in objective redemption. To the objection listed above they reply that you must distinguish a twofold intention on the part of Christ and a corresponding twofold acceptance on the part of the Eternal Father: "First, with a logical priority, God deigns to accept Christ's Redemption for Mary alone; then, once Mary is redeemed, God accepts Christ's Redemption *with Mary's co-operation* for the rest of the human race."⁴ To this the conservatives reply that such an awkward distinction, although possible, is a completely gratuitous assumption, being devoid of all scriptural and traditional foundation, and is therefore a new opinion in theology. It would mean, they say, that for centuries the Church has omitted to teach one of the essential elements of the doctrine of the redemption.⁵

Faced with the choice between these two positions, a Catholic must feel some hesitation. If he takes the conservative position, he must feel some uneasiness about certain papal pronouncements. As the conservatives themselves admit: "That these texts lend themselves to an interpretation which favours the immediate cooperation of Our Lady in the Redemption can be readily admitted. . . . It can be conceded that, were the doctrine elsewhere well-supported, these texts might well be construed as giving it confirmation and sanction."⁶

If, on the other hand, he declares for the advanced school, he will probably have some qualms about whether he is detracting from Christ's unique role in the redemption, and also about the seeming lack of traditional theological support for his position. In either case, since there are good theologians and fairly weighty arguments against his opinion, he will feel uncertain of his ground. This uncertainty about the vital role of Mary in relation to his own redemption can make him feel that an important element of his devotion to her is lacking.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 418.

⁵ Thus, e.g., H. Lennerz, S.J., *De beata virgine* (Rome, 1957) pp. 280 ff.

⁶ M. O'Grady, in K. McNamara, *op. cit.* (supra n. 1) p. 147. To avoid prolonging this article unduly, these papal texts, which must be quoted at the end of the article, are not repeated here.

Now the contentions of the present article are three. (1) As long as the question is couched in terms of "objective and subjective" redemption, it will be extremely difficult (if not impossible) to find a solution that will satisfy all theologians. (2) There is not complete opposition between the two schools of thought. Something of what both maintain must be upheld: (a) the unique position of Christ as Redeemer of mankind; (b) in some way Mary's merit and satisfaction on Calvary having worth before God for the salvation of the rest of men. (3) It is admitted, with the conservatives, that satisfactory arguments for this last statement (i.e., 2b) have not generally been given. It is asserted, however, that there do exist sound theological reasons—which will later be advanced.

A QUESTION OF TERMINOLOGY

Here the present writer subscribes to the opinion of that competent theologian, Charles Journet, who avoids the objective-subjective redemption terminology as being in no wise necessary—"which can perhaps be well understood, but which, it seems to us, must inevitably create misunderstandings."⁷

Let us consider the ways in which this terminology is used and see why it should create misunderstanding. Objective redemption as distinct from and contrasted with subjective redemption—why the distinction? What point did it serve to make? Summarily, the rise of the distinction was connected with this question: If Christ died for all men, why is it that not all are saved? The reply is best given in the words of St. Thomas:

There are two ways in which you can speak of the redemption wrought by the passion of Christ: either *according to sufficiency*, and in this way the passion redeemed all, because according to its own value it delivered all; for it is sufficient for all those to be redeemed and saved, even were they infinite in number, as St. Anselm says; or *according to efficacy*, and in this way He did not redeem all through His passion, because not all adhere to the Redeemer.⁸

The death of Christ is a certain universal cause of salvation. . . . But a universal cause must be applied to each one individually in order that each might share in the effect of the universal cause. . . .⁹

⁷ *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2 (Fribourg, 1951) 398, n. 2

⁸ *In Apoc.* 5 ⁹ *C gent* 4, 55

This distinction between the value of Christ's merits "according to sufficiency" and "according to efficacy," between the universal cause and the effects of that cause, was later expressed as the distinction between objective redemption (or redemption *in actu primo*) and subjective redemption (or redemption *in actu secundo*). As Paul Galtier, S.J., expresses it, we speak of objective redemption "in so far as men, antecedently to any act of theirs, by reason and by virtue of Christ, are regarded as fully redeemed causally."¹⁰ Christ, considered as universal cause of redemption, has made satisfaction for all sin, has merited salvation for all men, has offered to God the Father a sacrifice infinitely pleasing which has been accepted in favor of all mankind. In Him is the "source of all graces" which the Passion has opened for all men. This is called objective redemption. But our profiting by this work of Christ, our receiving the effects of the universal cause, or the graces which flow from the source, are then seen as something distinct, as realities in us. And this is known as subjective redemption.

This was quite a clear and serviceable distinction, serviceable still against the Reformers, who maintained that since Christ had redeemed us, all we need do is have confidence in His merits. Trent gave the traditional answer: "Although He died indeed for all, not all, however, profit by His death, but only those to whom the merit of His passion is communicated."¹¹

For the purpose of these older discussions there was no ambiguity about what was meant by objective and subjective redemption. The distinction, in whatever way it was expressed, was clear-cut and adequate. But in recent Mariological issues the old clearness of terminology has vanished. Confusion in the meaning of terms has added to the difficulty of a question already difficult enough in itself.

In the discussions there is a notable variety given to the terms. In the traditional sense just explained, objective redemption (or redemption *in actu primo*) is that which Christ did by way of merit and satisfaction, as universal cause of redemption, considered antecedently to any act of men, and therefore *as opposed to* what we receive from Christ in the way of grace, etc. By force of the definition, Mary can

¹⁰ *De incarnatione ac redemptione* (Paris, 1947) n. 431.

¹¹ Council of Trent, Session 6, chaps. 3 ff. (*DB* 795-96).

have no part in objective redemption in this sense. This was insisted on by Fr. Lennerz with his *Principium meriti non cadit sub merito*. It is clear that Mary herself is redeemed, receiving redemption from Christ.

As the result of discussion about the above matters, some theologians began to speak of redemption as "the work done to profit men," "men" being considered as apart from Mary. This, obviously, considers Christ's merits not as "antecedent to all reception of grace," but after Mary had received her fulness of grace. It is quite evident that this gives a different meaning to the term "objective redemption." The question most discussed today, and the one to be treated in the following pages, is whether Christ offered together with His own merits, also those of Mary, that the rest of men might receive subjective redemption.

Objective redemption can mean, also, all those objective realities whereby God, in Christ, has reconciled all men with Himself: redemptive Incarnation, passion and death, resurrection of Christ. This covers a field much wider than the scope of the present article.¹² In passing, it is interesting to note that Lennerz, strictly logical in his adhering to the traditional meaning of the term, says: The objective redemption is something that Christ did. But the Incarnation is not something Christ did. Therefore, Mary's co-operation in the Incarnation is not immediate co-operation in the objective redemption.¹³

"Objective redemption . . . the work whereby our debt is paid, graces are acquired, God is satisfied. . . Subjective . . . the application of the fruits already acquired."¹⁴ Perhaps deliberately, this definition leaves the meaning of objective redemption very vague and general. It has the further inconvenience that some theologians strongly criticize the distinction between the acquisition and application of grace.¹⁵

"The Incarnation may be considered as the Redemption . . . 'in actu primo,' and the sacrifice on Calvary as the Redemption . . . 'in

¹² For Mary's role in this wider view of the redemption, cf. J. Alfaro, S.J., "Significatio Mariae in mysterio salutis," *Gregorianum* 40 (1959) 9-37; K. Rahner, S.J., "Le principe fondamental de la théologie mariale," *Recherches de science religieuse* 42 (1954) 401 ff.

¹³ Cf. "Ex Mariologia," *Gregorianum* 33 (1952) 305 ff.

¹⁴ C. Boyer, S.J., *Synopsis praelectionum de beata Maria virgine* (Rome, 1946) p. 38.

¹⁵ E.g., Lennerz, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5); Journet, *op. cit.* (supra n. 7) p. 420.

actu secundo.'¹⁶ As if things were not complicated enough already! There is much good sense in what Emile Mersch wrote: "It is better to leave words in the possession of their technical sense which has been fixed with such painstaking labor and which is so necessary for exact exposition."¹⁷

The conclusion from all this should be evident enough. If you ask the question, Did Mary share in the objective redemption of men?, the chances are five to one that you will be misunderstood. The disputants will be fortunate if they can see clearly the theological issue without being confused by terminology. Therefore, as Fr. Journet says, it is best to avoid the terms.

THE THEOLOGICAL ISSUE

Concentrating our attention on the realities discussed in giving the second usage of terms, the question is asked: Admitting that Mary receives redemption from Christ as universal cause of salvation, did God "accept her merits and satisfactions together with those of Christ (although subordinately to them) as having redemptive value for the liberation of mankind from the slavery of Satan and its supernatural rehabilitation?"¹⁸ Many theologians hold that the question must be answered in the affirmative: God did accept Mary's merits and satisfaction for the redemption of men. The conservative school says that this assertion is a gratuitous assumption. Neither Scripture nor tradition offers any proof that Christ offered Mary's merits together with His own, or that God willed to accept hers as redemptive. As Lennerz points out,¹⁹ this is the real question: Did God will that Mary's merit and satisfaction be offered and accepted for the redemption of the rest of men? While admitting that the advanced opinion still maintains the infinity and sufficiency of the value of Christ's merit and satisfaction, he denies that this other question can be answered in the affirmative. There is no theological proof for it, he says; rather is there a strong argument against it. For if God wills Mary's co-operation for the redemption of men, this means that

¹⁶ Wenceslaus Sebastian, O.F.M., in J. Carol (ed.), *Mariology* 2, 331.

¹⁷ *The Theology of the Mystical Body* (St. Louis, 1955) p. 296.

¹⁸ Carol, *art. cit.* (supra n. 3) p. 390; cf. Lennerz, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5) p. 236

¹⁹ Lennerz, *ibid.*, p. 238.

Christ's work is insufficient. "For there is something 'lacking' in this work which from the will of God must be there. And in the same sense, it must be said that from the will of God, Christ 'needs' the work of the Blessed Virgin to perfect the work of the redemption."²⁰

In whatever way a theological answer is attempted to the question asked above, two truths must be maintained. The first is the unique position of Christ as Redeemer: His merit and satisfaction were the "price" of our redemption. His own personal act of loving obedience even unto death, His own personal act of offering the sacrifice which was to reconcile the whole of humanity to God—here Christ stands alone, above and apart from the rest of humanity, Mary included.

Christ in His sacred humanity is the exact and only point at which the action that purifies mankind becomes a divine action, and hence is possible and efficacious. He is also the exact and only point at which God's work is fully in contact with human activity and renders it completely and divinely powerful.

In the work of redemption, consequently, the action of Christ's humanity is not a part, even though the greater; it is totality and unity, it is the first, unique, and universal principle: 'the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.'²¹

This must stand, and nothing we attempt to say in the following pages can detract from this basic truth.

Yet we can answer the question from Fr. Carol, asked above, in the affirmative: God did accept the merits and satisfaction of Mary, together with those of Christ (although subordinately to them), as having redemptive value for the rest of mankind. The sense of our answer we must explain and prove. Whether or not our answer satisfies the advanced school is of small concern to us. What is important is the establishing of sound theological truth. If it does not satisfy them, then it will, as shall be shown later, destroy their main argument for a different, still more "advanced," answer.

A DIFFERENT APPROACH

I think that some clear light can be thrown on our problem by taking a starting point different from that of most Mariologists. It is one used by Journet and Mersch,²² but since these two do not favor

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Mersch, *op. cit.* (supra n. 17) p. 279.

²² Cf. supra nn. 7 and 17.

the current Mariological terminology, they seem to have escaped the notice of most who write on this question.

If you wish to have a true understanding of what Mary did on Calvary, you must begin with a consideration of what she received from Calvary. Further, the key to the understanding of her role in redemption is to insist not on what Christ did in contradistinction to what we receive (as in the early use of the subjective-objective redemption terminology), but on what Christ, by redeeming us, enabled us to do.²³

The consideration of a few principles from the certain theology of grace, merit, and satisfaction will help us here. The objection of the Reformers is well known, viz., that if we merit or make satisfaction, then the merits of Christ were not sufficient to redeem us or satisfy for our sins. Therefore, they concluded, the Catholic teaching is derogatory to the infinite value of Christ's merit and satisfaction, to His unique position as Redeemer. The classic reply given by the Council of Trent is well expressed in these words of St. Robert Bellarmine, quoted by Lennerz:

He is the vine, we are the branches; and as the branches cannot bear fruit unless they remain in the vine, so we can do nothing unless we abide in Christ. And as no one would be so foolish as to say that this detracts from the glory of the vine that its branches bear much fruit, so no one, unless altogether stupid, can say that it detracts from the glory of Christ if His servants, by His grace, through His Spirit, and through faith and charity inspired by Him should do works of such worth that the just Judge owes for them a crown of glory. . . . The merits of men are required not because of the insufficiency of Christ's merits, but because of their greater efficacy. . . . He merited for us the power of meriting.²⁴

Cajetan wrote: "The fact that man saves and redeems himself, fights for himself, merits, conquers, satisfies . . . and the like, regards our dignity, as is quite clear if we reflect on the matter."²⁵ He wrote of humanity in its perfect Exemplar. But, in their measure, these words apply to all the redeemed. For the just do not merely receive from Christ; they are not merely passive, for what they receive is a share in the very life of God. This life is active and moves men to action—supernatural, meritorious, satisfactory.

²³ This is *not* a solution similar to that of the German theologians referred to by Carol, *art. cit.* (supra n. 3) p. 381.

²⁴ *De gratia* (Rome, 1934) p. 297. ²⁵ *Comm. in Sum. theol.* 3, q. 46, a. 3.

The present order is an order of union; can we conceive that in the very act that restores this union God should wish to act in isolation, and that He holds man at a distance when He draws him to Himself? To save mankind without requiring mankind to co-operate in the saving act is truly to act at cross purposes.²⁶

It is the clear teaching of St. Paul that we ourselves should expiate our sins in and through Christ.²⁷

Men receive this redemption, not as a gift coming from another, but as the grace incorporating them into that other. They receive it by becoming one with Christ who saves them and with the active redemption; they are baptized in His death. . . .

Thus we see how the act of ransoming, of saving, of restoring is transferred from the Son of man to mankind, from Christ to the Christian, from the head to the body.²⁸

It is well-known Catholic doctrine that, when we receive justification from Christ, we receive the power of meriting and of making satisfaction, so that in Christ our merits and satisfaction will be acceptable to God. Further, we are taught that meritorious and satisfactory works can be offered *de congruo* for others, that others might profit by the redemption.

This point is most important for our present question; for if all the redeemed can do this, what of Mary who was perfectly redeemed? If our merit and satisfaction can be offered for others, to be accepted by God for others, so a fortiori could hers.

Christ alone is the Redeemer, as we have just said. But in communicating His life to His members, He communicates to them something of His quality as Redeemer. This quality He communicates especially to her who is united to Christ's members more closely than any other, that is, to His mother, who thus becomes the coredemptrix. This title which is attributed to the Blessed Virgin shows clearly that the fact of being redeemed does not prevent one from redeeming.²⁹

But, it may be asked, does this give a clear answer to the question: Can you prove that Christ offered Mary's merits and satisfaction together with His own to redeem the rest of men? If He did so, then

²⁶ Mersch, *op. cit.* (supra n. 17) p. 260.

²⁷ Cf. F. Prat., S.J., *The Theology of Saint Paul* 2 (London, 1934) 201.

²⁸ Mersch, *op. cit.* (supra n. 17) p. 295.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

they were certainly accepted by the Father. That she offered her merits together with His, that she joined in His sacrifice with the full generosity of her own heart and will—this we must admit. But did Christ offer them together with His own? This question has already been answered, of course, since there can be no doubt that what Christ willed should be accepted by the Father, He offered to the Father. There is no need to make a distinction between the doing of meritorious and satisfactory works, and the offering of them to the Father. But we must answer the question in the terms in which it was formulated, and we need to consider the mystery of the redemption from various aspects if we are to approximate to any understanding of it. The Council of Trent speaks in similar terms: “. . . all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, in whom we move, and in whom we satisfy, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which have their efficacy from Him, are offered to the Father by Him, and are accepted by the Father through Him.”³⁰

Pertinent to this question is a point on which St. Thomas insists: Christ’s merits, satisfaction, and obedience were accepted on our behalf because He offered Himself as Head of humanity.³¹ This cannot mean that He offered Himself as a Head detached from the body, isolated from the rest of His members. He offered the body together with Himself—a body composed of rational, free persons. That is, on Calvary He offered us with all that we would do by His grace. Our merit and satisfaction, our offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass, are of value only if united to His. Our offering is united to His not just because we will that it should be, but because *He* has willed that it should be, because on Calvary He offered what His members would later do, or rather what He would do through them. He offered as Head, i.e., He offered the merit and satisfaction of the whole body for the salvation of the world; otherwise we could do nothing now for the salvation of others. The whole value of the offering is from Christ alone, although He willed that the work be not done by Him alone, but in and through us, His living members. He could have done things otherwise. But it pertained to man’s dignity and to the greater efficacy of the redemption wrought by Christ that, through the grace that He

³⁰ Council of Trent, Session 14, chap. 8 (DB 904).

³¹ *Sum. theol.* 3, q. 48, *passim*.

gave them, men should contribute as much as possible to the fulness of their own redemption.

There is not complete opposition between what Christ offers to the Father and what He gives to us; for what we receive from Him is the power to join with Him in the offering He makes to the Father. Or, as Journet expresses it, we are drawn into the "ascending mediation" of Christ. All this follows quite certainly from the doctrine of merit and the Mystical Body; or rather, it is its declaration. For a full illustration of this teaching from the Fathers, I would refer the reader to the article by Sebastian Tromp, S.J., "De nativitate ecclesiae ex corde Iesu in cruce," *Gregorianum* 13 (1932) 489-527. In his summary of points treated, Tromp writes: "The Church was present to Christ on the cross; He prayed for her on the instrument of suffering; on the cross *He offered her*, in Himself, to *God the Father*." Pius XII wrote: "He offers to the Heavenly Father not only Himself as Head of the Church, but in Himself, also His mystical members, for He encloses them all, even the weak and frail among them, most lovingly in His Heart."³²

Unique among the redeemed was Mary the Mother of God. Full of grace beyond all others, of a personal dignity which is "in a way infinite"³³ as Mother of God, entrusted with a universal mission as mother of men, she would have merited on Calvary according to the measure of all these things. Christ would have offered the merits and satisfaction of the mother of men for the redemption of all men.

Some may say: But this does not explain the uniqueness of Mary's role in redemption. It is not meant to, for Mary's uniqueness explains itself. This was meant to provide theological reasons to show how her merit and satisfaction were offered by Christ on Calvary for the redemption of the rest of men. But does this just place Mary with the rest of the redeemed? To answer that, a distinction is necessary. She is with us in that she has been redeemed, in that she has received from Christ. She is far above us in what she has received. Because she is unique among the redeemed in what she receives, she is likewise unique in what she does. If you can measure the sublime dignity of the Mother

³² *Mystici corporis* (CTS translation) n. 81. Although written expressly of the Mass, this obviously applies to Calvary too.

³³ *Sum. theol.* 1, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4m.

of God, if you can measure the fulness of her grace and the fervor of her charity, then you can explain the greatness of her merits. If you can gauge the depth of her suffering as she stood on Calvary whither her faith and her fiat had brought her, and if you can know the generosity and fidelity with which she there embraced the will of God, then you can measure the value of her satisfaction, her sharing the offering of her Son.

The universality of her co-operation flows from the universality of her mission according to God's plan.³⁴ She is the mother of men. "As in flesh she is the mother of our Head," wrote St. Augustine, "so in spirit she is the mother of His members." Her vocation was to be the mother of Him who "would save His people from their sins," to accept Christ as the Saviour of humanity, not just as her Son. Her fiat was her consent to this universal mission. "She offered Him on Golgotha to the Eternal Father for *all the children* of Adam, sin-stained by his fall, and her mother's rights and mother's love were included in that holocaust."³⁵

CONCLUSION

We have given a theological answer to the question which, according to theologians of both "conservative" and "advanced" opinions, is the central theological issue in this coredeemption question. We have answered the question in a way which can give a true, theological understanding of some aspects of Mary's part in our redemption. But does it answer the question to the satisfaction of the advanced school, or does our conclusion leave us in the ranks of the conservatives? As stated above, that is of small concern to us. But if the advanced say that this exposition is not advanced enough, then they must forsake their main line of argumentation. For their main argument—and their strongest objection against the conservatives—was that more was demanded by papal documents than the conservatives were prepared to admit. Now, there can be no doubt that all the papal documents they quote fit in perfectly with what we have written. This is evident

³⁴ There seems no need to stress the obvious fact that since *Mary herself* was redeemed, this constitutes a limitation of absolute universality.

³⁵ *Mystici corporis*, Epilogue.

from a consideration of what were regarded as the most forceful papal texts:

When Mary offered herself completely to God together with her Son in the temple, she was already sharing with Him the painful atonement on behalf of the human race . . . (at the foot of the cross) she willingly offered Him up to the divine justice, dying with Him in her heart, pierced by the sword of sorrow.³⁶

She who had been the cooperatrix in the sacrament of man's Redemption, would be likewise the cooperatrix in the dispensation of graces deriving from it.³⁷

Owing to the union of suffering and purpose existing between Christ and Mary, she merited to become most worthily the reparatrix of the lost world, and for this reason, the dispenser of all the favors which Jesus acquired for us by His death and His blood.³⁸

Because she surpasses all in holiness and in union with Christ, and because she was chosen by Christ to be His partner in the work of human salvation, she merits for us *de congruo*, as they say, that which Christ merited for us *de condigno*, and she is the principal dispenser of the graces to be distributed.³⁹

To such extent did (Mary) suffer and almost die with her suffering and dying Son; to such extent did she surrender her maternal rights over her Son for man's salvation, and immolated Him—insofar as she could—in order to appease the justice of God, that we may rightly say she redeemed the human race together with Christ.⁴⁰

O Mother of love and mercy who, when thy sweetest Son was consummating the Redemption of the human race on the altar of the cross, didst stand next to Him, suffering with Him as Coredemptrix . . . preserve in us, we beseech thee, and increase day by day the precious fruit of His redemption and thy compassion.⁴¹

There is no need to stress the obvious fact: our exposition is very clearly in line with these texts.

If, on the other hand, some member of the conservative school should object that I have not brought out the uniqueness of the redemptive activity of Christ, or that what I have written is against that uniqueness, I would reply that this is no more than the old Protestant objection against the Catholic doctrine of merit and satisfaction, and that a reply can be found in any standard treatise *De gratia*.

³⁶ Leo XIII, *Iucunda semper*; ASS 27 (1894-95) 178. This and the following quotations are given as quoted by Carol, *art. cit.* (supra n. 3) p. 383 f.

³⁷ Leo XIII; ASS 28 (1895-96) 130-31.

³⁸ St. Pius X, *Ad diem illum*; ASS 36 (1903-4) 453. ³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Benedict XV, *Inter sodalicia*; AAS 10 (1918) 181-82.

⁴¹ Pius XI; *L'Osservatore romano*, April 29-30, 1935, p. 1.

I do not think that, against what has been written, Lennerz would press his objection, quoted above, about Mary's co-operation meaning that there was something "lacking" to the work of Christ. For the answer I have given is that of St. Paul, who filled up in his flesh "those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, for His Body, which is the Church."⁴² It is the answer of St. Augustine: "Your suffering is now added because it was then lacking. You are filling out the measure, you are not making it flow over. You are suffering as much as ought to be your contribution to the complete passion of Christ, who has suffered as our Head, and who now suffers in His members, that is, in us."⁴³

Finally, I wish to point out that I have tried to avoid issues of terminology. I have tried to concentrate on the theological realities behind the terms. Many theologians regret even the use of the title "coredemptrix." It is not for me to discuss the propriety of this term, particularly since Pope Pius XI has used it. He goes even further and exhorts Catholic youth to be "coredeemers."⁴⁴ An interesting point is that Pope Pius XII preferred to speak of Mary with that very rich title of *socia redemptoris*. My hope is that these pages may have contributed something towards an appreciation of what Mary's association with the Redeemer in His work really means.

⁴² Col 1:24. ⁴³ *In Ps. 61* (PL 36, 730).

⁴⁴ *L'Osservatore romano* 25 (March, 1934).