

5-22-2016

The Theology of Reparation to the Immaculate Heart Of Mary

Arthur Burton Calkins

Follow this and additional works at: https://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

Calkins, Arthur Burton (2016) "The Theology of Reparation to the Immaculate Heart Of Mary," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 67, Article 3, Pages 9-42.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol67/iss1/3

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 editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

THE THEOLOGY OF REPARATION TO THE IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY

Arthur Burton Calkins, STD

The Theology of Reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is a topic barely considered in modern theology, but strongly brought to the fore in the apparitions at Fatima and the subsequent apparitions to Sister Lúcia, the last surviving seer of Fatima and other mystics. The analogy or “likeness in difference” between the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the consecration to their Hearts, the Heart of the God-man and the Heart of the most perfect creature, is primary. In “Misericordissimus Redemptor,” Pius XI taught that just as in his agony Jesus not only saw every sin ever committed, he also saw every act of reparation offered to console him, and this on the basis of his beatific vision or infused knowledge (even though the pope did not use this explicit terminology in his encyclical). The teaching of subsequent popes continued in this line. In the past, theologians did explore the topic of Mary’s own infused and even possibly transitory beatific knowledge. Most recently the late Bertrand de Margerie, SJ, who authored notable studies on the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, wrote a very probing investigative essay on Mary’s

knowledge, providing many useful references in this regard. The devotion of reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is certainly practiced in the Church, especially on First Saturdays of the month, encouraged by mystics and sanctioned by the Holy See. The fruit of my research, I hope, indicates the solid theological basis for the practice.

I. Introduction

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 Fatima¹ and subsequently to the Servant of God Sister Lúcia of Jesus and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, OCD (1907-2005),² 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:

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

¹ 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), 108, 161, 162.

² Kondor, *Fatima*, 195-197; António Maria Martins, SJ (ed. & trans.), *Memórias e cartas da Irmã Lúcia* (Porto, Portugal: Simão Guimarães Filhos, Lda.), 409-411.

to make some reparation for the most bitter anguish that we caused her loving Heart to suffer.³

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 of 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.⁴ Likewise in 1885 the same congregation indulgenced an *Act of Reparation for Blasphemies against the B.V.M.*⁵ In 1914 the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office indulgenced a prayer *In Reparation for Insults offered to the B.V.M.*⁶ 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

³ Saint John Eudes, *The Admirable Heart of Mary*, trans. Charles di Targiani and Ruth Hauser (NY: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1948), 265.

⁴ *The Raccolta: A Manual of Indulgences*, ed. and trans. Joseph P. Christopher, Charles E. Spence, John F. Rowan (Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1957), #334; Cf. Saint Alphonsus de' Liguori, *The Glories of Mary*, trans. Eugene Grimm, CSsR (Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931), 655.

⁵ *The Raccolta*, #328.

⁶ *The Raccolta*, #329. This prayer also referred to Our Lady as "Coredemptrix of the human race."

order to make atonement for the blasphemies whereby the name and prerogatives of the same Blessed Virgin are reviled ...⁷

This had originally come as a result of the meeting of the Venerable Maria Dolores Inglese (1866-1928)⁸ 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. 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

⁷ *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.”

⁸ 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).

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!”⁹ 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.”¹⁰ Lúcia records this episode, which took place when she was a Dorothean sister in Pontevedra, Spain:

On December 10th, 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.”

⁹ Kondor, *Fatima*, 108.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 161.

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 company for fifteen minutes while meditating on the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary, with the intention of making reparation to me.”¹¹

III. A Foundational Principle

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.

A. The Principle 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

¹¹Ibid., 195.

equivocation.”¹² 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 equivocality 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 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.*]¹³

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

¹² G. P. Klubertanz, “Analogy,” in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), 1:463.

¹³ *In XI Metaph.* lect. 3, no. 2197, quoted in H. D. Gardeil, OP, *Introduction to the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas IV: Metaphysics*, trans. John A. Otto (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1967), 50-51.

(secondary) analogates have this formality predicated of them by mere extrinsic denomination.¹⁴

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.¹⁵

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 as 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.¹⁶

Theologians have long recognized that there exists an analogy, a certain “likeness in difference” between Jesus and

¹⁴ Gardeil, *Introduction*, 53.

¹⁵ Cf. J. Bittremieux, “Consecratio Mundi Immaculato Cordi B. Mariae Virginis,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 20 (1943): 102; Gabriele Roschini, OSM, “La Consacrazione del Mondo al Cuore Immacolato di Maria,” in *Il Cuore Immacolato di Maria*, *Settimana di Studi Mariani* (Rome: Edizioni “Marianum,” 1946), 60.

¹⁶ Gardeil, *Introduction*, 54.

Mary, a certain symmetry and complementarity, though not identity, between them.¹⁷

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,'¹⁸ 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

¹⁷ On the principle of analogy as it pertains to Mariology, cf. José M. Bover, SJ, "El Principio Mariológico de Analogía," *Alma Socia Christi* (Rome: PAMI, 1953), 1:1-13; Gabriele M. Roschini, OSM, *Dizionario di Mariologia* (Rome: 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*, 2nd ed. rev. and enl. (Frigento: Casa Mariana Editrice, 2007), 284-286; Emile Neubert, SM, *Mary in Doctrine* (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Co., 1954), 5-8.

¹⁸ He is citing here his Encyclical Letter *Mystici Corporis* of 29 June 1943: *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* [henceforth referred to as *AAS*] 35 (1943): 247.

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.¹⁹

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 Reginam* 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

¹⁹ Heinrich Denzinger, *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, 43rd ed., ed. Peter Hünermann for the bilingual ed., Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash for the Eng. ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012) [henceforth referred to as *D-H*], #3915-3916; *AAS* 46 (1954): 634-635.

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.*].²⁰

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 himself to us and unite us to him. We give ourselves to Jesus because he is our last end.²¹

²⁰ *Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, XX/2 (1997), 56 [L'Osservatore Romano, Eng. ed., #1502:7] [henceforth referred to as *Insegnamenti*].

²¹ *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.

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, OFM 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.²²

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

²² Firmin M. Schmidt, OFM Cap, "The Universal Queenship of Mary," in *Mariology*, ed. Juniper B. Carol, OFM (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Co., 1957), 2:510.

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 dependence on Mary, the reason for our act, is essentially a dependence on God.²³

B. 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:

²³ John F. Murphy, *Mary's Immaculate Heart: The Meaning of Devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951), 98.

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.²⁴

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

²⁴ AAS 48 (1956): 327-28; Francis Larkin, SSCC, ed., *Haurietis Aquas: The Sacred Heart Encyclical of Pope Pius XII* (Orlando, FL: Sacred Heart Pub. 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.

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 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.”²⁵ 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.²⁶

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

²⁵ Sacred Congregation of Rites, 4 May 1944 [*AAS* 37 (1945): 50].

²⁶ *Insegnamenti*, IX/2 (1986), 699-700 [*ORE* 959:12-13].

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.²⁷

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 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

²⁷ D-H, #2800.

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.²⁸

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 collaboration in the work of the redemption. They are not on the same level, but there is a profound analogy between them that is rooted in the divine will.

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.²⁹ While it is certainly true, as Father Édouard Glotin, SJ, 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,³⁰

²⁸ *Insegnamenti*, V/2 (1982), 1573-1574 [ORE 734:3]; emphasis my own.

²⁹ 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 *Pax in Virtute. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Cardinale Giuseppe Caprio*, ed. Francesco Lepore and Donato D'Agostino (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003), 271-323.

³⁰ Cf. Édouard Glotin, SJ, *Le Cœur de Jésus: Approches anciennes et nouvelles* (Namur, Belgium: Collection Vie Consacrée #16, 1997) 111-162.

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,³¹ it is quite remarkable that this encyclical makes explicit reference to Saint Margaret Mary four times³² and offers an unabashed theological rationale for the entreaty which was communicated to her by the Lord.³³ To my knowledge, this is unparalleled in the history of the modern papal magisterium.

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

³¹Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [henceforth referred to as CCC], #67.

³²Cf. *AAS* 20 (1928): 166, 167, 173, 177 [Raoul Plus, SJ, *Reparation: Its History, Doctrine and Practice* (NY: Benziger Brothers, 1931), 92, 94, 100, 105].

³³Cf. 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.

gratitude, has met only with neglect, indifference and insult, and these sometimes from souls that owe him a special duty of love.³⁴

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?”³⁵ 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,”³⁶ 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.³⁷

The possibility of our offering “retroactive” reparation or consolation to the Heart of Jesus is something that had

³⁴AAS 20 (1928): 173 [Plus100]. The original French text is found in F.-L. Gauthey (ed.), *Vie et Œuvres de Sainte Marguerite-Marie Alacoque* (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Poussielgue, 1920), 2:103.

³⁵AAS 20 (1928): 173. Here I am using the English translation provided in Claudia Carlen, IHM, *The Papal Encyclicals 1903-1939* (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Pub. Co., “Consortium Books,” 1981), 3:325.

³⁶*In Ioannis evangelium*, tract. XXVI, 4; AAS 20 (1928): 173 [Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals*, 3:325].

³⁷AAS 20 (1928): 174 [Plus 101] (emphasis my own).

long been held in the Catholic mystical tradition³⁸ 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 human soul by His Divine Person, and the third gave Him immediate knowledge of His Father.³⁹

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*

³⁸ Cf. Stackpole, "Consoling the Heart," 71-149.

³⁹ Bertrand de Margerie, SJ, *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* 36, no. 2-3 (May-Dec. 1983), entitled *La Visione Beatifica di Cristo Viatore*. For an excellent general exposition of the traditional teaching, cf. Albert Schlitzer, CSC, *Redemptive Incarnation: Sources and Their Theological Development in the Study of Christ* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962), 151-170.

*Body were continually and unceasingly present to him, and he embraced them with his redeeming love.*⁴⁰

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.⁴¹ 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.*⁴²

Here Pius XII was distinguishing between the human knowledge of Christ insofar as it derived directly from the beatific vision⁴³ and that which was directly infused for the sake of his mission.⁴⁴ The distinction between these two

⁴⁰ *D-H*, #3812 (emphasis my own).

⁴¹ Some authors had argued that it was on the basis of Christ's infused knowledge.

⁴² *AAS* 48 (1956): 327-328; *D-H*, #3924; [*Haurietis Aquas*, #56] (emphasis my own).

⁴³ 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, "Consoling the Heart," 338-342.

⁴⁴ The *CCC*, #473, seems to allude to this kind of knowledge in stating "The

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.⁴⁵

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 vision⁴⁶ while the other held that it derives from his infused knowledge.⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ Without taking sides on the matter, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states

Son in his human knowledge also showed the divine penetration he had into the secret thoughts of human hearts.”

⁴⁵ Cf. *ST III*, 9-12 and Stackpole, “Consoling the Heart,” 266-275.

⁴⁶ 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 *Cor Jesu: Commentationes in Litteras Encyclicas Pii PP. XII “Haurietis Aquas,” I: Pars Theologica* ed. Bea, Rahner, Rondet, and Schwendimann (Rome: Casa Editrice Herder, 1959), 657-682. Cf. comments in Stackpole, “Consoling the Heart,” 288-290.

⁴⁷ Father Bertrand de Margerie, SJ, 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 in his dissertation “Consoling the Heart,” 283-288, 291-294.

⁴⁸ On the twentieth century papal magisterium in the human knowledge of Christ, cf. Stackpole, “Consoling the Heart,” 278-282.

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.⁴⁹

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*.⁵⁰

V. 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 Grignion 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

⁴⁹ CCC, #478.

⁵⁰ 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.

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.]*⁵¹

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

⁵¹ AAS 34 (1942): 318-319, 325 [*Our Lady: Papal Teachings*, trans. Daughters of St. Paul (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1961), #380 alt.—henceforth referred to as *OL*]. 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.

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 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*,⁵² 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.⁵³

The theologian to whom I just referred above was the late Father Bertrand de Margerie, SJ (1923-2003), whom I have

⁵² 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].

⁵³ Murphy, *Mary’s Immaculate Heart*, 108-109.

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.”⁵⁴ 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.”⁵⁵ I happened to be one of the persons present on that occasion and I must admit that I do not 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 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.

⁵⁴ Bertrand de Margerie, SJ, “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.

⁵⁵ *Knowledge*, 40.

We follow here the approach and principles of Cardinal Lépiciér (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.⁵⁶

I offer here just a few comments. The sins and the consolation which Jesus saw in the agony by virtue of the beatific vision,⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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 post-conciliar 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."⁵⁹ Chapter Eight of *Lumen Gentium* is an exceedingly balanced document; it does not say everything about Mary, but carefully presents the Church's

⁵⁶ *Knowledge*, 31-32.

⁵⁷ Father de Margerie, however, always held that Jesus saw our sins and consolations by virtue of infused knowledge as well.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Knowledge*, 35; Alexis Henricus Maria Lépiciér, OSM, *Tractatus de Beatissima Virgine Maria Matre Dei*, 5th ed. (Rome: Ex Officina Typographica, 1926), 282-284; Roschini, *Dizionario*, 456; Gregory Alastruey, *The Blessed Virgin Mary*, trans. Sr. M Janet La Giglia, OP (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1963), 1:219-221; Antonio Royo Marin, OP, *La Virgen María: Teología y espiritualidad marianas* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1968), 356.

⁵⁹ Cf. *AAS* 98 (2006): 45-46 [*ORE* 1925:5-6].

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 source⁶⁰ 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*:

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.⁶¹

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.

⁶⁰ Lépiciér, *Tractatus*, 288-292. Cf. also Roschini, *Dizionario*, 454-456; Alastruey, *Blessed Virgin*, 221-225; Royo Marin, *Virgen Maria*, 356-357.

⁶¹ *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 (ca. 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.]

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.⁶²

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 Lépiciér. 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.⁶³

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 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.⁶⁴

⁶² *Knowledge*, 33.

⁶³ *Knowledge*, 35.

⁶⁴ Cf. my study, "Mary Coredemptrix: The Beloved Associate of Christ," in *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons*, ed. Mark Miravalle (Goleta, CA: Seat of Wisdom Books, 2008), 349-409; also, my "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*

Father de Margerie continues:

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

We think that Mary received all the intellectual gifts needed to be the worthy Coredeptrix of the human family, suffering and interceding for each of its members (in accord with the approach of Card. Lépiciér).⁶⁵

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 Coredeptrix, that is, to let Christ crucified console her through us. Her whole life was a life of joyful suffering for us.⁶⁶

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

del Simposio sul Mistero della Corredenzione Mariana, Fatima, Portogallo 3-7 Maggio 2005 (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2005), 113-169.

⁶⁵ *Knowledge*, 36.

⁶⁶ *Knowledge*, 33-34.

*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.*⁶⁷

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

⁶⁷ *AAS* 20 (1928): 174 [Plus 101] (emphasis my own).

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.

Author Biography

Monsignor Arthur B. Calkins is a native of Erie, Pennsylvania, and was ordained a priest on 7 May 1970 for the Archdiocese of New Orleans. where he served in various parishes as parochial vicar and was involved in other pastoral activities. He received a master's degree in theology from the Catholic University of America, a licentiate in sacred theology with specialization in Mariology from the International Marian Research Institute in Dayton, and a doctorate which he earned *summa cum laude* in the same field from the Pontifical Theological Faculty of St. Bonaventure (the Seraphicum) in Rome. His doctoral study, *Totus Tuus: John Paul II's Program of Marian Consecration and Entrustment* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, "Studies and Texts," No. 1), has gone into four printings and a second edition is scheduled for publication in 2016. In 2006, Edizioni Cantagalli of Siena, Italy, published

his anthology on the Marian Magisterium of Pope John Paul II entitled *Totus Tuus. Il Magistero Mariano di Giovanni Paolo II*. His articles on Mariology and spirituality have appeared in both popular and scholarly publications as well as in the acts of congresses and symposia. A list of his publications along with some of his articles may be found at <http://www.christendom-awake.org/pages/calkins/calkins.html>. Msgr. Calkins was named a corresponding member of the Pontifical International Marian Academy in 1985 and a corresponding member of the Pontifical Roman Theological Academy in 1995. He served as an official of the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei” from 1991 to 2010. He was named a Monsignor at the rank of Chaplain of His Holiness in 1997 and was promoted to be a Prelate of Honor in 2010. In recent years he has been involved in the publication of some English translations of the works of the Venerable Concepción (Conchita) Cabrera de Armida (1862-1937). He is presently chaplain of Christopher Inn in New Orleans with residence at St. Luke Church in Slidell, Louisiana.

