

# The Immaculate Heart of Mary in the Theology of Reparation

Arthur Burton Calkins

## I. Introduction

One can never speak of the Immaculate Heart of Mary without direct reference to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus because these two persons, one divine and one human, of whom their Two Hearts are symbols, were from all eternity united in the mind of God. Blessed Pope Pius IX declared this solemnly in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* in which he proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception when he stated that God

by one and the same decree, had established the origin of Mary and the Incarnation of Divine Wisdom [*ad illius Virginis primordia transferre, quæ uno eodemque decreto cum divinæ Sapientiæ incarnatione fuerant præstituta.*]<sup>1</sup>

Precisely because these two persons are not equal we cannot speak of them in exactly the same way and yet they are not entirely different. Thus, we must speak of them in terms of the principal of analogy or “likeness in difference” and then the analogy between the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Immaculate Heart of Mary. I trust that this necessary preliminary treatment will prove to be of value in the end.

## II. The Principal of Analogy

Analogy, in the classical sense in which this term is used by St. Thomas Aquinas and his followers, denotes “a kind of predication midway between univocation and equivocation.”<sup>2</sup> Here is the Angelic Doctor’s own description of what he meant by analogous predication:

It is evident that terms which are used in this way [i.e. analogically] are intermediate between univocal and equivocal terms. In the case of univocity one term is predicated of different things according to a meaning [*ratio*] that is absolutely one and the same; for example, the term *animal*, predicated of a horse or of an ox, signifies a living sensory substance. In the case of equivocity the same term is predicated of various things according to totally different meanings, as is evident from the term *dog*, predicated both of a constellation and of a certain species of animal. But in those things which are

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* I: (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck – n. Verlagsanstalt, 1971) 599; *Our Lady: Papal Teachings* trans. Daughters of St. Paul (Boston: St. Paul Editions 1961) [= *OL*] #34].

<sup>2</sup> G. P. Klubertanz, “Analogy,” *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 1 (NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967) 463.

spoken of in the way mentioned previously [i.e.] analogically, the same term is predicated of various things according to a meaning that is partly the same and partly different: different as regards the different modes of relation, but the same as regards that to which there is a relation. [*In his vero quae praedicto modo dicuntur, idem nomen de diversis praedicatur secundum rationem partim eandem, partim diversam. Diversam quidem quantum ad diversos modos relationis. Eandem vero quantum ad id ad quod fit relatio.*]<sup>3</sup>

Even more precisely, when one speaks of “consecration to God” and “consecration to Mary” one is effectively speaking in the first place of what the disciples of St. Thomas call the “analogy of attribution.” Gardeil says that

In the analogy of attribution there is always a primary (or principal) analogate (or analogue), in which alone the idea, the formality, signified by the analogous term is intrinsically realized. The other (secondary) analogates have this formality predicated of them by mere extrinsic denomination.<sup>4</sup>

Following this paradigm, then, “consecration to God” is the primary analogate whereas “consecration to Mary” is a secondary analogate. In other words, the term “consecration” signifies something that is common to both analogates, the recognition of our dependence on them, but since God is our Creator and Mary is a creature that dependence cannot be exactly the same.<sup>5</sup>

But it can be held as well that such usage of the term “consecration to Mary” is also an instance of the “analogy of proportionality” which Gardeil explains in this way:

It will be remembered that in the analogy of attribution the (secondary) analogates are unified by being referred to a single term, the primary analogue. This marks a basic contrast with the analogy now under consideration, that of proportionality; for here the analogates are unified on a different basis, namely by reason of the proportion they have to each other. Example: in the order of knowledge we say there is an analogy between seeing (bodily vision) and understanding (intellectual vision) because seeing is to the eye as understanding is to the soul.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *In XI Metaph.* lect. 3, no. 2197 quoted in H. D. Gardeil, O.P., *Introduction to the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas IV: Metaphysics* trans. John A. Otto (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1967) 50-51.

<sup>4</sup> Gardeil 53.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. Bittremieux, “Consecratio Mundi Immaculato Cordi B. Mariae Virginis,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 20 (1943) 102; Gabriele Roschini, O.S.M., “La Consacrazione del Mondo al Cuore Immacolato di Maria” in *Il Cuore Immacolato di Maria, Settimana di Studi Mariani* (Rome: Edizioni «Marianum», 1946) 60.

<sup>6</sup> Gardeil 54.

Theologians have long recognized that there exists an analogy, a certain “likeness in difference” between Jesus and Mary, a certain symmetry and complementarity, though not identity, between them.<sup>7</sup>

This concept of the analogy between Jesus and Mary is explicitly cited in the papal Magisterium itself. It is beautifully illustrated by the Venerable Pius XII in his Encyclical *Ad Cæli Reginam* of 11 October 1954:

From these considerations, the proof develops on these lines: If Mary, in taking an active part in the work of salvation, was, by God’s design, associated with Jesus Christ, the source of salvation itself, in a manner comparable to that in which Eve was associated with Adam, the source of death, so that it may be stated that the work of our salvation was accomplished by a kind of ‘recapitulation’, in which a virgin was instrumental in the salvation of the human race, just as a virgin had been closely associated with its death; if, moreover, it can likewise be stated that this glorious Lady had been chosen Mother of Christ ‘in order that she might become a partner [*consors*] in the redemption of the human race’; and if, in truth, ‘it was she who, free of the stain of actual and original sin and ever most closely bound to her Son, on Golgotha offered that Son to the Eternal Father together with the complete sacrifice of her maternal rights and maternal love, like a new Eve, for all the sons of Adam, stained as they were by his lamentable fall’<sup>8</sup>, then it may be legitimately concluded that as Christ, the new Adam, must be called a king not merely because he is Son of God, but also because he is our Redeemer, so analogously [*ita quodam analogiæ modo*], the Most Blessed Virgin is queen not only because she is Mother of God, but also because, as the new Eve, she was associated with the new Adam.

Certainly, in the full and strict meaning of the term, only Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is King; but Mary, too, as Mother of the divine Christ, as his associate in the redemption [*socia in divini Redemptoris opera*], in his struggle with his enemies and his final victory over them, has a share, though in a limited and analogous way [*quamvis temperato modo et analogiæ ratione*], in his royal dignity.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> On the principle of analogy as it pertains to Mariology, cf. Gabriele M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Dizionario di Mariologia* (Roma: Editrice Studium, 1961) 30-31; Roschini, *Maria Santissima nella Storia della Salvezza I: Introduzione Generale* (Isola del Liri: Tipografia Editrice M. Pisani, 1969) 171-177; Brunero Gherardini, *La Madre: Maria in una sintesi storico-teologica* (Frigento: Casa Mariana Editrice, seconda edizione riveduta e aggiornata, 2007) 284-286; Emile Neubert, S.M., *Mary in Doctrine* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1954) 5-8.

<sup>8</sup> He is citing here his Encyclical Letter *Mystici Corporis* of 29 June 1943: *Acta Apostolica Sedis* [henceforth referred to as AAS] 35 (1943) 247.

<sup>9</sup> Heinrich Denzinger, *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, 43<sup>rd</sup> Edition edited by Peter Hünermann for the bilingual edition and

Mary, then, shares in the royal dignity of Jesus; as he is King, so she is Queen, “but in a limited and analogous way.” John Paul II in his general audience address of 23 July 1997 adverted to this teaching of Pius XII on the Queenship of Mary as well:

My venerable Predecessor Pius XII, in his Encyclical *Ad Coeli Regnam* to which the text of the Constitution *Lumen Gentium* refers, indicates as the basis for Mary’s Queenship in addition to her motherhood, her co-operation in the work of the Redemption. The Encyclical recalls the liturgical text: ‘There was St Mary, Queen of heaven and Sovereign of the world, sorrowing near the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (AAS 46 [1954] 634). It then establishes an analogy between Mary and Christ [*Essa stabilisce poi un’analogia tra Maria e Cristo*], which helps us understand the significance of the Blessed Virgin’s royal status. Christ is King not only because he is Son of God, but also because he is the Redeemer; Mary is Queen not only because she is Mother of God, but also because, associated as the new Eve with the new Adam, she cooperated in the work of the redemption of the human race (AAS 46 [1954] 635).

In Mark’s Gospel, we read that on the day of the Ascension the Lord Jesus ‘was taken up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God’ (16:19). In biblical language ‘to sit at the right hand of God’ means sharing his sovereign power. Sitting ‘at the right hand of the Father’, he establishes his kingdom, God’s kingdom. Taken up into heaven, Mary is associated with the power of her Son and is dedicated to the extension of the Kingdom, sharing in the diffusion of divine grace in the world.

In looking at the analogy between Christ’s Ascension and Mary’s Assumption, we can conclude that Mary, in dependence on Christ, is the Queen who possesses and exercises over the universe a sovereignty granted to her by her Son [*Guardando all’analogia fra l’Ascensione di Cristo e l’Assunzione di Maria, possiamo concludere che, in dipendenza da Cristo, Maria è la regina che possiede ed esercita sull’universo una sovranità donatale dallo stesso suo Figlio.*]<sup>10</sup>

We can also say, then, that the consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary bears a proportionate relationship to the consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus because it is rooted in the latter. It is interesting to note that Saint Louis Marie de Montfort says,

We consecrate ourselves at one and the same time to Mary and to Jesus. We give ourselves to Mary because Jesus chose her as the perfect means to unite

---

for the English edition by Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012) [henceforth referred to as *D-H*] #3915-3916; AAS 46 (1954) 634-635.

<sup>10</sup> *Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II XX/2* (1997) 56 [*L’Osservatore Romano* English edition #1502:7].

himself to us and unite us to him. We give ourselves to Jesus because he is our last end.<sup>11</sup>

In that sense Mary is the means or proximate end that leads to Christ who is the final end of the consecration. This, in effect, is what the Venerable Pope Pius XII understood and taught regarding his consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. In the words of Father Firmin Schmidt, O.F.M. Cap.:

It is especially worthy of note that an obvious parallel is established between the consecration to the Sacred Heart by Leo XIII and this consecration by Pius XII to the Immaculate Heart. Consecration, by its very nature, is an expression of reverent submission and an acknowledgment of the dominion of him to whom the consecration is made. In the consecration to the Sacred Heart there is the recognition of Our Lord's supreme dominion. In the consecration to the Immaculate Heart there is also a true dominion recognized in Our Blessed Mother. However, Mary's dominion is subordinate to that of Christ and dependent upon Him. Pope Pius XII himself in subsequent documents confirmed the significant parallel between the two consecrations.<sup>12</sup>

As we have already seen, in his great encyclical on the Queenship of Mary, *Ad Cæli Reginam*, Pius XII specifically taught that Mary's Queenship, one of the fundamental dogmatic bases of consecration to her, is analogous to the Kingship of Christ. "Mary," he said, "has a share, though in a limited and analogous way [*quamvis temperato modo et analogiæ ratione*], in his royal dignity". Hence it might be said, in effect, that the Magisterium of the Church recognizes an "analogy of attribution" between the consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and that to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and, even more explicitly, an "analogy of proportionality". Monsignor John F. Murphy summed up the issue fairly succinctly, even while writing before the issuance of *Ad Cæli Reginam*:

In the devotion to the Sacred Heart, we consecrate ourselves to our Lord inasmuch as the redemption of Christ and the shedding of His blood gave Him a claim to all men. Analogously, a consecration can also be made to Mary because of her share in this Redemption and the all-embracing claims of her Motherhood.

We say "analogously," for though the term "consecration" is used in reference to both Christ and to Mary, when used in reference to Mary and her Immaculate Heart, it has a partly identical and a partly different meaning. The difference arises because of the divergence in the sovereignty or dominion of Jesus and Mary upon which the consecration is based. The analogy, however, is not simply made metaphorically, but is an analogy of proper proportionality and, further, an analogy of attribution, for our

---

<sup>11</sup> *True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin* #125 in *God Alone: The Collected Writings of St. Louis Marie de Montfort* (Bayshore, NY: Montfort Publications, 1988) 328.

<sup>12</sup> Firmin M. Schmidt, O.F.M. Cap., "The Universal Queenship of Mary," in Juniper Carol, O.F.M., ed., *Mariology* Volume 2 (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1957) 510.

dependence of Mary, the reason for our act, is essentially a dependence on God.<sup>13</sup>

### III. The Analogy between The Sacred Heart of Jesus and The Immaculate Heart of Mary

In what is perhaps the single most important passage in his monumental Sacred Heart Encyclical *Haurietis Aquas* of 15 May 1956 the Venerable Pope Pius XII taught authoritatively about the aptness of the Heart of Jesus as a symbol and the various levels of its symbolism:

The Heart of the Incarnate Word is deservedly and rightly considered the chief sign and symbol of that threefold love with which the divine Redeemer unceasingly loves His eternal Father and all mankind.

It is a symbol of that *divine love* which He shares with the Father and the Holy Spirit but which He, the Word made flesh, alone manifests through a weak and perishable body, since “in Him dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9).”

It is, besides, the symbol of that *burning love which, infused into His soul*, enriches the human will of Christ and enlightens and governs its acts by the most perfect knowledge derived both from the beatific vision and that which is directly infused.

And finally – and this in a more natural and direct way – it is the symbol also of *sensible love*, since the body of Jesus Christ, formed by the Holy Spirit, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, possesses full powers of feelings and perception, in fact, more so than any other human body.<sup>14</sup>

The physical Heart of Jesus, then, is “a particularly expressive symbol” of the divine-human love of the God-man.

In his address to the participants in the International Theological Symposium on the Alliance of the Hearts of Jesus and Mary on 22 September 1986 Pope Saint John Paul II offered some very important reflections on the Heart of Mary:

It is worthy of note that the Decree by which Pope Pius XII instituted for the universal Church the celebration in honor of the Immaculate Heart of Mary states: “With this devotion the Church renders the honor due to the Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, since under the symbol of this heart she venerates with reverence the eminent and singular holiness of the

---

<sup>13</sup> John F. Murphy, *Mary’s Immaculate Heart: The Meaning of Devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951) 98.

<sup>14</sup> AAS] 48 (1956) 327-28; Francis Larkin, SS.CC. (ed.), *Haurietis Aquas: The Sacred Heart Encyclical of Pope Pius XII* (Orlando, Florida: Sacred Heart Publications Center, 1974) 23-24 (emphasis my own). This text is also found in *D-H* #3914 with the omission of the quote from Col. 2:9.

Mother of God and especially her most ardent love for God and Jesus her Son and moreover her maternal compassion for all those redeemed by the divine Blood”.<sup>15</sup> Thus it can be said that our *devotion to Mary’s Immaculate Heart expresses our reverence for her maternal compassion both for Jesus and for all of us* her spiritual children, as she stood at the foot of the Cross.

I presented this same thought in my first Encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*, in which I pointed out that from the first moment of the Redemptive Incarnation, “under the special influence of the Holy Spirit, Mary’s heart, the heart of both a virgin and a mother, has always followed the work of her Son and has gone out to all those whom Christ has embraced and continues to embrace with inexhaustible love” (No. 22).

We see symbolized in the heart of Mary her maternal love, her singular sanctity and her central role in the redemptive mission of her Son. It is with regard to her special role in her Son’s mission that devotion to Mary’s Heart has prime importance for through love of her Son and of all of humanity she exercises a unique instrumentality in bringing us to him.<sup>16</sup>

The physical Heart of Mary, then, is the pre-eminent symbol of Mary’s love for her Son and all of the children born from his redemptive death. Further, the Heart of Mary pierced by the sword (cf. Lk. 2:35) graphically calls to mind “her central role in the redemptive mission of her Son”.

Mary’s Heart is the heart of a creature; Jesus’ Heart is the heart of the God-man. These two hearts are not equal, but there is a “likeness in difference”; there is an analogy between them. On the one hand there is an infinite distance between the creature and the Creator, but on the other hand in the case of Jesus and Mary this distance is uniquely bridged by the grace of her Immaculate Conception, which Blessed Pius IX thus described in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* of 8 December 1854 in which he declared that dogma:

God ineffable ... from the beginning and before the ages chose and ordained a mother for his only begotten Son, from whom he would become incarnate and be born in the blessed fullness of time. And God honored her above all other creatures with such love that in her alone he was pleased with a most singular benevolence. Therefore, he wonderfully filled her, far more than all the angels and saints, with an abundance of all the heavenly gifts taken from the treasury of his divinity. In this way, she, being always and absolutely free from every stain of sin, completely beautiful and perfect, would possess such a plenitude of innocence and sanctity that, under God, none greater could be known and apart from God, no mind could ever succeed in comprehending.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Sacred Congregation of Rites, 4 May 1944 [AAS 37 (1945) 50].

<sup>16</sup> *Inseg IX/2* (1986) 699-700 [ORE 959:12-13].

<sup>17</sup> *D-H* #2800.

Hence we may say that the Heart of Mary is closer to the Heart of Jesus than any other human heart. True, her physical heart is not hypostatically united to the Word of God, but it is physically, morally and spiritually united to the Heart of Jesus more than any other human heart.

In a truly marvelous way Pope Saint John Paul II further drew out the implications of this profound union of the Hearts of Jesus and Mary in the remarkable homily, which he gave in Fatima on 13 May 1982:

On the cross Christ said: “Woman, behold your son!” With these words He opened in a new way His Mother’s heart. A little later, the Roman soldier’s spear pierced the side of the Crucified One. *That pierced heart became a sign of the redemption achieved through the death of the Lamb of God.*

*The Immaculate Heart of Mary opened with the words “Woman, behold, your son!” is spiritually united with the heart of her Son opened by the soldier’s spear. Mary’s heart was opened by the same love for man and for the world with which Christ loved man and the world, offering Himself for them on the cross, until the soldier’s spear struck that blow.*<sup>18</sup>

Notice the analogy between the “opening” of the Heart of Jesus and the “opening” of the Heart of Mary. Just as Jesus’ Heart becomes the sign of the redemption *par excellence*, so Mary’s Heart becomes the sign of her collaboration in the work of the redemption. His Heart is the icon of the Redemption and hers is the icon of the Coredemption. These two Hearts are not on the same level because his is the Heart of the God-man and hers is the Heart of the most perfect creature, but there is a profound analogy between them that is rooted in the divine will.

### **Part One: The Heart of Mary as it Pertains to Her Making Reparation**

Here it is now necessary to consider the concept of reparation. The first and most fundamental way in which reparation is understood theologically may also be described as the **atonement, expiation, propitiation or satisfaction**, which Christ has made for us to the Father in his redemptive sacrifice. Each of these words emphasizes with a slightly different accent the profound truth that once man fell into sin he was incapable of “making up” for the offense which he had caused to God and the disorder which he had introduced into the universe.<sup>19</sup> Only Jesus could repair the damage done by sin and make the reparation owed to God in justice. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* neatly synthesizes this concept thus:

It is the love “to the end” (Jn. 13:1) that confers on Christ’s sacrifice its value as redemption and reparation, as atonement and satisfaction. He knew and loved us all when he offered his life. Now “the love of Christ controls us,

<sup>18</sup>*Inseg* V/2 (1982) 1573-1574 [ORE 734:3]; emphasis my own.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences *Indulgentiarum Doctrina* #2 in Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 1975) 63.

because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died” (2 Cor. 5:14). No man, not even the holiest, was ever able to take on himself the sins of all men and to offer himself as a sacrifice for all. The existence in Christ of the divine Person of the Son, who at once surpasses and embraces all human persons and constitutes himself as the Head of all mankind, makes possible his redemptive sacrifice *for all*.<sup>20</sup>

The first and most fundamental reparation, then, is the reparation made to the Father by Christ on the Cross and renewed on our altars, but this is not all. We, too, are called to participate in the reparation offered by Christ to the Father as the *Catechism* makes clear:

The cross is the unique sacrifice of Christ, the “one mediator between God and men”. But because in his incarnate divine person he has in some way united himself to every man, “the possibility of being made partners, in a way known to God, in the paschal mystery” is offered to all men. He calls his disciples to “take up [their] cross and follow (him)”, for “Christ also suffered for (us), leaving (us) an example so that (we) should follow in his steps.” In fact, Jesus desires to associate with his redeeming sacrifice those who were to be its first beneficiaries. This is achieved supremely in the case of his Mother, who was associated more intimately than any other person in the mystery of his redemptive suffering.<sup>21</sup>

We can say, then, that after Jesus himself, no one offered more perfect reparation to the Father than Mary. If his Heart may be acknowledged as the icon of the Redemption, then hers may be recognized as the icon of the Coredemption. Even though the sacrifice of Jesus was all-sufficient for our salvation, God willed that the sacrifice of Jesus, the new Adam, should be united with that of Mary, the new Eve for our salvation. The Venerable Pope Pius XII put it this way in his masterful Encyclical *Haurietis Aquas* on the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus:

That graces for the Christian family and for the whole human race may flow more abundantly from devotion to the Sacred Heart, let the faithful strive to join it closely with devotion to the Immaculate Heart of the Mother of God. By the will of God, the most Blessed Virgin Mary was inseparably joined with Christ in accomplishing the work of man’s redemption, so that our salvation flows from the love of Jesus Christ and His sufferings intimately united with the love and sorrows of His Mother. [*Quo vero ex cultu erga augustissimum Cor Iesu in christianam familiam, imo et in omne genus hominum copiosiora emolumenta fluant, curent cristifideles, ut eidem cultus etiam erga Immaculatum Dei Genetricis Cor arcte copuletur. Cum enim ex Dei voluntate in humanae Redemptionis peragendo opere Beatissima Virgo Maria cum Christo fuerit indivulse coniuncta, adeo ut ex Iesu Christi caritate*

---

<sup>20</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [henceforth referred to as CCC] #616.

<sup>21</sup> CCC #618.

*eiusque cruciatibus cum amore doloribusque ipsius Matris intime consociatis sit nostra salus profecta.]*<sup>22</sup>

In this classic passage every word is carefully weighed and measured in order to make a declaration on the redemption and Mary's role in it which remains unparalleled for its clarity and precision. No doubt for this reason it is included Denzinger-Hünemann's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*.<sup>23</sup> Pius professes that "our salvation flows from the love of Jesus Christ and His sufferings" [*ex Iesu Christi caritate eiusque cruciatibus*] which are "intimately united with the love and sorrows of His Mother" [*cum amore doloribusque ipsius Matris intime consociatis*]. The Latin preposition *ex* indicates Jesus as the source of our redemption while three other Latin words, *cum* and *intime consociatis*, indicate Mary's inseparability from the source. Finally, let us note Pius' insistence on the fact that this union of Jesus with Mary for our salvation has been ordained "by the will of God" [*ex Dei voluntate*].

Following, then, the same approach, which I used in an essay that I wrote several years ago, seeing the Heart of Jesus as offering the Father "objective reparation" and then as the object of our "subjective reparation",<sup>24</sup> I shall follow the same method here with regard to the Heart of Mary, while observing all due proportions. In this regard, I will reproduce here the line of argumentation that I developed in the essay "*Maria Reparatrix: Tradition, Magisterium, Liturgy*".<sup>25</sup> What we will say about Mary below may be appropriately related to her Heart, which, according to the Decree of the Congregation of Rites of 4 May 1944 in instituting the celebration of the Mass of the Immaculate Heart of Mary for the universal Church, states:

With this devotion the Church renders the honour due to the Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, since under the symbol of this heart she venerates with reverence the eminent and singular holiness of the Mother of God and especially her most ardent love for God and Jesus her Son and moreover her maternal compassion for all those redeemed by the divine Blood.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>AAS 48 (1956) 352 [*OL #778*].

<sup>23</sup>*D-H #3926*.

<sup>24</sup> Arthur Burton Calkins, "The Teaching of Pope John Paul II on the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Theology of Reparation" in Francesco Lepore e Donato D'Agostino (eds.) *Pax in Virtute. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Cardinale Giuseppe Caprio* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003) 271-323; cf. also <http://www.christendom-awake.org/pages/calkins/JPSHJREP-Part1.htm>, <http://www.christendom-awake.org/pages/calkins/JPSHJREP-Part2.htm>.

<sup>25</sup> Arthur Burton Calkins, "Maria Reparatrix: Tradition, Magisterium, Liturgy" in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross – III: Maria, Mater Unitatis. Acts of the Third International Symposium on Marian Coredeemption* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2003) 223-258.

<sup>26</sup>AAS 37 (1945) 50.

## I. The New Eve in Early Greek Patristic Thought

Our Lady's role in the work of the redemption is already touched upon in the very early ages of the Church's life. I used the title *Maria Reparatrix* in the work cited because the Latin word evokes many rich theological associations, while a literal rendering such as "Mary the Repairer" might instead conjure up visions of an auto mechanic. In fact, the term *reparatrix*, the feminine form of *reparator*, which may be translated as "repairer," "restorer" or "renewer", plunges us of necessity right into the story of the fall of our first parents and the redemption. It is a term which has been employed since the era of the Fathers of the Church and into the twentieth century to describe Our Lady's role in the work of our redemption which puts a particular accent on the fact that Mary "repairs" the sin of Eve and collaborates in "restoring" God's original work of creation. For that reason we must begin by reviewing what is meant when we refer to Mary as the "New Eve". A serious study of the New Eve theme as it emerges in early patristic literature, especially in its classical exposition by St. Irenaeus of Lyons, will help to lay a solid foundation for this brief foray into the development of Marian doctrine.

The Blessed Cardinal John Henry Newman exposed this question and responded to it with his accustomed clarity in his now famous Letter to Dr. Edward Bouverie Pusey<sup>27</sup>:

What is the great rudimental teaching of Antiquity from its earliest date concerning her [the Blessed Virgin]? By 'rudimental teaching', I mean the prima facie view of her person and office, the broad outline laid down of her, the aspect under which she comes to us, in the writings of the Fathers. *She is the Second Eve.*

*Eve had a definite, essential position in the First Covenant.* The fate of the human race lay with Adam; he it was who represented us. It was in Adam that we fell; though Eve had fallen, still, if Adam had stood, we should not have lost those supernatural privileges which were bestowed upon him as our first father. Yet though Eve was not the head of the race, still, even as regards the race, she had a place of her own; for Adam, to whom was divinely committed the naming of all things, named her 'the Mother of all the living', a name surely expressive, not of a fact only, but of a dignity; but further, as she thus had her own general relation to the human race, so again had she her own special place as regards its trial and its fall in Adam. *In those primeval events, Eve had an integral share. ... She co-operated, not as an irresponsible instrument, but intimately and personally in the sin; she brought it about. As the history stands, she was a sine-qua-non, a positive, active, cause of it. And she had her share in its punishment; in the sentence*

---

<sup>27</sup>On the context of this letter cf. John Henry Newman, *Mary: The Virgin Mary in the Life and Writings of John Henry Newman* edited with an Introduction and Notes by Philip Boyce (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001) 37-50.

*pronounced on her, she was recognized as a real agent in the temptation and its issue, and she suffered accordingly.*<sup>28</sup>

Newman continued to draw out the implications for the “three parties concerned”, the serpent, the woman and the man, as they are presented to us in the third chapter of the Book of Genesis. He quoted the first part of the celebrated passage known as the *protoevangelium*: “I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, while thou shalt lie in wait for her heel” (Gen. 3:15)<sup>29</sup> and then he made this illuminating comment:

The Seed of the woman is the Word Incarnate, and the Woman, whose seed or son He is, is His mother Mary. This interpretation, and the parallelism it involves, seem to me undeniable; but at all events (and this is my point) *the parallelism is the doctrine of the Fathers, from the earliest times; and, this being established, we are able, by the position and office of Eve in our fall, to determine the position and office of Mary in our restoration.*<sup>30</sup>

While noting that Newman’s final sentence is of capital importance for our theme, let us follow him briefly in his historical exposition on the New Eve.

He gives particular attention to three figures from Christian antiquity who are major witnesses to this understanding of Mary as the New Eve: St. Justin Martyr, St. Irenaeus of Lyons and Tertullian.<sup>31</sup> For our purposes the first two are quite sufficient. Justin Martyr (+ c. 165), after having studied various philosophies, became convinced of the truth of the Christian faith and was one of its first public defenders or apologists. His *Dialogue with Trypho* “contains one long, memorable passage, very probably the first patristic testimony on the Eve-Mary parallel.”<sup>32</sup> The passage in question reads thus:

---

<sup>28</sup>Newman 206-207. Emphasis my own.

<sup>29</sup>I have followed here the Douay-Rheims version which is a translation of St. Jerome’s Vulgate. For a discussion on whether the pronoun in the second part of the verse should be translated as he or she (favored in the Catholic tradition for well over a millennium) cf. Thomas Mary Sennott, *The Woman of Genesis* (Cambridge, MA: The Ravengate Press, 1984) 37-60. For a discussion of whether the verb should be translated as “bruise” or “crush”, cf. Sennott 61-80. Cf. also Thomas Mary Sennott, M.I.C.M., “Mary Coredemptrix” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross II: Acts of the Second International Symposium on Marian Coredemption* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2002) 49-63. For an overall treatment of the text cf. Stefano M. Manelli, *All Generations Shall Call Me Blessed: Biblical Mariology* trans. Peter Damian Fehlner (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 1995) 21-33.

<sup>30</sup>Newman 208. Emphasis my own. Cf. also CCC #411.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Newman 209.

<sup>32</sup>Michael O’Carroll, C.S.Sp., *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc.; Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1982) 211. Cf. also Lino Cignelli, O.F.M., *Maria Nuova Eva nella Patristica greca* (Assisi: Studio Teologico “Porziuncola” Collectio Assisiensis #3, 1966) 31-32 [my trans.]; Luigi

The Son of God became man through a Virgin, so that the disobedience caused by the serpent might be destroyed in the same way it had begun. *For Eve, who was virgin and undefiled, gave birth to disobedience and death after listening to the serpent's words. But the Virgin Mary conceived faith and joy; for when the angel Gabriel brought her the glad tidings that the Holy Spirit would come upon her and that the power of the Most High would overshadow her, so that the Holy One born of her would be the Son of God, she answered, "Let it be done to me according to your word" (Lk. 1:38).* Thus was born of her the [Child] about whom so many Scriptures speak, as we have shown. Through him, God crushed the serpent, along with those angels and men who had become like the serpent.<sup>33</sup>

On this passage Father Gambero comments:

Here it is interesting to note how Justin already presents Mary's role in salvation as the consequence of a free and conscious choice in response to the angel's message. However, just as the harmful action of Eve was subordinate to that of Adam, on whom fell the primary responsibility for sin, in the same way the action of Mary, in the order of human salvation remains absolutely subordinate to the necessary and essential action of Christ, the only Redeemer.<sup>34</sup>

Justin's is at least the first witness on this subject about which we have incontestable evidence. Interestingly Dom John Chapman, distinguished scholar and Abbot of Downside,<sup>35</sup> on the basis of the testimony of Victorinus of Pettau (+ c. 303),<sup>36</sup> held that Papias of Hierapolis (+ c. 125)<sup>37</sup> preceded Justin Martyr in giving this testimony with his allusive statement that "the Angel Gabriel evangelized Mary on the same day that the dragon seduced Eve."<sup>38</sup> If true, this is all the more significant since Irenaeus informs us that Papias heard John the Apostle preach and was personally acquainted with his disciple Polycarp (+ c. 155).<sup>39</sup>

---

Gambero, S.M., *Mary and the Fathers of the Church: The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought* trans. Thomas Buffer (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999) 44-48.

<sup>33</sup>Gambero 47. Emphasis my own.

<sup>34</sup>Gambero 48.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. *New Catholic Encyclopedia* [= NCE] 3:454.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. *NCE* 14:651.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. *NCE* 10:979-980.

<sup>38</sup>*Tract. de fabrica mundi* 9 *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 49:8. Cf. Abbot Chapman's article in *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908) 42-61. It is cited by E. Druwé, S.J., "La Médiation Universelle de Marie" in Hubert du Manoir, S.J. (ed.), *Maria: Études sur la Sainte Vierge* 8 vols. (Paris: Beauchesne et Ses Fils, 1949-1971) I:469 and by Cignelli 31 n. 1.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. *NCE* 11:535-536.

With Irenaeus (+ c. 202),<sup>40</sup> disciple of Polycarp, Bishop of Lyons, “the first theologian in the proper sense of the word ... considered the father of Catholic dogmatic theology”,<sup>41</sup> we arrive at the classical formulation of the New Eve thematic. In order to be fully appreciated, Irenaeus’ teaching on Mary must be seen within the context of his doctrine of recapitulation (*anakephalaiosis*) which Luigi Gambero explains in this way:

*According to St. Paul, the Redeemer brought together or “recapitulated” in himself all the things and events that had happened since the first creation, reconciling everything with God. In this view, the salvation of man appears as a second creation, which is essentially a kind of repetition of the first creation. Through this second creation God rehabilitates his original plan of salvation, which had been interrupted by Adam's fall; he takes up again and reorganizes it in the person of his Son, who becomes for us the second Adam. And, if the whole human race fell into perdition because of the sin of one man (cf. Rom. 5:12ff), it was necessary that God's Son should become man. He, as the fountainhead of a new humanity, could then realize God's plan of salvation by retracing, but in a contrasting manner, the same path walked by the first Adam in his rebellion against God.*<sup>42</sup>

In his writings Irenaeus consistently illustrates Mary’s role in this recapitulation of all things in Christ. In his major work, *Adversus Haereses* he states:

*Even though Eve had Adam for a husband, she was still a virgin. ... By disobeying, she became the cause of death for herself and for the whole human race. In the same way, Mary, though she also had a husband, was still a virgin, and by obeying, she became the cause of salvation for herself and for the whole human race. ... The knot of Eve's disobedience was untied by Mary's obedience. What Eve bound through her unbelief, Mary loosed by her faith.*<sup>43</sup>

Let us listen a moment to a penetrating analysis of this text made by Father Lino Cignelli who does so on the basis of his extensive study of the writings of Irenaeus:

From the human side, both the sexes contribute actively in determining the lot of the human race, but not however to the same extent. Ruin and salvation rest with the two Adams. With regard to Christ the New Adam, he can redeem because he is the God-man. As God, he guarantees the victory over the devil and communicates life, incorruptibility and immortality, which are essentially divine goods; as man, he is the primary ministerial cause of salvation and the antithesis of Adam, cause of universal ruin.

---

<sup>40</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 189-191.

<sup>41</sup>Gambero 51.

<sup>42</sup>Gambero 52-53. Emphasis my own. Cf. also Cignelli 4-5.

<sup>43</sup>Gambero 54. Emphasis my own.

The two virgins, Eve and Mary, beyond depending on Satan and God respectively, are ordained in their actions to the two Adams, with whom they share ministerial causality. They thus carry out an intermediate and subordinate task. Subordination, however, does not mean being simple accessories. Irenaeus clearly points back to the feminine causality of the ruin and the salvation of the human race. Eve is the “cause of death” and Mary the “cause of salvation” for all mankind.<sup>44</sup>

Now let us return to the words of Irenaeus himself:

*Eve was seduced by the word of the [fallen] angel and transgressed God's word, so that she fled from him. In the same way, [Mary] was evangelized by the word of an angel and obeyed God's word, so that she carried him [within her]. And while the former was seduced into disobeying God, the latter was persuaded to obey God, so that the Virgin Mary became the advocate of the virgin Eve.*

*And just as the human race was bound to death because of a virgin, so it was set free from death by a Virgin, since the disobedience of one virgin was counterbalanced by a Virgin's obedience.*<sup>45</sup>

By means of commentary, let us have recourse once again to the theological analysis of Father Cignelli:

As *New Eve*, with regard to Christ Mary is a complementary and associate figure, dependent and subordinate; while with regard to the human race, she is a co-cause of universal salvation. ... In virtue of her recapitulative function, the Virgin is thus inserted into the dimension or human causality of the work of salvation and the value of her cooperation is determined on the basis of her complementary relationship with the man Christ. As mother and associate of the New Adam, she consolidates the human element of objective redemption. Her contribution, made in free and meritorious obedience, constitutes with that of Christ the man a single total principle of salvation. At the side of the New Adam, she is thus a ministerial and formal co-cause of the restoration of the human race.<sup>46</sup>

Finally, in his *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* Irenaeus himself provides us with a neat summary of his preaching on this matter:

*Adam had to be recapitulated in Christ, so that death might be swallowed up in immortality, and Eve [had to be recapitulated] in Mary, so that the Virgin,*

---

<sup>44</sup>Cignelli 36-37 [my trans.].

<sup>45</sup>Gambero 54. Emphasis my own.

<sup>46</sup>Cignelli 233-234, 235-236 [my trans.].

having become another virgin's advocate, might destroy and abolish one virgin's disobedience by the obedience of another virgin.<sup>47</sup>

René Laurentin offers us a synthetic overview of the teaching of St. Irenaeus and its foundational importance:

Irenaeus gives bold relief to a theme only outlined by Justin. *With Irenaeus the Eve-Mary parallel is not simply a literary effect nor a gratuitous improvisation, but an integral part of his theology of salvation.* One idea is the key to this theology: God's saving plan is not a mending or a "patch-up job" done on his first product; it is a resumption of the work from the beginning, a regeneration from head downwards, a *recapitulation* in Christ. In this radical restoration each one of the elements marred by the fall is renewed in its very root. In terms of the symbol developed by Irenaeus, the knot badly tied at the beginning is unknotted, untied in reverse (*recirculatio*): Christ takes up anew the role of Adam, the cross that of the tree of life. *In this ensemble Mary, who corresponds to Eve, holds a place of first importance. According to Irenaeus her role is necessary to the logic of the divine plan. ...*

With Irenaeus this line of thought attains a force of expression that has never been surpassed. Later writers will broaden the bases of the comparison but to our day no one has expressed it in a way more compact or more profound.<sup>48</sup>

With St. Irenaeus of Lyons, then, who died around the year 202, we have already reached a milestone, a fixed point of reference in the understanding of Mary's role in the restoration of the human race. We may well ask: "Whence did this teaching come?" To that question Jaroslav Pelikan, then a distinguished Lutheran scholar, commenting on the text from the *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* which we have cited above, offers this reflection:

When it is suggested that for the development of the doctrine of Mary, such Christian writers as Irenaeus in a passage like this "are important witnesses for the state of the tradition in the late second century, *if not earlier*" that raises the interesting question of whether Irenaeus had invented the concept of Mary as the Second Eve here or was drawing on a deposit of tradition that had come to him from "earlier." It is difficult, in reading his *Against Heresies* and especially his *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, to avoid the impression that he cited the parallelism of Eve and Mary so matter-of-factly without arguing or having to defend the point because he could assume that his readers would willingly go along with it, or even that they were already familiar with it. *One reason that this could be so might have been that, on*

---

<sup>47</sup>Gambero 55. Emphasis my own.

<sup>48</sup>René Laurentin, *A Short Treatise on the Virgin Mary* trans. Charles Neumann, S.M. (Washington, NJ: AMI Press, 1991) 54, 57. Emphasis (except for "recapitulation" and "recirculatio") my own.

*this issue as on so many others, Irenaeus regarded himself as the guardian and the transmitter of a body of belief that had come to him from earlier generations, from the very apostles. A modern reader does need to consider the possibility, perhaps even to concede the possibility, that in so regarding himself Irenaeus may just have been right and that therefore it may already have become natural in the second half of the second century to look at Eve, the “mother of all living,” and Mary, the mother of Christ, together, understanding and interpreting each of the two most important women in human history on the basis of the other.*<sup>49</sup>

Like Dr. Pelikan, I believe that the evidence – particularly if one considers the Papias fragment as genuine and therefore the earliest link in the tradition about which we are presently aware – goes far toward supporting the belief that the teaching about Mary as the New Eve “comes to us from the Apostles”.<sup>50</sup> At the very least, with Father Lino Cignelli I believe it must be held that the Patristic exegesis, illuminated and directed by the Holy Spirit, made explicit what was already contained in embryo in the Scriptures.<sup>51</sup>

Father Cignelli, who has made the most thorough and profoundly theological study of the New Eve theme in early Greek Patristic literature of which I am aware, draws these conclusions not only on the basis of his study of Irenaeus, but also of other early major Greek fathers:

- 1) Mary stands towards the redemption as Eve stands towards the fall;
- 2) Mary, as Eve but in the opposite sense, cooperates in the determination of human destinies;
- 3) Mary, as Eve with respect to the action of Adam, participates -- in a subordinate way -- in the ministerial and meritorious causality of Christ the New Adam.<sup>52</sup>

## **II. *Maria Reparatrix* in Patristic and Medieval Thought**

Clearly, as I have already indicated, the concept of *Maria Reparatrix* refers to Mary as the New Eve precisely in her role as “repairer”, “restorer” and “renewer” at the side of the New Adam. In terms of the present state of research, St. Gaudentius of Brescia (+ c. 410)<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Jaroslav Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996) 43-44. Emphasis in second part of passage my own.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Mother Francesca Perillo, F.I. and Sister Maria Rosa Pia Somerton, F.I. clearly defend this position in their essay “Marian Coredemption Through Two Millennia” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross II* 83-84.

<sup>51</sup>Cignelli 18-19. Cf. the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei Verbum* #7-8.

<sup>52</sup>Cignelli 232 [my trans.].

<sup>53</sup>Cf. *NCE* 6:302.

seems to have made the earliest reference to Christ specifically as *Reparator*.<sup>54</sup> Not surprisingly, we soon find the analogous reference with regard to Mary. The earliest of which I am aware is found in the *Sermo Maurinus*, once attributed to St. Augustine (354-430), but now considered the work of an anonymous fifth century author:

Mary became the restoration of women because by means of her they find themselves excluded from the ruin of the first curse. [*Facta est Maria restauratio feminarum; quia per ipsam a ruina primæ maledictionis probantur exclusæ.*]<sup>55</sup>

Two things are to be noted here. Firstly, the Latin word used is *restauratio* which has virtually the same range of meaning here as *reparatio* and in fact the Italian translator renders it as *riparazione*.<sup>56</sup> Secondly, this statement follows strictly in the line of St. Irenaeus and the Greek Patristic tradition in which Mary is seen both as a representative of the whole human race and as a representative of the feminine sex, the “Virgin advocate of the virgin Eve”.<sup>57</sup> Father Cignelli puts it this way:

The ministerial and subordinate causality of *Mary the New Eve* functions in a *double direction*: in favor of the whole human race and in favor of the feminine sex alone. The patristic sources clearly attest both the directions while modern theology has unfortunately lost the second. The omission is due to the fact that the dimension of human causality in the work of redemption is undervalued and also because of the slight importance which is given to revealed anthropology and to the theme of recapitulation.<sup>58</sup>

It might be noted that this analysis published in 1966 is even more true today in the light of militant feminism which is intent on the complete negation of “revealed anthropology”.<sup>59</sup> This alone would be an excellent reason for an appreciation of the title *Maria Reparatrix*.

---

<sup>54</sup>PL 20:933. I am indebted to Father Bertrand de Margerie for this valuable information; cf. Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., *Histoire Doctrinale du Culte envers le Cœur de Jésus t. 2: L'amour devenu Lumière(s)* (Paris: Éditions Saint-Paul, 1995) 56, nn. 3 & 4.

<sup>55</sup>PL 39:1991. Cf. the Italian translation and comments on this text in Georges Gharib, Ermanno M. Toniolo, Luigi Gambero, Gerardo Di Nola (eds.) *Testi Mariani del Primo Millennio 3: Padri e altri autori latini* (Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1990) [= *TMPM* 3] 386-387.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. *TMPM* 3:387.

<sup>57</sup>PG 7:1175-1176 [Gambero 54].

<sup>58</sup>Cignelli 243-244 [my trans.].

<sup>59</sup>Father Cignelli devotes an entire and very illuminating section of his work to this revealed anthropology under the title of “The Mystery of the Woman” 209-227. Cf. also Mrs. Josephine Robinson, “Our Lady and Women in the Millennium” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross: Acts of the International Symposium on Marian Coredemption* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2001) 285-299.

Probably the first explicit use of the Latin word *reparatrix* attributed to Mary is found in the *Orationale Visigothicum* which is certainly redolent of the style of St. Ildefonsus of Toledo (+ 667),<sup>60</sup> if it does not come directly from him. Mary is addressed in a prayer as the “Virgin Mother of Christ and repairer of the human race” [*Virgo Christi genetrix et humani generis reparatrix*].<sup>61</sup>

At a slightly later date we find St. Andrew of Crete (c. 660-740)<sup>62</sup> in his fourth Oration on the Nativity of Our Lady declaring: “This is Mary, the Mother of God, the common refuge of Christians, the first restoration of the first fall of our first parents.”<sup>63</sup> In this case the original Greek word is *anablésis* which means a “restoration” or “calling back to its origin”. The rhetorical Greek phrase is rendered into equally graceful Latin as *prima primi lapsus primorum parentum reparatio*. The Italian translator has rendered the term as *riparazione*.<sup>64</sup>

Our final representative of Greek Patristic thought is St. Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 806)<sup>65</sup> who, in the concluding peroration of his Homily on the Presentation of Mary in the Temple, hails her as the “restoration of the whole world”.<sup>66</sup> Once again the Greek word used is *anablésis* and is translated into Latin as *reparatio*.

Father Henri Barré's collection of the most ancient prayers to Our Lady in the West provides us with two instances of the use of the term *reparatrix* as a title for Our Lady. The first comes from the famous Swiss Monastery of Saint Gall in a tenth century hymn which salutes Mary as the “Very Mother of God and illustrious restorer of the world” [*Ipsa Dei genitrix reparatrix inclita mundi*].<sup>67</sup> The other is found in an eleventh century manuscript from the Parisian Monastery of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in which the author begs Our Lady “who merited to restore the world [to] be the restorer of souls and bodies” [*sisque reparatrix animarum et corporum, quæ meruisti reparare mundum*].<sup>68</sup>

Our final two representatives are illustrious monks whose lives span the end of the eleventh and first part of the twelfth centuries. The first is Eadmer of Canterbury (1060/64-1141),<sup>69</sup> the associate of St. Anselm (1033-1099), who wrote in his Treatise on the Excellence of the Blessed Virgin Mary that Mary “merited to become most worthily the

---

<sup>60</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 177-178.

<sup>61</sup>Henri Barré, C.S.Sp., *Prières Anciennes de L'Occident à la Mère du Sauveur: Des origènes à Saint Anselme* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1963) 32.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 24-25.

<sup>63</sup>*PG* 97:879C.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. *TMPM* 2:412.

<sup>65</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 336-337 and Georges Gharib, Ermanno M. Toniolo, Luigi Gambero, Gerardo Di Nola (eds.) *Testi Mariani del Primo Millennio 2: Padri e altri autori bizantini* (Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1989) [= *TMPM* 2] 625-626.

<sup>66</sup>*PG* 98:1499.

<sup>67</sup>Barré 102.

<sup>68</sup>Barré 177.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 125-126.

reparatrix of the lost world” [*ut reparatrix perditæ orbis dignissime fieret*].<sup>70</sup> The other is the mellifluous Doctor, St. Bernard (1090-1153),<sup>71</sup> whose contribution to mariology lies not primarily in his originality, but in his rhetorical genius and in the warmth of his devotion. In a magnificent passage in which he meditates on Mary as the New Eve in his second homily in praise of the Virgin Mother he exclaims in a burst of enthusiasm:

You are the woman to be venerated in an altogether singular way, admirable above all other women; you are the restorer of our first parents and the life-giver of their offspring! [*O feminam singulariter venerandam, super omnes feminas admirabilem, parentum reparatricem, posterorum vivificatricem!*]<sup>72</sup>

Bernard has used here the noun *reparatrix* which other translations have rendered with the verb “repair”.<sup>73</sup>

With this passage I must conclude this brief overview of the use of the term *reparatrix* in the patristic and medieval periods. I have no doubt that many other illuminating instances could be found of the use of this term in theological literature down to modern times. Ippolito Marracci (1604-1675)<sup>74</sup> in his monumental *Polyanthea Mariana*<sup>75</sup> reports 38 instances of the word *reparatrix*.<sup>76</sup> Read without an appreciation of the rich theological tradition of which they are a part – and one could say this in an eminent degree of Marian panegyrics which abound in late Greek patristic literature -- these texts may seem to be only rhetorical effusions. But, if we return to the fundamental insights of the Bishop of Lyons at the very beginning of the tradition, we see that they form part of the very precious unbroken heritage of the Church and underscore the fact that the New Eve, indissolubly linked with the New Adam in the work of our salvation, had an active role in **repairing** the damage done by the first Adam and Eve and in **restoring** and **renewing** the human race.

### III. *Maria Reparatrix* in Modern Spirituality

The concept of reparation took on a particularly “subjective” tonality, while making a profound impact, during the seventeenth century, the golden age of French spirituality,

---

<sup>70</sup> PL 159:574, c. 9.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Theotokos* 75-76.

<sup>72</sup> PL 183:62 [my trans.].

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *Magnificat: Homilies in Praise of the Blessed Virgin Mary by Bernard of Clairvaux and Amadeus of Lausanne* trans. Marie-Bernard Saïd and Grace Perigo (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1979) 17; *St. Bernard's Sermons on the Blessed Virgin Mary* trans. by a priest of Mount Melleray (Chulmleigh, Devon: Augustine Publishing Company, 1984) 18; M. Francesca Perillo, F.I., & Sr. Maria Rosa Pia Somerton, F.I., “Marian Coredeemption through Two Millennia” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross II* 89.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *Theotokos* 233-234.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Francesco Petrillo, *Ippolito Marracci: Protagonista del Movimento Mariano del Secolo XVII* (Rome: Edizioni Monfortane, 1992) 132-136.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Marie de l'Adoration, S.M.R., « L'Esprit Marial dans la Société de Marie-Réparatrice, » *Maria* III:493.

particularly because of the revelations made to St. Margaret Mary (1647-1690).<sup>77</sup> While it is certainly true, as Father Édouard Glotin, S.J. pointed out in a very insightful study, that there had been a gradual process of “reading the Passion in the Heart of Jesus” in the course of the centuries before Margaret Mary,<sup>78</sup> nonetheless, it cannot be denied that hers was the pivotal role in transmitting the plea of the Heart of Jesus for consolation to the heart of the Church. This appeal is epitomized in what has come to be known as the “great revelation” which was made to the French Visitandine of Paray-le-Monial in June of 1675:

Behold this Heart that has so loved men that it has spared nothing even to exhausting and consuming itself in order to show them its love. And in return I receive from most men only ingratitude, by their irreverences and sacrileges, and by the coldness and contempt which they show to Me in this Sacrament of love. But what wounds Me yet more deeply is that this is done by souls who are consecrated to Me. That is why I ask that the first Friday after the octave of Corpus Christi shall be kept as a special Feast in honor of My Heart, that on that day Communion shall be offered as a special act of reparation for the indignities committed.<sup>79</sup>

Father Glotin had chronicled the history and practice of reparation in the various periods of the Church’s life and the burgeoning of reparation movements as a result of the revelations to St. Margaret Mary in his magisterial article on reparation in the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*<sup>80</sup> as well as in other studies. He indicates that a fundamental way of understanding this plaint of Christ to Margaret Mary in its continuity with the tradition is in terms of the paleochristian concept of *redamatio*, which means making a return of love for love.<sup>81</sup> Obviously, there is no figure who could ever equal Mary in returning the love of Christ and thus it is not surprising to find her proposed as the model of making reparation to the Heart of Jesus in various currents of reparative spirituality which take their impetus from Paray-le-Monial.<sup>82</sup> Hence we find the title *Maria Reparatrix* being employed with new connotations. Here we must limit ourselves to just two examples.

---

<sup>77</sup>Cf. Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., *Histoire Doctrinale du Culte au Cœur de Jésus t. 1: Premières lumière(s) sur l’amour* (Paris: Éditions Mame, 1992) [= HD 1] 177-206.

<sup>78</sup>Cf. Édouard Glotin, S.J., *Le Cœur de Jésus: Approches anciennes et nouvelles* (Namur, Belgium: Collection Vie Consacrée #16, 1997) 111-162.

<sup>79</sup>F.-L. Gauthey (ed.), *Vie et Oeuvres de Sainte Marguerite-Marie Alacoque* (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Poussielgue, 1920) II:103 [English trans. from Margaret Williams, R.S.C.J., *The Sacred Heart in the Life of the Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957) 116-117].

<sup>80</sup>*DSp* 13:369-413.

<sup>81</sup>*DSp* 13:377; Édouard Glotin, S.J., « L’expérience spirituelle de la réparation » in Bernard Peyrous (ed.), *Le Cœur du Christ pour un monde nouveau: Actes du congrès de Paray-le-Monial 13 au 15 octobre 1995* (Paris: Éditions de l’Emmanuel, 1998) 228, 230; *Ibid.*, *Il Cuore Misericordioso di Gesù* (Rome: Edizioni Dehoniane; Edizioni Apostolato della Preghiera, 1993) 43.

<sup>82</sup>Cf. *DSp* 13:403-404.

Of great interest is the fact that we find an institute of religious women which bears the title of Society of Mary Reparatrix.<sup>83</sup> It was founded by Blessed Marie de Jésus (Emilie d'Oultremont, Baroness d'Hooghvorst) (1818-1878), a noblewoman and widow. The impetus for the foundation of the institute came to her during prayer on 8 December 1854 in a private chapel in Bauffe, Belgium, at the same time that Blessed Pope Pius IX was solemnly declaring the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in Rome. Let us listen to the Blessed's own testimony:

The thought that a new glory was to surround my dearly loved Mother gave me such an indescribable sense of sweetness. Then this loving Mother, as though she would reveal to me a secret of her heart, brought my whole being into a state of great tranquillity. ... I saw this divine Mother – when I say I saw, I refer simply to the images which were impressed on the eyes of my soul, and which are still before my mind ... I asked Mary to tell me what she wanted from me.

She then told me the desire of her heart, and how grateful she would be to me could I realize it. She pointed out to me that Jesus in ascending to Heaven had not left the world, but that in her case it was not the same; *that it grieved her Mother's heart not to be there to surround Him, and see that He was surrounded with adoration and respect, tenderness and love; that that which pained her most deeply was to behold the outrages and the sacrileges of every kind with which Jesus was overwhelmed in the Blessed Sacrament, without being able to console Him, or in any way to make reparation. Then her Mother's heart told me of her desire to see herself replaced on earth by souls who would have for her Divine Son a deep respect, and a mother's tender love, and that she would be so happy to see Jesus surrounded by such faithful spouses.*<sup>84</sup>

Faithful to this impulse of grace, Blessed Marie de Jésus founded her institute whose *raison d'être*

was to gather souls who, replacing the Blessed Virgin near the Tabernacle, would repair by love, adoration and penance for the outrages and insults with which Our Lord is overwhelmed in the Blessed Sacrament.<sup>85</sup>

Sister Luisa Di Muzio, S.M.R., a spiritual daughter of Blessed Marie de Jésus, offers these further insights and precisions regarding the “founding charism”:

Jesus is the divine Repairer [*Réparateur*] and it is to him that this title pertains essentially while it also stipulates the primary plan of the society.

---

<sup>83</sup>Cf. *NCE* 9:395.

<sup>84</sup> “L'Esprit Marial dans la Société de Marie-Réparatrice,” *Maria* III:494 [*Emilie d'Oultremont, Baroness d'Hooghvorst, Foundress of the Society of Mary Reparatrix and Her Two Daughters* (London: The Manresa Press, 1932) 44-45]. Emphasis my own.

<sup>85</sup>*Emilie d'Oultremont* 46.

This precision is made in order to anticipate possible objections which could have been raised when this title was not common. Mary is Reparatrix [*Réparatrice*] insofar as she is Mother of God and because she freely associated herself "to the ignominies, sufferings, prayers and works of the divine Repairer [*Réparateur*]. It is she who is the new Eve: as Eve destroyed and ruined, so Mary restores and repairs. Mary is the Immaculate in whom the restored creation is made manifest; Mary is the Mother who stands at the foot of the Cross. ...

From the very first legislative texts up to the Constitutions renewed in 1984, we can note that the end of the Society is always described with clarity in these terms: "reparation for the outrages committed against the divine Majesty and for the evil caused to men by sin, striving in this to follow in the footsteps of the Virgin Mary, who was associated in the work of Redemption".

This is frequently made explicit thus: reparation for souls and reparation in souls. The first is attained by prayer, adoration, sacrifice, etc., and the second by retreats, religious instruction, etc.<sup>86</sup>

Evidently, this approach, absolutely legitimate in itself, represents a shift of emphasis from the classical understanding of the term *Maria Reparatrix* which we have seen up to this point. Instead of seeing Mary as the New Eve at the side of the New Adam as his associate in the work of redemption, it envisions her as making reparation before him in atonement for the sins of those who offend him. However, we cannot say that this excludes the earlier or classical approach which we find represented in the *Directory* which gives as the first reason for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception being the principal Marian feast of the society because "We must honor particularly the mystery of the Immaculate Conception in which the New Eve showed the virtue of reparation in crushing the head of the serpent".<sup>87</sup> It may well be that an in-depth study of the spirit of the society would yield many more points of identification with the classical tradition.

Another religious institute with a distinctively Marian and reparative stamp is the *Ancelle Riparatrici* founded by the Servant of God Antonino Celona (1873-1952).<sup>88</sup> This canon of the Archdiocese of Messina was a man of notable theological culture who, in a way similar to so many holy founders, was forbidden contact with the institute he founded for the last 18 years of his life. That, however, did not keep him from continuing his reading and meditation, from developing and refining his writings on the theology and practice of reparation which he finished just a few months before his death. These were published some years ago in three volumes under the title of *La Riparazione* with the first volume subtitled *Dottrina e Pratica della Riparazione*, the second *Il Divino Riparatore* and the third *Maria*

---

<sup>86</sup>Luisa Di Muzio, S.M.R., « La tendresse de Dieu pour le monde selon l'expérience spirituelle de Mère Marie de Jésus » in Bernard Peyrous (ed.), *Le Cœur du Christ pour un monde nouveau* (Paris: Éditions de l'Emmanuel, 1998) 96-97 [my trans.].

<sup>87</sup>« L'Esprit Marial dans la Société de Marie-Réparatrice » *Maria* III:499.

<sup>88</sup>Cf. Giuseppe Costa, *Il silenzio dell'innocente: Sulle tracce di Antonino Celona, presbitero messinese e fondatore delle Ancelle Riparatrici* (Messina: IAR, 2000).

*Riparatrice*.<sup>89</sup> The distinguished Italian Sacred Heart scholar, Father Andrea Tessarolo, S.C.J., points out that these volumes are of notable value even if some material in them may be of questionable worth.<sup>90</sup> I have found these volumes to be a gold mine of information which, however, very often remains to be verified in terms of its numerous citations and then weighed. Clearly, not all is of the same value and weight. There is no doubt, though, about Father Celona's vast erudition and depth as he moves easily from the Fathers of the Church to medieval authors, from mystics to the magisterium.

The volume which interests us in particular, *Maria Riparatrice*, is written primarily from the classical perspective i.e., that of Mary as the New Eve at the side of the New Adam, but it by no means ignores the more modern spiritual current that comes from Paray-le-Monial and sees Mary as a model of reparation to Jesus. (He also enters into the topic of reparation made to Mary, but this goes beyond our declared topic.) His third volume is a veritable treasure trove from which we can only extract a few examples. Here is a text which discloses to us the canon's theological framework:

Jesus is the Redeemer (*Redentore*); Mary is the Coredemptrix (*Corredentrice*) because she was associated intimately in his divine mission. Jesus is the divine Repairer (*Riparatore*); Mary the divine Repairer (*Riparatrice*). Jesus is the Mediator (*Mediatore*); Mary the Mediatrix (*Mediatrice*) with the Mediator. Jesus is the restorer (*restauratore*) of everything in heaven and on earth; Mary the restorer (*restauratrice*) and that *de congruo*, by convenience, by grace.<sup>91</sup>

The Latin term *de congruo* refers to the classical distinction drawn by theologians<sup>92</sup> and made by St. Pius X in *Ad Diem Illum* between what Christ merited *de condigno* [by right] and what Mary merited *de congruo* [by fittingness, by grace].<sup>93</sup>

In the above passage Father Celona indicates both Mary's partnership with Jesus as well as her subordinate role which is also communicated more readily by the nuances in the Italian original than in English. Italian authors like Father Celona rightly deny the accusation that the word *Corredentrice* makes Mary an equal to Jesus, arguing that Jesus is never called the *Corredentore* (Co-redeemer) but simply the *Redentore* (Redeemer).<sup>94</sup> Father Celona himself tells us that one could not refer to Jesus as *Corredentore con Maria* (Co-redeemer

---

<sup>89</sup>(Messina: Istituto «Ancelle Riparatrici», 1992).

<sup>90</sup>*Dottrina e Pratica della Riparazione* 8-11.

<sup>91</sup>*Maria Riparatrice* 20 [my trans.] cf. also 84, 299.

<sup>92</sup>Cf. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., "Our Lady's Coredemption" in Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M. (ed.), *Mariology 2* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1957) 380, 403-404, 410-416.

<sup>93</sup>Cf. Amleto Tondini, *Le Encicliche Mariane* (Rome: Belardetti Editore, 1954) 312-314 [OL #234].

<sup>94</sup>Cf. Brunero Gherardini, *La Madre: Maria in una sintesi storico-teologica* (Frigento: Casa Mariana Editrice, 1989) 262-286; *Ibid.*, *La Corredentrice nel mistero di Cristo e della Chiesa* (Rome: Edizioni Vivere In, 1998) 55-76.

with Mary) without impiety.<sup>95</sup> The use of this word is often more readily grasped in a language, like Italian, which is derived from Latin because, as Mark Miravalle points out:

The prefix “co” does not mean equal, but comes from the Latin word, “*cum*” which means “with”. The title of *Coredemptrix* applied to the Mother of Jesus *never places Mary on a level of equality with Jesus Christ, the divine Lord of all, in the saving process of humanity's redemption*. Rather, it denotes Mary's singular and unique *sharing with her Son* in the saving work of redemption for the human family. The Mother of Jesus *participates* in the redemptive work of her *Saviour Son, who alone could reconcile humanity with the Father in his glorious divinity and humanity*.<sup>96</sup>

In commenting on the dialogue between Gabriel and Mary at the Annunciation, he develops the Eve-Mary antithesis at length<sup>97</sup> and reproduces the classic text of Irenaeus about Mary untying the knot made by Eve without citing the source.<sup>98</sup> In a retrospective view which he provides towards the end of *Maria Riparatrice* Father Celona considers Mary's association in the entire reparative life of Jesus,<sup>99</sup> distinguishes with great care between Jesus' role as the only Redeemer and Mary's secondary and dependent participation in the work of our redemption while at the same time insisting on the qualitative difference between her cooperation and that of all the saints.<sup>100</sup> Finally he distinguishes between the Passion of Jesus and the Compassion of Mary precisely with regard to reparation:

The compassion of Mary contained in itself a magnificent and monumental reparation. Reparation is an essential element in all holiness – and it should be well noted – the entire endeavor of the Church of Jesus, as well as of its saints is a continual reparation for the iniquity committed by men in the Passion of Jesus.

Now if all of the reparations made by the Church and the saints to the end of the world were put together they would still not have as much value as the Compassion of Mary who, by virtue of her immense and unapproachable holiness, exceeds every other reparation.

This reparation was offered to the divine nature of Our Lord for the outrage which was made to his divine person and was almost proportionate to the same outrage. *It was a reparation made to him by his own Mother, also in the name of all men and thus of itself most pleasing and appropriate for its purpose. Jesus, on his part, offered his Passion to the Father in reparation for the sins of the world; the Mother [offered her Compassion] to God the Son. From the other perspective, uniting and beautifully interweaving all of*

---

<sup>95</sup> *Maria Riparatrice* 303.

<sup>96</sup> Mark I. Miravalle, S.T.D., *Mary: Coredemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate* (Santa Barbara, CA: Queenship Publishing, 1993) xv.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Maria Riparatrice* 78-82.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *Maria Riparatrice* 81.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. *Maria Riparatrice* 302-303.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *Maria Riparatrice* 303-305.

*their reparations, they offered to God the Trinity the most beautiful homage and tribute of the most perfect religion that ever rose from the earth to heaven.*<sup>101</sup>

Here, as in Father Celona's entire volume, we find both the subjective and objective poles of Mary's reparation: that which is offered to Jesus as God and that which is offered in union with him in his human nature to God the Father for our redemption. It might be argued that in *Maria Riparatrice* he brought both strands of this thematic to a new synthesis.

#### **IV. *Maria Reparatrix* in the Papal Magisterium**

It is well known that the magisterium is conservative in the sense that it does not immediately embrace new terminology or ideas, but, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, wisely awaits the right moment to introduce terms and concepts which may serve in the propagation of the truths of faith. Thus it is with the term *reparatrix*, which makes its entry in Blessed Pius IX's Apostolic Constitution *Ineffabilis Deus* of 8 December 1854, at the conclusion of which he declared the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception:

They [the Fathers] also declared that the most glorious Virgin was Reparatrix of the first parents [*parentum reparatricem*], the giver of life to posterity [*posterorum vivificatricem*]; that she was chosen before the ages, prepared for Himself by the Most High, foretold by God when He said to the Serpent, "I will put enmities between thee and the woman" – unmistakable evidence that she has crushed the poisonous head of the serpent.<sup>102</sup>

What is particularly fascinating about this statement is that the original Latin text reproduces exactly the terminology of St. Bernard which we have just examined, without, however citing him as a source – and, indeed, it is perfectly legitimate to make use of his words as a summary of the tradition in this regard. In any case, let us take note that the context makes clear that Mary is being presented in this passage as the New Eve who repairs the evil done by the first parents.

We next find the word occurring in Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter *Adiutricem Populi* of 5 September 1895. In this document, considered to be the greatest of all ten of his doctrinally rich rosary encyclicals,<sup>103</sup> he asserted that among Mary's

many other titles we find her hailed as "Our Lady," our "Mediatrice" (St. Bernard, *Serm. II in Adv. Domini*, n.5), the "Reparatrix of the Whole World" (St. Tharadius, *Or. in Præsent. Deip.*), "the Dispenser of all Heavenly Gifts" (*In offic. Græc., VII dec. Theotokion post oden IX*).<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup>*Maria Riparatrice* 306-307 [my trans.]. Emphasis my own.

<sup>102</sup>Tondini 46 [OL #52].

<sup>103</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 219.

<sup>104</sup>Tondini 224 [OL #170].

Here it is interesting to note that this document refers the quotation “Reparatrix of the Whole World” [*reparatricem totius orbis*] to St. Tarasius of Constantinople, but as we have seen above, it would seem to have been more accurate to have referred to her as “restoration of the whole world” since the Greek phrase employed by Tarasius is *tés oikoumenés hé anaklésis* and this was duly rendered into Latin as *totius orbis reparatio*.<sup>105</sup> I have not been able to determine the source of this discrepancy. But, in any case this is a rather minor point since both terms effectively indicate Mary’s role in the restoration of the world: the original text sees her as the source of restoration<sup>106</sup> while Pope Leo’s puts more emphasis on her active role.

We find the term appearing again in Pope St. Pius X’s Encyclical Letter *Ad Diem Illum* of 2 February 1904 which was written to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. It occurs in a key passage of this notable encyclical:

*From this community of will and suffering between Christ and Mary “she merited to become most worthily the reparatrix of the lost world” (Eadmer, De Excellentia Virg. Mariæ, c. 9) and dispensatrix of all the gifts that our Savior purchased for us by his death and by his blood.*

It cannot of course be denied that the dispensing of these treasures is the particular and supreme right of Jesus Christ, for they are the exclusive fruit of His death, who by His Nature is the Mediator between God and man. Nevertheless, by this union in sorrow and suffering, as We have said, which existed between the Mother and the Son, it has been allowed to the August Virgin “to be the most powerful Mediatrix and advocate of the whole world, with her Divine Son” (cf. *Ineffabilis Deus*).<sup>107</sup>

Once again we find a Supreme Pontiff citing an important historical figure about Mary’s reparative role in the work of our redemption. This time it is Eadmer whose text we have already seen above. What should be noted here in particular is that, while this passage also manifests the medieval development of the concept of merit and the distribution or mediation of graces, the context remains quite clearly that of the New Adam and the New Eve. The “community of will and suffering” [*communione dolorum ac voluntatis*], the “union in sorrow and suffering” [*dolorum atque ærumnarum Matris cum Filio communione*] is a way of describing what Father Cignelli calls “a single total principle of salvation”<sup>108</sup> and what Monsignor Gherardini refers to as a “conjoint action”.<sup>109</sup> While this text also integrates the developments of popular piety toward the “Sorrowful Passion” and the “Sorrowful Mother”, it cannot be denied that at the same time it still follows directly from the exposition of St. Irenaeus: Mary is rightly called the “Reparatrix of the lost world”.

---

<sup>105</sup> *PG* 98:1499.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *TMPM* 2:637.

<sup>107</sup> Tondini 312 [*OL* #233]. Emphasis my own. The reference to *Ineffabilis Deus* may be found in Tondini [*OL* #64].

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Cignelli 236 [my trans.].

<sup>109</sup> *La Corredentrice* 117.

The final magisterial document of which I am aware as referring to Our Lady as *reparatrix* is Pope Pius XI's Encyclical Letter *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of 8 May 1928 along with its accompanying "Act of Reparation". This is a foundational and authoritative document on the theology of reparation which deserves to be much better known. In it the Pope also makes explicit reference to Christ as *Reparator* in speaking of the "infinite love of our Repairer" [*Reparatoris caritatem infinitam*].<sup>110</sup> Unfortunately, the precise terminology of Pius XI, meant to illustrate the Heart of Jesus as symbolizing the reparative love offered by Jesus to the Father in atonement for our sins, is rendered in English translations of the encyclical as the "infinite love of our Redeemer" or the "infinite charity of our Redeemer". These renditions were no doubt made out of fear on the part of the translators that to speak of Jesus as "Repairer" or "Offerer of reparation" would be unduly awkward, but they do, nonetheless obscure the Pope's clear intention to indicate the Heart of Jesus as symbolizing Christ's work of offering the Father perfect reparation.

It is in this precise sense that Pius XI speaks of Mary as *Reparatrix* in his solemn conclusion of the encyclical:

May the most gracious Mother of God, who gave us Jesus as Redeemer, who reared Him, and at the foot of the Cross offered Him as Victim, who by her mysterious union with Christ and by her matchless grace rightly merits the name *Reparatrix*, deign to smile upon Our wishes and Our undertakings. Trusting in her intercession with Christ our Lord, who though sole Mediator between God and man (I Tim. 2:5), wished however to make His Mother the advocate for sinners and the dispenser and mediatrix of His grace, from the bottom of Our heart as a token of heavenly favor and of Our fatherly solicitude We heartily impart to you and to all the faithful entrusted to your care Our Apostolic Benediction.<sup>111</sup>

This is the first instance of the use of the term *reparatrix* in the papal magisterium in which the word is not attributed to any ecclesiastical author; it is simply used in a sense which is illuminated by the context of the entire encyclical. Like the text of St. Pius X cited above, it is a statement rich in theological implications. It underscores Mary's collaboration in the work of redemption in terms of her giving birth to Christ, rearing and offering him as victim [*Redemptorem ediderit, aluerit, apud crucem hostiam obtulerit*] as well as her mysterious union with him [*arcanam cum Christo coniunctionem*] and her matchless grace [*eiusdemque gratiam omnino singularem*] as rightly meriting the title of *Reparatrix* for her [*Reparatrix item exstitit pieque appellatur*].

Attached to the encyclical was an "Act of Reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus" [*Precatio Piacularis ad Sacratissimum Cor Iesu*] which Pius XI mandated for annual recitation on the Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Mary's position as *Reparatrix*

---

<sup>110</sup> AAS 20 (1928) 172.

<sup>111</sup> AAS 20 (1928) 178 [OL #287]. Emphasis my own.

is also carefully delineated in the final section of that prayer which is addressed to the Lord Jesus:

Would, O divine Jesus, we were able to wash away such abominations with our blood. We now offer, in reparation for these violations of Thy divine honour, the satisfaction Thou didst once make to Thy eternal Father on the cross and which Thou dost continue to renew daily on our altars; we offer it in union with the acts of atonement of Thy Virgin Mother and all the Saints and of the pious faithful on earth ... [*Quæ utinam crimina sanguine ipsi nostro eluere possemus! Interea ad violatum divinum honorem resarciendum, quam Tu olim Patri in cruce satisfactionem obtulisti quamque cotidie in altaribus renovare pergis, hanc eandem nos tibi præstamus, cum Virginis Matris, omnium Sanctorum, piorum quoque fidelium expiationibus coniunctam ...*]

O loving Jesus, through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary our model in reparation, deign to receive the voluntary offering we make of this act of expiation ... [*Excipias quæsumus, benignissime Iesu, B. Maria Reparatrice intercedente, voluntarium huius expiationis obsequium ...*].<sup>112</sup>

The wording here is very carefully crafted. The first point to be made is that we offer the satisfaction which Jesus once made on the cross in union with the acts of atonement made by Mary, the saints and the pious faithful on earth. The prayer at this point does not distinguish between Mary's role and that of the saints in heaven and the faithful on earth, but we could say that it nonetheless assumes her unique role as Reparatrix which is so clearly spelled out in the last lines of the encyclical and in the hierarchical order here whereby she takes precedence over the saints in heaven and the pious faithful on earth.

A second point to be noted is that even the official English translation of this prayer which follows the Latin original along with those in other modern languages in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* does not translate *Beata Maria Reparatrice intercedente* literally but resorts to the circumlocution “through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary our model in reparation”. In one sense, of course, this is quite understandable for two reasons. First, because there is no other human person who is such a perfect model of reparation as Mary. Secondly, because a literal translation like “with Blessed Mary the Repairer interceding” or “through the intercession of Blessed Mary the Repairer” would be awkward. The translation which appears in Raoul Plus’s *Reparation: Its History, Doctrine and Practice* renders “through the intercession of our Blessed Lady, our patroness in Reparation”<sup>113</sup> and that in the 1957 edition of *The Raccolta* renders “through the intercession of Our Lady of Reparation”.<sup>114</sup> Nonetheless the official Vatican

---

<sup>112</sup> AAS 20 (1928) 179 [185].

<sup>113</sup> Raoul Plus, S.J., *Reparation: Its History, Doctrine and Practice* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1931) 106, 108.

<sup>114</sup> *The Raccolta or A Manual of Indulgences* trans. Joseph P. Christopher, Charles E. Spence and John F. Rowan (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1957) 175.

translation as well as these others all to some extent obscure Mary's role, which is not just that of being a model, but of being "Repairer" along with Jesus, as the whole tradition rightly insists. The one translation that I can commend on this point is that provided by Sister Claudia Carlen in her collection, *The Papal Encyclicals*, which renders "by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Reparatrix"<sup>115</sup>.

A third and very significant point about Mary's position in the encyclical is made by Father Bertrand de Margerie:

The whole of this declaration shows that one must consider Mary as Repairer [*Réparatrice*] in the double objective and subjective sense: in giving us Christ the Savior, the only Repairer [*Réparateur*], Mary repairs [*répare*] the divine life in us and restores [*restaure*] it in our souls; and by the same token by her adoration she makes reparation [*répare*] for our sins to the Heart of Jesus. Consequently, she consoles us because she obtains pardon for our sins, and thus she consoles the divine Repairer [*Réparateur*] in accepting the revelation of the redemption in our name in faith and for our sake in hope. The consolation which she offered him at the foot of the Cross completely surpasses that which the Angel of the Agony was able to bring.<sup>116</sup>

It is not possible to enter here into a detailed analysis of the theology of *Miserentissimus Redemptor*. I have done that in another place.<sup>117</sup> What I would simply like to underscore here is that with this encyclical the appeal made by the Lord to St. Margaret Mary at Paray-le-Monial was solemnly transmitted to the entire Church as worthy of being believed and acted upon. In fact, given the Church's well-known circumspection with regard to private revelations,<sup>118</sup> it is quite remarkable that this encyclical makes explicit reference to Saint Margaret Mary four times<sup>119</sup>, quotes from the "great revelation" of June 1675<sup>120</sup> and offers a forthright theological rationale for the entreaty which was communicated to her by the Lord. To my knowledge, this is unparalleled in the history of the papal magisterium and it is definitely reflected in the "Act of Reparation". With *Miserentissimus Redemptor* we can say that the Church embraced the reparative spirituality of Paray-le-Monial which we saw represented by

---

<sup>115</sup> Claudia Carlen, I.H.M., *The Papal Encyclicals III: 1903-1939* (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co. "Consortium Books", 1981) 327, 328.

<sup>116</sup> HD 2:94 [my trans.]. The reference to the Angel of the Agony is to Lk. 22:43 and to Pius XI's treatment of this topic which is central to his argumentation in *Miserentissimus Redemptor*; cf. AAS 20 (1928) 174.

<sup>117</sup> "The Teaching of Pope John Paul II on the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Theology of Reparation" in Francesco Lepore e Donato D'Agostino (eds.) *Pax in Virtute. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Cardinale Giuseppe Caprio* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003) 271-323.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. CCC #67.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. AAS 20 (1928) 166, 167, 173, 177.

<sup>120</sup> AAS 20 (1928) 173.

Blessed Marie de Jésus, the foundress of the Society of Mary Reparatrix, and Father Antonino Celona, along with a host of others.

We have seen that in the closing lines of the encyclical Pius XI clearly presents Maria Reparatrix actively collaborating in the work of our redemption, particularly in the act of offering Christ as victim to the Father [*Redemptorem ediderit, aluerit, apud crucem hostiam obtulerit*]. In the “Act of Reparation”, on the other hand, we unite ourselves “with the acts of atonement of Thy Virgin Mother and all the Saints and of the pious faithful on earth” [*cum Virginis Matris, omnium Sanctorum, piorum quoque fidelium expiationibus coniunctam*]. In this statement Mary’s act of atonement (in the singular) could be understood in terms of her union with Jesus in the offering on Calvary, but her acts of atonement (in the plural since the text does not specify) could also be understood in terms of the reparation which she offered to Jesus there. Indeed, these two dispositions are not mutually exclusive and the text does not offer further precision, but does, in fact, place Mary on the side of “all the Saints and of the pious faithful on earth” rather than on the side of Christ as the New Adam. This is also true of the final petition of the “Act of Reparation” in which we ask Jesus to accept our offering of expiation through Mary’s intercession [*B. Maria Reparatrice intercedente*].

What emerges here, it seems to me, are two legitimate interpretations of *Maria Reparatrix*: the classical one which sees her in her secondary and subordinate role on the side of Christ and the other which enters with the spirituality of Paray-le-Monial and sees her on our side, leading us in making reparation to Christ. In the first case we see Mary in her christotypical role (or in her identification with Christ); in the second we see her in her ecclesiotypical role (or in her identification with the Church).<sup>121</sup> As I have already indicated, these two interpretations are not mutually exclusive. Whereas Father de Margerie sees both of these interpretations, which he refers to respectively as “objective” and “subjective”, present in the encyclical, I see the first in the encyclical and the second in the “Act of Reparation”.

## V. *Maria Reparatrix* in the Liturgy

In this section I wish to investigate the theme of *Maria Reparatrix* as it is testified to in the Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary.<sup>122</sup> This Collection, issued according to the Decree *Christi mysterium celebrans* of the Congregation for Divine Worship of 15 August 1986, is described in this way by Abbot Cuthbert Johnson, O.S.B. and Father Anthony Ward, S.M.:

The Collection is not strictly a new liturgical book nor a supplement to the Roman Missal, nor is it a wholly original composition. The Masses given in the Collection have, for the most part, been drawn from the Roman

---

<sup>121</sup>Cf. *Theotokos* 100-101.

<sup>122</sup>*Collectio Missarum de Beata Maria Virgine* 2 vols. (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987). English translation: *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary* 2 vols. (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1992).

Missal or from the Propers of Masses of local Churches or Religious Orders and Institutes. It is precisely what its name indicates: a gathering under one cover of several Masses in honour of the Virgin Mary. The material is gathered and sanctioned by authority for use in Marian sanctuaries, in the celebration of Saturday Masses of Our Lady, and other such occasions provided for by law.<sup>123</sup>

The Church's public worship, like her magisterium, is a privileged place for coming to grasp her deepest belief. Here is how the relationship between faith and liturgy is put in the Catechism of the Catholic Church:

The Church's faith precedes the faith of the believer who is invited to adhere to it. When the Church celebrates the sacraments, she confesses the faith received from the apostles – whence the ancient saying: *lex orandi, lex credendi* (or: *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*, according to Prosper of Aquitaine [5<sup>th</sup> cent.]). The law of prayer is the law of faith: the Church believes as she prays. Liturgy is a constitutive element of the holy and living Tradition.<sup>124</sup>

Blessed Pope Paul VI also cited this classic dictum *lex orandi, lex credendi* in his Apostolic Exhortation *Marialis Cultus* with specific reference to the place of Mary in the Church's worship:

The Church's devotion to the Blessed Virgin is an intrinsic element of Christian worship. The honor which the Church has always and everywhere shown to the Mother of the Lord, from the blessing with which Elizabeth greeted Mary (cf. Lk. 1:42-45) right up to the expressions of praise and petition used today, is a very strong witness to the Church's norm of prayer and an invitation to become more deeply conscious of her norm of faith. And the converse is likewise true. The Church's norm of faith requires that her norm of prayer should everywhere blossom forth with regard to the Mother of Christ.<sup>125</sup>

The first instance of the theme of *Maria Reparatrix* occurs in the Preface of the very first Mass of the Collection, that of "The Blessed Virgin Mary, Chosen Daughter of Israel" [*B.M.V., Electa Israel Progenies*]:

She is by nature the daughter of Adam, who by her sinlessness undid the sin of Eve. [*Ipsa enim condicione filia est Adæ, quæ culpam matris innocentia reparavit.*]<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup>*Notitiæ* 287-279 (1989) 633.

<sup>124</sup>CCC #1124.

<sup>125</sup>AAS 66 (1974) 162 [St. Paul Editions, #56, p. 46].

<sup>126</sup>*Collection* #1. Emphasis my own.

As we will almost always find to be the case, the Latin makes the point with more clarity than the English: Mary, the daughter of Adam, repairs or makes reparation for the fault of the mother, Eve. This we recognize immediately as an accurate reflection of the tradition handed on to us by Irenaeus of Lyons.

The second instance of our theme occurs in the first Opening Prayer of the second Mass of “The Blessed Virgin Mary at the Foot of the Cross” [*B.M.V. iuxta Crucem Domini, II*]:

Lord our God, you placed at the side of your suffering Son his mother to suffer with him, so that the human race, deceived by the wiles of the devil, might become a new and resplendent creation. [*Deus, qui ad humanam substantiam diabolica fraude deceptam mirabiliter reparandam Filio tuo patienti compatientem Matrem sociasti, ...*]<sup>127</sup>

Once again, the English, while rightly emphasizing Mary’s co-suffering or “compassion” with the suffering or “passion” of Christ, unfortunately and completely misses the idea of reparation. Without proposing here a definitive translation for liturgical use, but simply in order to bring out what disappears in the English translation, I would render this opening clause thus: “O God, who have associated the co-suffering Mother with your suffering Son in order to repair in a marvelous manner human nature deceived by diabolical fraud, ...” In this way we see clearly that the prayer underscores Mary’s active participation in the suffering of Christ in order to restore human nature.

The third liturgical example which we find is in the second or alternative Opening Prayer of the Mass of “The Blessed Virgin Mary, Seat of Wisdom” [*B.M.V., Sedes Sapientiae*]:

God of wisdom, in your desire to restore us to your friendship after we had lost it by sin, you chose the Blessed Virgin Mary as the seat of your Wisdom. [*Sapientissime Deus, qui lapsum reparaturus hominem, beatam Virginem Mariam Sapientiae tuae sedem ordinasti: ..*]<sup>128</sup>

Here we have a very precise statement that Mary was chosen by God, ordained as the seat of his Wisdom i.e., the bearer of Wisdom Incarnate, in order to restore fallen man. Of course, because of fear of trampling upon feminist sensitivities, the translators weren't free to say this so directly, but it is a statement in complete harmony with the whole tradition.

The final illustration of our theme comes from the first invocation of the Third “Solemn Blessing for Ordinary Time” [*Benedictiones Sollemnes: Tempore «Per Annum» III*]:

---

<sup>127</sup>Collection #12.

<sup>128</sup>Collection #24. Emphasis my own.

May the Father of mercies bless you through the intercession of blessed Mary, ever virgin, through whom he chose to remedy the fall of our first parents. [*Benedicat vos misericors Pater, beatæ Mariæ semper virginis intercessione, per quam voluit lapsum primæ mulieris reparare.*]<sup>129</sup>

Here we must commend the translator(s) for having admirably rendered the concept of *lapsum reparare* with “remedy the fall”, but we must fault him or them for having succumbed to feminist pressure in mistranslating *lapsum primæ mulieris* as “the fall of our first parents”. As we noted Father Cignelli pointing out above, Mary has a two-fold function in remedying the fall first of the whole human race and secondly in remedying the fall of Eve. This is an important point, but one which militant feminism cannot abide.<sup>130</sup>

These four examples serve admirably to indicate how the Roman liturgy, even in its modern vesture, illustrates the maxim *lex orandi, lex credendi* with regard to Maria Reparatrix as companion of the Redeemer in his work of redemption.<sup>131</sup>

## VI. Conclusions from Part I

1. We have examined the theme of *Maria Reparatrix* in the patristic and medieval periods as well as in the magisterium and the liturgy. From the historical, magisterial and liturgical perspectives we find Mary presented to us as the New Eve, indissolubly linked with the New Adam in the work of our redemption, in repairing the damage done by the first Adam and Eve and in restoring and renewing the human race. This follows organically from the earliest documentation of the tradition, which was given its classical form in the witness of St. Irenaeus of Lyons, and which may well have proceeded directly from the apostolic preaching.

2. With the modern period, the subjective current which derives from the spirituality of Paray-le-Monial, entered into Catholic spirituality and presented *Maria Reparatrix* as the model of *redamatio*, the chief offerer of reparation to Jesus in returning love for love. We have noted how this emphasis is exemplified in the spirituality of Blessed Marie de Jésus, the foundress of the Society of Mary Reparatrix, and in that of the Servant of God Antonino Celona.

<sup>129</sup> *Collection* #71. Emphasis my own. Here I follow the numeration for the Solemn Blessings given in *Notitia* (278-279) 646-648.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Joyce A. Little, *The Church and the Culture War: Secular Anarchy or Sacred Order* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995) and my review of her book in *Miles Immaculatae* XXXIV (Luglio/Dicembre 1998) 497-500.

<sup>131</sup> For a more extensive study of coredemptive themes in the *Collection*, cf. Arthur Burton Calkins, "Mary as Coredemptrix, Mediatrix and Advocate in the Contemporary Roman Liturgy," in Mark I. Miravalle, S.T.D., (ed.), *Mary Coredemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate, Theological Foundations: Towards a Papal Definition?* (Santa Barbara, CA: Queenship Publishing Company, 1995) 45-68.

3. Pius XI's Encyclical Letter *Miserentissimus Redemptor* and the accompanying "Act of Reparation" presented the figure of *Maria Reparatrix* in a way that unites both of these complementary currents. With these two documents the subjective interpretation emerges as a new theme in the papal magisterium, but the objective dimension is not in any way abandoned. What we witness in the "Act of Reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus" is an assimilation of the reparative spirituality of Paray-le-Monial, now fully integrated into the magisterium. Thus Mary is described as *Reparatrix* in her coredemptive role in union with Jesus as well as in her role as the principal offerer of reparation to him.

4. The coming together of these complementary currents is illustrated beautifully and at length in the writings of the Servant of God Antonino Celona who had the benefit of meditating for years on the Church's Christological and Mariological patrimony, the testimony of the mystical tradition and the theology of reparation in the light of *Miserentissimus Redemptor*. He offers us a marvelous synthesis on this topic in his book *Maria Reparatrix*.

5. While we have explicitly treated of Mary's Immaculate Heart as accompanying the reparation made to the Father by the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus and made to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, all that we have dealt with above corresponds to the statement of the Congregation of Rites in 1944 "since under the symbol of this heart [the Immaculate Heart of Mary] she [the Church] venerates with reverence the eminent and singular holiness of the Mother of God and especially her most ardent love for God and Jesus her Son and moreover her maternal compassion for all those redeemed by the divine Blood".<sup>132</sup>

## **Part Two: Reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary**

### **I. Historical Context**

Although the concept of reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary seems to be a relatively recent phenomenon in the life of the Church, especially linked to the apparitions of Our Lady at Fatima<sup>133</sup> and subsequently to the Servant of God Sister Lúcia of Jesus and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, O.C.D. (1907-2005),<sup>134</sup> its roots are much deeper. We find the great propagator of devotion to the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, Saint John Eudes (1601-1680), calling for reparation to her Admirable Heart:

---

<sup>132</sup>Sacred Congregation of Rites, 4 May 1944 [AAS 37 (1945) 50].

<sup>133</sup>Louis Kondor, SVD (ed.), *Fatima in Lucia's Own Words: Sister Lucia's Memoirs* Trans. Dominican Nuns of Perpetual Rosary (Fatima, Portugal: Postulation Centre, 1976) [henceforth referred to as Kondor] 108, 161, 162.

<sup>134</sup>Kondor 195-197; António Maria Martins, SJ (ed. & trans.), *Memórias e Cartas da Irmã Lúcia* (Porto, Portugal: Simão Guimarães Filhos, Lda.) [henceforth referred to as Martins] 409-411.

Is it not we miserable sinners who pierced this most innocent Heart of Mary, at the time of the Passion of the Savior, with countless thousands of shafts of sorrow by our innumerable sins? How greatly are we obliged then to render all the honor within our power in order to make some reparation for the most bitter anguish that we caused her loving Heart to suffer.<sup>135</sup>

In terms of the magisterium we find the concept already emerging in the early nineteenth century in grants of indulgences. Already in 1808 the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences granted an indulgence for the recitation a series of prayer to Our Lady for every day of the week composed by Saint Alphonsus de' Liguori (1696-1787), requiring that each should be concluded with three Hail Marys in reparation for blasphemies uttered against Our Lady by unbelievers and as well as by Christians.<sup>136</sup> Likewise in 1885 the same congregation indulgenced an Act of Reparation for Blasphemies against the B.V.M.<sup>137</sup> In 1914 the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office indulgenced a prayer In Reparation for Insults offered to the B.V.M.<sup>138</sup> Finally and most interestingly for our consideration, there was the grant of indulgence by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office in 1912 for

The faithful who on the first Saturday of each month perform some special exercises of devotion in honor of the B.V.M. Immaculate, in order to make atonement for the blasphemies whereby the name and prerogatives of the same Blessed Virgin are reviled ...<sup>139</sup>

This had originally come as a result of the meeting of the Venerable Maria Dolores Inglese (1866-1928)<sup>140</sup> with Pope Saint Pius X, who already in 1904 granted an indulgence for the practice of the Communion of reparation to Our Lady at her request.

---

<sup>135</sup> Saint John Eudes, *The Admirable Heart of Mary* Trans. by Charles di Targiani and Ruth Hauser (NY: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1948) 265.

<sup>136</sup> *The Raccolta: A Manual of Indulgences* Edited and Translated by Joseph P. Christopher, Charles E. Spence, John F. Rowan (Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1957) #334; Cf. Saint Alphonsus de' Liguori, *The Glories of Mary* trans. by Eugene Grimm, C.Ss.R. (Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931) 655.

<sup>137</sup> *The Raccolta* #328.

<sup>138</sup> *The Raccolta* #329. This prayer also referred to Our Lady as “Coredemptrix of the human race”.

<sup>139</sup> *The Raccolta* #367. It also went on to grant a further plenary indulgence for those “who once in their lifetime perform such a devout exercise on the first Saturdays of eight successive months.”

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Domenico Agasso, *Maria Dolores: Il fascino dell'inattuale* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004); Madre Maria Dolores Inglese, *Quanto è Buona Maria! (Autobiografia)* n. d. On the Marian devotion, which had developed regarding the miraculous image at Rovigo and to which the Venerable Maria Dolores had contributed, cf. Maria Maura Muraro, *L'Addolorata di Rovigo: Storia – culto – spiritualità* (Rome Edizioni «Marianum», 1995).

She was already deeply committed to reparation to Our Lady and in 1911 entered the Third Order Servite community of women religious in Adria in the Veneto region of Italy known as *Serve di Maria*. They eventually incorporated her charism into their constitutions and thus became known as *Serve di Maria Riparatrici* or Reparative Servants of Mary.

All of this sets the stage for the explicit request for reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary in the Fatima apparitions.

## II. Fatima

Up until the time of the Fatima apparitions, it would seem that the primary emphasis on reparation to Mary or to her Immaculate Heart, which in any case represents her person, was primarily on trying to shift the balance from offenses to acts of thanksgiving and praise. In terms of the virtue of justice this is laudable. It strives to overcome the negative with the positive and is an invitation to praise the Mother of God, the most perfect work of his entire creation. The Fatima event, on the other hand, seems to open up new or at least deeper reasons for reparation on the soteriological level: to strive to console her sufferings. This seems to have been grasped intuitively by Blessed Jacinta Marto (1908-1919) who is reported as saying “I am so grieved to be unable to receive Communion in reparation for the sins committed against the Immaculate Heart of Mary!”<sup>141</sup> It is made much more explicit in Lúcia’s fourth memoir regarding the apparition of 13 June 1917: “In front of the palm of Our Lady’s right hand was a heart encircled by thorns which pierced it. We understood that this was the Immaculate Heart of Mary, outraged by the sins of humanity, and seeking reparation.”<sup>142</sup> Lúcia records this episode, which took place when she was a Dorothean sister in Pontevedra, Spain:

On December 10<sup>th</sup>, 1925, the most holy Virgin appeared to her, and by her side, elevated on a luminous cloud, was a child. The most holy Virgin rested her hand on her shoulder, and as she did so, she showed her a heart encircled by thorns, which she was holding in her other hand. At the same time, the Child said:

“Have compassion on the Heart of your most holy Mother, covered with thorns, with which ungrateful men pierce it at every moment, and there is no one to make an act of reparation to remove them.”

Then the most holy Virgin said:

“Look, daughter, at my Heart, surrounded with thorns with which ungrateful men pierce me at every moment by their blasphemies and ingratitude. You at least try to console me and say that I promise to assist at the hour of death, with the graces necessary for salvation, all those who, on the first Saturday of five consecutive months, shall confess, receive Holy Communion, recite five decades of the Rosary, and keep me

---

<sup>141</sup> Kondor 108.

<sup>142</sup> Kondor 161.

company for fifteen minutes while meditation on the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary, with the intention of making reparation to me.”<sup>143</sup>

### III. The Question

The theological question now presents itself: if Mary, the New Eve, is now in heavenly glory, sharing in the triumph of Jesus, the New Adam, how can she be said to be suffering and seeking consolation? I believe that the answer to this question, insofar as we can perceive this mystery in this life, is based first of all on the analogy between Jesus and Mary, between his Sacred Heart and her Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart between consecration and reparation to his Heart and to her Heart. Let us consider first the philosophical and theological principal of analogy.

### IV. Reparation to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus

Now that we have established the analogy between the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, let us consider the Church’s teaching on reparation to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus.<sup>144</sup> While it is certainly true, as Father Édouard Glotin, S.J. pointed out in a very insightful study, that there had been a gradual process of “reading the Passion in the Heart of Jesus” in the course of the centuries before Margaret Mary,<sup>145</sup> nonetheless, it cannot be denied that hers was the pivotal role in transmitting the appeal of the Heart of Jesus for consolation to the heart of the Church. If this was her providential role in the plan of God, we can also say that the most solemn and authoritative transmission of this appeal on the part of the Church’s magisterium thus far has been Pope Pius XI’s classic encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of 8 May 1928. In fact, given the Church’s well-known circumspection with regard to private revelations,<sup>146</sup> it is quite remarkable that this encyclical makes explicit reference to Saint Margaret Mary four times<sup>147</sup> and offers an unabashed theological rationale for the entreaty which was communicated to her by the Lord.<sup>148</sup> To my knowledge, this is unparalleled in the history of the modern papal magisterium.

---

<sup>143</sup> Kondor 195.

<sup>144</sup> I have dealt with this entire topic in a much broader context and more detailed way in “The Teaching of Pope John Paul II on the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Theology of Reparation” in Francesco Lepore e Donato D’Agostino (eds.) *Pax in Virtute. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Cardinale Giuseppe Caprio* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003) 271-323.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Édouard Glotin, S.J., *Le Cœur de Jésus: Approches anciennes et nouvelles* (Namur, Belgium: Collection Vie Consacrée #16, 1997) 111-162.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [henceforth referred to as CCC] #67.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. AAS 20 (1928) 166, 167, 173, 177 [Raoul Plus, S.J., *Reparation: Its History, Doctrine and Practice* (NY: Benziger Brothers, 1931) 92, 94, 100, 105].

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Robert A. Stackpole, *Consoling the Heart of Jesus: A History of the Notion and its Practice, especially as found in the Ascetical and Mystical Tradition of the Church* (Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a S. Thoma Aq. in Urbe, 2001) 155.

After having expounded the dogmatic basis for devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and outlined the practices of consecration to it and the need for reparation, Pius XI quotes what has come to be known as the “great revelation” which was made to Saint Margaret Mary in June of 1675:

Behold this Heart that has so loved men and loaded them with benefits, but in return for its infinite love, far from finding any gratitude, has met only with neglect, indifference and insult, and these sometimes from souls that owe him a special duty of love.<sup>149</sup>

Following this, the Pope considered the practice of the “communion of reparation” and the “holy hour” as particular means of responding to this loving plaint of Christ.

All of this was prelude to the following theological question: “But how can these rites of expiation bring solace now, when Christ is already reigning in the beatitude of heaven?”<sup>150</sup> As a preliminary response Pius XI first cited a very apposite quotation from St. Augustine: “Give me one who loves, and he will understand what I say,”<sup>151</sup> and then gave the following reply:

*If, then, in foreseeing the sins of the future the soul of Jesus became sorrowful unto death, it cannot be doubted that he already felt some comfort when he foresaw our reparation, when “there appeared to him an Angel from heaven” (Lk. 22:43) bearing consolation to his heart overcome with sorrow and anguish. Hence even now in a mysterious, but true, manner we may and should comfort the Sacred Heart, continually wounded by the sins of ungrateful men.*<sup>152</sup>

The possibility of our offering “retroactive” reparation or consolation to the Heart of Jesus is something that had long been held in the Catholic mystical tradition<sup>153</sup> and was fully compatible with the Catholic theological tradition on the threefold human knowledge of Christ. Briefly this refers to the fact that as a wayfarer in his earthly life Jesus possessed three kinds of human knowledge: acquired, infused and beatific.

The first kind came to Him, as it does to other men, from the exercise of His senses and His reason; the second was immediately communicated to His

---

<sup>149</sup>AAS 20 (1928) [Plus173].

100]. The original French text is found in F.-L. Gauthey (ed.), *Vie et Œuvres de Sainte Marguerite-Marie Alacoque* (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Poussielgue, 1920) II:103.

<sup>150</sup>AAS 20 (1928) 173. Here I am using the English translation provided in Claudia Carlen, I.H.M., *The Papal Encyclicals 1903-1939* (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co. “Consortium Books”, 1981). III:325.

<sup>151</sup>*In Ioannis evangelium*, tract. XXVI, 4; AAS 20 (1928) 173 [Carlen III:325].

<sup>152</sup>AAS 20 (1928) 174 [Plus 101] (emphasis my own).

<sup>153</sup>Cf. Stackpole 71-149.

human soul by His Divine Person, and the third gave Him immediate knowledge of His Father.<sup>154</sup>

It was only in the next pontificate, however, that the Venerable Pius XII in his encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis* offered an explicit corroboration on the magisterial level of what his predecessor had already taught:

This most loving knowledge of our Divine Redeemer, of which we were the object from the first moment of his Incarnation, exceeds all that the human intellect can hope to grasp. *For hardly was he conceived in the womb of the Mother of God, when he began to enjoy the beatific vision, and in that vision all the members of his Mystical Body were continually and unceasingly present to him, and he embraced them with his redeeming love.*<sup>155</sup>

While it is true that Pius XI did not explicitly refer to Christ's beatific vision in the citation from *Miserentissimus Redemptor* given above, it seems the most obvious and direct way to understand his statement about Christ's foreknowledge of our sins and of our acts of reparation.<sup>156</sup> His successor's assertion in *Mystici Corporis* provided an excellent hermeneutic key to illuminate what he had already taught. It should also be noted that Pius XII offered a further precision on this matter in his great Sacred Heart encyclical *Haurietis Aquas* by stating that the "Heart of the Incarnate Word"

is the symbol of that burning love which, infused into His soul, enriches the human will of Christ and enlightens and governs its acts by *the most perfect knowledge derived both from the beatific vision and that which is directly infused.*<sup>157</sup>

Here Pius XII was distinguishing between the human knowledge of Christ insofar as it derived directly from the beatific vision<sup>158</sup> and that which was directly infused for the sake

---

<sup>154</sup>Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., *The Human Knowledge of Christ* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1980) 13. The entire work is lucidly written and valuable in clarifying this initial statement. Cf. *Summa Theologiae* [henceforth referred to as *ST*] III, 9, a. 1-4. This matter is treated from many perspectives in the special number of *Doctor Communis* XXXVI, N. 2-3 (Maggio-Dicembre 1983) entitled *La Visione Beatifica di Cristo Viatore*. For an excellent general exposition of the traditional teaching, cf. Albert Schlizter, C.S.C., *Redemptive Incarnation: Sources and Their Theological Development in the Study of Christ* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962) 151-170.

<sup>155</sup>*D-H* #3812 (emphasis my own).

<sup>156</sup>Some authors had argued that it was on the basis of Christ's infused knowledge.

<sup>157</sup>AAS 48 (1956) 327-328; *D-H* #3924; [*Haurietis Aquas* #56] (emphasis my own).

<sup>158</sup>Instead of speaking of the "beatific vision" the *CCC* #473 speaks of "the intimate and immediate knowledge that the Son of God made man has of his Father", but it is arguable that this text is dealing with the same reality; cf. Stackpole 338-342.

of his mission.<sup>159</sup> The distinction between these two modes of knowing in Christ was based on the traditional doctrine of the threefold human knowledge of Christ, which was given classic form in the teaching of Saint Thomas Aquinas.<sup>160</sup>

With regard to the interpretation of what Pius XI stated in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* about Christ's foreknowledge of our sins and also of our loving acts of reparation, two schools of thought developed. One held that this foreknowledge derives directly from Christ's beatific vision<sup>161</sup> while the other held that it derives from his infused knowledge.<sup>162</sup> Both of these positions seem compatible with the teaching of Pope Pius XI and within the parameters of the teaching of the papal magisterium, although I strongly favor the position of the protagonists of the beatific vision and will continue to assume that position.<sup>163</sup> Without taking sides on the matter the Catechism of the Catholic Church states

Jesus knew and loved us each and all during his life, his agony and his Passion, and gave himself up for each one of us: "The Son of God ... loved me and gave himself for me." He has loved us all with a human heart. For this reason, the Sacred Heart of Jesus, pierced by our sins and for our salvation, "is quite rightly considered the chief sign and symbol of that ... love with which the divine Redeemer continually loves the eternal Father and all human beings" without exception.<sup>164</sup>

What I have been presenting here has been summarized and skillfully presented to the general public by Father Michael Gaitley, MIC in his excellent book *Consoling the Heart of Jesus*.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup>#473 of the CCC seems to allude to this kind of knowledge in stating "The Son in his human knowledge also showed the divine penetration he had into the secret thoughts of human hearts".

<sup>160</sup>Cf. ST III, 9-12 and Stackpole 266-275.

<sup>161</sup>The late Monsignor Antonio Piolanti was perhaps the most eminent representative of this position. Cf. his article "Compresenza dei dolori del Cuore di Cristo ai peccati degli uomini e ripercussione sullo stesso divin Cuore delle soddisfazioni dei giusti" in Bea, Rahner, Rondet, Schwendimann (eds.), *Cor Jesu: Commentationes in Litteras Encyclicas Pii PP. XII "Haurietis Aquas"* Vol, I: *Pars Theologica* (Rome: Casa Editrice Herder, 1959) 657-682. Cf. comments in Stackpole 288-290.

<sup>162</sup>Father Bertrand de Margerie, S.J. held strictly to this position in *Histoire Doctrinale du Culte envers le Cœur de Jésus* t. 2: *L'amour devenu Lumière(s)* (Paris: Éditions Saint-Paul, 1995) 90-102. Stackpole presents summaries of the thought of a number of other distinguished theologians who took this position, pp. 283-288, 291-294.

<sup>163</sup>On the twentieth century papal magisterium in the human knowledge of Christ, cf. Stackpole 278-282.

<sup>164</sup>CCC #478.

<sup>165</sup>Michael E. Gaitley, MIC, *Consoling the Heart of Jesus: A Do-It-Yourself Retreat Inspired by the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (Stockbridge, MA: Marian Press, 2011) 41-59, 390-398.

## V. Theological Rationale for Reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary

Now after laying down this groundwork it is time to deal directly with the question: if Mary, the New Eve, is now in heavenly glory, sharing in the triumph of Jesus, the New Adam, how can she be said to be suffering and seeking consolation?

We have already taken note of the analogy between Jesus and Mary, between his Sacred Heart and her Immaculate Heart. Saint Louis Marie Grignon de Montfort also brought to the fore the relationship and analogy between consecration to Jesus and consecration to Mary, indicating at the same time Our Lady's role of mediation. Likewise, the Venerable Pius XII emphasized the complementarity of his consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary on 31 October 1942 to the consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus mandated by Leo XIII on 11 June 1899, while also underscoring Our Lady's mediatorial role of "hastening the triumph of the Kingdom of God":

Finally, just as the Church and the entire human race were consecrated to the Heart of your Jesus, because by placing in Him every hope, It may be for them a token and pledge of victory and salvation; so, henceforth, may they be perpetually consecrated to you, to your Immaculate Heart, O Our Mother and Queen of the world, in order that your love and protection may hasten the triumph of the Kingdom of God. [*Enfim como ao Coração do vosso Jesus foram consagrados a Igreja todo o género humano, para que, colocando n'Ele todas as suas esperanças, Ihes fosse sinal e penhor de vitória e salvação, assim desde hoje Vos sejam perpetuamente consagrados também a Vós e ao vosso Coração Imaculado para que o vosso amor e patrocínio apresse o triunfo do Reino de Deus.*

*Finalmente, siccome al Cuore del vostro Gesù furono consacrati la Chiesa e tutto il genere umano, perché, riponendo in Lui ogni speranza, Egli fosse per loro segno e pegno di vittoria e salvezza, così parimenti da oggi siano essi in perpetuo consacrati anche a Voi, al vostro Cuore Immacolato: affinché il vostro amore e patrocínio affrettino il trionfo del Regno di Dio.]*<sup>166</sup>

Given the analogies between Jesus and Mary that we have thus far recognized, we should suspect that there is also an analogy between reparation to the Heart of Jesus and reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. On the basis of what I have already presented, this would seem to be undeniable, but, as far as I know, only in the year 2000 did a theologian propose a specific theological basis for understanding the "how" of our reparation to the Heart of Mary, which follows analogously upon the teaching of Pius XI on reparation to the Heart of Jesus. True, Saint John Eudes, whom I quoted above, made a

---

<sup>166</sup> AAS 34 (1942) 318-319, 325 [*Our Lady: Papal Teachings*, trans. Daughters of St. Paul (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1961) {henceforth referred to as *OL*} #380 alt.]. The original Act of Consecration was made in Portuguese and published in the *Acta* in both Portuguese and Italian. Pius renewed it in Italian in St. Peter's Basilica on 8 December 1942.

passionate plea for the need for reparation to the Heart of Mary and mid-twentieth century theologians have made statements like the following one of Monsignor John F. Murphy:

Reparation to Mary is rooted in her union with Christ. Jesus and Mary, inseparable in life and action, are likewise inseparable in cult and in our acts of reparation. Every outrage committed against our blessed Lord is necessarily an outrage to His Mother and causes her more displeasure than offenses committed directly against her own person.

Since Jesus and Mary in virtue of *one*,<sup>167</sup> not two distinct decrees, are united inseparably in the work of Redemption, it is proper to integrate in some way the practice of reparation in the devotion to the Immaculate Heart. Reparation made to the Sacred Heart and reparation made to the Immaculate Heart are indeed acts which complement one another and which are most consonant with the origin, nature, and particular practices of each devotion.<sup>168</sup>

The theologian to whom I just referred above was the late Father Bertrand de Margerie, S.J. (1923-2003) whom I have already cited above and who gave a conference at the first Symposium on “Mary at the Foot of the Cross” entitled “The Knowledge of Mary and the Sacrifice of Jesus.”<sup>169</sup> The conference was in fact a kind of series of sketches, a work to be filled in by others, largely providing general references, rather than many specific ones. He himself said of it: “The main view here developed is only a theological hypothesis, quite daring and thought-provoking, submitted to the judgement of the Church and, in a particular way, of the persons here present.”<sup>170</sup> I happened to be one of the persons present on that occasion and I must admit that I don’t think his hypothesis was “daring” at all. I believe he had the grace of connecting dots and making use of his vast erudition in drawing logical and coherent conclusions. He began thus:

As Mother of God, Mary lived usually in the exercise of an ever-increasing faith, sharing with Paul the darkness of faith and with John its lights. Her faith did not exclude privileges in the order of knowledge in the measure in which they were necessary for the exercise of her mission as Mother of a

---

<sup>167</sup> The reference here is to this statement in Blessed Pius IX’s Apostolic Constitution *Ineffabilis Deus* in which he solemnly declared the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. In that authoritative document Pius stated that God by one and the same decree, had established the origin of Mary and the Incarnation of Divine Wisdom [*ad illius Virginis primordia transferre, quæ uno eodemque decreto cum divinæ Sapientiæ incarnatione fuerant præstituta*] *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* I: (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck – n. Verlagsanstalt, 1971) 599 [OL #34].

<sup>168</sup> Murphy, *Mary’s Immaculate Heart* 108-109.

<sup>169</sup> Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., “The Knowledge of Mary and the Sacrifice of Jesus” in *Mary at the Foot of the Cross: Acts of the International Symposium on Marian Coredemption* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2001) [henceforth referred to as *Knowledge*] 31-40.

<sup>170</sup> *Knowledge* 40.

saving God, at each period of her life. The consciousness of this mission in favor of mankind was linked with her knowledge of being Mother of God.

She received from her Son and from His Spirit, at the foot of the cross especially, an infused knowledge of the sins of those in whose salvation she collaborated in a unique way: “singulariter præ aliis generosa socia, singulari modo cooperata est” (*Lumen Gentium* 61). She received from that Son all the knowledge required to be a worthy Coredemptrix of the human family, as she was suffering and interceding for each human person.

We follow here the approach and principles of Cardinal Lépicier (1863-1936) [cf. his *Tractatus de Beatissima Virgine Maria Matre Dei*, Romæ 1926, in particular pp. 281-299], deepening them under the light of Aquinas, Suarez, and Pius XII.<sup>171</sup>

I offer here just a few comments. The sins and the consolation, which Jesus saw in the agony by virtue of the beatific vision,<sup>172</sup> Mary would have seen by virtue of her infused knowledge or even possibly by virtue of the transitory beatific vision, which saints, mystics and a number of theologians attribute to her.<sup>173</sup> Now in his astuteness Father de Margerie was well aware that *Lumen Gentium* emphasized Mary’s faith, but he also knew the tradition about her privileges, which follow from her Immaculate Conception, beautifully articulated by Blessed Pius IX, whom I have quoted above. Many postconciliar commentators have insisted that *Lumen Gentium* departed radically from the old “privilege-centered Mariology” to give us a new Mariology, which associated Mary with the rest of us. This is a gross exaggeration and an example of what Pope Benedict XVI called “the hermeneutic of rupture”.<sup>174</sup> Chapter Eight of *Lumen Gentium* is an exceedingly balanced document, which does not say everything about Mary, but carefully presents the Church’s understanding of Mary with great precision, bringing forth treasures new and old (cf. Mt. 13:52). Father de Margerie was well aware of the traditional teaching about Mary’s infused knowledge, providing one explicit source<sup>175</sup> and proposing the wider context provided by Aquinas, Suarez and Pius XII.

As a Jesuit of the classic mold, Father de Margerie cited two principles from the great Jesuit scholastic philosopher and theologian Francisco Suarez (1548-1617). The first was quoted by the Venerable Pius XII in his Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus*:

---

<sup>171</sup> *Knowledge* 31-32.

<sup>172</sup> Father de Margerie, however, always held that Jesus saw our sins and consolations by virtue of infused knowledge as well.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. *Knowledge* 35; Alexis Henricus Maria Lépicier, O.S.M., *Tractatus de Beatissima Virgine Maria Matre Dei*, Editio quinta (Rome: Ex Officina Typographica, 1926) 282-284; Gabriele M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Dizionario di Mariologia* (Rome: Editrice Studium, 1961) 456; Gregory Alastruey, *The Blessed Virgin Mary*, Vol. I, trans. Sr. M Janet La Giglia, O.P. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1963) 219-221; Antonio Royo Marin, O.P., *La Virgen María: Teología y espiritualidad marianas* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1968) 356.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. AAS 98 (2006) 45-46 [*ORE* 1925:5-6].

<sup>175</sup> Lépicier 288-292. Cf. also Roschini 454-456; Alastruey 221-225; Royo Marin 356-357.

The mysteries of grace, which God has accomplished in the Virgin should not be measured by ordinary laws, but in reference to divine omnipotence, given the fittingness of that work and absence of contradiction and opposition to the Scriptures.<sup>176</sup>

Father de Margerie continued:

Suarez formulated a second principle, which we can also make our own: “It was not fitting or necessary that she should know everything, that is every created reality. But it was fitting that she possess at all moments of her life the knowledge of all things to be known in the context of her state of Life”; the state of the Mother of the Redeemer.

So we can admit that Mary, associated with Christ by God the Father in the expiation of our sins and in the act of meriting our eternal salvation, received from the eternal Spirit of Christ a distinctive knowledge of the sins she had to expiate and of the good works she had to merit. This infused knowledge did not come from her reason or from her senses, but was infused immediately in her soul from the Holy Spirit. It was a supernatural knowledge linked with her mission.<sup>177</sup>

He went on to explain:

She so enjoys an infused knowledge, beyond the capabilities of human nature, but proportioned to her images and concepts, an infused knowledge of a human and not angelic type, says Cardinal Lépicier. In the mind of Mary, this infused knowledge and the notions acquired through experience and reflection on revealed truths, were perfectly united in the service of her unique mission in favor of the salvation of the world.<sup>178</sup>

Here we must emphasize, as Father de Margerie did, that Mary’s role as Coredemptrix was always secondary, subordinate and totally dependent upon that of Jesus. She was not one half of a team of Redeemers, nor does her offering of Jesus to the Father and her offering of

---

<sup>176</sup> *Knowledge* 32. Cf. *AAS* 42 (1950) 767 [*OL* #517]. The English translation in *OL* differs slightly from that given in *Knowledge*. It should be noted that this principle enunciated by Suarez is virtually identical with the position of Blessed John Duns Scotus (c. 1266-1308): “If it does not contradict the authority of the Church or the authority of Scripture, it seems probable that whatever is most excellent is to be attributed to Mary.” [Videtur probabile quod excellentius est attribuere Mariae, si auctoritati Ecclesiae vel Scripturae non repugnet. *Ordinatio*, III, d. 3, q. 1, no. 34.]

<sup>177</sup> *Knowledge* 33.

<sup>178</sup> *Knowledge* 35.

herself in union with him deny that Jesus' sacrifice was all-sufficient to redeem the world, but it is to state that God willed Mary to be united with Jesus in the salvation of the world.<sup>179</sup>

Father de Margerie continues:

Without merit at the foot of the cross, Mary is not Coredemptrix. Thanks to her infused knowledge, she is so.

We think that Mary received all the intellectual gifts needed to be the worthy Coredemptrix of the human family, suffering and interceding for each of its members (in accord with the approach of Card. Lépicier).<sup>180</sup>

What I am most anxious to present here, however, is this very significant statement that Father de Margerie presented early on in his essay:

From this perception of the knowledge of our sins by Mary at the foot of the cross and of the fact that she made reparation for these sins in union with Christ crucified and under Him, in the name of mankind, some important practical conclusions can easily be drawn: for instance, the acceptance of the duty of reparation toward the Immaculate Heart of Mary, a duty insisted upon by Pius XII in *Haurietis Aquas*; and the fact that Mary also knew, through her infused knowledge, our effective reparations toward her and was consoled by them. These spiritual consequences encourage us to become ever more the consolers of Mary Coredemptrix, that is, to let Christ crucified console her through us, Her whole life was a life of joyful suffering for us.<sup>181</sup>

Recall what Pius XI had taught in *Misericordissimus Redemptor*:

*If, then, in foreseeing the sins of the future the soul of Jesus became sorrowful unto death, it cannot be doubted that he already felt some comfort when he foresaw our reparation, when "there appeared to him an Angel from heaven" (Lk. 22:43) bearing consolation to his heart overcome with sorrow and anguish. Hence even now in a mysterious, but true, manner we may and should comfort the Sacred Heart, continually wounded by the sins of ungrateful men.*<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> Cf. my study, "Mary Coredemptrix: The Beloved Associate of Christ" in Mark Miravalle (ed.), *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons* (Goleta, CA: Seat of Wisdom Books, 2008) 349-409; "Marian Coredemption and the Contemporary Papal Magisterium: The Truth of Marian Coredemption, the Papal Magisterium and the Present Situation" in *Maria "Unica Cooperatrice alla Redenzione"*. *Atti del Simposio sul Mistero della Corredenzione Mariana, Fatima, Portogallo 3-7 Maggio 2005* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2005) 113-169.

<sup>180</sup> *Knowledge* 36.

<sup>181</sup> *Knowledge* 33-34.

<sup>182</sup> AAS 20 (1928) 174 [Plus 101] (emphasis my own).

If in the course of her earthly life, Mary had knowledge of those for whom she would merit Redemption, if she saw every sin committed against Jesus and against her, so she was also consoled by every act of loving reparation offered to her.

All of my arguments in this presentation have been in terms of the principle of analogy: there is an analogy between Jesus and Mary, between his Sacred Heart and her Immaculate Heart, between consecration to His Sacred Heart and her Immaculate Heart, between his Kingship and her Queenship, between his Ascension and her Assumption and finally between reparation to His Sacred Heart and her Immaculate Heart. In a certain sense, this is obvious, but I am grateful to Father de Margerie for his having laid out the steps by which one arrives at this theological conclusion, which is supported by a great weight of Catholic tradition.

In a certain sense we can see this reflected in *Lumen Gentium* #62:

This maternity of Mary in the order of grace began with the consent which she gave in faith at the Annunciation and which she sustained without wavering beneath the cross, and lasts until the eternal fulfillment of all the elect. Taken up to heaven she did not lay aside this salvific duty, but by her constant intercession continues to bring us the gifts of eternal salvation. By her maternal charity, she cares for the brethren of her Son, who still journey on earth surrounded by dangers and difficulties, until they are led into the happiness of their true home.

Even though Mary is now in heavenly glory, she still has a care for every one of us, even those of us who are oblivious or opposed to her. All of us know the anxieties of mothers here on earth and Mary has not given up such anxieties even in heaven. She will not rest until the last of her children are with her. Yes, this remains a mystery to some extent: how Mary in glory can still have anxiety, but by the same token, it is an incentive to us to offer her the reparation of our hearts and our lives.

## **VI. Final Conclusion**

I believe that the concept of reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is part of the development of Marian doctrine and highlights very emphatically what we have presented in Part One. Because of her coredemptive role as the New Eve, *Maria Reparatrix*, the *Alma Socia Christi*, because of what she has done for us, it is right that we should offer reparation to her person, to her Heart. In rendering reparation to her, we thus collaborate in the Triumph of her Immaculate Heart, which will hasten to bring about the reign of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus.

**Laus Cordibus Jesu et Mariae!**