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This study analyzes the work of the American Mariologist Fr. Juniper B. Carol O.F.M. (1911-1990) in light of his historical and theological context. Carol’s work focused primarily on the Coredemption, which he studied before Vatican II, and the primacy of Christ, which he studied after the Council. Carol’s work significantly influenced international Mariology and provides an example of how one Mariologist responded to the theological developments that occurred after Vatican II.

Carol’s work demonstrates the influence of his Franciscan heritage, in both his pre-Conciliar discussion of Mary’s mediation and Coredemption and his post-Conciliar discussion of the "debitum peccati," the preservative redemption, and the predestination and primacy of Christ. In his pre-Conciliar work, Carol argued that Mary immediately participated in the objective Redemption by co-meriting with Christ. His main argument in support of this position was based on the Patristic principle of recirculation-association and Mary’s role as the New Eve. After the Second Vatican Council, Carol began to study topics related to the predestination of Christ and Mary. Carol held the Franciscan position regarding Christ’s primacy in the order of
predestination; however, he also maintained that the Redemption was predestined prior to the Fall. In addition, he favored the idea that the Passion was primarily an act of perfect worship rendered to the Father, making the Redemption a secondary reason for the Incarnation. Our study investigates why Carol maintained this surprising variation on the traditional Franciscan thesis and argues that his position is an implicit attempt to defend his pre-Conciliar work on the Coredemption using themes present in *Lumen Gentium*.

Our study begins by considering the ultramontanism and anti-modernism of the early twentieth century and discusses Carol’s pre-Conciliar work on the Coredemption in light of this context and the debates within the Marian movement. Next, it considers the development of the conflict between the ecclesiotypical and Christotypical schools of Mariology, examining their impact at Vatican II by tracing the development of the Marian *schema*. Finally, it discusses Carol’s post-Conciliar work and considers how this work responds to the Council. It concludes by analyzing the connection between Carol’s pre-Conciliar and post-Conciliar work, arguing that his position on the primacy of Christ implicitly supports his position on the Coredemption based on the concept of predestination as expressed in *Lumen Gentium*. 
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INTRODUCTION

THE WORK OF FR. JUNIPER CAROL AND THE FRANCISCAN THESIS

The Intention of this Study

The intention of this study is to analyze the work of Fr. Juniper Carol O.F.M. (1911-1990) in light of his historical context. Fr. Juniper Carol was an American Mariologist who was formed in the ultramontanist and anti-modernist atmosphere of the twentieth century, lived through the Second Vatican Council, and continued his academic work in the post-Conciliar period. Although considered the “most prominent” pre-Conciliar North American Mariologist, after the Council, Carol and his work fell into relative obscurity. Despite the high praise he received at his death, no study has been undertaken of his work since the summary provided by Fr. Peter Fehlner the year after his death. His work is important both because it provides an example of the thought of an American Franciscan theologian of the twentieth century and because Carol had a major influence on international Mariology, making it worthwhile to consider how he responded to the changes in Mariology after Vatican II.

Our study will consider Carol’s scholarly work in a chronological fashion and analyze how it was shaped by the theological debates occurring during his life. Carol was a Franciscan, and his work was strongly formed by his Franciscan heritage. This can be seen throughout his career, in both his pre-Conciliar focus on the Coredemption and his post-Conciliar discussion of

---

2 Ibid., 17-59.
the primacy of Christ. Carol’s understanding of the relationship between these topics led him to deviate from the traditional Scotistic position and maintain that the Redemption was logically prior to the Fall. Through a consideration of his historical context, we intend to investigate what would lead him to this position on Christ’s primacy and how this position is related to his understanding of the Coredemption.

The Franciscan Thesis

Before we begin to examine Carol’s work, it is necessary to introduce the Franciscan school of theology to which he belonged. Both of Carol’s major concerns, the Coredemption and the primacy of Christ, originate from major emphases of the Franciscan school, especially as it was developed by John Duns Scotus (1266-1308). Our consideration of the general Franciscan position will demonstrate how these two topics are connected in traditional Franciscan thought. This is especially important because chronologically, Carol’s work begins with the conclusions derived from the Franciscan thesis and it is not until the end of his life that he discusses its foundation. Therefore, this overview will provide the theological background that undergirds even Carol’s pre-Conciliar work. Our summary of the Franciscan thesis will be brief and will not discuss all of its complexities. Our emphasis will be on the standard articulation of the Franciscan thesis as expressed by Scotus and his close followers, who more fully developed his doctrine’s application to Mary.

---

3 Ibid., 18.
Scotus’ Theology of Predestination

Although often presented philosophically, the Franciscan position can be understood as an extended theological reflection on the Ephesians canticle, which describes how “before the foundation of the world…. [God] destined us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of his will, to the praise of his glorious grace which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved” (Eph. 1:4-6). From Scriptural passages such as the Ephesians hymn, Scotus develops a “teleological conception of creation that consists of a graced and glorious end.” All of creation is ordered to glory because “God desires to manifest the divine goodness and show forth divine glory…. In the person of Jesus Christ, independently of the reality of human fallenness.” This “Incarnational thrust,” an understanding of all of creation as ordered to the Incarnation, characterizes all of Scotus’ work. For Scotus, predestination is the central point from which all of God’s economic activity can be understood.

In his *Ordinatio*, Scotus states, “Predestination consist in foreordaining someone first of all to glory and then to other things which are ordered to glory.” For Scotus, the intended end, glory, is willed before the means, the things ordered to glory. However, temporally, the things ordered to the end must occur before this end. Scotus distinguishes between these two orders, calling the first “the order of intention” and the second “the order of execution.” While we see

---

5 Scotus himself has been described as “highly philosophical” in his presentation of this doctrine and although he did quote Scripture, this “was the exception rather than the rule.” See Daniel P. Horan, “How Original was Scotus on the Incarnation? Reconsidering the History of the Absolute Predestination of Christ in the Light of Robert Grosseteste,” *The Heythrop Journal* 52 (2011): 385.
6 Ibid., 384.
8 Horan, “How Original was Scotus on the Incarnation?,” 384.
10 The book Scotus either wrote or dictated and planned to publish based on his teaching commentaries on Lombard’s *Third Book of Sentences* while at Oxford (1298-1300) and Paris (1300-1302). The authenticity of some parts of the *Ordinatio* are disputed. We will focus on the undisputed texts. See Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?: Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), 121-22.
the order of execution occurring temporally, the order of intention occurs in the mind of God; therefore, it is instantaneous.  However, since God, in His Divine Wisdom, wills things in a coherent and reasonable way, we can discuss the logical order of His will, discerning that some acts are willed prior to others. The discussion of predestination centers on understanding the order of intention, how God planned the divine economy. The discussion of Coredemption, in contrast, seeks to understand the order of execution.

The second component to Scotus’ definition is that predestination is “an act of the divine will, whereby an intellectual creature is chosen for grace and for glory.” Predestination is a free act of God’s will. For Scholastics, love is the action of the will. Therefore, for Scotus, “the source and cause of predestination is the love of God…. love is synonymous with freedom and will: A free act and an act of love are one and the same thing [emphasis original].” Since predestination is a free act of love, it originates from God’s goodness. One who is good has a properly ordered will, which means that one loves greater things before lesser things. This means that in God’s act of predestining, He willed greater things before lesser things. If predestination is ultimately to glory, then the soul who receives the greatest glory should be predestined first because in being closest to the intended end it is the greatest thing in existence.

---

14 Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?*, 5.
16 Rosini, *Mariology of Scotus*, 16.
17 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 20, art. 1 in *Summa Theologica: Volume IV – Part III, First Section*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007). “In God there is love: because love is the first movement of the will …. Love, however, regards good universally, whether possessed or not. Hence love is naturally the first act of the will.”
18 Pancheri and Carol, *The Universal Primacy of Christ*, 36.
The Predestination and Primacy of Christ

As Scotus explains, Christ’s human nature is hypostatically united to the Word, resulting in His human soul having the greatest possible glory. Therefore, God “intends glory to this soul (of Christ) before he wills glory to any other soul, and to every other soul he wills glory before taking into account the opposite of these habits (namely, the sin or damnation of anyone) [translator’s parenthetical comments].” Christ’s soul has the greatest glory; therefore, it should be willed not only before the rest of the predestined, but also before the permitting of the opposite of predestination, damnation. Following this logic, Scotus comes to his position on the relationship between the Fall and the Incarnation:

If man had not sinned, of course, there would have been no need of a redemption. Still it does not seem to be solely because of the redemption that God predestined this soul to such glory, since the redemption or the glory of the souls to be redeemed is not comparable to the glory of the soul of Christ. Neither is it likely that the highest good in the whole of creation is somethings that merely chanced to take place, and that only because of some lesser good. Nor is it probable that God predestined Adam to such a good before he predestined Christ.

To Scotus, it does not seem fitting that the Incarnation, the greatest act of God, should be conditioned not only on the existence of Adam, whose existence is a lesser good, but also on the Fall, which is an evil. Yet, if the “sole purpose” of the Incarnation was the Redemption, the Incarnation would have been willed for the lesser good of the restoration of the human race.

Scotus notes a further, “even more absurd” conclusion that results from maintaining that the Incarnation is dependent on the Fall, saying, “If the predestination of Christ’s soul was for the sole purpose of redeeming others, it would follow that in foreordaining Adam to glory God would have had to foresee him as having fallen into sin before he could have predestined Christ to

---

22 Scotus, Ordinatio, I, dist. 41, q. unica, in trans. Wolter, Four Questions on Mary, 27.
23 Ibid., 29.
Scotus points out that “no one therefore is predestined simply because God foresaw another would fall, lest anyone have reason to rejoice at the misfortune of another.” Thus, Christ is predestined first so that our greatest source of joy is not dependent on Adam’s Fall. He has primacy in everything because the Incarnation is predestined independently of the Fall.

The *Opus Parisiense* provides an important summary of the order of predestination in Scotus’ thought. This summary is commonly used by Franciscans to describe God’s predestining of the Incarnation based on His properly ordered love:

*First,* God loves himself. *Secondly,* he loves himself for others, and this is an ordered love. *Thirdly,* he wishes to be loved by him who can love him with the greatest love – speaking of the love of someone who is extrinsic to him. And *fourthly,* he foresees the union of that nature that must love him with the greatest love even if no one had fallen.

In this scheme, it is apparent that “the motive of the incarnation is thus the diffusion of the divine love.” Christ is predestined to become Incarnate to love God to the greatest possible extent.

**The Modality of the Incarnation**

The Franciscan thesis generally holds that if there had been no Fall, Christ would have become Incarnate in an impassable body. This position is based on Scotus’ statement that “Christ would not have come as redeemer, if man had not sinned. Perhaps, too, he would not have been able to suffer, since there would have been no need of a union with a passible body.”

Since sin led to suffering, the only reason for having a passable body would be to have the ability

---

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
27 One of the most important of the Reportaciones, the lecture notes taken by Scotus’ students, see Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?*, 125.
28 Ibid., 125.
to suffer in atonement for sin. As we see in Scripture, once the work of Redemption is over, Christ has an impassible body. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that Christ’s predestination to passibility is independent of the Fall.33 This differentiation between the Incarnation and Christ’s passibility is a differentiation between the substance and the mode of the Incarnation, respectively.34

Mary’s Predestination as the Mother of God

In Scotus’ thought, the role of Mary in the economy of salvation is based on her divine maternity. As the Mother of God, Mary has a greater intimacy with and proximity to Christ than any other creature.35 Although Christ’s conception was miraculous, Mary contributed to the formation of His human nature in the same way as a natural mother.36 This unique, natural bond to Christ’s humanity makes Mary uniquely close to Christ.

The full implications of Mary’s role as the Mother of God was not fully articulated by Scotus himself, but was developed from his principles by his followers. First, we will consider what this role reveals about the order of intention. Following the principle that God wills in an ordered fashion, the second soul predestined must be Mary, due to her unique closeness to Christ, the highest good.37 If Christ is to become Incarnate, then He needs a human nature, taken from a human mother. Having foreseen the Incarnation, God would then foresee the Mother from whom He would take His flesh.38 As Carol explains, “the terms ‘mother’ and ‘son’ are so correlative that one necessarily calls for the other;” therefore, Mary must be predestined in the same decree

33 Unger, “Franciscan Christology,” 436.
34 Carol, Why Jesus Christ?, 133.
36 Scotus, Ordinatio III, dist. 4, q. unica, in trans. Wolter, Four Questions on Mary, 113, “It can be said that if to act pertains to the mother as to a secondary cause, Mary was truly a mother, for the total action that is due to the mother pertained to her.” See also, Scotus, Ordinatio III, dist. 4, q. unica, in trans. Wolter, Four Questions on Mary, 127, “But there was something naturalistic about Mary’s active potency….And she can be called the natural mother of Christ in virtue of this natural active power by which she functioned.”
38 Dean, A Primer on the Absolute Primacy of Christ, 63.
as Christ.\textsuperscript{39} Exactly what the implications were of this “joint predestination” with Christ would become a major topic of discussion in the twentieth century.

In addition to this predestination with Christ in the order of intention, further conclusions about the order of execution can be drawn from this principle of Mary’s divine maternity. It is from Mary’s unique predestination to the divine maternity that all of her other privileges flow. Again, most of these would not be discussed by Scotus himself; rather, they were developed by later Mariologists. However, Scotus did discuss Mary’s Immaculate Conception, providing an explanation for how she could be conceived without Original Sin and still be redeemed. The logic he used when making this argument came to play an important role in the Marian movement, as we will see in chapter one.

Scotus bases his argument for the Immaculate Conception on Christ’s role as the One Mediator. He explains that:

> For a most perfect mediator has a most perfect act of mediation possible with respect to some person for whom he intercedes, therefore, Christ had the most perfect degree of mediation possible in regard to some person with respect to whom he was mediator; but with respect to no person did he have a more excellent degree than as regards Mary; therefore, etc. But this would only be because he merited to preserve her from original sin.\textsuperscript{40}

Since Christ is the most perfect Mediator, it is fitting for Him to perform one act of perfect mediation. Christ mediates between the rest of humanity and God by reconciling them to the Father through meriting the remission of their Original Sin after birth. However, there is a more perfect form of mediation; the preservation of one from ever being estranged from God.\textsuperscript{41} Later Scotists often argue that Christ owed His mother this great gift.\textsuperscript{42} Scotus, however, emphasized that Christ owed God this perfect mediation of preservation:

\textsuperscript{40} Scotus, \textit{Ordinatio} III, dist. 3, q. unica, in trans. Wolter, \textit{Four Questions on Mary}, 41.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 41-42.
\textsuperscript{42} Rosini, \textit{The Mariology of Scotus}, 58-59.
No one pleases someone most perfectly and in the highest degree for an offense that someone contracts unless he could prevent that person from offending to begin with…. God is not offended with the soul because of something it inflicts upon God himself but only because of a fault existing in the soul itself; therefore, Christ does not placate the Trinity most perfectly for the fault contracted by the children of Adam unless he does prevent someone from possessing such a fault.  

For Scotus, the preservative redemption primarily regards God and rendering to Him the greatest possible act of atonement. Since Christ’s love is perfectly ordered, He first loves God and thus offers Him this perfect act of mediation. As a result of Mary’s closeness to “the hypostatic union, the source of grace,” it is fitting that she receive from Christ this greatest grace, the preservation from the stain of Original Sin.

Since this preservation is merited by Christ in light of His future Passion, Mary is truly redeemed. Further, since she receives this highest good of preservation from any stain of sin, Mary is more “obligated” and “indebted” to Christ than the rest of humanity. Citing Augustine, Scotus explains, “One loves more to whom more is forgiven” (Lk. 7:47). Scotus admits that Scripture does not require this position to be held; however, he explains that “if the authority of the Church or the authority of Scripture does not contradict such, it seems probably that what is more excellent should be attributed to Mary [translator’s emphasis].” This Scotistic Marian principle has a corresponding Christological principle, “In extolling Christ, I prefer to praise him too much than to fail by defect, if through ignorance I must fall into either excess.” The preservative redemption illustrates both of these principles at work in Scotus’ theology; Mary is elevated to the Immaculate Conception for the sake of further glorifying Christ. These principles

---

45 Ibid., 55.
46 Ibid., 77-79.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid., 55.
will be important for the Christotypical school of Mariology and for Carol’s work in particular, which extends Scotus’ logic to the concept of the Coredemption.

The Life of Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M. (1911-1900)

Having concluded our examination of Carol’s theological background, we will briefly summarize his life before beginning our investigation of his theology. Carol was born in Cardenas, Cuba in 1911 and entered the seminary in 1924. In 1930, he entered the novitiate of the Franciscans of the Holy Name Province in Paterson, New Jersey. He was ordained in 1935 and pursued a doctorate at the Athenaeum from 1937-1940; however, due to the outbreak of World War II, he was unable to defend his dissertation until 1949.51 In 1949, he founded the Mariology Society of America and his leadership ensured its continuation through the post-Conciliar Marian decline.52 He edited the three volume encyclopedia Mariology53 and wrote Fundamentals of Mariology, a textbook, for which he won the Marian Library Medal in 1957.54

As a leading Mariologist, Carol discussed a broad range of topics and wrote articles from the popular to the scholarly level.55 However, his pre-Conciliar scholarly work was focused on defending Mary’s immediate role in the Redemption, leading him to be called the “secretary of the Coredemptrix.”56 As we will see in chapter one, his 1950 De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis

55 Topics covered by Carol included the Assumption, Mary’s death, the state of the Marian movement in general, the Immaculate Conception, and the Virgin Birth. For a full list of his works, see: Fehlner, “Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M.,” 48-59. For Carol’s position on all major Marian topics, see his textbook, Carol, Fundamentals of Mariology.
Mariae: Disquisitio Positiva, raised him to the “front rank of the world’s specialists in the field of Marian theology,”57 and played a major role in shifting the international field of Mariology.58

After the Council, Carol was never quite successful at directly engaging post-Conciliar theological trends. By 1975, his scholarly focus had shifted from the Coredemption to the debate over Mary’s debitum peccati and preservative redemption.59 His position on these topics was “but the corollary of the absolute primacy of Christ.”60 Thus, it is unsurprising that this work led him to the publication of Why Jesus Christ?: Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives in 1986. In this work, Carol defended the Franciscan thesis of Christ’s primacy and briefly offered his own conclusions on this topic. Whereas before the Council Carol’s work was influential, many reviewers considered this work out-of-touch with contemporary theology.61

In many ways, such an assessment of his work is correct; Carol never directly engages with the theological shifts that occurred after Vatican II or even with the Marian chapter of Lumen Gentium. However, we will see that Carol’s theological career indirectly demonstrates the influence of the Council. By defending the primacy and predestination of Christ, Carol indirectly supports his pre-Conciliar Christocentric approach to the Coredemption by defending a starting point used in Lumen Gentium to explain Mary’s role in the economy of salvation, as we will see in chapter two. Further, as we will see in chapter three, Carol’s unique variation on the Franciscan thesis increases the emphasis on Christ’s primacy by placing the Redemption at an even more central position in the divine economy, which can be seen as supporting the significance of Carol’s pre-Conciliar work on the Coredemption.

59 Ibid., 39.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid., 39-41.
The overall objective of our thesis will be to understand the connection between Carol’s pre-Conciliar Mariology and his post-Conciliar Christology, with the particular aim of understanding the concerns that lead to his unique variation on the traditional Franciscan thesis. This overall objective contains three subordinate aims. First, to understand the historical context of Carol’s work and how this influenced his thought. Second, to understand each stage of Carol’s theology. Third, to understand how his post-Conciliar work responds to the Second Vatican Council. To undertake this investigation, our thesis will be organized into three chapters. The first will provide the historical context of the early twentieth century and discuss Carol’s pre-Conciliar work on the Coredemption. The second will discuss the major developments within the field of Mariology during the twentieth century and their eventual impact at Vatican II. The third will present Carol’s post-Conciliar work on the debitum peccati, the preservative redemption, and the primacy of Christ. In our conclusion, we will argue that Carol’s post-Conciliar focus is an implicit attempt to support his pre-Conciliar work on the Coredemption in accordance with themes present in Lumen Gentium.
CHAPTER ONE
COREDEMPTION IN THE PRE-CONCILIAR THOUGHT OF FR. JUNIPER CAROL

General Theological Background to Juniper Carol’s Work

Before considering Carol’s theological contributions in particular, it is necessary to examine the historical context for his work. First, we will mention two well-known general theological trends in which Carol’s work is situated. From there, we will narrow our focus to the Marian movement, to which Carol belonged, that developed after the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854. This will provide us with the context for understanding Carol’s work and the debates in which he engaged.

The first overarching theological theme that shaped Carol’s theological environment was ultramontanism. Although papal infallibility is limited to ex cathedra definitions, many Catholics, including theologians, took all of the Pope’s theological statements as having extreme significance for determining the Church’s teaching.62 Although not influenced by the political struggles that fed into the original growth of ultramontanism in Europe, ultramontanism still developed in America, albeit in a different form, which emphasized personal devotion to the papacy and upheld this loyalty to the pope as a means of establishing Catholic identity.63 Thus, like their European counterparts, American theologians still considered papal statements, even

non-dogmatic ones, as having significant authority. We will see that Carol often marshaled papal
documents as support for his position, even when they were not authoritative.

Another major factor shaping Carol’s historical and theological environment was rise of
modernism and the corresponding papal response. Concerns about modernity began with Leo
XIII (1878-1903), who encouraged scholasticism, in particular Thomism, as a response to the
political challenges stemming from the French Revolution.\(^64\) Closely following these political
changes were theological developments that challenged the metaphysical framework of Catholic
theology.\(^65\) Concerned by the efforts of some theologians to reconcile Catholic theology with
modern metaphysics, Pius X condemned such attempts in *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (1907),
labeling them as modernism, and instead promoted scholasticism.\(^66\) Not only did he establish
scholasticism as the metaphysical norm for Catholic theology, but later, in *Doctoris Angelici*
(1914), he further specified that Thomism in particular should be studied.\(^67\) Although it was a
response to a legitimate problem, the sometimes over-zealous suppression of modernism led to
“an atmosphere of rigidity in theology,”\(^68\) which influenced even Carol’s post-Conciliar work.

Despite the papal emphasis on Thomism, Franciscans continued to value their own
intellectual heritage. For example, a 1953 article from *Franciscan Studies* stated, “Not each and
every portion of Aquinas’s philosophical system has the same eternal value.”\(^69\) One can disagree
with Aquinas and still be in agreement with the Church; Aquinas does not have a “quasi-

\(^{64}\) Russell Hittinger, “*Pascendi Dominici Gregis* at 100: Two Modernisms, Two Thomisms: Reflections on the
\(^{65}\) Hittinger, “Two Modernisms, Two Thomisms,” 847. This metaphysical framework depended on the concept that
there were truths that could be known by natural reason, an assumption based on Vatican I’s *Dei Filius*, which stated,
“God… can be known with certitude by the natural light of human reason,” see First Vatican Council, *Dei Filius*
[Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith], Interdisciplinary Encyclopedia of Religion and Science, April 24, 1879,
\(^{66}\) Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 42.
\(^{67}\) Hittinger, “Two Modernisms, Two Thomisms,” 869.
\(^{68}\) Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 44.
\(^{69}\) Franz Pelster, “The Authority of St. Thomas in Catholic Schools and the Sacred Sciences: An Opinion Regarding
Two Recent Articles,” *Franciscan Studies* 13 (1953): 5-6.
infallibility." This defensive stance that seeks to prove Franciscan ideas are in harmony with the teaching of the Church will shape Carol’s work, even after the Council.

The Marian Movement in the Early Twentieth Century

Carol’s work belongs to the twentieth century Marian movement, which developed from an increased interest in Mariology when Pius IX, after consulting the bishops, defined the Immaculate Conception in 1854. Since theologians played a role in clarifying the doctrine to make it definable, this definition set a precedent that was followed throughout the Marian movement, in which theologians sought to clarify doctrines to obtain definitions. Such goals gave the movement ultramontanistic tendencies, which can be seen in Carol’s work.

In the first volume of *Marian Studies*, Carol described the goal of the Marian movement not as obtaining definitions, but as an attempt to analyze Marian doctrines “to penetrate more profoundly into their very essence, to weigh and re-examine, in conformity with the critical standards of the day, their claim to be warranted by the sources of revelation.” He wanted his fellow American Mariologists to focus not simply on devotional aspects, but to systematize “the logical nexus linking the various Marian prerogatives.” A major component of the Marian movement was increasing Marian devotion among the laity; however, Carol’s statements demonstrate it had the further desire to establish Mariology, “as an essential portion of the course in dogmatic theology.” This goal indicates the neo-scholastic bent of the movement.

---


As the preceding discussion shows, the Marian movement was ultramontanistic, neo-
scolastic, and orientated towards devotions; however, Carol also credits the publishing of “the
critical edition of innumerable patristic writings and liturgical texts…. which has made it possible
for contemporary scholars to reconstruct a positive Mariology on a scientific basis, and to
eliminate a good deal of spurious documentation much exploited in the past.”
Thus, *ressourcement* also had a role in the Marian movement, as we will see with Carol. Although
there is some truth in the dichotomy sometimes presented between the Marian and *ressourcement*
movements, we should be wary of over-emphasizing their separation.

Developing a scientific outline of Mariology required a primary principle, “a fundamental
truth about Our Blessed Lady from which the other doctrines relative to her logically flow.”

Many theologians held that the divine maternity, Mary’s unique role as the Mother of God, was
the starting point for all of Mariology. There were some variations on this principle, however,
in the early twentieth century, the fundamental principle of Mariology almost always associated
Mary with Christ in some way. Those who accepted such an association as the starting point of
Mariology belonged to the Christotypical school of Mariology. After World War II, a second
school, the ecclesiotypical school, developed, which took as its starting point the association
between Mary and the Church. Their different starting points led to significant division
between the two schools, which became apparent at the Third International Mariological-Marian
Congress in 1958. Since the Marian movement began with a Christotypical approach and most

---

79 See for example, Thompson, “Vatican II and Beyond,” 406.
80 Connell, “Toward a Systematic Treatment of Mariology,” 60.
83 Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 264-68.
of the scientific studies and the debates in which Carol was involved were related to this school, the ecclesiotypical-Christotypical debate will not be significant for our study until chapter two.

**Overview of Carol’s Work of the Coredemption**

As explained in the introduction, Carol’s pre-Conciliar scholarly work focused on the Coredemption. In studying his work, we will take a topical and chronological approach. Carol’s theological position did not change over time; however, his later work builds on the positions taken in his earlier work as he addresses new concerns about the Coredemption that developed in his field. However, our analysis will not be strictly chronological. Although *De Corredemptione* was not published until 1950, preliminary versions of many of its chapters had been published since 1936. Similar to his 1957 article “Our Lady’s Coredemption” in *Mariology* and his textbook repeat many of his earlier arguments. Therefore, these later arguments will be discussed at the first time each issue appears in Carol’s work.

**The Validity the Title *Coredemptrix***

The first theological debate in which Carol participated was over the acceptability of the use of the title Coredemptrix. Beginning in 1936, Carol defended the use of this title starting from the assumption that most theologians accepted the concept of Coredemption, which he defined as “the doctrine which teaches that our Blessed lady is a true, though secondary, co-factor in the Saviour’s redemptive work.” His earlier articles respond to theologians who held that the title Coredemptrix did not develop until sometime between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries; therefore, it was a novelty. This charge of novelty would have been particularly concerning in Carol’s anti-modernist atmosphere. Carol responded to this concern in two points.

---

First, Carol argued that “Coredemptrix” has earlier origins than these authors claimed. In his earliest works, Carol claimed that the title was used in the Sharakan, part of the fifth century Armenian liturgy\(^\text{87}\) and was even used in the fourth century in Syria.\(^\text{88}\) However, by his 1957 article on Coredemption in Mariology, Carol places the first use of the term in fourteenth century liturgical hymns, of which he cites three in the body of his text.\(^\text{89}\) This is perhaps one example of how the increased availability of Patristic sources decreased unwarranted Mariological claims.

Carol does not think that the later appearance of “Coredemptrix” impacts his argument for its validity. Even in his earliest article, Carol stated that “even if the title of co-redemptrix had never been used before the fifteenth century, that would be no argument against our contention, for the simple reason that newness of a word is not necessarily incompatible with its legitimacy.”\(^\text{90}\) For example, homousious and transubstantiation were novelties when they were first used.\(^\text{91}\) Carol argues that the Church has the authority to define new words to express her doctrine at any time; therefore, it does not “make any difference” when the term was first used.\(^\text{92}\)

Carol cites several magisterial documents to demonstrate that this title has been accepted by the Church.\(^\text{93}\) His conclusion is the title Coredemptrix should not be rejected as modern innovation. Although this appeal demonstrates an ultramontanist tendency, Carol acknowledges that the documents “in which the Holy See styles Mary our ‘Co-redemptrix’ are not infallible,”\(^\text{94}\)

---

87 Carol, “In Defense of the Title of Co-redemptrix,” 1197-198; Carol, The Blessed Virgin’s Co-Redemption Vindicated, 16. In neither of these articles does Carol provide the Armenian word translated as “Coredemptrix.”

88 Carol, “In Defense of the Title of Co-redemptrix,” 1198; Carol, The Blessed Virgin’s Co-Redemption Vindicated, 16. Carol’s evidence is from a German translation.


91 Ibid. This point is repeated in Carol, The Blessed Virgin’s Co-redemption Vindicated, 9-10; Carol, “The Problem of Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 33, 35-36.

92 Carol, “The Holy See and the Title of ‘Co-redemptrix,’” 747. This point is repeated in Carol, The Blessed Virgin’s Co-redemption Vindicated, 12.

93 Carol, “The Holy See and the Title of ‘Co-redemptrix,’” 747; Carol, The Blessed Virgin’s Co-Redemption Vindicated, 12.

94 Carol, “The Holy See and the Title of ‘Co-redemptrix,’” 748.
although he holds that they should be respected. Carol holds the magisterium in high regard; however, he properly distinguishes between the ordinary and extraordinary magisterium.

The Prudence of Using the Title Coredemptrix

In addition to defending the legitimacy of the title Coredemptrix, Carol addressed concerns regarding the prudence of its use. Some of his contemporaries considered this phrase misleading because it could be misinterpreted establishing another Redeemer alongside Christ, rather than signifying Mary’s “singular association with her Redeemer.” This made its use imprudent because such a misunderstanding could have negative ecumenical repercussions.

Carol’s first response to this concern was to examine the meaning of the prefix “co-.” He states that “co-” is derived from the Latin *cum*, which means “*with and not equal* [emphasis original].” This is seen in the Epistles of Paul, in statements such as, “‘for we are God’s co-adjutors’” (1 Cor. 3:9) and that we must “cosuffer with Christ in order to coreign with Him” (2 Tim 2:12). If Paul uses such terms to express Christians’ “intimate union” with Christ, Carol argues that “it should be equally legitimate” to do so when describing Mary’s association with Christ in the Redemption. Paul clearly did not mean that our working, suffering, and reigning with Christ makes us equal to Him. Rather, he means that in “the sanctification of souls….God’s share in that work is absolutely primary and necessary, while theirs [the apostles’] is merely

---

95 Ibid.
96 Carol, *The Blessed Virgin’s Co-Redemption Vindicated*, 3.
99 Carol, *The Blessed Virgin’s Co-Redemption Vindicated*, 9. Carol’s translation from Greek, which he provides in the text.
100 Carol, “The Problem of Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 37. Carol’s translation, for which he does not provide the Greek.
101 Ibid.
secondary and un-essential.”

Paul uses “co-” to indicate cooperating with God in a subordinate role; thus, “Coredemptrix” should be understood in a similar way.

Since Scripturally “co-” clearly indicates cooperation without equality, Carol stated that “Coredemptrix” is not objectively misleading because the word itself does not contradict Catholic dogma. Carol sympathized with those who considered the title subjectively misleading because he understood that external factors could create confusion about its true meaning; however, he held that this had been the case for most dogmas throughout Church history. Carol believed that it would be better to educate people about the title’s meaning than to avoid proclaiming the truth.

The Development of the Debate over Mary’s Coredemption

Although his discussion of the validity the term Coredemptrix is an important preliminary, Carol’s more important work is his study of the development of the doctrine of Coredemption. It is to this aspect of his work that we will now turn. In the 1904 encyclical *Ad Diem Illum*, Pius X discussed Mary’s meriting in the Redemption and her role in distributing graces, stating that she “has been associated by Jesus Christ in the work of redemption.” In 1930, debate erupted over what it meant to say that Mary was “associated” with Christ in the Redemption.

In 1930, Heinrich Lennerz published *De Beata Virgine*, in which he defined the actual Passion as the “objective redemption” and the application of grace to individual souls as the “subjective redemption.” He stated that Mary only remotely cooperated in the objective

---

103 Ibid. Repeated almost verbatim in Carol, “The Problem of Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 34.
redemption and that any statements about her merit applied to the subjective redemption alone.\textsuperscript{107} Lennerz was the first person to make this distinction between the objective and subjective redemption. Previously, “Redemption” referred to the acquisition of grace on Calvary and “application” to the dispensing of grace to individuals.\textsuperscript{108} This distinction led Mariologists to argue over whether Mary had an “active, direct, or immediate cooperation in the redemption won by Christ” or not.\textsuperscript{109} Theologians began discussing if “Coredemption” meant that Mary cooperated with Christ in objective redemption or if it merely indicated her cooperation in applying graces to souls in the subjective redemption.

In addition to this objective-subjective redemption distinction, there developed a further distinction between “remote” and “immediate” cooperation in the objective redemption. Some theologians held that in her \textit{fiat} Mary remotely cooperated in the objective redemption, while others maintained that she immediately cooperated in the objective redemption through meriting with Christ on Calvary.\textsuperscript{110} Dodd hypothesizes the controversy begun by Lennerz’s distinction “may have contributed to Carol’s decision to devote most of his writing to Mary’s coredemption as the first phase of Mary’s mediation.”\textsuperscript{111}

Carol never discusses his motive for studying the Coredemption and therefore never explicitly confirms this hypothesis; however, he does strongly oppose Lennerz’s distinction in several of his works.\textsuperscript{112} Further, in 1940, Carol wrote an article critiquing the third edition of

\textsuperscript{107} Dodd, \textit{The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace}, 230.
\textsuperscript{108} Carol, “The Problem of Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 41-42.
\textsuperscript{109} Dodd, \textit{The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace}, 230.
\textsuperscript{110} Carol, “Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 379. To further complicate matters, remote Coredemption was also called meditate or indirect Coredemption and immediate Coredemption was also called proximate or direct Coredemption.
\textsuperscript{111} Dodd, \textit{The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace}, 233.
\textsuperscript{112} For example, Carol, \textit{De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae: Disquisitio Positiva} (New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1950), 4; Carol, “Our Lady’s Part in the Redemption According to Seventeenth-Century Writers,” \textit{Franciscan Studies} 24 (1943): 156; Carol, “Mary’s Co-redemption According to Nineteenth Century Italian Writers,” \textit{Marianum} 4 (1949): 15, in which Carol states that the nineteenth century writers did not “mar the limpidity of their assertions with such highfaluting and newfangled terminology as ‘objective’ Redemption…Had they been privileged to live in the post-Lennerzian era, they, too, would have undoubtedly succumbed victims to the prevailing fashion.”
Lennerz’s *De Beata Virgine*, opposing Lennerz’s distinction between the objective and subjective redemption, his interpretation of the Protoevangelium, his historical argument that Mary’s cooperation in the objective redemption is not found the Church’s tradition, and his conclusion that the position that Mary cooperated in the objective redemption is incompatible with Catholic dogma.¹¹³ In his critique, Carol focuses on the inadequacies of Lennerz’s historical analysis, stating that his 1939 article “Ultrum B. Virginis Co-redemptio sit in S. Scriptura formaliter revelata” already refuted Lennerz’s position on the Protoevangelium.¹¹⁴

We will see that Carol’s *De Coredemptione* will both analyze the Protoevangelium and trace the development of the doctrine. Thus, there is a strong link between his discussion of the Coredemption and Lennerz’ work, making it logical to conclude that Carol was concerned with refuting his position. However, this Scriptural and historical analysis is not Carol’s main focus when he first begins writing. Instead, Carol seeks to prove that “Coredemption” does indicate Mary’s immediate cooperation in the Redemption¹¹⁵ by arguing that Coredemption is simply one function belonging to Mary’s broader role as Mediatrix, which includes both the Coredemption and the distribution of graces. Thus, we could understand Carol as seeking to prove that the objective-subjective redemption distinction is incompatible with a proper understanding of the relationship between Mary’s mediation and her Coredemption.

**Coredemption as a Component of Mediation**

In his discussion of Mary’s mediation, Carol sought to establish Coredemption as a subcategory of Mary’s mediation. Carol began his argument for Mary’s role as Mediatrix by defining the role of a mediator. Expressed most simply, “the function of a ‘mediator’ is to

---

¹¹³ Carol, “Pater H. Lennerz et problema de Co-redemptione Mariana,” *Marianum* 2 (1940): 195. Carol summarizes Lennerz’s conclusion as being that “doctrinam de Co-redemptione objectiva non solum a Traditione exclusam esse, sed etiam ut incomponibilem cum dogmate catholico merito reputari.”

¹¹⁴ Carol, “Pater H. Lennerz,” 196-99. See also, “Ultrum B. Virginis Co-redemptio sit in S. Scriptura formaliter revelata,” *Marianum* 30 (1939): 3-46. It should be noted that in this article Carol does not specifically refer to Lennerz.

¹¹⁵ Following Carol, when we use the word “Redemption” we will be referring to the objective redemption.
intervene between two persons or groups of persons in order to bring them together.”

Normally, these two people are separated in some way; therefore, it can be said that the mediator’s role is “to reconcile the extremes.” Mary’s title Mediatrix refers to the two ways in which she mediates; (1) in cooperating with Christ in the Redemption and (2) in applying grace to individuals. It is for the first that she is called Coredemptrix and for the second that she is called Dispenser of all graces. With these basic definitions, we will now examine how Carol supports this position.

To understand Mary’s mediation, Carol examines the mediation of Christ, taking as a starting point the presupposition that “the nature and characteristics of her role closely follow and resemble the nature and characteristics of Christ’s mediatorial office.” Carol’s method is to examine Christ’s mediation and then apply these principles about the various aspects of mediation to Mary. Carol begins by distinguishing between Christ’s “ontological and moral Mediation.”

Ontologically, since Christ is a midpoint between God and humanity by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, He is the most perfect Mediator. However, it is not simply having two natures that formally establishes Christ as an ontological Mediator. Rather, these natures give him two properties, “passibility and a plenitude of grace; and it is by these two proprietates [qualities] that

---

117 Ibid., 56.
118 Ibid.
120 Ibid., 644.
121 Ibid. Carol’s statement in Latin, “Esse medius inter duo vel plura extrema, es conjungendi.” He then states, “notice that we abstain from using the word, ‘reconciliandi.’”
the adequate ontological mediation is had.”\textsuperscript{123} Moral mediation is divided into two subcategories, actual, how the mediatiorial activities are “applied” to individuals, and radical, how the reconciling of the extremes objectively occurs.\textsuperscript{124} Moral mediation presupposes that one is an ontological mediator.\textsuperscript{125} Carol focuses on radical moral mediation, saying that the actual moral mediation of Christ is not debated.\textsuperscript{126}

Radical mediation was debated because some theologians considered Christ’s radical mediation to be the same as the Redemption and others did not. Those who viewed them as the same supported their position with 1 Tim. 2:5,\textsuperscript{127} which seems to indicate that Christ’s mediatorship consists of reconciling humanity to God. Carol, however, takes the position that in addition to the Redemption, Christ’s role as Mediator includes His Kingship, Headship, and Priesthood.\textsuperscript{128} Carol admits that these offices are all interconnected and that “in the present economy (\textit{post lapsum}) the office of Priesthood is almost identified with the element of Redemption.”\textsuperscript{129} However, if considered outside of the context of our \textit{post lapsum} state, these concepts have unique meanings.

Carol’s support for this position is based on the Franciscan thesis.\textsuperscript{130} At this point, however, Carol does not explain the thesis in detail. He simply states that it is possible to offer a sacrifice simply to glorify the Father, without it remitting sin.\textsuperscript{131} Indeed, it is even possible that the salvific character of Christ’s mediation “was a result of an after-thought (humanly speaking) in the mind of God.”\textsuperscript{132} Logically, Christ’s role as King and Head were prior to His role as Savior

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{124} Carol, “The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption,” 644.
\textsuperscript{126} Carol, “The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption,” 645.
\textsuperscript{127} “For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus…” (1 Tim. 2:5). All Scriptural citations from the RSV-CE unless otherwise noted.
\textsuperscript{128} Carol, “The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption,” 645-46.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid. 646.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
and Redeemer; therefore, He could have been the midpoint between God and humanity even if there was no need for Redemption.\textsuperscript{133} Since His office of priesthood does not necessarily include Redemption, radical mediation is not limited to Redemption.\textsuperscript{134} Carol believes “that even if original justice had not been lost, we would have had in Christ a perfecty [sic] ontological Mediation.”\textsuperscript{135} Although Carol bases his argument for Mary’s mediation on the Franciscan thesis, it is not until the final stage of his life that he will elaborate on this concept.

\textbf{Mary’s Mediation as a Participation in Christ’s Mediation}

After explaining Christ’s mediation, Carol begins his consideration of Mary’s mediation. He points out that it must be remembered that “the Mediation of the Blessed Virgin is nothing else but a participation in the one Mediation of Christ.”\textsuperscript{136} Since her mediation is a participation in His, her mediation should parallel His. Therefore, just as Christ’s mediation includes but is not limited to Redemption, Mary’s mediation includes her Coredemption, but is not limited to this.\textsuperscript{137} Her mediation cannot be limited to the dispensation of grace, especially since when the Church Fathers discuss her mediation they usually refer to its coredemptive aspect.\textsuperscript{138}

Carol notes that those who would limit Mary’s mediation to the dispensation of grace argue that the Fathers call Mary \textit{Mediatrix} not \textit{Coredemptrix}. However, Carol argues that based on what he has shown, mediation includes much more than dispensing grace. Carol’s opponents limited the term \textit{Mediatrix} to indicating actual moral mediation, rather than including its ontological and radical moral components. Carol admits that the Fathers often use \textit{Mediatrix} in the context of dispensing grace; however, they use it in many other contexts as well, citing as support Basil of Seleucia, Antipater of Bostra, and Sophronius of Jerusalem, who all discuss

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 646-47.
\textsuperscript{136} Carol, “The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption,” 647.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 647-48.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 648.
Mary’s mediation in the context of the Redemption. Furthermore, Paul calls Christ the one Mediator in the context of the Redemption (1 Tim. 2:5-6). Overall, Carol holds that the term “mediation” has multiple meanings, including Redemption in our post lapsum state; therefore, Mary’s title as Mediatrix indicates that she mediates in multiple ways, including Coredemption.

Carol’s previous argument started from the presupposition that Mary’s mediation parallels Christ’s mediation. Only later does he support this position, the argument for which we will now consider. As the Mother of God, Mary differs from God because as a creature, she is “infinitely inferior” to Him; yet, she differs from humanity because, as His mother, she is uniquely close to God. Carol states that everybody recognizes that Mary is fully human; thus, there is no reason to discuss how she differs from God. Therefore, his argument focuses on how Mary differs from the rest of humanity.

For Carol, Mary’s divine maternity establishes her as an ontological mediator because it causes her to differ not only in degree, but also in order of closeness to God. Mary is not only “an adopted child of God [emphasis original];” rather, as Christ’s mother, she has a “true natural relationship [emphasis original]” with Him. Whereas the relationship of adoption can be broken through sin and is thus accidental, the natural relationship cannot be broken; therefore, it is “substantial and eternal.” Mary does not belong to the order of the saints, nor does she “constitute the hypostatic order.” Instead, she is a midpoint between these two orders; a midpoint “intrinsically and…even necessarily” related to the hypostatic order, truly “consubstantial” with Christ. Carol explains that “the manner in which Christ enters into the
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The hypostatic order is essentially different from the manner in which Mary shares therein.\footnote{Ibid., 13.} The different verbs in this statement should be carefully noted, Christ “enters into” this order; He establishes it, whereas Mary only “shares” in it. In a later homily, Carol explains this more clearly, saying, Mary “does not, of course, belong to the Hypostatic Union; but she belongs to the Hypostatic Order inasmuch as it was through her that the Union was accomplished.”\footnote{Carol, “Our Lady’s Immunity from the Debt of Sin,” \textit{Marian Studies} 6 (1955): 165.} Mary’s place in the Hypostatic Order is logical because God predestined Christ and Mary in “\textit{one and the same decree}”\footnote{Carol, “The Nature of the Blessed Virgin’s Ontological Mediation,” 13.} Once again, we can see that Carol’s argument for Mary’s mediation depends on the Franciscan school of thought. If one does not accept this thesis, then one can easily refute his conclusion, as we will see at the beginning of chapter three.

**Mary’s Predestination and her Debt to Sin**

The idea of the union between Christ and Mary figures in an important theological debate to which we will return in chapter three. This debate was over the \textit{debitum peccati}, or Mary’s debt to sin. Before Vatican II, Carol only addresses this issue in his textbook and a homily given in 1955.\footnote{Carol, “Our Lady’s Immunity from the Debt of Sin,” 164. This occurred at the Holy Hour of the MSA’s yearly conference.} Both of these works only briefly touches on the issue, but they are significant because they demonstrate Carol’s thought on this topic before the Council, which becomes a component of his theological focus in his post-Conciliar work.

The concept of the \textit{debitum peccati} flows from the Franciscan idea of Mary’s predestination due to her union with Christ, which we discussed in the introduction. To say that Mary has no \textit{debitum} means that when ordaining the Immaculate Conception, God did not simply preserve Mary from “a sin she \textit{should} have contracted…but rather from a sin she \textit{would} have contracted, had God so decided [Carol’s emphasis].”\footnote{Carol, “Our Lady’s Immunity from the Debt of Sin,” 166.} This thesis further removes Mary from
sin by arguing that in the Immaculate Conception, God did not merely intercede to prevent Mary from obtaining Original Sin at the moment of conception; rather, He had always determined that she would not have this stain because she was predestined with Christ before the Fall. This means that she has no “debt to sin” because in no way was she ever under the obligation to contract Original Sin.\textsuperscript{151} This position is a corollary of Carol’s understanding of Mary’s association with Christ in the Hypostatic Order, as both are based on the presupposition that Mary was predestined with Christ in the same degree.\textsuperscript{152} At this point, Carol supports this aspect of the Franciscan thesis simply by referring the definition of the Immaculate Conception in \textit{Ineffabilis Deus} and the definition of the Assumption in \textit{Munificentissimus Deus}, as “Both state unequivocally that Jesus and Mary were predestined ‘uno eodemque decreto [one and the same decree].’”\textsuperscript{153}

Carol admits that this debate and his position was “a highly controversial point in theology.”\textsuperscript{154} However, for Carol, Mary’s lack of the \textit{debitum} is required by “the immutability of God’s decrees.”\textsuperscript{155} Mary’s unique role in the economy of salvation must have been “a positive act on the part of God’s will from all eternity.”\textsuperscript{156} If God had placed Mary under the debt of sin, then it would be as if He had changed His mind at the Immaculate Conception, suddenly deciding to preserve her from sin. Therefore, Mary can have no \textit{debitum}.\textsuperscript{157} Carol takes this position a step further, saying that not only was Mary predestined before the Fall, but that it was for her and for Christ that the Fall was permitted.\textsuperscript{158} Carol does not elaborate on this surprising position, he
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simply states in a footnote that he favors the position of a French Franciscan theologian Fr. J.F. Bonnefoy, who holds that the Fall was permitted to allow the Redemption and Coredemption to occur, as this more fully manifests God’s love.\footnote{Ibid., 23-4, footnote 32.}

It is not until after the Council that Carol will return to the concepts of the *debitum*, the predestination of Christ and Mary, and the relation between the Redemption and the Fall, at which point he will more fully elaborate on his positions. What is important for us at this point is to see Carol had considered the Franciscan thesis before the Council, although he did not fully discuss this foundational principle for Mary’s union with Christ in the Hypostatic order.

**Recirculation-association and the Coredemption**

Our next consideration will be how Carol’s understanding of mediation, especially the Coredemption, is supported by his understanding of the divine economy, in which he sees Mary’s role as united to Christ’s action. Although this idea is underlined by the theory of joint predestination, Carol’s focus is on Mary’s action in divine economy, not how God prepared her for this action in His divine decree. For Carol, the principle of recirculation-association (*retroversionis-consotii*) supports the idea that Coredemption is an important element of the divine economy.\footnote{Carol, *De Corredempzione*, 58-59.} In *De Corredempzione*, he seeks to establish that this principle “was formally in Scripture, was basic to the entire economy of salvation, and directly touched the central act of redemption.”\footnote{Fehlner, “Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M.,” 28.} In this study, Carol approaches the same topic, Mary’s relation to Christ in the Redemption, from a new angle. Whereas in his previous articles he used neo-scholastic logic to argue that Mary cooperated with Christ, now Carol intends to demonstrate that the Scriptural and Patristic principle of recirculation establishes Mary as the New Eve, indicating her Coredemptive role.
Carol’s definition of recirculation is based on one given by A.M Mayer in *Advanced Mariology*. Mayer states that recirculation is when “certain subsequent events are opposite in nature and direction to certain previous events, and that said subsequent events make a reversal of the situation with such effect as to produce an annulment of what up to that time had been the result of the previous events.”

Mayer goes on to state that recirculation “is the descriptive of the principle of consortship [association].” The principle of association emphasizes that Mary cooperates with Christ, whereas the principle of recirculation emphasizes what occurs during this association, Redemption through the reversal of the order in which Satan ruined humanity.

Although this principle is seen as early as Justin Martyr, Carol focuses on Irenaeus’ presentation of the concept of recirculation as it relates to Mary. For Irenaeus, recirculation is the “antithetical parallelism” between Mary and Eve, in which Mary undoes what was done by the first Eve. In contrast to Eve’s disobedience, which resulted in the Fall, “Mary…becoming obedient (to the angel’s message), became the cause of salvation to herself and to the entire human race…. the knot of Eve’s disobedience received (its) unloosing through the obedience of Mary [Carol’s parenthetical comments].”

Carol cites many other Patristic theologians to demonstrate that the concept of recirculation has been a means of understanding the salvation
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wrought by the Incarnation throughout Catholic tradition. At this point, Carol is not concerned with how the Fathers understood Mary’s role of the New Eve; his goal is simply to establish that the divine economy reverses the order of the Fall, giving Mary the role of the New Eve.

**The Protoevangelium and Coredemption**

Although Carol admits that the Fathers did not consider Mary’s role as the New Eve to give her an immediate role in the Redemption, he believes that this doctrine is implicit in the Scriptural presentation of recirculation-association. Carol’s argument for this position begins with an examination of the passage in which he holds this principle is first seen, the Protoevangelium (Gen. 3:15), in which God says to the serpent “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel.” Rather than basing his argument on the Vulgate translation “she will crush your head,” Carol bases his argument on the original Hebrew and the Greek of the Septuagint, stating that both of these are more accurate in attributing the crushing of the serpent’s head to the woman’s seed. His goal is to defend a literal interpretation of this passage in which “the woman” to whom the text refers is Mary and “enmity” indicates Mary’s active role in the Redemption.

Carol’s argument that the woman is Mary in the literal sense was a response to theologians who held that the woman is in one sense Eve and in another, Mary. For Carol, there is no sense in which the woman could be considered Eve. His first reason is that
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Scripturally, Eve is always associated with ruin and sin. Furthermore, if the woman was Eve, then the next statement would say that the seed of Eve conquered the devil, which would associate her with this victory. Carol emphatically rejects the possibility of Eve having a role in the Redemption. Furthermore, “the woman” cannot be understood as referring to Eve as a type of Mary because in Christian tradition, Eve is an antithetical type of Mary, not a similar type; thus, the passage cannot be read as a typology in which Eve and Mary do the same thing. For Carol, all of these exegetical reasons establish Mary to be the woman to whom the Protoevangelium literally refers.

Next, Carol seeks to demonstrate that Protoevangelium indicates that the woman, Mary, has an immediate, active role in the Redemption. For Carol, such a role is necessary based on the principle of recirculation. Since Eve participated immediately in the Fall, Mary should participate immediately in the Redemption. Carol first considers the Genesis narrative of the Fall, in which Eve gave Adam the forbidden fruit, emphasizing that in doing so, she actively cooperated in transgressing God’s law. Based on Rom. 5:12-17, Carol places the primary responsibility for the Fall on Adam, with the direct and efficacious cooperation of Eve.

Carol then analyzes Paul’s Epistles to demonstrate how Paul understood recirculation. He points to two main passages that establish an antithetical parallelism, 1 Cor. 15:21-22 and Rom. 5:12-21. Carol focuses on Rom. 5:12-21, explaining that that this passage contains three
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177 "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin….If because of one man’s trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace…reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ.”
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antithetical parallels; between the instruments that anger God and those that provide justification (sin and grace), between the consequences of sin and the consequences of grace (condemnation and justification), and between the persons of Adam and Jesus. Carol’s point is that Christ really functions as a Second Adam and that it is through recirculation that God is satisfied and friendship with Him is restored.  While recognizing that Paul does not explicitly refer to “the woman,” Carol believes it is sufficient that he describes salvation as an antithetical parallel linked with the Protoevangelium, leading to the logical conclusion that “the woman” also has an active role in recirculation. Therefore, Mary, as the New Eve, is active in our Redemption.

To support his argument that the Protoevangelium establishes Mary as the New Eve, Carol turns to magisterial statements, especially Pius IX’s *Ineffabilis Deus*, to support his idea that the Protoevangelium literally refers to Mary. Carol considers the following passage:

> The Fathers…. quoting the words by which at the beginning of the world God announced his merciful remedies...“I will put enmities between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed” -- taught that by this divine prophecy the merciful Redeemer of mankind…was clearly foretold: That his most Blessed Mother, the Virgin Mary, was prophetically indicated… Hence, just as Christ, the Mediator between God and man… blotted the handwriting of the decree that stood against us, and fastened it triumphantly to the cross, so the most holy Virgin, united with him by a most intimate and indissoluble bond, was, with him and through him, eternally at enmity with the evil serpent, and most completely triumphed over him, and thus crushed his head with her immaculate foot.

In this text, Pius IX describes the Patristic interpretation of the Protoevangelium as indicating that Mary was united with Christ in His triumph over the devil. Carol attempts to use this passage to support his position that the only correct way to interpret the Protoevangelium is to take “the woman” to refer to Mary in the literal sense, rather than a typical sense. Further, he argues that
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this interpretation is the only one that is faithful to papal teaching. Fehlner states that many critics considered this to be a weak point in Carol’s argument, as Carol too strongly insisted that those who disagreed with his interpretation of *Ineffabilis Deus* were contradicting the Magisterium. Carol’s strong reliance on this magisterial document was likely influenced by his ultramontanist atmosphere.

**The New Eve, Mediation, and Coredemption**

In *De Corredemptione*, Carol is concerned with proving that Mary’s direct cooperation in the Redemption is rooted in the Protoevangelium, which presents her as the New Eve. Thus, he does not discuss the implications of this role that were debated in the twentieth century. In other works, however, Carol elaborates on the significance of this role, maintaining that Mary’s role as the New Eve was a public role that related her to all Christians; therefore, her meriting would be publicly ordered to all souls.

Carol supports his position with the epilogue of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, in which Pius XII stated that Mary “always most intimately united with her Son, as the New Eve, offered Him on Golgotha…to the Eternal Father…Thus she who corporally was the mother of our Head…became spiritually the mother of all His members.”

Carol explains that this passage means that “Mary stands at the foot of the Cross not as a private person, not as an ordinary mother watching the death of her innocent son, but rather in an *official* capacity, as the New Eve…This role of Mary as the New Eve…designates Mary’s intimate and universal consortship
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with the New Adam, Christ, in the work of our Redemption [emphasis original].”

For Carol, “the New Eve” is not merely a pious Marian title; it designates that Mary has a public, official role in the work of our Redemption according to the principle of recirculation. It is because she is the New Eve, because she has this official role, that Mary merits with Christ to redeem humanity.

Carol takes pains to emphasize that this does not mean that Mary’s mediation was strictly essential for our salvation. Rather, God chose to establish Mary’s “merits and satisfactions as a nonessential (though necessary), secondary, and totally subordinate element of the same Redemption.”

Carol made a similar conclusion when scholastically evaluating Mary’s office as a mediator, demonstrating that he sees this argument for Mary’s role as the New Eve as a Scriptural and Patristic starting point that leads to the same conclusion as his previous work.

**Development of the Doctrine of Coredemption in Tradition**

One of Carol’s major goals was tracing the development of the doctrine of the Coredemption from its implicit presence in the Patristic period to its presentation in the magisterial documents of his time. Although this doctrine was not explicit in the Patristic period, Carol explains that the Church is “a living organism [emphasis original],” that can define doctrines that were previously only implicitly expressed in the tradition. He states that the Church has defined several doctrines that are not explicitly stated in Scripture, such as the Immaculate Conception. In *De Coredemptione*, Carol tries to demonstrate that an implicit understanding of Coredemption is present in Scripture and the Fathers and that this doctrine
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developed, becoming more explicit, throughout the history of the Church.\textsuperscript{193} Using historical sources, he attempts to demonstrate the “\textit{theological, not historical, fact [emphasis original]}” that Mary’s Coredemption is a doctrine.\textsuperscript{194} He does this through an examination of approximately three-thousand authors from a great variety of countries and religious institutes, in an effort to demonstrate that this doctrine is universal and does not belong to a particular region or school.\textsuperscript{195} His conclusion is that immediate Coredemption is “found in revelation….Where that doctrine is to be found in the sources of revelation and how it is there contained are important but secondary questions.”\textsuperscript{196} Our analysis of this section of Carol’s work will focus on the main themes in the development of the doctrine that he emphasizes in each historical period.

**The Implicit Understanding of Coredemption in the Patristic Period**

Unsurprisingly, the core aspect of the doctrine expressed in the Patristic period is Mary’s role as the New Eve alongside the New Adam. Carol considers many of the same sources as he did when discussing the concept of recirculation. However, in this section of his argument, Carol’s focus when analyzing these texts has shifted from the concept of recirculation in general to one particular aspect of it, Coredemption. Although the Fathers did not discuss immediate Coredemption, Carol argues that this concept is nevertheless present in their writings.\textsuperscript{197}

Most of Carol’s theological contemporaries accepted that in the writings of the Fathers there was an Eve-Mary parallel in which Mary is described has having a role “with Christ in the reparation of the initial fall.”\textsuperscript{198} They debated, however, how to interpret this parallel and if it implied immediate Coredemption or not.\textsuperscript{199} Despite being a stanch supporter of Mary’s participation in the Redemption, Carol believed that the Eve-Mary parallel as presented in the
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Fathers cannot be claimed as direct, explicit support for immediate Coredemption. Rather, their writings only indicate that they understood Mary as remotely participating in the Redemption. They saw her as actively cooperating in the Incarnation, which they described as the first step of our Redemption.\(^{200}\) He states, “it is one thing to say that Mary’s immediate co-operation in the Redemption itself is *implied* in, or *deduced* from, the teachings of the Fathers; it is another thing to assert that the Fathers themselves perceived this type of co-operation. The former is perfectly legitimate; the later quite unwarranted [emphasis original].”\(^{201}\) Carol is not concerned that the doctrine is only implied because he maintains that doctrine develops; therefore, it does not need to be explicitly expressed in its entirety in the Patristic period to be a valid doctrine.

Carol sees the root of the concept of immediate Coredemption in the Fathers’ accounts of the New Eve because they describe Mary as having an active role in the Incarnation and as being associated with Christ in the process of Redemption through recirculation.\(^{202}\) Fehlner states that although Carol’s conclusion about the witness of the Fathers is in general sound, it is weakened because he does not discuss, “the difference between the Church as the New Eve and Mary as the New Eve in the mind of those Fathers.”\(^{203}\) It seems that if Carol had done this, it would have strengthened his argument since, as Felhner describes, the Fathers discussed the Church as the New Eve when referring to “the distribution of graces on completion of the work of redemption,” while when Mary is described as the New Eve they refer “to her involvement in their acquisition, viz., in the very completion of that work.”\(^{204}\) However, as a Christotypicalist, Carol did not approach Marian doctrine with an understanding that there could be parallels between Mary and the Church, which likely contributed to his failure to make this distinction.
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Making Mary’s Role in the Redemption Explicit in the Medieval Period

In the next section, Carol moves to the medieval witness for the doctrine of the Coredemption.²⁰⁵ He considers this period a turning point in the understanding of Mary’s Coredemptive role in the economy of salvation that was influenced in particular by Bernard, Bonaventure, pseudo-Albert the Great, and Arnold of Chartes.²⁰⁶ Eadmer of Canterbury (d. 1124) was “the first to mention Mary’s merit in connection with man’s Redemption [emphasis original].”²⁰⁷ Carol credits Arnold of Chartes (d. 1160) as being the first to explicitly discuss the Coredemption.²⁰⁸ Arnold described Christ and Mary accomplishing the Redemption together on Calvary by offering “the same sacrifice to God…so that, together with Christ, she obtains a common effect in the salvation of the world [Carol’s emphasis].”²⁰⁹ This statement contains all of the major components present in the twentieth century understanding of the immediate Coredemption, although the precise terminology of the twentieth century is not present.

Carol explains that Albert the Great (d. 1280) extended the principle of recirculation-association found in the Fathers to “the entire process of man’s Redemption,” and describes Bonaventure (d. 1274) as coming to the conclusion that Mary “co-offered the divine Victim, satisfied for our sins, and paid the price of our Redemption.”²¹⁰ Carol considers the work of Scotus who, despite having significantly aided the development of the doctrine of the Coredemption by solving the difficulties surrounding the Immaculate Conception, contributed little directly to the Coredemption debate.²¹¹ Scotus did, however, state that in the Passion, Mary
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²⁰⁹ Ibid. See Carol, De Corredemptione, 157, for a longer selection of this passage.
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²¹¹ Fehlner, “Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M.,” 34, footnote 41.
merited out of compassion, a statement that will be further developed in later centuries. Overall, the Middle Ages demonstrates the explicit expression of the key components of the doctrine of the Coredemption.

**Discussion of the Coredemption between the Fifteenth and Nineteenth Centuries**

Carol states that during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there was no development of the doctrine of the Coredemption. Fehlner notes that several theologians criticized Carol for his failure to give an account for the lack of interest in the topic of Coredemption in these centuries, considering this to be the “most serious criticism” of Carol’s work. In Fehlner’s view, theologians during this time were absorbed with the problem of the Immaculate Conception, which needed to be resolved before the study of the Coredemption could move forward. Although not proclaimed dogmatically until 1854, the doctrine was “practically achieved before the Reformation… [bringing] in its wake a clearer and more explicit avowal of the coredemption.” In our third chapter, we will see that Carol eventually considers some of the debates related to the Immaculate Conception, although he does not connect their development to that of the Coredemption.

Next, Carol moves to the modern period, during which prodigious development in the doctrine of the Coredemption occurred. He states that the seventeenth century was “the ‘Golden Age’ of Mary’s Coredemption.” This century was so central to the development of the doctrine of the Coredemption that Carol states that since then, almost no “new element of
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importance” regarding this doctrine had been contributed.\textsuperscript{219} Carol groups his study of the modern period into the four categories that his contemporaries used to discuss the Coredemption; “merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, and ransom.”\textsuperscript{220} We will briefly consider the main developments of each category.

By the mid-seventeenth century, how Mary’s merit was rewarded by God was generally expressed by the formula that “the Blessed Virgin merited for us \textit{de congruo} what Christ merited for us \textit{de condigno}.”\textsuperscript{221} To say that Mary merited \textit{de congruo} means that God rewarded Mary’s action because it was fitting in light of His generosity. Christ’s meriting \textit{de condigno}, in contrast, means that Christ was strictly owed the reward given to Him by God for His suffering.\textsuperscript{222} In the nineteenth century, two authors claimed that Mary merited \textit{de condigno}, a point significant for a twentieth century debate that we will discuss in a later section.\textsuperscript{223}

In parallel to the idea that Mary merited in the Redemption, the idea that Mary offered satisfaction for our sins through her compassion began to appear in the seventeenth century. Theologians commonly referred to Mary’s suffering at the foot of the Cross during the Passion as her compassion. Although some held that in her compassion, even satisfaction \textit{de condigno} was possible, most held that she satisfied \textit{de congruo}.\textsuperscript{224} When combined, merit and satisfaction constitute our ransom, the “metaphorical expression” in which “the merits and satisfactions of Christ constitute the ‘price’ which he paid to the Eternal Father.”\textsuperscript{225} Theologians discussed Mary’s role in ransoming in similar ways as they discussed the previous two concepts.\textsuperscript{226}
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Theologians also considered if Mary participated in Christ’s Sacrifice of Himself to the Father. Carol notes that most modern theologians held that Mary participated in this Sacrifice; however, they debated if her participation was a true sacrifice (sacrifice *sensu proprio*). To say that her sacrifice was a true sacrifice would mean that Mary did not just suffer with Christ, but in union with Him, offered Him to God. This opinion first appeared in the twelfth century and by the nineteenth century its standard formulation was that Mary “offered up the divine Victim on Calvary for our Redemption.” Some went so far as to state that Mary had “a true priestly character,” an opinion Carol called “a deformation.” His reasoning for holding this stance will be considered in a later section.

The point of Carol’s entire historical investigation was to illustrate that the idea of immediate Coredemption was not “an abrupt creation of the twentieth century.” Rather, it developed from the Patristic concept of the New Eve to its explicit expression in nineteenth century. His work shows that the position that Mary cooperated immediately in the Redemption has a traceable development from the earliest period of the Church.

**Modern Magisterial Support for Immediate Coredemption**

The last part of Carol’s argument is an analysis of magisterial documents to demonstrate that they support defining the Coredemption as Mary’s immediate cooperation in the Redemption. Such an argument from papal authority would be expected from somebody of Carol’s era. Of course, most theologians with whom he debated appealed to the same papal documents to support their positions; therefore, they debated how to interpret these documents.
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As we will see in the next section, Carol did not always agree with every phrase in papal documents, but on the whole, he took them as having great authority.

Unsurprisingly, Carol first considers *Ineffabilis Deus* of Pius IX, the pope who first “formally recognized” the Coredemption and whose evidence supporting the connection between the Protoevangelium and the Coredemption we considered elsewhere. In considering the document’s support for the doctrine of the Coredemption, Carol discusses how the pope considered Mary to have triumphed over the serpent with Christ, as seen in his statement that Mary “united with him [Christ] by a most intimate and indissoluble bond, was, with him and through him, eternally at enmity with the evil serpent, and most completely triumphed over him, and thus crushed his head with her immaculate foot.” Carol considers this to mean that Mary had a subordinate but active role in the Redemption, as it was in the Redemption that Christ triumphed over Satan. Therefore, according to Carol, this document supports Coredemption in the proper sense.

Leo XIII also made important contributions to the magisterial acceptance of the Coredemption. In *Adiutricem* (1895), Leo XIII described how Mary as “‘cooperatrix in the sacrament of man’s Redemption would be likewise the cooperatrix in the dispensation of graces deriving from it.’” Here, Leo XIII distinguishes between the two forms of mediation, Coredemption and distribution, maintaining that Mary cooperated with Christ in both. Pius X made a similar distinction in *Ad Diem Illum* (1905), stating that, united to Christ, Mary “‘merited to become most worthily the reparatrix of the lost world, and for this reason, the dispenser of all the favors which Jesus acquired for us.’” In addition, he repeated the nineteenth century axiom
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that Mary merited *de congruo* what Christ merited *de condigno*,\(^{240}\) a statement that came to be debated in the twentieth century, as we will see in the next section.

Carol considers Benedict XV’s to have made an important contribution to the Coredemption discussion in his Apostolic Letter *Inter sodalicia* (1918), in which he stated, “‘To such an extent did [Mary] suffer and almost die with her suffering and dying son…and immolate Him – insofar as she could…that we may rightly say that she redeemed the human race together with Christ.’”\(^{241}\) For Carol, this statement clearly supports immediate Coredemption, as it describes Mary as redeeming humanity with Christ specifically in His Passion.\(^{242}\)

Carol devoted particular attention to the writings of the current pontiff when he was studying the Coredemption, Pius XII. In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (1943), Pius XII described Mary as offering Christ to God on Calvary in her office of the New Eve.\(^{243}\) Later, when defining the Assumption in the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* (1950), Pius XII stated that Mary “the new Eve, who, although subject to the new Adam, is most intimately associated with Him in the struggle against the infernal foe, which as foretold in the Protoevangelium (Gen. 3:15), finally resulted in that most complete victory over sin and death.”\(^{244}\) For Carol, this is significant because Mary’s official role as the New Eve, which Carol ties to her role as Coredemptrix, is being used as justification for the Assumption.\(^{245}\)

This concludes our discussion of Carol’s analysis of Papal statements. For Carol, these documents demonstrate that his understanding of the Coredemption is found in papal statements, which become increasingly more explicit about Mary’s role in the Redemption. However, these

\(^{240}\) Carol, “Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 383; Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 517.

\(^{241}\) Carol, “Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 384. Carol’s translation. See also, Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 524.

\(^{242}\) Carol, “Our Lady’s Coredemption,” 384; Carol, *De Corredemptione*, 524-25.


statements did not define Mary’s Coredemption, nor did Carol attempt to claim that they did so. His goal was simply to show that there was magisterial support for his position, which would have been important in the ultramontanistic and anti-modernistic early twentieth century.

**Further Clarifications regarding Immediate Coredemption**

The majority of Carol’s work on the Coredemption sought to prove her immediate cooperation in the Redemption; therefore, most of his work did not discuss contemporary debates regarding Mary’s Coredemption. It was not until his 1957 article “Our Lady’s Coredemption” that he addressed some of these issues, two of the most significant of which we will consider.

First, we will consider the debate over how to describe God’s reception of Mary’s merit, which is significant because it resulted in public controversy among the Christotypicalists. The root of this debate was Pius X’s statement in *Ad Diem Illum* that Mary “‘merits for us de congruo, as they say, what Jesus Christ merits for us de condigno.’”

Mariologists debated if Mary really merited *de congruo*, or if she could perhaps be considered to have merited *de condigno*. The majority of theologians held that Mary merited *de congruo*; that God rewarded her compassion because He is gracious and doing so is fitting. Carol held the minority position that Mary merited *de condigno*, meaning that it was just for God to reward her merit. He supported this position by arguing that since God predestined Mary to the unique role of *Coredemptrix* in the economy of salvation, God “owed it to Himself to reward her merits not only out of fittingness, but in justice.”

Carol’s position in this debate is undergirded by the idea to which he will return after Vatican II, the predestination of Christ and Mary.

The second debate we will consider is the debate over Mary’s sacrifice of Christ. While it was accepted that Mary offered Christ on Calvary, Mariologists debated if this was a true
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sacrifice, which would mean that Mary was an ordained priest. Some theologians held that Mary, “was invested with a true priesthood… [superior] to the ministerial priesthood of those properly ordained [emphasis original].” Carol, on the other hand, sided with the majority, who stated that although Mary cooperated in Christ’s Sacrifice, her cooperation as not “a true and proper sacrifice” because Mary was not a priest in the proper sense. Rather, she belonged to the universal priesthood of the baptized, although as the Mother of God, she was “of a much higher degree” than other members. This position is significant because it demonstrates that although he was a strong Christotypicalist, Carol’s theology led him to one of the major emphases of the ecclesiotypical school, that Mary was a member of the Church. It is unfortunate that Carol never developed this point, especially after Vatican II’s increased emphasis on the universal priesthood of the laity.

**Carol’s Influence on the Coredemption Debates**

This concludes our discussion of Carol’s arguments in favor of the definition of the Coredemption as immediate participation in the objection Redemption. We saw that Carol’s argument for this position was based on the principle of recirculation-association as seen in the Church Fathers and Scripture. We also saw how it developed throughout tradition and was supported by the magisterium. Furthermore, we saw how all of Carol’s work was shaped by the Mariological movement and theological atmosphere in the early twentieth century. Carol’s major work, *De Corredemptione*, made a significant contribution to the field of Mariology and led Carol to be considered one of the leading Mariologists of North America.
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Exactly how impactful Carol’s work was on the Coredemption debate is hard to define. Whereas before *De Corredemptione* theologians debated if the Coredemption was an immediate participation in Christ’s Sacrifice on Calvary or a remote participation in this through her *fiat*, by the 1958 Mariological congress of Lourdes, the main debate was over how to explain Mary’s immediate participation. It is of course possible that this shift could have occurred without Carol’s work, although he is considered to have been a major contributor to it. The two major sides in this new debate were the Christotypical school and the ecclesiotypical school, whose different Mariological starting points had a significant role in the Marian debates of Vatican II. Our second chapter will examine the development of the conflict between these two schools and how this shaped the Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium*, which will provide the historical background for our examination Carol’s post-Conciliar work in our final chapter.
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CHAPTER TWO
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARIAN CHAPTER OF LUMEN GENTIUM

The Mariological Movement on the Eve of Vatican II

On the eve of Vatican II, major shifts were occurring not only in Mariology, but also in the broader realm of Catholic theology, the major ones being the biblically orientated liturgical movement, the ecumenical movement, and the ressourcement movement. These movements’ varied theological emphases arose from different historical circumstances than did the Marian movement, which we described in chapter one.256 As these movements developed, their members began to consider Mariology from new starting point, her relationship to the Church. The interplay between this new ecclesiotypical school of Mariology and the Christotypical school had a major impact on the Second Vatican Council’s presentation of the Church’s Marian doctrine in Lumen Gentium.

This chapter will trace the development of chapter eight, the Marian chapter, of Lumen Gentium, beginning with the 1958 Lourdes Mariological Congress. This Congress was the first time these two schools of Mariology came together; therefore, it provides important historical background for their interaction during the Council. In keeping with our goal of understanding the connection between Carol’s pre-Conciliar focus on Coredemption and his post-Conciliar

256 Thompson, “Vatican II and Beyond,” 406. Many members of the liturgical and ecumenical movements were from Germany. This is significant because Cardinal Mercier, a leader in the Marian movement, was also a leader in resisting the German occupation of Belgium during World War I. The resulting tension between Mercier and the German bishops, in addition to theological concerns, may have negatively impacted their willingness to support the Marian movement. See Dodd, The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace, 69-74, 194-95, 201.
focus on the Franciscan thesis, our particular focus will be on debates surrounding the Coredemption and predestination of Christ and Mary. We will see that through the influence of Fr. Charles Balić, Carol’s mentor, these two topics are connected in the Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium*. Although Carol himself was not present at the Council, Vatican II resulted in major changes in his field. Thus, this chapter provides the necessary historical context for examining his later work.

Before beginning our analysis, there are a few qualifications we must make. Sometimes, the history of this period is portrayed as a clash between the ecclesiotypical school and the Christotypical school, in which the ecclesiotypicalists are portrayed as being involved in the liturgical, ecumenical, and *ressourcement* movements, while the Christotypicalists are portrayed as ignoring all of the new theological trends in the Church. While it is true that the ecclesiotypical school was more strongly influenced by these other movements, the Christotypical Marian movement also sought to be rooted in Scripture and Patristic sources. We saw that Carol both based his work on the Patristic concept of recirculation and attributed new critical editions of Patristic texts with influencing the Marian movement. René Laurentin produced several important exegetical works on the Gospel of Luke, including *Structure et Théologie de Luc 1-2* (1957) and *Jésus au Temple: Mystère de Paques et Foi de Marie en Luc 2, 48-50* (1966). Cardinal Mercier, the “most famous promoter” of the movement for the dogmatic declaration of Mary as *Mediatrix* in the early twentieth century, facilitated “the ‘Malines Conversations,’ the first official Catholic ecumenical efforts since the Council of Trent.”

---

259 Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 74.
260 Ibid., 199. These conferences were small, composed of “five private conversations, from 1921-1926, between a few Anglican and Catholic theologians.” See also, George H. Tavard, *The Thousand Faces of the Virgin Mary* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 202, who states, “but among the growing number of theologians who
complex; it is important to avoid stereotyping these two schools, especially since our brief survey cannot account for all of their nuances.

One common way of discussing the ecclesiotypical school and the Christotypical school is to call them the minimalists and the maximalists, respectively. These terms at first glance seem appropriate. The Christotypicalists were seeking new Marian dogmas, which can be considered an attempt to increase, or maximize, Mary’s status with new definitions that would further highlight her unique role in the Church. In contrast, the ecclesiotypical school desired to emphasize Mary’s membership in the Church, which could be seen as an attempt to decrease, or minimize, her status by highlighting how she is similar to other members of the Church. However, such terminology, and more importantly, such an understanding the two schools, is problematic.

The main intention of both schools was theological clarity; neither group had the sole purpose of changing Mary’s status in the Church. The Christotypicalists sought new definitions to provide theological clarity, not merely to honor Mary, and the ecclesiotypicalists sought to highlight aspects of the Church’s Marian doctrine that connected it to other areas of theology; they were not merely seeking to counter the Christotypicalists. Since the Christotypical-ecclesiotypical distinction can be seen as indicating the starting point of each group, it seems to be the more useful distinction and it was used by the twentieth century theologians.

were familiar with ecumenical issues, no one desired another papal gesture that would further antagonize…both the Protestant and the Orthodox worlds.” Mercier believed that Marian definitions could help ecumenism, as had been argued since 1904. Some of those making this argument, such as the Armenian Patriarch Paul Peter XIII, were concerned with ecumenical relations with the Eastern Churches, while others, such as Balić and Fr. Joseph Bittermieux, the founder of the Flemish Mariological society, held that it could aid unity with Protestants as well. See Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 213, 411-16.
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themselves. Thus, we will use this distinction, although it is still imperfect. Both groups discussed Mary’s relation to Christ and to the Church. The difference is one of starting point and emphasis, not of complete rejection. With our terminology defined, we can proceed to our historical analysis, beginning with a consideration of the development of the ecclesiotypical school.

Theological Problems in the Christotypical School

Part of what lead the ecclesiotypical school to develop were the problems within the Marian movement. Most of the original members of the Marian movement were Christotypicalists. Therefore, we will start by considering some of the theological problems of this approach to demonstrate the legitimacy of the concerns of the ecclesiotypicalists.

One problem within the movement was the exaggerated language sometimes employed by Mariologists. Post-Conciliar Mariologists, sometimes with great frustration, describe the Council Fathers as overemphasizing 1 Timothy 2:5, that Christ is the One Mediator. They depict this as misguided ecumenism that attempts to address a controversy between Catholics and Protestants while ignoring how the Orthodox understood Mary’s mediation. Such an account does not accurately acknowledge the history of the Marian movement on the eve of Vatican II.

Joseph Lebon, a Belgium Mariologist and the teacher of Balić, in attempting to support the position that Mary merited *de condigno*, separated Mary’s mediation from Christ’s mediation.

269 Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 226-27. Lebon was actually the theologian who began the controversy over whether Mary merited *de congruo* or *de condigno*.
Dodd describes Lebon as holding that “since the divine maternity was not for Mary’s personal sanctification, the divine maternity was a gift directly from God, not given by the merits of Christ….Mary’s cooperation in the redemption, by her renunciation of her maternal rights, did not pass through the intermediacy of Christ.” Such a position, while not denying that Mary’s merit is due to her association with Christ, gives her an independent mediation to God. Although opposed by many, including Carol and Balić, Lebon was supported by some theologians. Thus, the Marian movement itself created a situation in which Christ’s sole mediatorship needed to be emphasized.

Lebon’s separation of Mary’s mediation from Christ’s mediation is merely one example of the sometimes extreme statements that occurred within the Marian movement, although it is perhaps the most theologically problematic. Two other concepts that were considered problematic by Carol were the ideas that Mary sacrificed her maternal rights over Christ and that she was a ministerial priest. Therefore, there were legitimate excesses within the Marian movement that even the Christotypicalists themselves recognized. The ecclesiotypicalists’ desire to emphasize Mary’s place within the Church was a necessary counter-balance to the problematic ideas that had developed from the Christotypical emphasis.

In addition to the problem of exaggeration, Mariology was also truly lacking in its discussion of the relationship between Mary and the Church. Although critical of the ecclesiotypical approach to Mariology, Cyril Vollert admitted that it sought “to check a movement that has at times excessively assimilated the Blessed Virgin to Christ and that has failed to relate her salvific role to the Church.” Carol himself serves as an example of this failure. We saw how Carol, in his discussion of Mary as the New Eve, failed to acknowledge
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272 Cyril Vollert, *A Theology of Mary* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), 150. Vollert’s view of this school becomes apparent in the next sentence, in which he states, “In reaction against such deviations, they tend to detach Mary from Christ and to assimilate her excessively to the Church.”
how the Church Fathers understood the Church as the New Eve. Thus, he missed an important link between Mariology and ecclesiology. In addition, while acknowledging that Mary’s priesthood was that of the laity, Carol never developed this point. Thus, his work lacks the important concept of Mary as an exemplar for the laity. Carol, of course, was not the only Christotypical Mariologist to omit such concepts. However, his work provides an example of some of the neglected areas of Mariology that the ecclesiotypical school sought to fill.

Development of the Ecclesiotypical School of Mariology

The ecclesiotypical school began to develop shortly after World War II and was spearheaded by German theologians such as Otto Semmelroth, H.M. Köster, and Alois Müller. Such Mariologists took Mary’s role as the archetype of the Church as their fundamental principle, rather than the Divine Maternity. We will examine Semmelroth’s work to explain what it means to call Mary the “archetype” of the Church, although Journet, Bouyer, Balthasar, and de Lubac also discussed this concept. Semmelroth defines an archetype as “the manifestation of an idea or spiritual entity through tangible form.” Calling Mary the archetype means that in her, the invisible Church is made visible. Semmelroth states, “It is the Ecclesia which shines forth in Mary, the center of God’s plan of salvation, the economy of salvation in its concrete form.” Mary is not a mere symbol of the Church; rather, the Church is present within her. Since this archetype is a living person, she is also an example for the Church’s members.

276 Semmelroth, Mary, Archetype of the Church, 29-31. To explain this, he uses the Patristic concepts of symbolon and mysterion. These concepts are important in Eastern Patristic sacramental theology, showing how the ecclesiotypical movement was connected to the liturgical movement and the resourcement movement.
277 Ibid., 24. De Lubac’s Mariology helps illustrate this point. He explains that in regards to the Church, Mary is “the ‘sacrament’ of it….Our Lady speaks and acts in the name of the Church at every moment of her existence.” See Henri De Lubac, The Splendour of the Church, trans. Michael Mason (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 242.
278 Semmelroth, Mary, Archetype of the Church, 30-1.
Another important point stressed by this school is that Mary is “one of us redeemed and a member of her Son’s body, the Church, albeit an extraordinarily favored one [emphasis original].” Congar explains that rather than describing Mary as the neck of the Body, ecclesiotypicalists emphasized that “Mary is in the body.” De Lubac explains that Mary “is as much a member of the Church as each one of us is; but in another sense… [she is] the sum of perfection of all the other members.” All members of the Church participate in her perfect fiat to Christ, the bridegroom. This understanding of Mary is not minimalistic. It retains Mary’s uniqueness, while emphasizing that the faithful are called to respond to Christ as she did.

Rahner highlights another consequence of seeing Mary as the representative of the Church. He describes how her Assumption represents the promise of the new age inaugurated by Christ, the age in which victory over death has been won. She is “the main exemplar for the ‘early’ total fulfillment of history;” early in that she experiences what the rest of us hope to experience at the end of the world. Emphasizing Mary as a member of the Body does not reduce her to a mere example of virtue; it also makes her a symbol of hope that the promises of Scripture will be fulfilled.

**Coredemption in the Ecclesiotypical School**

Having briefly considered the themes of the ecclesiotypical school in general, we will now consider how Coredemption fits into this Marian synthesis. Ecclesiotypicalists modified the idea of Mary’s role in the objective redemption. Rather than the active role the Christotropicalists attributed to Mary, they described Mary as having “a receptive Mediatrix role…vis-à-vis her
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Son’s unique saving work.”

Semmelroth states that this means that Mary is really the co-redeemer, but in the same sense as the Church is co-redeemer. He states, “we must reject any concept...in which Mary is interpreted as really co-meriting grace within Christ’s work.” His reasoning draws on Lennerz, who says that an immediate Coredemption is illogical because:

One would have to declare that Mary was not redeemed through the same kind of objective redemption as the rest of mankind. For Mary would not be able to cooperate if it were not a fact that she was in a state of grace....One would also have to concede that though Mary bore the debitum of original sin in her human nature inherited from Adam – but not imputed to her person – she was redeemed not in her nature...but by specific redemptive work applied to her person alone.

Since she is a member of the human race, Mary is still under the debitum to sin, although God preserved her from Original Sin. Therefore, she cannot be in a state of grace until after the Passion, which makes possible the removal of this debitum. For this reason, she cannot merit in the objective redemption. For Lennerz, one can only describe Mary as physically and remotely cooperating in the objective redemption through supplying Christ with a Body in His Incarnation. In contrast, Semmelroth, maintaining that Mary is the Type of the Church, sees her as involved immediately in the objective redemption without meriting. Mary has a real causality in the Redemption, but it is a “receptive causality.” She receives the grace of Redemption, appropriating it for her own redemption and for the entire Church. In explaining his understanding of Marian Coredemption, Semmelroth’s work provides a way to understand Mary’s active involvement in the Redemption without requiring that her role be meritorious.
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The 1958 Lourdes Congress

The first time these two schools of Mariology were brought together at the international level was the 1958 Mariological Congress in Lourdes. The Congress demonstrated that the development of the ecclesiotypical school had divided the Marian movement and foreshadowed the conflict that would occur at the Council regarding the Marian schema. By looking at the Congress, we will have a better understanding of the areas of agreement and disagreement between the two schools when the Council began. Our discussion will pay particular attention to the role of Carol’s mentor, Fr. Charles Balić, who played a major role both in the Lourdes Congress and the Council, always advocating for Christotypical, Franciscan Mariology. Upon Balić’s death in 1977, Carol stated, “His letters [about Vatican II]…contain much valuable information, and are a source of inspiration to me.” This demonstrates that Balić’s role in the Council had an influence on Carol, making it helpful for our study to consider his thought in particular during this period of transition in Mariology.

The theme of the 1958 Congress was Mary and the Church, which was “inspired especially by the works written between 1947 and 1951 by Heinrich Köster, Otto Semmelroth, and Hugo Rahner.” It had the highest attendance of any Mariological Congress, with approximately 250 to 300 theologians. Balić summarized the Congress in a positive tone, perhaps masking some of the true tension that would become apparent at the Council. He states, “While disagreeing in many respects…these theologians, nevertheless, were of one mind in their defense of Mary’s excellence… attributing to her a real social task, a task that is universal, public, redemptive, as well as cooperative with Christ the Redeemer in the objective order.”
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general, the two schools agreed Mary had a role in the objective Redemption. Her cooperation in the Redemption was “complementary” to Christ’s role through her suffering “at the foot of the Cross for our salvation by consenting to His death, and by co-offering the sacrifice in a manner completely special to herself.”299 While the schools agreed that Mary’s role in the Redemption was immediate and active, they debated whether her role was meritorious.

**Carol’s Theology of the Coredemption Compared to the Lourdes Congress**

In many ways, the Congress’ description of Mary’s role in the Redemption parallels Carol’s understanding of Coredemption. The general assemblies described how Mary is related to Christ because she is a member of the hypostatic order, making her the Mother of God and the New Eve, Christ’s associate. This association, begun at the Annunciation, makes Mary the *Coredemptrix* and means that the Redemption must be attributed to Christ and Mary.300

As the Congress began to consider more specific topics of the Mary-Church relation, however, it began to diverge from Carol’s focus. One such topic was whether Mary is within the Church or “outside and above” the Church [emphasis original] on the basis of her singular privileges.301 Ecclesiotypicalists were concerned that in emphasizing Mary’s relation to Christ, she was removed from her proper place as a redeemed member of the Body of Christ. Many opposed the idea that Mary is outside the Church on the grounds that she is “the first and principal member of the Church,” and also is “in the Church because of her incorporation in one
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Such concerns were never present in Carol’s work, as he was involved in debates within the Christotypical school.

In his overall evaluation of the Congress, Balić presents Mariologists as united in their desire to better understand Mary, albeit theologically divided, saying that “there were in their ranks no enemies, no ‘Minimists’ [sic], no Maximists.” However, he still called both schools to “depart for some length from their proper field, and…bring about with their united efforts a common synthesis.” From our discussion of the Congress, we can conclude that Mariologists were united on the basic level in maintaining that Mary was in some way uniquely related to the redemptive mission of Christ. How exactly she was related; however, was debated.

The Calling of Vatican II

On January 25, 1959, Pope John XXIII announced his plans for an ecumenical council. A major theme of the Council was a renewed effort to achieve Christian unity. In his announcement, John XXIII “stated his confidence in the ‘divine mediation of the Immaculate Mother of Jesus and our Mother’ and expressed pastoral and ecumenical hopes for the Council. Both of these goals, especially ecumenism, would have important implications for the development of chapter eight of Lumen Gentium. Even before the ante-preparatory phase, members of the ecumenical movement, including Congar and Otto Karrer, began arguing that the
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Council should avoid proclaiming any dogmas, especially Marian dogmas, as this would hinder Christian unity.308

Despite Balić’s positive description of the relationship between the two schools in his closing speech at the 1958 Lourdes Congress, Vatican II revealed great tension between the various movements in the Church. Ratzinger described this tension as the result of the bringing together the liturgical movement, which, with the ecumenical and biblical movements, emphasized “its own piety as being ‘objective’ and sacramental,” with the Marian movement, the piety of which was more “subjective and personal.”309 He elaborates, saying that the Council needed to bring “these two divergent movements together” and that “we can understand correctly the struggles that marked the first half of the Council…only in light of the tension between these two forces.”310 Thus, the clash over the Marian schema can be considered a microcosm of the general conflict that occurred at the Council.

The Marian Movement’s Requests in the Ante-Preparatory Surveys

The ante-preparatory commission was appointed May 17, 1959 and met for the first time nine days later.311 To help determine the direction of the Council, the commission wrote letters to “the bishops, heads of religious orders, and Catholic university facilities” asking for suggestions about what the Council should discuss.312 A total of 81 bishops indicated that they opposed either dogmatic definitions in general, or Marian dogmatic definitions in particular.313 In contrast, there
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were 310 requests “for the dogmatic definition of Mary’s mediation,” and 101 bishops who desired the Council to discuss the Coredemption in some way. These numbers do not constitute a majority, showing that these Marian topics were not major areas of concern.

The MSA was among those who submitted a memorandum to the Council requesting for Coredemption to be defined, making them “the first theological society to submit a… [petition for the definition of Coredemption] to the Holy See.” As the secretary of the MSA at this time, Carol clearly had a role in this petition. His role was likely more than simply approving it, since it highlights several themes that were important in his own work, including Mary’s immediate, yet secondary and subordinate, cooperation in the Redemption and her role of meriting and satisfying with Christ. Although Carol was never directly involved in Vatican II, his role in this petition demonstrates that he desired Coredemption to be discussed and perhaps even defined at the Council.

The Preparatory Theological Commission and the First Marian Schema

On June 5, 1960, Pentecost Sunday, Pope John XXIII established the preparatory theological commission, which intended to have “four schemata: on the sources of revelation, the depositum fidei, the Church, and morality.” Originally, the commission planned to discuss
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Marian doctrine in the *schema* on the *depositum fidei*; however, during the first meeting on October 1960, they determined to include it in the *schema* on the Church instead.\(^{321}\) The task of writing the Marian *schema* was given to Bālić, who was assisted by other members of the Pontifical Marian Academy.\(^{322}\) This sub-commission was given two instructions; “the text should not be a scientific treatise and matters still in dispute or not ‘mature’ should be omitted.”\(^{323}\)

In this first stage, Bālić and his associates produced a *schema* entitled “Mary, Mother of Jesus and Mother of the Church,” the title of which would change many times.\(^{324}\) After five drafts, in September 1961, the *schema* was discussed by the sub-commission.\(^{325}\) Congar expressed his general dislike for this *schema*. He was especially concerned that some statements “insinuated, or it is possible to insinuate, the worst theses concerning objective coredemption.”\(^{326}\) He appreciated, however, that it contained “several very strong statements” on the uniqueness of Christ’s roles as Mediator and Redeemer and thought that it said the minimum possible about Mary’s prerogatives concretely, especially in light of the various petitions for Marian definitions.\(^{327}\) Despite this, Congar still felt that it was too Christotypical. This early stage foreshadows the struggles that would occur between the bishops during the Council.

In March 1962, the preparatory theological commission considered this *schema*. Their discussion resulted in two important developments. First, it was determined that the Marian *schema* should be separated from the *schema* on the Church. Second, it was stated that Mary’s

\(^{321}\) O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29; Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 45.

\(^{322}\) O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29; Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 45; Dodd, *The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Grace*, 273.

\(^{323}\) O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29.

\(^{324}\) The ongoing debate over the title of the *schema* demonstrates the tension between the two schools, who debated in particular the use of the title “Mother of the Church.” See, O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29.

\(^{325}\) O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29; Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 45-46.
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mediation needed to be clarified.\textsuperscript{328} The \textit{schema} was revised in light of these concerns and sent to the preparatory theological commission in June.\textsuperscript{329} This schema did include the word \textit{Mediatrix}, but not \textit{Coredemptrix}. According to Congar, “Balić told us [the preparatory theological commission] that Pius XII had deleted the word \textit{Coredemptrix} in all the documents bearing this title and had replaced it by ‘\textit{Socia Christi Redemptoris}.’”\textsuperscript{330} The avoidance of this term in the \textit{schema} was perhaps an attempt to keep it in accordance with the recent magisterium.

\textbf{Coredemption and Joint Predestination in the Marian \textit{Schema}}

As this schema was eventually given to the Council Fathers, we will briefly consider how it discussed Mary’s relation to Christ and the Coredemption. This \textit{schema} “was over 1700 words, roughly half the length of the text that would be finally approved as chapter 8 of \textit{Lumen Gentium}.”\textsuperscript{331} It was composed of six sections:

1) Her [Mary’s] close necessary connection (\textit{de necessitudine}) with Christ in accord with God’s gracious purpose (\textit{beneplacitum}); 2) her role in the economy of our salvation; 3) the titles that customarily express her intimate association with Christ in the economy of our salvation; 4) her singular privileges as the Mother of God and of men; 5) devotion to her; and 6) her place as patroness or protectress (\textit{Fautrix}) of Christian unity.\textsuperscript{332}

From the outline of the \textit{schema} itself, we see several themes. The \textit{schema} is Christotypical and ‘privileged centered;’ it focuses on describing Mary’s unique graces due to her unique association with Christ.\textsuperscript{333} The strong influence of Balić in the composition of this \textit{schema} is clear. Another point that is specifically important for our study is that the ordering of the sections corresponds with the Franciscan thesis, which is seen in the overall flow of the \textit{schema} from the joint

\textsuperscript{328} Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 46; O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29; Escudero Cabello, \textit{La Cuestión de la Mediación Mariana}, 236-37; Dodd \textit{The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces}, 273-74.

\textsuperscript{329} Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 46; O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 29; Escudero Cabello, \textit{La Cuestión de la Mediación Mariana}, 236-37.
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\textsuperscript{333} Ibid., 48.
predestination of Jesus and Mary to her role in the economy of salvation.\textsuperscript{334} We will see that this concept is still present in the final Marian chapter, albeit less explicitly.

Since we are concerned with the presentation of the joint predestination of Jesus and Mary and Coredeption in this \textit{schema}, we will only discuss its first three sections. Near the beginning of the first section, it is stated that God, “in one and the same eternal decree preordained, together with the Incarnation of the Divine Wisdom, the most blessed Virgin.”\textsuperscript{335} The section ends by considering Mary in relation to the Church, saying that she “not only is a ‘supereminent’ and completely singular member of the Church, but is also called exemplar and mother of the same Church.”\textsuperscript{336} In this section, we see the theme that Mary was predestined with Christ, but not, however, the more specifically Franciscan idea that this predestination was logically prior to the Fall. Furthermore, the relationship between Mary and the Church is explained in terms of her role as its Mother, rather than her role as a member of it.

The second section of the \textit{schema} begins by considering the theme of recirculation, stating that “just as death came from a woman so also life might arise for us through a woman and thus the liberation would be had by the work of each sex.”\textsuperscript{337} In the work of Redemption Mary was associated “with him [Christ] and under him.”\textsuperscript{338} Without using the terms, it describes an immediate cooperation in the objective Redemption by stating that on Calvary, Mary “suffered

\textsuperscript{334} Such an understanding of mediation as flowing from Mary’s predestination it should be noted, is not unique to the Franciscans, but is shared with the Thomistic school of thought. For a Thomistic example of the concept of mediation see, Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, \textit{Christ the Savior: A Study of the Third Part of the Summa Theologica} (Veritatis Splendor Publications: 2012), 597-611. How these two schools differed in particular will be discussed in our third chapter. What is important for our current discussion is to note that the \textit{schema} follows the general ordering of the Franciscan thesis, as opposed to an ecclesiotypical approach.


\textsuperscript{336} Ibid., 199, 201.

\textsuperscript{337} Ibid., 201.

\textsuperscript{338} Ibid.
greatly with her only-begotten; with Him and through Him she offered Him magnanimously as the price of our redemption; and finally she was given as mother to men by Christ.”

Overall, this second section upholds the concept of immediate Coredemption without using scholastic language. It does not involve itself with contemporary debates, such as Mary’s priesthood, the sacrifice of her maternal rights, or her mode of meriting (de congruo or de condigno). Near the end of this section, certain Marian titles are considered. She is called “the generous associate [generosa socia] of the suffering Christ,” and due to this role, is considered the “administratrix and dispensatrix of heavenly graces.” She is not, however, called the Coredemptrix. Thus, this section is compatible with the thought of the Franciscan school; however, it does not disprove the Thomistic school regarding whether the Fall or the Incarnation was foreseen first in the mind of God.

The third section focuses on Marian titles describing Mary’s work in the economy of salvation. The schema makes the strong statement that “it is criminal (nefas) to say that these same titles, in the sense understood by the Church, are… opposed to Sacred Scripture.” Compared to all other mediators, Mary had a uniquely important role in the work of “reconciling God to man,” although she is “dependent on” and “subordinate to” Christ in all things.

Significantly, it provides a more precise statement defining Mediatrix, saying that Mary “is called the Mediatrix of all graces because she was associated with Christ in acquiring them… [and because] she intercedes for all through Christ.” Thus, Mary’s mediation is seen as a broader category that includes her Coredemption and her intercession in heaven. Importantly, the text goes on to explain how Mary’s role does not take away from Christ’s role as the One
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Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5), specifying in particular that the concept of analogy must be observed “whenever some word or office is predicated simultaneously of Christ and the Virgin Mary: for in no way is the Mother of God to be equated with Christ.” Thus, this chapter, while taking a strong Christotypical stance regarding Marian titles, also speaks strongly about the difference between Mary and Christ. Its use of the concept of analogy to make its arguments that these titles do not detract from Christ seems stronger than Carol’s arguments in this area.

Our examination of these sections of the schema has shown us that not only is it strongly rooted in the Christotypical school of Mariology, but also that its general argument corresponds to the Franciscan understanding of Mariology. Its use of the concept of analogy is important because this concept will appear in Carol’s post-Conciliar writings, although he never discussed it before the Council. Although the schema attempts to avoid matters disputed among the Christotypicalists and neo-scholastic language, overall it favors the Christotypicalists. Despite Balić’s statement at the Lourdes Congress that it was necessary for the ecclesiotypical and Christotypical schools to work together and achieve “a common synthesis” he was not successful in achieving such a synthesis in this schema.

The Conciliar Debates over the Marian Schema

The Council began on the feast of the Divine Maternity, October 11, 1962; however, the Marian schema was not considered until the second session. In January 1963, the Council Fathers began to consider the schema. Council periti, including Rahner, Semmelroth, and Ratzinger, expressed similar concerns to those of Congar during the drafting stage. They were especially concerned that the schema would harm ecumenism. Bishops from Germany and
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Scandinavia, influenced in part by Rahner, requested for the Marian *schema* to be included in the *schema* on the Church.\textsuperscript{349} Ecumenical concerns led some bishops to believe not only that the two *schemata* should be integrated, but that the Marian *schema* should be an “appendix to the schema on the Church.”\textsuperscript{350} In addition to ecumenical concerns and concerns over Mary’s mediation, bishops from Latin America and France pointed out that Marian devotion was often taken too far and thus favored combining the *schemata* to show that Marian devotion was connected to other parts of Catholic doctrine.\textsuperscript{351} Opposed to these desires for the integration of the *schemata* were the Eastern-rite Council Fathers, who believed that a separate *schema* would help ecumenism with the Orthodox.\textsuperscript{352} The Spanish bishops desired a separate *schema* on Mary due to her unique role “in the economy of redemption.”\textsuperscript{353}

Clearly, there were a variety of positions regarding the *schema* in general and the topics it discussed. The conflict over the *schema* led the Conciliar commission and the Moderators to announce that on October 29, following a period of debate, there would be a vote regarding whether the Marian *schema* should be included in the *schema* on the Church.\textsuperscript{354} The major Council debate occurred on October 24, between Cardinal Santos of Manila, Philippines, and Cardinal Koenig of Vienna, Austria. Cardinal Santos, whose speech was composed by Fr. Balić, spoke in favor of having two separate *schemata*. Cardinal Koenig, whose speech was composed by Rahner, spoke in favor of including the Marian *schema* in the *schema* on the Church.\textsuperscript{355} We will only consider a few key points of these speeches.

\textsuperscript{349} Ibid., 92-93.
\textsuperscript{351} Wiltegen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, 93.
\textsuperscript{353} Wiltegen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, 93.
\textsuperscript{354} Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 50; Thompson, “Vatican II and Beyond,” 410-11.
\textsuperscript{355} O’Carroll, “Vatican II and Our Lady’s Mediation,” 34; Thompson, “Vatican II and Beyond,” 410-11.
Cardinal Santos emphasized that Mariology is closely connected to Christology and soteriology; therefore, it should not be included in the schema on the Church, as if it was only connected to ecclesiology. Furthermore, Mary, the Mother of the Church, is “the first and preeminent member of the Church and so in a certain sense “above the Church.” In addition, a separate schema “would help avoid getting Vatican II involved in the controversy among Catholic theologians regarding the preference for a Christotypical or ecclesiotypical mariology.”

Cardinal Koenig argued that “the Church is the central theme of the second session of the Council as well as of Vatican II as a whole. It was therefore fitting that Mary, because of her intimate relationship with the Church, be a part of that central theme.” Mary is not only the preeminent member of the Church, but also its archetype. Combining the schemata would not favor ecclesiotypical Mariology; the Christotypical position would be seen through Mary’s presentation as “the most sublime cooperatrix with Christ through his grace of both the accomplishment and the application of the fruits of redemption.” Since Vatican II was a pastoral Council, it should avoid giving the impression that a new dogma was being defined, which could occur if there was a unique Marian schema.

These speeches serve as a good summation of the Christotypical and ecclesiotypical positions. Both sought to demonstrate how Mariology was united to other aspects of theology and neither denied Mary’s cooperation with Christ in the Redemption. The clash between the two positions.
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schools was as a conflict over the starting point taken to arrive at these conclusions and what should be emphasized; Mary’s privileges or her role as a type of the Church.

On October 29, after much discussion, the Council Fathers voted to include the Marian schema in the schema on the Church. The decision to combine the schemata was exceedingly close; 1114 in favor and 1074 against. This was a victory of less than two percent, whereas most other Council votes had a majority of over 90 percent. The bishops were stunned that the vote was so close. Ratzinger stated that the decision was not an attempt to minimize the importance role of Mary in the life of the faithful, nor was the close vote an indication of doctrinal divisions in the Council. Rather, the decision was one of pastoral prudence; it was necessary to show that two “charismatic currents” of the time, the devotional Marian movement and the liturgical movement, were “complementary,” not “contrary.” Thus, according to Ratzinger, it is more appropriate to understand the inclusion of the Marian schema into Lumen Gentium as a reintegration of these branches of theology into a common exposition of the Catholic faith than to see it as the victory of the ecclesiotypicalists over the Christotypicalists.
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363 Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 60; Albergio, ed., The Mature Council, 98. In the five days between the speeches and the final vote, there was serious discussion among bishops, petiri, and theological experts. The American bishops invited four members of the MSA to give a presentation on Mariology and advise them regarding the combining of the schemata. Fr. T. William Coyle, one of these Mariologists, states that most likely, “This was…the first time a national hierarchy had invited its theologians as a group to give input or background on a Council document.” The theologians decided they would “urge the rejection of the current schema and favor its incorporation into the document on the Church, because some of the shortcomings of the marian schema could be more easily modified if it were going to be entirely reworked… rather than if the Marinan text were just to undergo a piecemeal amending.” The presentation resulted in over 20 American bishops switching their position and deciding to vote for the inclusion of the schema. Coyle considers this presentation to have been significant in leading to the final decision to combine the schemata. Considering the closeness of the vote, his conclusion seems valid. The role of these MSA members is intriguing, especially considering the MSA’s petition during the ante-preparatory phase for a definition of the Coredemption. See T. William Coyle, “Appendix VII: American Influence on the Conciliar Decision Regarding BVM Schema,” Marian Studies 37 (1986): 266-69. It should be noted that this appendix provides, “notes from remarks offered by Rev. T. William Coyle at the first discussion during [the] 1986 Convention,” and thus may not be his exact words, although it is his first person account of what occurred.
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The Preparation of Chapter VIII of *Lumen Gentium*

The task of writing this new Marian *schema* fell to Koenig, Santos and two other Bishops, with Balić and Philips as the *periti.* Balić and Philips had collaborated before and represented the two different approaches to Mariology. The main goals that they had to fulfill in drafting the new *schema* were; taking the concerns of biblical and ecumenical movements into account, revising the tone of the *schema* to be more Patristic, and presenting Marian doctrine in light of Mary’s relation to the Church. The text went through five drafts until the committee could agree on a *schema* to propose to the Council. This draft was sent to the Doctrinal Commission and approved on June 6, 1964.

The Council debates over the new Marian text began during the third session of the Council, on September 16, 1964. There were 33 speeches about this chapter before it was finally approved. The two most discussed aspects of the text were “Mary’s mediation and her motherhood of the Church.” Some Council Fathers desired that *Mediatrix* be eliminated from the chapter, some held that its inclusion would be acceptable if it was listed with other titles, and others desired that no change be made to the text’s discussion of mediation. The constant debating between the two schools led to the speech of Cardinal Frings, “who, at the request of Fr. Balić, appealed to both sides to sacrifice some of their ideas… for the sake of a consensus on the
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best possible text.\textsuperscript{375} Finally, on October 29, 1964, the Fathers voted on the chapter. The vote was almost unanimous; 1159 voted “yes,” 531 voted “yes with further emendations,” and only 10 voted “no.”\textsuperscript{376} After 26 changes, the chapter was finally approved on November 18, by 2096 of the Council Fathers. Only 23 voted against the text.\textsuperscript{377} Balić and Phillips had succeeded in composing a text that united Council in regards to Mariology.

**Introduction to Chapter VIII of Lumen Gentium**

Much has been written analyzing the final Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium*. Our focus will be on its portrayal of Coredemption and the joint predestination of Jesus and Mary.\textsuperscript{378} First, however, we will briefly consider the chapter as a whole to provide the context for our discussion.

The chapter comes at the conclusion of *Lumen Gentium*. Although some thought that this would seem to indicate that the Council desired to deemphasize Mary, Oscar Cullmann, a Protestant observer and guest of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity stated that “‘in reality [this has] made it even stronger, because everything stated about the Church culminates, so to speak, in this chapter.’”\textsuperscript{379} The chapter seeks synthesize the two schools of Mariology.\textsuperscript{380} The chapter’s section on the Marian cult states that both maximalist and minimalist attitudes need to be avoided.\textsuperscript{381} The document itself seeks to do exactly this.

The chapter is composed of five sections: “Introduction,” “The Role of the Blessed Mother in the Economy of Salvation,” “On the Blessed Virgin and the Church,” “The Cult of the

\textsuperscript{375} Jelly, “Introduction to Chapter 8,” 67.
\textsuperscript{376} Ibid., 68.
\textsuperscript{377} Ibid., 69. The 26 changes were based on 95 proposed amendments.
\textsuperscript{378} Fehlner, presentation of the Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus, by Ruggero Rosini, xvi-xvii. The correspondence between *Lumen Gentium* and the Franciscans thesis is not merely the opinion of Fehlner, the original author, Fr. Rosini, “organized his exposition with great ease and facility along lines suggested by Vatican II, the thought of Scotus clearly appears to reflect, or, better, to anticipate the overall outline of chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium*. ”
\textsuperscript{379} Wiltgen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, 158. Cullmann was not pleased about this, he was a true minimalist, who desired a decreased emphasis on Mary in Catholic theology.
\textsuperscript{380} Mactal, “Mariological Development after the Second Vatican Council,” 271.
Blessed Virgin in the Church,” and “Mary the sign of created hope and solace to the wandering people of God.” As emphasized by many Mariologists, the chapter states that its intention is not “to give a complete doctrine on Mary, nor does it wish to decide those questions which the work of theologians has not yet fully clarified.”382 Although the chapter is written with ecumenism in mind, it does not make an explicit appeal to non-Catholics or their veneration of Mary until the concluding section.383 For our consideration, the most important sections are the first three, which discuss, with increasing clarity, Mary’s role in the economy of salvation.

Some theologians present the lack of words such as Coredemptrix in the chapter as indicating that the Council rejected the concept of Coredemption and have described the inclusion of Mediatrix in a list of other Marian titles as a way to “relativize” it; making it one pious title among others, rather than a doctrine.384 Others have argued that the “highpoint” of chapter eight is its teaching “on the cooperation of Mary in redemption, which belongs to her participation in the mediation of Christ.”385 Our analysis will show that the latter position is the more accurate of these two stances; even if it is not necessarily the “highpoint,” Mary’s role in the Redemption is clearly present in the chapter. Furthermore, the general outline of Franciscan thesis is present, although less explicitly than in the original schema.

**Joint Predestination and Coredemption in Chapter VIII of Lumen Gentium**

Although it is no longer as explicitly tied to the Franciscan thesis, the presentation of the Church’s Marian doctrine in Lumen Gentium still demonstrates the influence of Fr. Balić through its use of many of key themes of the Franciscan thesis. The second paragraph of the introduction
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states that Mary is “united to Him [Christ] by a close and indissoluble tie.”\footnote{Second Vatican Council, \textit{Lumen Gentium} [Dogmatic Constitution on the Church], §53.} For Franciscans, this is the basis of the argument that Mary is \textit{Coredemptrix} due to her association with Christ. This idea becomes more explicit in the second section, entitled “The Role of the Blessed Mother in the Economy of Salvation.” This section draws strongly on the concept of Mary as the New Eve, and therefore the associate of Christ.\footnote{Dodd, \textit{The Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces}, 373-74.} According to Balić, the principle of recirculation-association (\textit{principium consortii}) is the theme not only of this section, but of the entire chapter.\footnote{Balić, \textit{Mary and Ecumenism}, 21.}

The second section opens by tracing the Scriptural texts that describe Mary, beginning with the Old Testament, stating that she is “prophetically foreshadowed” in the Protoevangelium.\footnote{Second Vatican Council, \textit{Lumen Gentium} [Dogmatic Constitution on the Church], §55.} The next paragraph has been described as “one of the chapter’s strongest statements on Mary’s cooperation in the Redemption.”\footnote{James T. O’Connor, “\textit{Lumen Gentium}, NOS. 55 to 59,” \textit{Marian Studies} 37 (1986): 84. O’Connor, referring to the numbering of a previous draft of the chapter discussed by the Council, calls this section paragraph 55, although in the final version, the text to which he refers belongs to paragraph 56.} In it, the theme of recirculation is given in language reminiscent of the Church Fathers. The first sentence describes God as predestining Mary’s consent at the Annunciation to precede the Incarnation, “so that just as a woman contributed to death, so also a woman should contribute to life.”\footnote{Ibid.} The section then describes how Mary “became the mother of Jesus, the one and only Mediator….she devoted herself…to the person and work of her Son, under Him and with Him, by the grace of almighty God, serving in the mystery of redemption.”\footnote{Ibid.} Thus, she is not a “passive” instrument, but is “freely cooperating in the work of human salvation.”\footnote{Ibid.} We should not be surprised that the text then cites St.
Irenaeus. In describing her as dedicating herself to serving her Son, the chapter implies that Mary actively cooperated with Him throughout His life.

It is not until two paragraphs later that Mary’s union with Christ on Calvary is made explicit. By examining 14 presentations of Mary in the New Testament, the theme of the section becomes Mary’s singular, active and constant cooperation with Christ. The greatest expression of this is at Calvary, in which Mary is specifically stated to have united herself to Christ’s sacrifice. It explains that Mary “faithfully preserved in her union with her Son unto the cross, where she stood, in keeping with the divine plan…uniting herself with a maternal heart with His sacrifice, and lovingly consenting to the immolation of this Victim which she herself had brought forth.”

In moving from the theme of Mary as the New Eve to her union with Christ on Calvary, Lumen Gentium roots its discussion of Coredemption in Mary’s association with Christ as the New Eve. Therefore, we can see why Coredemption was acknowledged as being present in the text by Catholics and Protestants across the theological spectrum. By rooting its portrayal of the Coredemption in Scripture and Patristic texts, the manner in which Mary’s cooperation is described has potential for ecumenical dialogue, in comparison to the neo-scholastic manner in which the Coredemption was often discussed before the Council.

Mary and the Church in Chapter VIII of Lumen Gentium

Although it is not the main focus of our investigation, we will briefly the section of the Marian Chapter that discusses Mary’s relationship to the Church to see how the insights of the
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ecclesiotypical school were expressed at the Council. This section, entitled “On the Blessed Virgin and the Church,” has been described as having a “triple synthesis – mother, member, type-exemplar,” in which the first and last are explicitly used to organize the section, while “member” is assumed.\textsuperscript{402} It covers the main points of the ecclesiotypical school, that Mary is a type of the Church and that she is a model for the faithful. The Mariology of this section can be summarized as teaching that “the Church looks to Mary as model of a motherhood which they both share. Furthermore, everyone in the Church is to find in Mary an example of that disposition of soul that should animate the apostle.”\textsuperscript{403} The balance between the previous section and this section of \textit{Lumen Gentium}, rather than the Christotypical focus of the original \textit{schema}, demonstrates that “the ecclesiotypical is mutually complementary with the Christocentric emphasis…. just as Christ cannot be understood and revered apart from the ecclesial Body or Church that he received through his redemptive activity, so neither can the Madonna be properly contemplated and venerated as though she were not in solidarity with that same Body.”\textsuperscript{404}

It is actually in this section of the chapter that the title \textit{Mediatrix} is used. The title is given less emphasis than some Christotypicalists had originally hoped. It is listed with other titles and is not defined or described. However, its placement in this section, rather than in the following section on the Marian cult, indicates that the title is not relegated to a devotional status. Furthermore, the context surrounding this title provides it with a doctrinal justification. We will briefly outline this section of the chapter to understand the justification it provides for this title.

The first paragraph of the section emphasizes that Christ is the One Mediator.\textsuperscript{405} The section then elaborates on Mary’s role, saying, “Predestined from eternity by that decree of divine providence which determined the incarnation of the Word to be the Mother of God…” [Mary is]
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above all others and in a singular way the generous associate and humble handmaid of the Lord. It describes Mary’s role in raising Christ and how she “was united with Him by compassion as He died on the Cross.” Next, it states that her maternity leads her to continue to intercede for the Church until they are brought to heaven and that, “Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked by the Church under the titles of Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjuratrix, and Mediatrix.”

Overall, the major components of the Franciscan thesis; Mary’s predestination, her association with Christ, and her union with Him by her compassion on Calvary, are strongly present even in this section on Mary’s relation to the Church.

These Marian titles are not merely devotional; they are theologically justified by Mary’s maternal role, which indicates that the grounding of this presentation of Mary’s relation to the Church is her divine maternity. Not only the titles, but the entire structure of chapter eight roots all of Mary’s roles in the divine maternity; her role in “the Church flows from her relationship to and association with her Son, the Church’s Head. Her role as Mother of the Christ is what fundamentally gives her a maternal role in relation to the members of His Body.”

Although it is sometimes depicted as if chapter eight’s two doctrinal sections are divided, with Christotypical concepts in first section and ecclesiotypical themes second section, in reality, major Christotypical themes shape both of them.

Overall, we have seen that the major elements of the Franciscan thesis are present in Lumen Gentium implicitly and its more specific elements, although not discussed, are not contradicted. Therefore, we can conclude that the Franciscan thesis and its manner of explaining Mary’s role in the Redemption correspond with the teaching of Council. Lumen Gentium
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presents Christ’s predestination to become Incarnate and Mary’s predestination to the divine maternity as the sources from which His Redemption and her Coredemption logically flow. This is significant because the final stage of Carol’s work will focus on defending the Franciscan thesis, which could be understood as an implicit means of demonstrating that the Coredemption can be defended in a manner that corresponds to the Council’s presentation of Mariology.

**Post-Conciliar Trends in Mariology**

Based on our analysis, it would be incorrect to say that *Lumen Gentium* overturned the Christotypical method or required a minimalistic approach to Mariology. Although some of those who desired a definition of Mary as *Coredemptrix* or *Mediatrix* may have expressed disappointment, many Mariologists viewed the chapter positively and considered it a successful presentation of the Church’s Marian doctrine in keeping with the pastoral, biblical, and ecumenical concerns of the Council.\(^{412}\) In addition, the inclusion of the Marian *schema* into *Lumen Gentium* was in keeping with the earliest plans of the Preparatory Commission, meaning that this decision was not a radical break with the original intent of the Council.

Many theologians saw the inclusion of the Marian *schema* into *Lumen Gentium* as “providential.”\(^{413}\) As early as 1966, Balić describes Chapter VIII quite positively, saying that it “contains a magnificent synthesis of Catholic doctrine on the Virgin Mary.”\(^{414}\) He points out that Vatican II was the first time a Council ever presented an extended discussion on the role of Mary and attributes the chapter to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.\(^{415}\) The Protestant observer Cullmann, who admitted that he desired “a weakening of emphasis” of the Catholic teaching about Mary, stated “that Mariology at this Council has in general been intensified.”\(^{416}\) It was
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mainly true minimalists, not the Christotypicalists, who were disappointed with the chapter. Overall, *Lumen Gentium* was considered an excellent synthesis of pre-Conciliar Mariological developments.

In spite of this praise from Mariologists, after Vatican II, what has sometimes been called a “‘Marian silence’ descended over the Church.” Marian devotions decreased and there was a major decline in scholarly Mariology, especially in areas related to Carol’s work. This dramatic reduction was due in part to the misrepresentation of the inclusion of the Marian *schema* into the *schema* on the Church by the media, who presented it as decreasing Mary’s importance in the Church, and in part because “the new, ecclesiocentric Mariology was foreign…precisely to those Council Fathers who had been the principle upholders of Marian piety.” In addition, the number of Marian feasts was reduced in the new liturgical calendar, leading some to believe the Church desired Marian piety to decrease.

Fundamentally, there was also a natural component to the decline. As one Mariologist stated, “Reaching a climax in… the last years of Pius XII’s pontificate – and no climax is intended to be sustained – the movement found several of its goals for the moment successfully reached, and it yielded to other preoccupations within the Catholic church.” While the Council may have been the trigger, at some point, the Marian movement had to decline. The same Mariologist stated, “Authentic Mariology runs no risk of fading away….A crisis can be
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beneficial, like a thunderstorm that clears the atmosphere and enables us to breathe a purer air."423 Through the elimination of excesses, the crisis allowed Mariology to refocus on its core teachings.

Following the trends of Christotypical Mariology in general, little attention was paid to the theme of Coredemption after the Council. The concept of Coredemption did not gain major attention again until the early 1990’s, when *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatricis* began seeking a dogmatic definition of Mary as *Mediatrix, Coredemptrix*, and Advocate.424 The 12th International Mariological Congress, held in 1996, studied, at the request of the Holy See, “the possibility and the opportunity of a definition” of these titles and concluded that they were “ambiguous.”425 As these developments occurred after Carol’s death, they do not provide us with the context for Carol’s post-Conciliar work; therefore, we will not analyze them further.

In this chapter, we have seen how the general theological shifts before the Council, in particular the increased emphasis on ecumenism and the Patristic, Scriptural, and liturgical renewal, came to impact the Marian movement. We have seen how the two major methods of Mariology, the ecclesiotypical school and the Christotypical school, influenced the development of what became the eighth chapter of *Lumen Gentuim*, which contained several major elements of the Franciscan thesis in its portrayal of Mary’s role in the economy of salvation. Finally, we have considered the unintended decline of Mariology. Our third and final chapter will consider Carol’s
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work after the Council and how it is related to *Lumen Gentium*, the theological shifts that occurred after the Council, and his own re-evaluation of his pre-Conciliar work.
Carol’s Engagement with Post-Conciliar Theological Currents

In this, our final chapter, we will consider the work Carol conducted after the Council. As mentioned previously, during the Council, Carol published no scholarly works. From 1959-1975, Carol’s publications were limited to popular level articles for Catholic periodicals, encyclopedia entries, and reports on the MSA annual conventions. In 1976, he began publishing scholarly works again. We will see a major transition in Carol’s work during this period of his theology. Rather than focusing on Mary’s mediation and Coredemption, which he championed before the Council, Carol shifts his focus, publishing on the topics of the debitum peccati and eventually the predestination of Christ. In this chapter, we will consider how Carol’s discussion of these topics modifies their traditional presentation in the Franciscan thesis and how his concerns are shaped by his post-Conciliar historical context.

Carol’s Final Discussion of Marian Coredemption

In 1975, Carol engaged in a debate regarding the proper understanding of Coredemption in light of Lumen Gentium in Ephemerides Mariologicae with Joaquín María Alonso, a Spanish theologian and the editor of the journal. This debate demonstrates Carol’s understanding of how Lumen Gentium should influence this area of Mariology. Furthermore, Alonso not only bases his
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argument on *Lumen Gentium*, but also roots his interpretation of Marian Core redemption in a Thomistic understanding of the economy of salvation. Since Carol’s later work on the primacy of Christ proposes an alternative scheme to this concept of the economy of salvation, this debate provides a key example linking his pre-Conciliar work to his final work on the primacy of Christ, which we will consider at the end of this chapter.

Before we consider Carol’s arguments in this debate, we will summarize Alonso’s position, to which Carol was responding. Alonso’s work is based on one twentieth century Thomistic synthesis of Aquinas’ theology of creation and the economy of salvation, which distinguishes between the natural and supernatural orders in the economy of salvation. The natural order, the order of creation, is an *exitus* from God, as it was created by Him from nothing. The supernatural order is the *reditus*, how creation is returned to God through Christ after the Fall.427 Through assuming a human nature Christ became our Mediator428 and through His mediation, we are elevated from the natural order to the supernatural order.429

From this foundation, Alonso begins his Marian discussion. Quoting Aquinas, he argues that only Christ has grace in the “highest possible excellence and in its greatest possible extension to all effects.”430 This is because Christ alone has the unique grace of the hypostatic union and it is this grace that makes Him the Redeemer and Mediator.431 Others can, of course, serve as mediators in a less strict sense if “they cooperate in uniting men to God dispositively or ministerially.”432 Alonso argues that *Lumen Gentium* presents its as doctrine that Mary does not have an ontological mediation.433 Mary’s mediation occurs in the same modes as that of the rest of the faithful, meaning that she can be a “moral” mediator, an “intercessor,” and as an
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“exemplar.” Although at the Annunciation Mary truly consented to being the Mother of God, this only makes her a cause of Christ’s mediation, not the mediator herself. The One Mediator, Christ is the cause of our Redemption.

Having briefly summarized Alonso’s argument, we are prepared to look at Carol’s response, which, in many ways is simply a re-articulation of his pre-Conciliar positions on Mary’s mediation. Carol argues that Mary is ontological mediator because the divine maternity, when properly considered, places Mary “in a category all her own, in an order which transcends the orders of nature and of grace, and brings her close to the hypostatic order.” Therefore, she is a member of the hypostatic order. There is no reason to avoid acknowledging that she is a midpoint (ratio mediī), which based on Carol’s pre-Conciliar discussion, makes her a mediator.

Carol addresses the important Scriptural text on Christ as the One Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5), arguing that Paul’s words are best understood as meaning that “Christ is the only Redeemer in His sphere, that is to say, in the order of primary, self-sufficient causality. He alone merited and satisfied for us de condigno ex toto rigore justitiae. This does not exclude, a priori, the completely subordinate role of Mary [emphasis original].” That Mary’s mediation is dependent on and subordinate to Christ’s mediation is not a new argument for Carol; however, it is framed in a new way. Compared to his pre-Conciliar discussions, this statement is more Christocentric; it emphasizes Christ’s unique “sphere,” His unique mediation established by the hypostatic union.

From this foundation, Carol considers Alonso’s position on the Mariology of Lumen Gentium. Carol explains that the Council explicitly stated that it was not giving a complete Marian doctrine or deciding on debated theological issues and allowed theologians to continue to
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discuss such issues.\textsuperscript{440} Regarding Marian Coredemption, Carol states, the Council “neither endorsed nor rejected this doctrine. It is well known that the theologians who drafted the text of \textit{Lumen Gentium} purposely left the question as it was before.”\textsuperscript{441} This statement implies that Carol did not think that \textit{Lumen Gentium} had any major implications for his area of research. Although we saw in the previous chapter that \textit{Lumen Gentium} did discuss Mary’s mediation and role in the Redemption, Carol does not use it to support his argument, instead he relies on the writings of Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII,\textsuperscript{442} as he did before the Council. This further supports the idea that Carol did not consider \textit{Lumen Gentium} to provide major insight into the concepts of Mary’s mediation and the Coredemption.

This debate continues in two more articles, in which each author responds to the other one more time. Alonso makes the distinction that although Mary is certainly an ontological midpoint in the Incarnation, this pertains only to the hypostatic order, not to the order of our Redemption.\textsuperscript{443} Therefore, even if one holds Carol’s position that Mary has been elevated to the hypostatic order, this does not give her an active role in the supernatural order in which Christ enacted our Redemption. In Carol’s final reply to Alonso, he admits that his argument lacks theological strength, relies instead on enthusiasm, and does not substantially address this new critique.\textsuperscript{444}

Overall, Carol relies on pre-Conciliar arguments rather than engaging with \textit{Lumen Gentium}. This contrasts with his pre-Conciliar use of contemporary magisterial sources. As discussed in chapter two, Ratzinger considered the inability of pre-Conciliar Mariologists to adapt to the ecclesiotypical approach of \textit{Lumen Gentium} to be part of the reason for the post-Conciliar decline in Mariology, which we can perhaps see in Carol’s argument. Carol’s consideration of
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Marian Coredemption after Vatican II exhibits no major theological developments. Furthermore, Alonso’s argument demonstrates a major problem in Carol’s pre-Conciliar work; Carol assumes that the orders of nature, grace, and the hypostasis are united and that what occurs in one has implications for the others. Alonso demonstrates that if one choses to hold that these orders are completely separate, Carol’s argument loses its significance. Mary could be in the hypostatic order and this still would not make her the *Mediatrix* in the supernatural order. Carol’s eventual work on the Franciscan thesis could be seen as an attempt to provide support for this necessary premise in his argument.

**Background to Carol’s Work on the *Debitum Peccati***

The rest of Carol’s post-Conciliar work considers four interrelated topics, Mary’s *debitum peccati*, her preservative redemption, the predestination of Jesus and Mary, and the primacy of Christ. As he did before the Council, Carol considers these issues by discussing their historical development. In doing so, he considers various positions held in these debates, although his bias towards the Franciscan position is clearly shown. We will consider Carol’s work on each of these issues. We do not have the space to fully discuss the historical development of each topic; therefore, our focus will be on aspects of his discussion that provide a better understanding of his position or how these topics are connected in the Franciscan thesis.

**The *Debitum Peccati* and Mary’s Preservative Redemption***

The first topic Carol considers is Mary’s *debitum peccati*, or debt to sin. Admittedly, this debate appears to involve useless neo-scholastic hairsplitting. By the time Carol began to devote his attention to it, this debate had fallen from favor. Fehlner explains that Carol’s *A History of the Controversy over the “Debitum Peccati”* was received as a “wasted effort, because the
question… was so obscure as to be intractable.”445 Carol, however, clearly thought this topic was significant. Fehlner states Carol considered the concepts of the debitum and Coredemption to be “intimately linked.”446 He summarizes the connection, saying, “the time spent pondering so abstruse a point as the debitum peccati is not time wasted. It is necessary to show the possibility (the potuit) and the fittingness (the decuit) of what otherwise is known to be a fact: the coredemption.”447 Our eventual goal will be to consider if Carol’s work in this area supports his pre-Conciliar discussion of the Coredemption.

In our first chapter, we briefly discussed Carol’s position on the debitum, as based on the Franciscan thesis. In general, his position can be summarized as saying that since Mary is united to Christ in all things, and since Christ was predestined to become Incarnate before the Fall, Mary was also predestined before the Fall. Thus, she had no debitum peccati; she was under no obligation, or “debt,” to contract Original Sin. Carol held that the presence or absence of a debitum in Mary “makes all the difference in the world from the perspective of Mary’s singular role in the over-all economy of salvation.”448 We will now consider how he supports this position.

Carol defines the debitum peccati, in its most general and basic sense, as “the universal necessity to contract original sin.”449 There are two reasons for this universal necessity. The first is being under the physical headship of Adam, meaning that one is “conceived according to the normal laws of propagation.”450 This type of necessity is called the debitum remotum because it
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is not the main cause of the propagation of Original Sin.\textsuperscript{451} The second is being under the moral headship of Adam, meaning that one is “included, by divine disposition, in the act of disobedience by which Adam lost the grace of God for all his descendants.”\textsuperscript{452} This type of necessity is called the \textit{debitum proximum} because it is the primary cause of the transmission of Original Sin, as God could have decreed that this would not occur.\textsuperscript{453}

There are three basic positions that a theologian can take regarding the presence or absence of Mary’s \textit{debitum}.\textsuperscript{454} The first position is that Mary had the \textit{debitum proximum}. This position maintains strongest connection between Mary and the \textit{debitum}. In summary, it states, “since Mary was conceived by way of seminal generation, and since she was included in the will of Adam as the moral representative of the race, she \textit{should} have contracted original sin, although, in fact, God suspended the application of the law in her case [emphasis original].”\textsuperscript{455} Thus, according to this position, Mary is under the physical and moral headship of Adam.

The second position regarding Mary’s debitum is that she has the \textit{debitum remotum}, meaning “that, owing to her normal generation, Mary should have been included in the sinful will of Adam, but God exempted her from this, and hence from actually contracting original sin.”\textsuperscript{456} Although under the physical headship of Adam, God prevented Mary from being included in the moral headship of Adam, thus preserving her from the consequences of the Fall. Theologians holding either of these two positions are called “debitists.”

The third position maintains that Mary had no \textit{debitum}, which means “God preserved Mary from every necessity (proximate or remote to contract original sin).”\textsuperscript{457} Such a position
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holds that Mary “was preserved (in view of the redemptive merits of Christ), not from a sin she 
should have contracted, but rather from a sin she could or might have contracted if God had so 
decided [emphasis original].”\(^{458}\) Mary is under neither the moral nor the physical headship of 
Adam; therefore, it was not necessary for her to have contracted Original Sin, as in the previous 
two positions. Instead, this was merely a possibility, since God could have placed her under 
Adam’s headship, although He did not. Theologians holding this position are called “anti-
debitists.”

Since he maintains the anti-debitist stance,\(^ {459}\) Carol attempts to respond to the major 
concerns of the debitists with three arguments. First, he considers the argument that Mary is truly 
related to Adam through physical generation; therefore, she should have a *debitum*.\(^ {460}\) Carol 
explains, “Seminal generation does not, of itself, create in the offspring a *necessity* to contract 
original sin, it merely gives rise to the *possibility* of contracting it [emphasis original].”\(^ {461}\) Carol 
states that although for many centuries intercourse was considered inherently sinful and that the 
sinfulness of this act was thought to transmit sin to the offspring, “it now seems to be generally 
admitted that the mere fact of seminal generation does not constitute a cause, but only a *conditio 
sine qua non* to incur original sin.”\(^ {462}\) The shift away from understanding intercourse as sinful 
negates the idea that being under Adam’s physical headship alone requires one to contract sin.

One reason many theologians held the debitist position was because they were concerned 
that without a *debitum*, Mary was not truly redeemed. Carol’s second argument responds to this 
concern by explaining that Mary’s lack of a *debitum* makes her “all the more indebted to the


\(^{459}\) In a footnote, Carol states that his position is that “what Our Blessed Lady should have at her conception is grace, 
not original sin... since God had predestined her to an ineffable dignity of divine motherhood, *He owed it to Himself* to 
grant her this unique privilege [emphasis original].” However, since Carol does not elaborate on this position we will not 
consider it in detail. See, Carol, *A History of the Controversy*, 6, footnote 10; Carol, “The Blessed Virgin and the 
‘Debitum Peccati,’” 185, footnote 11.


redemption. The efficacy of the Saviour’s redemptive grace was so overwhelming in her case, that it not only preserved her from the actual contraction of sin, but even placed her beyond any possible reach of the universal law of sin [emphasis original].” Carol’s anti-debitist’s position depends on the concept of Mary’s preservative redemption. Carol eventually writes an article on Mary’s preservative redemption, which can be understood as fortifying this aspect of his anti-debitist argument.

Carol’s final argument is that the debitist position is illogical. If Mary had a debitum, it would mean that God had predestined her to be under the law of sin and later annulled this decree in His intervention to insure her Immaculate Conception. Therefore, the position that Mary has a debitum violates the principle of God’s “immutability.” When Carol considers Marian predestination at the end of his theological career, he can be understood as supporting this position. Further, we will see that Carol’s concern about God’s immutability leads him to favor a modified position of the Franciscan thesis.

Carol’s work is a historical study; therefore, he does not directly elaborate on these three arguments. However, his discussion of the historical development of the debitum debate implicitly supports them by demonstrating how each of the concerns of the debitists developed. Our summary of his work will focus on the aspects of this study that support his arguments for the anti-debitist position.

The Church Fathers, Original Sin, and the Debitum Remotum

Carol’s first major point is that debitum debate is rooted in Patristic misconceptions about Original Sin and its inheritance, which in the West was especially influenced by Augustine. Carol summarizes Augustine’s understanding of Original Sin, saying that he viewed it as an
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infection in our nature, which is “actualized in us by the means of generation, which is tainted by concupiscence.”466 This “theory of the infectio carnis” was largely abandoned by the time of Carol’s study.467 Carol states that this theory is the root of the debitist position because in it, physical generation necessarily involves the contraction of Original Sin.468

Carol contrasts this theory with the idea of Anselm (d. 1109) that Original Sin is the “privation of original justice.”469 Without denying that Original Sin is a peccatum naturae and that all of humanity is related to Adam by generation, Anselm states that “guilt could not be transmitted by the semen.”470 Intercourse is it a necessary condition (conditio sine qua non), but this does not make it the cause of Original Sin.471 By Carol’s time, most theologians agreed with this understanding of the transmission of Original Sin.

The Middle Ages: The Debitum and the Immaculate Conception

The debitum debate did not begin in earnest until the feast of the Immaculate Conception began spreading throughout the Western Church.472 For some theologians, the concept of the Immaculate Conception and the debitum were intimately linked. Other theologians did not view them as connected. Considering the position of his followers, it is interesting that Scotus falls into the second category. Carol describes his position on the debitum as “ambivalent.”473 Scotus held that “In the first instant of her conception, Mary was sanctified, not from a sin that was then present, but from a sin which would have been present, if grace had not been infused into her soul.”474 This conditional formula can be interpreted as being either for or against the existence
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of a *debitum*. Scotus’ followers would develop the implications of his understanding of predestination for Mary’s *debitum*.

In contrast to Scotus’ ambivalence, at the Council of Basel (1431-1448), John de Torquemada argued against the Immaculate Conception precisely because one of its logical consequences would be that Mary could not have a *debitum*.\(^{475}\) He states that immaculists who held that Mary “should have contracted” the *debitum* held an “absurd” position; to have any association with sin is to be an enemy of God, and “no one should be God’s enemy [emphasis original].”\(^ {476}\) As Carol points out, Torquemada strongly connects the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as leading to the logical conclusion the Mary has no *debitum*, although he was actually against the Immaculate Conception.\(^ {477}\) Although Carol does not state it, this implies that since the Immaculate Conception had been dogmatically defined, the anti-debitist position is the most logical position to hold.

**The Eighteenth Century: The Preservative Redemption and the Debitum**

In the eighteenth century, Catholic theology in general entered an age of decline due to political upheaval;\(^ {478}\) however, Salvator Montalbanus de Sambuca, O.F.M.Cap. (d. 1722) made a major contribution to the *debitum* debate during this century. Montalbanus viewed Original Sin as meaning that since all people are in Adam by God’s decree, their wills would be included in his during the Fall.\(^ {479}\) Natural generation only transmits sin in that it allows for the conception of a person “who had already sinned with Adam before being conceived [emphasis original].”\(^ {480}\) Thus, if one was included in the original decree placing humanity in Adam’s will, there would be no possible way to be conceived without sin. As a result, if one is to be immaculately conceived,
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she must be excluded from this decree.\textsuperscript{481} This means that if Mary is immaculately conceived, she could not have been placed in Adam’s will and therefore cannot have a \textit{debitum}.

Using Scotus’ concept of the preservative redemption, Montalbanus explains that Mary is redeemed even without a \textit{debitum}. Mary’s redemption is preservative not because she is prevented from contracting sin, but because she was predestined before the Fall,\textsuperscript{482} making it \textit{“impossible for her to be included therein [emphasis original]”}.\textsuperscript{483} Montalbanus’ contribution is important for our consideration because it connects two Scotistic ideas, the preservative redemption and Mary’s predestination, to support the anti-debitist position.

\textit{Ineffabilis Deus and the Debitum Debate}

The major Mariological event of the nineteenth century was the definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854. Since the Immaculate Conception and the \textit{debitum} were linked throughout history, it makes sense that Carol would consider \textit{Ineffibilis Deus} in detail, although it does not explicitly discuss Mary’s \textit{debitum}. Carol argues that Pius IX implicitly supports the anti-debitist position in several statements. One such statement occurs in Pius IX’s discussion of the liturgy, in which he states, \textit{“it was customary… to use the selfsame expressions with which the divine Scriptures speak of uncreated Wisdom and apply them to the origins of the Virgin which had been pre-established in one and the same decree with the Incarnation of divine Wisdom [Carol’s emphasis]”}.\textsuperscript{484} As we saw when discussing Montalbanus, the theory of Mary’s predestination before the Fall supports the anti-debitist position. Even strong debitists stated that if one accepted the principle of the predestination of Mary with Christ, then it was a \textit{“logical necessity [to] exclude all debitum peccati from Our Lady”}.\textsuperscript{485}
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Carol next considers if Pius IX reached the logical conclusion that Mary had no *debitum* due to her predestination with Christ. First, Carol recalls the statement of Francisco Suárez S.J. (d. 1617), that “to have the guilt of sin” (*esse obnoxium peccato*) and “to have the *debitum*” (*habere debitum peccati*) are synonymous statements. Although Pius IX does not specifically refer to the *debitum*, he does state that Mary never had the mark of guilt (*nulli umquam naevo obnoxiam*) and was never cursed with guilt (*numquam maledicto obnoxia*). Based on Suárez’s position, it does not seem that one could be without the guilt of sin and yet somehow have the debitum. For Carol, this means that Pius IX implies that Mary has no *debitum*.

Carol also considers one of the main objections against the Franciscan position; the argument that the prologue of *Ineffibilis Deus* cannot be reconciled with the Franciscan understanding of the predestination of Christ and Mary before the Fall. The Bull states:

> The ineffable God…, having foreseen from all eternity the most lamentable ruin of the entire human race which would derive from Adam’s transgression, and having decreed, with a design hidden from the ages, to fulfill in an even more profound mystery the primitive work of His goodness through the Incarnation of the Word…, from the beginning and before the ages chose and preordained a Mother to His only begotten Son.

This seems to indicate that God first foresaw the Fall and then predestined the Incarnation. Carol, however, argues that all the Bull indicates is that “In the present economy, Christ was decreed as *Redeemer* after Adam’s fall had been foreseen…. [not] that the Incarnation itself was essentially ‘dependent’ on the sin of Adam [emphasis original].”
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indicates “the Incarnation as ‘the first work of His (God’s) goodness [emphasis original]’”\textsuperscript{493} and that having foreseen the Fall, God determined to fulfill his previous plan, the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{494} Carol’s argument has some merit, as the text does allow the reading that the Incarnation was the first work willed by God; however, it is by no means definitive.

Carol offers several more arguments as to why \textit{Ineffabilis Deus} supports the anti-debitist position. Like the ones we previously considered, all of these arguments are based on ideas implied by the text and some are rather weak. Overall, our analysis shows that Carol saw a strong connection between Mary’s predestination with Christ before the Fall and the anti-debitist position, as would be expected for a Franciscan. This helps explain the motive for his eventual focus on the joint predestination of Jesus and Mary.

If we consider the entirety of Carol’s study of the \textit{debitum} argument, two major concepts can be seen as the support for his anti-debitist position. The first is that the preservative redemption does not require Mary to have a \textit{debitum}; to be placed outside of Adam’s headship is still a type of redemption. The second is that it is through her joint predestination with Christ before the Fall that Mary is placed outside of Adam’s headship. In the next two major themes Carol discusses, he supports these two premises in his anti-debitist argument. We will now turn to the first premise, the preservative redemption.

\textbf{The Preservative Redemption and the Necessity of the \textit{Debitum}}

Carol only published one article on the topic of Mary’s preservative redemption, in which he develops the idea that Mary’s preservative redemption, as explained in \textit{Ineffabilis Deus}, is logically compatible with the position that Mary had no \textit{debitum peccati}.\textsuperscript{495} He begins by discussing the aspects of \textit{Ineffabilis Deus} that are infallible and what it left undefined. Carol

\textsuperscript{493} Ibid. The original text of the Bull states “\textit{primum suae bonitatis opus}.”
\textsuperscript{494} Ibid., 177-78.
holds that it is defined that Mary was “immune from all stain of original sin” at conception “due to a singular grace and privilege” from God in view of the merits of Christ.\footnote{Ibid., 21.} Further, although she was preserved from Original Sin, she was still redeemed by Christ. Pius IX did not define if Mary had the \textit{debitum}, when her preservation was foreseen, and how she was redeemed.\footnote{Ibid., 21-22.}

Carol follows his usual historical method, explaining that there are three positions regarding Mary’s preservative redemption; that she was not redeemed, that she was redeemed in the proper sense (\textit{sensu proprio}) or that she was redeemed in the improper sense (\textit{sensu improprimo}). In general, we can understand redemption \textit{sensu proprio} as maintaining a stronger relationship between Mary’s redemption and our redemption, although we will not discuss the intricacies of this debate.\footnote{Ibid., 23.} Our focus will be on how theologians relate the \textit{debitum} to the concept of redemption.

Unsurprisingly, many theologians attributed a \textit{debitum} to Mary because it allowed them to argue that she had a relation to sin from which she needed to be redeemed. Thus, in preserving her from sin, God is “purchasing” her from Adam’s headship, either physically or remotely.\footnote{Ibid., 32-34, 36-42, 50.} Most theologians who held that Mary had a \textit{debitum} considered her to be properly redeemed, although there were some who considered her redemption improper.\footnote{For example, see Nicholas Assouad’s opinion, Carol, “Reflections on the Problem of Mary’s Preservative Redemption,” 50.} Those who held that Mary had no \textit{debitum} often relied on a broader sense of analogy between Mary’s redemption and our redemption, even if they held that she was properly redeemed.\footnote{For example, see Alejandro de Billalmonte’s work, Carol, “Reflections on the Problem of Mary’s Preservative Redemption,” 42-43.} However, it seems more common that anti-debitists admitted that Mary’s redemption had to be understood in the improper sense. Carol was one such anti-debitist.
For Carol, Mary, by virtue of being a creature, had the potential of falling into sin. Therefore her predestination with Christ, which prevents her from falling in Adam, is a form of redemption.\textsuperscript{502} In light of the merits of Christ’s Passion, Mary “was preserved, not only from original sin itself, but also from every necessity to contract it.”\textsuperscript{503} Carol agrees with the objection that “redemption” only has meaning if refers it to sin. However, he argues that Mary’s redemption still has reference to sin in that in her redemption, the relationship between her and sin is destroyed. As a result, she is even more fully redeemed than the rest of humanity.\textsuperscript{504}

Carol recognizes his position on Mary’s redemption seems to contain a contradiction, which he explains:

If Our Lady was redeemed by the Passion of Christ, she must have been predestined \textit{after} the prevision of Adam’s fall, without which such a redemption is meaningless. In this event, by the time Christ’s merits were applied to her, Mary must have been included in the moral headship of Adam, and hence under some necessity to contract original sin. Her redemption by Christ, therefore, means that she was preserved from a sin she \textit{should} have incurred [emphasis original].\textsuperscript{505}

If Mary is redeemed by the foreseen merits of Christ, there does not seem to be any possible way to avoid holding that she was predestined after the Fall, which would result in her being under the headship of Adam and thus having a debitum. Although reconciling this apparent contradiction is possible using the traditional Franciscan thesis, Carol believes a modification of this theory by the twentieth-century theologian Fr. Bonnefoy more successfully solves this problem.\textsuperscript{506} Thus, we see that after the Council, Carol favors the same position as he did in his 1957 \textit{Fundamentals of Mariology}, as we mentioned in chapter one.

\textsuperscript{502} Ibid., 47-50.  
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In brief, Bonnefoy develops the idea that Christ’s Passion was predestined even before the Fall. As a result, even if Mary is predestined with Christ, she can still be predestined in light of His merits. In this article, Carol only briefly presents how Bonnefoy argues for this surprising position. It is not until his later work on Christ’s primacy and predestination that Carol discusses this thesis in detail. We will now consider Carol’s work on Christ’s primacy, which will eventually return us to this topic of preservative redemption.

**Carol’s Work on Primacy and Predestination**

As a Franciscan, Carol’s discussion of the predestination of Jesus and Mary is necessarily linked to his understanding of Christ’s primacy; therefore, we will consider his four works on these topics together. Although all of these works are historical studies, we will again focus on Carol’s position. The majority of our discussion will be based on two books, Carol’s *Why Jesus Christ? Thomistic, Scotistic, and Conciliatory Perspectives* from 1986, which is the culmination of his two previous studies, and his translation and adaptation of an Italian work by Fr. Francis Xavier Pancheri, O.F.M., which provides important insights into Carol’s modification of the Franciscan thesis.

**The Thomistic Thesis on Christ’s Predestination**

Although Carol discusses the Thomistic thesis in detail, we will only briefly consider some of his more important points, especially ones that provide insight into Carol’s eventual position on Christ’s predestination. Carol summarizes the Thomistic position with the following scheme:

1. God decrees to create the universe in order to manifest His goodness.
2. God decrees the permission of Adam’s sin.

---
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(3) God decrees to become man (Incarnation) in order to redeem man. 

Conclusion: The only determining reason for the Incarnation is man’s Redemption. Hence, if Adam had not sinned, there would be no Incarnation.510

Although this scheme is usually given by the disciples of Aquinas, Carol takes pains to point out that Aquinas never spoke this definitively on the topic.511 In the *Summa Theologica*, when considering the question of whether the Incarnation would have occurred without the Fall, Aquinas admits that some hold that Christ would have become Incarnate if Adam had not sinned and others hold that He would not have become Incarnate, saying “it seems that our assent ought to be given rather to this… opinion.”512 His reason for this tentative conclusion is that we can only know God’s will through Scripture:

Since everywhere in the Sacred Scripture the sin of the first man is mentioned as the reason for the Incarnation, it is more in accordance with this to say (“convenientus dicitur”) that the work of the Incarnation was ordained by God as a remedy for sin; so that, if sin had not existed, the Incarnation would not have come about [Carol’s parenthetical comment].513

Thus, Aquinas does not view the Franciscan thesis as contrary to Scripture; rather, he bases his conclusion on the idea that sin and the Incarnation are always linked in Scripture.514 Carol’s concern with demonstrating that his position does not contradict Aquinas demonstrates the influence of the pre-Conciliar emphasis on centrality of Aquinas’ work for theology.515

The Thomistic argument for an Incarnation conditioned on the Fall that Carol finds the most lucid is that of Louis Thomassin (d. 1695), whose explained, “Only a redemptive Incarnation reveals the goodness of God because true goodness is based on mercy. God’s


513 Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, III*, q. 1, art. 3 in Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?*, 9. The next sentence in this article states, “And yet the power of God is not limited to this; - even had sin not existed, God could have become Incarnate.” Carol, however, does not quote this statement, although it would have strengthened his argument. See, Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, III*, q. 1, art. 3.
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merciful love – the supreme form of goodness – presupposes our fallen nature.”\textsuperscript{516} Since mercy requires an external object in need of a remedy,\textsuperscript{517} the Fall must be logically prior to the Incarnation. For Carol, the Thomistic understanding of the Incarnation conditioned on the Fall means “that divine mercy is at the root of the entire process of God’s becoming man. It is its ultimate explanation.”\textsuperscript{518} The foundation of the difference between the Thomists and the Scotists is whether God’s relation to humanity is rooted in goodness or in mercy.\textsuperscript{519}

**The Franciscan Thesis on Christ’s Predestination as Presented by Scotus**

As discussed in the introduction, Scotus’ theory of Christ’s predestination differs from Thomas’ version due to Scotus’ emphasis on Divine Freedom. Carol’s summary of the Scotistic thesis provides a helpful reminder of what we previously discussed:

1. God decrees the existence of Christ, independently of any other circumstance, in order to have someone who will love Him in a most perfect way.
2. God decrees the existence of angels and men, with Christ as their final, exemplary and efficient (meritorious) cause.
3. God decrees the rest of the universe for the glory of Christ.
4. God decrees the permission of Adam’s sin.
5. God decrees that Christ will come \textit{in carne passibili} as Redeemer. 

\textit{Conclusion:} Even if Adam had not sinned, God would have become incarnate, not as Redeemer, of course, but as King of all creation.\textsuperscript{520}

As explained in the introduction, Scotus bases his schema of Christ’s predestination on the premise that God wills all things in an orderly manner based on His perfect freedom and goodness.\textsuperscript{521} God’s properly ordered will means that Christ has primacy over all of creation.

Although Scotus held that the Incarnation would have occurred regardless of the Fall, it is possible that he thought the mode of the Incarnation was dependent on Adam’s transgression. The \textit{Opus Parisiense} states that only the glory of Christ’s soul was predestined prior to the Fall.
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\textsuperscript{517} Pancheri and Carol, \textit{The Universal Primacy of Christ}, 64-65.
\textsuperscript{518} Carol, \textit{Why Jesus Christ?}, 22.
\textsuperscript{519} Pancheri and Carol, \textit{The Universal Primacy of Christ}, 68.
\textsuperscript{520} Carol, “The Absolute Predestination of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” 182; Carol, \textit{Absolute Primacy and Predestination}, 11-12.
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and then, foreseeing the Fall, God delayed the glorification of Christ’s body, “because the glory of the blessed to be redeemed through the passion of his body was greater than the glory of Christ’s body.”522 Based on this passage, many hold that Scotus taught that God first decreed that Christ would become Incarnate in impassable flesh and only after permitting the Fall did He determine that Christ would be passable.523 This means that although the substance of the Incarnation remained the same, its mode changed after the permission of the Fall. The problem with this position is that “it seems to postulate two decrees in God…and this is against the dogma of divine immutability.”524 Carol finds this highly problematic and favors later Scotists who modified this traditional thesis to avoid the changing modality of the Incarnation.525

**Purifying the Discussion of Christ’s Predestination**

Carol has several unique concerns about the Franciscan thesis, many of which were not held by the majority of Scotists throughout the centuries. By considering what aspects of the thesis Carol emphasizes and what particular concerns he has, we can begin to understand how his historical context, particularly the post-Conciliar period, influenced Carol’s theology.

Carol’s first two concerns can be understood as indicating a desire to return the Franciscan thesis to its original framework and avoid some of the convolutions that had developed through the scholastic discussion of this topic. The first place we see this is in his statement that we should not frame the discussion of Christ’s predestination in terms of motive, as it is often framed. Although phrasing the argument in such a way was common for later Franciscans, it seems to imply that an external force induces God to act.526 Carol finds this
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impossible in light of the Franciscan emphasis that God is “absolutely free, independent, and immovable.”

However, God’s action is orderly; “He always has a reason for acting. We ought to search, then, for the reason or primary cause of the Incarnation.”

Therefore, it would be more precise to discuss the reason for the Incarnation, rather than the motive.

Another scholastic articulation that Carol desires to avoid is discussing Christ’s predestination in terms of the hypothetical question of, “Whether or not the Word would have become incarnate if Adam had not sinned.” He argues that we can know nothing about a possible world in which Adam did not sin. Only by considering Revelation can we understand Christ’s predestination and Revelation provides us no insight into any ordering other than the present economy.

Carol’s emphasis on the need to maintain a strong Scriptural foundation parallels the shift between the first Marian schema and the final text of Lumen Gentium, in which Scriptural and Patristic language replaced scholastic terminology.

**Scriptural Support for the Franciscan Thesis**

Since Carol emphasized the need to insure that the discussion of Christ’s predestination and primacy is rooted in Revelation, we will first consider his Scriptural support for the Franciscan thesis. The first important passage to consider is Colossians 1:13-20. The major argument surrounding this passage is determining whether statements such as, “He is the image of the invisible God” (Col. 1:15a) refer to Word exclusively or to the Incarnate Word because
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only if this passage refers to Christ’s human nature does it support the Franciscan position.\textsuperscript{533} Carol believes that it refers to Christ’s human nature because “for an image to be able to reflect something invisible, it should itself be visible and perceptible to the senses like the human body.”\textsuperscript{534} Furthermore, numerous Church Fathers argued that the next statement, “the firstborn of all creation” (Col. 1:15b) refers to Christ in His human nature. Finally, this interpretation is more fitting because the Divine Nature is eternal and therefore should not be discussed in relation to time.\textsuperscript{535} Carol makes similar exegetical conclusions for the rest of Colossians,\textsuperscript{536} leading him to the final conclusion that the passage indicates “that our Blessed Lord, the God-man, was the first to be predestined by God (hence, \textit{ante praevismum lapsus}), and that His specific mission was not only to redeem … but also to draw all creation to Himself [emphasis original].”\textsuperscript{537} It is important to note that Carol is not arguing that Christ does not have a redemptive mission, but that He also has the greater mission of unifying all of creation as its Head.

The second major Scriptural foundation of the Franciscan thesis is Ephesians 1:3-10.\textsuperscript{538} The opening phrase of this hymn is, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:3-4). Franciscans argue, unsurprisingly, that this passage refers to Christ in His human nature and thus is proof of His primacy. Carol argues that this text refers to Christ in His human nature because it eventually discusses our Redemption “through His blood” (Eph 1:7). Carol also argues that the major concern of this
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\textsuperscript{538} “Blessed be the God… who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world…. He destined us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of his will, to the praise of his glorious grace which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved. In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace…. For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him…” (Eph. 1:3-10).
passage is our predestination to divinization, to become the Father’s sons through Christ (Eph. 1:5). Although the Redemption is discussed, it “is not given any special prominence.”

Rather, the key point is that God primarily predestined the elect to become His children. The Redemption is simply a step in accomplishing this plan, which supports the position that the Incarnation was not conditioned on sin.

The final passage Carol considers in support of the Franciscan thesis is Romans 8:29-30, which states, “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the first-born among many brethren. And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified.” Carol explains that Christians were not predestined to redemption or justification; rather, they “were predestined to become conformed to the image of God’s Son.… This redemption is the means used by God, in ordine executionis, to carry out His original plan [emphasis original].” Since it is Christ, as Man, who is the exemplar to which people are conformed, Christ, as Man, must have been logically prior to the creation of humanity.

Finally, Carol responds to the Thomist position, which emphasizes the many Scriptural passages in which Christ’s mission is described in terms of the Redemption. He states that none of these passages say that the Redemption is the only reason for the Incarnation. Overall, Carol demonstrates that the Franciscan thesis has a strong Scriptural foundation.

The Franciscan Thesis in the Church Fathers

Carol also considers how elements of the Franciscan thesis are expressed in Patristic sources. Although the Fathers do not outline the exact Franciscan thesis, their writings do contain
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some of its major elements.⁵⁴⁵ We will only consider two major patristic sources from Carol’s study. Since Irenaeus played a major role in Carol’s work on the Coredemption, we will consider his position on Christ’s primacy. Irenaeus is often considered a witness against the Franciscan thesis due to his statement that there would have been no Incarnation if we had not needed salvation. However, he also held that the “since the One who saves already existed, it was necessary to create that which needed salvation, so as not to leave the Savior without a saving mission.”⁵⁴⁶ Thus, the Fall is permitted “so that Christ, who had already been predestined as Redeemer (praexisteret) would have something to redeem us from [emphasis original].”⁵⁴⁷ This has significant parallels with the modified Franciscan theses that Carol favors, as we will see shortly. Since Ireneaeus was highly significant in Carol’s thesis on the Coredemption, we should not be surprised that he also shapes Carol’s understanding of Christ’s primacy.

Another major Patristic witness to the Franciscan position is St. Maximus the Confessor (d. 622). Carol cites Maximus as saying, “‘It was for the sake of Christ, that is, the mystery of Christ, that all the ages and the things in the ages themselves received the beginning and end of existence in Christ.’”⁵⁴⁸ By explicitly referring to the mystery of Christ, Maximus makes it clear he is concerned with the Incarnation, not Christ’s Divine Nature. In a different work, Maximus states, “‘for this reason God the Word…became the Son of Man and man that He might make men gods and children of God [Carol’s emphasis]’”⁵⁴⁹ Deification, not Redemption, is the main goal of the Incarnation.⁵⁵⁰ In another significant passage, Maximus says, “‘for this is the only reason for His [the Word’s] fleshy birth, the salvation of nature.’”⁵⁵¹ To understand this difficult
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passage, Carol considers Unger’s interpretation.\textsuperscript{552} Unger proposes that Maximus defined salvation not as “liberation from sin followed by deification, but primarily deification, which would have been verified even if the state of innocence had not been lost.”\textsuperscript{553} Such an interpretation is important because we will see that Carol defines the Redemption in a similar way, which includes Mary among the redeemed. From these examples, we can see that Patristic sources had an important role in shaping Carol’s position on Christ’s primacy, further demonstrating his desire to return these neo-scholastic debates to their original foundation.

**The Franciscan Thesis in *Ineffabilis Deus***

For Carol, the authority of the Papacy is still highly important; he has not left behind the ultramontanism of the pre-Conciliar period. Carol admits that magisterial documents rarely discuss the topic of primacy and predestination and that when they do, it is “vague and indirect.”\textsuperscript{554} He discusses multiple papal statements and, unsurprisingly, spends a great deal of time discussing *Ineffabilis Deus*, the main text from his analysis of magisterial sources that we will consider. Carol focuses on the same passage from the prologue that he emphasized in his discussion of Mary’s *debitum*. First, he argues that since only the Redemption is described by the pope as being “decreed after Adam’s sin had been foreseen,” this text does not support the idea that the Incarnation is dependent on the Fall.\textsuperscript{555} In addition, the Bull states that after foreseeing the Fall, “God determined… to fulfill in an even more profound mystery the primitive work of His goodness through the Incarnation.”\textsuperscript{556} Carol argues that means that the Incarnation was logically prior to the Fall and that God determined that it would still be carried out despite the
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Fall. Carol’s use of the same text to support his position on the *debitum* and Christ’s predestination demonstrates that these concepts are linked in Carol’s mind, although he never develops a full synthesis tying his Mariology and Christology together.

**The Franciscan Thesis in the Conciliar Period**

Significantly, for the first time since his debate with Alonso, Carol discusses *Lumen Gentium*, although he does not discuss chapter eight. Carol begins by considering the statement in chapter one that:

> The eternal Father, by a free and hidden plan of His own wisdom and goodness, created the whole world. His plan was to raise men to a participation of the divine life. Fallen in Adam, God the Father did not leave men to themselves, but ceaselessly offered helps to salvation, in view of Christ, the Redeemer “who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.” All the elect, before time began, the Father “foreknew and pre-destined to become conformed to the image of His Son, that he should be the firstborn among many brethren.”

Carol interprets this text as meaning that God did not abandon His original plan to divinize humanity after the Fall and that the purpose of the Redemption to provide the grace needed to fulfill God’s original plan. Divinization, not Redemption, is the main reason for the Incarnation.

Carol then considers the next paragraph of *Lumen Gentium*. This paragraph cites the Ephesian hymn, stating, “The Son, therefore, came, sent by the Father. It was in Him, before the foundation of the world, that the Father chose us and predestined us to become adopted sons.” Carol argues that stating that all things were predestined in Christ in this way is an indication that
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the Incarnation is logically prior to the Fall. His interpretation of this passage makes sense in light of his exegesis of Ephesians, which we discussed earlier.

Carol further supports his argument that Christ’s primacy is upheld by *Lumen Gentium* by considering its statement that, “[Christ] is the image of the invisible God and in Him all things came into being. He has priority over everyone, and in Him all things hold together…. He is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He might have the first place [Carol’s emphasis].” This statement is based on Colossians 1:15-18, so we should not find it surprising that Carol views this passage as indicating that Christ was predestined before the Fall.

What is surprising, however, is that Carol bases his argument on Abbott’s English translation of *Lumen Gentium*, rather than the actual Latin text. This translation seems to support the Franciscan thesis more than the phrasing actually given in Latin. The most important example of this is in Abbot’s translation that Christ “has priority over everyone.” The Latin text is, “Ipse est ante omnes.” A more literal translation would seem to be that Christ is “before all creatures.” In light of Carol’s previous exegesis of Colossians, this more literal translation would still support his argument that *Lumen Gentium* supports Christ’s primacy. However, his reliance on this translation makes the text appear to support his position more explicitly than does the original version. This is a weakness in Carol’s consideration of the text. Another weakness is Carol’s failure to consider chapter eight of *Lumen Gentium*, which as we
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saw in chapter two, strongly connects Mary’s role in the economy of salvation to her predestination with Christ. Carol’s failure to address this chapter seems to indicate that although he used quotations from *Lumen Gentium* to support his position, he did not analyze it to a substantial degree.

**Historical Support for the Franciscan Thesis**

In his historical analysis, Carol marshals support for the Franciscan position mainly by citing texts in which theologians support all or part of the Franciscan thesis and provides little or no discussion of them. When discussing the development of the thesis, Carol admits that, “it was subject to a slow, sometime imperceptible progress, but its inner vitality managed to surface periodically and with increasing clarity until it reached the time of its ‘official’ exponent at the close of the thirteenth century.”

Although the development was slow, Carol believes his study indicates that the thesis has always been present in the Catholic tradition.

Carol does not, as he did before the Council with the Coredemption, make an argument that the Franciscan thesis has developed to the point where it should be defined. Perhaps this is because the Franciscan thesis never became as widely supported and well-developed as the doctrine of Coredemption or perhaps it indicates that Carol understood that the pastoral emphasis of Vatican II had shifted the Church away from trend of *ex cathedra* definitions. Rather, Carol simply argues that the Franciscan thesis is an acceptable position to hold that has significant continuity with tradition, does not contradict the teaching of the Church, and is not limited to the Franciscan Order.
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Responding to the Thomistic Critique over the Modality of the Incarnation

Having considered how Carol supports the Franciscan thesis in general, we are prepared to consider how he modifies the standard thesis in light of his own concerns. The first major modification that Carol favors is the idea that the Fall did not change the mode of the Incarnation.571 This is in part a response to a major critique of the Thomists, who emphasized that “One cannot say that God first willed the substance…and later in a concrete manner after the prevision of man’s sin; the first indetermined volition is neither intelligible…. Or else one would have to suppose that God first willed Christ to be impassible (substance and modality), and then after the perversion of sin, changed the modality.”572 God cannot will a vague concept of “Incarnation” without willing how it will occur, nor can He first will the Incarnation as impassable and later decide to make it passable, as this would amount to positing a change in God’s decree. The necessity of avoiding attributing any change in God’s decree was a major pillar of Carol’s anti-debitist argument; therefore, we can understand why Carol would favor positions that avoid the impassible-passible distinction of the traditional Scotistic thesis. Not only do such modified versions of the Franciscan thesis respond to what he considers to be a proper critique from the Thomists,573 but they also cohere with his defense of the anti-debitist position.

In addition to responding to the Thomists and supporting his anti-debitist argument, Carol’s emphasis on the lack of modality in God’s decree establishes that there is one, unmodified order of predestination. As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, Alonso critiqued Carol’s understanding of Mary’s mediation through arguing that there were three orders in the divine economy and that what happens in one order does not necessarily effect the others. The
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Franciscan thesis offers Carol a way of implicitly responding to this critique. As explained by Pacheri and Carol, “There are not two orders of salvation – one before sin, which abstracted from Christ, and the other after sin, which hinges on Him… The breach created by the Fall was not decisive… the initial supernatural orientation to Christ remains firm and intact.” Arguing for this one order indirectly responded to Alonso. Mary’s predestination to be the Mother of God necessarily has implications for her role in the Redemption because all of God’s works ad extra belong to one divine plan.

**Passibility for the Glorification of God**

Having discussed how Carol’s emphasis on the lack of modality in God’s plan supports his Marian positions, we need to consider how it effects his understanding of the place of the Redemption in the economy of salvation. Carol clearly needs to modify the traditional Franciscan position since, in his view, not even the mode of the Incarnation is based on the Fall. Thus, he needs to provide an explanation for how the Passion could primarily have value in a non-meritorious sense. Our discussion of how Carol achieves this will be aided by considering the summary of his position that he provides in *Why Jesus Christ?*:

I. The *ultimate* reason why God decreed the Incarnation is His intrinsic goodness. This applies to creation in general.
II. The *proximate* reason for the Incarnation is twofold:
   1. *Primary* reason: The supreme love and worship which only Christ can render to the Father. (This is where Scotists differ from non-Scotists.)
   2. *Secondary* reasons: The personal glorification of Christ and Mary; the “deification” of rational creatures through Christ’s meritorious causality; the redemption of the world, etc. (The *finis operis* of creation in general is the extrinsic glorification of God.) [Emphasis original].

As we saw previously, Carol considers the Thomistic vision to define the Incarnation as an act of mercy. In contrast, for Franciscans, rooting the Incarnation in God’s goodness means that “The
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*ordro amoris* is the only reason for the Incarnation.”\(^{576}\) Carol’s thesis is a logical step from the Franciscan position that God’s action can be understood as perfectly ordered love. If God acts primarily from love, then Christ, the God-man, should also act from perfectly ordered love, which means that He would first love God, the greatest good. There are secondary effects of the Incarnation that relate to the rest of creation, including the act of creation, the Redemption, and the gift of supernatural life.\(^{577}\) However, “Christ, having been willed on account of the divine goodness and not on account of mercy, has not been constituted a *means* to obtain all these blessing. These blessings are *not* the end or purpose of His existence; they are rather benefits flowing from the Incarnation [emphasis original].”\(^{578}\) God’s mercy is the overflowing of His goodness.\(^{579}\)

Since Carol holds that Christ’s passibility was willed before the Fall, even His Passion must be understood primarily as an act of love for the Father. As Fr. Matthias Joseph Scheeben (d. 1888) explains, when preforming deeds for another, one better shows love by suffering because this proves that the lover is putting the beloved before himself.\(^{580}\) For Scheeben, the reason Christ “chose to assume a human nature rather than an angelic one, was precisely because the former made it possible to die and thus show His love for the Father.”\(^{581}\) The capacity to suffer makes possible Christ’s self-immolation on Calvary, His “supreme manifestation of worship and love toward the Father.”\(^{582}\) Demonstrating this love is worth “‘incalculably more’” than redeeming humanity.\(^{583}\)
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Thus far, we have determined that for Carol, Christ’s passibility can be predestined independently of the Fall because its primary purpose is to offer adoration to God. We next need to understand how this primary reason for the Incarnation overflows to the secondary reasons for the Incarnation. St. Bernardine (d. 1444) explains it is Christ’s disinterested love that is meritorious, not the mere fact that He suffers.\(^{584}\) As Carol explained in his pre-Conciliar work, the Redemption is the result of Christ’s meritorious action. Based on this, we can summarize Carol’s thesis as follows: Christ loves the Father; therefore, He suffers to manifest this love. Such suffering is meritorious in the eyes of God; therefore, Christ merits the Redemption. As Marshner, one theologian whose thesis Carol favored explains, “The Incarnation thus chosen first, and for the sake of which all else will follow, is already a redemptive Incarnation.”\(^{585}\) Thus, we need to consider how Carol can define the Redemption as independent of the Fall.

**The Primacy of Christ and the Preservative Redemption**

Our previous consideration of the preservative redemption hinted at how Carol will define Redemption independently from the Fall, although his theory is more developed at this final stage of his theological career. Carol and Pancheri explain that redemption can either be preservative, protecting one from the possibility of sinning, or liberating, removing one from a state of sin, a position that Carol maintained in his previous work. Carol and Pancheri develop this argument by explaining that redemption is motivated by God’s goodness; therefore, its fullest sense cannot merely be the merciful purchasing of the sinner from his fallen state.\(^{586}\) Since it is an act of God’s goodness, “In its deepest sense, therefore, *to redeem means to liberate a created freedom – by means of an elevation to the supernatural state – from a condition made possible by*
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Although Carol and Pancheri still define redemption in reference to sin, they also define it in reference to its ultimate purpose, divinization. Beyond saving one from sin, redemption is an elevation to the divine life.\textsuperscript{588}

In this understanding of redemption, Mary is redeemed without a \textit{debitum} because she is preserved from the potential of falling into sin. Furthermore, the rest of humanity’s redemption is not completed until their full union with God in heaven, as only then do humans have impeccability. Such an understanding of redemption helps explain why Mary’s redemption is greater than the rest of humanity’s redemption. Unlike the rest of humanity, her redemption has already been fully accomplished.

**The Meaningful Value of the Fall**

From what we have outlined so far, a theory in which the Redemption is prior to the Fall, it could seem as if the Fall has little significance in Carol’s thesis. However, this is a result Carol specifically desires to avoid. He states that “not a few Scotists seem to regard the Adamitic disobedience as no more than a tragic episode with little or no bearing on the total divine economy. But that is hardly how Sacred Scripture considers it.”\textsuperscript{589} Carol considers Romans 11:32, which states, “For God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all” (Rom. 11:32). He argues that the Fall was permitted “\textit{because} it was an integral feature of His over-all plan to manifest His infinite mercy precisely through a redemptive Incarnation…. Adam and the permission of his sin are willed by God \textit{for the sake of Christ} [emphasis original].”\textsuperscript{590} As we previously discussed, Carol wants to insure that all of God’s actions \textit{ad extra}, even the Redemption, are primarily based on His goodness. However, in this consideration of Scripture, Carol seems to be saying that the Redemption is willed by God to manifest His
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mercy and that it is a liberation from sin. These two views can be reconciled if we remember that Carol understands mercy as the overflowing abundance of God’s goodness.

The theses given by Marshner and Bonnefoy are helpful for illuminating how a liberating redemption can be the result of God’s goodness. As Marshner explains, this possible world was chosen for “the infinite glory” of the redemptive Incarnation. Thus, the redemptive Incarnation is willed first and the Fall is allowed as a means to this end. However, Marshner fails to explain why a redemptive Incarnation is considered by God to be infinitely glorious.

Bonnefoy’s scheme is helpful for explaining why this is the case. His thesis contains seven steps describing God’s work ad extra. In summary, Bonnefoy’s position is that:

(1) God decrees the Incarnation…in order to have someone who will love Him in a supreme way….
[(2-4) God decrees Mary, followed by the rest of creation, to give Christ beneficiaries with whom He can share His goodness]
(5) Since it is more noble to dispense one’s own gifts… God decrees that Christ and Mary will earn (merit) such gifts for their beneficiaries [the rest of creation].
(6) Since the most excellent way to show one’s love is to lay down one’s life for the loved ones (John 15:13), God decrees Christ’s suffering and death…
(7) Since it is more noble and perfect “to forgive” than “to give,” God decrees (with a permissive will) the fall of our first parents so as to make possible the Redemption (and Coredemption) from sin…

Thus, the redemptive Incarnation is the most glorious because it allows Christ not only to distribute gifts to others, but further, to distribute these gifts to those who are unworthy of them.

This scheme supports the majority of Carol’s thesis, in that Christ’s primary purpose is to love God and secondarily to share His goodness with others. Mercy is secondary to goodness, as Christ is predestined first to share His goodness with humanity and then to share His goodness in a merciful way. However, Bonnefoy’s scheme does not support Carol’s position that the
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Redemption is independent of the Fall. Redemption may be allowed as a demonstration of God’s abundant goodness, but it is still associated with liberation from sin. It is not primarily the preservation from sin or the elevation to participation in the divine life.

Carol seems to recognize that his attempt to demonstrate the meaningful role of the Fall in the economy of salvation has challenges and does not fully cohere with his understanding of the Redemption as independent from the Fall. At the end of his discussion in *Why Jesus Christ?*, he reflects on his position by saying, “That there is some mystery involved here? Indeed there is.” Carol’s attempt to balance the Scriptural position of Christ’s primacy with the significance of the Fall, while also holding a concept of redemption that could apply to Mary does not fully succeed. This statement is an indication that he recognizes his synthesis is not lacking challenges. However, Carol’s main goal in *Why Jesus Christ?* was not to solve all of the difficulties of the Franciscan position; rather, it was simply to demonstrate that the Franciscan thesis is present in the tradition and is not contrary to the teaching of the Church. In this, he was successful.

**In Summary**

If we consider the entirety of Carol’s post-Conciliar work, we will realize that it covers all of the major aspects of the Franciscan thesis. On one hand, this is not surprising for a Franciscan. On the other, the unique concerns of his historical context led Carol to favor positions that did not follow the standard Franciscan understanding of Christ’s passibility, which led him to favor a major modification of the Franciscan position. What remains to be discussed in our conclusion is how this work connects to Carol’s pre-Conciliar work, both in regards to how it supports his thesis and how it represents a development of his previous position.
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CONCLUSION

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE PRIMACY OF CHRIST AND THE COREDEMPTION

A Brief Review of Our Study

In the previous three chapters, we surveyed Carol’s scholarly work over the entirety of his theological career. Although for Carol, the topic of Christ’s primacy and the Coredemption were linked,\(^\text{597}\) he never explicitly developed this connection, nor did he focus on linking his work to the Council and the corresponding shifts in Mariology. However, there are implicit indications that his work was influenced by the Council. In our conclusion, we will first consider the connection between the changing emphasis of his work and Vatican II. Secondly, we will consider the implications of his post-Conciliar work for his pre-Conciliar work.

To begin, we will offer a brief summary of the overall trajectory of Carol’s work. Before the Council, Carol defended and sought a definition of Mary’s Coredemption as an immediate participation in the Redemption that was secondary to and dependent on Christ, based on the principle of recirculation. For Carol, this principle means that as the New Eve, Mary actively co-merited our Redemption through her suffering at the foot of the Cross. Although he was a Christotypicalist, Carol never directly engaged with the ecclesiotypical school’s arguments that eventually led to substantial debate over the Marian *schema* at Vatican II. After the Council, Carol only considered the Coredemption once, admitting that he did not possess the ability to counter his opponent’s arguments. Carol’s focus then shifted to the debate over Mary’s *debitum*,
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in which he maintained that Mary was completely removed from the moral headship of Adam due to her preservative redemption. Finally, he discussed the absolute predestination and primacy of Christ, favoring a variation on the Franciscan thesis that held that even the Redemption was logically prior to the Fall.

The Chronological Trajectory of Carol’s Work

In some ways, it may seem as if Carol did not successfully adjust to the theological concerns of post-Conciliar theology.\(^{598}\) It is likely that he was, like many other Mariologists, unable to adapt to the ecclesiotypical aspects of the Mariology of *Lumen Gentium* after decades of arguing for Mary’s Coredemption based on her association with Christ.\(^{599}\) However, Carol’s shift to studying the *debitum* and the primacy of Christ does indicate an indirect response to the Mariological trends of Vatican II. Although Carol does not attempt to integrate his theology with the ecclesiotypical approach or even to directly engage with the concerns of the ecclesiotypical school, he does attempt to support the legitimacy of Christotypical Mariology by emphasizing the joint predestination Christ and Mary in the order of intention, which leads to their union in the economy of salvation.

As we saw in chapter two, Balić held that the theme of recirculation undergirded the entire Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium*. As a student of Balić, Carol likely agreed with this analysis, which would indicate that he considered a foundational principle in his pre-Conciliar argument for the Coredemption to be present in *Lumen Gentium*. However, as seen in his argument with Alonso, he did not feel capable of defending his Mariology after the Council. By focusing on predestination, another theme Balić described as foundational to the Marian chapter, Carol perhaps sought to develop a topic that could offer another means of supporting Mary’s Coredemption. As we saw in chapter one, Carol first argued for Mary’s mediation and
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Coredemption based on scholastic principles and later switched to the Patristic concept of recirculation. Thus, switching his theological starting point to defend this doctrine is not unprecedented in Carol’s work.

*Lumen Gentium* describes how Mary is “Redeemed by reason of the merits of her Son and united to Him by a close and indissoluble tie, she is endowed with the high office and dignity of being the Mother of the Son of God.” Mary is connected to Christ by her preservative redemption and her office as the Mother of God. Her predestination with Him is explicitly described in the statement that “Predestined from eternity by that decree of divine providence which determined the incarnation of the Word to be the Mother of God, the Blessed Virgin was on this earth the virgin Mother of the Redeemer, and above all others and in a singular way the generous associate and humble handmaid of the Lord.” This statement bases Mary’s association with Christ on her predestination. Therefore, by emphasizing the Franciscan thesis, Carol is perhaps providing a basis for his Christological understanding of the Coredemption in a way that can be supported by *Lumen Gentium*.

Thus, Carol’s post-Conciliar theology indirectly responds to theologians such as Alonso, who insisted that Carol’s understanding of the Coredemption was contrary to the Mariology of Vatican II. By explaining the Franciscan thesis and showing how it is present in Scripture, the tradition, and magisterial teaching, including *Lumen Gentium*, Carol demonstrates that this foundation for his position on the Coredemption is in harmony with Church teaching. Furthermore, in arguing for the Franciscan thesis, Carol supports the position that there is only one order in the economy of salvation, rather than the three orders proposed by Alonso. Thus, although it is indirectly, at the end of his life Carol answers the challenge posed by Alonso’s argument that Mary’s association with Christ in the hypostatic order has no bearing on the
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process of Redemption. Carol’s thesis offers an alternative to Alonso’s starting point by establishing the Redemption as predestined before the rest of creation was even considered by God. In this view, in the economy of salvation there is no division between Christ’s existence and His action. Thus, Mary’s association with Christ as His Mother necessarily means that she will be associated with His salvific work.

Carol’s emphasis on Christ’s primacy also has the potential to offer an indirect response to the ecclesiotypicalists in several ways. First, if Mary is predestined with Christ before the Fall was even considered by God, then she is more properly understood as His active associate than as a member of the Church, which is not predestined until after her role in the economy of salvation is established. Such an understanding of Mary does not negate the contributions of the ecclesiotypical school, but it would make them secondary aspects. For Carol, the Fall has significance in the divine economy. Therefore, we could postulate that the establishment of the Church as a means of extending the offer of salvation throughout history would have ecclesiotypical implications for Mary’s role in the divine economy. However, these roles as a member and archetype of the Church would be secondary to her role as the handmaid of the Lord.

In his work on the *debitum*, Carol emphasized that Mary’s preservative redemption is a more complete redemption than our liberating redemption, which will not be complete until our salvation is fully accomplished with the beatific vision. This presentation of the preservative redemption recalls Rahner’s description of Mary as our exemplar because in her the entirety of salvation history is fulfilled. However, Carol’s means of arriving at this conclusion is not based on Mary’s role as a member of the Church, but on her unique position as the predestined associate of Christ. Thus, Carol’s presentation of Mary’s unique predestination has the potential to integrate the insights of the ecclesiotypical school while maintaining that the Christotypical approach is the starting point for all further insight into Mary’s role in the economy of salvation.
Overall, we can conclude that Carol’s various areas of study after the Council offer an indirect response to the conflict between these two schools of Mariology. One major question after the Council was how these two schools should be balanced. Many theologians, in part misled by the media, considered the Marian chapter of *Lumen Gentium* as indicating that the ecclesiotypical school was to be favored over the Christotypical school. In contrast, Mariologists such as Balić saw *Lumen Gentium* as a balanced presentation of the two schools. Through the Franciscan thesis, Carol offers an understanding of the economy of salvation in which the Christotypical approach to Mariology is the logical starting point for considering Mary based on a concept found in *Lumen Gentium*. His presentation has the potential to integrate the contributions of the ecclesiotypical school; however, Mary’s roles as discussed by the ecclesiotypicalists would be secondary to her primary role as the associate of Christ, whose existence is not dependent on the rest of creation, including the Fall and the sacramental economy established to remedy it.

**The Theological Coherence of Carol’s Mariology and Christology**

Having considered how Carol’s shift in theological focus perhaps indirectly responded to Vatican II, we must consider the internal coherence of Carol’s theology. At the close of chapter three, we mentioned that Carol’s various understandings of the primacy of Christ and the order of predestination are not completely coherent. However, we can see that Carol’s overall goal was to maintain two ideas, that the Redemption was predestined independently of the Fall and that the Passion was primarily an act of love, not atonement. We will not reconsider why Carol’s two positions are not coherent at this time; rather, our discussion will focus on how these positions are connected to Carol’s pre-Conciliar theology of the Coredemption.

The desire to insure that the Fall is meaningful was perhaps influenced by Carol’s focus on the Coredemption, rather than, for example, Mary’s role as *Mediatrix*. As we saw in the first chapter, for Carol, Mary’s mediation can be understood separately from sin, whereas her
Coredemption cannot. When Carol discussed the Redemption and Coredemption before the Council, he emphasized how Christ and Mary merited our redemption in light of their joint suffering. As this aspect of the Redemption was so central for him before the Council, it makes sense that he would want to preserve the significance of the Fall, as this would emphasize the Redemption’s importance in the economy of salvation. Since, in responding to the concerns of the Thomists, Carol favored a modified version of the Franciscan thesis in which the modality of the Incarnation was not dependent on the Fall, he would have needed a new way of describing the Fall’s significance. Carol’s position that the Fall was permitted in order to allow the liberating Redemption insures that the Redemption and Coredemption are central to the economy of salvation and maintains their connection to atonement and to meriting redemption from Original Sin, as Carol emphasized before the Council.

Carol’s argument for the Fall as permitted for sake of the Redemption provides a strong Christotypical foundation for Marian Coredemption. In his scheme, Mary is associated with Christ before the Fall and the Fall is permitted for the purpose of allowing Christ and Mary to act in the most perfect manner. There can be no separation between Mary’s role as Christ’s Mother and the Redemption because Mary does not exist for the purpose responding to the Incarnation, as do other members of the Church. Rather, the rest of the world and the Redemption exists for Christ and for her as His dependent associate. As a result, the Coredemption belongs to the absolute center of creation. The Redemption is not simply a means to return creation to God; rather, creation was allowed to Fall because the Redemption would further glorify Christ. Since Mary is associated primarily with Christ, the Fall is secondarily permitted for her Coredemptive role. Carol’s thesis thus demonstrates the importance of the Coredemption. Such an argument would be significant in light of the decline in Mariology and Marian devotion after the Council because it demonstrates that Mary’s role is central to the economy of salvation. This means that
Mariology is an important part of theology and that Marian devotion is an integral part of Catholic piety.

The other major point that Carol sought to maintain was the idea that the Passion, including Mary’s role in it, existed primarily for the purpose of offering God a perfect act of adoration because it was ordained by God prior to the Fall. This position seems less coherent with Carol’s pre-Conciliar work. Although it emphasizes that the Passion, and thus Mary’s role in it, was always intended by God and is the central act of His love, it require a shift away from Carol’s pre-Conciliar emphasis on the suffering in the Passion as meritorious for our Redemption. Carol’s position is that the Incarnation is primarily an act of perfect adoration to the Father and secondarily about our Redemption. Thus, Carol’s pre-Conciliar work is relegated to being a secondary aspect of the Incarnation.

The implications of this scheme seems to indicate both a shift in Carol’s thought and an attempt to place his earlier work into a broader theological vision of the economy of salvation that he had always held. Even before the Council, Carol favored Bonnefoy’s position on the relation between the Redemption and the Fall. However, Carol’s description of the Passion as primarily an offering of perfect adoration to the Father seems to indicate a shift in his thought between his pre-Conciliar and post-Conciliar work. Even when discussing how the Redemption is only a component of Christ’s mediation in “The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption,” Carol never describes the Redemption as merely one component of the Passion. If Carol’s position was always that the Sacrifice on Calvary was intended primarily for the glorification of God and secondarily for the salvation of souls, it would seem more fitting to refer to it as the Passion of Christ and the Compassion of Mary, rather than in terms of Redemption.

His new emphasis on the Passion as primarily an act of adoration is counter to how Carol discussed Mary’s meriting at Calvary before the Council and indeed to the position of many
theologians, including many Franciscans, throughout history. However, this position is not contrary to the thought of his school. As we saw in the introduction, when providing a rationale for the preservative redemption, Scotus states, “Christ does not placate the Trinity most perfectly for the fault contracted by the children of Adam unless he does prevent someone from possessing such a fault.” Scotus’ logic is that that preservative redemption has the primary purpose of pleasing the Trinity, rather than being something Christ “owed” to His mother. Carol’s presentation of the Passion as primarily an act of love for God follows this principle of analyzing how Christ acted based on His rendering of perfect adoration to God. Perhaps Carol saw his position as more faithful to the original Scotistic vision, just as he saw the eschewing of the hypothetical construction of the predestination debate as more faithful to Scotus. It is also possible that Carol came to the conclusion that he had overemphasized the mechanisms of the Sacrifice on Calvary in his pre-Conciliar period and desired to rectify this by focusing on the core of this action as an act of love for God.

Overall, Carol’s Mariology and Christology presents the Sacrifice of Calvary and Mary’s role in it as the central intention of God when creating the world. For Carol, this is appropriate in light of the Scriptural presentation in the canticles of Colossians and Ephesians of the Redemption as the means God uses to carry out His original plan of the deification of humanity, as discussed in chapter three. Carol’s post-Conciliar work both supports the centrality of his pre-Conciliar emphasis on the Coredemption and offers a corrective to it. Although his work is not entirely internally coherent, it presents the Passion and Mary’s role in it as central to God’s plan for the economy of salvation, while emphasizing that the Passion and Compassion were primarily acts of love and not solely about meriting and satisfying for our Redemption.
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Directions for Future Research

This concludes our analysis of the Christology and Mariology of Fr. Juniper Carol. His work is significant because it played an important role in the Marian movement of the early twentieth century and because it provides an example of a preeminent American Mariologist’s response to the Marian doctrine expressed in *Lumen Gentium*. Carol’s post-Conciliar theology does not simply indicate a failure to adapt to the new Marian trends. Rather, in emphasizing a Franciscan understanding of the primacy of Christ, it offers a Christotypical approach to Mariology in a manner that has the potential to integrate the contributions of the ecclesiotypical school as belonging to the many secondary reasons for the joint predestination of Christ and Mary. Although Carol’s synthesis was not fully internally coherent, it is successful in overcoming the traditional Thomistic objections to the Franciscan thesis and in responding to the critique that the concept of the Coredemption is contrary to the Mariology of *Lumen Gentium*.

Carol never fully connected his later Christology with his Mariology and our conclusion has only briefly discussed the possible connections between the two. Therefore, there is potential for further research in developing the implicit connections between the two aspects of his theology. Such a study could enhance our understanding of the coherence between the Christotypical and ecclesiotypical schools of Mariology, which would be in keeping with the Marian teaching of *Lumen Gentium* and would deepen our appreciation of Mary’s role in the divine economy.

Further, Carol, although analyzing the major Scriptural foundations for both the Coredemption (Gen. 3:15) and the primacy of Christ (Eph. 1:3-10, Col. 1:13-20, Rom. 8:29-30), does not fully elaborate on the coherence of his theology with the entirety of Scripture. Thus, there is potential for the development of a Scriptural presentation of his theology. Reflection on Carol’s understanding of the Passion and Compassion in the light of Scripture would deepen our
appreciation of St. Paul’s praise of the mystery of God’s will “according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth” (Eph. 1:9-10). Further, it offers a theological meditation on Christ’s own prayer before His Passion, “Father, the hour has come; glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you, since you have given him power over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom you have given him” (Jn. 17:1-2).
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