

1-24-1964

Our Lady's Coredemption as an Ecumenical Problem

Robert E. Hunt

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies

 Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hunt, Robert E. (1964) "Our Lady's Coredemption as an Ecumenical Problem," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 15, Article 7, Pages 48-86.
Available at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol15/iss1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

OUR LADY'S COREDEMPTION AS AN ECUMENICAL PROBLEM

In the presidential address to the thirteenth annual convention of the Mariological Society of America at New Orleans two years ago, Father Walter Burghardt set forth the role of the mariologist as ecumenist.¹ On the theological level, he said, "the ecumenical effort has for its function to restudy those doctrinal themes which have proved divisive, to determine to what extent division is inevitable, in what measure a matter of misunderstanding; in a word, an effort at theological clarification: where do we really differ, and why?"² And if it is true that for the mariologist "the heart of the matter is the problem of development,"³ it is also true that the single Marian themes enjoy proper characteristics as ecumenical issues. This diversity of aspect within the one ecumenical problem of Mary is due not only to the vast differences between our Eastern and Western partners in dialogue, but also to the structure of Catholic Mariology itself. Some themes are dogmas, and even they differ as problems: *theotokos* is not the same problem as *assumpta*. Other themes are not, or not yet dogmas; they range from matters of faith to matters presently under more or less free discussion among Catholic theologians. Each theme creates, at least potentially, its own ecumenical problem to be treated in its own way. My scope here is limited to one theme, that of our Lady's Coredeemption, and to one partner in dialogue, our Protestant brethren.⁴ I shall attempt

¹ W. J. Burghardt, S.J., *The Mariologist as Ecumenist*, in MS 13 (1962) 5-12.

² *Ibid.*, 6.

³ *Ibid.*, 9. Cf. A. B. Vaughan, *The Development of Marian Doctrine as an Ecumenical Problem*, the preceding article in this volume.

⁴ Since Marian doctrine and devotion in Eastern Orthodoxy are so radically different from Protestantism, to combine them in one treatment

the theological clarification called for by our former president, first by examining the internal state of Catholic theology, then by considering the ecumenical issues and, finally, by saying a word on some current trends in Protestant theology.

I

"Coredeemption" and "Coredeemprix" are perhaps the most ambiguous terms in Catholic theology today. The very legitimacy of using such words has been challenged by some theologians,⁵ while some simply omit them in explaining the theological position intended.⁶ Others vigorously defend the usage and would, in fact, demand it on the basis of papal sanction and long term acceptance.⁷ But it is not merely a

would be offensive to both, as well as misleading. Recent studies clearly show that the Western vision of Mary owes much to the East, and that, despite the grave misunderstandings which developed after the Roman dogmatic formulations of the nineteenth century, a solid basis for serious rapprochement already exists in our common Marian heritage and current Marian recognitions. Cf. *Mariologie et Oecuménisme, I, Eglise Orthodoxe: Doctrine mariale et influence sur l'Occident*, in *BSFEM* 19 (1962) entire; various studies by members of the Spanish Mariological Society, in *EM* 22 (1961) 9-108; B. Schultze, S.J., *La Mariologie sophianique russe*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 6 (Paris, 1961) 213-239. Further, the Orthodox themselves have contributed heavily to the Marian ecumenical dialogue with Protestants, especially through their participation in the World Council of Churches: cf. V. Lossky, *Mariology (b.) Orthodox*, in P. Edwall, E. Hayman, W. Maxwell (eds.) *Ways of Worship, the Report of a Theological Commission of Faith and Order* (New York, 1951) 263-288; A. R. Dulles, S.J., *The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement*, in *DR* 75 (1957) 38-54; B. Leeming, S.J., *The Churches and the Church* (London-Westminster, 1960) 84-87.

⁵ Cf. K. Rahner, S.J., *Le principe fondamental de la théologie mariale*, in *RSR* 42 (1954) 494 f.; A. Michel, *Mary's Coredeemption*, in *AER* 122 (1950) 184.

⁶ Cf., e.g., J. B. Alfaro, S.J., *Significatio Mariae in Mysterio Salutis*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 9-37, and in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 4 (Rome, 1959) 283-313, wherein the author speaks of Mary's "immediata et effectiva cooperatio" with Christ.

⁷ Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *Our Lady's Coredeemption*, in J. B. Carol (ed.) *Mariology*, 2 (Milwaukee, 1957) 422-424; G. Roschini, O.S.M., *La Ma-*

matter of apt locution; the ambiguity remains even among those who freely employ the terms. Not that each author fails to give or at least conclude with a precise supposition; rather, the suppositions themselves represent a wide range of theological position. And the positions range from similar to contradictory.⁸

Startling evidence of this ambiguity is furnished by a random catalog of Catholic views on approximately the same position: "nova quaedam opinio" which should be rejected;⁹ pertains to "popular trends of the nineteenth and twentieth century;"¹⁰ an open question which presently "non constat",¹¹ "sententia . . .

donna secondo la fede e la teologia, 2 (Rome, 1953) 314-315, 317-318, 381-384; J. A. de Aldama, S.J., *Mariologia*, in *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, 3 (3rd. ed., Madrid, 1956) 427, n. 158; E. Druwé, S.J., *Le médiation universelle de Marie*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Maria. Etudes sur la Sainte Vierge*, 1 (Paris, 1949) 427-435. If "Pius XI was the first Pope explicitly to apply this title to our Lady" (Carol, *op. cit.*, 384), he was also the last. To my knowledge Popes Pius XII and John XXIII never used either word, and Pope Paul has not used them to date. On the history of the term "coredemptrix," cf. R. Laurentin, *Le titre de Corédemptrice. Etude historique*, in *Mm* 13 (1951) 396-452.

⁸ An extreme instance may be cited in the difference of position between Fr. Carol and Fr. Lennerz. While the latter "finds no difficulty" in calling our Lady "coredemptrix," the former lists him among those who deny Mary's coredeption! Cf. H. Lennerz, S.J., *De Beata Virgine Tractatus Dogmaticus* (Rome, 1957) 284-285; Carol, *op. cit.*, 380-381. Normally, however, those who hold Fr. Lennerz's position would not use the term, and those who use the term hold in common a basic view which Lennerz denies.

⁹ Lennerz, *op. cit.*, 231-286. Cf. W. Goossens, *De Cooperatione immediata Matris Redemptoris ad redemptionem obiectivam. Quaestionis controversae perpensatio* (Paris, 1939). Canon Goossens is cited even today as the classic expression of the negative view. In English the most popular expression of the same is found in G. Smith, *Mary's Part in our Redemption* (2nd. ed., London, 1954) esp. 92-99. Its latest defender seems to be M. D. Köster, O.P., *Ist die Frage nach der Corredemptio Mariens richtig gestellt?*, in *TQ* 139 (1959) 402-426.

¹⁰ G. Baum, O.S.A., describing the events of Vatican II in *The Commonweal* 79 (November 22, 1963) 252.

¹¹ M. O'Grady, S.J., *Mary's Role in Redemption*, in K. McNamara (ed.), *Mother of the Redeemer* (New York, 1960) 158. Fr. O'Grady is cited

saltem probabilis";² a truth which was clarified and affirmed so clearly by Pope Pius XII that it can no longer be denied;¹³ "approaching the category of certain";¹⁴ "at least theologically certain";¹⁵ "reaching the field of faith";¹⁶ dogmatically definable much as the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption were before the actions of Pius IX and Pius XII respectively.¹⁷ Thus, almost the entire range of theological notes (not to mention some severe censures), short solely of *de fide definita*, is assigned to Our Lady's Coredemption!

Another, and more basic, instance of confusion is the classic terminology of the Redemption as used in connection with the "Coredemption." A neat distinction is drawn between "objective" redemption (variously called *in actu primo, quoad efficientiam, in causa, virtualis*, or simply *acquisitiva*) and "subjective" redemption (*in actu secundo, quoad efficaciam, in effectibus, actualis*, or simply *applicativa*) as two distinct phases of the soteriological accomplishment of Christ. This distinction is, of course, valid.¹⁸ But according to some theologians it can

with approval by B. Leeming, S.J., *Protestants and our Lady*, in *ITQ* 27 (1960) 107.

¹² G. Baraúna, O.F.M., *De partibus Deiparae in oeconomia salutis iuxta Ecclesiae magisterium*, in C. Balic (ed.), *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo* (Rome, 1962) 328. This collection was prepared by the Pontifical International Marian Academy as an aid to the Fathers of Vatican II.

¹³ W. G. Most, *De Corredemptione et Regalitate in Epistula Encyclica "Ad Caeli Reginam"*, in *Mm* 17 (1955) 354-368.

¹⁴ J. A. de Aldama, S.J., *Posición actual del Magisterio Eclesiástico en el problema de la Corredención*, in *EM* 18 (1958) 75.

¹⁵ Roschini, *op. cit.*, 317.

¹⁶ *La Sociedad Mariológica Española y la Corredención Mariana*, in *EphM* 9 (1959) 86. This judgment represents the "official" position of the Spanish Mariological Society after the Mariologico-marian Congress at Lourdes in 1958.

¹⁷ Enrique del S. Corazón, O.C.D., *Alma Redemptoris Socia, seu conclusiones circa corredemptionem Marialem ex doctrina Magisterii Ecclesiastici deductae*, in *EphM* 12 (1962) 413-414. The author attests that a "sollemnis definitio a multis exoptetur."

¹⁸ It serves well in answering the classic question: "If Christ died for all men, why are not all men saved?", and is implied in Trent's response to the

easily create unnecessary misunderstandings when applied either too casually or too rigidly in a mariological context.¹⁹ If, for example, by objective redemption one intends that which Christ did as universal cause antecedent to all reception of salvation by men and, therefore, as *opposed* to what mankind received from Christ, obviously Mary, herself receiving all from Christ, had no part in redemption taken in this sense. If, however, in the definition of objective redemption one limits "men" to exclude Mary, a different concept of redemption emerges in which a question about Mary's cooperation can at least be placed.²⁰ Further, in the real, as distinguished from conceptual, order, can graces be "acquired" by Christ without thereby being "applied" to men? Where are they between acquisition and application? Can God "give" without anyone's actually "receiving"? The whole metaphysics of the eternal dimension of the temporal acts of Christ is involved here.

Now, this sampling should serve somewhat to illustrate the difficulties encountered in defining the Marian theme under present consideration. By not taking sufficient cognizance of the root problem of terms and suppositions in Catholic theology, one immediately exposes himself to the acute danger of

Reformers; cf. *DB* (32nd ed., revised by A. Schonmetzer, S.J.) 1523. It is no less valid today, appearing clearly in the teaching of Pius XII: cf. G. Pilote, *La coopération de Marie et de l'Église à la rédemption selon les enseignements de Sa Sainteté Pie XII*, in *Maria et Ecclesia* 4 (Rome, 1959) 484-488.

¹⁹ Cf. C. Journet, *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*, 2 (Fribourg, 1951) 398 f., who states his preference for "médiation ascendante" and "médiation descendante"; also, O. Semmelroth, S.J., *Mary Archetype of the Church* (New York, 1963, translation of *Urbild der Kirche. Organischer Aufbau des Mariengeheimnisses*, 2nd ed., Würzburg, 1954) 72-73, 88-89. E. J. Cuskelly, M.S.C., *Mary's Coredemption: a Different Approach to the Problem*, in *TS* 21 (1960) 209-213, attributes some of Fr. Lennerz's difficulties on coredemption to equivocation in the term "objective redemption," and speculates that "If you ask the question, did Mary share in the objective redemption of men?, the chances are five to one that you will be misunderstood" (p. 212).

²⁰ Cf. Cuskelly, *art. cit.*, 210-211.

beginning with a *petitio principii*, if not in reality, at least in the mind of the readers. It should also serve immediately to enlist our sympathy for the Protestant theologian who, with all good will, sets out to discredit the charge so often levelled against him, *catholica non leguntur*. Equivocations abound in our writings on this subject. The confusion is real, but capable of being discerned more properly; the conflicts are real, but only in some instances necessary. I shall attempt to define the precise point at issue here with the minimum use of controverted terminology and maximum detachment possible under the circumstances.

Negatively, I am not directly concerned here with the general questions of Mary's spiritual motherhood by which she contributes in some way to the supernatural life of all men, or of Mary's universal mediation by which she in some way joins us to Christ, her Son. Nor am I directly and primarily concerned with the *particular* question of Mary's celestial intervention in the communication of all graces *in concreto* to all men *in individuo*. Positively, my concern is that one aspect of the aforementioned general questions which is correlative to the aforementioned particular question,²¹ namely, whether and to what extent Mary cooperated in *the complexus of many elements (whether on the part of the Trinity, on the part of Christ, or on the part of creatures) which converge in whatever fashion to give rise to the supra-individual state by virtue of which men can acquire divine filiation and the other salutary gifts which were lost by their first parents.*²² This "complexus" we will term "redemption" throughout this paper. It is hoped that the use of such a broad category right at the start allows

²¹ This seeming circumlocution is necessary as long as authors differ so greatly in assigning a logical order between the various concepts here. For two different approaches to the matter, notwithstanding a marked similarity *quoad rem*, cf. J. A. de Aldama, S.J., *Mariologia*, in *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, 3 (3rd ed., Madrid, 1956) 408-455, nn. 131-200, and G. Roschini, O.S.M., *Dizionario di Mariologia* (Rome, 1961) 323-354.

²² Cf. Baraúna, *op. cit.*, 276-277.

sufficient latitude for all conceivable elements which the various Catholic writers on this subject might wish to include in an adequate concept of redemption.

Since it is a primordial truth among us that "sacred theology lives and moves and has its being in the sacred magisterium,"²³ the state of Catholic theology on the Marian theme at hand is determined to a large extent by the actual state of the magisterium on the question. Hence, we must first direct our attention to the "*proxima et universalis veritatis norma*."²⁴

The Council of Ephesus long ago settled the question of "whether" Mary played a role in the redemption. By defining *theotokos*,²⁵ it implicitly defined that Mary is a "cause" of our salvation at least insofar as she is truly the mother of that divine Person who, having assumed human nature, redeemed the world. The extent of her cooperation as implied in the decree of Ephesus can be conveniently designated by the term *remote*.

Beyond Ephesus there is no document of the extraordinary or solemn magisterium to further describe the extent of Mary's role in redemption. For the rest, our documentation does not exceed the teaching and preaching of the ordinary magisterium of Roman Pontiffs during the past century.²⁶ And there is no unanimity among Catholic theologians in interpreting the precise import of papal statements, just as there is great diversity in assigning value and authority to the various forms of papal

²³ Our attention is focused on this truth in a lucid exposition of the post-*Humani Generis* magisterium of Pius XII by the now president of our society, Msgr. G. W. Shea, *Theology and the Magisterium*, in *PCTSA* 12 (1957) 217-231.

²⁴ Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, in *AAS* 42 (1950) 567.

²⁵ Cf. *DB* (32nd ed.) 251.

²⁶ Note that our concern here is not directly that ordinary and *universal* magisterium spoken of by Vatican I as infallibly setting the norm of divine and Catholic faith. Cf. *DB* (32nd ed.) 3011. Such would be the magisterium of the bishops throughout the world together with and under the Roman Pontiff, as studied, e.g., by J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *De Coredeptione Beatae Virginis Mariae* (Vatican City, 1950) 539-619.

utterance. The norms of *Humani Generis* are clear enough;²⁷ but one soon finds that they are invoked to bolster or force the most contradictory views in this point of Marian theology. One fears that the *via media* prescribed by Pope Pius XII is not always traversed in this regard, that "correct middle ways, avoiding whatever falsely and intemperately goes beyond the bounds of truth, while keeping apart from those who are filled with a kind of unreasonable fear of conceding more than they ought to the Blessed Virgin. . . ."²⁸

It is not possible here to rehearse and analyze document upon document from Pius IX to Pius XII,²⁹ nor is it necessary for our purposes. This work has been done by many before us, albeit with a variety of conclusions.³⁰ The following points

²⁷ Cf. *DB* (32nd ed.) 3885.

²⁸ Pius XII, *Inter Complures*, in *AAS* 46 (1954) 679 (radio message to participants of the Mariologico-marian Congress at Rome).

²⁹ The principal texts are excerpts from the following, in chronological order: the brief *Cum purgaturus aream* of Pius IX; the encyclicals *Octobri mense*, *Iucunda semper*, *Adiutricem populi* and *Fidentem piumque* of Leo XIII; the encyclical *Ad diem illum* of Pius X; the apostolic letter *Inter sodalicia* of Benedict XV; the encyclicals *Explorata res*, *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, and the prayer *O Mater pietatis* of Pius XI; the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, the bull *Munificentissimus Deus*, the encyclicals *Ad caeli Reginam* and *Haurietis Aquas* of Pius XII. For the Latin texts, cf. Baraúna, *op. cit.*, 278-284; in English, cf. the Solesmes monks' selection as translated by the Daughters of St. Paul, *Papal Teachings. Our Lady* (Boston, 1961), following the above order, nn. 69; 113; 169; 194-195; 231-234; 267-268; 282; 287; 334; 381-384; 518-520; 703-705, 706, 709, 711; 778.

³⁰ Besides the works of Baraúna, de Aldama, Enrique del S. Corazón, Most and Pilote cited above in notes 12, 13 14, 17 and 18, cf. J. Bittremieux, *Adnotationes circa doctrinam B. M. Virginis Corredemptricis in documentis Romanorum Pontificum*, in *ETL* 16 (1939) 745-778; Crisóstomo de Pamplona, O.F.M. Cap., *La Corredención mariana en el magisterio de la Iglesia*, in *EM* 2 (1943) 89-110; J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *Romanorum Pontificum doctrina de B. V. Corredemptrice*, in *Mm* 9 (1947) 161-183; N. García Garcés, C.M.F., *¿Es sentencia bastante firme y universal del magisterio ordinario la Corredención objetiva inmediata?*, in *EphM* 3 (1953) 245-256; B. Prada, C.M.F., *Consociationis Deiparae V. cum Christo adversus novatorum censuras vindicatio iuxta Pii XII magisterium*, in *EphM* 6 (1956) 5-43; H. Lennerz, S.J., *De Beata Virgine Tractatus Dogmaticus* (Rome, 1957) 274-284; C. Balic, O.F.M., *Circa Thema III Congressus Mariologici*

contain what is in my judgment the actual state of the papal magisterium on Mary's role in the redemption.

(1) It is *certain* (and perhaps *de fide* from the ordinary *universal* magisterium insofar as what is taught by the popes already pertains to the common faith of the *Ecclesia docens et discens*) that, in excess of the doctrine of Ephesus, Mary was throughout her entire life intimately associated with the work of our redemption, especially through her consent to the Incarnation and her union with her Son's suffering and oblation on Calvary. Mary is *Alma Socia Redemptoris*, a category of truth beyond the defined Ephesine category of *Mater Dei*. This further and yet undetermined extent of Mary's cooperation in redemption is aptly designated by the term *proximate*.³¹

(2) It is *certain* the Mary's terrestrial cooperation in her Son's salvific work is in some way the foundation of her celestial activity in regard to the graces by which individual men are saved. These two particular aspects of Marian soteriology are correlative.

Concerning these two points there is substantial agreement among theologians, notwithstanding some divergencies in terminology and secondary aspects. For example, Fr. Lennerz apparently disagrees with some of the above elements because

Internationalis "Maria et Ecclesia," in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 1-20.

³¹ What about the whole wealth of auxiliary and explanatory elements which surround the above nucleus of papal teaching? What about, for example, the vicarious and ecumenical nature of Mary's consent at the Incarnation? Her role on Calvary? The Eve-Mary parallel? The Mary-Church similarity? The covenant and sponsal themes? What about all the marvellous modalities according to which Mary is said to cooperate in her Son's redemptive work? All of these items most certainly appear, in one way or another, throughout the corpus of papal magisterium and have been variously used by theologians in further refining the general doctrine. But in regard to our specific point here, they remain auxiliary and explanatory. Besides, the use of them by the popes does not of itself alter the perspective or doctrinal quality which they already enjoy from the scriptural, patristic and theological sources whence they were drawn. Cf. *DB* (32nd ed.) 3885.

of his limited "anselmian" concept of redemption as something adequately distinct from and subsequent to the Incarnation; hence, he admits only a remote cooperation in redemption, while granting a proximate cooperation in the Incarnation. But since in our broad supposition the Incarnation is included in the concept of redemption, Fr. Lennerz may rightly be said to grant our proposition.³²

(3) The papal utterances of the past one hundred years create a presumption favorable to the existence of a deeper and ultimate *ratio* of the explicitly taught facts of Mary's cooperation in redemption. Theologians are thereby furnished with sufficient foundation, if not an implicit mandate, to justify their labor of inquiring into the question of *immediate* cooperation. By immediate I mean a cooperation which is not reducible to the divine maternity as defined by Ephesus, nor to the so-called distribution of graces to individual men, and which involves *another and distinct theological step* beyond the general and admitted fact of proximate cooperation—a step which, by specifying the general data to an ultimate *ratio*, would reveal that fundamental soteriological role of Mary which lies at the root of the previously explicated doctrines of Spiritual Maternity and Dispensatrix, in such wise that these latter would then take their full perspective from the former.³³

All theological positions which in this way intend to *exceed* the general doctrine of proximate cooperation and explain the nature of immediate cooperation remain under free discussion today. At present the papal magisterium cannot be invoked as a decisive argument for or against any position advanced. Whence, theologians can justifiably claim that the unspecified

³³ In regard to terminology, note that to the terms *remote*, *proximate* and *immediate* as used in this paper belong solely the suppositions which I have given; the usage by other authors is too varying and problematic to be taken stock of here. Also, of those theologians who admit the terms *coredeemption* and *coredeptrix*, most limit them to describe positions on *immediate* cooperation, many deny the propriety of using them more broadly, and some reserve exclusive use to their own position.

fact of immediate cooperation is "*doctrina conformior textibus . . . SS. Pontificum*,"³⁴ but the maximum theological qualification that can be assigned to any particular position is *sententia probabilis*;³⁵ none enjoys the note *communis*.³⁶ And under the circumstances, the adverbs "more," "less" and "most" are merely points of view when used to qualify someone's *sententia probabilis*. Wherefore, unless and until some real clarification or determination is forthcoming from the magisterium, all forms of immediate cooperation (hence, of "coredemption" as the term is used to designate the positions on this matter) may be freely advanced, freely rejected or freely called into doubt without theological censure.³⁷

³⁴ Thus, de Aldama, *op. cit.* (above, n. 21), 427, n. 158.

³⁵ I am using the note *probabilis* in the generally accepted sense determined by S. Cartechini, S.J., *Dall'opinione al Dogma* (Rome, 1953) 139-141: "Una proposizione si dice probabile quando poggia su di un motivo non del tutto sicuro ma abbastanza grave; tanto in modo assoluto, se considerato in se stesso, quanto in modo relativo se paragonato con le ragioni della sentenza opposta. Perciò una tesi probabile potrebbe per se anche essere falsa; e se una tesi è soltanto probabile non si può dire che sua contraddittoria sia certamente falsa . . . si vede quanto sia importante rendersi conto della nota teologia; perchè, se accettiamo una tesi che crediamo essere certa e ignoriamo che è invece soltanto probabile, ci si espone al pericolo di dovere ritrattare in seguito la nostra sentenza . . . L'essere una sentenza più probabile non impedisce che la sua opposta rimanga anch'essa probabile. . . ."

³⁶ Cf. Baraúna, *op. cit.*, 326-329; cf. *Idem*, *Qual o grau de certeza da Corredenção mariana*, in *REB* 20 (1960) 548-607. Extreme caution must be exercised in drawing the distinction between the *fact* of Mary's immediate cooperation and the *manner* in which this fact is explained, lest a subtle equivocation result. One can hardly formulate any more than a nominal definition of the fact without describing what is meant by *immediate*. At which point he already runs the risk of begging a freely discussed question and implying his own position regarding the manner! Cf. e.g., the note of the Spanish Mariological Society in *EpbM* 9 (1959) 78-86, where a pretense at great detachment is made, but a "christotypical" position is implied.

³⁷ Freedom of discussion was certainly the mind of Pope Pius XII as manifested shortly before his death in an autograph to the president of the Pontifical International Marian Academy; cf. C. Balic, O.F.M., *Circa Thema III Congressus Mariologici Internationalis "Maria et Ecclesia,"* in

The freedom allowed by the magisterium on the specific issue of immediate cooperation has been fully utilized by theologians. We have already noted that some, whose number is impossible to calculate but whose principal spokesmen are well known,³⁸ reject immediate cooperation, and consider their own positions as meeting and exhausting the data of revelation and the norms of the magisterium. Mary's intimate association with our Redeemer, they say, is perfectly well explained in the line of intercession. "Another and distinct theological step" is not required. Mary is, by divine will, the spiritual mother of all men, the mediatrix, even the coredeptrix. But her role in the "acquisition" of graces by which individual men are saved *presupposes* the work of redemption as already integral and complete. She cooperates *proximately* only in the sense that she concurred with the salvific acts of her Son, especially on Calvary; her faith and charity were supreme; but this concurrence did not in any way "acquire" the redemption itself.³⁹

Maria et Ecclesia, 2 (Rome, 1959) 6-7: "Sed si ulterius pergendo interrogemus quid magisterium Ecclesiae, quid Romani Pontifices circa cooperationem B. Virginis in opere salutis locumque quem Maria teneat in Ecclesia, quid itaque docuerint circa problemata a nobis posita, et praesertim de ipsamet indole seu natura marialis cooperationis, notum est non adesse unam eandemque vestrum hac de re sententiam. Pontifex . . . in documento autographo nobis dato et vobis nunc perlecto, *nullam sententiam pronuntiat, nullos limites ponit sive quoad ipsam rem sive quoad nomenclaturam*" (emphasis is Fr. Balic's). Cf. also R. Leiber, S.J., *Pius XII in SZ* 84 (1958/1959) 86, as quoted by H. Küng, *The Council, Reform and Reunion* (New York, 1961) 126-127: ". . . on the subject of the titles of 'mediatrix' and 'co-redemptrix,' Pius XII, a few weeks before his death and just after the Mariological Congress at Lourdes, said that both matters were too unclear and too unripe; that he had consciously and deliberately, throughout his pontificate, avoided taking up any positive attitude towards them, preferring to leave them to free theological discussion. It was not his intention to alter this attitude." Attempts at clarification of Fr. Leiber's statement have been made by A. Doolan, O.P., *Our Lady's Cooperation in our Redemption. The Mind of Pius XII*, in *IER* 97 (1962) 45-49; N. García Garcés, C.M.F., *Hojeando revistas*, in *EphM* 9 (1959) 317-322; and W. G. Most, in a letter to *HPR* 62 (September, 1962) 1020-1030.

³⁸ Cf. above, note 9.

³⁹ Cf. Lennerz, *op. cit.*, 220-230, 231, 284-286.

Time and again, papal utterances have been invoked to discredit this view; time and again, its alleged speculative inadequacies have been pointed up; time and again, the objections of men like Fr. Lennerz have been met and "solved." Yet, despite all attempts to demonstrate the folly of rejecting immediate cooperation, the negative position has survived and remains a legitimate entry in Catholic theology.⁴⁰ To some mariologists, this whole matter has been the cause of frustration and dismay, if not serious embarrassment.

Passing now to the affirmative positions on Mary's immediate cooperation, we must limit ourselves to an extremely summary indication. A complete index of the field far exceeds the scope of this paper and would, in fact, challenge the capacity of even the most ponderous tome. Thus, without pretense of capturing the nuance of individual entries, we will sketch the barest outline of the main approaches appearing in Catholic theological literature.⁴¹

⁴⁰ I note here that an important factor seems often to be overlooked when acknowledging the dissenting vote on immediate cooperation. One of the keys to the intransigence of those who have defended the negative view can be found in a closer examination of the context in which they wrote. It is my contention that Fr. Lennerz *et. al.*, did not reject *all* immediate cooperation, but only that particular approach which constitutes their specific frame of reference on the question. I am referring to the so-called "christotypical" school. For the most part they have not considered the other possibilities, much less have they passed judgment on them, especially on the less extreme "ecclesiotypical" positions. Granting the many defects of his theology of redemption and the gross inadequacy of his own offering, my point is that Fr. Lennerz's refutation of immediate cooperation is a reaction against only one way of specifying the theology of coredemption. To list him as a direct adversary of coredemption is an oversimplification, and already tendentious on behalf of the "christotypical" approach.

⁴¹ For a detailed account of the affirmative position advanced in recent years, cf. G. Baraúna, O.F.M., *De natura corredemptionis marianae in theologia hodierna (1921-1958)*, (Rome, 1960), which, however, should not be read without noting the critical observations of H. M. Köster, S.A.C., *De corredemptione marianae in theologia hodierna (1921-1958). Animadversiones circa librum R. P. Baraúna*, in *Mm* 24 (1962) 158-182. For a brief and schematic presentation of the same matter, cf. H. M. Köster, S.A.C., *Quid iuxta investigationes hucusque peractas minimum tribuendum*

(1) *The Christotypical Approach*. This general position is well known to the members of our Society, especially as represented in the works of our founder, Fr. Carol.⁴² Abroad, it is the "official" position of the Spanish Mariological Society⁴³ whose members are responsible for literally hundreds of articles, notes and reviews explaining and defending this position since the inception of the society in 1941. Likewise, the Spanish Claretian Fathers, through their quarterly *Ephemerides Mariologicae* which began publication 1951, have for the most part vigorously insisted on this position. Elsewhere, it is associated with the names, among others, of Lebon,⁴⁴ Bittremieux,⁴⁵ and Roschini.⁴⁶

In this general conception of coredemptrix, Mary, the New Eve, exercises a causality in the "objective" redemption which is, to be sure, secondary, subordinate, dependent, *in se* insufficient, and only hypothetically (granting the actual economy decreed by God) necessary, but nonetheless *collateral* to that of Christ Himself. Mary's contribution participates with Christ in the one "acquisitive" principle of all supernatural life. Her

sit B.M. Virgini in cooperatione eius ad opus redemptionis, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 21-49.

⁴² Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *Our Lady's Coredemption*, in J. B. Carol (ed.), *Mariology*, 2 (Milwaukee, 1957) 377-425 which summarizes the author's findings and views after over 25 years of writing on the subject; cf. also C. Vollert, S.J., *The Fundamental Principle of Mariology and Mary and the Church* (*ibid.*, 30-87 and 550-595 respectively); W. G. Most, *De Corredemptione et Regalitate in Epistula Encyclica "Ad Caeli Reginam"*, in *Mm* 17 (1955) 354-368; *Idem*, *Maria et Ecclesia: tentamina ad synthesim novam*, in *Mm* 22 (1960) 27-289; *Idem*, *The Problem of Causality in the Coredemption*, in *EphM* 13 (1963) 61-76.

⁴³ Cf. *EphM* 9 (1959) 79-86.

⁴⁴ Cf. J. Lebon, *Comment je conçois, j'établis et je défends la doctrine de la médiation mariale*, in *ETL* 16 (1939) 655-744; *Idem*, *Sur la doctrine de la médiation mariale*, in *Ang* 35 (1958) 3-35.

⁴⁵ Cf. J. Bittremieux, *Adnotationes circa doctrinam B. M. Virginis Corredemptricis in documentis Romanorum Pontificum*, in *ETL* 16 (1939) 745-778.

⁴⁶ Cf. G. Roschini, O.S.M., *La Madonna secondo la fede e la teologia*, 2 (Rome, 1953) 311-407.

causality is "productive," "efficient," "co-efficient." The role of Mary is usually described in the same categories of causality which delineate the aspects of Christ's redemptive work: Mary, subordinate to and dependent upon Christ, by the positive will of God and not *ex natura rei*, cooperated *per modum meriti, satisfactionis, redemptionis* and *sacrificii*. This approach, therefore, inquires deeply into the nature and species of Mary's redemptive merit, and tends to assimilate it more and more to the merit of Christ Himself. One of the questions presently under debate is whether *congruous, hypercongruous, or condign* is the proper classification of her merit, and it seems that the advocates of some form of condign merit are starting to prevail.⁴⁷ Mary's "priesthood" (true and hierarchical),⁴⁸ her "concapitality" with Christ,⁴⁹ her absolute correlative predestination with Him,⁵⁰ even her physical instrumental causality in the production of created grace⁵¹ are all suggested and elaborated within the general context of this approach.

Arguments for this position may be alligned according to the classic thesis form: magisterium (ordinary, both papal and universal) as the *decisive* proof; Sacred Scripture (proto-evangelium, Luke 2, John 19); fathers (especially their use of

⁴⁷ For a general survey of the views on Mary's merit, cf. R. Gauthier, C.S.C., *La nature du mérite corédempteur de Marie. Etat de la question depuis le Congrès de 1950*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 4 (Rome, 1959) 315-351; D. Desilets, *On the Nature of Marian Coredemptive Merit*, in *SMR* 1 (1958) 225-244; 2 (1959) 3-54.

⁴⁸ For a survey of current views, cf. C. Koser, O.F.M., *De sacerdotio Beatae Mariae Virginis*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 169-206; Basilio de S. Pablo, C.P., *Los problemas del sacerdocio y del sacrificio de María, conquistas des los últimos veinte años, perspectivas actuales*, in *EM* 11 (1951) 141-220.

⁴⁹ Cf. T. M. Bartolomei, O.S.M., *Il problema sulla partecipazione della grazia capitale di Cristo alla B. Vergine Maria*, in *EphM* 7 (1957) 287-314.

⁵⁰ For a brief statement of the various views, cf. G. Roschini, O.S.M., *Dizionario di Mariologia* (Rome, 1961) 395-401.

⁵¹ For a survey of current views, cf. G. Roschini, O.S.M., *De natura influxus B. M. Virginis in applicatione redemptionis*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 223-295.

the New Eve idea); alleged long-term theological tradition and *consensus theologorum*; theological reasoning; solution of objections.⁵²

Moreover, the proponents of this thesis claim that theirs is exclusively the genuine concept, that all others are depriving Mary of her rightful place, and that their doctrine, at least in substance, pertains to the deposit of divine and Catholic faith. It is not, they insist, a simple *opinio theologica*; it is at least theologically certain, definitively taught by the recent papal magisterium, even implicitly revealed and proximately definable as a dogma.⁵³

(2) *The Ecclesiotypical Approach*. This general position is also well known, but, it seems, more from the prolixity of writing on the part of those who reject it than from primary sources. In the past decade or more nearly every exponent of the Christotypical persuasion summarizes the ecclesiotypical position with a view mainly towards refuting it. Obviously, the position has suffered greatly by being presented so often in such a prejudicial or inadequate manner. At any rate, it is usually associated with the names of Köster,⁵⁴ Semmelroth,⁵⁵ A. Müller,⁵⁶ and to a certain extent, K. Rahner,⁵⁷ Schmaus,⁵⁸

⁵² Cf. T. M. Bartolomei, O.S.M., *Difficoltà contro la grazia capitale di Maria in quanto investono tutta la sua collaborazione immediata all'opera della redenzione, e loro soluzione*, in *EphM* 8 (1958) 217-248.

⁵³ Cf. above, pp. 49-50, with notes 13-17.

⁵⁴ Cf. H. M. Köster, S.A.C., *Unus Mediator* (Limburg, 1950); *Die Magd des Herrn*, (2nd ed., Limburg, 1954); *Quid iuxta investigationes hucusque peractas tamquam minimum tribuendum sit B. M. Virgini in cooperatione eius ad opus redemptionis*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 21-49; *De corredemptione mariana in theologia hodierna* (1921-1958). *Animadversiones circa librum R. P. Baraúa*, in *Mm* 24 (1962) 158-182.

⁵⁵ Cf. O. Semmelroth, S.J., *Mary Archetype of the Church* (New York, 1963, translation of the 1954 German edition).

⁵⁶ Cf. A. Müller, *Ecclesia-Maria. Die Einheit Marias und der Kirche* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1955); *De influxu analogiae inter Mariam et Ecclesiam in fundamentum et structuram Mariologiae*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 2 (Rome, 1959) 343-366; *Fragen und Aussichten der heutigen Mariologie*, in J.

Bur⁵⁹ and Alfaro.⁶⁰ Not that any one of these present the pure and complete position; rather, they each make their own contribution, and only compositely characterize the general approach.

Although Fr. Köster himself acknowledges that the ecclesio-typical conception of coredeptrix has been indirectly stimulated by the weaknesses inherent in the Christotypical position,⁶¹ nevertheless, it is not simply reactionary; it rests on its own direct foundations, namely, an analogy with the cooperation of every creature in his own salvation, that divino-human synergism which rules the present economy.

The history of salvation is a unified whole whose end and essence is the union of God with humanity in the "new and eternal covenant." God offers and communicates Himself to men; the initiative is His. Humanity is enabled by God to receive Him by freely giving itself over to God in faith and love. This union is bilateral: the part of humanity (receiving God and giving itself) pertains to the substance of the union. Just as in the justification of individual men (subjective redemption) "*neque homo ipse nihil omnino agat, inspirationem illam recipiens, quippe qui illam et abicere potest, neque tamen sine gratia Dei movere se ad iustitiam coram illo libera sua*

Feiner, J. Trütsch, F. Böckle (eds.), *Fragen der Theologie Heute* (Zurich-Cologne, 1960) 301-317.

⁵⁷ Cf. K. Rahner, S.J., *Le principe fondamental de la théologie mariale*, in *RSR* 42 (1954) 481-522.

⁵⁸ Cf. M. Schmaus, *Dogmatica Cattolica*, 2 (Turin, 1961, translation of the 1959 German edition) 551-596.

⁵⁹ Cf. J. Bur, *Médiation mariale* (Paris, 1955); *La médiation de Marie. Essai de synthèse spéculative*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Marie. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 6 (Paris, 1961) 473-512.

⁶⁰ Cf. J. B. Alfaro, S.J., *Significatio Mariae in mysterio salutis*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 9-37 and *Maria et Ecclesia* 4 (Rome, 1959) 283-313; *Marie sauvée par le Christ*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Marie. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 6 (Paris, 1961) 451-470, and the same under the title *Maria salvada por Cristo*, in *RET* 22 (1962) 37-56.

⁶¹ Cf. Köster, *Quid iuxta investigationes . . .*, 28-30.

voluntate possit,"⁶² so also when God establishes that state which formally concerns the community as such (objective redemption) a reciprocal "receiving and self-giving" is required on the part of humanity (the Church).

The supreme receiving of God and giving of self on the part of humanity is the divine maternity of Mary. In this event, the theandric union effected in the virginal womb, Mary, constituted by God on behalf of humanity to be redeemed, anticipated and eminently wrought what later was to be done by individual members of the Church. The fundamental themes according to which this general position is formulated vary from author to author; Köster insists on "covenant," Müller on the Mary-Church similarity, Semmelroth on Mary as archetype of the Church, Schmaus on *Sponsa Christi*. But whatever the variations, the causality exercised by Mary is in all cases *actively* receptive. Köster sums it up in this way: "the ecclesio-typists think of objective redemption as a great sacrament, a super-sacrament. No sacrament can be celebrated unless it be received. Thus, the sublime sacrament of the death of the Lord was not celebrated except at the same moment it was devoutly received by the world through the Virgin."⁶³ Semmelroth does us the service of summing up his position in familiar terminology:

"If—in spite of the inherent inadequacies of the terms—what we have developed here were to be ordered according to the traditional terminology of *redemptio objectiva* and *redemptio subjectiva*, we would say the following: Mary cooperated directly, not with the *redemptio objectiva*, if by this term we mean the work of Christ alone; and not with *redemptio subjectiva*, as long as this term is taken to mean the application of the fruits of redemption to individual men. Rather, Mary cooperated with her own *redemptio objectiva*, which redemption, however, *simultaneously signifies* the

⁶² Cf. Council of Trent, session 6, *Decretum de iustificatione*, c. 4, in *DB* (32nd ed.) 1525.

⁶³ Cf. Köster, *Quid iuxta investigationes . . .*, 33.

reception of the fruits of salvation for the entire Church and which is therefore objective with regard to the individual.

"If we want to formulate this into a thesis we can say: Mary is the Type of the Church which imparts salvation, insofar as by assuming the work of Christ, she receives the fruits of that work both for herself and for the whole Church."⁶⁴

We include the positions of men like K. Rahner, Bur and Alfaro under the general heading "ecclesiotypical" not to identify them too closely with Köster, Müller and Semmelroth, but simply as an expedient of classification. While it is true that these former bear the most general characteristics of the latter, they also show important differences. For example, Bur views Marian mediation as including three aspects, the physical, the moral and the ecclesial, all of which are implied in the three major Marian moments, viz., Annunciation, Calvary and celestial distribution of graces. He explains his doctrine in such perfect analogy with the common doctrine of justification that he can aptly speak of Mary's "dispositive" causality throughout the entire work of redemption.

Rahner insists on his fundamental principle *perfecte redempta* to illustrate the ecumenical role of Mary's perduring consent to the total salvific activity of Christ, which consent is in the order of objective redemption since it "permits" the divine act whose effect is the objective salvation of all. Alfaro seems to assume Rahner's basic insight and develop it in terms of a decisive and abiding "rendering immediately possible" the entire mystery of salvation (Incarnation—Death—Resurrection of Christ, whose sacred humanity is the salvific conjoined instrument of the Divinity):

The Incarnation is in itself a salvific event, the actual beginning of the mystery of salvation and does not merely make it possible; in the Incarnation, the Death (freely accepted) and Resurrection of Christ, as the integral mystery of salvation, are already pre-contained and pre-signified; the Incarnation is the event giving internal unity

⁶⁴ Cf. Semmelroth, *op. cit.*, 88-89.

to the entire salvific mystery which is nothing other than the full unfolding in time and history of the humanity assumed by the Word; for, by assuming true humanity, the Word assumed temporality and historicity which are fundamental conditions of human life. . . . The Mysteries of Christ are constituted by diverse moments and events . . . but the different mysteries constitute one sole mystery. . . . This mystery of salvation was wrought by God in and through Christ alone (i.e., by Christ alone as sent from the Father); *the cooperation of Mary made the integral mystery of salvation immediately possible. . . .* The total reality of Mary's cooperation proceeded in the line of her maternal connection with the Person and work of the Son of God, our Saviour. . . . Mary receives from Christ and depends upon Christ, not only in her personal salvation, but also in her cooperation in the work of salvation: the cooperation of Mary receives its universal significance from the salvific mystery of Christ. . . . *Christ, a Divine Person, and Mary, a created person, do not constitute one principle of salvation: Mary is in no way combined with Christ, rather she depends upon Him: neither does she interpose herself between Christ and the Church. . . .* Both Mary and the Church directly receive from and depend upon Christ; the manner is similar but not identical: Mary's connection with the Incarnate Word, our Saviour, is supreme and qualitatively different from that of the Church. . . . Mary is type of the Church. . . . Mary in no way depends upon the Church: the Church in some way depends upon Mary, *not as upon a salvific principle (which is uniquely Christ) but as upon that created person who made the mystery of salvation immediately possible.*⁶⁵

And Alfaro sums up:

God willed to save man through man: the Incarnation represents the highest possible human cooperation in the salvation of humanity: the humanity of Christ is the conjoined salvific instrument of the Divinity: this is the meaning of the mystery of Christ. God willed the highest possible cooperation of a human person in bringing about the salvific work of Christ: this is the meaning of Mary in the mystery of salvation. God willed the cooperation of all humanity

⁶⁵ Cf. Alfaro, *Significatio . . .*, in *Gr* 40 (1959) 18, 27, 35-36 (emphasis added).

in the prolongation and application of the salvific power of Christ: this is the meaning of the mystery of the Church.⁶⁶

Finally, it may be said that the theologians of a general eclesiotypical persuasion usually present their offering with modesty: presuming, of course, that their positions amply satisfy the teachings of the papal magisterium, they are not so much urging a thesis or point of faith as attempting to gain that "aliquam Deo dante mysteriorum intelligentiam eamque fructuosissimam... ex mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo" which the First Vatican Council said could be attained by reason, illuminated by faith, when it sedulously, reverently and soberly investigates.⁶⁷ And since they are not "demonstrating" a dogma, they present *probable* positions as a result of positive investigations and personal synthesis of their findings. They are interested, not in dogmatic definitions, but simply in gaining a deeper appreciation of the unique meaning of Mary in the history of salvation.⁶⁸

From what has been said thus far, it is obvious that the particular Marian "theme" under consideration in this paper is not a "monolithic" position in Catholic theology, much less an article of Catholic faith, but a freely, and at times, vigorously disputed area in which Catholics themselves have taken radically different views of what is meant by "Our Lady's Coredeemption." It should also be evident that this question is inseparable from two other highly controverted "themes" which occupy mariologists today: the search for the "fundamental principle" and the problem of the exact lines of relationship between Mary and the Church. These three questions imply one another; they are all concerned with Mary's role in our redemption. A position taken on one implies the position to be taken on the others.⁶⁹ What is at stake here is not on the

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁶⁷ Cf. *DB* (32nd ed.) 3016.

⁶⁸ Cf. Köster, *De corredemptione mariana* . . . , 165-166.

⁶⁹ Cf. Müller, *Fragen und Aussichten* . . . , 311-317.

periphery of Marian understanding; it touches the very essence of Mary's soteriological significance. Yet, on all three Catholic theology is still far from a unified and coherent view of the matter. The frank recognition of the objective fact of the immaturity of the question as thus far elaborated in Catholic theology is of prime importance if "Our Lady's Coredemption" is to be approached under the formality of "ecumenical problem"! Just as the whole future development of Catholic Mariology will be shaped by the prevailing positions on these points, so also will the whole tone of ecumenical endeavor in their regard be set.

At this point I should like to inject a few reflections in general appraisal of our internal state on the theology of coredemption.

First, the existence of two diverse ways of conceiving Mary's immediate cooperation in our redemption does not leave us, as one author suggests,⁷⁰ with another "molinism-thomism" feud which could be settled by nothing short of total victory by one side at the expense of unconditional surrender by the other, and, in the meantime, with the grim prospect of simple co-existence in a state of cold (and at times not so cold!) war. Yet, the manner of presentation by the vast majority of authors writing to date seems certainly to reveal such an "exclusivist" mentality. Normally, we are confronted with two completely irreducible and mutually exclusive approaches which *sic et simpliciter* stand in conflict. A choice must be made. As long as this method prevails, useless repetitions with increasingly rhetorical insistence continue, but no real progress is made. Yet, the true figure of Mary in her soteriological role is both Christotypical and ecclesiotypical; her function is precisely to unite Christ to the Church. She is the perfect image of redeemed humanity precisely because in her we find the most perfect configuration to Christ, her Son. She is "type" of the

⁷⁰ Cf. Köster, *Quid iuxta investigationes . . .*, 43.

Church precisely because she is so Christ-like.⁷¹ It appears to me that until and unless authors recognize that the two approaches are at least *partially reducible* there will be no breakthrough, no progress. Any author who at this point refuses to re-examine the whole matter, as if the final word were already spoken, and is irrevocably and intransigently committed to the last jot and tittle of his own presentation will not and cannot further the cause.

I am not suggesting that "meeting half-way" is the panacea for all problems here. The two approaches are only *partially* reducible; the other "part" remains irreducible and will not be solved by negotiation. What I mean is that certain tensions could be easily and quickly relieved by a frank and thorough appraisal of both self and others. For instance, communications are evidently quite poor between the two approaches, as is evidenced by the manner in which each is so often misrepresented in the writings of the other. Those of a Christotypical bent seem ready to make the "receptive" causality of the opposition antonymous to "active" and conclude that if Mary is purely "receptive" of redemption, she does absolutely nothing, is a purely passive object and not an operative principle. Likewise, those of the ecclesiotypial persuasion imagine that the others make Mary an autosufficient part of the work which is exclusively Christ's, and are convinced that the unicity of Christ-Mediator is thereby violated. Yet, thus interpreted, *both* positions are equally untenable. The truth of the matter is that in both views Mary is intensely active and plays an *immediate* role, but does not infringe upon what is exclusively Christ's. It would seem that the "efficient" causality of some and the "receptive" causality of others are not so contradictory

⁷¹ Cf. G. Philips, *L'orientation de la Mariologie contemporaine. Essai bibliographique 1955-1959*, in *Mm* 232-243; *Idem*, *Le mystère de Marie dans les sources de la Révélation. Essai bibliographique 1959-1961*, in *Mm* 24 (1962) 35-45; *Idem*, *De unitate Christi et Ecclesiae deque loco ac munere B. Mariae Virginis in ea*, in *Maria et Ecclesia* 2 (Rome, 1959) 51-71.

after all: Mary's "receiving" produced an effect; Mary's "effecting" was received from Christ!⁷² My point is that the wealth of accurate scriptural, patristic, and speculative insights contained in both general approaches must no longer be lost to the folly of exclusivism; the time has come for all elements heretofore acquired to be combined afresh with a view toward that common position which alone will further the state of the question. Some few attempts have already appeared along these lines, but much more is required.⁷³

Secondly, it must be recognized that the actual state of the magisterium leaves the specific explanation of Mary's immediate cooperation to the free discussion of theologians. Neither general approach and certainly no one position can claim papal authority as its proof or decisive argument: the *norma proxima* of ordinary magisterium can be well satisfied by the offerings of both basic orientations. Any attempt to withdraw questions from free pursuit before they have been properly explored and developed is a positive disservice, not a sign of loyalty, to the magisterium. Hence, the question of methodology must be more realistically examined in certain quarters. The efforts to prove one specific concept of immediate cooperation over all others from the papal magisterium are already discredited as radically defective in method as well as content. The magisterium is the proximate norm within whose bounds and according to whose spirit all theological labors must proceed; but it is not a *fons revelationis*. Whence, the probability of a particular thesis can be established solely by its own validity as a

⁷² Cf. Philips, *L'orientation* . . . 234-236.

⁷³ The latest works of C. Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., are of particular note here: cf. his *Marie dans l'économie de la création renouvelée* (Paris, 1957), and *Le mystère de Notre Dame et notre dévotion mariale, avec orientations pour un dialogue oecuménique* (Paris, 1962). Cf. also the attempts made recently by authors elsewhere committed to a strict "christotypical" approach: F. Sebastiá, C.M.F., *La cooperación de María al misterio de la redención*, in *EphM* 12 (1962) 5-58; Basilio de S. Pablo, C.P., *Hacia una común inteligencia de la Corredención mariana*, in *EphM* (1963) 193-352.

synthesis of the data of revelation which observes the full analogy of faith.

Serious confusion has already arisen in Catholic minds over the role played by the magisterium on coredeption. But since the excessive claims on the magisterium appearing in some of our writings have caused certain Protestant theologians to speak of a "trend" in all of Catholic Mariology,⁷⁴ I feel that a fuller articulation of the matter will be helpful here. In the past few decades, and especially since the definition of the Assumption in 1950, some theologians have considered the doctrine of coredeptrix (Mary's immediate cooperation, usually formulated in a strict christotypical thesis) as perfectly paralleling the development undergone in the past by *Immaculata* and *Assumpta*, but with an amazing velocity which would soon lead to papal dogmatic definition. Vigorous efforts were expended to hasten the final stages of evolution and clarification; both positive and speculative studies were multiplied and all objections were finally "solved." After all, the truth was already clearly taught by ordinary magisterium; what could now stand in the way of a solemn and extraordinary intervention by the Pope? That such a trend was at least implicit in a huge quantity of theological writings on coredeption can hardly be denied. And perhaps it was precisely the quantity which led some to believe that a *bona fide* common position was actually achieved.

I am not here disputing the merits of the theological position advanced within this trend. I will merely observe that it existed within only one sector of Catholic theology at large, and evidently did not take realistic cognizance of the freedom of discussion left by the magisterium and the great use of this freedom made by hosts of other and equally important theologians. The specific issue of coredeption was never, in my

⁷⁴ Cf. R. McA. Brown, *The Spirit of Protestantism* (New York, 1961) 176; G. Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* (Philadelphia, 1955, translation of the 1950 Italian original with some revisions) 155-177, esp. 167-169.

judgment, a sufficiently mature question to found the hope of early clarification, much less of infallibly proclaimed victory for one or another entry to date.

At any rate, although some surprising instances of this trend towards dogmatic definition are still in evidence here and there on more popular levels, it seems well on the wane. The decisive reason for this is found, of course, in the internal state of the Catholic theology of coredemption itself; the specific issue of Mary's immediate "christotypical" cooperation is being recognized more and more by its advocates as not really parallel in development and acceptance to the homogeneous evolution of the previously defined Marian dogmas. Hence, it would be naïve (and not totally devoid of offensive implications) to attribute the discernible change in this trend to the encroachments of ecumenical expedients. This is not to deny that a number of entirely secondary factors have played some part in lessening the insistence of those who formerly fostered the trend. We may presume that after the announcement of the Second Vatican Council just five years ago this month, the prospect of any solemn papal definitions appeared quite remote to even the most optimistic supporter of the trend. Then, Pope John's express disapproval, on the opening day of the council's first session, of any intent that the Fathers formulate new definitions of dogma may also have been a factor. Moreover, it was well known that the draft on Mary prepared for discussion on the council floor purposely avoided all but already dogmatic and otherwise uncontroverted elements of Catholic doctrine.

Thirdly, the spirit of many writings on the Catholic ledger of coredemption leaves much to be desired. One leading mariologist has recently felt constrained to call for an ecumenical movement *ad intra!*⁷⁵ The terms "minimalist" and "maximalist"

⁷⁵ Cf. R. Laurentin, *Bulletin marial*, in *RSPT* 46 (1962) 363; *Idem*, *Faut-il parler de la Vierge?*, in *Informations catholiques internationales*, n. 203 (November 1, 1963) 25-28. In this latter entry, an interview on the occasion of the publication of his new work, *La question mariale* (Paris, 1963), Fr. Laurentin speaks in a frank and at times startling way of

are odious and have no place in characterizing the entries into the field. The implication has come to be that those so labeled either deprive Mary of her due glory, or Christ of His. Further, the "ecclesiotypists" have no less respect for the magisterium, no less fidelity to scientific norms, and no less love for Mary than do the "christotypists." Neither are they given to "false irenicism" as some have implied; and the fact that some live in "Protestant regions" is irrelevant to the objective worth of their theology. At this stage such polemics can serve no other purpose than further to obfuscate the whole matter. *In omnibus caritas!*

Finally, a word about the recent action taken by the Fathers of Vatican II on the proposed schema *De Beata Maria*. In the conciliar debate immediately prior to the vote, Cardinal Rufino Santos, the officially designated spokesman for those who opposed its inclusion within the schema *De Ecclesia*, warned that such inclusion "would seem to be cutting off a controversy among theologians regarding 'christotypical' and 'ecclesiotypical' mariology";⁷⁶ in other words, it would be interpreted as deciding in favor of ecclesiotypical. Since the majority vote then proceeded to incorporate all future discussions and presentation of Mary within the framework of *De Ecclesia*, the question arises as to whether the implication feared by the Cardinal is in fact contained in the council's action. The answer to this question, of course, must await future events in the council hall which alone will reveal the mind of the Fathers not only on this preliminary action but also on the whole question of the proper orientation of Mariology. In the meantime it is impossible to discern any trends actually created by the council vote.

the "crisis" of mariology, and laments that the Virgin has become "an object of controversy and a sign of contradiction" among Catholics themselves!

⁷⁶ Cf. the official summary of Cardinal Santos' presentation in *OR*, October 30, 1963, 3: "... il Concilio sembrerebbe voler troncane una controversia fra i teologi a proposito della mariologia 'cristotipica' oppure 'ecclesiotipica.' "

These, then, are my findings on the internal state of our theology of coredemption. An adequate view of the entire spectrum of things and not merely an espousal of one or another "position" was the absolute requisite for placing this particular Marian theme in the frame of reference desired. We can hardly determine "where we really differ, and why?" without first knowing where we ourselves stand. However, already two "ecumenical" conclusions of basic importance are possible.

First, the frank description of the state of Catholic theology at large will serve well to dissipate much Protestant misunderstanding of "coredemptrix," and enable Protestant theologians better to enucleate the *real* point of division as distinguished from those which also divide Catholics among themselves. Protestants must be made more aware of the danger of readily identifying the views of one Catholic author or "school" with Catholic doctrine as such.⁷⁷ It is senseless to allow certain positions advanced by some Catholic theologians to become ecumenical problems *ad extra* when they are even more of a problem *ad intra*; in matters of free dispute Protestants enjoy the same freedom as Catholics.

⁷⁷ Thus, G. Miegge's chapter on "The Co-Redemptress" (*loc. cit.*) is essentially a protest against the method and positions of Fr. Roschini identified with Catholic mariology. The influence of Miegge's work cannot be underestimated: besides the English and American editions of the original Italian, it has recently appeared in French under the title *La Sainte Vierge* (Paris, 1961). J. Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (New York-Nashville, 1959), considers Miegge a "sympathetic and well-informed" interpreter who gives a "critical but balanced statement" of Roman Catholic mariology (p. 138 with n. 17). It is interesting to note that Dr. Pelikan sees the Catholic Mary as a "semi-divine being" (*op. cit.*, 142), while Fr. Alfaro (*Gr* 40 [1959] 27) warns: "Ad recte extollendam unicitatem et exclusivitatem functionis salvificae Christi cavendum est a tendentia transferendi et applicandi Mariae illas categorias (e.g., capitalitas, etc.) quibus revelatio exprimit characterem proprium operis salvifici Christi. Si enim illae categoriae applicantur Mariae (quamvis fortiter dicatur quod in Maria verificantur solum secundarie et dependenter a Christo), Maria eveniet paulatim pro nobis *Christus secundarius et diminutus*, imago quaedam reducta et quasi *duplicatum* quoddam Christi (sit venia termino)." One wonders whether both have been reading the same Catholic authors.

Secondly, the two basic rules of Marian ecumenism expressed by the president of the Pontifical Marian Academy in Rome are well applied here:

- "1) omnia, quae sive de fide sive tamquam theologicè certa ab Ecclesia tenentur, integre et fideliter a cunctis exponantur, ita tamen, ut, quatenus fieri possit, pervia captui fratrum nostrorum reddantur;
- 2) illa, porro, quae inter catholicos in utramque disputantur partem, minime sunt urgenda."⁷⁸

The specific theme of Mary's coredeemption clearly falls into the second category: *minime urgenda!*

II

If it is time now to focus our attention on the real ecumenical issues implied by our theology of coredeemption and to ask in regard to our Protestant brethren "*where* do we really differ?". the answer is as absolute as it is obvious. We really differ insofar as the question of Mary's immediate cooperation in redemption can be seriously placed to all Catholics of whom some would respond in the affirmative, while no Protestant true to the principles of the Reform can even accept the question. It is answered long before it can be asked. And to respond to the second question, "*why* do we really differ?" (understood on a doctrinal, not historical, level), would be to describe all the major doctrinal themes which continue to support Protestant-Catholic desunity! For, coredeemption, howsoever it be formulated in the various Catholic approaches, is for the Protestant "a culminating doctrine in which the whole preceding development of mariology comes to its conclusive and synthetic formula";⁷⁹ in its turn, mariology is nothing more than the embodiment and expression of fundamental Protestant-Catholic dif-

⁷⁸ C. Balic, O.F.M., *De motu mariologico-mariano et motione oecumenica saeculis XIX et XX*, in C. Balic (ed.), *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo* (Rome, 1962) 559-560.

⁷⁹ Cf. Miegge, *op. cit.*, 156.

ferences. A near perfect "compenetration" of issues is in startling evidence here.⁸⁰

At the risk of making an exegesis of the obvious, I should like briefly to indicate the roots of the ecumenical problem of coredeemption as they run deep into the more general situation.⁸¹ Mary's immediate cooperation stands, as does the greater part of Catholic Marian doctrine and devotion, in direct contradiction to some basic principles which can be called characteristic of the Protestant view of redemption.⁸²

Solus Deus. God alone works our salvation; no human causality, albeit allegedly arising from grace itself, has any share in this work. (This principle of the Reform has never been abrogated, although it is not always expressed and urged as such.)⁸³ But for Catholics, Mary is a *cooperans* who usurps a function reserved exclusively to God.

Solus Christus. Christ alone is Saviour; He is the "one mediator between God and man" (1 *Tim.* 2:5) who excludes all further human mediation. But for Catholics, Mary is the *Socia Redemptoris* who becomes mediatrix to obscure and infringe upon the unique position of Christ.

Sola Gratia. Justification does not empower man to make

⁸⁰ Cf. the detailed description of same in Schmaus, *op. cit.*, 527-534.

⁸¹ Cf. Balic, *op. cit.*, 519-573.

⁸² I am speaking here of the "spirit" of Protestantism, and not of any particular form it takes. Obviously, the "liberals" who deny even the divine maternity of Mary are outside the question, as are those Anglo-Catholics who closely approximate Roman doctrine and practice. The "spirit" characterized by the principles enuniated is described, for example, by Brown, *op. cit.*; J. Dillenberg and C. Welch, *Protestant Christianity* (New York, 1954) esp. 255-283, 302-326; and L. Bouyer, *The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism* (Westminster, 1957). For an account of the mariological situation in Anglicanism, cf. G. Corr, O.S.M., *La doctrine mariale et la pensée anglicane contemporaine*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Maria. Etudes sur la Sainte Vierge*, 3 (Paris, 1954) 711-731; A. Luis, C.Ss.R., *Significación de Maria en la Iglesia anglicana*, in *EM* 22 (1961) 125-155.

⁸³ Cf. A. Brandenburg, *De mariologia ac de cultu venerationeque Mariae apud Christianos disiunctos Protestanticos hoc tempore vigentibus*, in C. Balic (ed.), *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo* (Rome, 1962) 514.

claims in the sight of God. All human merits arising from grace are excluded. But for Catholics, Mary is the quintessence of deserving merit, and no longer the proclamation of undeserved grace.

Sola Scriptura. The Scriptures alone contain revealed truth and are themselves the norm and rule of genuine Christian faith.⁸⁴ But for Catholics, who pretend to find revealed truth in the living faith of their Church, and hold the ecclesiastical magisterium as their norm of belief,⁸⁵ Mary achieves an identity unknown under the Protestant norm and, therefore, far in excess of revelation.

Mary, *sola creatura.* Protestants insist that Mary stands on the side of sinful humanity,⁸⁶ and charge that Catholics have deified her, at least virtually. Catholics attribute to Mary powers and qualities which for the Protestant are incommunicably divine.

Moreover, Protestants are quick to see the ecclesiological dimension of Catholic exaltation of Mary. By a perfectly valid intuition they see the role we attribute to Mary in human redemption as strictly analogous to our concept of the Church's role. Barth reflects that "in the doctrine and worship of Mary is disclosed the one heresy of the Roman Catholic Church which

⁸⁴ Brandenburg, *loc. cit.*, observes: "Etsi theologis protestanticis nostrorum temporum persuasum est Traditionem a Scriptura prorsus separari non posse, sed cum ea utcumque cohaerere . . . tamen, ultima dogmata mariana perpendentes, iterum ac saepius ad Scripturam solam respiciunt. Dicit quoque potest: hae duae notiones—et Scriptura et Traditio—quas modo accuratius determinando inter se coniunctas esse etiam non pauci theologi protestantici affirmant, in usu cotidiano disiunguntur. Vix ullus theologus protestanticus de mariologia disputat, quin plus minusve exclusive principium 'Scripturae solius' defendat."

⁸⁵ Brown, *op. cit.*, 176, feels that the Catholic Church "need no longer listen to Scripture. It need only listen to itself."

⁸⁶ M. Thurian says that "[Mary] is a personage unique in history, but she remains a miserable sinner who has need of the forgiveness of her Son"; cf. *Mariology (d) Reformed*, in P. Edwall, E. Hayman, W. Maxwell (eds.), *Ways of Worship. The Report of a Theological Commission of Faith and Order* (New York, 1951) 312.

explains all the rest. The Mother of God of the Catholic Marian dogma is quite simply the type and essence of the human creature cooperating servantlike in its own redemption on the basis of prevenient grace, and to that extent the principle, type and essence of the Church."⁸⁷ Mary is the supreme instance and exemplar of our faith in the fundamental nature of Christian salvation.

In a word, the question of coredemption cannot even be placed to a Protestant because he has a radically different way of viewing the status and requirements of man before the God Who saves him through Jesus Christ. The Catholic understanding of man's own, but God-given, role in salvation, of mankind's part in the divino-human synergism by which he is saved, is simply at loggerheads with basic Protestant tenets.⁸⁸ This is why the very suggestion that Mary plays an immediate role in redemption is not only unintelligible to the Protestant, but offensive as well. The placement, therefore, of this question (a "theme" under serious consideration by Catholics but still hotly debated) must await a resolve of the more basic problem of human cooperation in general.

In the meantime, however, and precisely because of the

⁸⁷ Cf. K. Barth, *Esquisse d'une dogmatique* (Paris, 1950) 127. This same insight is shared by other Protestants: cf. W. von Loewenich, *Modern Catholicism* (London, 1959) 196; F. J. Leenhardt, *Catholicisme romain et protestantisme* (Geneva, 1957) 17; P. Maury, *La Vierge Marie dans le catholicisme contemporain* in *Le protestantisme et la Vierge* (Paris, 1950) 47. A detailed analysis of the ecclesiological implication of mariology, including considerations of development of dogma, magisterium, etc., is found in J. Vodopivec, *La Vierge Marie: obstacle et espoir de la réunion des Chrétiens*, in *Maria et Ecclesia*, 10 (Rome, 1960) 143-180. An analysis of the mariological views of Barth is included in the following works of J. Hamer, O.P.: *Mariologie et théologie protestante*, in *DTFr* 30 (1952) 347-368; *Protestants and the Marian Doctrine*, in *Thom* 18 (1955) 480-502; *Marie et le Protestantisme a partir du dialogue oecuménique*, in H. du Manoir (ed.), *Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, 5 (Paris, 1958) 983-1006.

⁸⁸Schmaus, *op. cit.*, 572 f., describes these differences in the specific context of coredemption.

"compenetration" of issues involved here, the presentation of our Catholic theology of Marian mediation in general and co-redemption in particular can serve a useful function in clarifying those same more basic problems and in considerably lessening Protestant misunderstanding and the resultant misconstruction of our efforts. But, of course, such service to the cause of rapprochement will be rendered only to the extent that our writings reflect a profound ecumenical preoccupation.⁸⁹

I do not mean to equivocate on the hard fact that the Catholic view of the nature of salvation is really different from that of "typical" protestantism. What I mean is this: those same principles which can characterize the Protestant view of salvation and bear a negative sense which we cannot accept in the same way, bear a positive or "assertative" sense with which we already agree. *Solus Deus, solus Christus, sola gratia, Mary sola creatura*, even *sola Scriptura* can be axiomatic of Catholic doctrine and theology as well. And, I submit, to accentuate the positive will at least mitigate the negative.

Thus, it falls to us to emphasize and, where necessary, to reinforce our emphasis on the abiding initiative and primacy of the Divine Action in and through Mary (*solus Deus*); the absolute inviolability of our common dogmatic truth of the unicity of Christ-mediator, not by mere verbal formulas or distinctions of dubious value, but in reality as well, showing that all purely human mediation, including the altogether special mediation of Mary, is *in* Christ and not "next to" Christ (*solus Christus*); the ineffable power of undeserved grace which is so vital and dynamic that it transforms and elevates human nature even to share in the divine work as the divine life itself, reaching a unique intensity in Mary who embodies, as it were, redeemed humanity (*sola gratia*); the fact that Mary *of herself* would belong to the *massa damnata*, and is immaculately holy from the first moment of her conception solely by

⁸⁹ Cf. the description of three levels of ecumenism by Y. Congar, O.P., in *The Ecumenist*, 1 (1963) 66.

the fruits of Christ's redemptive grace, and that she is not really above human condition; it is just that Christ raised her so high above the *fallen* condition of mankind (*sola creatura*); that our view of Mary illustrates and confirms, rather than obfuscates, the magnitude, transcendence, munificence, omnipotence and freedom of God; finally, that everything we affirm of Mary is founded in some way in the Scriptures whose full understanding has homogeneously come to the fore within the bosom of the Church (*sola Scriptura*).⁹⁰

It further falls to us sedulously to avoid whatever could be ambiguous to our Protestant readers, especially those exaggerations against which Catholics themselves have reacted, and to continue to search out the foundation in revelation for our doctrinal elaborations. In this way, our efforts in the theology of coredemption will serve not only their immediate purpose, but also the cause of ecumenism which is the special grace of our times.

III

In conclusion, we might ask whether there are any signs of thaw in the glacier which separates Protestants and Catholics on the question of Mary's cooperation in our redemption.⁹¹ Without doubt, the "round no"⁹² typical of Protestant anti-Marian polemic in general is currently being tempered in some quarters by a more understanding attitude towards Catholic

⁹⁰ Cf. Balic, *op. cit.*, 561 f.

⁹¹ For a general survey of Marian trends in contemporary Protestantism, cf., besides the works of Frs. Hamer and Brandenburg already cited, B. Leeming, S.J., *Protestants and Our Lady*, in *ITQ* 27 (1960) 91-110; K. F. Dougherty, S.A., *Our Lady and the Protestants*, in J. Carol (ed.), *Mariology*, 3 (Milwaukee, 1961) 422-439; I. Ruidor, S.J., *La mariología en el protestantismo actual*, in *EM* 22 (1961) 109-124; P. Fannon, S.M.M., *The Protestant Approach to Mariology*, in *ITQ* 29 (1962) 121-135; J. Galot, S.J., *Marie et certains protestants contemporains*, in *NRT* 85 (1963) 478-495.

⁹² The phrase of R. Mehl, *Du catholicisme romain. Approche et interprétation* (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1957) 83.

positions and some remarkable appreciations of Mary's role in God's plan. In fact, one could now assemble an interesting *corpus* of positive mariology comprised exclusively of Protestant authors. It goes without saying that such was completely non-existent a relatively few years ago.

It has been pointed out that one of the fundamental reasons for the changing attitude is the rediscovery by contemporary Protestants of the Marian teachings of the first Reformers.⁹³ Twilight has come upon the day when those who flatly reject all Marian theology and devotion can honestly consider themselves faithful to Luther, Zwingli and Calvin. It has been shown that the original reformers preserved precious elements of traditional Marian doctrine and even promoted their own form of Marian veneration. Although mediation was not accepted, still not only *theotokos* and *semper virgo* but also distinct traces of *immaculata* and *assumpta* appear in original Reformation writings. This realization is especially vivid within the precincts of German Lutheranism.⁹⁴

Other reasons adduced to explain the revival of Marian theology among Protestants include: the sincere ecumenical intent evidenced already in 1937 at the Edinburg Conference, again in 1952 at Lund, and which continues rapidly to gain momentum; the Protestant "shock" at the 1950 definition of the Assumption which forced a review of general outlooks on the problem of tradition, development of doctrine, authority and the norm of faith; and, of course, the marvellous renewal in biblical studies which has given rise to a suspicion that the

⁹³Cf. Galot, *op. cit.*, 478 f.

⁹⁴Due in large part to the recent historical works of men like Schim-melfennig and the anthology of Reformation Marian texts compiled by Tappolet; cf. Galot, *loc. cit.* We would note also the latest work of W. Delius, *Geschichte der Marien Verehrung* (Munich-Basel, 1963), wherein the author shows himself quite familiar with Catholic mariological literature, and does not hide his ecumenical intent. For an excellent summary of the Marian views of the original Reformers, cf. E. Stakemeier, *De Beata Maria Virgine eiusque cultu iuxta Reformatores*, in C. Balic (ed.), *De Mariologia et Oecumenismo* (Rome, 1962) 423-477.

Marian *loci* in Scripture are more frequent and more meaningful than previously realized.⁹⁵

Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that a certain "sympathy" is felt in some Protestant circles, and that many Protestant scholars, particularly exegetes, would readily accept the admonition of Dr. Pelikan: "Misgivings are not enough . . . The Protestant criticism of Roman Catholic mariology will not do any more than score points until it is accompanied by a positive discussion of the mother of our Lord as viewed from a biblical and evangelical perspective. 'Behold,' she said, 'henceforth all generations will call me blessed.' This generation should be no exception . . . Truth is, we know very little about her . . . In any Protestant Mariology (if one may put those two words together) there are two insights that must be included—Mary's significance for Christ and Mary's significance for the Church."⁹⁶ And Pelikan's introduction to the English translation of Semmelroth's insight is further proof of his sincerity in this.⁹⁷

Thus, while there is no justification at all for identifying these favorable signs with a large scale Protestant conviction, or to see them at present as anything more than exceptional, it remains true that the serious theological consideration of Mary in her relationship to Christ and the Church is no longer as exclusively Roman as in former times.

But in regard to our specific issue here, the question of Mary's coredemption, one recent work is altogether remarkable and deserves our special attention.⁹⁸ I am speaking of Brother

⁹⁵ Cf. Leeming, *op. cit.*, 91-95; Galot, *op. cit.*, 481-483.

⁹⁶ Cf. J. Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (New York-Nashville, 1959) 141.

⁹⁷ Cf. J. Pelikan, introduction to O. Semmelroth, S.J., *Mary Archetype of the Church* (New York, 1963) vii-xiv.

⁹⁸ I presume the work of H. Asmussen, *Maria die Mutter Gottes* (1st ed., Stuttgart, 1925; 2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1951) is already well-known: cf. Dougherty, *loc. cit.*; Brandenburg, *loc. cit.* It must be noted, however, that Asmussen is considered "heterodox" by his German Lutheran coreligionists. Also, I would not want to omit notice of the doctoral thesis prepared by

Max Thurian's *Mary, Mother of the Lord, Type of the Church*, published last year by his reformed (Calvinist) Community of Taizé.⁹⁹ Thurian states his intention "simply to listen to the Gospel by attempting to prescind from all echoes of controversy,"¹⁰⁰ and proceeds serenely to elaborate his theme, that "neither the Gospel nor the authentic Christian tradition has been able to separate Mary from the Church. To speak of Mary is to speak of the Church. They are united in one and the same fundamental vocation: maternity."¹⁰¹ He explains:

One enables us to understand the other, for the one is the type of the other. Mary, mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, is a type of the Church, mother of the faithful. All that Mary has been and has lived, the Church is and must live, except for that which belongs to the unique vocation of Mary in the Incarnation of the Son of God.¹⁰²

Thurian sees Mary as the Daughter of Sion who replaces the Ark in the temple of Jerusalem because God has come to dwell in her, calling her by a new and marvellous name *kechari-tôméné*.¹⁰³ She is ever-virgin, mother of the Lord, mother of the Messiah-King, mother of the Suffering Servant.¹⁰⁴ In a long and beautiful analysis of the miracle at Cana, Mary is

a Dutch Reformed Church pastor, C. A. Ridder, *Maria Medeverlosseres? De discussie in de huidige Rooms-Katholieke Theologie over de medewerking van de Moeder Gods in het Verlossingswerk* (Utrecht, 1960). I have not seen this work, but Msgr. Philips reports that it summarizes the current Catholic debate on coredemption in a balanced and well-documented manner: cf. *Mm* 24 (1962) 36-37. And Fr. Köster quotes Ridder as recognizing the Catholic "ecclesiotypical" approach as perhaps capable of making coredemption "acceptable": cf. *Mm* 24 (1962) 167.

⁹⁹ M. Thurian, *Marie, Mère du Seigneur. Figure de l'Eglise* (Taizé, 1962) 286 pp. Cf. the notice of this book taken by C. Boyer, S.J., in *CC* 114 (1963) 350-354; M. J. Le Guillou, O.P., in *Istina* (1963) 211-230; Galot, *op. cit.*

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Thurian, *op. cit.*, 8.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 19-37.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 39-172.

presented as the figure of the Church confessing the glory of the Son of God.¹⁰⁵ Commenting *John*, 19, in a way which rivals the best of Catholic appreciations, Mary is the sorrowful virgin symbolizing the Church whose compassion, faith, hope and charity she expresses, just as the disciple John represents all faithful.¹⁰⁶ Finally, the Woman of the Apocalypse is Mary and the Church announcing in their victory the fruit of Christ's resurrection.¹⁰⁷

Thurian seems to equivocate on the word "culte" which he denies to Mary in favor of rendering thanks and glory to God alone.¹⁰⁸ It seems that he is denying what we would deny, namely "adoration," while at the same time offering veneration, admiration and praise to Mary on every page. And, although the step to invoking Mary's intercession is not actually taken, true Marian mediation seems certainly to be the logical implication of his work.¹⁰⁹ Thus, with this one reservation of "culte," a Calvinist Reformed monk has written of late a biblical meditation on Mary of which Catholics could be jealous!

Thurian is an exception, not the rule. I have singled him out, first, because he manifests the same "ecclesiotypical" intuition which underlies one very valid Catholic approach to coredeemption, a fact which is significant in considering coredeemption as an ecumenical problem; and secondly, because he might well stand as the exemplar of the whole form and spirit which any future Marian rapprochement must take, even on the delicate question of Mary's mediation and possible immediate role in our redemption: fraternal collaboration in an effort to penetrate ever more deeply the inexhaustible riches of God's revelation, primarily on our common ground of its source, the Scrip-

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 196-212.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 212-242.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 261-278.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 272: "il ne s'agit pas de rendre un culte à Marie, mais de rendre grâce et gloire à Dieu seul pour tout ce qu'il a fait pour elle."

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Fr. Boyer's observations in *OR* (December 14, 1962) 6.

tures read in the light of that "authentic Christian tradition" to which Brother Thurian refers. In my judgment, the work of this man is the most outstanding contribution to Marian ecumenism to date. It is my hope that it will be followed by a long series of outstanding contributions until that day, in God's good providence, when the priestly prayer of Christ will be perfectly fulfilled, that "all may be one."

REV. ROBERT E. HUNT
Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, N.J.