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INTRODUCTION

Cardinal Charles Journet (1891-1975) gained fame for his ecclesiology, especially as expressed in his monumental work *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*. His theology of the Church has been noted and commented upon by leading theologians, authors of ecclesiological texts, and graduate students. However, apart from a few small articles in journals and encyclopedias, we have no comprehensive survey of his Mariological doctrine. The *status questionis* is to be regretted, since Journet considered Mariology to be an integral and indeed a privileged part of Ecclesiology. His deep personal and theological interest in the Blessed Virgin is reflected in the large amount of space he accords her in his theological output, in his preaching, and in his view of the spiritual life. The unique characteristics of his Mariology, especially the ways he connects it with salvation history, Ecclesiology, and Christology, both anticipate the teaching of the Second Vatican Council in *Lumen Gentium*, and suggest pathways for future development. This thesis comes about in response to the above-described need.

We propose to offer the first in-depth study of Journet’s Mariology, concentrating on its dogmatic content while acknowledging its spiritual value. Two facts are to be noted at the outset: first, with the exception of *Notre-Dame des sept douleurs* and the *Esquisse du développement du dogme marial*, Journet’s Marian teaching has to be extracted from his Ecclesiological and dogmatic works; second, there is remarkably little change in his positions over time. These facts suggest the employment of a thematic or synchronic method. We will assemble from various sources Journet’s thought on classic Marian themes (predestination, Immaculate Conception, Divine motherhood, virginity, Assumption, coredemption, etc.), presenting the fundamental principles of his Mariology, and highlighting ideas peculiar to his thought. Throughout, the
thesis will examine how various parts of Journet's work relate one to the other, in order to discover how it coheres and where there may be weaknesses, structural or otherwise. Then it will be possible to compare his Mariology with that of other contemporary theologians, with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, and with post-conciliar magisterial documents. Thus, synthesis will lead to analysis.

The main purpose of this thesis remains survey, summary, and synthesis. It is hoped that our modest presentation will stimulate further research into and analysis of the works of a "classical" author whose Mariology is still relevant today.

The first three chapters of the thesis are introductory to the main material. Chapter One gives a brief biography of Journet. It also attempts to sketch an intellectual profile of the theologian, and to pick out some highlights of his spiritual life, especially in relation to the Virgin Mary. Chapter Two aims to introduce the reader to those writings in which Journet's Marian teaching is found, and to situate his Marian teaching within his overall work. Chapter Three takes a look at Mary's life and knowledge according to Journet.

With Chapter Four, the dogmatic survey begins. First we locate Journet's fundamental Mariological principles, showing what ecclesiological thematics trigger his Mariology. Here is found his treatment of the classic themes of predestination and Divine motherhood. The titles of Chapters Five through Eight attempt to express the highlights of his ecclesiotypical approach.

Chapter Five describes how the Virgin Mary, immaculate in her Conception, is an icon of the spotless Church. Chapter Six describes her as the "eschatological icon" of the Church's
destiny in her glorious Assumption. Chapter Seven examines how Mary participates in the Church’s saving mission as Coredemptrix, Mediatrix, and Mother of the Church. Chapter Eight situates Mary in relation to the three ages of the Church and the distribution of graces through the sacraments.

Chapter Nine presents Journet’s teaching of the development of Marian dogmas. Here we depart from ecclesiotypical considerations to examine questions of fundamental theology. The Marian dogmas, especially the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption, prompt investigations because they are not explicitly mentioned in Sacred Scripture. Yet important Ecclesiological points are raised here, regarding the nature of the Church’s Magisterium, as well as the mysterious correspondence between successive definitions of Marian dogma and the changing needs of the Church in different historical situations.

Beginning with Chapter Ten, we move from synthesis to analysis. Chapter Ten looks for evidence of Journet’s influence on the Marian teaching of the Second Vatican Council and of Pope Paul VI. Chapter Eleven moves ahead into the post-conciliar Magisterium, comparing Journet’s Marian writings with those of Pope John Paul II and the Marian texts in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Chapter Twelve concludes the thesis by situating Journet in the overall Mariological context of his time. His Marian doctrine is compared with that of selected theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Avenues for further study are suggested.
CHAPTER ONE
CHARLES JOURNET (1891-1975)

Before studying the theological work of Charles Journet, we wish to take a look at the man himself. We offer a brief outline of his life, then attempt to outline his intellectual and spiritual profile, situating him within the theological tendencies of his time, and looking for his thoughts on Marian piety in particular.

Charles Journet was born January 26, 1891 in Meyrin, near Geneva, Switzerland. His father attached great importance to his son’s studies, helping him with his lessons at home, and sending him to the Collège Schwyz to learn German. His aim was to enable the boy to move up the economic ladder. As a teenager, Charles was apprenticed at the Crédit Suisse bank, but shortly afterward opted to study for the priesthood. In 1913, while still a seminarian, he received the inspiration for what would become his life’s work. Curiously, Journet was obliged to break the rules of the seminary before this could happen. In the seminary library, the works of the mystics were off-limits to the students. Nevertheless, Journet clandestinely picked up and read the Dialogue of St. Catherine of Siena. “I opened the book. There was a revelation of what the Church was, the Church in her splendor!”1 He read the following lines: “...this is how I want you to act toward those of my ministers who are out of line, who are covered with the filth of sin and ragged from their abuse of charity when they bring you the great treasures of the Church’s sacraments... For it is not my will that they should administer the Sun to you out of

their darksomeness..." This revelation remained central to Journet’s theological work: the Church is sinless, though she contains sinners; she is God’s masterpiece, built of materials taken from a sinful world. All his theological work would be at the service of this initial vision; he would strive to make known, precisely, scientifically, and thoroughly, what St. Catherine of Siena had known experientially and intuitively. 3 This is why the name of the Virgin of Siena stands at the head of his monumental treatise on the Church, L’Église du Verbe Incarné.

In 1917 he was ordained a priest of the diocese of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg and assigned as parochial vicar in the town of Carouge. According to some reports, Journet attempted to enter the Dominican Order in 1920. After only a month or two, it was decided that his frail health would not allow him to continue in the Order of Preachers, and he returned to his diocese and served parishes in Fribourg and Geneva. 4 In 1922, he met and became friends with Jacques Maritain, with whom he had begun a correspondence in 1920; this friendship had a great influence on his life and thought. 5 In 1924, he began to teach Dogmatic Theology at the Grand Seminaire in Fribourg, a task he continued until 1970. On weekends and during summer vacations, he would preach, give lectures, visit the sick, and instruct converts in Geneva, at the church of the Sacred Heart, where he had been baptized, received

---


3EVI, I, p. xviii. See also Emonet, pp. 13-15.


5The Journet-Maritain correspondence is being published under the direction of Bishop Pierre Mamie and Father Georges Cottier, O.P. So far two volumes have appeared, covering the years 1920-1939 and totaling almost two thousand pages, Journet Maritain : Correspondance (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Paris: Éditions Saint-Paul, 1996 -).
his first Communion, been confirmed, and served as a priest before being named professor.⁶ In 1926, together with his former schoolmate (and future bishop) François Charrière, he founded the journal *Nova et Vetera*, which he edited until his death (many articles first printed in this journal became part of *L’Église du Verbe Incarné*; others were re-printed in pamphlet form). At first, his talent as a theologian emerged gradually, but soon it flowered and was expressed in a steady stream of articles and books that revealed the extraordinary fecundity of his thought.⁷ Chief among his writings is the massive *L’Église de Verbe Incarné*, dedicated to the mystery of the Church. Joumet completed only three out of a projected four volumes.⁸

He was a member of the preparatory commission for the Second Vatican Council. In 1965, Pope Paul VI named him Cardinal, and as such he participated in the final session of the Council. Joumet died April 15, 1975 and, in accord with his express wishes, was buried at the Charterhouse of Valsainte, near Fribourg. The choice of his final resting place expresses the desire for contemplation that had always characterized his life. His grave is marked by a simple cross that bears no name.⁹

His intellectual style is in keeping with the style of his life, which was austere and at

---

⁶Méroz, pp. 11, 16. Méroz gives a charming description of Joumet’s office at Sacred Heart Church, and a detailed eyewitness account of Joumet’s pastoral work.

⁷*Au lancement de la revue [Nova et Vetera], il a 35 ans et c’est peu à peu que son génie théologique va se découvrir. ...Les études, les chroniques, les comptes rendus, les éditoriaux échelonnés sur un demi-siècle restent ainsi les témoins privilégiés de la croissance, de la maturation et du déploiement d’une œuvre de très grandes dimensions. ...Il reste que de l’essentiel de cette œuvre nous n’avons jusqu’ici point encore parlé. En effet, Charles Joumet fut avant tout un théologien de l’Eglise.* Georges M.-M. Cottier, O.P., “L’œuvre de Charles Joumet (1891-1975).” NV 1975/4, p. 250. Hereafter “L’œuvre...”

⁸Ibid., p. 251.

⁹Méroz, 148.
times severe. Taking as a motto the phrase of the psalmist, *viam veritatis elegi*, he strove to express the truths of the faith without compromise. In the words of Georges Cottier, O.P., who knew him well, “Charles Journet put his fiery temperament at the service of the light—the divine light—which he perceived.” This often led to polemics, especially in the early part of his writing career. Later in life he drew back from this somewhat. For example, his first book, *L’Esprit du protestantisme en Suisse*, has been characterized as putting the dominant liberal Protestantism of the Swiss Romande on trial. The same book, however, does not appear in the “Bibliographie résumée” of Journet’s works found in RThom 71 (1971). Cottier observes, “at the end of his life, he reproved himself for lack of charity toward persons that he might have committed in his first writings. He was thinking especially of *l’Union des Églises et le christianisme pratique* (1927), devoted to the conference of Stockholm.” In the final analysis it is clear from the witness of those who knew him well that Journet had *un tempérament de lutteur*, but if he fought it was for truth and justice.

The rigor of his temperament did not soften in matters of devotion, including devotion to Mary and the saints. For example, in his discussion of the development of the dogma of

---


11 Cottier, op. cit., n. 10.


13 *Son première livre...contient, en effet, un vagaries preaches Des ten dances du protestantisme liberal alors largement dominantes en terre romande.* “L’œuvre...” p. 243.


Mary’s Immaculate Conception, he describes and rejects the “temptation” to exalt Mary endlessly, in such a way as to separate her from redeemed humanity and from the Church. He does not think much of arguments for Mary’s privileges based on fittingness (de convenance).

Concern for the truth had to win out over unfounded piety and obscurantism, said Journet, calling for the suppression of questionable devotions and the scientific examination of dubious “relics.”

Journet’s fiery temperament and vigorous intellect were inspired and directed by certain key ideas, authors, books, and friendships which it is possible to identify thanks to his own accounts and the testimony of his friends.

During his studies at the Collège Saint-Michel in Fribourg, preparatory to entering the major seminary, he encountered Dante and Pascal. Journet would later list Dante, along with Fr. Clerissac and St. Catherine of Siena, as the three persons to whom he owed his vocation as

16 Il y aurait argument de convenance à dire, par exemple: “Si une vierge devait enfanter, elle ne pouvait n’enfanter qu’un Dieu; et si Dieu devait naitre, il ne pouvait naitre que d’une vierge, qui serait telle toujours.” L’argument de convenance (appelé par certains argument de raison) n’a, crions-nous, aucune valeur propre; tout sa valeur, qui est valeur de signe, consiste à nous référer à une intuition plus secrète, préconçue et informulée, fondée sur l’Evangile. EDDM, p. 106, n. 5.

17 In a handwritten document left in the possession of Jacques Maritain, marked “Projects for the Holy Father,” Journet outlined some leading pastoral priorities for the Church. The document would appear to date from between September 1945 and April 1947, during which period Journet made three visits to Maritain in Rome, where the latter was the French Ambassador to the Holy See. Recommendation no. 7 reads, Il conviendrait de faire prévaloir partout le souci de vérité, en révisant non seulement les leçons du second Nocturne, dans le Bréviaire, mais un supprimant des lieux et des objets de culte évidemment inauthentiques. Le P. Ehrle sous Léon XIII a fait disparaître des “reliques” dont le culte déshonorait l’Église; et trouverait sa justification non dans l’histoire, mais dans la psychanalyse. Plus récemment Mgr Salège a fait supprimer, du propre de son diocèse, bon nombre de vénérations non suffisamment fondées.

Il ne faudrait pas refuser aux savants l’autorisation d’analyser chimiquement une partie du sang de saint Janvier et du “Saint Suaire.” “Quelques points qui semblent urgents” NV 1993/4, p. 301.

a theologian of the Church. He was also "profoundly formed by frequent reading of Pascal; he cites him constantly in his books, and more than any other French classic [author]; he knew by heart, in the truest sense of the phrase, the culminating passages, and especially his 'Mystère de Jesus.'”¹⁹

Most importantly for his later work, he began studying St. Thomas Aquinas. One of his fellow students recalls, "Very early in the morning, a half-hour ahead of schedule, he would get up. When we arrived in the study hall you would find his face buried in the Summa of St. Thomas.”²⁰

It is well that Joumet chose to get his St. Thomas directly, since the Grand Séminaire in Fribourg in his day offered its students “St. Thomas formulated by Fr. Sertillange or Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange,” according to Maurice Zundel, ordained two years after Joumet.²¹ Cottier sees Marin-Sola, Garrigou-Lagrange, and Maritain as the masters of Joumet's thought, at least in Thomism.²² It is worth noting that Joumet knew all three of these men personally.

There is a deeper, more spiritual dimension to Joumet's theological style:

In writing his Introduction à la Théologie, the future cardinal posed this question: “When the theologian is in the presence of a word of God, has he the right to do anything other than to burn with love for it?” He would reply “yes,” because theology is necessary in the Church. Later, more and more, he would demand that the Wisdom of the saints; i.e., the wisdom of those who allowed themselves to burn with love for the truths of the faith, should penetrate even into the theological act. Not only as a pious corollary but, once again, as a requirement. For he was convinced that, in order to have an in-depth grasp of

¹⁹"Itinéraire...”, p. 53.
²⁰Emonet, p. 22.
²¹Itinéraire...”, p. 55.
²²Ibid.
the principles of his own wisdom, the theologian had to humbly study at the school of those who “suffered” and “experienced” divinely revealed truths. Just as Joumêt was willing to go beyond the manuals of scholastic theology to study the teaching of Aquinas at first hand, so he went beyond books to sit humbly at the feet of the saints. His own spiritual life was an inspiration to many. He lived a life of simplicity and poverty, “like a Carthusian in the world,” while carrying out an intense apostolate. Almost every day, when he was in Fribourg, he would climb up to the Marian shrine of Bourgillon to say his Rosary. His simplicity is also evidenced by his ability to speak to children, and in the little catechetical books he wrote for their instruction.

Shortly before his death, Joumêt wrote a “spiritual testament,” dated Easter 1975, 23


25 Among these the Petit catéchisme de la Sainte Vierge.
which expresses the spiritual values he held most dear.

Here is my testament.
- He has filled me with His Love and with His Love for His Church.
- He has never allowed me to lose the faith of my Baptism, 84 years ago, in Sacred Heart Church in Geneva.
- He attended me to wash me in the blood of His Eucharist.
- He came into my presence through the most extraordinary and deeply moving friendships.

Al nome di Gesù Cristo e di Maria dolce.²⁶

Here we see in Journet’s own spirituality elements that will be fundamental to his theology: the primacy of God’s love which wills to save the world through the Church, the gift of the Eucharist, the influence of friends, and the presence of Mary.

Journet’s spirituality was marked by trust in and abandonment to the love of God.²⁷

“Only an abandonment which is ever more complete and extensive will save us in all the moments of our life... (F)aith is not found in an impression made by evidence, but in the deep good will that clings to God, submitting itself to Him like a blind man abandoning himself to one who leads him by the hand... Throw yourself into God as if into a sea.”²⁸

²⁶Voici mon testament.
- Il m’a envahi de son Amour et de son amour pour son Église. Par elle, il m’a tout donné.
- Il n’a pas permis que je perde jamais la foi de mon Baptême, il y a 84 ans, au Sacré-Cœur de Genève.
- Il est venu au-devant de moi par les plus extraordinaires et le plus bouleversantes des amitiés.

Al nome di Gesù Cristo e di Maria dolce.


²⁷An overview of his spiritual teaching may be found in Marie-Joseph Nicolas, O.P. “Comme une flèche de feu. La doctrine spirituelle du cardinal Journet.” NV 1991/4, pp. 159-171. Hereafter “Comme un flèche...”

²⁸C’est un abandon toujours plus total et plus étendu qui seul nous sauvera en tous les moments de notre vie... (L)a foi n’est pas dans une impression d’évidence, elle est dans la bonne volonté profonde d’adhérer à Dieu, de se soumettre à Lui comme l’aveugle s’abandonne à celui qui le conduit par la main... Jetez-vous en Dieu comme à la mer. “Comme un flèche...” p. 160.
It was this deep mystical faith that enabled him to love the Church, after the example of St. Catherine of Siena.

No one ever saw the wretchedness of the people of the Church as clearly as Catherine of Siena: “daemoni incarnati,” she would say in reference to certain priests. And no one ever loved the Church as much as she did. It is enough for you to know that the Church is torn by its own children so that you might love it even more.29

The Church, Journet would say, is found in its fullest realization in the Virgin Mary. His great chapter on Mary in EVI is called “the Virgin Mary at the heart of the Church.” For him, Mary is also at the heart of the spiritual life, especially for priests: “Mary supports the apostolic Church by her silent contemplation, for she is the living presence hidden within the ministry of the priest.”30 Not just priests, but all members of the Church participate, through their spiritual life, in the coredeemptive activity of the Church. This outlook informed Journet’s spirituality of the Cross: “The sacrifice of the Cross does not work without the participation of humanity... Thus humanity, in each of its stages, constitutes the Church which is the Body of Christ, and the Cross is the tree where the human offering of all time is changed into blood.”31 In becoming the Church, humanity becomes coredeemptive.32 When the members of the Mystical Body sense their inadequacy to participate in the Church’s coredeemptive task, Journet reminds them, “What we can not do, what we will not do, what we can no longer do, because we have said, ‘et

31 Le sacrifice de la Croix ne va pas sans participation de l’humanité... Ainsi l’humanité constitue à chacune de ses étapes l’Eglise qui est le Corps du Christ, et la Croix est l’arbre où se change en sang l’offrande humain de tous les temps. “Comme un flèche...” p. 168.
32 “Comme un flèche...” p. 168.
in hora mortis nostrae,' the Virgin Mary will do."33

The Virgin Mary has a central place in the contemplative life as well. Joumet recommended that Christians imitate the faith of Mary, who consented to God's will as expressed both at the Annunciation and at Calvary. Her consent was given within the night of faith; that is, she knew what was happening in the "superconscious" of her soul, but only later would she be able to explain it in concepts. It is in the night of faith that one attaches one's self to the absolute of God. That is why Joumet would say, "Try to contemplate the mysteries of the Gospel with the Virgin's eyes."34

Just as Joumet could say "L'Eglise du Christ tout entière est mariale," so those who knew him best could say, "Le Cardinal Joumet était une âme mariale."35

---

33 Ce que nous ne pouvons pas faire, ce que nous ne ferons pas, ce que nous ne pourrons plus faire, parce que nous aurons dit: "et in hora mortis nostrae," la Vierge Marie le fera. "Comme un flèche..." p. 169.


35 "L'œuvre...", p. 257.
CHAPTER TWO
THE PLACE OF THE VIRGIN MARY IN JOURNET’S WRITINGS

We have referred to the centrality of the Virgin Mary in Journet’s spiritual life. Now we wish to show the important place he accorded her in his theological work. The closest Journet came to writing a separate treatise on Mariology was his Esquisse du développement du dogme marial (EDDM, 1954). The definitive statement of his Marian doctrine, however, is to be found in volume two of l’Église du Verbe Incarné (EVI, II, 1951). Also, the Virgin Mary appears in several other books and articles, usually, though not always, in an ecclesiological context.

Although in this chapter we intend to make a more or less chronological survey of his writings with Mariological relevance, this should not be understood as an attempt to trace the “evolution” of Journet’s Marian doctrine. To the contrary, his Marian doctrine remains remarkably consistent over nearly fifty years of writing. One rarely finds a reversal or correction of an earlier position, but one often finds an exact repetition of vocabulary and even of entire paragraphs. This repetition is characteristic of his theological work in general.

The first locus theologicus to be examined is the periodical Nova et Vetera (1926 - ). As noted in the previous chapter, many articles that first appeared in Nova et Vetera eventually became part of EVI. Among those articles pertinent to this thesis, we note the following: “Du problème de la sainteté de l’Eglise au problème de la nature de l’Eglise.” NV 1 (1934) pp. 27-32; “La Vierge est au cœur de l’Eglise.” NV 25 (1950) pp. 39-95. Parts of these were incorporated into EVI, II (1951). Two articles from Revue Thomiste should also be noted: “Nature du Corps de l’Eglise.” RThom 49 (1949) pp. 122-205; “Note sur l’Eglise sans tache ni

1934 saw the publication of a devotional work on Our Lady: Notre-Dame des sept douleurs (NDSD). As the earliest Marian book by Journet, NDSD commands our interest. As we are primarily concerned with Journet’s theological doctrine, we look in NDSD for signs of continuity or discontinuity with his later work in EVI. There are two “theological” items to notice in NDSD; first, that it is primarily about Mary’s love for her Son, which becomes compassion and makes her Coredémptrix (passim, esp. Appendix II); second, the idea that Mary’s life entered a new phase at the death of Christ, when the public life of the Church began to emerge (ch. 3, the Seventh Sorrow). These same two ideas are found in EVI in a much-expanded form; the essential theological content is continuous. NDSD also comments on the Sorrows of Mary in the Liturgy, and describes artist’s depictions of the “Swoon” of Mary.

Three years later, Journet published a Marian catechism for the children of the Canton of Geneva: Petit catéchisme de la Sainte Vierge (PC). This little book (37 pp.) was reprinted

---

1See EVI, I, “Introduction.”

2Comprising: A retreat on the Virgin preached in 1951, the introduction to his Petit catéchisme de la Sainte Vierge, and two conferences from a retreat preached to the priests of the diocese of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg during their annual retreat at the Salesianum in Fribourg, 1974. This text recalls many of the fundamental tenets of Journet’s Mariological doctrine, and gives some beautiful points for meditation on the Christian life in general and the ministry of priests in particular.
without substantial change in 1951. A new edition with a new introduction was published in 1968. The contents reflect Joumet's special concerns; e.g., The divine maternity is the cause of all of Mary's privileges, Mary is the worthy Mother of God, the link between Cana and Calvary, the Woman of Rev 12, the Assumption as anticipation of the collective eschatological destiny of the Church, coredemption of Mary and of individual Christians, etc.

For a full-blown doctrinal statement of Mariology, we must turn to EVI, the definitive treasury of Joumet's ecclesiology. Originally four volumes were projected, but only three have been published. Volume one treats the apostolic hierarchy, the immediate efficient cause of the Church; it also discusses apostolicity as one of the notes of the Church. Volume two studies the internal structure of the Church and the catholic unity of the Church. The Church is shown to be composed of an invisible spiritual element and a visible material element. The former is the formal cause or soul of the Church; the latter is the material cause or body of the Church. Also, volume two contains most of the Marian material, under the heading “La Vierge est au cœur de l'Église.” Volume three is actually part one of what was supposed to be volume four. Titled “Essai de théologie de l'histoire du salut,” it looks at what the Church was in is preparation, before the Incarnation, and at what it will be in its consummation, in purgatory and in heaven. The projected third volume would have treated the final cause of the Church; namely, God, the Church's goal. It is the Church's duty to reflect and to be the dwelling place of the holiness of God.\(^3\) Together with EDDM, EVI contains the bulk of Joumet's Mariology.

The different editions of volumes one and two call for a brief comment. The plates for volume one, which first appeared in 1941, were a casualty of the Second World War. This gave

\(^3\)A fragment of this unfinished volume was published in 1985: “La cause final et la sainteté de l'Eglise.” NV 60 (1985) pp. 185-216.
Journet the opportunity to make “numerous improvements” and to add two *excursus* in the 1954 edition. Neither *excursus* has Mariological relevance. A third edition, in 1962, was augmented by two appendices (*Annexes*) treating Church-state relations and questions of hierarchical powers. Volume two first appeared in 1951; a second revised and enlarged edition was published in 1962. Journet notes two important improvements to the text of the first edition. The first concerns religious deviations such as heresy and schism; the second concerns Islam, which Journet calls a semi-dissidence from Christianity. As far as we have been able to determine, there is no evolution or change in the Marian theology of EVI from one edition to the next.

While Journet’s writings do not evidence dramatic development, he was aware of the drama of the development of dogma. He had studied under the Spanish Dominican, Francisco Marin-Sola, whose *L'évolution homogène du dogme* decisively shaped his own thought on the matter. EDDM came about as a response to the centenary of the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception, and to the recent (1950) dogmatic definition of the Assumption. Naturally, these two dogmas are thoroughly discussed in this work. It contains a review of Journet’s opinions on the development of dogma in general, and on the relation between Ecclesiology and Mariology. It also offers valuable insights into his method of Biblical exegesis.

Sometimes the Virgin Mary will surface in the midst of a book of a different theme.

---


This definition occasioned *La définition solennelle de l'Assomption de la Vierge* (1950, 1965 (revised and enlarged)), a brief popular résumé of his thought on this dogma and its development.
Such is the case with *Entretiens sur la grâce* (1959). This book, which originated as a series of retreat talks, repeats his teaching that Mary condenses in herself an entire age of the Church (the age of Christ’s incarnate presence). *Le mal* (1960), a theological essay properly speaking, contains a few brief mentions of Our Lady; one page speaks of “a faith illuminated by wisdom (as) the only light which allows the mind to plumb the depths of evil without foundering.” An example of this is the Blessed Virgin coming to terms with the suffering entailed by her acceptance of the Angel’s message at the Annunciation. The passage reads like a brief summation of *Notre-Dame des sept douleurs*, including the reference to the Quattrocento paintings of Mary’s swoon. A smaller book, *La Messe, présence du sacrifice de la Croix* (1957), contains some remarks that reinforce his teaching on coredemptive mediation.

This brief survey has familiarized us with the terrain to be covered; now it is time to scout out the territory. The next chapter will look what Joumet has to say about Mary’s life and person, preparatory to an in-depth look at the meaning of her life and the role she plays in our own lives.

---

CHAPTER THREE
MARY'S LIFE AND KNOWLEDGE

Joumet’s primary interest is in the Virgin’s place in the Church and in salvation history, but he is also deeply interested in her as a person. Before plunging into the depths of Joumet’s theological speculation, we first look at his understanding of the Virgin’s life and person, giving a biographical sketch of the Virgin. Also, we wish to inquire into Joumet’s opinions concerning her own personal knowledge of the momentous events in her life and in the life of her Son. This will lead to his depiction of the Holy Family as the “Church of the New Law,” which in turn introduces some of the leading themes of his Ecclesiology.

Our main sources will be the *Petit catéchisme de la Sainte Vierge* (PC), and the article “La Vierge Marie et l’Église,”¹ along with the *Esquisse du développement du dogme marial*.

Mary’s Life

Joumet discusses all the episodes in Mary’s life mentioned by the canonical Gospels. Also, he uses St. Paul and the Protoevangelium of James as sources about Mary’s origins. According to Romans 1:3, Jesus was “descended from David according to the flesh.” Since Mary gave Jesus His human nature, this means that Mary was descended from David.² From non-Biblical sources, “we know that her mother was St. Ann and her father was St. Joachim, and that she was brought to the Temple in Jerusalem to be raised there.”³

²PC, q. 47.
³PC, q. 49.
The next significant moment in Mary’s life is the day of the Annunciation. When the angel Gabriel greets her with the words, “The Lord is with you,” Mary is troubled by the strangeness of the greeting. “She knew well that she was with the Lord, but she did not know how deep was the significance of that truth for her.”4 Then the angel tells her she will conceive and bear a child. She asks: how can this be, since I know not man? This shows that she has made a vow of virginity.

Moved by a desire for total and exceptional purity, the meaning of which she does not yet know, but which she feels in her heart, she had made a vow of virginity. Consequently, her alliance with Joseph was made to protect her virginity against the indiscrete entourage who could have wanted to marry her.5

As the angel explains further, Mary understands the meaning of his message.6 “The Virgin heard the greeting and asked what it meant. She is aware (lucide), with a complete alertness (tension) of understanding and soul.”7

Saint Augustine...speaks of “multiloquium,” the tumult of thoughts that always dwell in him...We are filled with this multiloquium. [By contrast.] “the Virgin Mary has only one word to say. It will be the most beautiful YES that earth has ever spoken to heaven. St. Thomas Aquinas states: she pronounces it in the name of all humanity...This “yes” sums up the whole acquiescence of earth to the invitation of heaven: ‘Behold the handmaid of the Lord.’ Ecce Ancilla Domini.8

---

4Elle savait bien qu’elle était avec le Seigneur, mais elle ne savait pas jusqu’à quelle profondeur cela pût être vrai. VME, p. 4.

5Poussée par un désir de totale et exceptionnelle pureté, dont elle ne sait pas encore la signification, mais qu’elle sent en elle, elle avait fait vœu de virginité. Par conséquent, son alliance avec Joseph n’était là que pour protéger sa virginité contre l’entourage indiscret qui pourrait vouloir la marier. VME, p. 5.

6PC, q. 13.

7La Vierge a donc écouté et elle a demandé ce que signifiait cette salutation. Elle est lucide, avec une tension de l’intelligence et de l’âme toute entière. VME, p. 6.

8Saint Augustin... parle du “multiloquium”, du tumulte des pensées qui habite toujours en lui... nous sommes remplis de ce “multiloquium”... La Vierge Marie n’a qu’un mot à dire. Il sera la plus beau OUI que la terre ait jamais dit au ciel. Saint Thomas d’Aquin affirmera: elle le prononce au nom de l’humanité toute entière... Ce oui
She freely and fully consented to what God expected of her. The account of the Annunciation indicates how God addresses Mary with great delicacy, respect, courtesy and love.

Joseph’s reaction indicates an awareness of the mystery at hand:

When Joseph learns that she has conceived a child, a great disquiet is born in him. Why? He understands that the child who is coming belongs to another world. He feels unworthy to be the one who will give his name and ancestry to the Child. So he wants to withdraw. But the angel tells him: you must be there, and it will also be you who will give the child the name JESUS.

From this interpretation we may safely assume that Journet would not support a translation such as that of the New American Bible: “Joseph...decided to divorce her quietly.”

Mary conceived and gave birth to Jesus as a virgin. She had no other children. In the Gospel, the phrase “brothers and sisters of Jesus” refers to cousins and relatives of Jesus.

Mary’s virginity is the seal of her total consecration to God. She not only received a revelation of it, but (also) it was in the knowledge of her whole being that she trembled inwardly with the knowledge of her bodily virginity, ante, in et post partum.

At the Visitation, Elizabeth shows that she, too, is aware of how greatly God loves...
Mary, Elizabeth knows that the Virgin was full of holiness. “She tells Mary that she is blessed among all women, that she is the Mother of the Lord, and that she is blessed for believing the Angel (Lk 1:42-45).”\(^{14}\) The Magnificat expresses Mary’s awareness of how much God loved her.\(^{15}\)

Moving to the public ministry of Jesus, we find Mary at Cana and Calvary. In asking for the miracle at Cana, the Virgin did not act indiscreetly. Rather, “Jesus heard her request, and advanced the hour of His manifestation for her sake.” His response to her (Jn 2:4) means, “Woman, these things have very little importance! My hour to manifest myself and to perform a miracle has not yet come. Nevertheless, I will grant your request.”\(^{16}\)

Jesus addressed His Mother solemnly as “Woman” on two occasions: Cana and Calvary. In each case “He was going to act externally in the fulness of His Divine power.”\(^{17}\)

At Calvary, Mary “prayed that the sacrifice of Jesus would bring grace to all men.”\(^{18}\)

Journet comments on the so-called “hard sayings” of the Gospels (Mk 3:20, -31-35; Lk 14:26; Lk 11:27-28). These apparent “challenges (défis), far from representing a rejection of Mary or a lowering of her status, serve to raise our level of understanding.\(^{19}\)

Mary’s role was not public like that of the Apostles. Her role was “to watch over the hidden life of Jesus and to accompany Him at His death. Then to pray and suffer in silence for

\(^{14}\)PC, q. 20.

\(^{15}\)PC, q. 10.

\(^{16}\)PC, q. 23.

\(^{17}\)PC, q. 24.

\(^{18}\)PC, q. 40.

\(^{19}\)This matter will be fully discussed in Chapter Nine (The Development of Marian Dogmas).
the Church: this is a hidden role.”20 At Pentecost, her role is contrasted with that of the 
Apostles. For the Apostles, Pentecost is a baptism in the Spirit which gives them the power to 
witness to Christ to the ends of the earth, to found the universal Church. It is a beginning. For 
Mary, Pentecost is not a beginning, but the term of her earthly mission, the signal that her 
departure from this earth draws near.21

Mary died, but her body did not decompose. “Jesus raised it up and took it to heaven on 
the day of the Assumption.”22

Mary’s Knowledge

We have seen above that Mary responds to God’s invitation with understanding and 
freedom. But the knowledge she has of the Divine intervention in her life is distinct from her 
knowledge of everyday things. Journet uses the word “supraconscious” to describe a non-
conceptual or supra-conceptual awareness:

At the moment the Incarnation takes place, the Virgin knows what is 
happening. She knows it with an absolute and non-conceptual certainty...This is 
not a question of speaking conceptually about the two natures in Jesus, [etc.] 
...The Virgin has an absolute certainty that transcends everything in the 
supraconscious of her being...Certain learned men tell us of how a discovery 
came to them after a search of many years, during which they have been led on 
in a certain direction of light, as if in a great luminous fog. At a given moment, 
all at once, they see the light. From the supraconscious it has descended into the 
conscious mind. The same thing happened to the Virgin at the Annunciation.23

20pC, q. 59.

21EVI, II, p. 442. Journet’s thoughts on Mary at the Pentecost are laid out fully in Chapter Eight (Mary in the 
times of the Church).

22pC, q. 31.

23Au moment où s'accomplit l'Incarnation, la Vierge sait de quoi il s'agit. Elle se sait d'une certitude 
absolue et non pas conceptuelle.
This "non-conceptual" knowledge extends to specific privileges:

At the moment of the Incarnation, I am convinced that the Virgin Mary was aware of her Immaculate Conception. She had been prepared for her task, so that there was in her no imprint of the original sin from which she had been preserved. The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was like the first stage of her union with the divine purity, a union which would reach its peak in the Incarnation.24

The "supraconscious" knowledge of what is happening may eventually be put into words:

The Virgin Mary knows it all from the beginning; there was never the shadow of a doubt. But this certainty had to be made explicit little by little before it could reach her knowledge. She could have expressed it herself in concepts, interiorly, and she could have had her Son formulate them for her.25 This does not mean that everything is immediately clear to her. For example, when Mary and Joseph found Jesus in the Temple, "they did not yet understand how or why their hearts had been broken by the demands of their Son's Divine mission."26 Jesus Himself may have made some things explicit for her:

It is reasonable to think that Jesus, from the moment when He was found among the doctors [in the Temple] —and especially later, as an adult—progressively revealed to Mary and Joseph all the mysteries of God that...
He had come to accomplish. Given their immense love for each other, how could He have not communicated first to them what He would later hand on to the apostles and to all men? Without a doubt, Mary, in one sense, already knew everything; I would say that she knew it in the supraconscious of her soul. The illumination produced by the angel’s words made clear to her all the mysteries of salvation and, above all, the fact that the child she had conceived was the incarnate God. But all of this knowledge remained supraconscious, preconceptual or rather supraconceptual...All that she knew with clarity on the day of the Annunciation, all that she could have said in interior concepts, was that she, by a miracle of the Almighty, would give birth to the Savior of Israel, whose kingdom would have no end, whose arrival on earth would turn all human values upside-down, cast down the mighty, and raise up the lowly. Is this not what we find in an attentive reading of the Magnificat, the imagery of which is saturated with the Hebrew environment, as are all the memories of the Virgin Mary?27

Eventually, she will put her experience into words that will be preserved in the Gospel accounts:

In retrospect, the Virgin Mary understands everything. Let us return to a very concrete question, the virginity of Mary. She conceives as a virgin. Virginity ante partum, in partu and post partum. We could not have known this reality except through a confidence from the Virgin Mary. The whole infancy narrative, in the Gospel of St. Luke, comes from reminiscences of the people who knew John the Baptist and the Virgin Mary. 28

Another example of the “darkness” of Mary’s knowledge is the Finding in the Temple.

---

27Il est donc raisonnable de penser qu’à partir du moment où il a été retrouvé parmi les docteurs - et surtout plus tard, adulte - Jésus a révélé progressivement, à Marie et à Joseph, tous les mystères de Dieu qu’il était venu accomplir. Étant donné leur immense amour mutuel, comment aurait-il pu ne pas leur communiquer à eux d’abord ce qu’il devait transmettre aux apôtres et à tous les hommes? Sans doute, Marie, en un sens, savait déjà tout; je vexe dire qu’elle se savait dans le supraconscient de son âme. L’illumination produite par les paroles de l’ange au moment de l’Annonciation lui avait fait connaître en un éclair tous les mystères du salut et, avant tout, le fait que l’enfant conçu par elle était le Dieu incarné. Mais tout cette connaissance restait supraconsciente, préconceptuelle ou plutôt, supraconceptuelle... Ce qu’elle a su en toute clarté le jour de l’Annonciation, ce qu’elle pouvait se dire en des concepts interieurs, c’était seulement que, par un miracle du Tout-Puissant, elle enfantierait le Sauveur d’Israël dont le règne durerait sans fin; celui dont l’arrivée ici-bas renverserait toutes les valeurs humaines, déposerait les puissants, exalterait les humbles. N’est-ce pas ce qui nous apparaît à la lecture attentive du Magnificat dont l’imagierie est imprégnée de l’ambiance hébraique, comme le sont tous les souvenirs de la Vierge Marie? VME, p. 9.

The evangelist reports the words of the twelve-year old Jesus in the Temple, “Why were you seeking me? Did you not know that I must be about my Father’s business? (Lk 2:49)” Then he adds: “And they did not understand the word He said to them.” Journet explains in what sense this misunderstanding is to be understood:

His Mother is not ignorant of the fact that He had to be about His Father’s business; the angel had told her that He would be Son of the Most High that He would rule over the house of Jacob for all ages (Lk 1:32-33). Simeon had added that He would be the glory of Israel and the light of the nations (Lk 2:32). How would she have forgotten that He was more the Son of God than He was a Son to her? But only obscurely did she foresee the demands of the mission that would make her the Mother of a Savior God. Why, in order to be about His Father’s business, would He separate her from Himself? Why would He occupy Himself without her? Then she knew a mysterious trial, a most sorrowful night. It was necessary that she should be separated from Him. It was a little like the time when He Himself will be separated from His Father, when He will cry out: “My God, my God, why have you abandoned me? (Mk 15:34)”

The Holy Family

For Journet, the Holy Family sums up his teaching on the Church. He calls the Holy Family “the Church of the New Law.”

One can suppose that during a visit to Nazareth, Jesus confided to His two well-beloved [Mary and Joseph], by some sweet and sublime initiation in which He spoke from the abundance of His heart, without need of figures or parables, the secrets of the uncreated Life and of the Redemption. Then, Mary recognized, in wondering contemplation, what she had already known in the heights of the supraconscious of her soul, but which remained hidden from her conscious thought.

---

29Sa Mère n’ignorait pas qu’il devait être aux choses de son Père: l’Ange lui avait annoncé qu’il serait le Fils du Très-Haut et qu’il régnerait sur la maison de Jacob pour les siècles (l, 32-33). Siméon avait ajouté qu’il serait la gloire d’Israël et la lumière des nations (11, 32). Comment aurait-elle oublié qu’il était plus le Fils de Dieu que son Fils à elle? Mais elle n’entrevoit alors qu’obscurement les exigences de la mission qui fera d’elle la mère d’un Dieu Sauveur. Pourquoi, pour être aux choses de son Père, voudra-t-il la détacher ainsi de lui? Pourquoi voudra-t-il s’en occuper sans elle? Elle connaissait alors une épreuve mystérieuse, une nuit très douloreuse. Il faudra qu’elle soit séparée de lui; un peu comme il sera lui-même séparé de son Père, quand il s’écriera: “Mon Dieu, mon Dieu, pourquoi t’as-tu abandonné?” (Marc, xv, 34). EDDM, p. 87.

30VME, p. 9.
Thus, at Nazareth, Jesus, remaining Himself in a life of manual labor and mystic contemplation...was the illuminator and sanctifier of Mary and Joseph. They were the first to receive the Gospel with a matchless fulness. The Holy Family, throughout the hidden life, appeared as the Church of the New Law concentrated in three persons. This is what makes us consider the Holy Family as something infinitely higher than a simple example of domestic virtues...it was a Church sine macula, sine ruga, not only in its essential life, but also in the individual conduct of its members, even given the inequality of their degrees of perfection and holiness. One, truly, was the Word Incarnate Himself, Comprehensor et Viator. He possessed at once the beatific vision in the summit of His soul, while remaining vulnerable in the lower regions of His being. ...The second was the Théotokos, immaculate in her conception, pure creature, but who as it were touches the limits of divinity. The third did not have this unique privilege, but he remains the first and greatest saint of the new Law among those who share the human condition. This Church of the New Law took shape in the womb of the old Law like a seed, in a secret and hidden fashion, as a child takes shape in the womb of his mother before he comes to light. There is then a regime of the new Law which commenced, even as the regime of the old Law continued for all the other Jews. 31

The following chapters will show how strict are the parallels between this description of the Holy Family and Jourmet’s doctrine of the Church.

This brief exposé has revealed to us something of Jourmet’s approach to the data of

31 On peut penser qu‘une fois de retour à Nazareth, Jésus a confié à ses deux bien-aimés, par quelque sublime et douce initiation où il parlait de l’abondance du cœur, sans besoin de figures ni de paraboles, les secrets de la Vie incrée et ceux de la Redemption. Alors, Marie reconnaissait, dans une contemplation émerveillée, ce qu’elle savait déjà dans les hauteurs du supraconscient de son âme, mais qui restait caché à sa pensée consciente.

Ainsi, à Nazareth, Jésus, tout en menant lui-même une vie de travail manuel et de contemplation mystique... a été l’illuminateur et le sanctificateur de Marie et de Joseph. C’est d’abord eux qui ont reçu l’Evangile avec une piété indépassable. La Sainte Famille, pendant toute la vie cachée, apparaît comme l’Eglise de la Loi Nouvelle concentrée en trois personnes. C’est ce qui nous fait considérer la Sainte Famille comme quelque chose d’infiniment plus élevé qu’un simple exemple des vertus domestiques ainsi que la présente tout à fait légitimement Léon XIII. C’était une Eglise sine macula, sine ruga, non seulement dans sa vie essentielle, mais dans le comportement individuel de ses membres, si inégaux que fussent leurs degrés de perfection et de sainteté. L’un, en effet, était le Verbe Incarné lui-même, Comprehensor et Viator. Il possédait à la fois la vision béatifique dans le sommet de son âme tout en demeurant vulnérable dans les régions intérieures de son être... L’autre était la Théotokos, immaculée dès sa conception, pure créature, mais qui touche comme aux confins de la divinité. Le troisième n’avait pas ce privilège unique, mais il reste le premier et le plus grand saint de la Loi nouvelle parmi ceux qui partagent la condition humaine. Cette Eglise de la Loi nouvelle a pris forme au sein de la Loi ancienne à la manière d’un germe, d’une façon secrète et cachée, un peu comme, avant de naître au dehors, un enfant prend forme dans le sein de sa mère. Il y avait donc un régime de la Loi nouvelle qui commençait, tandis que le régime de la Loi ancienne continuait pour tous les autres juifs. VME, pp. 9-10.
Sacred Scripture and the mysteries of the faith in general. While taking the scriptural narrative as essentially historical, he does not stop at a bare, phenomenological understanding, but delves more deeply into the matter at hand, examining it with the eyes of faith to find the higher, spiritual lessons that lie behind the Gospel narratives.

Mary is seen as having a fairly complete knowledge of what is happening to her, but she does not possess the beatific vision in this life. Nonetheless, because her union with God is more intense than that of any other human creature, she has a supraconscious awareness of the divine mysteries of her Son’s life.
CHAPTER FOUR
JOURNET'S FUNDAMENTAL ECCLESIOLOGICAL
AND MARIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

In this chapter we intend to set forth the fundamental theological principles on which Journet’s Mariology is based. It will be seen that the fundamental ideas that generate his Marian doctrine are also the basic ideas of his ecclesiology. This is one of the most original aspects of his highly original work.

Journet’s theology is markedly Neo-Thomistic, in the words of Congar:

...a theology without compromise, depending with confidence on categories of rational analysis. This neatly intellectual and conceptual character is balanced internally by an intense spiritual life and a contact with mystics and spiritual writers. Charles Journet is, in that regard, of the same family as Maritain with whom he is closely associated in friendship and in thought. Journet’s ecclesiology can be characterized as an effort, often powerful, to manifest the divine causes and the supernatural depth of the visible institution of the Church.¹

Journet himself put it this way:

We have placed ourselves in the line of doctrine arising from Scripture, passing through the Greek and Latin Fathers, the medieval and baroque theologians, trying...to put ourselves in the same light that overflowed out of St. John and St. Paul, which has never ceased to shine in the Church, and which finds its abiding-place in St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. John of the Cross.²

Journet also takes into account the sensus fidelium and the pronouncements of the


²Nous nous sommes mis dans l'axe de la doctrine sortie de l'Écriture, passant par les pères grecs et latins, les Théologiens médiévaux et baroques, essayant pour la livre de nous cacher dans la lumière qui d'abrode de saint Jean et de saint Paul, qui ne cesse jamais dans l'Église et qui trouve ses reposoirs en saint Augustin, en saint Thomas d'Aquin, en saint Jean de la Croix. EVI, II, p. xlvi.
Magisterium.³

We have already described Joumet's clear vision of the all-pure Church, *sine macula et ruga* (to use one of his favorite phrases), that stands at the heart of his Ecclesiology (see Chapter One). Now is the time to offer a short description of his Ecclesiology, highlighting the thematics that trigger his Mariology. After that we will present what he considers the fundamental principles of Mariology.

**Fundamental Ecclesiological Principles**

Yves Congar called Joumet's work the most profound dogmatic work in Ecclesiology of the first half of the twentieth century.⁴ Along with many other well-known theologians of that period, Joumet defines the Church above all as the Mystical Body of Christ. His greatest theological inspiration was St. Thomas Aquinas, who did not write a treatise on the Church. The first treatises *de Ecclesia* appeared during the Counter-Reformation, a historical situation that called for a certain kind of Ecclesiology, with an emphasis on apologetics that at times crossed over into polemics. Catholic authors such as Bellarmine focussed on the visible signs, or marks, of the *true* Church. The reality beyond the signs, the mystery of faith, was explored to a much lesser degree, if at all.

³“Journet, Charles.” *Marienlexikon* (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1988-).
⁴“The dogmatic work in ecclesiology which is the most profound has been that of Charles Journet, still incomplete. This theologian assumes the medieval stance, even that of the Counter-Reformation and of the nineteenth century, with regards to the visibility and the hierarchical structure of the Church-Society..., but to all of this he gives a foundation properly *theological* and a spiritual depth using the teaching of the great Thomists on Trinity, grace, and charity.” Yves Congar, *L’Eglise de Saint Augustin à l’époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970), p. 464. Quoted in Thomas F. O'Meara, O.P., “The Teaching Office of Bishops in the Ecclesiology of Charles Journet.” *The Jurist* 49 (1989), p. 23.
The renewal of Ecclesiology began with the appearance, in 1825, of Johann Adam Möhler’s *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, which exhibited a more “mysterious” outlook on the theology of the Church.⁵ Möhler considered the visible aspect of the Church as the exterior manifestation of an invisible spiritual principle; namely, charity. This represented a shift from looking at the Church as miraculous institution to a vision of the Church as a mystery of love. Joumet credits Möhler with rediscovering the Pauline concept of the Church. In 1865, Matthias Joseph Scheeben published his *Mysterien des Christentums*, in which he “developed the notion of a maternity of grace in and through the sacramental economy of the Church, which would find a place of honor in *L’Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, as well as in the article commissioned from Joumet for the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* in 1960.”⁶

Vatican Council I also led late nineteenth-century theologians to affirm the hierarchical structure of the Church. Theologians of this time who influenced Joumet include Palmieri, Franzelin, and Dom Adrien Grèa.

The single book that had the greatest influence of Joumet’s thought and career was Humbert Clérissac’s *Le mystère de l’Eglise*. Left unfinished at the author’s death, the book was edited by Jacques Maritain and published in 1918.⁷ Clérissac offers a “profound, contemplative

---


⁶L’auteur y développe la notion d’une maternité de grâce à travers l’économie sacramentelle de l’Église, qui se trouvera en bonne place dans L’Eglise du Verbe Incarné, ainsi que dans l’article demandé à Joumet par le Dictionnaire de Spiritualité en 1960. Ibid.

⁷This helped begin the correspondence between Joumet and Maritain, which continued until the latter’s death. Joumet’s first letter to Maritain thanks him for his introduction to Clérissac’s book: *Voici longtemps que j’aime vos écrits, à cause de l’amour de la vérité que j’y sens, et de cette sagesse surnaturelle dont vous parlez si bien. Je prends prétexde ce petit article pour vous en remercier, pour vous remercier en particulier de*
vision of the theology and liturgy of the Church.” While *Le mystère de l’Église* is not a complete treatise of Ecclesiology, Journet recognized in it a key to approaching the theology of the Church,⁸ so that he credited Clerissac, along with St. Catherine of Siena and Dante, with giving him his “vocation” as a theologian of the Church.⁹ When he began his great treatise on the Church, Journet sought to carry on the rediscovery of the Church as mystery, without neglecting the hierarchy and the marks of the Church. He wanted to avoid the error of distinguishing between the juridical Church and the Church of charity.¹⁰

In what follows we do not attempt anything like a summary of Journet’s vast ecclesiological vision. Instead, we confine ourselves to a basic outline of his fundamental ecclesiological principles, selecting specific key ideas on which his Marian doctrine is based.

There are, said Journet, three ways of looking at the Church. The first way is superficial, as exemplified by the “history of religions” school. The Church is seen as one religion among many. The second way goes deeper, recognizing the signs of the Catholic Church: its constancy, unity, catholicity, holiness, and apostolicity. The third way, Journet’s way, he calls the viewpoint of faith. The Church is seen in its mystery, its deep reality, as the Body of Christ, indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

---


¹⁰EVI, I, p. xii.
First of all, the Church is the outpouring or expansion of the Incarnation, and this is what we mean by the Mystical Body of Christ. The tie that binds the Church to the incarnate Word can be understood in three ways. First, nuptially. To say that the Church is the body of Christ, is to say that it is the bride of Christ-God, or the Bride of the incarnate Word. This way of opposing Christ and the Church will be very important for Journet’s Mariology. Second, biologically. To say that the Church is the body of Christ is to say that the Church resembles Christ-God, conforms to Him. Third, personally. To describe the Church as the Body of Christ is to describe it as an outpouring of Christ-God, in the celebrated words of Bossuet, whom Journet loved to quote: “Jesus Christ spread out and communicated.” The gratia unionis, the grace of the Incarnate Word, becomes the gratia capitis when it is communicated to the Bride.

We may call Journet’s work a “theandric” Ecclesiology, as well as a dramatic Ecclesiology, for Journet conceives of history as a great drama of salvation. The fallen world had to be restored; this could only happen through an outpouring of grace. But grace is communicated in different ways during the three great ages of the world, corresponding to the three “times of the Church.” So there is a historical aspect to Journet’s theology of the Church. He considers the Church in its preparatory state, before the coming of Christ, what it was during the time of Christ’s presence, what it is on earth now, during the age of the Holy Spirit, and what it will be in its final status, in purgatory and heaven. The double tension of conformity to the Christ of the Gospels and of eschatological fulfillment is present in the

---


13EVI, II, pp. 334-337; 616-632.
Church in every moment of its existence.\textsuperscript{14}

Joumet was “one of the rare authors of our age to risk composing an ontology of the Church.”\textsuperscript{15} Joumet organizes his ontology of the Church according to Aristotle’s four causes: efficient, formal, material, and final. To each of these, he intended to devote one volume of EVI, as follows:

1. **Efficient cause:** the apostolic hierarchy.

   The hierarchy produces the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, by its sacramental and jurisdictional power.

   The Mystical Body has two constitutive causes, namely

2. **Formal cause:** the soul which renders it spiritual;

3. **Material cause:** the body which renders it visible,

   in order to spur it on to its final goal which is

4. **Final cause:** God, or the holiness of God,

   which it is the Church’s mission to reflect and house.

The four notes of the Church correspond to the four causes; viz, apostolicity, unity, catholicity, and holiness.

Although the apostolic hierarchy is listed as the first cause of the Church, it is not the most important cause. The soul of the Church is its highest and most mysterious aspect. The uncreated soul of the Church is the Holy Spirit, who makes the riches of Christ spread


throughout the Church. The created soul of the Church is charity, more specifically charity as communicated by the incarnate Word. It is christic charity, or grace as "cultic, sacramental, and directed," that animates the Church.

The "soul" of the Church precedes its "body," but it has need of the body to make it visible. Christic charity is found in a "completed act," when it is illumined by the teaching of the Magisterium and guided by its pastoral directives, united, through the Mass, to the cultic act of the Cross, and fed by sacramental graces. The hierarchy is an instrument at the service of holiness; it does not exist for its own sake, but is ordered to communicating the holiness of charity to the world, so that the members of the Church on earth may enjoy the indwelling of the divine Persons and conformity with Christ.

To express the priority of the values of charity and holiness over the merely instrumental holiness of the hierarchy, Jourjet distinguishes the "grandeurs of holiness" from the "grandeurs of hierarchy."\footnote{This terminology was inspired by Pascal. See Abbé Emmanuel Lemière, "'Les grandeurs de hiérarchie au service des grandeurs de sainteté': Aux sources d'une principe ecolésiologique du cardinal Jourjet." NV 66 (1991), pp. 66-79.}

Fundamental Mariological Principles

The fundamental principles that shaped Jourjet's Mariology have to be extracted from the middle of his ecclesiology. As it happens, the word "middle" may be taken literally; for the very geography of L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné (EVI) indicates the centrality of Mariology for Jourjet. In the middle or second volume of EVI we find that Chapter Three is titled "The
Virgin is at the Heart of the Church.”¹⁷

The first principle of Journet’s Mariology is “Mary is the Worthy Mother of a Savior God.”

The heart of the matter is the Incarnation, which connects Christ with the Church and through the Church to all humanity. The Incarnation came about in response to the Fall. After the Fall, “the battle was not definitively lost; it will continue between the Serpent and the Woman, between his descendants and hers (Gn 3:15).”¹⁸ The Redeemer, the second Adam, the antitype, had to be of the lineage of the first Adam. He had to be our brother, and “the firstborn of many brothers (Rm 8:29).” For this reason, He had to be “born of a woman (Gal 4:4).”

Let us imagine that, after having decided upon the Incarnation, God, instead of taking from the Virgin Mary the body to which He wished to be united, had decreed that His body should be created from nothing, or decided to bring it from Heaven with Him. What would have been the consequence of such a decree?

Christ would have been a man of the same species as we are, but not of the same race; He would have been one with us in His essential likeness, but would have remained separate from us with respect to (our) historical and existential condition.¹⁹

Because Mary is our sister, Christ can be our brother, a member of the same sinful race

¹⁷La Vierge est au cœur de l’Église. EVI, II, pp. 382-453.

¹⁸Il laisse entendre, dès après la chute, que la bataille n’est pas définitivement perdue et continuera entre le Serpent et la Femme, entre la descendence de l’un et la descendence de l’autre. EVI, II, p. 383.

¹⁹Imaginons qu’après avoir décidé l’Incarnation, Dieu, au lieu de prendre de la Virgin Marie le corps auquel il voulait s’unir, ait décrété de le créer de rien, ou de l’apporter du ciel avec lui. Quelle aurait été la conséquence d’un tel décret?

Le Christ aurait été homme de même espèce que nous, mais pas de même race: il aurait été un avec nous quant à la ressemblance essentielle, mais serait resté séparé de nous quant à la condition historique et existentielle. EVI, II, pp. 382-383.
that He came to redeem. Because Christ is God, Mary is the Mother of God. Her divine maternity is her supreme privilege, the principle and explanatory cause of her other privileges.

But it is not enough to say “Mother of God.” The title must be expanded, made more specific, in order to acknowledge the redemptive purpose of the Incarnation. Considered abstractly, the concept of Incarnation does not connote the idea of Redemption. Considered concretely, however, in the light of revelation, the concept of Incarnation does connote the concept of Redemption. Scripture knows no other concept but that of Redemptive Incarnation.

We have to speak of Mary in relation to Christ. The same eternal decree of predestination that made Christ the Incarnate Son of God made Mary Mother of God. Mary, then, is the Mother of a God who is born a man to redeem men. Simply for being the Mother of the Word Incarnate, Mary deserves a special reverence, distinct from that owed to other saints. But the Word became flesh to save the world. Although His title “Son of God” precedes His title “Savior of the world,” He was predestined to be both, inseparably. Thus the

20 Journet quotes St. Athanasius: “The Word brought about the salvation of the whole man, body and soul. What He received from Mary was, according to the divine Scriptures, human, and it was, in the Savior, a true body. A true body: in other words, a body just like ours. For Mary is our sister, since we all come from Adam.” Epistola ad Epictetum, 7. PG 26, 1061.

21 Voilà toute la raison de la maternité divine de Marie, c'est-à-dire de son privilège suprême, qui sera, quand on parlera d'elle, le principe et la cause explicative de ses autres privilèges. EVI, II, p. 384.

22 EVI, II, p. 387. This point is echoed in Journet’s article, “La Rédemption, drame de l’amour de Dieu; Ce que Dieu a voulu de toute éternité, c'est l'Incarnation du Verbe en tant que rédemptrice, en tant qu’apte à racheter le monde. Si nous parlons d’Incarnation rédemptrice, c'est pour unir les deux moments d’un acte unique par lequel le Verbe sauve le monde. L’Incarnation est le principe radical de notre salut; la Rédémption en est le principe prochain. NV 48 (1973), p. 83.

23 C’est par rapport au Christ qu’il faut parler de sa Mère... EVI, II, p. 386.

Incarnation redeems Mary in a unique way:

In the case of the Virgin, one would say that she was predestined inseparably to the Divine Maternity and to the fullness of chris
toconforming grace; but first to be Mother of God, and then to be full of grace. 25

Considered abstractly, the concept “Mother of God” does not demand the presence of grace, but considered concretely, in the Gospel perspective, the concept of Mary’s Divine Maternity is identified with the concept of the “worthy Mother of a Redeemer God.” 26

Thus the concept of Theotokos, Mother of God, which Christians honor, on which the sense of the Church has depended infallibly from the beginning, and on which basis all the privileges of the Virgin and the fullness of chris
toconforming grace in her will be deduced, not by weak arguments of fittingness, but by an authentic unfolding, is not an abstract and arbitrarily circumscribed concept of divine maternity, but a concrete, existential, evangelical concept of the “worthy Mother of a Savior God.” 27

The word “worthy” acknowledges that the Divine Maternity has made Mary “full of grace.” She is no mere instrument or neutral receptacle, unchanged by the conception and birth of God’s Son in and from her flesh. Joumet clarifies his teaching on this point by first pointing out the error of the Lutheran-Calvinist doctrine of grace:

According to the Lutheran-Calvinist doctrine, man remains intrinsically a sinner, the grace of Christ the Redeemer only covers up his sin, and does not touch it except by way of extrinsic imputation; this is the principle of the Lutheran-Calvinist teaching on the Virgin and on the Church.

To replace the traditional [i.e. Catholic] concept of the effects of the

25 De la Vierge on dira pareillement qu’elle était prédestinée inseparablement à la maternité divine et à la plénitude de la grâce chris

26 EVI, II, p. 390.

27 Ainsi le concept de Théotokos, de Mère de Dieu, que vénèrent les chrétiens, sur lequel porte avec infaillibilité dès le début le sens de l’Église, et à partir duquel se déduisent, non par de fragiles arguments de conveniance, mais par un authentique déséveloppement, tous les privilèges de la Vierge, et la plénitude en elle de la grâce chris
toconformante, n’est pas un concept abstrait et arbitrairement circumscri p de la maternité divine; c’est le concept concret, existentiel, évangélique de “digne Mère d’un Dieu sauveur.” EVI, II, p. 390.
redemption and grace with the Lutheran concept is to replace Mariology and Ecclesiology that speak of a real, intrinsic, christoconforming grace with a Mariology and Ecclesiology based on a grace that is merely imputed and extrinsic. The Catholic doctrine on the Virgin and the Catholic doctrine on the Church crumble simultaneously. 28

In the light of the first principle of Mariology (the Divine Maternity), Mariology and Ecclesiology are related with respect to the redemptive Incarnation, and the spiritual motherhood of the mystical body. “The mysteries of the Incarnation and the Church are rightly understood in the light of the Marian mystery.” 29

The second principle of Journet’s Mariology has to do with the modality of Christ’s work of salvation; that is, how christoconforming grace is communicated. Salvation has two realizations: one collective, in the Church; the other personal, in the Virgin. It is in this sense that Mary will be called “prototype” of the Church.

Christ, Head of the mystical body, is the source and principle of the work of salvation. He is the Incarnate Savior God. Christ’s work of salvation has two realizations: a collective realization in the Church, and a personal realization in the Virgin Mary.

Both Mary and the Church are aspects of “the Bride.” These different aspects are revealed at different moments in salvation history. For example, when Christ was actually

28Suivant la doctrine luthéro-calvinienne, l’homme reste intrinsèquement pécheur, la grâce du Christ rédempteur ne fait que recouvrir son péché, et ne le touche par manière d’imputation extrinsèque: d’où le principe de l’enseignement luthéro-calvinien sur la Vierge et sur l’Église.

Substituer la conception luthérienne des effets de la rédemption et de la grâce, à la conception traditionnelle, c’est substituer, à la mariologie et à l’ecclesiologie de la grâce réelle, intrinsèque, christoconformante, une mariologie et une ecclesiologie de la grâce seulement imputée et extrinsèque. La doctrine catholique sur la Vierge, et la doctrine catholique sur l’Église, s’écrouleront simultanément. EVI, II, pp. 391-392; emph. in original.

29“Journet, Charles,” Marienlexikon (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1988-).
present in the world,

What was the Church then? There were no hierarchical powers, for these were all centered in Christ Himself. Jesus promised to hand them on to His apostles, but so long as He was there, no one had authority. There was the bridegroom, Christ, and the bride, His Church; and the Church at that time consisted solely of the Virgin Mary. The Church will never be holier than it was at that time, and this concentration of grace in Our Lady gave the infant Church a complexion of its own, making it a “Marial” Church.\(^{30}\)

After the Pentecost, when the hierarchy assumed its task of spreading grace through the sacraments, the Church is seen as the Bride of Christ in her collectivity. The Church is a collective person who brings together everything authentic in each of her children, but who leaves out everything sinful. The Church is sinless, but she contains sinners.\(^{31}\)

Christoconforming grace is given to restore sinful humanity to the likeness of God. Since God is all-holy, humans must be freed from sin in order to share His likeness. The Bride, then, is all-holy and stainless, *sine macula et ruga*, because Christ suffered and died for her.

The fruits of the redemption are applied to Mary before any other creature (Immaculate Conception). She receives grace before the sacramental order is established, and in a superior way. God preserves her from original sin and personal sin both, while all the other individual members of the Church will be unable to avoid all sins throughout their lives. She is the only human creature apart from Christ who will be perfectly sinless. This is why she can be called the form or prototype of the Church.

To understand Mary is to understand the Church. There is a strict parallel between the invitation to divine motherhood addressed to Mary, her response, the effects of grace in her,


\(^{31}\)Cf. EVI, II, pp. 1115-1128.
and the Church's task of spiritual motherhood, fidelity to Christ, and the perfect holiness of the
Church. To understand this is to understand that the whole Church is "Marial."

We see that when Journet calls Mary "prototype," he is not speaking in a rhetorical or
homiletic manner. The resemblance between Mary and the Church is of more than poetic
interest to him. His is an essential or ontological typology. This is in keeping with Journet's
theological temperament, which disdains "weak arguments of convenience," preferring to base
his conclusions on the rigorous logical development of principles found in the "initial revealed
deposit" of the Christian faith.  

As personal realization of the Church without spot or wrinkle, the Virgin Mary can also
be called the "mystical personality" (personnalité mystique) of the Church. The highest interior
grace of the Church has been personalized in her, so that the Church has become mariale.

In the light of the second principle of Mariology, Ecclesiology and Mariology are related
with respect to exemption from sin, participation in the life of Christ, in His passion, death,
and resurrection, His ascension, and His glorification.

What connects the two fundamental principles? The nature of the Incarnation itself,
which is a redemptive Incarnation. "If we speak of the redemptive Incarnation, we do so in order
to unite two moments of a single act through which the Word saves the world. The Incarnation

---

32Digne mère d'un Dieu rédempteur de tous les hommes: quiconque, guidé par la foi de l'Église, aura pénétré assez avant dans le sens de cette révélation, y trouvera la prémisse dont se déduisent, non point par d'inefficaces arguments de convenance, mais par voie d'authentique inclusion, les prérogatives de l'immaculée Conception, de la corédemption universelle, de l'Assomption, qui font de la Vierge le prototype de l'Église. EVI, II, pp. xiv-xv.

33See EVI, III, pp. 636-638, La Vierge Marie, personnalité mystique de l'Église.
is the radical principle of our salvation; the Redemption is the next principle of our salvation.  

The Incarnation as radical principle of our salvation is the basis of the first Mariological principle (Mary is the worthy Mother of a Savior God); the Redemption is the basis of the second Mariological principle (two realizations of salvation: one personal, in the Virgin; the other collective, in the Church).

This explains why Joumet makes Mariology a part, and a privileged part, of Ecclesiology. The two treatises have parallel destinies. It is remarkable that Joumet had firmly established this in the second volume of EVI (1951), a full decade before the Fathers of Vatican II decided to speak of the Blessed Virgin Mary within the Constitution on the Church, leading to the famous Chapter Eight of Lumen Gentium.  

---

34 Si nous parlons d’Incarnation rédemptrice, c’est pour unir les deux moments d’un acte unique par lequel le Verbe sauve le monde. L’Incarnation est le principe radical de notre salut; la Rédemption en est le principe prochain. “La Rédemption, drame de l’amour de Dieu.” NV 48 (1973), p. 83.

35 A la Vierge comme à toute l’Église, mais avec des différences d’intensité qu’il faudra définir, cette grâce christoconformante apporte des dons analogues d’exemption du péché, de participation à la vie du Christ, à sa passion, à sa mort, à sa résurrection, à son ascension, à sa glorification. En sorte qu’à parler d’une manière approximative, on pourra considérer la mariologie et l’ecclesiologie, comme deux traités parallèles, et dire qu’elles sont faites d’une même étoffe, et portent sur le même mystère, considéré d’une part dans sa réalisation exceptionnelle, et d’autre part dans sa réalisation commune. EVI, II, p. 392.

CHAPTER FIVE
FIRST AMONG THE REDEEMED (THE CHURCH SAVED)

In this chapter we look at how Jouquet views the effects of the redemption in the case of individual Christians, in the case of the Church as a whole, and in the case of the Virgin. This will be the context for his explanation of the dogma of Mary’s Immaculate Conception.

The grace that forms the Church is termed “christoconforming” grace; it brings about a likeness to Christ. In doing so, it banishes sin, according to the dictum of St. Thomas Aquinas, “the remission of sin is not conceivable without an infusion of grace.”

Christoconforming grace is extended to the Virgin in a privileged manner, and to other Christians in a common manner. There are two modes of extension of christoconforming grace, one privileged, one common, and we are going to compare these two modes to one another.

In the case of individual Christians, the grace of Christ takes away original and actual sin, and makes them members of the Church. Some will lose grace and charity through mortal sin. The rest will not be able, “throughout their lives, to avoid all sins, even venial ones.” The Church, then, is made up of individuals who all started out being deprived of grace. Even after joining the Church, they will never be always and entirely in grace.

The Church is formed of individuals who are neither always nor entirely in grace, but the Church is always and totally in Christ. (The Church) “began with the outpouring of christoconforming grace and the full indwelling of the Holy Spirit.” The Church has never lost

1ST I-IIæq. 113, a. 2. Quoted in EVI, II, p. 393.
2EVI, II, p. 393.
3Council of Trent, session VI, can. 23, DS 1573. Cited in EVI, II, p. 394.
4EVI, II, p. 395.
grace and the indwelling of the Spirit; were one of these to be interrupted for an instant, the Church would cease to exist. Thus the Church is always in Christ.

That the Church is entirely in Christ is demonstrated by a Scripture text that Joumet quotes with great frequency: “Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself up for her, that He might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish. (Eph 5:25-27)”

Thus the Church, by her likeness to Christ, is always and entirely free from sin. This is her profound law... She would like it to be the case that each of her members might be always and entirely without sin. She tends toward this point as toward a limit, which here below is unreachable. But later, the law of Christ and His Church, to be always and totally without sin, will be fulfilled in each of the elect.

It is the Virgin’s privilege to be the only member of the Church in whom this limit is reached during this life. She alone will be as pure, personally, as the Church is, collectively.

This is how Joumet will explain the Immaculate Conception.

The grace of the bloody Cross, which takes away the sin of the world, and which extends to [men of ] all times...to purify them from contracted sin, extends to the Virgin to preserve her from contracting it. The universal law of incurring sin, to which she is submitted, is suspended in her insofar as its effect is concerned... The redemption of Christ, which is purificative for all men, is

---

5 See Chapter One for the account of how Joumet initially found this idea, not in the letter to the Ephesians, but in the works of St. Catherine of Siena.

6 Ainsi, l’Église, à la ressemblance du Christ, est toujours et tout entière exempte du péché. C’est sa loi profonde, qui la tient au-dessus de chacun même de ses plus grands saints. Elle voudrait la réaliser dans chacun de ses membres, que chacun d’eux fût toujours et tout entier sans péché. Elle y tend comme vers une limite, ici-bas inaccessible. Mais plus tard, la loi du Christ et la loi de son Église, d’être toujours et totalement sans péché, sera la loi de chacun des élus (EVI, II, 396). The words plus tard refer to the status of the elect after their resurrection and glorification. For Joumet’s teaching on the resurrection of the faithful, see Chapter Six.
preventative, preservative for Mary.7

The law of total purity, in the case of the Virgin, also demands her moral impeccability. Journet points out the teaching of the Council of Trent in this regard, and indicates that it is the common teaching of theologians. He also finds a demonstration of it in Scripture: “A simple reading of the Gospel, provided it is sufficiently profound, will reveal to us, not an indiscretion [on Mary’s part], but rather the extraordinary power of her intercession at Cana in Galilee (Jn 2:1-11).”8

Thus, the law of total purity is found in Christ as its source, and in the Virgin and in the rest of the Church by way of participation. In the Virgin, this realization remains, as in Christ, personal; in the rest of the Church, it is a realization that has already become collective, which tends in each of its members, as toward a limit, to a personal realization, unreachable here below.9

7La grâce de la croix sanglante, qui ôte le péché du monde, et qui atteint tous les temps...en vue de les purifier du péché contracté, atteint la Vierge pour la préserver de le contracter. La loi universelle d’encourir le péché, à laquelle elle est soumise, est suspendue en elle quant à son effet...La rédemption du Christ, purificatrice pour tous les hommes, est préventive, préservatrice pour Marie. EVI, II, p. 397. See Chapter Nine for additional material on the notion of preservative redemption.

8EVI, II, p. 397.

9Ainsi, la loi de totale pureté se trouve comme en source dans le Christ, et comme en participation dans la Vierge et dans le reste de l’Église: dans la Vierge, il s’agit d’une réalisation restant encore, comme dans le Christ, personnelle; dans le reste de l’Église, il s’agit d’une réalisation déjà devenue collective, qui tend en chacun de ses membres, à la réalisation personnelle, comme vers une limite, ici-bas inaccessible. EVI, II, p. 397.
CHAPTER SIX
FIRST IN THE ORDER OF CORESURRECTION OR CONGLOMICATION IN CHRIST (DESTINY OF THE CHURCH)

In this chapter we shall see how Joumet explains the privilege of Mary’s Assumption into Heaven. Just as he will explain Mary’s coredemptive mediation by comparing it to Christ’s redemptive mediation, he will explain the Assumption as a participation in the resurrection of Christ. He treats the theme at length in EVI, under the heading “La place de la Vierge dans le temps de l’Église,”1 and in EDDM.

Mariology can be considered a treatise about an exceptional realization of the Church in the Virgin Mary, and a common realization in the faithful. But the Church and the Virgin are not two discrete realities. “The truth is that the Church and Virgin are one. When I distinguish the Church from the Virgin, I say that the Virgin is the point toward which the Church tends.”2 It is like the distinction between a mountain and its summit. The Virgin is the summit toward which the mass of the faithful tend “asymptotically,” without ever reaching this summit of holiness.3

The Church is the Bride of Christ without stain or wrinkle (cf. Eph 5:27). The Bride is realized in different ways: personally, in the Virgin; collectively, in the rest of the members of the Church (“the faithful”). Although these two realizations can legitimately be distinguished,

---


2La vérité consiste à dire que l’Église et la Vierge ne font qu’un. Quand je distingue l’Église de la Vierge, je dis que la Vierge est le point vers lequel tend l’Église. VME, p. 10

3Toutefois, par pure commodité de vocabulaire, et usant d’une synécdoque, il nous arrivera ici d’appeler parfois Église, non pas le tout composé de la Vierge et des chrétiens, mais seulement la partie de l’Église formée par ces derniers; nous opposerons alors, comme les deux parties d’un même tout, la Vierge et l’Église, la mariologie et l’ecclesiologie. EVI, II, p. 393
one from the other, it is important to grasp how Joumet distinguishes them. The distinction hinges on words like "time," and "rhythm." In other words, it is within the framework of salvation history, as understood by Joumet, that we may see both the commonality between the faithful and the Virgin, and the differences.

There is, in the Church, a law or rule of co-resurrection (and conglorification) with Christ. Joumet finds this summarized especially in the following Pauline text: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his proper order. First, Christ, as firstfruits. Then, after His coming, those who belong to Christ. Then will come the end, when He will give back the kingdom to His God and Father, and will reduce to nothing every principality, domination, and power. For Christ must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death" (I Cor 15:22-26).

From the expression "each in his proper order," Joumet derives his notion of "rhythm." To say that Mary anticipates the collective rhythm of the Church is to say that she already experiences the glory that the Church will experience at the end of time. Just as Mary was the first to be redeemed by Christ, she will be the first to rise with Christ.

The mystery of the Resurrection and Ascension are first and primarily realized in Christ the Bridegroom. Then, in a completely subordinate way, in the Bride: after Christ, with Christ, in Christ, she must rise from the dead and go up into heaven. To deny this would be to destroy the foundation of Christianity.

Who is the Bride? Considered collectively, the Bride is the Church. The word "collectively" is critical. The members of the Church are corrupted by sin, while the Bride is *sine macula et ruga*. Hence, the Bride is the Church only as the Church considered collectively, not as
each of its members.

The law of co-resurrection with Christ applies to the Church only inasmuch as she is a collective. When the Church will have reached her fulness in the end of time, she will rise as a collective whole to be assumed into heaven. ④

In the generality of the faithful, resurrection is not fully realized until the end of the world. For the members of Christ who are touched by original sin, the law of co-resurrection in Christ is impeded, and will not be actualized until the end of the world. At that moment, original sin, a sin of all human nature, will be fully conquered. This is brought about in two ways: first, through the interruption of natural generation, which propagates original sin; second, through the resurrection of all those who had been condemned to death. “The last enemy to be destroyed is death” (I Cor 15:26). ⑤

At this point we can begin to see where the Blessed Virgin’s destiny can be explained. Once it has been established that being touched by original sin is an impediment to immediate resurrection, a correlative proposition is also revealed. In the members of Christ who are not touched by original sin, the law of co-resurrection (and conglorification) in Christ finds no impediments, and will be applied immediately.

The only person other than Christ who was untouched by original sin is His Blessed Mother. Because the Virgin was sinless, the Pauline law of co-resurrection with Christ had to be

④L’Épouse, qui n’est telle que parce qu’elle est sans tache ni ride ni rien de semblable, mais sainte et immaculée, c’est l’Église, considérée non pas dans chacun des ses membres, qui sont tous touchés par le péché, mais comme un tout collectif. La loi de corésurrection dans le Christ ne la concerne donc qu’en tant précisément qu’elle est un tout collectif. C’est quand elle aura atteinte sa pleine mesure, la fin du temps, qu’elle ressuscitera tout entière, dans tous ses membres à la fois, pour être assumée dans le ciel. EVI, II, p. 450.

realized in her before in the rest of the Church. Because she is sinless, all-holy, she is personally identified with the Bride sine macula et ruga. During the age of Christ's presence among us, the Bride is contained entirely in the person of the Virgin Mary. "Thus, the law of co-resurrection with Christ can touch her personally. This is why her resurrection and assumption can happen in anticipation of the collective rhythm of the rest of the Church, and assume the personal rhythm of the destiny of Christ."\(^6\)

In Mary, then, there is a double exceptionality. First, as regards her personal exemption from the mark of original sin; second, as regards the result of this exemption. Because she is all-holy, she alone realizes the Church personally, while the other members of Christ do not. Because she is all-holy, the law of co-resurrection (and conglorification) with Christ is applied to her immediately, while the other members of Christ must wait for the end of the world.

Now, the appearance of the word "immediately (tout de suite)" elicits the question: immediately after what? Her death? Did Mary die? After all, the bull Munificentissimus Deus, in defining that Mary's Assumption was a dogma of the faith, left open the question whether Mary's earthly existence was terminated by death.

Journet aligns himself with "la plupart des théologiens"\(^7\) who teach that the Virgin Mary

\(^6\)Mais l'Épouse sainte, sans tache, immaculée, est tout entière rassemblée, au temps de la présence du Christ, dans la personne de la Vierge Marie. La loi de co-résurrection dans le Christ peut donc la toucher personnellement. C'est pourquoi sa résurrection et son assomption pourront anticiper sur le rythme collectif du reste de l'Église, et se régler sur le rythme personnel de la destinée du Christ. EVI, II, p. 450.

\(^7\)EVII, II, p. 450. Elsewhere, Journet observes that Jugie, who laid much of the groundwork for the solemn definition of the Assumption, found himself unable to chose between the thesis of mortality and the immortalist position. Consequently, and in order to promote the doctrine of the Assumption, he asked that the question of the Virgin’s death be left out of the dogmatic definition (see also article "Jugie, Martin" in Michael Carroll's Theotokos). However, the death of the Virgin is regarded as certain by numerous theologians (cf. Merkelbach, Mariologia, pp. 264-266). Journet also averts to the Dominican rite, in which the Assumption is the feast “in which the holy Mother of God experienced temporal death, yet she could not be held back by the bonds of death.” EVI, II, p. 447, n.1.
did taste death. “As for ourselves, we attach too much importance to the mystery of death and resurrection to be able to think that the Virgin did not experience it.” However, since she was preserved from contracting original sin, there was for her no necessity to die. “If she died in order to follow, as coredemptrix, the itinerary that Jesus walked as Redeemer, her death was not only a free and loving sacrifice; it was an effect of her love. Also, death has no rights over her, as it has over us...” In any case, since the dogmatic definition of the Assumption left open the question of Mary’s death, Journet is careful to speak of “coresurrection or glorification,” leaving room for the immortalist position.

There are, of course, those who hold that the Virgin did not know death and resurrection. According to these thinkers, she was transferred directly into heaven. This would be a favor granted her by Jesus, out of His filial love for her. Journet does not polemicize against the immortalist position, but he does make clear that it does not harmonize with his own. He recognizes that the dogmatic definition leaves aside the question of Mary’s death. But, he adds, it does not in any way contest the reality of her death and resurrection, as commonly taught by theologians, nor does it contest the mysterious depths that her death and resurrection signify. The common destiny of man is to die with Christ, to rise with Christ, and with Christ to go up to heaven. God not only wanted to create a glorious Christ and a glorious Church; He also wanted a risen Christ and risen Church. “Was it not necessary that Christ

8Nous attachons, pour nous, une trop grande importance au mystère de la mort et de la résurrection, pour pouvoir penser que la Vierge ne l’aurait pas éprouvé. EVI II, p. 447, n.1.

9Si elle meurt pour suivre en coredemptrice l’itinéraire que Jésus a parcouru en redempteur, sa mort non seulement sera un libre et amoureux sacrifice, elle sera l’effet même de son amour. Il reste que la mort n’a pas sur elle de droits, comme elle en a sur nous... EVI, II, p. 47.

10Cf. EDDM, 139.
should suffer these things so as to enter into His glory?" (Lk 24:26). The law of the Bride is equal to the law of Christ, he points out. The implication is clear: Mary died. It was fitting that the experience of the Bride conform to that of the Bridegroom.

. . . (T)he law of conformity with Christ is realized most intensely in the person of the Virgin alone, who belongs to the age of the presence of Christ, than in the whole collectivity of the Church which, since Pentecost, belongs to the age of the Holy Spirit. The Church, the Bride, is never more intensely holy than she was in the time of Christ, when the grandeurs of the hierarchy were all still folded up, hidden within Christ, and when ...(the Church) was represented totally by the Virgin. She is never as intensely pure, coredemptrix, virgin and mother, victorious over sin and death.11

The Assumption, then, can be defined both in terms of the intimate relation of the Bride and Bridegroom, and in terms of the intimate solidarity that binds the Church to the Virgin. The definition of the Assumption is but a further clarification of the meaning of this intimate solidarity. Looking more deeply into these bonds of relation, we can find the profound reason why the Assumption had to be defined in a solemn manner. This profound reason for the definition is found in the image of the Woman clothed with the Sun.

How does Joumet identify the woman of Revelations 12? Is she the Virgin Mary, or the Church? Both, or neither?

In fact, his exegesis of this passage depends on his Marian ecclesiology. There are two main meanings to be found in the Woman clothed with the Sun and the Dragon who threatens her. First, the scene encapsulates the three main stages of salvation history, the three great ages

11(La loi de conformité au Christ est réalisée plus intensément dans la seule personne de la Vierge, qui relève de l'âge de la présence du Christ, que dans toute la collectivité de l'Église, qui, depuis Pentecôte, relève de l'âge de l'Esprit saint. Jamais l'Église, l'Épouse, n'est aussi intensément sainte qu'au temps du Christ, quand des grandeurs de hiérarchie sont encore toutes repliées dans le Christ, et quand, n'existant en elle-même que dans l'ordre des grandeurs de sainteté, elle est représentée tout entière par la Vierge. Jamais elle n'est aussi intensément pure, coredemptrice, vierge et mère, victorieuse du péché et de la mort. EVI, II, 453.)
of the Church. Second, we see in this apocalyptic scene the whole struggle between good and evil, and how the working of God in the world will face opposition until the end of this creation. Joumet also sees this struggle as a context for understanding the development of dogma.\(^\text{12}\)

After the Fall, after the first man lost the grace of Adam, the grace of Christ is offered to him by anticipation. Insofar as this grace is accepted, the Church of Christ exists before Christ, en formation, awaiting the day of His first coming. The woman clothed with the sun is understood to be the Church, as she waits for the coming of Christ.\(^\text{13}\)

The image of the Woman in Rev 12 represents, first and foremost, the Church, but the Church in the different stages or times of salvation history. It belongs to the essence of the Church to give birth to just men; i.e., to the sons of God. At the supreme moment of the Church's existence, the Church gives birth to Christ Himself, the very Son of God. At that moment, the Church is represented or condensed entirely in the Virgin Mary.\(^\text{14}\)


\(^\text{13}\)Conférences données... p. 129.

\(^\text{14}\)Mais jamais la Femme n'est aussi proche du Christ qu'au moment, absolument inoui, centre de toute l'histoire du salut, où, représentée par la Vierge, elle doit le mettre lui-même au monde, l'assister dans son enfance, le retrouver à la Croix. Jamais elle n'est aussi exceptionnellement sainte, aussi pleinement gardée du péché, aussi consciemment corédemptrice du monde, aussi solidaire de sa victoire sur la mort, qui est le "dernier ennemi." (EDDM, p. 94)

Ainsi la Femme est l'Église qui...depuis le jour de la chute jusqu'à celui de la Parousie, s'efforce de donner à Dieu des enfants. A un moment de son existence, qui va la modifier profondément elle-même, la faire entrer dans son âge de plénitude, et changer, en conséquence, la condition du monde entier, il lui est demandé de mettre au monde, non seulement des enfants d'adoption, mais le Fils, l'unique, engendré de Dieu. A cet instant décisif, où l'Église est l'Église plus qu'elle ne l'a jamais été et qu'elle ne pourra jamais l'être, c'est dans la Vierge qu'elle est rassemblée. (EVI, II, p. 425)
The Woman cries out in the pangs of labor. She is being persecuted and pursued by the power of evil, by the Dragon, the Serpent of Genesis, who waits to devour her Child. It is in midst of suffering and anguish and agonies that the Kingdom is formed. In the same way, Christ was the object of misunderstanding and hate.

A constant in the Church's history is the struggle against evil, the battle between the Church and the world. This struggle between the city of God and the city of evil began immediately after the Fall, during the age of waiting for Christ. But, as an element of salvation history, this great struggle has different phases which correspond to the different ages of the Church. The battle reaches the paroxysm of its intensity, in the moment when the Woman, i.e. the eternal Church, represented by the Virgin, gives birth to the Messiah: “The Dragon stood waiting for the Woman to give birth, in order to devour her Son, when she would bring Him to light. And she gave birth to a baby, a male child, who will rule the nations with a rod of iron, and the Child was taken away to God and to His throne.” This is an announcement of the Ascension. She gives her Child to the world, He will pass 33 years in our midst and, after experiencing death and resurrection, He will be taken up into heaven. “... and the Woman fled into the desert” (Rv 12:4-6).15

After the Ascension of Jesus, the Woman is the Church which had been interiorly reformed by the presence of Jesus. Before, she existed en formation; at the moment when Jesus comes into her midst, He gives her her plenitude as the Church. This is the age of Christ's presence. She becomes the mother of all the saved and, when Christ ascends into heaven, she goes and flees into the desert. From this moment, the Church has entered the phase of the

---

15Conférences donées... p. 130.
definitive struggle which will continue until the end of the world. "Little children, this is the
final hour." (I Jn 2:18) This final phase of the struggle corresponds to the age of the Holy
Spirit.

We are living in the age of the Holy Spirit; we are caught up in this great battle against
the city of evil. This, says Joumet, is the profound reason for the definition of Mary's
Assumption, the reason it was opportune: to prepare the Church for the supreme struggle
against the Antichrist. The Church will be an effective adversary against the Antichrist to the
extent that she is fully herself. One might say that the Church has need of self-knowledge. The
Church has to know what she is up against; she also has to know her own greatness. Mary
exemplifies this greatness in her person:

By experiencing in love always more about what she herself is, the whole Church
continually finds out more explicitly what Christ wants of her, and what He
wanted of His Mother, and who He wanted for Himself, and finally what He is
in Himself. She learns in her own flesh the mystery of Christ, of His entry into
time, His battle against evil, His desire to save the world, His passage into
glory.¹⁶

This is what it means to say that Mary is prototype of the Church; the whole destiny of
the Church is shaped like Mary's destiny. This explains why the Church can only progress in
the knowledge of her own destiny by understanding the destiny of the Virgin, her sorrows and
her grandeurs. We may observe that Joumet holds true to the notion that Mariology and
Ecclesiology develop in parallel.¹⁷

¹⁶En expérimentant dans l'amour toujours davantage ce qu'elle est elle-même, l'Eglise entière éprouve
toujours plus explicitement ce que le Christ veut d'elle, et ce qu'il a voulu de sa Mère, et ce qu'il a voulu pour lui-même, et finalement ce qu'il est lui-même. Elle apprend dans sa propre chair le mystère du Christ, de sa descente dans
le temps, de sa lutte contre le mal, de son désir de sauver le monde, de son passage à la gloire. EDDM, p. 147.

¹⁷EVI, II, p. 392.
We have seen that what Christ accomplishes for His Bride is realized in parallel but unequal ways, first in the Virgin Mary, then in the Church as a collectivity. Just as this reasoning has enabled Journet to clarify the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception, it has enabled him to explain her Assumption in a like manner.
CHAPTER SEVEN
FIRST IN THE ORDER OF COREDEMPTION (THE CHURCH SAVING)

At the close of the third session of the Second Vatican Council, Pope Paul VI solemnly proclaimed Mary "Mother of the Church." Like Joumet, the Pontiff saw Mary's Divine Maternity as the foundation of the title. Joumet uses the title to summarize his teaching on Mary as Coredemptrix/Mediatrix:

At the foot of the Cross, the Virgin shared, more intensely than anyone else, her Son's desire to save the whole world. She intercedes—more urgently than at Cana—that this desire be fulfilled in all men, that all who do not refuse it may be saved; in this sense, she is the Mother of all men, whether they know it or not. But for those who are openly members of the mystical Body of which Christ is the head, her intercession is colored by a new flame. She begs (God) that, according to their powers, they might be to an extent, through Christ, with Christ, in Christ, not only saved, but savors of other men; in this precise sense, Mary is invoked as Mother of the Church.

This brief paragraph contains, in highly condensed form, all that Joumet would teach about what he preferred to call "coredemptive mediation." This is an ecclesial concept which comprises the participation in Christ's redemptive sufferings on the part of individual Christians, of the Church, and of the Virgin Mary. Although this text (from 1964) refers to a title (Mother of the Church) which was officially proclaimed by Paul VI during the Second Vatican Council, it contains nothing (apart from the title itself) which Joumet did not already

---

1 The full text of Paul VI's proclamation is reproduced in Marianum 26 (1964), pp. 298-306.

2 Au pied de la Croix, la Vierge a épousé plus intensément que personne le désir qu'avait son Fils de sauver le monde entier. Elle intercède - plus instamment qu'à Cana - pour que ce désir s'accomplisse en tous les hommes, pour que tous ceux qui ne s'y refusèrent pas soient sauvés; en ce sens, elle est Mère de tous les hommes, qu'ils le sachent ou qu'ils l'ignorent. Mais pour ceux qui sont ouvertement membres du Corps mystique dont le Christ est la Tête, son intercession se colore d'une flamme nouvelle. Elle supplie pour que, selon leur force, ils puissent être un peu, par le Christ, avec le Christ, dans le Christ, non seulement sauvés, mais sauveurs des autres hommes; en ce sens précis, Marie est invoquée comme Mère de l'Église. VME, pp. 2-3.
teach in the second volume of EVI (1st edition, 1951). In EVI, it is discussed under the heading "The Virgin, Prototype of the Church" (II, pp. 393-423).

While the word "coredemption" may call to mind the Marian title "Coredemptrix," it has to do, first of all, with the Church:

The church is an agent of coredemption for the world...Coredemption involves the extension of the church through the increase of members in the body of Christ and the exercise of their mediatorial activity in the world. Coredemption is the cooperation of the church's members with God on behalf of the world.¹

Joumet is aware that Protestants have difficulty with the ideas of intercession, co-mediation, co-redemption, so that his explanation has a high level of apologetic content. He takes pains to illustrate how coredemptive mediation does not imply disrespect or undervaluing of Christ's redemptive sufferings; to the contrary, coredemptive mediation implies total dependence on and total subordination to Christ's unique redemptive mediation. In order to do justice to his rigorous reasoning and careful distinctions, it will be necessary to outline his doctrine at some length.

Co-mediation, co-merit, co-redemption, etc. will be defined in relation to the unique mediation, merit, and redemption of Christ. When we speak of Christ's mediation, we may intend either ascending or descending mediation. "In His ascending (or moral) mediation, Christ saves us by way of merit, and by way of satisfaction or redemption...In his descending (or physical) mediation, He saves us by way of 'instrument' or 'organ' of divinity."² In this chapter, we are primarily concerned with Christ's ascending mediation and Mary's ascending coredemptive

---


mediation. As will be explained later in this chapter, Joumet chooses to consider Mary as intercessor rather than as instrument, to avoid associating her with the hierarchy of the Church. While, the hierarchy is the efficient personality of the Church, Mary may be called the "mystical personality" of the Church:

To speak of the Virgin Mary as the mystical, bridal, or maternal personality of the Church, is to speak in images: it would mean that the realization of the marvelous personality of the Church does not attain its matchless and supreme extent except in the Virgin Mary, the member of the Church par excellence.5

In order to clarify "coredemptive merit" and "coredemptive mediation," we must first define "redemptive merit" and "redemptive mediation."

Sorrow and distress continue as long as human history continues. This is the "human tragedy." Christ's mission was not to abolish the human tragedy, but to sanctify it. In assuming human sorrow, He illuminates it and makes it redemptive.6 In Christ's passion, human suffering is supreme, unique, and redemptive. He shared in human suffering so that all human suffering might be coredemptive in and through Him. This can happen in those who "suffer-with" and "die-with" Christ; i.e., in His brothers, the sons of adoption, the members of His body.

The relationship between the redemptive suffering of Christ and the coredemptive suffering of Christians is one of participation, not addition; of compenetration, not juxtaposition.

Joumet cites St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on Colossians, in which the Common Doctor explicates the text: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I am

---

5 Parler de la Vierge Marie comme personnalité mystique, sponsale ou maternelle de l'Église, ce sera encore parler en images: cela signifier que la prise de conscience de la merveilleuse personnalité de l'Église, n'atteint son degré inégalable et suprême que dans la Vierge Marie, membre par excellence de cette Église. EVI, III, p. 639.

filling up what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ on behalf of His body, which is the church” (Col 1:24). It would be heterodox, says St. Thomas, to understand this to mean that the passion of Christ is insufficient, so that the sufferings of the saints are required to make it complete (according to Joumet, contemporary Protestants have difficulty with co-redemption because they conceive it in this very way). Rather,

Christ and the Church are a single mystical person, of which Christ is the head, and the body is all the just, each being just as a member of the head. God, in His predestination, has disposed the measure of the merits which the whole Church must attain, both head and members, just as He predestined the number of the elect...The merits of Christ, the head, are infinite; each saint, however, must merit according to his measure.

This text of St. Thomas establishes the fundamental dynamic to be followed by Joumet: the participatory, subordinate, finite co-merit of the Church and of Christians is defined in comparison to the unique, absolute, and infinite merit of Christ.

Christ’s redemptive self-offering on the cross is uniquely theandric. Because of the infinite dignity of Him who offers the sacrifice, its meritorious and satisfactory value is infinite. The human suffering offered by Christ, the head of the Church, is redemptive, in Him and in Him alone. The supplication of His passion is meritorious in justice, de condigno, of all the graces given to men. His merit is for the sake of the whole world at all times and places.

In the Church and in Christians, “christoconforming” grace, merited by Christ for all

---

7 EVI, II, p. 405.

8 Sed intelligendum est, quod Christus et Ecclesia est una persona mystica, cuius caput est Christus, corpus omnes justi quilibet autem justus est quasi membrum hujus capitis. Deus autem ordinavit in sua praedestinatione quantum meritorum debet esse per totam Ecclesiam, tam in capite quam in membris: sicut et praedestinavit numerum electorum...sed Christi, scilicet capitis, merita sunt infinita; quilibet vero sanctus exhibet aliquando merita secundum mensuram suam...St. Thomas Aquinas, Opera Omnia (New York: Misurgia, 1948-50) vol. XIII, pp. 538-539. Cited in EVI, II, p. 401.

9 EVI, II, pp. 401-402.
men, enables them to live and die with Christ and in Him. It transforms their activity, giving it a value of supplication called merit. Because this merit is totally dependent on Christ’s merit, it is called co-merit. Its value is finite and variable. We see that the prefix “co-” denotes not only “with,” but subordination.¹⁰

Grace that an individual Christian merits for himself is called merit de condigno. But when we speak of intercession on behalf of others, we cannot speak of merit de condigno. A Christian in a state of grace is a friend of God who can effectively intercede for others. His prayer has, as it were, a right to be heard, because of the merit of fittingness, called de congruo.

“Amen, amen, I say to you, whatever you ask the Father in my name he will give you” (Jn 17:23).

As explained above, only the mediation of Christ is redemptive and meritorious de condigno. The mediation of Christians and the Church can only be coredemptive, can only be meritorious de congruo; it is preceded and sustained by the redemptive mediation of Christ. ¹¹

The coredemptive mediation of Christians, of the Church, of the Virgin, is a mediation of “supposit” (suppôt), but not a mediation of virtue or power. Journet uses an astronomical illustration: the earth is a reality interposed between sun and moon, a supposit. It really carries the moon (by its gravity), but without canceling the sun which, by virtue of its gravitational pull, carries both earth and moon in turn. Between the sun and the moon, there is a mediation of supposit (the earth), but an immediation of virtue (sun’s gravitational pull).

¹⁰Ainsi Jésus est notre unique Rédempteur; et la Vierge est notre suprême corédémptrice. Jésus, qui est Dieu, est notre unique Médiateur dans la ligne de la rédemption infinie; et la Vierge, qui est créature, est notre suprême médiateur dans la ligne de la corédemption finie. PC, p. 22.

¹¹EVI, II, p. 405.
Or, to use a historical example: the conversion of St. Augustine depends on the prayers of St. Monica, whose prayers depended on the prayer of Christ on the cross. This does not mean that Monica is carrying none of the weight. Nor does it mean that, what Monica carries, Christ does not carry.  

Christ’s redemptive mediation carries everything totally, at all times, by immediate of virtue. Coredemp tive mediation is interposed in a supposit, without destroying the immediate of redemptive virtue.

We can distinguish three categories of coredemp tive mediation: that of individual Christians, of the Church, and of the Virgin. These are three related but distinct ways of participating in Christi’s redemptive mediation.

Because the Church is the body of Christ the Head, who is redeemer, the Church is properly called coredemptrix. To the extent that a man is a member of Christ and the Church, he too is called to be a coredeemer. This can happen in those who belong to the Church by desire, so that Abraham’s mediation on behalf of Sodom and Gomorrah was truly a participation in the redemptive mediation of Christ. Those who belong to the church corpor ally, through sacramental baptism, are ipso facto called to intercede for others as coredeemers. They are to be, not only saved, but saviors of others through their intercession.  

This is called the individual coredemp tive mediation of Christians. It is measured by the intensity of each individual’s fervor. It is deployed according to the “order of charity” which

---

12EVI, II, pp. 405-406.
14Hans Urs von Balthasar, in giving his own explanation of the coredemption exercised by individual Christians, echoes this point: “This delimits the meaning and the limit of what can be called
orders the obligations of each person. In its temporal deployment, it does not extend beyond those human generations contemporary to the individual coredeemer.

The collective coredeemptive mediation of the Church is also measured by its fervor, which can be greater or lesser according to time and place. But the fervor of the Church is always greater than that of each of its members; moreover, its scope is also greater. The first and immediate end of the Church’s prayer is to bind the universe ever more closely to Christ: *adveniat regnum tuum*. The intention of each Mass is the intention of the cross: the salvation of the world. Temporally, the Church does not exist *tota simul*; it exists in time. At every moment of its existence it bears the weight of the current needs of humanity.15

Can one say that the Church’s collective coredeemptive mediation is *universal*? Yes, but this universality is relative, for the Church’s coredeemptive mediation (1) is not fully valid except for the age when the Church is fully formed; i.e., from Pentecost onward; (2) obtains only a part, not the totality, of the graces given to men from Pentecost until the Parousia.16

Having painstakingly distinguished the coredeemptive mediation of Christians and of the Church, we can now see what distinguishes the coredeemptive mediation of the Virgin.

While the Church’s coredeemptive mediation is universal only in a relative sense, that of the Virgin is *absolutely universal*:

coredeption. The distance between the ‘Head’ and the ‘body’ must be maintained under all circumstances, so that Christ as the Head is the sole redeemer of all, even of his ‘proleptically redeemed’ mother; but at the same time, the one Redeemer takes up the ‘body’ of the Church into his redemptive activity, and this becomes yet more fruitful the more a member conforms itself to the selflessness that is Christ’s disposition, and the less he exercises reserve in putting his existence at the service of universal redemption.” In a footnote to this passage, von Balthasar refers the reader to EVI, II, pp. 406, 418ff. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989) vol. VII, p. 465.


16EVI, II, p. 408.
(1) it extends to all men of all times;

(2) it obtains for them (mediation of supposit) all the graces which derive from the redemption of Christ (immediation of virtue);

(3) it is anterior to the coredemptive mediation of the Church and contains (enveloppante) it.\textsuperscript{17}

Once again we see the Virgin as the ultimate realization of the Church, so that even the title \textit{Mediatrix omnium gratiarum} is ultimately a title of the Church: “The mediation of the Virgin is...the point toward which the Church’s mediation tends without ever reaching it, as a curve tends toward its asymptote... It is only in the Virgin that the Church can become mediatrix (of a coredemptive mediation) of all graces, \textit{mediatrix omnium gratiarum.”}\textsuperscript{18}

These are the essentials of Joumet’s teaching on Mary as Coredemptrix and (Co-)Mediatrix of all graces. It also forms his justification for the title “Mother of the Church.” He also clarifies how these titles are related to the privilege of the Immaculate Conception. This will allow him to compare the manner in which Mary is coredemptrix to the manner in which other Christians are coredeemers, and to show convergence and divergence between her and them.

We know from history that the notion of Mary’s Immaculate Conception gave rise to opposition and questioning, which eventually led to the solution of preservative redemption. A

\textsuperscript{17}A la différence de la médiation corédemptrice collective de l’Église, la médiation corédemptrice personnelle de la Vierge est universelle absolument: 1° elle s’étend à tous les hommes de tous les temps; 2° elle obtient pour eux (mediation de suppôt) toutes les graces qui dérivent de la rédemption du Christ (immediation de vertu); 3° elle est donc antérieure et enveloppante par rapport à la médiation corédemptrice de l’Église. EVI, II, p. 409.

\textsuperscript{18}La médiation de la Vierge est... le point vers lequel la médiation de l’Église tend sans jamais le rejoindre, comme la courbe tend vers son asymptote... C'est en la Vierge seule, que l'Église peut devenir mediatrix (d’une médiation corédemptrice) de toutes les graces, mediatrix omnium gratiarum. EVI, II, p. 409.
related question might be raised about the appellation “coredemptrix.” Joumet poses the question, which contains both the justification of the title and an objection to it:

To be the worthy mother of a God-redeemer of the entire world, Mary, as demanded by such a notion, has to be associated in the act of the redemption of the world, as intensely and as totally as her condition as the first to be redeemed by the cross of Christ permits. But can she be coredemptrix of the entire world, can she be the first and universal coredemptrix, since she herself is among the redeemed?19

His response depends on two notions: first, the common notion of coredemption on the part of Christians; second, the particular case of Mary, the first to be redeemed and the first coredemptrix.

In general, every coredeemer must be among the redeemed. The more intense the grace of redemption in him, the more it becomes coredemptive grace.

In the particular case of Mary: had Mary been redeemed in the same manner as the rest of men, she would have been a coredeemer in the same manner they are. It is the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, says Joumet, that makes the difference. She was redeemed in a different way, a unique way, superior to that of all others; namely, by preservative redemption. She is the first to be redeemed, so that the intensity of the grace of redemption is supreme in her, making her the first, unique, and supreme coredeemer.

Her coredemption, then, differs from that of other redeemed persons in intensity, priority, and manner of redemption. Also, it is distinguished from the coredemptive mediation

---

of the Church.\textsuperscript{20} Again, this is so because of the privilege of the Immaculate Conception. All the graces given to Mary in anticipation of the passion were destined “to be united to the infinite passion of Christ, (which was) directly redemptive of the Virgin herself and of all other men, by the act of an ineffable Compassion, surpassing in intensity, elevation, and amplitude all that men are capable of conceiving, and directly coredemptive of all other men.”\textsuperscript{21}

Once again, we have the image of the curve approaching its asymptote without ever meeting it: “In Mary, the Church reaches the point toward which it tends without being able to reach it by itself... In Mary, the Church is fully the Church. In Mary, the Church becomes coredemptrix in Christ...of all men...from the beginning of the world until Christ, and those who live from Christ to the end of the world.”\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20}In NDSD, Journet discusses Mary’s coredemptive mediation in connection with her compassion. In EVI, he does not spend much time discussing her compassion, perhaps because he wants to restrict himself to more precise theological terms. His first work on Our Lady gives a simple summary: “The Compassion of Our Lady is united to the Passon of Our Lord to \textit{merit} the salvation of the whole world. Remember what merit is.

When man, acting freely under the divine motion, achieves that which God, in pure goodness, had destined him, we say there is merit. Then if one considers the \textit{divine motion} which proportions man to his goal, the merit is due in justice — it is called strict merit, condign merit; if one considers the consent of the \textit{free will} moved by grace, it will be seen as suitable that God should grant his favours to the man who accepts the divine motion; this is the merit of congruity, not due in strict justice but founded upon the divine generosity and friendship...

Thus when Our Lady, under the impulse of love, suffered with Christ, she became, if we consider the impulse that came from heaven, worthy to receive the salvation that came from heaven; and if we consider the consent of her free will, it was further fitting that God, by His liberality, should grant her profoundest desire which was the desire of her Son, namely the salvation of the world. Thus the Virgin merited \textit{de condigno} her own salvation, \textit{de congruo} the world’s salvation. It is accurate to say in this sense that she laboured to merit for us the grace of redemption.” \textit{Our Lady of Sorrows} (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1938), pp. 76-77.

\textsuperscript{21}...à l’unir à la \textit{Passion infinie du Christ}, directement riedemprice de la Vierge elle-même et de tous les autres hommes, par l’acte d’une \textit{Compassion} indicible, dépassant en intensité, en élévation, en amplitude, tout ce que les hommes sont capables de concevoir, et directement \textit{coredemptrice} de tous les autres hommes. EVI, II, p. 411.

\textsuperscript{22}En Marie, l’Église rejoint le point vers lequel elle tendait sans pouvoir l’atteindre par soi seule... En Marie, l’Église est pleinement l’Église. En Marie, l’Église devient \textit{coredemptrice} dans le Christ... de tous les hommes... qui ont vécu depuis le commencement du monde jusqu’au Christ, et de ceux qui vivent depuis le Christ jusqu’à la fin du
In Chapter Eight, we shall see that Joumet defines Mary as the only person privileged to belong to the age of Christ's historical, incarnate presence (from His conception to His Ascension). This privilege also bears on the nature of her coredemptive compassion:

At the moment of Christ's death on the cross, the collective coredemptive compassion of the whole Church...is condensed...and brought to a point of supreme intensity, in the heart of His Mother...This mystery of the condensation of all the collective compassion of the Church in a single heart, a single personal subject, pertains to no one except the Virgin: for she is the only person who belongs to the age of Christ's presence. This will not be true in the case of St. John or to Mary Magdalene; however great the intensity and lucidity of their love, they belong to the age of the Holy Spirit. 23

Joumet divides salvation history into three periods, from the Fall until the end of this created world (cf. Chapter Eight). In his teaching about mediation, he looks beyond the limits of creation into the life of heaven. We need to distinguish between the mediation of earth and the mediation of heaven. While the mediation of earth can be meritorious and consequently redemptive, the mediation of heaven can be neither meritorious nor redemptive. At first, this appears to annul everything Joumet has said about the value of Mary's coredemptive mediation. After all, she is now in heaven, along with the elect, so that her "intercession and that of the elect has...ceased to be meritorious and coredemptive." 24

But this difficulty is only apparent. The fact that Mary now enjoys the timeless life of heaven does not invalidate her earthly charity. Let us re-trace the steps of Joumet's

---

23 Au moment où le Christ meurt en croix, c'est la compassion coredemptrice collective de toute l'Église...qu'il condense en quelque sorte, en la portant à un point d'intensité suprême, dans le cœur de sa Mère...Ce mystère de condensation de toute la compassion collective de l'Église dans un seul cœur, un seul sujet personnel, ne concerne que la Vierge; car elle est seule à relever de l'âge de la présence du Christ. Il ne saurait concerner saint Jean ou Marie de Magdala: quelles que soient l'intensité et la lucidité de leur amour, ils appartiennent à l'âge de l'Esprit saint. EVI, II, pp. 444-445.

24 EVI, II, p. 419.
When we speak of the mediation of earth: the source of all co-merit is the merit of the infinite redemptive supplication of Christ, which obtains, acquires, and purchases all graces. The finite coredemptive supplication of Christians co-obtains, co-acquires, and co-purchases the salvation of others. The first and universal coredemptive supplication of the Virgin merits and acquires in supreme fittingness all the graces of the rest of the human race.25

The mediation of heaven is totally different. The risen Christ “at the right hand of God, indeed intercedes for us” (Rm 8:34). His charity never diminishes, but it has ceased to be meritorious and redemptive. Rather, the intercession of the risen Christ ratifies, “by an uninterrupted supra-historical act, the earthly and historical supplication of the cross, which is valid for each successive moment of our time. ‘For by one offering He has made perfect forever those who are being sanctified’ (Hb 19:14).”26

We see that the mediation of heaven, on the part of Christ, ratifies and validates His earthly, historical self-offering on the cross. In an analogous manner we can clarify the heavenly intercession of the Virgin and the elect. Their intercession continues in charity, but has ceased to be meritorious and coredemptive.

---

25 La supplication infinie du Christ...mère en condignité et directément...toutes les grâces, tant celles du genre humain que celles de chaque personne individuelle. Dire qu’elle mérite, cela signifie qu’elle est donnée à Dieu pour obtenir, pour acquérir, pour acheter, toutes ces grâces. Ce sont les mots mêmes de l’Écriture (Actes xx, 28...; I Tim 1, 6...; I Pierre 1:18-19). ...(L)α supplication finie des chrétiens...est donnée à Dieu pour co-obtenir, pour co-acquérir, pour co-acheter dans le Christ le salut d’autrui. ...En la Vierge, [la corédemption] sera première et universelle, en sorte que la Vierge mérite et acquiert en suprême convenance toutes les grâces du reste du genre humain. EVI, II, pp. 418-419.

26 Son intercession consiste à ratifier, par un acte supra-historique ininterrompu, la supplication terrestre et historique de la croix, valable pour chacun des moments successifs de notre temps: “Par une seule offrande, il a amené à la perfection pour toujours ceux qui sont sanctifiés” (Hébr., x, 14). EVI, II, p. 419. Emph in original.
"Its whole task is to ask for graces of salvation to be given to men in compensation of the merits of (their) earthly historical charity... The Church of heaven presents to God the earthly charity of the Virgin, which is coredemptive for all historical time, and it presents to God the earthly charity of the Church and the saints, which (is coredemptive)... for the moment of history with which they are contemporary." 27

Heavenly and earthly mediation can be distinguished, but not separated. The mediation of heaven does not aim at the acquisition of new graces, graces not tied to historical acts of Christ, of the Virgin, of the saints; rather, it validates the earthly merits of Christ, the Virgin, the saints, on our behalf.

Joumet allows that one could speak of earthly mediation as the "acquisition of graces" and heavenly mediation as the "distribution of graces;" however, he does not care for these terms, which suggest an opposition between the mediation of earth and the mediation of heaven. In avoiding these terms, he sets himself apart from the crowd:

Most Mariologists, even when they oppose each other about the fact and doctrine of the Virgin's coredemption, end up by accepting (while pointing out the inconveniences) a terminology that distinguishes a cooperation with "objective redemption" or "the acquisition of graces" and a cooperation with "subjective redemption" or "application or distribution of graces." They dispute among themselves about whether one ought to accord to the Virgin only the latter, or also the former. We will try to discard this unnecessary terminology; while it is undoubtedly well-intentioned, nevertheless we have to think that it must inevitably lead to misunderstanding. 28

27 L'intercession de la Vierge et des élus a cessé, elle aussi, d'être méritoire, d'être coredemptrice. Elle procède toujours de la charité, mais d'une charité qui n'a plus à mériter ni à acquérir, et dont toute l'office est de demander que les grâces de salut soient données aux hommes en compensation des mérites de la charité terrestre, historique... L'Église du ciel présente à Dieu la charité terrestre de la Vierge, coredemptrice de tout le temps historique. Et elle présente à Dieu la charité terrestre de l'Église du temps et de ses saints, valable surtout pour le moment de l'histoire dont ils sont contemporains. EVI, II, pp. 419-420.

28 La plupart des mariologues, même quand ils s'opposent entre eux sur le fait et la doctrine de la coredemption de la Vierge, finissent par accepter, tout en en signalant eux-mêmes les inconvénients, la terminologie distinguant une coopération à la "rédemption objective" ou à "l'acquisition des grâces", et une coopération à la "rédemption subjective" ou à la "l'application ou distribution des grâces". Ils disputent entre eux pour savoir s'il faut accorder à la Vierge seulement la seconde, ou aussi la première. Nous essaierons d'écarter ici une terminologie
As mentioned above, Jourent is primarily concerned with ascending or moral mediation, rather than descending or physical mediation. He does discuss the problem of Mary’s descending or physical mediation, but leaves open certain questions. His treatment of the problem is directly related to certain other elements in his ontology of the Church.

For Jourent, to ask, “Must one regard the Virgin at the foot of the cross as an efficient instrumental cause of the graces which form the Church?” is very close to asking whether Mary shares in the work of the hierarchy. Jourent makes a distinction between the “grandeurs of hierarchy” and the “grandeurs of holiness” in the Church. The hierarchical activities of the Church have to do with efficient causality, with instrumental causes. The life of charity lived in the Church’s members, including the Virgin, is more directly tied to the Church’s final causality. The Church’s jurisdictional and sacramental powers depend on the order of the “grandeurs of hierarchy.”

If one regards the Virgin at the foot of the cross as an efficient instrumental cause of the graces which form the Church, then she would be a “privileged separated instrument,” sort of like a sacrament with universal efficacy, through which all graces would pass. 29 This considers her life under the aspect of ministry and service.

If, on the other hand, the Virgin belongs totally to the order of the “grandeurs of holiness,” then she is involved in our justification and sanctification only by way of her ascending and moral mediation. This considers her life under the aspect of intercession and merit.

29 EVI, II, p. 422.
Journet prefers the second option. "It seems to us...that the Virgin’s mission demands only the grandeurs of holiness." Even leaving open the question of Mary’s efficient instrumental causality, her descending mediation can be said to have “an infinity of tasks: she brings the Savior into the world, she watches over His infancy, she participates in the first steps (démarches) of the Church, she sheds upon it the flame of her goodwill (bienfaisance) and her love.” In these tasks, however, her mediation is only dispositive, not instrumental.

There is, I believe, another reason why Journet speaks only briefly and secondarily about Mary as an “instrument,” a reason based on his own personal experience as a Catholic theologian living and working in a region of Switzerland with a strong and long-established Protestant presence. He is constantly aware of the need to distinguish his own doctrine from the Lutheran and Calvinist views of salvation and justification. In an article of 1968, Journet comments on Karl Barth’s recently published work, Ad limina Apostolorum. This slim volume

30 Il nous semble... que les grandeurs de sainteté sont seules exigées par la mission de la Vierge. EVI, II, p. 422.

31 (S)a médiation descendante trouve encore à s’exercer dans une infinité de tâches: elle met au monde le Sauveur, elle protège son enfance, elle participe aux premières démarches de l’Église, elle répand autour d’elle la flamme de sa bienfaisance et de son amour. EVI, II, p. 423.

32 The influence of Journet’s environment on his theology is noted by Cardinal Garrone: J’oserai penser que le climat propre à l’Église helvétique a été ici plus ou moins formellement un facteur décisif. La foi catholique en ce pays n’a cessé de vivre affrontée à une pensée protestante vigoureuse et militante. Et cela ne pouvait pas ne pas orienter un théologien dans sa réflexion, en l’amenant à approfondir les points de doctrine où les divergences s’affirment. Nous ne voulons retenir ici que l’influence supposée de cet élément sur la matière des études. En effet, les ouvrages fondamentaux du Cardinal Journet, quel qu’en soit l’objet immédiat et précis: le Verbe incarné, l’eucharistie... ne semblent être en réalité et en profondeur qu’une longue méditation théologique sur l’Église. “Présentation,” RThom 71/2-3, p. 200.

33 Journet’s first book, L’Esprit du Protestantisme en Suisse, was so polemical in tone that Journet seems to have disowned it later in life. It does not appear in his bibliographies after 1960, not even in the bibliography of the festschrift printed in RThom 71/2-3 to honor his eightieth birthday. See Emonet, pp. 27-36.

was born from the great Reform theologian’s experience as an official “observer” at the last two sessions of the Second Vatican Council. Joumet says that Barth shows a profound misunderstanding of the dogmatic constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*. At the root of the misunderstanding is the classic debate on justification. Joumet approvingly quotes Marie-Joseph Nicolas: “The mystery of the Church and the mystery of Mary are united in an even deeper mystery: God’s plan to associate His creature with Himself in the very work of His creature’s salvation and *divinization*... The great debate between Catholicism and Protestantism is found here: how to reconcile Christ’s unique mediation with the elevation and the implementation (*mise en œuvre*) of everything human for the purpose of accomplishing the work of God.”

Nicolas is echoed by Congar: “Here we have come down to our central problem: the role that humanity, *even the humanity of Christ*, plays or does not play in the economy of salvation... What Luther wants, is for ALL of salvation to come from God alone, or from the working of God alone... But this point of view is not without influence on his conception of the role of the humanity of Christ in the economy of salvation. It no longer has any causality.”

If, in fact, the Lutheran view rules out the possibility of humanity (even the humanity of Christ) playing a causal role in human salvation, then all that is left is mere instrumentality. The Catholic view, by contrast, allows human beings the dignity of true association in the work

---


36 *Nous sommes ramenés... à notre problème central: le rôle que joue ou ne joue pas l’humanité, même celle du Christ, dans l’économie du salut... Ce que veut Luther, c’est que TOUT dans le salut vienne de Dieu seul, soit l’œuvre de Dieu seul... Mais ce point de vue n’est pas sans influer sur la conception qu’il se fait du rôle de l’humanité de Christ dans l’économie du salut. Elle non plus n’aura pas de causalité.* Yves Congar, *Le Christ, Marie et l’Eglise* (1952), pp. 34-47. Quoted by Journet in NV 43 (1968), p. 253. Emph. in original.
of salvation. Mary is no mere instrument. Although Journet was commenting in 1968 on a recently published book, his objections to Barth and to Reform theology are substantially identical with his views as published earlier in EVI. 37

If Mary's cooperation in the work of our redemption is so central to authentic Catholic thought, is it not surprising that the Fathers and early Christian writers do not develop the idea? Not really, Journet says. In the first centuries, the leading question was the theology of the Incarnation. When the Fathers speak of Mary's cooperation in the Incarnation, they consider her cooperation as a ministry or service. Later, Mary's cooperation is spoken of in a general way to indicate her cooperation in the work of redemption; then, it appears under the aspect of co-intercession and co-merit. The Patristic witness could be synthesized in the statement: "Mary cooperated positively in our redemption by freely giving birth to the Redeemer, by her faith and obedience at the moment of the Incarnation." 38 This truly contains the germ of the doctrine of Mary's co-redemption, since the Incarnation and the Redemption are but two successive moments of a single mystery: the redemptive incarnation. 39

Journet reprises the classic Eve-Mary parallel, present in Patristic writing since Justin

---

37 See EVI, I, pp. 56-57; EVI, II, pp. 390-391, including p. 391, n. 1; and especially EVI, II, pp. 1129-1171 (Excursus VII: L'ecclesiology de Karl Barth).

38 EVI, II, p. 412. Journet cites one text of Augustine where the Doctor of Grace seems to move from a consideration of Mary's role in the Incarnation to a consideration of her cooperation in our redemption. He says that Mary, who is corporally mother of Christ the head, is spiritually the mother "of His members, of ourselves, because she cooperated by her charity so that faithful (children) might be born in the Church, who are members of the head, quia cooperata est caritate ut fideles in Ecclesia nascen tur, quae illius capitis membra sunt" (De sancta virginitate, cap. 6:6, PL 40, 399).

39 EVI, II, p. 415, note 1. Cf. Merkelbach, Mariologia (Paris), p. 91: "Mary consents to these two things; to become the mother of God, and to become the associate of the Redeemer, but she consents in a single movement. The two things are not disassociated in the Angel's message; she accepts to be mother of the God-Redeemer, as such."
Martyr, but with a rather different emphasis and outcome. The Fathers contrasted Eve’s disobedience in Eden with Mary’s obedience at the Annunciation. While Eve cooperated in our downfall, the Mary cooperated in our redemption by obeying God at the Annunciation.

Jouyet, for his part, sees the Cross as the other great moment of obedience for Mary. If the Incarnation and the Redemption are two moments of a single mystery, then the Annunciation and the Cross are the two episodes in Mary’s life which reflect these two moments. In both scenes, she cooperates with the redemption on behalf of the whole human race, from the Fall to the Parousia. This is in keeping with Jouyet’s insistence that we must always consider the Incarnation as a redemptive Incarnation (see Chapter Three).

The first Eve sprang from the side of the first Adam, as he slept in Paradise. Put to the supreme test, she shares her giddiness (vertige) with Adam, and draws us with her into catastrophe. The second Eve springs from side of the second Adam, “sleeping on the cross”. At the time of the supreme sacrifice, she shares her love, and draws us with her into deliverance.

“The second Eve, in the first place, is Mary. She comes entirely from Christ on the Cross. In effect, it is in virtue of Christ’s passion that she is immaculate from the beginning. And it is the passion of Christ which provokes in her that unimaginable compassion which, with God, will merit in fittingness (en convenance), what the passion itself merits in condignity (en condignité), namely the universal salvation of the human race. The merit in fittingness, which allows for degrees, reaches its supreme intensity in Mary, so that Jesus gives her to us to be our Mother.”

“In the second place, the second Eve is the rest of the Church. She is born from the side of Christ, where blood and water flow out, symbolizing baptism and Eucharist, in short the sacraments which, according to St. Thomas, establish the Church. She too is immaculate, without spot or wrinkle or anything of that sort. In resemblance to the Virgin, she too is com-patient, although her compassion is less intense and less vast.”

“La seconde Ève, c’est d’abord Marie. Elle vient tout entière du Christ en croix. C’est en effet, en vertu de la passion du Christ, qu’elle est, dès le princep, immaculée. Et c’est la passion du Christ qui va provoquer en elle cette inimaginable compassion, qui, auprès de Dieu, méritera en convenance, ce que la passion elle-même mérite en...”

40
Mary’s compassion, as distinguished from that of the Church, extends to men of all
times, while the Church’s compassion is contemporaneous. Mary’s presence within the prayer
of the Church enlarges its scope:

In every moment..., the Mass brings her all the passion of Christ, so that
she can, by her compassion at that moment, labor for a part to save the world of
that moment...The passion of Christ merits in condignness, and Mary’s
compassion merits in convenience, all the graces of all men; the Church’s
compassion of every epoch merits in convenience an important part of the graces
of all men of that time.

The prayer of each Christian is lifted up by the prayer of the Church,
which is itself lifted up by the prayer of the Virgin, lifted up in its turn by the
prayer of Christ on the Cross. In the final analysis, the burden of the entire
world depends on this prayer of Christ on the Cross. 41

Joumet has a great deal to say about the “how” of coredemptive mediation. But what
about the “why” of it? The answer to this question lies in his insistence on the classic Catholic
view of the dignity of redeemed humanity, and in his ecclesiology. “To the extent that a man
becomes a member of Christ and of the Church, he is called to be a co-redeemer.” 42 Mary is the
active instrument of the Incarnation which is always to be viewed as a redemptive Incarnation:
"The doctrine of the Virgin's coredemptive mediation...is merely a development of the highest principle of Mariology: Mary is the worthy mother of God who became incarnate to save us. Mary is the worthy mother of the Redeemer."\textsuperscript{43}

We may also find an answer to the "why" in Journet's \emph{Petit catéchisme de la Sainte Vierge}, which was written for schoolchildren:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Did God need the Blessed Virgin?}

God has never needed any creature, but, that we might know how much He loves the world, He chose the Blessed Virgin, to associate her closely with His birth, His sacrifice, and the dispensation of His graces.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}
We have observed that Journet treats Mariology as a privileged part of Ecclesiology. In doing so, he also situates the Marian question within salvation history. Salvation history is a drama of redemption, and students of this drama should note the different ways in which the effects of the redemption reach human beings in different periods of history. It is important that this contextuality be understood and appreciated.

Since Mariology is a privileged part of Ecclesiology, it follows that all of Journet’s Marian doctrine will be situated within his doctrine of the Church. Another theologian might, for example, explain that all of Mary’s privileges stem from her divine maternity, without mentioning the Church. For Journet, this is simply not possible. At the same time we hasten to add that, for Journet, the Church can be described and explained only in strict connection to the mystery of the Incarnation. This is evidenced by the title of his magnum opus: l’Église du Verbe incarné.

Journet does not speak of a “hierarchy of truths,” preferring to appeal to the “analogy of faith,” which arranges all the truths of the faith in proper relation to each other. According the Catechism of the Catholic Church, the expression “hierarchy of truths” refers to their order in relation to the foundation of the Christian faith (the highest truth being the teaching on the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity). The analogy of faith, on the other hand, means “the coherence of the truths of faith among themselves and within the whole plan of Revelation.”

1CCC, par. 90, 234.

2CCC, par. 114.
Journet asserts, "It is impossible to speak and speak well about one Christian truth in isolation from the rest. One always ends up destroying the proportion [between the various truths]. [Each truth] needs to be situated within the whole of the Gospel message." He does not want to "isolate the facts (données) which concern the Virgin, (but) to give them their true place...in the revelation of the doctrine of salvation."

One of the most striking features of Journet's explanation of salvation history is the idea of the "temps de l'Eglise," the three times or ages of the Church's history in creation, corresponding to three ages of the world. These three ages correspond to successive manifestations of the divine Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and to their missions of creation, redemption, and sanctification.

The age of the Father: this is the time of original grace and innocence: it ends with the Fall. The people of God is not yet the Church, the body of Christ.

---


4 Nous avons veillé à respecter constamment l'analogie de la foi, à ne jamais isoyer les données qui concernent la Vierge, à leur donner leur vraie place...dans la révélation de la doctrine du salut. EDDM, p. 99.

5 The attribution of the three ages of the Church to the three Persons of the Trinity was taken from Martin Grabmann's study of the ecclesiology of Aquinas, Die Lehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk (Regensburg: G.J. Manz, 1903). Grabmann refers this doctrine back to Rupert of Deutz. This same work of Grabmann is also the source for the idea of the Holy Spirit as the uncreated soul of the Church. Cf. EVI, I, p. 517; EVI II, p. 280; Emmanuel Lemièrè, "Itinéraire intellectuel et spirituel d'un théologien de l'Église: Charles Journet (1891-1975)," NV 69 (1994), p. 50.

The third volume of EVI reprises and greatly expands the section of volume two that dealt with the three ages of the Church. In volume three Journet has drawn on the works of Mircea Eliade to bring out the distinctive Christian view of the meaning of history, as opposed to the "myth of the eternal return." St. Augustine and J-Ch. Puech (La gnose et le temps) are also cited. See EVI, III, p.25, pp. 43-44, 46, 67-70. While this adds a certain intensity to what was said in volume two, it does not represent an alteration of what Journet said in that volume with regard to the Virgin Mary and the three existential ages of grace. Journet himself makes this quite clear: Nous demandons la permission de reproduire ici, en la résumant un peu, la 3e section du chapitre III: La Vierge est au cœur de l'Église, intitulée: La place de la Vierge dans les temps de l'Église. EVI, III, p. 583, n.1. The one significant addition to what had been printed in volume two is the concluding paragraph of the section, which mentions Paul VI's proclamation of the Marian title "Mother of the Church" as a summary of Mary's continuing maternal role. EVI, III, p. 590.
The age of the Son begins after the Fall: man perceives that his defeat is not decisive, that God forgives him, that the struggle between the Woman and Serpent continues on earth, that a Messiah will come.6

The age of the Son lasts from Adam’s fall until the glorification of the risen and ascended Christ. This age may be divided into two distinct periods: first, the time of waiting for Christ; second, the time of His incarnate presence.

At first there is a very long period, comprising the regime of the law of nature and the regime of the Mosaic law. This is the time of waiting for Christ. The Church, that is the gathering or recapitulation of the world in Christ, is inaugurated. The Church is the body of Christ in an act commenced. She prepares herself to receive the Christ, who will be her head, and will permit her to be fully herself, to be the body of Christ in a completed act.

Then comes the time of Christ’s presence. It lasts only a few years, but it is decisive. In this time, the Church is completed in its principle, who is superior to it, that is its Head, who is Christ.7

The third age, the time of the Holy Spirit, begins at Pentecost. The whole task of the Holy Spirit is to make Christic grace overflow (faire déborder), in pouring it out upon the world, to form the Church in its completed act, as the body of Christ.8

This view of salvation history enables Joumet to explain in a very precise manner how

---

6L’âge du Père: c’est le temps de la grâce originelle et de l’innocence; il finit à la chute. Le peuple de Dieu n’est pas encore l’Église, le corps du Christ.

L’âge du Fils commence après la chute: l’homme comprend que sa défaite n’est pas décisive, que Dieu lui pardonne, que la lutte va continuer sur la terre entre la Femme et le Serpent, qu’un Messie pourra venir. EVI, II, p. 436.

7Il y a d’abord une immense période, embrassant le régime de la loi de nature et le régime de la loi mosaique. C’est le temps de l’attente du Christ. L’Église, à savoir le rassemblement ou la récapitulation de monde autour du Christ, est inaugurée. Elle est corps du Christ en acte commencé. Elle se prépare à accueillir le Christ que sera sa tête, et qui lui permettra d’être pleinement elle-même, d’être le corps du Christ en acte achevé.

Puis vient le temps de la présence du Christ. Il ne dure que quelques années. Mais il est décisif. L’Église est achevée alors dans son principe, qui lui est supérieur, à savoir dans sa tête, qui est le Christ. EVI, II, p. 436.

8Toute la tâche de l’Esprit saint est de faire déborder au dehors la grâce qui est dans le Christ et, en la répandant sur le monde, de constituer dans son acte achevé l’Église, corps du Christ. EVI, II, pp. 436-437.
the world is being saved in Christ. Primarily it allows him to clarify the problem of the hierarchy, the instrumental cause of the Church. He uses the same distinction (of the three ages of the Church) with regard to grace, the formal, interior, and immanent cause of the Church. Grace has different characters and will be distributed in different ways during the three ages of the Church, which may also be called the "three existential ages of grace."10

During the prelapsarian age of the Father, the grace of innocence came wholly from the Trinity, without the mediation of any incarnated divine Person or any intermediate hierarchy. Grace and truth descended directly from heaven into the soul of the first human beings.11

Throughout the age of the Son, both during the time of Messianic expectation and during the time of the Son's incarnate presence, grace is filial and comes through the mediation of the Incarnate Word.12 Grace is now a christic grace; i.e., a grace given because of the foreseen future passion of Christ. Even before the Incarnation, it confers adoptive sonship.13

During the period of the Son of God's incarnate presence, grace comes through sensible contact with Jesus Christ.

The age of the Holy Spirit follows the age of the Son but does not abolish it; rather, it completes it. The visible mission of the Son establishes the head of the Church, and the mission of the Spirit establishes the body of the Church on the day of Pentecost (the wind and

---

9 EVI, II, p. 280.
10 EVI, II, p. 278.
11 EVI, II, p. 280.
12 EVI, II, p. 281.
13 EVI, II, p. 283.
flame merely render visible the Spirit’s invisible mission). The arrival of the age of the Holy Spirit, or the age of Christianity, is marked by two new mysteries: the Eucharist and the hierarchy. “The grace of the age of the Spirit is christic in the strongest sense of the term; it receives all the perfection of intensity and extension that Christ came to give it.” This is the age of the “catholicity of Christian salvation.” The graces of contact, formerly available only to those who were privileged to have met Christ during the time of His presence, are henceforth extended to all the peoples of history in and through the Eucharist and the sacramental powers of the hierarchy.

This necessarily brief outline of the “times of the Church”, as described by Journet, lays the foundation for our main line of questioning: to what age of the Church does the Virgin Mary belong? This is not a quantitative question of history or chronology; it is a problem of salvation history.

Journet responds that it is the Virgin’s privilege to belong to the time of Christ’s presence. All the other contemporaries of Christ belonged, either to the time of waiting for Christ (Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna), or to the age of the Holy Spirit (the Apostles). John the Baptist, and the other saints of the Gospel, are to be counted among the saints of the old Law, even as it is coming to an end. It is only with the glorification of Christ (Ascension) that they pass over into the age of the Holy Spirit.

Chronologically, the Virgin’s life appears before Christ and is present on the day of

---

14 EVI, II, p. 292.

15 On comprend...que la grâce de l'âge de l'Esprit va être christique au sens le plus fort du mot, et qu'elle va recevoir toute la perfection intensive et extensive que le Christ était venu lui donner. EVI, II, p. 302.

16 EVI, II, p. 303.
Pentecost. Qualitatively, she belongs only to the age of Christ’s presence. Again, this view allows Journet to illustrate convergence and divergence between Mary and the rest of the Church:

She fulfills, in herself alone, an entire age of the Church: the age of Christ’s presence. This means that the grace of Christ is meted out to her according to a law, a rule proper to her; that, keeping intact the distinction between Christ-God who is the head, and the Church (a pure creature) who is the body, the Virgin, who is immediately directed to the person of the redeeming Word by her maternity, is the point or pole within the Church at which, in return, the attraction of the redeeming Word makes itself felt with the greatest force; that the law of conformity with Christ is realized more intensely in the single person of the Virgin than in the entire Church as a whole.17

Three main points should be observed in the paragraph above: Mary receives christic grace in a manner peculiar to her; she is the highest personal realization of what the Church is as a collective whole; how the law of conformity with Christ is realized in her (see Chapter Seven for a full discussion of this last point).

What is distinctive and unique about the derivation or distribution of grace in the case of the Virgin Mary? First, she receives the divine grace of Christ by “immediate contact,” not through the sacramental powers of the hierarchy. As noted above, others had received grace by sensible contact with Christ, during the time of His presence (from the Annunciation to the Ascension). But these others had also participated in the distribution of grace in the manner proper to the age of the Father, or the age of the Holy Spirit. All the contemporaries of Christ, except His mother, stand either at the end of the Old Testament, or at the beginning of the age

17Elle remplit à elle seule tout un âge de l’Église: l’âge de la présence du Christ. Cela veut dire que la grâce du Christ lui est dispensée suivant une loi, un régime, qui lui est propre; que, la distinction entre le Christ-Dieu qui est la tête, et l’Église pure créature qui est le corps, étant intacte, la Vierge, référée immédiatement à la personne du Verbe rédempteur par sa maternité, est dans l’Église le point, le pôle, sur lequel, en retour, l’attraction du Verbe rédempteur se fait sentir avec le maximum de puissance; que la loi de conformité au Christ, est réalisée plus intensément dans la seule personne de la Vierge, que dans toute l’Église entière. EVI, II, p. 440.
of the Holy Spirit. The Virgin alone is in-between. She was present just before Jesus came, at the Annunciation, and she remained a little while after He departed, after His Ascension.

Why does Joumet insist on this point? The distinction is, first of all, negative: the Virgin does not receive grace through the mediation of the sacraments, which are like a continuing touch of Christ, extended forward in time and throughout the world. The sacramental economy could have functioned partially during the time of Christ’s presence, but it did not become necessary until after His Ascension (age of the Holy Spirit). Thus, during the time of Christ’s presence, Mary did not need the sacraments to receive christic grace. Moreover, during the age of Christ’s presence, “the whole Church was represented by Mary.”

The grace that would be extended to the world through the sacramental economy was hers by immediate contact.

The expression “immediate contact” with Christ arouses curiosity. Just what is the nature of this immediate contact? Is it strictly physical? Psychological? After all, she was not the only one to have received graces in this manner. The Gospel tells of others who received the grace of Christ by immediate contact, from “a look from His eyes, a word from His mouth, brushing against His garment, or by the laying on of His hands. These were the most rich and precious of graces.” While the rich graces of immediate contact constituted the Church, it is grace given at a distance, sacramentally, that expands the Church. The former are the most

---

18EVI, II, p. 290.
19EVI, II, p. 440.
20Méroz, p. 251.
21Certaines seront confrères par contact immédiat, par un regard de ses yeux, par un mot de sa bouche, par le frôlement de ses vêtements ou par l’imposition de ses mains. Ce seront les graces les plus riches et les plus précieuses. EVI, II, p. 288.
intensive, while the latter are more extensive. As it happens, Journet does not go into personal or psychological detail when explaining how Mary received grace. Ultimately, the reason for the uniqueness of the derivation of christic grace in her case is her divine motherhood. As was pointed out in Chapter Four: Mary is not only the Mother of God; she is the Worthy Mother of a Savior God. The Incarnation is a redemptive incarnation, and in accepting a role in it (at the Annunciation), Mary accepts the fulness of redemption.

The grace Mary receives may also be viewed as a response to or reward for Mary's physical contribution to the Incarnation. She gave Jesus, by contact, certain traits of His human nature: the color of His eyes. His personality, His way of speaking, etc., in return, she received divine grace by immediate contact.²²

Even after the Ascension, Journet insists, Mary continued to belong to the age of Christ's presence. He does not offer any justification for this assertion beyond what has been cited above; however, we might add one obvious reason that would be fully consistent with Journet's doctrine: since Mary is totally sinless, she has no need of the sacraments. But could she have received any of the sacraments? Journet responds:

Because she is without any sin, in her case one must rule out Penance, Extreme Unction, and, apparently, the Baptism of the new Law. Because she shines out completely in the order of the grandeurs of holiness, and has no share in the grandeurs of hierarchy, which will not be employed in heaven anyway, one must rule out Holy Orders.²³

The possibility of any woman receiving the sacrament of Holy Orders is much-discussed.

²²EVI, II, pp. 440-441.

²³Puisqu'elle est sans aucun péché, il faut écarter d'elle la pénitence, l'extrême-ontion, et semble-t-il le baptême de la loi nouvelle. Puisqu'elle brille tout entière dans l'ordre des grandeurs de sainteté, et qu'elle n'a point de part aux grandeurs de hiérarchie, qui seront d'ailleurs sans emploi dans le ciel, il faut écarter d'elle le sacrement de l'ordre. EVI, II, p. 441.
in our time. Therefore we should point out that Joumet excludes Mary from the ministerial priesthood, not only because of her sex, but because of her place in salvation history. She belongs totally to the age of Christ’s presence, when the grandeur of hierarchy are totally contained within Christ. In her case, Joumet says that we could speak of a mystical and interior priesthood of love, unique to her and non-transmissible; this would be another way of expressing her role as co-redemptrix of the entire world (see Chapter Six).

Because she is present in the Upper Room at the moment of Pentecost (Acts 1:14, 2:1), it does not appear that she needed to receive Confirmation afterward. Two sacraments remain: Marriage and the Eucharist. She enters into Marriage on the day of the Incarnation. For her, Marriage is not so much a means of receiving sanctification, as a means of bringing [into the world] the Messiah, the principle of all sanctification.

The reference to marriage is intriguing. What exactly does Joumet mean? Marriage to St. Joseph? To the Holy Spirit? Unfortunately Joumet gives no clarification in this passage. There is, however, another place where he speaks of Mary and marriage; that happens when he describes Mary as the prototype of the Church, the Bride of Christ. Instead of speaking of a “marriage” of human and divine nature in Christ, Joumet prefers to reserve the term for the union of Christ and His Church. Christ is the Bridegroom, the source of grace. The nature of Christ’s grace is nuptial, and the Church, Christ’s Bride, receives this “capital grace” in mutual

---

24 Joumet reviews the reasons why the ministerial priesthood is reserved to men in EVI, I, pp. 119-120 (incl. notes).

25 EVI, I, pp. 120-121 (incl. notes).

26 Puisqu’elle est présente au Cénacle au moment de Pentecôte (Actes, I, 14; II, 1), il ne semble pas qu’elle ait dû recevoir ensuite la confirmation. Restent deux sacraments, le mariage et l’eucharistie. Elle entre dans le mariage aux jours de l’incarnation, moins pour en recevoir quelque sanctification, que pour y introduire avec elle le Christ, principe de toute sanctification. EVI, II, p. 441.

27 EVI, II, p. 113.
The "grace of the Bride" is the grace of Christ inasmuch as it is distinct from its source; that is, inasmuch as it is received and given in mutual love. The grace of the Bride has two realizations: one collective, in the Church; the other personal, in the Virgin Mary. It is in this sense, it appears, that Joumet speaks of Mary entering into Marriage on the day of the Incarnation.

She undoubtedly participated in the assemblies wherein the first Christians commemorated the Last Supper, and communed, according to St. Paul, in the Body and Blood of Christ (I Cor 10:16-17). Until the end of her life, these communions must have increased her universal desire to save the world which her heart had embraced, from the time of the crucifixion onward. Just the same...she continued...to belong to the age of Christ’s presence. She does not belong to the age of the Holy Spirit.

Given that Mary belongs to the age of Christ and so receives grace by immediate contact, how does Joumet account for her reception of sacramental Communion? His explanation has to do with time—not, however, in the sense of times of the Church, but the relation of the risen Christ and of His mother, before her Assumption. The risen Christ has passed beyond the world of time, while His mother is “exiled” within time for a little while.

28 EVI, II, pp. 334-337.
29 EVI, II, p. 431. In line with Joumet’s thought, we might say that it is more meaningful to call Mary “Bride of the grace of Christ” than “Bride of Christ.”
30 Elle a certes participé aux réunions où les premiers chrétiens commémoraient la cène, et communiaient, selon le mot de saint Paul, au sang et au corps du Christ (I Cor., x, 16-17); ces communions devaient accroître, jusqu’à la fin de sa vie, le désir universel de sauver le monde que embraisit son cœur depuis le temps de la crucifixion. Mais même alors...elle continuait...de relever de l’âge de la présence du Christ. Elle n’appartenait pas à l’ère de l’Esprit saint. EVI, II, p. 441.

With regard to the Holy Eucharist, we may profitably cite the following comparison, taken from a section of EVI that discusses the common priesthood of the faithful: Le baptisé, en effet, a le pouvoir de coоперer liturgiquement au sacrifice de la messe, où Jésus ne cesse d’offrir le monde à son Père céleste: il peut être, à la messe, non seulement un spectateur et un assistant, mais un acteur et un participant—ou du moins, si l’on emploie ici le mot assistant, il signifie que le baptisé assiste à la messe un peu comme la Vierge à la mort du Christ: stabat...EVI, I, p. 98.
"The risen Christ could nevertheless have used [the sacramental] economy to assist His mother, who was still exiled within time, and to give her the Communion of His Body and Blood, as He had previously given it to His apostles."  

Mary does not belong to the age of the Holy Spirit, but this does not imply that her presence on the day of Pentecost may be passed over without comment.

Because Mary belongs to the age of Christ's presence, while the Apostles belong to the age of the Holy Spirit, the effects of the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost differ. For the Apostles, Pentecost is a baptism in the Spirit which gives them the power to witness to Christ to the ends of the earth, to found the universal Church. It is a beginning. For Mary, Pentecost is not a beginning, but the term of her earthly mission, the signal that her departure from this earth draws near.

Mary was uniquely privileged to receive the grace of Christ in a unique manner because of her unique association with Him. In the case of Mary, the derivation or distribution of grace happens in a manner "prior to and greater than the entire sacramental economy."

...(T)he law of conformity with Christ is realized more intensely in the Virgin alone, than in the whole collectivity of the Church which, since Pentecost, belongs to the age of the Holy Spirit. The Church, the Bride, is never as intensely holy as in the time of Christ, when the grandeurs of hierarchy were still totally hidden away in Christ, and when...[the Church] is totally represented by the Virgin. She is never so intensely pure, coredemptrix, virgin

---

31 "Le Christ ressuscité pourra néanmoins se servir de cette économie, en vue d'aider sa Mère encore exilée dans le temps, et de lui donner, comme naguère à ses apôtres, la communion de son corps et de son sang. EVI, II, p. 442.

32 EVI, II, pp. 441, 442.

33 "...antérieur et supérieur à toute l'économie sacramentelle." EVI, II, p. 442.
and mother, victorious over sin and death.\textsuperscript{34}
CHAPTER NINE
THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARIAN DOGMAS

The title of the journal *Nova et Vetera* was suggested to Joumet by the ideas of innovation and tradition. These he saw as two complementary aspects of the gradual unfolding and explicitation “of the message that Christ deposited in the heart of the primitive Church.”¹ The *et* of the title does not connote opposition; it is a “both-and.”

As might be expected, the two Marian dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are thoroughly discussed by Joumet in connection with the development of dogma. Together with these two solemnly defined dogmas, Joumet groups Mary’s coredeemptive mediation. All three are discussed as examples of the same development from implicit to explicit knowledge. He is careful not to give coredeemptive mediation equal status with the two solemnly defined dogmas, but it is an integral part of his ecclesiological-mariological doctrine, and he does think that it may someday be defined.²

In studying Joumet’s explanation of the development of Marian dogmas, we wish to examine two main questions. First, how does he explain the development of dogma in a historical sense? Second, how does he handle Scripture?

Our main sources will be the first two volumes of EVI, the *Esquisse du développement du dogme marial* (*EDDM*), and the pamphlet *La définition solennelle de l’Assomption de la Vierge*. All of the fundamental principles of Joumet’s teaching on how dogma develops were already present

¹Méroz, p. 29.

²La doctrine de la médiation coredéemptrice de la Vierge, qui sera peut-être définie demain… When discussing the three dogmas on the same page, he is careful to capitalize *immaculée Conception* and *Assomption*, but *médiation coredéemptrice* never has initial capitals.
in the first volume of EVI (first edition, 1941). Joumet draws his fundamental ideas on the
development of dogma from the work of Francisco Marin-Sola, O.P., *L'Évolution homogène du
dogme catholique* (Fribourg, 1924).3 EDDM (1954) reprises this teaching at full length, including
the main Marian themes found in Volume Two of EVI, and adding some additional reflections;
e.g., a discussion of the meaning of Mary's virginity.

Joumet nowhere gives a summary statement of his approach to Scripture. His guide to
exegesis is Fr. Lagrange.4 Reading through EDDM, we may characterize Joumet's approach to
Scripture as "literal," in that he accepts the Gospel narratives as accurate accounts of historical
events. He holds that the Evangelists learned certain details about the lives of Jesus and Mary
from the lips of the Virgin herself. At the same time we need to say that Joumet's view of
Scripture does not stop at the level of historical event. He looks deeper, to find the mysterious
theological principles expressed in and through the events recorded. One ought to look at
Scripture with "the eyes of faith." In fact, for Joumet, the more "mysterious" reading of
Scripture is superior to an exegesis based primarily on grammatical principles.

It is very interesting to watch a theologian of the Neo-Thomistic school appealing to the
notion of implicit, preconceptual, unformulated knowledge. Joumet's theological work is
characterized by rigor of terminology. He does not hesitate to use very precise concepts; indeed,
for him, concepts make knowledge possible.5 "Concepts are (for faith) a specific instrument, its

---

3See EVI, I, p. 436, note.
4Emmanuel Lemiére, "Itinéraire intellectuel et spirituel d'un théologien de l'Eglise: Charles
5Blanc, p. 24.
formal means of reaching God.” How, then, will he get from the initial preconceptual faith of the primitive Church to the Marian dogmas of today, which are defined in an explicit conceptual manner?

Joumet begins with the “initial revealed deposit” of faith. This initial depth of content is preconceptual, obscure, perhaps even confused. Any mutation or extraneous addition is to be excluded from this initial faith or “sense” of the Church. This sense really contains, in an implicit unformulated state, everything that will be defined about the Virgin’s privileges later. This is why, in the definitions of the Marian dogmas, the Magisterium can say “the Church has always believed...” and “the Church has always been convinced...”

This primitive, preconceptual, unformulated knowledge can rightly be called “the Church’s initial faith.” To be more precise:

The starting-point of dogmatic development is the revealed deposit as it was known, not by the apostles, who received its revelation, apocalypsis; but as it was known by the early Church, which received it by tradition, paradosis.

In handing down the Gospel to the first Christians, the apostles employed both oral and written teaching (cf. II Th 2:15; I Cor 15:1). In this context, the word “tradition” embraces the whole paradosis, that which was handed down both orally and in writing.

The word “tradition” can also be used in contra-distinction to the word “Scripture.” In

---


In order to stay within the scope of this thesis, here we give only a summary description of Joumet’s teaching on dogmatic development. Our main concern is with the Marian material.

EVI, I, pp. 169-170, 437, 687-694; EDDM passim.

*Le point de départ du développement dogmatique est le dépôt révélé tel qu’il est connu, non point par les apôtres, qui en ont eu la révélation, apocalypsis; mais par l’Eglise primitive, qui le reçoit par pure tradition, paradosis.* EDDM, p. 29.

EDDM, p. 29.
this restricted sense, it refers only to those truths which the first Christians received solely by

\[
\text{Christ and His Spirit} \downarrow \\
\text{The Apostles} \downarrow \\
\text{Tradition} \downarrow \\
\text{Scripture} \downarrow \\
\text{Revealed Deposit}
\]

word of mouth.\(^{11}\) This may be illustrated by the following diagram, found in EDDM (p. 30):

Journet avoids the common phrase “Tradition, Scripture, Magisterium,” preferring the word-pair “Tradition and Magisterium.”\(^{12}\) This he does to avoid the tendency of certain theologians and exegetes who “present Scripture and Tradition as two theological loci which are not only distinct, but separate, forming two halves of the revealed deposit.” Journet’s view is that “Scripture...presents itself as containing explicitly, not to be sure all the truths of the revealed deposit,

\(^{11}\)EDDM, p. 30.

\(^{12}\)EDDM, p. 46. He does acknowledge that the phrase “Tradition, Scripture, Magisterium” can be understood in an “excellent” sense, citing the example of Henri de Lubac, Méditation sur l’Église (Paris, 1953), p. 189.
but at least the essential truths, the first principles, the articles of faith, based on which the entire revealed deposit can later be made explicit, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit."\(^{13}\) This task of explicitation falls to the Magisterium, "an authority infallibly entrusted by Christ with the task of protecting the apostolic deposit and developing it in the course of time."\(^{14}\)

Thus, the initial revealed deposit is not transmitted except in being made explicit. As time passes, the treasure of this initial deposit needs to be made explicit, formulated. The new dogmatic definitions are not new revelations, but only new explicitations or new developments of the revealed deposit, which was given to the world by Christ and the Apostles, once and for all. Nothing is added from without; all is hidden within the primitive deposit.

According to Vatican I, the Holy Spirit was "promised to Peter and his successors, not to reveal to them some new doctrine...but to assist them in the task (a) of guarding... (b) and keeping...the revelation that comes to us from the Apostles; i.e., the deposit of faith."\(^{15}\)

We can conceive of two kinds of deposits, says Journet:

1. inert, to be conserved as they are

2. living, which is conserved only if it develops.

The Gospel story of the scribe gives the answer: Every scribe who has knowledge of the kingdom is like the head of a household who draws from his treasury both new and old—\textit{nova et

\(^{13}\)l'\'Ecriture...se présentait comme contenant explicitement, non pas sans doute toutes les vérités du dépôt révélé, mais du moins les vérités essentielles, les principes, les articles de foi, à partir desquels le dépôt révélé tout entier pourrait, avec l'assistance de l'Esprit saint, s'expliciter ultérieurement, EDDM, 36 (emph. in original).

\(^{14}\)...une autorité infaillible chargée par le Christ de protéger le dépôt apostolique et de le développer au cours du temps... EDDM, p. 43.

\(^{15}\)Cf. \textit{le Concile du Vatican, session IV, chap. 4, ...où il est dit que le rôle des successeurs de Pierre est non pas de révéler une nouvelle doctrine, mais de garder fidèlement la révélation transmise par les apôtres}.EDDM, p. 41, n. 38.
A living deposit, then.

The revealed foundation of the Church’s faith about Mary, the initial primitive deposit which will constitute the point of departure for all dogmatic development, must present the following characteristics:

(1) It will offer an explicit sense/meaning, capable of giving birth to all of Marian doctrine;
(2) This sense will not say anything explicit about the Immaculate Conception, Mary’s coredeemptive mediation, the Assumption;
(3) but it will not deny anything that will later be formulated in these dogmas;
(4) it will be capable of triumphing over the challenges (défis) that will arise in the course of centuries, and thus be capable of being made explicit by means of a rigorous application of logic, but within the transluminous night of faith, thanks to the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit. 16

The faithful carry in their hearts the living roots of everything that will later be defined, inasmuch as they share in the “initial faith” of the Church in Mary. They share in the Church’s “initial and perennial sense” of this mystery. These definitions will not catch the faithful by surprise, except in cases of insurmountable and therefore not-culpable error. This is also Newman’s teaching (Journet quotes at length):

First, Infallibility cannot act outside of a definite circle of thought, and it must in all its decisions, or definitions, as they are called, profess to be keeping with it. The great truths of the moral law, of natural religion, and of Apostolic faith, are both its boundary and its foundation. It must not go beyond them, and it must ever appeal to them. Both its subject-matter, and its articles in that subject-matter, are fixed. Thus, in illustration, it does not extend to statements, however sound and evident, which are mere logical conclusions from the Articles of the Apostolic Depositum; again, it can pronounce nothing about the persons of

---

16EDDM, p. 100.
heretics, whose works fall within its legitimate province. It must ever profess to be guided by Scripture and by tradition. It must refer to the particular Apostolic truth which it is enforcing, or (what is called) defining. Nothing, then, can be presented to me, in time to come, as part of the faith, but what I ought already to have received, and have not actually received; if not, merely because it has not been told me. Nothing can be imposed upon me different in kind from what I hold already,—much less contrary to it. The new truth which is promulgated, if it is to be called new, must be at least homogeneous, cognate, implicit, viewed relatively to the old truth. It must be what I may even have guessed, or wished, to be included in the Apostolic revelation; and at least it will be of such a character, that my thoughts will readily concur in it or coalesce with it, as soon as I hear it ... Let me take the doctrine which the Protestants consider our greatest difficulty, that of the Immaculate Conception... indeed, it is a simple fact to say, that Catholics have not come to believe it because it is defined, but it was defined because they believed it.\(^\text{17}\)

If it has been stipulated that Scripture will not say anything explicit about the Immaculate Conception, co redemptional mediation, and the Assumption, then what exactly is this “explicit sense” Journet speaks of? An explicit sense of what? Not of the doctrines that were later to be made explicit, but of two fundamental principles of Marian doctrine. The first principle concerns the work of salvation, whose source and principle is Christ, the head of the mystical body. Salvation has two realizations: one collective, the Church; the other personal, the Virgin. What is common to these two realizations? The idea of the spiritual maternity of the mystical body. The second principle is the divine maternity: Mary alone is worthy mother of the Savior-God.\(^\text{18}\) The scriptural foundations of these two principles have been left us by St. Luke and St. John.

St. Luke


\(^{18}\)EDDM, pp. 60-63; 99-100.
At the outset, Journet admonishes us that we need to read St. Luke as the primitive Church did, with the “eyes of faith.”

His witness does not depend on a single word, on the question of whether or not one ought to translate κέχαριτομένη as gratia plena... The only possible reading is the most profound reading, the reading that is most aware of the holiness of the Incarnation and of its repercussions, in short, the most... “mysterious.”

By “mysterious”, Journet means a reading that takes into account the great mysteries of the faith. According to Journet, our goal in reading St. Luke is to discover a foundational principle (idée-mère); namely, “the primitive Church’s intuition concerning the mutual relationship between Mary and her Son, who is God.”

He will look for this intuition in three places: the annunciation of John the Baptist, the Annunciation of the Savior, and the Magnificat.

The annunciation of the Forerunner (Lk 1:5-25) parallels the Annunciation of the Savior, but on a different level. The former happens during the age of waiting for Christ, when the Church can give birth only to members of the mystical body; the latter is the privileged moment when the Church, represented by the Virgin, gives birth to Christ Himself.

The greeting that Elizabeth offers Mary at the Visitation (Lk 1:41-45) shows that Elizabeth understands the difference between the two events:

“She knows the mystery of Mary’s maternity; she confesses her as mother of her Lord (1:43) And she understands that Mary is mother spiritually, in a...
The Annunciation offers the greatest sign of Mary’s unparalleled holiness: the unparalleled miracle of virginal motherhood. Gabriel’s task is to explain God’s plan for the world’s salvation (cf. Dan 8:16, 9:21). Mary questions the angel (“How can this be...?”), because she has taken a vow of virginity. Does God now want her to give it up? The angel explains that the miracle of her virginal motherhood will respect this vow. Then all is clear for her. “She has heard God’s word in its entirety. She sees what the angel asks of her: it is up to her to believe—and to respond. The Angel, before departing, awaits her consent.”

The unique importance and the incomparable greatness of Mary’s acceptance is due to the God’s infinite respect for her, her vow of virginity, her free decision. Herein lies the

---

22 Elisabeth...connaît le mystère de la maternité de Marie: elle la confesse mère de son Seigneur (I, 43). Et elle comprend que c’est spirituellement, saintement, que Marie est mère: elle la proclame bénie parmi les femmes, bienheureuse d’avoir cru à la parole du Seigneur (I, 42, 45)...C’est, en termes équivalents, la reconnaissance expressé de la Théotokos, de la digne Mère de Dieu. EDDM, pp. 79-80.

23 EDDM, p. 99.

24 Mais elle n’ignore pas que Dieu a accepté et ratifié son vœu de virginité. Lui demande-t-il maintenant d’y renoncer? De là son anxiété. EDDM, p. 81.

25 EDDM, p. 81. In a retreat conference (1951), Journet draws a moral lesson from this:

An English mystic, Julian of Norwich, said something which I love very much: “See with what courtesy God treats His creature.” The Virgin Mary could have said “no”...But of course God knew from all eternity that she would say “yes,” a totally free “yes.”

With us, God uses the same courtesy. He does not insist; He never forces. He proposes this or that to you. You could say “no.” If this is not a fault, you will not fall into mortal sin; you will remain in the state of grace, but you will have excused yourself from an adventure that could have been marvelous...It will be one of the sorrows of Purgatory if, one day, God should admit us there, to have passed up so many of these invitations of divine grace, soft as the breeze that Elias heard on the mountain as the Lord was approaching. (La Vierge Marie et l’Église, reprinted from Nova et Vetera 1979/1 (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1979), p. 6.)
mystery: “She was proportioned, as far as it was possible for a mere human creature, to the sublime mission of giving birth, not only to members of the mystical body, but to Christ-God Himself. ...The unique holiness of...the Virgin Mary in the hidden order of grace is signified, in the visible order, by the unique miracle...of her virginal conception.”26 The true meaning of kēcharitōmēnē is that it signals how God has favored her by “proportioning” her to the greatness of her mission, so that she is not only Mother of God, but the worthy mother of God who is the Savior of the world.

This is why Journet is rarely satisfied to say “Mother of God”, preferring to say “worthy Mother of a Savior God (digne Mère d’un Dieu sauveur).” This somewhat lengthy title has its advantages: above all, it strictly links Mary’s privileges to her Incarnate Son, and places her within salvation history. It brings out the redemptive purpose of the Incarnation. Because the Church is the mystical body of Christ, whose mission is the salvation of the world, the title is also ecclesial (cf. Chapter Four).

In Mary’s Magnificat, Journet sees an expression of Mary’s awareness of how much God has done for her, specifically, in what he has done to prepare her for her mission. She understands that God has set her apart. “Mary knows that she is at the center of time—at the point where all the promises of the Old Covenant, since Abraham, are fulfilled and all the graces of the salvation to come begin.”27 Before the Annunciation, she knew that she was loved, but every man is loved by God more than he thinks. After the “yes” of the Annunciation, she

---

26...elle a été proportionnée à la mission sublime d’enfanter, non pas seulement des membres du corps mystique, mais le Christ-Dieu lui-même...La sainteté unique au monde de la Vierge Marie dans l’ordre caché de la grâce est signifiée, dans l’ordre visible, par le miracle unique au monde de sa conception virginales. EDDM, p. 81 (emph. in orginal).

27Maria sais qu’elle est au centre du temps. Au point où aboutissent toutes les promesses de l’Ancienne Alliance, depuis Abraham, et d’où partiront toutes les graces de salut pour l’avenir, jusqu’à la fin des temps. EDDM, p. 82.
sees all at once, in retrospect, the holiness demanded by the mystery of the Incarnation. She sees the remote preparations, from Abraham until John the Baptist, and she sees the ultimate preparation God has made in her: “and it is at this moment, it seems to us, that she must have become aware, in the wonderment of her heart, of the reason and the reality of her Immaculate Conception.”

St. John

The Protogospel of Genesis (Gn 3:15) is too obscure and implicit to serve as a point of departure for Mariology. St. John, however, as an apostle, can show us what the Protogospel ultimately signifies. He does this in chapter 12 of Revelations, which may be called “the authoritative reading, the apostolic exegesis of the Protogospel.” The Woman clothed with the sun is the Church, whose mission is to give birth to members of the mystical body. The Church, however, at the supreme moment of her existence, is represented by the Virgin, who gives birth to Christ Himself. The image of the Woman Clothed with the Sun shows that Mary is strictly associated with Christ’s war against the devil. The main point to be found in this portion of the initial revealed deposit is that the entire Church is recapitulated in the Virgin (cf. Chapter Eight).

In his Gospel, St. John depicts two episodes of Marian interest: Cana and Calvary. In

---

28 Mais maintenant, après le oui de l’Annonciation, elle voit tout d’un coup rétrospectivement dans la lumière inouïe des exigences de sainteté du mystère de Jésus, la sainteté des préparations divines avant-dernières de l’Incarnation, commencées avec Abraham pour durer jusqu’à Jean-Baptiste, et des préparations dernières, commencées avec la bienveillance de Dieu sur elle: et c’est à ce moment, nous semble-t-il, qu’elle doit prendre conscience, dans l’émerveillement de son cœur, de la raison et de la réalité de son immaculée Conception. EDDM, pp. 82-83.

29 EDDM, p. 91.
each scene, Jesus makes a solemn statement to His Mother: “first, at Cana in Galilee, when He begins His public life; second, on the Cross, when He brings it to completion. The relationship (between the two scenes) is very profound...They form an ensemble.”

Jesus’ words, “Woman, what is this to you and to me?” express the necessity of separation, as in the story of the Finding in the Temple (Lk). The solemn word “Woman” indicates distance. The miracle, performed at Mary’s behest, manifests Jesus’ divine glory. It reveals something about Mary as well: she has been heard: “Nothing that could be said about the power of the Virgin’s intercession will ever equal the Gospel account of Cana. It is the hour of Mary’s glory, hidden within the glory of Jesus’ first manifestation [of His glory].”

Calvary, like Rev 12, shows Mary joined with Christ in the struggle against evil. “The Apocalypse shows us the Woman strictly associated with and totally participating in Christ’s combat and...represented by the Virgin, she is contemporary with the days from His birth to His ascension. The supreme moment of Jesus’ conflict with...the Prince of this world...is that of his death on the Cross...” Here too, the Virgin is strictly associated with and totally participating in Jesus’ sacrificial act of redemption, on behalf of the whole world. Just as the Annunciation shows Mary freely and knowingly giving her consent to the mystery of salvation which begins in the Incarnation, Calvary shows Mary freely and knowingly giving her consent to the mystery of salvation that is consummated in the Redemption. As was the case at the Annunciation, her consent makes her a mother. “‘Woman, behold your son.’ Then He said to

30EDDM, p. 95.
31EDDM, p. 97.
32EDDM, p. 97.
the disciple, 'Behold your mother’" (Jn 19:26-27). “It is she that is his mother, not the other way around. The words, “Whoever does the will of my Father, is my mother,” do not give the Beloved Disciple any spiritual maternity over the Mother of Jesus.”

Calvary shows us the ideas of coredemption and Mary’s universal spiritual motherhood. In Christ and with Christ, Christians have the possibility of participating in the Redemption of the world (cf. Chapter Seven).

Scripture not only reflects the primitive Church’s initial faith in Mary’s uniqueness; it also contains passages which seem to raise serious difficulties. Although these difficulties or “défis évangeliques” seem to oppose the “explicit sense” of the passages mentioned above, it will be seen that, in the end, this sense will be sufficiently vigorous to triumph.

These apparent contradictions are not rare in the Gospels. For example, it is stated that Jesus is God (Jn 1:1), but then we see Him complaining that God has forsaken Him (Mk 15:34). There are several other significant examples. Why didn’t God arrange the Scriptures differently, so as to do away with obscure passages, to remove the possibility of serious misunderstanding?

First, because of the “congenital weakness” of human language itself, especially in regard to supernatural mysteries, it was not possible to compile a scripture in such a way as to rule out all future misunderstandings or equivocation. The only solution, to ensure publicly that the original sense of the revealed deposit (whether oral or written) would be preserved, was to establish an infallible Magisterium. Indeed, this same possibility of misunderstanding establishes the necessity for such a Magisterium.

---

33EDDM, p. 98.
There is a second answer, which pertains to the very heart of the evangelical life. These obstacles serve to raise the level of our understanding, to alert us to the power of God. Happy are those who, instead of being scandalized, discover providential reasons in them. They are instructive.

The story of the Finding in the Temple indicates that Mary did not understand Jesus’ saying: “Did you not know that I must be about my Father’s business?” How could she forget that her Son was the Son of God? In fact, what Mary does not understand is why Jesus, in doing His Father’s will, had to be separated from her. This is a demand of her mission as Mother of the Savior-God, a demand previously unknown to her. “It was necessary that she should be separated from Him; this is similar to [the cross, when] He Himself will be separated from His Father... “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”

What of the scene in Mark, where Jesus’ family comes looking for Him and, when informed of their search, He responds: “Who are my mother and my brothers? And turning and looking around at those seated in the circle He said, ‘Here are my mother and my brothers. For whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother” (Mk 3:32-35). These words contain a teaching, first, for those who would follow Jesus; second, for His mother. The bonds which unite the children of the kingdom are superior to the human bonds of family relationships. The bonds of spiritual relation take precedence: “If anyone comes to me without hating his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple” (Lk 15:26). As for His Mother, who has never done anything other than God’s will, she learns that Jesus must face rejection and sarcasm now that He has begun His public mission, and face it alone, without her.
From now on...the Virgin will no longer approach her martyred Son to console Him. He will again be treated as a blasphemer; the governor’s soldiers will also consider Him to be out of His mind. Mary will remain at a distance; she will leave Him in solitude. She understood that a solitude like this was required for the redemption of the world.34

A third apparent challenge (défi) is found in St. Luke, when an unnamed woman praises Jesus: “Blessed is the womb that carried you and the breasts at which you nursed.” He replied, “Rather, blessed are those who hear the word of God and keep it” (Lk 11:27-28). In fact, this woman was glorifying Mary. “Hearing the word of God and keeping it, that is what this magnanimous woman came to do. And Jesus, in return, makes her understand that this is precisely what He loves in His Mother.”35 The words of the unnamed woman echo those of Elizabeth: “Blessed is she who believed that the Lord’s words to her would be fulfilled” (Lk 1:42, 45) as well as Mary’s own words in her Magnificat: “Behold, henceforth all generations will call me blessed” (Lk 1:48).

Ultimately, the challenges (défis) in the Synoptic Gospels illuminate the meaning of the Annunciation, the Visitation, and the Magnificat.

In what has been said above, we have outlined what Journet calls the “revealed foundation” of Marian doctrine. In it he discerns two foundational principles:

All the sources [of Marian doctrine] are in Christ alone. He is the principle of the whole work of salvation. He is the Head of the whole mystical body. This is the first principle of our Marian doctrine.

The work of salvation has two realizations: one collective, the Church;

34Désormais... la Vierge n’approchera plus pour consoler son Fils martyrisé. Il sera de nouveau traité de blasphémateur; les soldats du gouverneur le regarderont eux aussi comme hors de sens. Marie demeurera à distance. Elle le laissera à sa solitude. Elle a compris qu’une telle solitude est requise pour la rédemption du monde. EDDM, p. 88.

35Écouter la parole de Dieu et la garder, voilà ce que venait de faire cette femme magnanime. Et Jésus, en échange, lui fit comprendre que c’est précisément cela qu’il aimait en sa Mère. EDDM, p. 88.
the other personal, the Virgin. The Church, in hearing the word of God, in keeping it, in doing the will of the heavenly Father, in fighting against Satan, is divinely (saintement) the mother of the members of the mystical body. The Virgin, in hearing the word of God, in keeping it, in doing the will of the heavenly Father, in fighting against Satan, is divinely (saintement) the mother of Christ-God, Head of the whole mystical body. The Virgin, moreover, is mother of the disciples, and mother of the Beloved disciple. Therefore, within the mystical body, she represents an absolutely unparalleled (inégalable) holiness.

From the holiness prepared by God for giving birth to members of the mystical body, to the holiness prepared by God for giving birth to Christ, is a distance which cannot be bridged by any extrapolation, to be compared to a passage to the limit. The Gospel itself gives us a sign of this unequaled discontinuity in the hidden order of holiness: the unequaled and unrepeated miracle of virginal motherhood. In short, according to the witness of Scripture, among all the daughters of men, Mary alone is the holy Mother of a Savior God. This is the second principle of our Marian doctrine. 36

The explicitation of the initial revealed deposit left by Christ and the Apostles has been going on for almost twenty centuries now. The process of unfolding has not always moved at a steady pace, but has ebbed and flowed according to historical circumstance. Joumet discusses the vicissitudes of this explicitation in EDDM, 103-149. Here we do not give a complete summary of his historical analysis, but to bring out only those points peculiar to him, showing what is unique and noteworthy in his observations.

36Toutes les sources sont dans le Christ seul. Il est prince de toute l’œuvre du salut. Il est tête de tout le corps mystique. Voilà le premier principe de notre doctrine mariale.

L’œuvre du salut a deux réalisations, l’une collective, l’Église; l’autre personnelle, la Vierge. L’Église, en écoutant la parole de Dieu, en la gardant, en faisant la volonté du Père céleste, en luttant contre Satan, est saintement mère des membres du corps mystique. La Vierge, en écoutant la parole de Dieu, en la gardant, en faisant la volonté du Père céleste, en luttant contre Satan, est saintement mère du Christ-Dieu, tête de tout le corps mystique; et par surcroît mère des disciples, et même du disciple bien-aimé. Elle représente de ce fait dans le corps mystique une sainteté absolument inégalable. De la sainteté préparée par Dieu pour enfanturer les membres du corps mystique, à la sainteté préparée par Dieu pour enfanturer le Christ, il y a une distance qui ne se franchit que par une extrapolation, par l’équivalent d’un passage à la limite. De cette discontinuité sans exemple dans l’ordre caché de la sainteté, l’Évangile nous donne, en outre, lui-même un signe: le miracle sans exemple ni récidive de la maternité virginnale. En résumé, selon le témoignage de l’Écriture, parmi toutes les filles des hommes, Marie seule est la sainte Mère d’un Dieu Sauveur. C’était le second principe de notre doctrine mariale. EDDM, pp. 99-100.
Mary's Virginity

Above all, Journet wants to show that the Church's teaching on Mary's perpetual virginity resulted from a rigorous, logical reflection on the Church's belief in the Incarnation and its consequences for Mary.

When the Church has to interpret Matthew 1:25 ("And he (Joseph) did not know her until she gave birth to a son") or Luke 2:7 ("And she gave birth to a son, her first-born") or has to explain who "the brothers of Jesus" are, the Church knows in advance that her belief in Mary's perpetual virginity has nothing to fear from the results of an accurate exegesis, and that, since Mary understands the mystery of the Incarnation as the Gospel bears witness, and since she freely acquiesced to the demands of her mission as Mother of God and experienced (éprouvé) within herself the miracle of the virginal conception, it is no longer possible that she could have looked for any reason to live, other than her Child. Here is a rigorous development of the initial intuition of the Church's faith.37

The argument from fittingness, or argument of convenience, has no proper value, says Journet; it has value only as a sign that can lead us to "a more hidden, pre-conceptual, unformulated intuition, based on the Gospel."38

When he speaks of theologians who lack clairvoyance (second paragraph of quote above), he may be referring to Karl Barth. "A theologian like Karl Barth understands...that, on the one hand, the Catholic doctrine on the Virgin and, on the other hand, the Protestant doctrine on the Virgin, are, in virtue of an inescapable logic, the result of the initial vision which, on the one hand,

37Quand il faudra interpréter Matthieu, 1, 25: "Et il (Joseph) ne la connut pas jusqu'à ce quelle enfantât un fils", ou Luc, 11, 7: "Et elle enfanta son fils premier-né", ou expliquer qui sont les "frères de Jésus", l'Eglise sait d'avance que la croyance en la perpétuelle virginité de Marie n'a rien à craindre des résultats d'un exégèse exacte, et que, Marie ayant cette intelligence du mystère de l'Incarnation dont témoigne l'Evangile, ayant acquiescé librement aux exigences de sa mission de Mère de Dieu et éprouvé en elle le miracle de la conception virginnale, il n'est plus possible qu'elle ait pu chercher d'autres raisons de vivre que son Enfant. Il y a là un développement rigoureux de l'intuition initiale de la foi de l'Eglise. EDDM, p. 105.

38EDDM, p. 106, n.5. He offers an example of the sort of argument of convenience that he declines to use: "If a virgin had to give birth, she could only give birth to a God, and if God had to be born, he could not be born except from a virgin, who would remain a virgin always." See also EDDM, p. 107, n. 8.
Catholicism and, on the other hand, Protestantism have of Christ and His work.\(^3^9\)

With regard to the development of the doctrine of the virginal conception of Jesus, Journet rejects the historical analysis of E. Neubert and other Catholic authors: "It is an immense oversimplification to oppose...the 'faithful people' to the most famous Fathers and Doctors who were able to err on a point of Mariology..."\(^4^0\)

In defining the doctrine of Mary's virginity before, during, and after the birth of Christ, the Church is not adding

"any new revelation to the data (donné) that the Apostles handed down to her; rather, she is clarifying it, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. This is an 'in-depth re-reading' (re-lecture en profondeur) of Scripture which avoids the challenges (défis) addressed to her from the beginning. What the Church discovers about the virginal conception in the Gospel account is nothing but the initial realization, God's plan to give Mary the personal gift of an intimate bodily sign...of the divine transcendence of her Son, and of the unimaginably gratuitous privilege of her motherhood.\(^4^1\)

In discussing the historical development of the doctrine of Mary’s virginity, Journet has taken the occasion to show that "our sole foundation is the Scripture, read within the faith of

\(^{3^9}\)Un théologien comme Karl Barth comprend au contraire avec force que, d'une part, la doctrine catholique sur la Vierge, et, d'autre part, la doctrine protestante sur la Vierge, sont, en vertu d'une logique inéluctable, le résultat de la vision initiale qu'ont, d'une part, le catholicisme, et, d'autre part, le protestantisme, du Christ et de son œuvre. EDDM, p. 106, n.6.

\(^{4^0}\)C'est simplifier démesurément les choses que d'opposer, avec certains auteurs catholiques, comme E. NEUBERT... aux plus illustres des Pères et des Docteurs qui ont pu errer sur un point de mariologie... EDDM, p. 107, n. 7.

\(^{4^1}\)L'Eglise... n'entend ajouter aucune révélation nouvelle au donné que lui ont transmis les apôtres; mais éclairée par l'Esprit saint qui l'assiste, c'est à une "re-lecture en profondeur" de l'Écriture que l'invitent les "défis" qui lui ont été adressés du dehors; et ce qu'elle découvre dans le récit évangélique, c'est, à propos de la conception virginielle, qui n'en est que la réalisation initiale, le dessein de Dieu de donner personnellement à Marie un signe corporel intime... de la transcendance divine de son Enfant, et du privilège inimaginablement gratuit de sa maternité. EDDM, pp. 107-108. Emph. in original.
the Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit."\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{The Immaculate Conception}

As we have seen above, the basis for the Church's Marian doctrine is found in the Scripture alone. But Scripture also contains apparent challenges to Marian dogmas. For example: Scripture clearly teaches that holiness and salvation come to men only through Christ's self-sacrifice on the Cross. "If the Virgin is holy and saved, she could not be so except through the redemption [won by] Christ."\textsuperscript{43} Here is the major question, the major challenge: "Mary has been saved from sin; how can she be all-holy?" As was the case with the doctrine of Mary's virginity, this question will be answered, not by "the doctors alone, even less by 'all the faithful people who are not theologians,' but by the Church insofar as infallibly assisted by the Holy Spirit."\textsuperscript{44}

The Council of Ephesus (431), in defining the total purity of the Theotokos, made it impossible to teach that the Virgin had been saved from a personal, actual, committed sin. One would have to say, then, that she had been saved from original, transmitted sin. But could she have been saved from original sin without actually contracting it? And if she never contracted it, would not redemption be superfluous? It appeared that a choice had to be made between immaculateness and redemption.

\textsuperscript{42}Notre seul fondement est l'Ecriture, lue dans la foi de l'Eglise, assistée par l'Esprit saint. EDDM, p. 107, n. 8.

\textsuperscript{43}...si la Vierge est sainte et sauvée, elle ne peut l'être que par la rédemption du Christ. EDDM, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{44}Il sera finalement résolu, non certes par les seuls docteurs, moins encore par le peuple de "tous les fidèles non théologiens, mais par l'Eglise en tant qu'inaïfèrement assistée de l'Esprit saint. EDDM, p. 113. Cf. p. 107, n. 7.
Here we pass over Joumèt's lengthy narrative and analysis of the theological debate as it continued up to the Middle Ages. We wish, however, to call attention to that historical point which he calls "the hour of temptation." The temptation was this: to affirm Mary's total holiness and thereby remove her from the work of redemption. "As opposed to the Church, which does not exist except under the Cross of Christ, Mary is independent of the Cross of Christ. She is thereby separated from the Church. In this view, one could exalt the Virgin endlessly, but she is henceforth deracinated from redeemed humanity, and disconnected from the Church. Mary is not the first of the redeemed. She is not glorified except in robbing the redemption of its fairest fruit. This is the hour of temptation." 45

Those who reacted against this view, according to Joumèt, did so because they were aware of the unbreakable bond between Mary and the Church. "They knew that Mary and the Church are inseparably united, that neither one exists except under the Cross of Christ. They are the two realizations, one personal, the other collective, of the Bride, of the new Eve, sprung from the side of Christ dying on the Cross." 46

It is common to read that theologians such as Aquinas opposed the Immaculate Conception, lest the dignity of Christ's redemption be lessened. But Joumèt's ecclesiological insights induce him to express the problem differently.

Happily, the hour of temptation was followed by the "hour of the solution;" namely, the


46 Ils savent que Marie et l'Eglise sont inséparablement unies, qu'elles n'existent l'une et l'autre que sous la Croix du Christ. Elle sont les deux réalisations, l'une personnelle, l'autre collective, de l'Épouse, de la nouvelle Ève, sortie du côté du Christ expirant sur la Croix. EDDM, p. 131.
concept of preservative redemption, articulated by William of Ware and Duns Scotus. Joumet notes that Cardinal Cajetan gave the best explanation of how this concept enables the holder “to remain faithful to the evangelical doctrine of the universality of redemption.”

The Church solemnly defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception on December 8, 1854. Joumet stresses that it was not Scotus and Cajetan who determined the final form of the dogma, “much less the non-theologians. The Spirit progressively led the Magisterium up until the hour of the definition.”

In concluding the section of EDDM that discusses the development of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, Joumet again has recourse to the couplet “collective-personal” in reference to the effects of Christ’s redemption.

What the faith of the Church read in the initial revealed deposit, was, first, that Christ-God is the Redeemer of all men. All men have been delivered and saved from sin by the grace that descends from His Cross to form His mystical Body. It (grace) leads to two realizations: one collective in the Church, the mother of Christians, which is without stain or wrinkle or anything of the sort, but there is no member of the Church who is always and entirely personally exempt from sin. The other personal in the Virgin, mother not only of Christians but of Christ...If Mary, according to the Gospel, is the all-holy (tres sainte) Mother of God, this supposes an incomparable redemption in her case...Thus one sacrifices neither Mary’s holiness nor her redemption. The Gospel is confessed whole and entire; the great dogmatic explicitations, which demanded centuries of work, ultimately serve only to manifest its divine coherence.

47EDDM, p. 134. See also n. 51.

48Ainsi Scot et Cajetan, d'une manière certes diverse, servent l'Eglise. Mais ce ne sont pas eux qui fixent la foi. Ce n'est pas non plus le peuple des non théologiens. C'est l'Esprit qui conduit progressivement le magistère jusqu'à l'heure de la définition. EDDM, pp. 134-135.

49Ce que la foi de l'Eglise lit dans le dépôt révélé initial, c'est d'abord que le Christ-Dieu est rédempteur de tous les hommes. Tous les hommes ont à être délivrés et rachetés du péché par la grâce qui descendent de sa Croix pour former son Corps mystique. Elle aboutit à deux réalisations. L'une collective dans l'Eglise, mère des chrétiens, qui est sans tache ni ride ni rien de semblable, mais dont aucun membre n'est personnellement toujours et tout entier exempt de péché. L'autre personnelle dans la Vierge, mère non seulement des chrétiens mais du Christ... Si donc Marie, selon l'Evangile, est la très sainne Mère de Dieu, cela suppose en elle une rédemption incomparable... On ne sacrifice
The Immaculate Conception and the Assumption

Joumet notes the close relationship between the two dogmas, as mentioned in the bull Munificentissimus Deus itself. Mainly, however, he wants to show that the dogma of the Assumption is not primarily based on the consensus fidelium, but on the initial revealed deposit of faith. Here he is, in part, responding to Oscar Cullman and Berthold Altaner. Cullman complained that the definition of the Assumption did not give a scriptural basis for it, but appealed to the consensus of the Church only. Altaner, in 1950, had challenged theologians to establish the truth of the Assumption without using arguments of convenience, the implication being that the dogma could not be defended in any other way. The relevant scripture is I Cor 15, where St. Paul reveals what Joumet calls “the law of co-resurrection” with Christ (we have discussed Joumet’s thoughts on this matter in Chapter Seven).

Saint Paul reveals to us, not only that the faithful will rise (or be glorified) at the end of the world. He also reveals to us why the law of the faithful is not to rise (or be glorified) until the end of the world. St. Luke and St. John reveal to us explicitly the incomparable holiness of Mary, mother not only of the faithful...but of Christ....She will be the first among the redeemed... In this explicit revelation, the notion of preservative redemption from original sin is implicitly contained; in such a way that the law of Mary will be to rise (or be glorified) without delay.

In the Church’s faith, adhering to the initial revealed deposit, there is a deep intuition of the still partly implicit, preconceptual, and unformulated depths concerning on the one hand the exceptional holiness of the Theotokos, and on the other the absolute necessity, the universality, the efficaciousness of the

donc ni la sainteté ni la rédemption de Marie. L’Evangile est confessé tout entier: les grandes explicitations dogmatiques, qui réclament le travail des siècles, n’ont pour fin que d’en manifester la divine cohérence. EDDM, pp. 136-137. Emph. in original.

50EDDM, p. 138, n. 52.

51EDDM, p. 140, n. 53. See also pp. 143-144 for another discussion of arguments of convenience.
redemption of the Cross of Christ. From these depths, given initially, the Church today, through the solemn definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, draws an explicit, conceptual, formulated knowledge.52

The role of the passing of time and of experiential knowledge in the development of Marian dogma

It is no accident that Marian dogmas were defined in stages, only after centuries of discussion and debate. According to Journet, the consecutive definitions of Marian dogma correspond, in a hidden way, to the great events of the life of the Church, and to the pressing pastoral questions of their times. “They mark the moments when, in the face of terrible ‘challenges’ (défis) addressed to her by the world, the Church must, through faith, come to a new awareness of the divine resources hidden within her from the days of her formation.”53 The cause of Mary and the cause of the Christian people are identical in each case.

“At Ephesus, when the divinity of Christ and Mary’s divine maternity are defined, what is immediately in question is the nature of Christ, head of the Church, and the two realizations

52Saint Paul ne nous révèle pas seulement que les fidèles ressusciteront (ou seront glorifiés) à la fin du monde. Il nous révèle encore pourquoi la loi des fidèles est de ne ressusciter (ou de n’être glorifiés) qu’à la fin du monde. Saint Luc et saint Jean nous révèlent explicitement la sainteté incomparable de Marie, mère non seulement des fidèles... mais du Christ... Elle sera la première des rachetés... Dans cette révélation explicite, est contenue implicitement la notion de rédemption préservatrice de la tache originelle; en sorte que la loi de Marie sera de ressusciter (ou d’être glorifiée) sans délai.

Il y avait dans la foi de l’Eglise adhérant au dépôt révélé initial, une intuition de profondeurs en partie encore implicites, préconceptuelles, informulées, concernant d’une part la sainteté exceptionnelle de la Théotokos, d’autre part la nécessité absolue, l’universalité, l’efficacité de la rédemption de la Croix du Christ. De ces profondeurs, données initialement, l’Eglise aujourd’hui, par les définitions solennelles de l’Immaculée Conception et de l’Assomption, prend une connaissance explicite, conceptuelle, formulée. EDDM, pp. 139-140. Emph. in original.

53Elles marquent les moments où, en face des “défis” terribles qui lui sont adressés par le monde, l’Eglise doit prendre par la foi une nouvelle conscience des ressources divines cachées en elle dès les jours de sa formation. EDDM, p. 145.
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of His mystical body, one personal in Mary, the other collective in the Church." The dogma
of the Immaculate Conception preaches the necessity of redemption of Christ for all men, and
the holiness of this redemption, to a world which denies sin and the need for the Cross, placing
its hope in human progress. The doctrine of the Virgin’s coredemptive mediation, which may
yet be defined, invites Christians to be united in and through Christ to all the Church, not
merely as “saved” but as “saviors” of the modern world. The Assumption militates against
materialism, emphasizing the sublime end to which our bodies and souls are destined.

We have seen that Journet presents the development of Marian dogmas as an
explicitation of theological principles that are implicit in the initial revealed deposit. These
dogmas are not manufactured out of a desire to heap more “glories” upon Mary; instead, they
are the result of an unfolding of fundamental principles. In the theology of Journet, these
principles are always ecclesiological principles first and foremost. According to evolving pastoral
need, the Magisterium gradually makes these truths explicit, under the guidance of the Holy
Spirit, in a rigorous logical development.

With this chapter we bring to a close our survey and synthesis of Journet’s Marian
document. The next two chapters represent an investigation into the possible influence of that
document on the Marian texts of the Second Vatican Council, the *Catechism of the Catholic
Church*, and the writings of two Popes: Paul VI and John Paul II.

---

54A Ephèse, où est définie la divinité du Christ et la maternité divine de Marie, ce qui est immédiatement en
question, c'est la nature du Christ, tête de l'Eglise, et des deux réalisations de son corps mystique, l'une personnelle en
Marie, l'autre collective en l'Eglise. EDDM, p. 146.
We have already noted that certain aspects of Journet’s Marian doctrine appear to anticipate the teaching of the Second Vatican Council in *Lumen Gentium*. In this chapter we shall discuss Journet’s participation in different phases of the Council, pointing out references to his works in the *Acta Synodalía* and his interventions during the fourth session. Next, we shall situate Journet’s ecclesiological approach among the approaches operative at the Council, to see how it relates to the ecclesiological vision expounded in *Lumen Gentium*, with special attention to Chapter VIII. Journet’s comments on the Mariological content of *Lumen Gentium* and on the title “Mother of the Church” will be examined.

Here we shall take a look at Paul VI. The pope who watched over the conclusion of the Council, who named Journet a Cardinal, was an avid reader of Journet’s works. What role did Journet’s writings play in Paul VI’s decision to proclaim Mary “Mother of the Church” at the end of the third session of the Council? Next we examine the period immediately following the Council. We shall look for traces of Journet’s thought in Paul VI’s apostolic constitution *Indulgentiarum Doctrina* and in his *Credo of the People of God*.

Throughout we must watch for causality or influence. Is it possible to ascertain to what extent Journet influenced the text of *Lumen Gentium* VIII and the teaching of Paul VI?

In October, 1960, Pope John XXIII named Journet a member of the theological Commission for the preparation of the Council. He was also on the subcommission *de Ecclesia.*

---

Joumet attended the first meeting of the theological Commission but his hearing was by then so impaired that he never came back. He then followed the unfolding of the first three sessions of the Council from a distance, relying on the reports of the press and the books of Fr. Antoine Wenger. His friend and bishop, Pierre Mamie, related that Joumet was so troubled by the events of this time that he was unable to work on the third volume of EVI. After Paul VI named him a cardinal on February 25, 1965, on the eve of the fourth session, he was able to be physically present at the fourth and final session.

While Joumet did not participate directly in the preparatory phase of the Council, his writings were cited in four schemata. The schema “de Ecclesia,” sent to the Fathers on November 23, 1962, contains only one reference to Joumet, concerning the duty of the Church to proclaim the Gospel. The reference is relatively insignificant. During the discussion of the schema “Christus Dominus,” distributed to the Council Fathers on April 27, 1964, Bishop Dino Staffa listed Joumet among many other theologians who supported his position on the authority of bishops and of ecumenical councils. This reference has nothing to do with teaching peculiar to Joumet. A more substantive appeal to Joumet was made during the debate on the schema “Apostolicam Actuositatem.” Bishop Repullès of Salamanca cited Joumet’s *Théologie de...* 

---


4“Présence...,” p. 44.

5“Présence...,” p. 41.

6“Présence...,” p. 47.
l’Église very closely in speaking of the activity of the Christian laity.\(^7\)

A more important appearance of Journet’s writings during the first three sessions of the council occurred during the debate over the schema “de Oecumenismo,” sent to the Fathers on April 22, 1963. In this case, Journet’s writings had a notable effect on the outcome. A note accompanying the schema quoted a passage from EVI about the status of the “dissident” churches of the East.\(^8\)

For our purposes, the most important appeal to Journet’s writings came during the discussion of the theme of the holiness of the Church. The schema cited Eph 5:27 which speaks of the Church “without spot or wrinkle, but holy and immaculate.” Here Msgr. Paul Philippe intervened, calling for more precision and citing Journet’s writings to support his position:

According to Msgr. Philippe, it was necessary to be more precise about the fact that it is the members of the Church who need to be purified and renewed, and not the Church itself, as the text of the schema could be understood to say. Further, in speaking of the holiness of the Church in an eschatological sense only, the text takes a clear-cut position on a matter freely debated among Catholic theologians: some consider that the Church on earth is already without spot or wrinkle; others think, to the contrary, that the Church is not yet without spot or wrinkle. The decree, then, had to be expressed in such a fashion as to not make one position more privileged than the other. In support of this proposition, Msgr. Philippe appealed to the long excursus that Journet devoted to this question and recalled that Fr. Congar had recognized the legitimacy of this position.\(^9\)

\(^7\)“Présence...,” pp. 50-51.


\(^9\)Selon Mgr Philippe, il faut mieux préciser que ce sont les membres de l’Eglise qui doivent se purifier et se rénover, et non pas l’Eglise elle-même comme le texte du schéma le laisserait entendre. De plus, en parlant de la sainteté de l’Eglise en un sens uniquement eschatologique, le texte tranche une position librement débattue entre théologiens catholiques: les uns estiment que l’Eglise sur terre est déjà sans tâche ni ride; d’autres pensent au contraire qu’elle ne l’est pas encore. La décret devrait donc s’exprimer de façon à ne pas privilégier une opinion plutôt que l’autre. A l’appui de cette proposition, Mgr Philippe renvoie au long excursus que Journet consacre à cette question et rappelle que le P. Congar a reconnu la légitimité de cette position. “Présence...,” pp. 50-51. Cf. n. 25.
The result of the debate was that one of Journet's central positions was allowed to stand. In the end, the Commission formally declared that “the text of the schema does not say that the Church herself is sinful, although one could say that the sanctification of her members renders her more pure...her permanent holiness is not denied.”

On the whole, Journet's writings were not used to a large extent during the first three sessions of the Council. Once he was named a Cardinal and began to participate fully as a Council Father, he made some dramatic and important interventions. On September 21, 1965, Journet intervened on the question of religious liberty. During the elaboration of *Gaudium et Spes*, he intervened four times: three times by submitting written amendments, and once in an oral intervention. It is worth noting that he spoke up on the indissolubility of marriage at the personal request of Pope Paul VI. On September 29, 1965, the Melkite Bishop Zoghby proposed in the Council aula that the Church should allow the remarriage of an innocent Christian who had been unjustly abandoned by his or her spouse. That evening, Pope Paul VI's personal secretary telephoned Journet and passed on the Pope's request that he should prepare a response and deliver it the next day. Journet composed his intervention that night, assisted by Fr. Antoine Wenger. The next morning, “by decision of the highest authority,” Journet was the first speaker on the schedule. His “grave and solemn” intervention held the attention of the Fathers as well as that of the journalists in attendance, who rushed to question Bishop Zoghby as he left the aula. Zoghby was obliged to clarify his views on October 4. Although the subject

---

10 *Textus schematis non dicit Ecclesiam ipsam esse peccatricem. Sanctificatione membrorum autem purior Ecclesia fieri dicit potest...Sanctitas permanens textu schematis non negatur.* AS III/VII, p. 46.

11 “Présence...,” p. 51.

12 “Présence...,” pp. 52-53.
matter of Joumet’s dramatic intervention does not bear upon his Marian doctrine, it reveals
how much confidence Paul VI had in him as a theologian.\textsuperscript{13}

Two other interventions touch upon his ecclesiology directly. On October 8, 1965 he
spoke of how adherents of non-Christian religions could be touched by the grace of Christ.
According to Torrell, “here is revealed the great thesis of the ecclesiology of mystery (ecclésiologie
mystère) which makes Joumet the anti-Bellarmine par excellence.”\textsuperscript{14} The final text accords with
Joumet's opinion, “but one could not say that his intervention determined this, since numerous
Fathers (quamplurimi patres) intervened with the same meaning.”\textsuperscript{15} He also submitted a written
list of 48 critiques and suggestions, of which 13 were accepted or taken into account, 8 were
rejected, and 27 were not mentioned in the Council documents.\textsuperscript{16}

Joumet made two written remarks on the schema on the life and ministry of priests,
which became \textit{Presbyterorum ordinis}. The first remark reveals one of his favorite ecclesiological
themes; the second shows his thoughts on theological study and method. With regard to no. 1
of the schema, he called for a greater emphasis on the idea that “the ministry of the hierarchy is
entirely ordered to the common good of grace and charity of the whole Mystical Body, since
the whole sacramental order and the whole hierarchical order are at the service of that end.”\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{13}“Présence...,” 59-61. Joumet later published a more developed essay on the subject: “Le

\textsuperscript{14}C’est ici que se révèle la grande thèse de l’ecclésiologie mystère qui fait de Joumet l’anti-Bellarmine par

\textsuperscript{15}“Présence...,” p. 62.

\textsuperscript{16}ibid.

\textsuperscript{17}...le ministère hiérarchique est entièrement ordonné au bien commun de grâce et de charité de tout le Corps
This idea was later incorporated into PO 2, but there is no evidence that the Commission was inspired by Journet’s suggestion.

Journet’s second written remark suggested that the original text, which spoke of the necessity of priests devoting themselves to the study of sacred Scripture, be amended to read “and the study of the Fathers and Doctors, above all of the Common Doctor.” Journet thought that by speaking of the study of Scripture alone, the text appeared to suppress Tradition as a locus theologicus in the Church. The final text, PO 19, recommends “reading and meditation on sacred Scripture” along with “the study of the holy Fathers and doctors and other witnesses of the Tradition.”

We may accept Torrell’s conclusion that Journet’s writings had only a very modest influence at the Council. And yet, the vision of the Church set forth by the Council agrees with one of Journet’s fundamental ideas; namely, the primacy of the values of grace. Without neglecting the institutional aspect of the Church, Journet’s ecclesiology sees charity as primary. “Charity, to the extent that it is fully christic, that is ‘to the extent that it is cultic, sacramental, oriented,’ constitutes the created soul of the Church.” Without this notion, “it is not easy to take into account the teaching of Lumen Gentium on the Church as communion, nor the diversity of possible ways of belonging to this ecclesial communion.” The primacy of charity is the basis for Journet’s unflagging insistence that the Church is all holy and absolutely sinless.

18...sur ce plan de la présence par ses écrits, Journet n’a exercé qu’une influence plutôt modeste. “Présence...,” p. 66.

19EVI, II, p. 646.

Journet himself brings this out in his 1965 article, “Le mystère de l’Église selon le deuxième concile du Vatican.” Journet’s commentary on Chapter VIII of *Lumen Gentium* becomes an occasion for him to review the main points of his own Marian teaching. Frequently he quotes verbatim from EVI. The text is worth reproducing in full:

It is in the perspective of holiness that it will be possible to define...the relation of the Church to the Blessed Virgin Mary (ch. VIII). All the holiness of the Church here below is condensed in Virgin’s “yes” made in the presence of the mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and, later, in the presence of the mystery of the redemptive death of Christ on the cross: “In conceiving Christ, giving birth to Him, nurturing Him, presenting Him to the Father in the temple, and suffering with her Son as He was dying on the cross, she cooperated in a wholly singular way by her obedience, faith, hope, and burning charity, in the Savior’s work of restoring supernatural life to souls.” All the holiness of the Church of heaven—with its concern for us and its powers of intercession—is condensed in the Virgin Mary from the instant of her transfiguration and assumption in glory: “The Virgin’s maternal role in the economy of grace, which began with the consent she faithfully offered at the Annunciation and which she sustained without wavering at the foot of the Cross, continues unceasingly until the time of the final consummation of all the elect. She did not lay aside this mission when she was assumed into heaven, but she continues in a wonderful way, by her manifold intercession, to obtain for us the gifts of eternal salvation.”

Without wishing to propose a complete doctrine on the Virgin, the conciliar Constitution (VIII 52-69) begins by pointing out her place both in the mystery of Christ and in the mystery of the Church (§ 1). It recalls the Virgin’s role in the economy of salvation: her presence in the Old Testament as mother of the expected Messiah, her virginal conception, her virgin birth, her presence in the infancy and then in the public life of Jesus, her Immaculate Conception and Assumption into heaven (§ 2). Because of the part she took in the drama of the world’s redemption, she became our Mother in the order of grace; she continues to intercede from heaven as advocate, auxiliatrix, helper, mediatrix; she is the type of the Church which resembles her as virgin and mother (§ 3). She is honored by the Church above all other saints as *Theotókos* (§ 4). She is the image...

---


22 LG VIII, 61.

23 LG VIII, 62.
and the firstfruits of the Church risen and glorified, the sign of hope for the pilgrim Church (§ 5).

In his discourse closing the third session, the sovereign Pontiff underscored the importance of these declarations: “This is the first time...that an ecumenical council has presented such a broad synthesis of Catholic doctrine on the place that Mary occupies in the mystery of Christ and of the Church.”

The grandeurs of the Church’s hierarchy will pass away; the grandeurs of the Church’s holiness will not pass away. For one who knows how to look upon the Church with the contemplative gaze of faith, the Church in its most basic essence reveals itself as marvelously connected to the mystery of the Virgin’s holiness. Such is the vision of the sovereign pontiff: “In truth, the reality of the Church is not exhausted in its hierarchical structure, its liturgy, its sacraments, its juridical ordinances. Its profound essence, the premiere source of its sanctifying efficaciousness are to be looked for in its mystical union with Christ; a union which we can not conceive in abstraction from her who is the Mother of the Incarnate Word, and who Jesus Christ Himself wished to unite so intimately with Himself for our salvation. This is why the loving contemplation of the marvels which God has wrought in His holy Mother has to be inserted into the vision of the Church. And the knowledge of the true Catholic doctrine on Mary will always constitute a key to an accurate understanding of the mystery of Christ and the mystery of the Church. The reflection on the strict relationships between Mary and the Church, so clearly established by the conciliar Constitution, persuades Us that this moment is the most solemn and the most appropriate time to fulfill a vow to which We alluded at the end of the preceding session...to declare explicitly, during the Council, the maternal function which the Virgin carries out on behalf of the Christian people. ...We believe it the right moment to dedicate...a title of honor for the Virgin...because it admirably synthesizes the privileged place of the Virgin in the holy Church, as recognized by the Council. To the glory of the Blessed Virgin and for our own consolation, We proclaim holy Mary to be MOTHER OF THE CHURCH...”

The Virgin, in whom the whole Church is entirely condensed during the time of Christ’s presence among us, espoused, more intensely than anyone else, her Son’s infinite desire to save the whole world through His Cross. She intercedes with her Son...that this vast desire might be fulfilled in all men, and that all those who do not refuse it might have eternal life and be saved; she is the Mother of all men without exception, whether they know it or not.

But for those who, like Mary, are openly members of the Mystical Body of which Christ is the Head, her intercession is colored by a new flame. She supplies for those who also espouse it, according to their capacity, the same desire for the salvation of the world that is in her...so that they are not only saved members but, with (Christ), in Him, through Him, saviors of their neighbors; i.e.,
of all men.\textsuperscript{24}

The Virgin Mary, \textit{Mother of all men}, is even more mysteriously \textit{Mother of the Church}. To invoke her in this way is to ask through her intercession for the most precious of graces here below, that of being conformed to Christ in order to suffer-with-Him and die-with-Him for the salvation of the whole world.\textsuperscript{25}

Here we find reprised Joumet’s teaching on Mary as prototype of the Church, in whom

\textsuperscript{24}Compare the following passage from EVI: \textit{Pour ceux qui appartiennent effectivement et corporellement à l’Église en acte accompli... ils sont... appelés d’une manière immédiate à intercéder pour les autres... Leur tâche n’est pas simplement d’être des membres sauvés par le Christ, elle est d’être dans le Christ, avec le Christ, par le Christ, des membres corédempteurs du reste des hommes. EVI, II, p. 407.

\textsuperscript{25}C’est dans la perspective de la sainteté qu’il sera possible de définir sous leur aspect le plus intime les rapports de l’Église et de la bienheureuse Vierge Marie (ch. VIII). Toute la sainteté de l’Église d’ici-bas se condense dans le oui de la Vierge mise en présence du mystère de l’Incarnation du Verbe et plus tard du mystère de la mort rédemptrice du Christ en croix: “En concevant le Christ...la vie surnaturelle des âmes.” Et toute la sainteté de l’Église du ciel—avec ses sollicitudes pour nous et ses puissances d’intercession—s’est condensée dans la Vierge Marie dès l’instant de sa transfiguration et de son assomption dans la gloire: “Le rôle maternel...les dons du salut éternel.” Sans vouloir proposer une doctrine complète de la Vierge, la Constitution conciliaire, VIII, 52-69, commence par indiquer la place qui lui revient soit dans le mystère du Christ soit dans le mystère de l’Église (§ 1). Elle rappelle ensuite le rôle de la Vierge dans l’économie du salut: sa présence dans l’Ancien Testament comme mère du Messie attendu, sa conception virgine, son enfantement virginal, sa présence dans l’enfance puis dans la vie publique de Jésus, sa conception immaculée et son assomption au ciel (§ 2). En raison de la part qu’elle a prise au drame de la rédemption du monde, elle est devenue notre Mère dans l’ordre de la grâce; elle continue au ciel d’intercéder comme avocate, auxiliatrice, aide, médiatrice; elle est le type de l’Église qui à sa ressemblance est vierge et mère (§ 3). Elle est honorée par l’Église par-dessus tous les saints comme Théotocos (§ 4). Elle est l’image et les prémices de l’Église ressuscitée et glorifiée, le signe d’espérance de l’Église pérennisante (§ 5).

Lors de son discours de clôture de la troisième session, le souverain pontife souligne l’importance de ces déclarations: “C’est la première fois... du Christ et de l’Église.”

Les grandeurs de hiérarchie de l’Église passeront; les grandeurs de sainteté de l’Église ne passeront pas. Pour qui sait lever sur l’Église le regard contemplatif de la foi, l’Église dans le plus essentiel d’elle-même se révèle comme merveilleusement apparentée au mystère de sainteté de la Vierge. Telle est la vision du souverain pontife: “En vérité, la réalité...MÈRE DE L’ÉGLISE...”

La Vierge, en qui l’Église est tout entière condensée au temps de la présence du Christ parmi nous, a épousé, plus intensément que personne, l’infini désir qu’avait son Fils de sauver par sa Croix le monde entier. Elle intercédera auprès de son Fils... pour que ce vaste désir s’accomplisse en tous les hommes, et que tous ceux qui ne s’y refuseront pas aient la vie éternelle et soient des sauvés; elle est Mère de tous les hommes sans exception, qu’ils le sachent ou l’ignorent.

Mais pour ceux qui, comme elle, sont ouvertement membres du Corps mystique dont le Christ est la Tête, son intercession se colore d’une flamme nouvelle. Elle supplie pour qu’eux aussi épousent, selon leur force, le même désir du salut du monde qui était en elle... pour qu’ils soient, non seulement des membres sauvés, mais, avec lui, en lui, par lui, des membres sauveurs de leurs prochains, c’est-à-dire de tous les hommes.

La Vierge Marie, Mère de tous les hommes, est encore plus mystérieusement Mère de l’Église. L’invoquer comme telle, c’est demander par son intercession la plus précieuse des grâces ici-bas, celle d’être conformés au Christ pour souffrir-avec-lui et mourir-avec-lui pour le salut du monde entier. “Le mystère...”, pp. 41-43.
the essential reality of the Church is “condensed” during the age of Christ’s incarnate presence.

The basic essence of the Church is not hierarchy, but holiness, a holiness due to union with Christ. Joumet also repeats, more or less word for word, his teaching on coredemptive mediation as found in EVI, II. The title “Mother of the Church”, proclaimed by Paul VI, is interpreted as confirmation of that teaching.

Paul VI also appears to endorse Joumet’s assertion that Mariology is a privileged part of Ecclesiology, that the two disciplines have parallel destinies, that to be mistaken about Mary is to be mistaken about the Church. Paul VI says: “knowledge of the Catholic doctrine about Mary will always constitute a key to an accurate understanding of the mystery of Christ and the mystery of the Church.”

Joumet says: “There is a relationship between the Catholic doctrine on the Virgin and Catholic doctrine on the Church...one could consider Mariology and Ecclesiology as two parallel treatises, and say that they are made of the same material, and bear on the same mystery, considered on the one hand in its exceptional realization, and on the other in its common realization.” And, more bluntly, “The Catholic doctrine on the Virgin and the Catholic doctrine on the Church crumble simultaneously.”

Paul VI’s allocution closing the third session of the Council leads us into our next object

---

26 Quoted in “Le mystère...”, p. 42.

27 Il y a parenté entre la doctrine catholique de la Vierge et la doctrine catholique de l’Église. ...En sorte qu’à parler d’une maniè re approximative, on pourra considérer la mariologie et l’écclesiologie, comme deux traités parallèles, et dire qu’elles sont faites d’une même étoffe, et portent sur le même mystère, considéré d’une part dans sa réalisation exceptionnelle, et d’autre part dans sa réalisation commune. EVI, II, p. 392.

of study; namely, the influence of Journet on the Mariology of Paul VI. This theme deserves broader and more intensive study than this thesis can afford; here we content ourselves with indicating some points of contact between Journet and Paul VI.

The influence of Journet’s writings on Paul VI’s ecclesiology has been investigated by Torrell (1986) who lists the following theologians as Paul VI’s “favorites:” Yves Congar, Jérôme Hamer, Charles Journet, Henri de Lubac, and Johannes Adam Möhler.29 Paul VI himself, in a general audience of Mary 26, 1971, speaking on the Mystical Body of Christ, mentions “outstanding theological studies (such as those of Johann Möhler, Cardinal Journet, Father Congar...)”30 In his audience of June 5, 1974, he called ecclesiology “the most attractive chapter in modern theology,” citing “the voluminous and very rich work of Cardinal Charles Journet.”31 The Pope’s text for his audience of July 27, 1977, has an explicit reference to EVI, II, concerning the four notes of the Church.32 These examples could be multiplied. Already as archbishop of Milan, Giovanni Battista Montini had cited Journet more frequently than any other author in his pastoral letter to the archdiocese of Milan, “Pensiamo al Concilio.”33 The papal secretary, Msgr. Macchi, reported seeing Paul VI consult EVI a great many times.


30OR, May 27, 1971; ORe, June 3, 1971.

31Cited in “Paul VI...”, p. 169.

32Ibid.

33Giovanni Battista Montini, "Pensiamo al Concilio. Lettera pastorale all’arcidiocesi ambrosiana per la Quaresima 1962.” Discorsi e Scritti sul Concilio I (Brescia: Istituto Paolo VI, 1983). The relevant passages are reviewed by Torrell, “Paul VI...”
In all of Paul VI's teaching, Torrell finds twenty-one citations of Joumet's ecclesiology, witnessing to "a real, profound, and warmly accepted influence." Moving from general to specific, we now inquire into the possibility of Joumet's influence on Paul VI's decision to proclaim the title "Mother of the Church" at the close of the third session. It does appear that Paul VI may have used EVI in working out the justification for the title. Giuseppe Colombo observes:

"The handwritten notes in the Archives of the Istituto Paolo VI in Brescia, kept in the file marked "Mary" for the most part have to do precisely with the question of Mater Ecclesiae, without however allowing one to decide if these notes stem from before the Council or from later. In any case, among the texts favoring [the title], meticulously collected together, the greatest number are by Charles Joumet, from the work L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné, and those of Jean Galot, in addition to two articles from the "Nouvelle Revue Théologique" ... We stress that Paul VI relied on Joumet in justifying the title, because the title itself does not appear in Joumet's writing before Paul VI's proclamation. The research of Canon René Laurentin has clearly established that Joumet never used the title before that point.

---

34 "Paul VI...", p. 171, n. 4.
36 The full text of Paul VI's proclamation is reproduced in Marianum 26 (1964), pp. 298-306.
states that Paul VI found the title and justification for it in de Lubac’s *Méditation sur l’Église*. \(^{39}\)

However, it is clear that Paul VI’s explanation of the title is in agreement with Journet’s ecclesiology in that the Pope presents Mary as Mother of the members of the Church, of “the pastors and the faithful,” not as Mother of the person of the Church or of the institution or of the society.

It is well known that a good many bishops and *periti* at the Council favored a more “maximalist” approach to Mary, and were disappointed when the original schema *De beata Maria* was integrated into the dogmatic constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*). To insert Mary into the Church, they felt, was to reduce her status. These participants favored the title “Mother of the Church,” as a means of safeguarding Mary’s exalted status. Paul VI’s explanation of the title both retained Mary’s superiority over the Church and balanced it with other complementary designations such as “daughter” and “sister” which speak of Mary’s integration within the Church. Does this not call to mind the teaching of Joumet, who begins his great chapter on the Virgin Mary with the statement, “The holy Virgin is at the heart of the Church,” \(^{40}\) and adds, “If our sister Mary is His Mother, then Christ is our brother?” \(^{41}\) At the same time, Joumet maintains Mary’s supereminent status, since she alone is the personal realization of the Church’s essence. She is the only member of the Church in whom the law of conformity to Christ is fully realized.

As we have seen, Joumet enthusiastically embraced the title after its official


\(^{40}\)La sainte Vierge est au cœur de l’Église. EVI, II, p. 382.

\(^{41}\)Le Christ sera notre frère, si notre sœur Marie est sa Mère. EVI, II, p. 384.
proclamation and used it to summarize his teaching on Mary’s coredemptive mediation. He does not fail to express his disappointment that the Council did not pronounce more clearly on Mary’s mediation, attributing this to the presence of non-Catholic observers:

(T)he presence of non-Catholic observers... is without a doubt one of the major innovations of this Council. ...We note that the timorous desire to avoid anything that might risk offending the non-Catholics could have sometimes led certain bishops to surprise their own flocks, for example when, in the discussion of a schema in which the intercession of the Virgin Mary was abundantly spoken of, they stumbled at the term “mediation,” as if all intercession was not mediation, and all mediation intercession.42

Moving into the post-Conciliar period, we can descry traces of Joumet’s thought in two important papal documents: the Apostolic Constitution Indulgentiarum Doctrina and the Credo of the People of God. With regard to the Apostolic Constitution, Paul VI personally asked Joumet to involve himself. The Pope had asked the Council for advice on the text, but the debate rapidly took an unsatisfactory turn. The Pope then asked Joumet to read over the text. He pronounced himself happy with the work, and continued, “It seems to me that the new discipline has made a great step forward by its sobriety and by its decision to renounce all “comput” and everything that recalls mathematics in the granting of indulgences. (It) allows one to insist—and one can never do this too much—on the fervor and primary importance of the theological virtue of charity: 1) which alone inserts us into the Communion of Saints, allowing the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the saints to revert to us, in short, the “treasure of the Church;” 2) which alone gives a satisfactory value to our own actions and good

42...la présence d’observateurs non catholiques... [est] sans doute une des innovations majeures de l’actuel concile. ...Notons que le désir timoré d’éviter ce qui risquait de heurter les non-catholiques a pu porter parfois certains évêques à surprendre leurs propres ouailles, par exemple quand, dans la discussion d’un schéma où il était parlé abondamment de l’intercession de la Vierge Marie, ils ont achoppé au terme de médiation, comme si toute intercession n’était pas médiation et toute médiation intercession. “Le mystère...”, p. 8.
works." 43

As was the case in the controversy over the indissolubility of marriage, Paul VI had once again demonstrated his confidence in Journet as a theologian and advisor. It is another indication that the kind of ecclesiological doctrine being embraced by the Magisterium was more in harmony with that of Journet. How otherwise could Mary and the saints participate in our salvation, except by being united with us in a bond of charity? 44

As for the Credo of the People of God, there is one passage that stands out in relation to Journet’s treasured concept of the sinless Church:

She (the Church) is therefore holy, though she has sinners in her bosom, because she herself has no other life but that of grace; it is by removing themselves from her life that they fall into sins and disorders that prevent the radiation of her sanctity.

This could be viewed as a summary of Journet's teaching on how the Church can be utterly sinless, while containing sinners. Perhaps we might see it as a fulfillment of what Journet himself said about his teaching on the holiness of the Church, “They don’t understand it, but I am sure that one day this doctrine will be acknowledged.” 45

43...Journet s’était déclaré “heureux du travail approfondi représenté (!) par les auteurs de la présente ‘relazione.’” „La nouvelle discipline me paraît réaliser un grand progrès par sa sobriété et par sa décision de renoncer à tout “compt” et à tout ce qui rappellerait la mathématique dans l’octroi des indulgences ... (Elle) permet d’insister—on ne le fera jamais trop—sur la ferveur et l’importance primordiale de la vertu théologale de charité: 1) qui seule nous insère dans la Communion des saints, permettant la réversibilité sur nous des satisfactions surabondantes du Christ, de la B. V. Marie et des saints; bref du “trésor de l’Eglise”; 2) qui seule donne une valeur satisfaisante à nos propres actions et bonnes œuvres. “Présence...”, p. 64.


How may we evaluate the influence of Journet on the Marian teaching of the Second Vatican Council? It does not seem possible to find any direct influence. One can understand the musings of Jean-Pierre Torrell:

> In comparing (Journet's) influence on Paul VI and the richness of his contribution to the fourth session (of the Council) on the one hand, and the very small number of references to his writings during the preparatory work on the other, it is difficult to avoid the thought that his work was neglected. The matter struck me so forcefully that I asked myself at first whether (Journet's work) had not been systematically ignored. Sometimes, before looking for reasons for this possible setting aside, it was necessary first to check to see whether Journet constituted a case apart from other, more favored theologians. 46

Even though Journet's writings cannot be said to have informed the Marian teaching of *Lumen Gentium* VIII, it could be said that the reverse is true. Reading the conciliar text, a text of the Magisterium, enables one to see how much Journet's Mariology still speaks to the post-conciliar Church. The ecclesiology of the Council, while not heavily influenced by Journet's writings, can be seen to validate the central insights of his theology of the Church.

We may gain a further appreciation for Journey's Marian doctrine by situating him in relation to the Mariological approaches in vogue at the time of the Council. During the debate about the schema *De beata*, two opposing Mariological tendencies were at work. In the words of Msgr. Philips,

> Those who held the first conception (of Mariology) began by looking at sources, from the very earliest documents, to observe the gradual evolution, not only of the history of salvation, but of the movement of theology and the daily life of the Church. A positive study, devoid of polemical intentions and without

---

46 *En comparant son influence sur Paul VI et la richesse de son apport à la quatrième session, d’une part, et le très petit nombre de références à ses écrits durant le travail préparatoire, d’autre part, il est difficile de s’empêcher de penser que son œuvre a été méconnue. La chose m’a tellement frappé que je me suis même demandé, en un premier temps, si elle n’avait pas été systématiquement négligée. Toutefois, avant de chercher les raisons de cette éventuelle mise à l’âge, il fallait d’abord vérifier si Journet constituait un cas à part parmi d’autres théologiens qui auraient été plus favorisés. “Présence...”, p. 65.*
false irenicism, seemed to them the surest way to accomplish a constructive dogmatic work, along with rendering the most useful service to pastoral practice and to piety. This approach had the advantage of avoiding disagreeable conflicts, without taking refuge in a disloyal silence about certain parts of official teaching or controversial devotional practices.

The partisans of the second tendency wished to set out from an absolutely different starting point, notably by way of exploiting Our Lady’s “privileges,” as they are described in the encyclicals of the recent popes. By an exact analysis of concepts and principles, they intended to propose, for the edification of the Christian people, new titles for the glory of the Blessed Virgin, and to clothe her cult with an even more radiant brilliance. To prove and reinforce positions determined in this way, they attempted to find dicta probantia in sacred Scripture and in Tradition, and to construct a strongly structured, free-standing doctrinal system. 47

In many ways, LG VIII is the product of compromise between these two tendencies, although it may be broadly stated that the first tendency prevailed, given that the Council did away with the plan of a separate document on the Blessed Virgin and declined to define new titles or privileges. Further, the first tendency stressed history and exegesis, and this led to the adoption of a final text that situated Mariology within the history of salvation. 48 Where is

47 De fait, deux conceptions restaient opposées face à face, irréductibles. Les tenants de la première partaient des sources pour observer, depuis les documents les plus anciens, l’évolution graduelle aussi bien de l’histoire de salut que du mouvement de la théologie et de la vie quotidienne de l’Église. Une étude positive, dénuée d’intentions polémiques et sans irénisme de mauvais aloi, leur semblait la voie la plus sûre pour accomplir une œuvre dogmatique constructive, tout en rendant d’émérites services à la pastorale et à la piété. Elle présentait l’avantage d’écarte bien des conflits désagréables, sans se réfugier dans un silence déloyal concernant certaines parties de la doctrine officielle ou concernant les pratiques dévotionnelles discutables.


Joumet to be situated between the two tendencies?

In the first place it is clear that Joumet develops his explanations for Mary’s privileges by “an exact analysis of concepts and principles,” in that he derives all of Mary’s privileges from her Divine Maternity: Mary is the worthy Mother of a Savior God. In addition, the “law of total conformity to Christ” is used to explain what it means to say that Mary is the “prototype” of the Church. In turn, the two principles he calls “the law of total purity” and “the law of co-resurrection,” themselves derived from the “law of total conformity to Christ” explain her Immaculate Conception and Assumption respectively. In this respect he would appear to fall among the partisans of the second tendency. Nevertheless, he does not fit neatly into this category. It would be wrong to characterize Joumet as a simple Marian maximalist. The titles he accords to Mary are not given merely out of fervor, out of a personal or devotional desire to render her more honor, in keeping with the saying de Maria nunquam satis. Nor does he desire to construct a “free-standing” Mariology; to the contrary, his Mariology is perfectly integrated into his theology of the Church and his understanding of salvation history. Mary’s privileges, according to Joumet, are, in the final analysis, the privileges of every Christian who participates in the life of the Church, the Bride, as she is more and more conformed to Christ her Spouse. Mary is not a semi-divine being, set apart from the other members of the Church; rather, she is the exemplar of redeemed humanity, transformed by christic grace. What sets her apart is the exceptional way in which christic grace is communicated to her.

LG VIII does not depend on Joumet’s ecclesiotypical Mariology and was not directly inspired by it; nevertheless, it confirms the validity of his insights into the parallels between Mary and the Church, who
herself is a virgin, who keeps in its entirety and purity the faith she pledged to her spouse. Imitating the mother of her Lord, and by the power of the Holy Spirit, she keeps intact faith, firm hope and sincere charity. But while in the most Blessed Virgin the Church has already reached that perfection whereby she exists without spot or wrinkle (cf. Eph. 5:27), the faithful still strive to conquer sin and increase in holiness. And so they turn their eyes to Mary who shines forth to the whole community of the elect as the model of virtues.\footnote{LG VIII, 64-65.}

Without at all setting out to do so, the Council has confirmed Journet’s teaching that Mary is personally what the Church is collectively.

In the next chapter, we set out to show that the Catechism of the Catholic Church and the teachings of Pope John Paul II develop the Mariology of Vatican II in a direction that brings the official teaching of the Magisterium even closer to the Mariology of Charles Journet.
CHAPTER ELEVEN
JOURNET'S MARIAN DOCTRINE, THE CATECHISM
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND JOHN PAUL II

At the close of the previous chapter we asserted that the post-Conciliar Magisterium, as expressed in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the writings of Pope John Paul II, presents a Marian doctrine that draws close to that of Charles Journet in several significant places. In the present chapter we present passages from the CCC and from the teachings of John Paul II, pointing out how they resemble key points in the Mariology of Charles Journet. Again the question of influence or causality will be posed. Because the Marian texts of the CCC often quote the writings of John Paul II, we will investigate the *Catechism* and the Pope's works in the same chapter.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*

Emmanuel Lemière, in the course of his first reading of the CCC, was convinced that the text "reflected Journet's thought on a certain number of precise points where his teaching is most personal." But he also asks whether this might be merely "a first intuition which needs to be checked and verified by research."  

Lemière identifies four themes in the CCC which he considers a close reflection of

---

1 *Cet article est né de la conviction intime, acquise lors d'une première lecture..., que ce document officiel de l'Eglise catholique... reflétait la pensée de Journet sur un certain nombre de points précis où sa doctrine est plus personnelle. "Charles Journet, pour en finir avec un mythe. Réflexions à l'occasion d'une première lecture du 'Cathéchisme de l'Eglise catholique.'"* NV 68 (1993), p. 6.

2 *Impression vive et inoubliable de la tranquille assurance du cardinal Journet? Ou simplement intuition première que la recherche doit contrôler et vérifier?* Ibid.
Joumet’s thought: religious liberty, a conception of the Church as mystery (*ecclesiology mystérieuse*), intercommunicability of holiness in the Church, and the holiness of the Church itself. The last three themes are relevant to our investigation, especially the theme of the holiness of the Church. After a quick look at the last two of the four themes surfaced by Lemière, we look into a theme he did not mention; namely, the Marian teaching of the Catechism and its relationship with that of Joumet.

The intercommunicability of holiness is the basis for the doctrine of indulgences as presented in the CCC. Here the CCC depends heavily on Paul VI’s Apostolic Constitution *Indulgentiarum Doctrina* (see previous chapter), which it quotes at length in paragraphs 1474-1478. A comparison of Paul VI’s text, promulgated January 1, 1967, with Joumet’s article on the theology of indulgences, dated February 2, 1966, reveals that both documents appeal to the notions of the Mystical Body and of the communion of saints. For the purposes of our study we should note that the theology of indulgences is related to the question of coredemptive mediation. Mary and the saints are described as cooperating in the salvation of their brethren in the unity of the Mystical Body. The doctrine of indulgences is intelligible only within a vision of the Church that puts charity at the heart of the mystery, and sees Christ and the members of the Church as *una mystica persona*.

A more important theme for our study is the holiness of the Church. CCC 823 quotes the Second Vatican Council’s document *Unitatis Redintegratio*: “The Church...is held, as a matter of faith, to be unfailingly holy. This is because Christ, the Son of God...loved the

---

3 CCC 1477, quoting ID 5.

4 St. Thomas Aquinas, ST III, q. 48, a2. ad 1.
Church as his Bride." But the CCC continues, "In her members perfect holiness is something yet to be acquired... (825).” Paragraph 829 concludes the section on the Church’s holiness by quoting LG 65: “But while in the most Blessed Virgin the Church has already reached that perfection whereby she exists without spot or wrinkle, the faithful still strive to conquer sin and increase in holiness. And so they turn their eyes to Mary...” and then the CCC adds one short summary statement, “in her, the Church is already the ‘all-holy.’”

Up until that last little statement, the CCC had been quoting Vatican II. With the addition of that statement, the text immediately recalls Joumet’s teaching concerning Mary as Prototype of the Church. Mary anticipates the collective destiny of the Church. But Mary and the Church are not two utterly distinct realities: “The truth is that the Church and Virgin are one. When I distinguish the Church from the Virgin, I say that the Virgin is the point toward which the Church tends.”

The CCC also quotes the passage from Paul VI’s Credo of the People of God already discussed in the previous chapter: “The Church is therefore holy, thought having sinners in her midst, because she herself has no other life but the life of grace.”

It may or may not be mere coincidence that both Joumet and the CCC quote the exact same passage from St. Thérèse of Lisieux wherein the Little Flower describes love as the heart of the Church.

---

5La vérité consiste à dire que l’Église et la Vierge ne font qu’un. Quand je distingue l’Église de la Vierge, je dis que la Vierge est le point vers lequel tend l’Église. VME, p. 10

6Credo of the People of God 19, CCC 827. Cf. EVI, II, pp. 905, 906, 908.

Joumet's conception of Mary as prototype, as personal realization of who the Church is in her collectivity, as anticipating in her person the collective rhythm and destiny of the Church, finds another close parallel in the section of the CCC that discusses the actions of the Holy Spirit in history. Beginning at paragraph 722, we find a passage organized around the idea that the Spirit first accomplishes in Mary, an individual, what He will subsequently accomplish in the Church as a collective whole. The same four verbal ideas are referred, first to Mary, then to the Church, as seen in the following excerpt (italics in the original):

(1) “The Holy Spirit prepared Mary by his grace... (722)
(2) In Mary, the Holy Spirit manifests the Son of the Father,
(3) now become the Son of the Virgin. (724)
(4) Finally, through Mary, the Holy Spirit begins to bring men... into communion with Christ. (725)"

Moreover, the Catechism echoes, in part, Joumet's idea of the "times of the Church."

At the end of the mission of the Spirit, Mary became...the mother of the "whole Christ." As such, she was present with the Twelve, who "with one accord devoted themselves to prayer," at the dawn of the "end time" which the Spirit was to inaugurate on the morning of Pentecost with the manifestation of the
Church (726).

By his coming [on the day of Pentecost]...the Holy Spirit causes the world to enter into the "last days," the time of the Church...(732)."

Is it possible to ascertain what influence Joumet's writings may have had on the CCC in general and on the Marian texts in particular? We can, at least, establish that Cardinal Christoph von Schönborn, who may be considered the main architect (or at least structural engineer) of the CCC, is rather familiar with the ecclesiology of Joumet and quotes him admiringly. For example, in his book From Death to Life, Schönborn cites 3 passages in EVI and 2 articles from NV, as well as Joumet's speech on the power of evil delivered during the Second Vatican Council. Schönborn calls Joumet "one of the most significant spiritual figures of modern Church history." While none of the passages in question has Marian content, Schönborn does quote with approval Joumet's statement that "From the time of Christ onward, the whole Church has entered the end time; she is eschatological." And without an eschatological vision of the Church, much of Joumet's Marian doctrine, and much of the Catechism's Marian doctrine, makes no sense.

John Paul II

Perhaps the most striking parallel between the Marian doctrine of Joumet and the

---


10Schönborn, op. cit., p. 120.
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teaching of John Paul II is in the Pope’s teaching about the “Marian dimension of the Church.”

Drawing partly on John Paul II’s Mulieris Dignitatem, the CCC identifies Mary with the spotless Bride of Eph 5:27:

In the Church this communion of men with God, in the “love [that] never ends,” is the purpose which governs everything in her that is a sacramental means, tied to this passing world. “[The Church’s] structure is totally ordered to the holiness of Christ’s members. And holiness is measured according to the ‘great mystery’ in which the Bride responds with the gift of love to the gift of the Bridegroom.” Mary goes before us all in the holiness that is the Church’s mystery as “the bride without spot or wrinkle.” This is why the “Marian” dimension of the Church precedes the “Petrine.”

It is regrettable that the CCC does not define the meaning of the “Marian” and “Petrine” dimensions of the Church. From the context, however, it is clear what John Paul II is saying: in the Church, holiness precedes structure, charism precedes institution. If we understand the “Marian dimension” as identical with holiness, and the “Petrine dimension” as identical with hierarchy, is this idea not virtually identical with Journet’s teaching that the grandeurs of holiness are greater than the grandeurs of hierarchy? Remember that, according to Journet, Mary belongs entirely to the grandeurs of holiness.

It is not clear and at present cannot be said whether John Paul drew this insight from the writings of Journet. On the face of it, his Marian-Petrine vocabulary appears inspired by Hans Urs von Balthasar.

Journet’s concept of the “times of the Church” represents an attempt at a historical view of the mystery of the Church and thus of the various modalities of the distribution of grace before, during, and after the physical presence of the Incarnate Word in our world. We have

12CCC 773, quoting MD 27. A footnote at the end of the final sentence also refers the reader to MD 27.
already seen echoes of Journet’s vocabulary and thought in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. There are also some striking similarities between Journet’s analysis of Pentecost (see Chapter Eight) and the teaching of Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*:

Among those who devoted themselves to prayer in the Upper Room, preparing to go “into the whole world” after receiving the Spirit, some had been called by Jesus gradually from the beginning of his mission in Israel. Eleven of them had been made Apostles, and to them Jesus had passed on the mission which he himself had received from the Father. “As the Father has sent me, even so I send you” (Jn 20:21), he had said to the Apostles after the Resurrection. And forty days later, before returning to the Father, he had added: “when the Holy Spirit has come upon you...you shall be my witnesses...to the end of the earth” (cf. Acts 1:8). This mission of the Apostles began the moment they left the Upper Room in Jerusalem. The Church is born and then grows through the testimony that Peter and the Apostles bear to the Crucified and Risen Christ (cf. Acts 2:31-34; 3:15-18; 4:10-12; 5:30-32).

Mary did not directly receive this apostolic mission. She was not among those whom Jesus sent “to the whole world to teach all nations” (cf. Mt 28:19) when he conferred this mission on them. But she was in the Upper Room, where the Apostles were preparing to take up this mission with the coming of the spirit of Truth: she was present with them. In their midst Mary was “devoted to prayer” as the “mother of Jesus” (cf. Acts 1:13-14), of the Crucified and Risen Christ. 13

Obviously, Journet and Pope John Paul agree that Mary did not receive the mission to teach all nations. For Journet, the expansion of the Church is the task of the hierarchy, carried out during the age of the Holy Spirit, while Mary belongs entirely to the age of Christ’s presence. There is another, less obvious and less complete convergence: while the Pope points to Mary’s devotion to prayer, Journet points out that even though she did not receive an apostolic mission, she may be said to have received a special visible mission: “to manifest the grandeurs of holiness as they are joined to the grandeurs of hierarchy, for the expansion of the Church, and that is why the visible mission carried out by the Virgin at Pentecost did not differ from

13RM 26.
that of the apostles and disciples.” 14 One of the four traits of the Christian hierarchy is its affinity with the grandeurs of holiness, or its connatural relationship with the believing and loving Church. 15 This is illustrated by the story of Pentecost: Mary and the Apostles are gathered in the same room, awaiting the promised Holy Spirit, yet their missions differ. Jouret associates Mary’s holiness with the visible activity of the Church; the Pope calls our attention to Mary’s prayerful presence at the beginning of that activity. John Paul continues:

And that first group of those who in faith looked “upon Jesus as the author of salvation,” knew that Jesus was the Son of Mary, and that she was his Mother, and that as such she was from the moment of his conception and birth a unique witness to the mystery of Jesus, that mystery which before their eyes had been disclosed and confirmed in the Cross and Resurrection. Thus from the very first moment the Church “looked at” Mary through Jesus, just as she “looked at” Jesus through Mary. For the church of that time and of every time Mary is a singular witness to the years of Jesus’ infancy and hidden life at Nazareth, when she “kept all these things, pondering them in her heart” (Lk 2:19; cf. Lk 2:51). 16

Jouret insists that Mary alone belongs entirely to the age of Christ’s presence, beginning with the Annunciation. This agrees with the Pope’s observation that Mary is a “unique witness” to the mystery of Jesus. Further investigation discloses an even more striking parallel between the passage from John Paul II quoted above and the Marian doctrine of Charles Jouret. The Pope states that the early Church “looked at” Jesus through Mary, the better to understand the mystery of Jesus. It is startling to find Jouret saying exactly the same

15 The four traits of the hierarchy are 1. its organic character (corps apostolique), 2. its continuity in time (succession), 3. its instrumentality in relation to Christ (mediation), 4. its connaturality in relation to the Church believing and loving (affinity with the grandeurs of holiness). See EVI, I, pp. 643, 666-676, 679-680, 723.
16 RM 26.
thing, and recommending Christians of today to do the same:

...[T]he Church...looks at (regarde) the mysteries of Christian revelation with the eyes of the Virgin. The Church knows that the Virgin has looked at (a regardé) these things before we have. What the Church finds in the mysteries of the Annunciation, of Christmas, of the Redemption on the Cross, of Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, is the same thing that the Virgin saw. The Virgin’s faith forever colors the faith of the Church.

Try to contemplated with your own resources the mystery of the Crib, or the mystery of the Cross. Think, but only after you have tried this, of what these events were for the Virgin of the Gospel, whose eyes saw them. You will understand what was missing in your first contemplation. And you will perceive, perhaps, what escapes the Churches who refuse to use the Virgin’s outlook (regard) to read the Gospel revelation.17

It is impossible not to see a very strict parallel between the two passages. Someday, perhaps, scholars will have access to information that will tell us whether RM 26 was directly inspired by this passage from EVI.

Journet and John Paul II both teach, in different ways, that understanding Mary and understanding the Church go together. Journet identifies Mary with the Church, to the extent that, during the age of Christ’s incarnate presence, “the Church... at that time consisted solely of the Virgin Mary.” To understand Mary is to understand the Church, and to misunderstand Mary is to misunderstand the Church. While presenting Mary as an aid to understanding the Church, John Paul speaks more in terms of Mary’s spiritual motherhood in the Church, taking care not to place her outside the Church. He cites the Second Vatican Council’s teaching that

17Cela signifie que l’Église... regarde les mystères de la révélation chrétienne avec les yeux de la Vierge. Elle sait que la Vierge a regardé ces choses avant nous. Ce qu’elle retrouve dans les mystères de l’Annunciation, de Noël, de la Rédemption sur la croix, de Pâques, de l’Ascension, de Pentecôte, c’est cela même que la Vierge y a vu. La foi de la Vierge colore à jamais la foi de l’Église.
Essayez de contempler, avec vos propres ressources, le mystère de la Crèche, ou le mystère de la Croix. Pensez, mais seulement ensuite, à ce qu’ils ont été pour la Vierge de l’Évangile, de quels yeux elle les a vus. Vous comprendrez ce qui manquait à votre première contemplation. Et vous devinerez peut-être ce qui échappe aux Églises qui refusent d’emprunter le regard de la Vierge pour lire la révélation de l’Évangile. EVI, II, pp. 431-432.

the truth concerning the Blessed Virgin, Mother of Christ, is an effective aid in exploring more deeply the truth concerning the Church... Paul VI said, "Knowledge of the true Catholic doctrine regarding the Blessed Virgin Mary will always be a key to the exact understanding of the mystery of Christ and of the Church." Mary is present in the Church as the Mother of Christ, and at the same time as that Mother whom Christ, the mystery of the Redemption, gave to humanity in the person of the Apostle John. Thus, in her new motherhood in the Spirit, Mary embraces each and every one in the Church, and embraces each and every one through the Church. In this sense Mary, Mother of the Church, is also the Church's model.

Our conclusion to this chapter echoes the conclusion of the preceding chapter. While it may not be possible to prove a direct influence of Journet's writings on the Catechism of the Catholic Church or on the Marian doctrine of Pope John Paul II, nevertheless these magisterial documents can be seen to confirm several of Journet's key insights into the mystery of the Church and the mystery of Mary, and his views on how these two mysteries intertwine. It is hoped that further research will be able to show whether some of the striking parallels uncovered here are more than mere coincidence.

19 Paul VI, Address at the Closing of the Third Session of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council (November 21, 1964): AAS 56 (1964), 1015.

20 RM 47.
CHAPTER TWELVE
CONCLUSION

This final chapter will offer more commentary and critical reflection on Journet's main
Marian themes, following the order of the thesis chapters, beginning with Chapter Four. First,
we want to examine Journet's fundamental Mariological (and Ecclesiological) principles in
order to situate him within the overall Mariological context of his time.

Throughout this thesis attention has been drawn to original elements in Journet's
Mariology (and Ecclesiology). This might give the mistaken impression that Journet and his
views were a sort of "genetic sport" on the family tree of theology. In fact, he can be situated in
relation to a number of other contemporary theologians and theological tendencies. First, we
may ask, where does Journet locate the treatise on Mariology?

As we have seen, he locates it within Ecclesiology. We may justly place Journet among
the ecclesiologists of the "theandric" school. This began with the insights of Johann Adam
Möhler in the mid-19th century, eventually flowering into the theology of the Church
understood as the Mystical Body of Christ. The theology of the Mystical Body naturally tends
to examine Mary in terms of her place and role within the Church.¹

The authors who treated this subject after Scheeben had to follow his
brief, but very dense, developments. This is true, not only in the case of German
authors (J. Beumer, E. Commer, K. Feckes) but also in the case of French
theologians of the mystical body (J. Anger, E. Mura, and Father Mersch). In
general, they tend to develop Mary's universal role with regard to the Church,
her privileges, and her perfect holiness. Above all, they consider the Mother of
God as the most outstanding member [of the Church] and, as such, ordained to
cooperate in the work of Redemption. Father Mersch writes, "This is the kind of

¹"En fait, le développement puissant de l'écclesiologie et de la mariologie allait de pair dès le
commencement du renouveau théologique du milieu du XIXe siècle." Jaki, Stanislaus, O.S.B. Les
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Mariology which this work ought to propose: a Mariology in which the glory of Mary has to do with no one except with Christ, with nothing except Christianity, nothing except being the Mother of Christ” [Mersch, Théologie du Corps mystique, I, 208].²

It is easy to see how Journet’s Mariology fits into this framework. He states categorically that Mariology is a part, a privileged part, of Ecclesiology. He does not deny the validity of Mariology as a distinct topic or treatise, and yet, he integrates it into Ecclesiology. But what distinguishes his views from those of other theologians of the Mystical Body? One critical issue, which ought to be studied in depth, is the question of the fundamental principle of Mariology.³

Journet agrees with Suarez that the divine maternity is the basis of all of Mary’s privileges.⁴ He hastens to add, however, that Mary’s divine maternity must be viewed concretely, in the Gospel perspective of a redemptive incarnation. In this his view is partially congruent with that of J.M. Bover, for whom “the supreme principle of Mariology is the divine motherhood such as it was historically realized, and is really represented in revelation, which


makes of the Mother of God, the new Eve."\(^5\) There is a critical difference: for Bover et al the notion of New Eve is part of the fundamental notion of Mariology, while for Journet it is secondary and explanatory. Journet's view is closer to that of Scheeben. In fact, a brief comparison of Journet and Scheeben on the question of Mary serves to illustrate how the theology of the mystical Body naturally tends toward a certain kind of Marian doctrine.

[Scheeben] proceeds from the divine motherhood, but a more profound analysis...makes him discover in that unique motherhood a formal aspect distinguishing [it]...from every other human motherhood; namely, here the mother is, at the same time and inseparably, the bride of her Son. ... In order to call Mary's basic privilege at the same time the main principle of Mariology, he speaks of a bridal motherhood of God, or a maternal state as bride of God.\(^6\)

In Chapter Four we identified two fundamental principles of Journet's Mariology: first, Mary is the Worthy Mother of a Savior God; second, salvation has two realizations, one collective, in the Church, and the other personal, in the Virgin. Journet's two principles harmonize well with Scheeben's fundamental Mariological principle. First, Journet insists that Mary's divine maternity be viewed concretely, as related, not to Incarnation as an abstract concept, but as it really was, at the service of a redemptive Incarnation. Second, Journet speaks of Mary and the Church as two aspects of Christ's Bride, sine macula et ruga.

There is also a manifest resemblance between Scheeben's presentation of Mary as "prototype of the Church" and Journet's explanation of that same phrase. Both authors use the word "prototype" to indicate that Mary, individually, is the first and most perfect realization of the Church.


Compare

Scheeben:

But Mary is for that reason the prototype of the Church, as the idea of the Church is originally realized in her person and in the most perfect manner. Since she herself belongs to the Church and at the same time forms the head-member as root and heart, the idea of the Church as a supernatural principle assisting Christ also obtains its full, concrete and living figure. 7

and Journet:

This christoconforming grace brings, to the Virgin as to the Church, ...the gifts of exemption from sin, participation in the life of Christ, in His passion, His death, His resurrection, His ascension, and His glorification.

Speaking in an approximative manner, one could consider Mariology and Ecclesiology as two parallel treatises, and say that they are made of the same material, and contain the same mystery, considered on the one hand in its exceptional realization, and on the other hand in its common realization. 8

The convergence is evident: for both authors, Mary is the outstanding member of the Church, its first and most perfect realization.

Both authors call Mary the heart 9 and prototype of the Church. Despite certain similarities of vocabulary, one could not say that Journet owes the most original aspects of his Mariology to Scheeben. He gives Scheeben credit, along with Möhler and Grosche, for breaking away from the polemical and juridical Counter-Reformation conception of the Church and

8 A la Vierge comme à toute l’Église, mais avec des différences d’intensité qu’il faudra définir, cette grâce christoconforme apporte des dons analogues d’exemption du péché, de participation à la vie du Christ, à sa passion, à sa mort, à sa résurrection, à son ascension, à sa glorification.
   En sorte qu’à parler d’une manière approximative, on pourra considérer la mariologie et l’ecclésiologie, comme deux traités parallèles, et dire qu’elles sont faites d’une même étoffe, et portent sur le même mystère, considéré d’une part dans sa réalisation exceptionnelle, et d’autre part dans sa réalisation commune (EVI, II, 392). Emph. in original.
9 EVI, II, p. 573.
rediscovering the mystical concept of the Church as Bride of Christ. But Journet has gone far beyond Scheeben in developing the Mariological implications of such an Ecclesiology.

Another way to situate Journet is by looking at the dominant Mariological tendencies at the eve of the Second Vatican Council. We have done this to some extent in Chapter Ten, using the analysis of Philips. Now we return to the pre-Conciliar stage as described by C. Pozo, S.J., who characterized the debate in terms of a Christological vs. an Ecclesiological tendency:

The Christological tendency may be described in its broad outlines thus: first of all, it insists on Mary’s divine maternity, because of which she belongs to the hypostatic order; from this fundamental fact all the other privileges of Mary are derived. These privileges are explained in a kind of parallel with the privileges of Christ Himself, with whom Mary is intimately associated.

The Ecclesiological tendency insists on the fact that the first principle, from which all the others derive, is that Mary is the type of the Church; there is a parallel between Mary and the Church, so that Mary’s privileges must be understood by analogy to the notes or properties of the Church.

In a word, the theologians of the first tendency “conceive Mariology after the likeness of the treatise de Christo; the others after the likeness of the treatise de Ecclesia.”

The Council, not wishing to make a complete statement of Marian theology, nevertheless came down on the side of the second (and newer) tendency by laying aside the idea of a separate treatise on Mary, treating the topic within the dogmatic constitution on the

---

10Tendentia christologica potest in lineis generalioribus sic describi: ante omnia, insistit in Maternitate divina Mariae, propter quam ipsa pertinet ad ordinem hypostaticum; ex hoc facto fundamentali derivantur cetera omnia privilegia Mariae, quae in parallelismo quodam cum privilegiis ipsius Christi, cui Maria est intime associata, explicantur.

Tendentia ecclesiologica insistit in eo quod primum principium, a quo cetera omnia derivantur, est quod Maria est typus Ecclesiae; parallelismus existit inter Mariam et Ecclesiam, et talis parallelismus facit, ut privilegia Mariae per analogiam cum notis seu proprietatibus Ecclesiae intelligi debeat.

But this placement in itself is not a clear statement about the fundamental principle of Mariology. Where is Joumet to be placed in relation to the two tendencies outlined above?

It seems that in a way he bridges the two approaches. The first principle of his Mariology is the divine maternity: Mary is the Worthy Mother of a Savior-God. But because he insists that the Incarnation is a redemptive Incarnation, it is not possible to speak of Christ without speaking of the Church, which is Christ poured out and communicated. Christ’s work of salvation is realized collectively in the Church and personally in the Virgin, so that her privileges are understood in parallel to the properties of the Church.

It should also be said that, while the Mary-Church theme was very widely discussed in the 1950's, thanks to the work of the French Mariological Society and authors such as Hugo Rahner, Joumet’s conception of the Mary-Church parallel stands alone. No other author insisted as strongly as he on a virtual identification between Mary and the Church. That is why we have characterized his typology as an “essentialist” or “ontological” typology. Mary does

11Das Konzil hat seine Marienlehre in die neuen ekklesiologischen Perspektiven hineingestellt, d.h. die aus der Erneuerung der katholischen Lehre über die Kirche gewonnen Einsichten verwertet und den tiefen inneren Zusammenhang zwischen der Gestalt Marias und der Gestalt der großen als neues Israel erwählten, pilgernden Mutter Kirche ausgesprochen, an der sich noch vollende soll, was an der Mutter des historischen Jesus schon geschehen ist. Georg Söll, "Maria in der Geschichte von Theologie un Frömmigkeit," in Handbuch der Marienkunde, Wolfgang Beinert and Heinrich Petri, eds. (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1984), pp. 232-314. The quotation is from p. 225.

12This is not appreciated by Cyril Vollert, S. J., who writes: “[Mary] stands close to the Church, but closer to Christ, for the mystery of Mary finds its explanation in Christ Himself, the Incarnate Word, rather than in the Church, Christ’s mystical body. Her maternal relation to the Church is derivative from her maternal relation to Christ, and her collaboration in the genesis and building up of the Church is a consequence of her collaboration with Christ in the Redemption of mankind. Therefore, C. Joumet proposes an unacceptable theory when he writes: ‘Mariology is a part of ecclesiology, that part of ecclesiology which studies the Church at its most excellent point (EVI, II, p. 393).’ Mariology is not a part of ecclesiology, but a distinct part of theology in its own right. Moreover, although Mariology is, indeed, connected with ecclesiology, it is far more closely connected with the theology of the Incarnate Word.” Mariology, ed. J. B. Carol (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1957) vol. II, p. 27.
more than represent the Church; she is the Church in its first and highest realization.

The notion of Mary as prototype or figure of the Church continues to be an aspect of Jouret's work that finds parallels in today's theological writing. One theme we would like to bring forward has to do with Mary being, not just a prototype of the Church, but more specifically an icon of the feminine aspect of the Church.

The noted scripture scholar, Ignace de la Potterie, quotes Jouret to summarize his Marian and Ecclesiological exegesis of several New Testament passages:

It is the text of John 19:25-27 which has made possible the Marian interpretation of Revelation 12. There is, however, a difference between the two pericopes. If the two visions are not identical, they are, however, perfectly complementary.

In the Fourth Gospel, especially at Cana, but also near to the cross, the accent is placed on the individual person of Mary, the Mother of Jesus...but with the ecclesiological resonances which we have tried to echo.

In Revelation 12 the relationship of who Mary personifies is inverse. Here in the foreground is the ecclesiological aspect: the Woman Zion, the Church, will become the Spouse of the Lamb in the definitive conclusion of the Covenant (21:1-19). This indeed concerns the Church, but more precisely inasmuch as she is the accomplishment of what from the beginning had already been realized in the figure of Mary. In Revelation 12 the accent falls on the Church, but with Mariological resonances. ...

As we have already remarked several times, the Church has, then, a feminine dimension, a Marian countenance, in her spousal relationship with God: "The entire Church is Marian." (EVI, II, 428) On a deep symbolic level, the Church is Woman before God. Tradition has spontaneously represented (the Church) as a woman; but this Woman who became the symbol of the Church is the concrete person of Mary. ...If we consider the Church in the light of Mary, we will see it less as a complex organization, an image that is too human and masculine, and more as a living person, as a woman, as a mother in our life of faith as disciples of Christ.\(^{13}\)

\(^{13}\)Ignace de la Potterie, *Mary in the Mystery of the Covenant* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1992) pp. 263-4. See also pp. 229-235 for de la Potterie's comments on the Marian "countenance" of the Church, where he mentions Jouret's description of Mary as prototype and Spouse.
In contemporary theology, the closest parallel to Joumet’s conception of Mary as the personal realization of the Church is found in the writings of Hans Urs von Balthasar, who writes,

...the Lord wills to see his Church standing before him, not as a singular, palpable failure but as a glorious bride worthy of him. Here the Marian principle in the Church necessarily comes into play. Mary is the subjectivity that, in its womanly and receptive manner, is enabled fully to correspond to the masculine subjectivity of Christ, through God’s grace and the overshadowing of his Spirit...

...a special grace is needed, qualitatively different from that of the rest of the faithful, which elevates the Marian response of faith to the status of principle and exemplar of the response of the entire Church. ...In her the Church is also personally immaculate and beyond the tension between reality and ideal.14

“[T]he Church’s personal concreteness in Mary is one of the fundamental concerns of von Balthasar’s thought,”15 which could very well be said of Joumet. However, von Balthasar sees Mary as the personal realization of the Church above all in her fiat, within the context of the new Covenant. Joumet is more inclined to see Mary as the personal realization of the Church as sinless Bride; the theme of subjective response to God’s covenantal invitation is very much in the shade in his works.

A comparative study of the Marian theology of Joumet and von Balthasar would be a worthwhile and rewarding task. Such a study would be a thesis in itself and here we content ourselves with pointing out the possibility. Nevertheless a preliminary scan of the terrain suggests that von Balthasar developed his thoughts on the matter independently of Joumet and


his writings. The closest thing to an explicit reference in von Balthasar to Journet’s Marian theology is a reference to coredemption already pointed out in Chapter Seven. The passage in question, however, refers only to the coredemptive mediation of individual Christians, not to the universal coredemptive mediation of the Virgin.

Chapter Five discussed Journet’s theological explanation of Mary’s Immaculate Conception, in terms of her participation in the mystery of the all-holy Church sine macula et ruga. In presenting the implications of this principle, Journet highlights the sinlessness of the Church. The Church is all-holy and completely without sin, yet she contains sinners. This position maintains the distinction between objective redemption and subjective redemption, but it raises questions. Something that deserves further study is the relationship between the sinlessness or total purity of the Church and the sinlessness or total purity of the Virgin Mary. Theologians of the latter half of the twentieth century have had to grapple with the historical and theological question of whether we can say that the Church has sinned, and in what sense. Journet never drew back from his original ecclesiological intuition of the Church’s total purity (sine macula et ruga); his understanding of the Church’s absolute sinlessness shaped his

---


17 “This delimits the meaning and the limit of what can be called coredemption. The distance between the ‘Head’ and the ‘body’ must be maintained under all circumstances, so that Christ as the Head is the sole redeemer of all, even of his ‘proleptically redeemed’ mother; but at the same time, the one Redeemer takes up the ‘body’ of the Church into his redemptive activity, and this becomes yet more fruitful the more a member conforms itself to the selflessness that is Christ’s disposition, and the less he exercises reserve in putting his existence at the service of universal redemption.” In a footnote von Balthasar cites EVI, II, pp. 406, 418ff. Hans Urs von Balthasar, The Glory of the Lord (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989) vol. VII, p. 465.
Mariology in a fundamental way. This is also one of the points of his theology that has been criticized by some rather astute observers. For example, Yves Congar writes:

J's ecclesiology can be characterized as an effort, often powerful, to manifest the divine causes and the supernatural depth of the visible institution of the Church. On many points this effort has advanced understanding of these questions. At the same time he has been criticized for not taking into account the earthly condition of a Church which only tends to its eschatological consummation (see our Sainte Église, Paris 1963, pp. 659-669). 18

A similar critical observation is made by René Latourelle:

Journet...distinguishes in the Church a sociological aspect and a theological aspect, only the latter having the value of a formal element and composing the soul and the body of the Church. The soul of the Church is both uncreated (the Holy Spirit) and created (charity)... The body of the Church is not so much the material congregation of Christians as the spatio-temporal sphere of the Church's activity (EVI, II:873). The purpose of the body... is to make visible in time and space... the uncreated soul and the created soul of the Church (II:871). The body, consequently, "is not made up of all the activity of baptized human beings, but of that part of their exterior activity which is informed by the created soul of the Church (charity), and aims immediately at the spiritual health of the Church (II:873)."

Hence... Jourmet defends intransigently the idea of a pure and holy Church without spot or wrinkle; for since sin is an act which is not animated by charity, it is foreign to both the soul and body of the Church. His fundamental thesis is expressed thus: "The Church theologically considered is without sin (EVI, II:904)." "The Church is not without sinners," but "she is without sin (EVI, II:904-905)." ...

J's position is consistent with his ecclesiology. But...although well defended...[his ecclesiology] still seems to me that of an abstract Church, not of a real Church, a People of God, a community of human beings. This fissure, moreover, this vertical split which is introduced into the depths of every member of the Church (dividing what is holy from what is impure) seems highly artificial; for it is the entire People of God, and the entire individual Christian who is holy and sinful: the person as such is indivisible. One last point is that in stressing the mystery of holiness in the Church, Msgr. Jourmet does not face the apologetic problem...of a Church who presents to the world a sinful face. 19

19 Christ and the Church. (Staten Island: Alba House, 1972), pp. 229-231.
Latourelle, in the same work quoted above, surveys theological opinion on the question of a sinful or sinless Church. Malmberg, like Journet, does not allow the expression “sinful Church.” Stohr criticizes Rahner’s position and adheres to Journet’s (MthZ 18 (1967)). G. Philips concedes that one may talk of a Church “for sinners;” i.e. working for the sanctification of sinners, but not of a “sinful Church” or a “Church of sinners.”

Congar takes a middle course between Rahner and Journet, avoiding the “artificial division” which Journet introduces into the innermost depths of the person of the Church. Fr. Congar looks at the Church from above (objective holiness, the holiness of the institution) and from below (subjective holiness, the holiness of the community).

More recently, Cardinal Ratzinger was asked, “Can we conclude...that the Church as she really exists in time and as a whole also has the obligation to repent...for instance in the sense of the phrase *Ecclesia semper reformanda* or even beyond it?”

He replied, in part,

If I understand your question correctly, you are asking to what extent we can describe the Church herself as sinful...I think that the Catholic tradition on this question is most concisely expressed in the prayer that the Roman liturgy places in the mouths of the priest and the faithful before they receive Communion... “Lord,...do not look upon *my* sins but upon the faith of *your* Church.” ...In the Lord’s Prayer all members of the Church without exception must say “forgive us our trespasses,” but this communion prayer certainly did not imply that one could also call the Church as Church sinful...

[The communion prayer] qualified the Church with two predicates: she is “your” (The Lord’s) Church and she is the bearer of “faith.” Both are important to the same degree. The Church herself is not Christ, but a response to him, and this response is “faith.” She is Church to the extent that she is an act of faith. And, from the opposite perspective, faith is by its very nature a believing with the Church; in the act of faith we become the Church and from her we actually

---


21 Latourelle, loc.cit.
receive this act. Since this is the case, she is “your Church” and not “our Church.” Everything that is only “our” Church is not Church in the true sense of the word.\textsuperscript{22}

To what extent does a theologian’s view of the sinlessness or sinfulness of the Church influence his explanation of Mary’s privileges and specifically of her Immaculate Conception? It seems to me that a very fruitful study on this topic could and ought to be made.

Chapter Six shows that Joumet’s teaching on the Assumption is based on his understand of Mary as prototype of the Church. Considering the Mary, according to Joumet, anticipates in her person the collective destiny of the Church, that she is already where the whole Church will be at the end of time, may we not say that Joumet presents Mary as an eschatological icon of the Church? This is, of course, strongly in line with Chapter Eight of \textit{Lumen Gentium}, as well as the \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church}. It also closely parallels the thoughts of Louis Bouyer (who, however, is speaking of the feast of the Immaculate Conception) when he writes

\begin{quote}
As to the most recent Feast of the Immaculate Conception it is perhaps...the most eschatological of all feasts in its grasp of the Mystery [of the Cross]. The perfect purity and beauty achieved in a human creature at the very beginning of the realization of the Mystery, achieved because of Mary’s unique proximity to and cooperation with the Mystery,—this is...a living image of the purity and beauty which will be acquired at the end of time by the whole City of the redeemed, when all its members will have attained to such a perfect response to the Divine Word, to such a perfection of their self-offering in the great thanksgiving of Christ to the Father, as was realized in Mary from the first. More than an image...let us rather say that Mary, immaculate from the very moment of her conception, is an earnest already given us of what the whole Church will be at the end of times, a pledge, so to say, of the actual possibility of man’s attaining the perfect consummation of the Mystery as it is realized in
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{A New Song for the Lord.} (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1996) 149-150. Emph. in original.
Christ. And, still more, Mary is herself the perfection of that cooperation of the Mystery as it is realized in Christ, in the work, that is, of its own redemption, which is the most powerful means of hastening the end of time, and the advent of the Kingdom of God "on earth as it is in heaven."23

Chapter Seven describes how Mary participates in the redemption won by Christ. Mary’s co-redemption has also become much-discussed today. Journet’s explanation of the doctrine has the advantage of not separating Mary from membership in the Church. Thus he avoids the danger of removing her from the Church and raising her to a quasi-divine status. In Journet’s view, all Christians are co-redeemers, though to a lesser extent than the Virgin. In his comments on the Immaculate Conception (see Chapter Nine), Journet says that it would be wrong to remove Mary from the work of redemption; i.e., as a beneficiary or recipient of redemption. In explaining co-redemption, we may say that every recipient of redemption is also an active participant in the work of redemption.

This way of looking at coredeemptive mediation is not so different from certain modern approaches which begin by speaking of Christ as the "man for others," then speaking of how all Christians share in His preexistence. The basic idea is the same: to be saved is to have the dignity of contributing to the salvation of others by participating in the redemption that comes through Christ.

Finally, with regard to the development of dogma: In our day there is a renewed call from some quarters for the Pope to solemnly define the Marian titles of Coredemptrix, Mediatrrix of all Graces, and Advocate. In considering this matter, we could profit by listening

---

to Joumét’s teaching. On the one hand, he gives a very clear and thorough explanation of the theological foundations for these titles (see Chapter Seven). On the other hand, he calls our attention to the correspondence between dogmatic definitions and historical need see Chapter Nine). “They mark the moments when, in the face of terrible challenges addressed to her by the world, the Church must, for the sake of the faith, achieve a new awareness of the divine resources hidden within her in the days of her formation.”24 Pastors and theologians could use this criterion of pastoral need, reading the signs of the times, before pronouncing on the opportuneness of any new dogmatic definitions. There is no opposition between the need to give honor to Mary and the obligation to give the flock a shepherd’s care.25

Nevertheless, Joumét’s notion that the successive definitions of dogma correspond to the needs of the times ought to be considered a secondary motive or justification for such definitions, since dogma must develop from a rigorous unfolding of principles contained in the initial revealed deposit. Further, neither the Immaculate Conception nor the Assumption was proclaimed as a way of quelling heresy or of firming up Church teaching or structures,26 as was the case for example at Ephesus.

24EDDM, 145.

25n...la cause de Marie sera la cause même de l’Eglise et du peuple chrétien; et chaque fois, la cause du peuple chrétien sera la cause de Marie; et ces deux causes, celle de Marie et celle du peuple chrétien, seront toujours, avant tout, la cause du Christ lui-même.” EDDM, 145-146.

Joumet never wrote a Mariology textbook or a separate treatise on Mary. Nevertheless, it is possible to synthesize a complete, free-standing, and coherent statement of his ecclesiotypical Mariology. We should like to conclude this thesis by offering such a statement.

Since Mariology is a privileged part of Ecclesiology, one must begin with the Church. Christ and the Church form one mystical person. The unity of this person may be expressed by saying that the Church is at once the mystical Body of Christ and His Bride. Joined to Christ, the Bride conforms to the Bridegroom and is therefore all-holy and absolutely immaculate, without spot or wrinkle or anything of the sort (cf. Eph 5:27). The Church is utterly sinless yet it contains sinners.

All of Mary's privileges stem from the divine maternity. Mary is the Worthy Mother of a Savior God. The Savior's work of redemption has two realizations: one personal, in the Virgin, the other collective, in the Church. All Marian doctrine will be based on these two principles.

There is only one member of the Church in whom the essence of the Church has ever been fully realized, and this one member is the Blessed Virgin. She is, personally, what the Church is as a collective whole. In this ontological sense she is rightly called the Prototype of the Church. In her Immaculate Conception, she is the all-holy and immaculate Bride (The Church Saved), redeemed by the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. Because Mary's coredeemptive mediation extends to all men of every time and place, she is the mother of the Church and of all men, whether they know it or not (The Church Saving). In her glorious Assumption, the Church has already risen with Christ and been glorified with Him (Destiny of the Church).
The Church is Jesus Christ poured out and communicated. It is Mary's privilege to belong totally to the age of Christ's presence, during which she received christic grace directly, by immediate contact. During that time, Mary alone was the Church. It will never be more itself than it was when it was totally condensed in the Virgin Mary. Now, during the age of the Holy Spirit, christic grace is communicated sacramentally; this is the task of the hierarchy. Mary belongs totally to the grandeurs of holiness, rather than to the grandeurs of hierarchy. Holiness precedes hierarchy; Mary precedes the Apostles and their successors. Mary has preceded the Church into the glory of heaven, to be our Mother, our hope, and the eschatological icon of the Church.
POSTSCRIPT

In this thesis, we have confined ourselves to dogmatic theology, touching on Journet's spiritual doctrine only briefly and in passing. We should take at least one page to acknowledge what moved Journet to write so carefully and copiously. Here we offer a few moving passages from among many.

Il faut trembler de toucher au mystère de la Vierge Marie. C'est une chose profonde, très pure, très lumineuse. Celui qui manque ce qu'il faut pour s'en approcher—c'est le cas de chacun de nous à cause de nos résistances et de la lourdeur de notre esprit—va l'abaisser et le déformer dans son optique particulière. 27

La Vierge Marie est la douceur de notre vie. Salva Regina, mater misericordiae, vitae dulcedo disent les chartreux. Dire vitae dulcedo, tendresse de la vie, douceur de la vie, est encore plus beau que la juxtaposition des deux mots. Dans les maisons de contemplatifs, comme une chartreuse, il est émouvant de voir peut-être simplement dans un verre d'eau une fleur des prés posée là devant une petite statue de la Vierge. Elle a été mise là par un frère... La Vierge Marie est la Reine du désert. J'ai souvent pensé que s'il n'y avait pas dans la solitude de la chartreuse cette tendresse, qui poursuit les moines jusque dans leur intimité, ils ne pourraient pas tenir. 28

Je pense aussi à ceux qui meurent sous nos yeux.... On ne sait pas s'ils entendent encore. Il faut être très prudent. Ils vont bientôt passer de l'autre côté. C'est alors qu'il y a la prière. Mais quelle prière faire? Spontanément, je n'arrive pas à dire une autre prière que celle des Ave Maria... Je les dis tout doucement. Je murmure à la Vierge Marie: "Vous, vous voyez, vous êtes de l'autre côté. Vous savez ce que c'est que la mort, ce passage dans l'éternité." Et je dis l'Ave Maria. Je ne crois pas que j'aie pu dire quelque chose qui soit plus valable. 29


28Ibid., p. 15.

29Ibid., p. 17.
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