

## Marian Studies

---

Volume 43 *Proceedings of the Forty-Third  
National Convention of the Mariological Society  
of America held in Houston, Tex.*

---

Article 7

1992

### Fr. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.: His Mariology and Scholarly Achievement

Peter Fehlner

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies)



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Fehlner, Peter (1992) "Fr. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.: His Mariology and Scholarly Achievement," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 43, Article 7.

Available at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies/vol43/iss1/7](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol43/iss1/7)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

## FR. JUNIPER B. CAROL, O.F.M.: HIS MARIOLOGY AND SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT

I am sure that, were any of us here present asked to indicate one theologian to whom the cultivation of mariology in the United States is primarily indebted, we would not hesitate to name the late Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M., founder, first president and long-time secretary of the Mariological Society of America.

Last year, on behalf of the Society, Fr. James McCurry rendered a personal salute to Fr. Juniper; and, in a forthcoming issue of *Marianum*, a memorial by Fr. Theodore Koehler, his successor as Secretary of our Society, together with a bibliography prepared by Fr. Luigi Gambero, will appear. In this study I propose to describe and assess the scholarly achievement of Fr. Juniper, i.e., his contribution to mariology, for, in fact, his scholarly work is almost exclusively marian in character.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \*

In the preface to his *opus magnum* on the coredeemption Fr. Juniper records that *iam ab incoepto theologiae disciplinae studio (1931) in votis nobis fuerat documenta omnium retro aetatum hac de re in unum redigere eaque opportuno tempore tamquam thesim ad lauream consequendam Pontificio Athenaeo Antoniano de Urbe submittere*.<sup>2</sup> He was, in 1931, twenty years old, a newly

<sup>1</sup>The assessments are based on his published works and on their reception, as indicated in critical reviews and discussions of these. Personal correspondence which was not available to me (and whose use would have expanded this study far beyond the limits originally stipulated) undoubtedly would have shed further light on the conclusions reached, but would, I suspect, hardly have altered them in any substantial way.

<sup>2</sup>J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae. Disquisitio Positiva* (Civitas Vaticana, 1950), 8.

professed novice just beginning his formal theological study at Holy Name College in Washington, D.C., and would not begin his doctoral studies at the Antonianum until 1937. It is remarkable that he should have had so early so clear a vision of the scholarly work he wished to accomplish as a theologian devoted to the Virgin Mother of God.

Undoubtedly, marian devotion within his family, his early education in his native Cuba—in particular at St. Charles College and Seminary in Havana (1924–1930), the distinctive accents of franciscan marian piety and thought so much in evidence within the Order at that time, and the then-general interest throughout the Church in the theme of Our Lady's mediation (not only her role in the distribution of graces, but also her sharing in their acquisition as *Coredemptrix*) played a part. Yet, it is difficult to explain this quite exceptional choice without suspecting the special intervention of Mary herself in guiding the intellectual development of so gifted a servant. Whatever, until Fr. Juniper's first encounter (epistolary), in 1935, with Fr. Charles Balić, the future moderator of his doctoral studies in Rome, there does not appear to have been any professor or scholar who could be described as the major or a major influence in his scholarly formation.

We might say that Fr. Juniper's was an *anima naturaliter franciscana*, a mind predisposed to admire and follow the great franciscan masters, especially the Ven. John Duns Scotus, to appreciate the intimate connection between the subtle metaphysics of Scotus—revolving about the christocentrism of St. Francis (the primacy of Christ the King and conformity to Christ crucified) and mariology in a franciscan key (centered on the Immaculate Conception)—even if he was rather disinclined personally toward the intricacies of scotistic metaphysics.

His superiors recognized his exceptional ability. After priestly ordination in 1935 and a year teaching Spanish at St. Bonaventure University, he was sent to Quaracchi where, from 1936 to 1937, he spent five to six hours a day laboring over medieval manuscripts. The next three years, until 1940—when Italy's entrance into World War II forced his

return to the USA, he pursued doctoral studies in theology under the direction of Fr. Charles Balić. Not until 1948 was he able to return to defend his dissertation and obtain the doctorate in sacred theology.<sup>3</sup> Only a part of his original 1931 project, that dealing with the coredemption as expounded by seventeenth-century theologians, was in fact defended. The rest was published in 1950 by the Vatican Press as a substantial 639-page volume with the title: *De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae. Disquisitio positiva*, and as no. 2 in the "Theology Series" of the Franciscan Institute Publications. This study, together with his numerous scholarly essays related to the general theme of the coredemption published in European and American journals (ca. 30 between 1936 and 1953), established his reputation as a first-rate mariologist, in the words of Fr. Cyril Vollert, S.J., the most prominent in North America at the time.<sup>4</sup>

Late in 1949, just before the publication of his *opus magnum*, Fr. Juniper launched the Mariological Society of America with 135 members.<sup>5</sup> Its first convention was held in Washington, D.C., in January, 1950; it has met annually ever since, issuing promptly a volume with the studies read at the convention. Founder and first President of the Society, Fr. Juniper was subsequently its longtime secretary and the editor of *Marian Studies* until he was succeeded by Fr. Theodore A. Koehler, S.M., in 1979.<sup>6</sup> The high level of scholarship evidenced in the work of the Society and the respect quickly won by *Marian Studies* among the learned<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Cf. *Antonianum* 24 (1949): 145. The defense of the thesis was held on June 26, 1948, and was approved *magna cum laude*.

<sup>4</sup>He is unquestionably the most prominent Mariologist in the United States and ranks with the best in the world." Prefatory note in J. Carol, O.F.M., *Fundamentals of Mariology* (New York, 1956), viii. "The publication of *De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae* has raised him to the front rank of the world's specialists in the field of marian theology": statement in a review of the same, in *Theological Studies* 13 (1952): 442.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. *Marian Studies* 1 (1950): 11–24.

<sup>6</sup>*Marian Studies* 30 (1979): 11. In fact, Fr. Juniper edited vols. 1–20 and 22–29.

<sup>7</sup>Critiques of *Marian Studies* by competent scholars, all favorable, appeared in the following reviews: *Marianum*: vol. 1–13 (1951): 348–349 (H. Morris, O.S.M.); vols. 2,3,4,5,6,8,9,11–13 (1951): 349–350, 15 (1953): 100, 16 (1954): 96–97 and

in no small measure can be accredited to Fr. Juniper's leadership.

The success of this venture greatly facilitated the realization of another work first projected by Fr. Juniper in 1938, but temporarily abandoned at the outbreak of World War II, viz., the publication of a comprehensive collection of essays treating every aspect of mariology and of marian devotion. The three volumes of *Mariology* edited by Fr. Juniper, to which he contributed the important essay on the co-redemption, were published by Bruce of Milwaukee between 1955 and 1961.<sup>8</sup> Like similar works published during the same period in Europe (e.g., Straeter, Du Manoir),<sup>9</sup> it served as a kind of encyclopedia or source work for serious students of mariology. In 1964, a Spanish translation of the first two volumes, those dealing with mariology (sources and doctrine), appeared with a new introduction by N. García Garcés.<sup>10</sup> Together with *Marian Studies* this three-volume set constitutes Fr. Juniper's second major contribution to scholarly reflection on the mystery of Mary.

His third and last major contribution, *Why Jesus Christ?*, a massive "annotated bibliography" dealing with the primacy of Jesus and Mary and preceded by several essays and shorter book-length studies touching aspects of that theme, appeared

546–547, 18 (1956): 139–140, 20 (1958): 270–271 and 271–272, 22 (1960): 522–523 (all by G. M. Corr, O.S.M.); vol. 10–23 (1961): 177 (P. M. Lustrissimi, O.S.M.); vol. 12–25 (1963): 174–177 (G. Nolli). *Miscellanea Francescana*: vols. 4,5,6–55 (1955): 414–415 (L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv.); vols. 8,9,10–59 (1959): 228–230 (L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M. Conv.); vols. 11,12,13–62 (1962): 164–166 (L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv.); vols. 14,15–63 (1963): 551–553, 64 (1964): 223–224 (both by A. Pompei, O.F.M.Conv.). *Ephemerides Mariologicae* (the journal most regularly featuring reviews of the volumes edited by Fr. Juniper): vols. 1–26, 28–29 (reviewed by M. Peinador, A. Rivera, J. M. Alonso, D. Fernández, F. Sebastián Aquilar, and P. L. Suárez—all C.M.F.). *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*: vols. 19,20–45 (1969): 219–220 and 490 (both by G. Philips). *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*: vol. 6–78 (1956): 1090 (J. Galot, S.J.). *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*: vol. 9–93 (1960): 205–206 (D. Flanagan). The volumes of *Marian Studies* received more frequent and more extensive critical notice before 1965, the year Vatican II ended.

<sup>8</sup>*Mariology*, ed. J. B. Carol, O.F.M. (3 vols.; Milwaukee, 1955, 1957, 1961).

<sup>9</sup>P. Straeter, S.J., ed., *Katholische Marienkunde* (3 vols.; Paderborn, 1949–1952); H. Du Manoir, S.J., ed., *Maria: études sur la Sainte Vierge* (8 vols.; Paris, 1949–1971).

<sup>10</sup>*Mariologia* (2 vols.; Madrid, 1964).

in 1986 and was the fruit of his "retirement."<sup>11</sup> Separated by a quarter century from his other works, nonetheless it is so linked to these, methodologically as well as thematically, as to illustrate that franciscan-inspired vision of the Virgin Mother reflected in all Fr. Juniper's study.

\*\*\*

But before examining these contributions of Fr. Juniper to mariology more in detail, it is necessary to say something about the thought and work of Fr. Balić, his mentor while a doctoral student in Rome and, thereafter, his life-long friend.

Fr. Juniper describes him as a "towering figure," not only in scotistic and mariological studies in general, but in his own life as well. "My greatest indebtedness to Fr. Balić"—he writes—"is due to the tremendous assistance he gave me in my mariological studies. As moderator of my doctoral dissertation, he was most generous with his time and advice—although he was also extremely demanding regarding scholarly precision. It was Fr. Balić who got me interested in the question of the so-called *debitum peccati* in mariology, and he often encouraged me to continue his own anti-debitist crusade . . ."<sup>12</sup> The indebtedness to which Fr. Juniper refers involved not only scholarly method and in part selection of major areas of research, but also the articulation of a vision of mariology within which the particular specializations, both in regard to theme and argumentation, can be understood and assessed.

When the history of Catholic theology in the twentieth century is dispassionately written, without doubt the name

<sup>11</sup>*Why Jesus Christ? Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives* (Manassas, VA, 1986).

<sup>12</sup>J. Carol, O.F.M., "A Towering Figure," in P. Melada and D. Aračić, eds., *P. Carlo Balić, O.F.M. Profilo, impressioni, ricordi* (Roma, 1978), 137. On no major issue did Fr. Juniper ever differ from his master. It would appear, however, that in certain details, e.g., the precise sense in which the woman of Gen. 3, 15 is Mary, and in the exposition of the *debitum*, there seems to have been some divergence. On the first cf. D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., *The First-Gospel* (St. Bonaventure, NY, 1954), 287, 291; and on the latter cf. W. H. Marshner, "A Critique of Marian Counterfactual Formulae: A Report of Results," in *Marian Studies* 30 (1979): 108–139.

of Charles Balić will figure in a significant way.<sup>13</sup> Although his scholarly work in theology was multifaceted, his enduring fame rests on two particular achievements: his contributions to the revival of scotistic studies within the last seventy years and to the progress of mariology. From the 1920s—when Balić, as a doctoral student at Louvain, wrote a dissertation on the marian doctrine of the “Subtle Doctor” and successfully pioneered the method eventually used in the difficult task of editing a critical text of the writings of John Duns Scotus—these two fields of research were inseparably linked in his work.

Fr. Balić's contribution to mariology is, therefore, unabashedly franciscan in inspiration.<sup>14</sup> It takes its cue from the so-called franciscan thesis: the absolute primacy of the Word Incarnate (Kingship of Christ) and his Blessed Mother's association *uno eodemque decreto* in that primacy (qua Immaculate Queen of Heaven and Earth), an association particularly evident at three points in the life of the Virgin: her conception, her cooperation in the work of salvation, her triumph in heaven, or put doctrinally: the Immaculate Conception; the universal, maternal mediation of Mary; and her glorious Assumption and Coronation in heaven as Queen of the Universe. Fr. Balić, with his genius for organization, gave effective expression to this point of view in the titles of three scholarly monograph series he founded to treat of the privileges of Mary most holy: *Bibliotheca Immaculatae Conceptionis*, *Bibliotheca Mediationis B.V. Mariae*, and *Bibliotheca Assumptionis*.<sup>15</sup> Within this overall perspective the crusades to which Fr. Juniper refers—anti-debitist, coredemptive, assumptionist—are but code words identifying the points

<sup>13</sup>Melada-Aračić, *passim*, in particular the observations of C. Pozo, S.J., “La contribución del P. Carlos Balić, O.F.M., a la mariología,” pp. 47–62; and of N. García Garcés, p. 273; D. Aračić, O.F.M., *La dottrina mariologica negli scritti di Carlo Balić* (Roma, 1980) [= *Bibliotheca Mariana Moderni Aevi*, 4].

<sup>14</sup>Aračić, *La dottrina...*, 266–267.

<sup>15</sup>The *Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi*, the first of these series to be inaugurated by Fr. Balić (in Croatia, in 1931), had as its goal the promotion of studies dealing with these privileges during the middle ages, the period when the “Franciscan thesis” came to be formed.

where the distinctive implications of the thesis on absolute primacy are tested speculatively.

The impact of Fr. Balić's work, his own and that of the mariologists he formed over a long teaching career, was significant, not only in the cultivation of mariology and the organization of the international mariological-marian congresses, but also in the formulation of the Church's doctrine, as can be seen from his contributions to the preparation for the definition of the Assumption, proclaimed in the bull *Munificentissimus Deus*, and to the eighth chapter of the dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium*, of Vatican II.<sup>16</sup>

There is one other fact of considerable interest in assessing the background and influences which shaped the theological and scholarly vision of Fr. Juniper. Fr. Balić began his scholarly work at Louvain in the years immediately following the great mariological congress of Brussels (1921), organized under the patronage of Cardinal Mercier to promote the doctrine of the universal mediation of Mary, not only her role in the distribution of graces, but in their acquisition as well, i.e., the doctrine of the coredemption.<sup>17</sup> It was at this time that the great controversy of contemporary mariology began to take shape, the controversy over the mediation of Mary, centering on her part in the redemptive work of her Son, in relation to which maximalist and minimalist, christotypologist and ecclesiotypologist thought would be defined on the eve of Vatican II.<sup>18</sup>

As anyone familiar with the history of franciscan mariology knows, this was a set of circumstances propitious for a franciscan contribution.<sup>19</sup> In 1937 Fr. Balić made the first of

<sup>16</sup>Aračić, *La dottrina...*, chapters 2 & 3.

<sup>17</sup>On Card. Mercier cf. M. O'Carroll, C.S.S.P., "Still Mediatrix of all Graces?" *Miles Immaculatae* 24 (1988): 114–115; B. Gherardini, *La Madre* (Frigento, 1989), 297–298.

<sup>18</sup>For a general survey of the controversy from 1921 until the eve of the Council, cf. G. Baraúna, O.F.M., *De natura corredemptionis marianae in theologia bodierna (1921–1958)* (Romae, 1960) [= Bibliotheca Mediationis B. V. Mariae, 2].

<sup>19</sup>In these very circumstances, quite independently of Fr. Balić, another Franciscan eventually to exert an influence on post-conciliar mariology, St. Maximilian M. Kolbe, O.F.M.Conv., began to formulate his ideas for an Academy of the



several important contributions on this theme, an article in *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* on the coredemption according to the eighteenth-century Spanish Franciscan Carlos del Moral.<sup>20</sup> In this study Fr. Balić shows how neither the fact of the coredemption, as this was being defended by such scholars as Msgr. Lebon of Louvain, nor the explanation of its modalities, was a recent innovation of twentieth-century theologians, but had already been developed—both in its main outline and in its particulars—more than two centuries earlier, without the weak points of the contemporary (1937) elaboration. The special importance of this article consisted in that it effectively removed any grounds for objecting to the coredemption as a speculative innovation of contemporary, i.e., twentieth-century, theologians. Rather, the speculation appeared to stem from principles deeply imbedded in the doctrinal tradition of the Church.

\* \* \*

The same year, 1937, there appeared in the prestigious *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* a very important study of the theological concept of mediation and coredemption by Fr. Juniper, then a doctoral student at the Antonianum.<sup>21</sup> This is his first major contribution to marian scholarship. Obviously scotistic in inspiration, along the lines of Del Moral's interpretation, this article is a careful exposition of the elements involved in the notion of coredemption and of where that notion fits within the wider theological perspective.

Immaculate, whose specialty would be the promotion of scholarly studies on the Immaculate qua Mediatrix of all graces. Cf. *Gli Scritti di Massimiliano Kolbe* (3 vols.; Florence, 1975–1978), no. 508 (1: 930); no. 647 (2: 215–216).

<sup>20</sup>K. Balić, O.F.M., "Die sekundäre Mittlerschaft der Gottesmutter. Hat Maria die Verdienste Christi de condigno für uns mitverdient?," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 4 (1937): 1–22. On the stormy reaction to this article, cf. Baraúna, *De natura coredemptionis* . . . , 29, note 32.

<sup>21</sup>"The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 14 (1937): 642–650.

In 1939, he published two more essays illustrating the theory of coredemption. The first, in *Miscellanea Francescana*,<sup>22</sup> dealt with the nature of our Lady's ontological mediation (the *ratio medii*), while the second, published in *Marianum*,<sup>23</sup> analyzed the proximate foundation of marian coredemption (*retroversio-consortium*). The substance of the latter article reappeared as the preliminary section of *De Corredemptione*.<sup>24</sup>

*Retroversio-consortium* explains why he places such great importance on the protoevangelium and its use by Pius IX in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*. The association of the Immaculate Virgin with her Child in his triumph over the ancient serpent places her at the very center of that conquest: Calvary, as Coredemptrix in the acquisition of the graces later to be distributed to those in need of liberation from sin. But the speculative background for that association, as understood by Fr. Juniper, can still be pondered quite conveniently in the first two aforementioned articles cited, but not reproduced, in his 1950 *Disquisitio positiva*.

That phrase accurately describes the main thrust of his scholarly work: to demonstrate via critical documentation how a point of theology, such as the coredemption, is in the first instance not a theological opinion, but is attested as a "theological fact," i.e., is found in revelation. Fr. Juniper's first great work was just that: showing how the fact of our Lady's direct, immediate, proximate association with her Son and Savior in the acquisition of graces, when the work of redemption was accomplished in the sacrifice of the cross, is not an innovation of contemporary mariology, but a revealed doctrine attested as such by the infallible teaching and faith of the Church. Where that doctrine is to be found in the sources of revelation and how it is there contained are important but secondary questions, whose definitive

<sup>22</sup>"The Nature of the Blessed Virgin's Ontological Mediation," *Miscellanea Francescana* 39 (1939): 449-470.

<sup>23</sup>"De fundamento proximo Co-redemptionis Marianae," *Marianum* 1 (1939): 173-187.

<sup>24</sup>Carol, *De Corredemptione* . . . , 57-70.

resolution within "our theology" always presupposes that we are certain the basis of "our theological speculation" is part of the deposit of faith.

This approach is none other than that of Fr. Balić<sup>25</sup> in dealing with the definable character of the Assumption of our Lady: the Church may solemnly define as an object of faith—i.e., certify that a given doctrine is indeed revealed by God and to be professed explicitly—what she recognizes as always believed by her with varying degree of explicitation. The faith of the Church is the proximate point of departure for any theological argument formally presented, as distinct from a simply literary or historical use of the sources of Revelation. Once the faith of the Church on any given article of belief is sufficiently clear, a theologian may proceed to an examination of the sources of Revelation and engage in reflection on the contents of the Deposit (biblical and speculative theology respectively). But in regard to the coredeemption, it was precisely the clarity of the Church's faith which was in question. And it was to show that, apart from the scriptural and speculative problems involved, there was, in fact, no doubt about the fact that Fr. Juniper directed his research in his *opus magnum*.

Though the materials for the kind of demonstration which engaged Fr. Juniper are principally historical, the demonstration itself is formally theological. Its objective is to show that a given doctrine is traditional and apostolic, handed down from the Apostles, and so to be believed because it is a *theological*, not merely historical, fact. Further, it is not the purpose of such study to explain how the doctrine in question came to pass as an object of faith from implicit to explicit profession, but only to verify the fact. The question of how, like the question of where, in Revelation, need not be definitively or perfectly resolved in order to reach a conclusion theologically valid concerning the "fact" revealed. The en-

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Balić, "De Sacra Scriptura, Traditione et Ecclesia," in *De Scriptura et Traditione* (Romae, 1963), 665–712; Aračić, *La Dottrina...*, 155–170. For Fr. Juniper's defense of the approach against the criticisms of J. Coppens, cf. his study "The Definability of Mary's Assumption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 118 (1948): 161–177.

tire approach rests on the authenticity of Christ's promise to guarantee the integrity and infallibility of the Apostolic Magisterium and, thereby, the faith of the Church across the centuries, from his Ascension to his final coming in glory.

Being theological, such an argument is not simply an enumeration of facts. Rather, the facts discovered are the evidence of a principle of Catholic theology: in this case, that of recirculation-consortium, whose implications for belief are more and more expressly formulated in the history of the Church. According to many scholars, this approach of Fr. Balić had a significant impact on the final redaction of the bull of definition of the Assumption, *Munificentissimus Deus*.<sup>26</sup> If so, then the work of Fr. Juniper in regard to the coredemption takes on added significance. For as he himself noted, the revealed basis for the Assumption, alluded to in the bull of definition, is the same as that claimed for the coredemption: the principle of recirculation-consortium, revealed in the protoevangelium and utilized in the bull of definition of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX.<sup>27</sup> If the Immaculate Conception and Assumption are solemn dogmas of faith, the coredemption is potentially such, because the key, revealed basis for both dogmas in the faith of the Church is the protoevangelium: the prophecy of the Woman's (the Virgin Mary's) immediate association with her Offspring (Christ) in his triumph (the victory of the cross). In terms of this particular theological method, we confront what has for centuries been known as the "Franciscan thesis" in theology, but whose roots antedate both Scotus and Francis himself. It is franciscan, not by reason of origin (in this it is rather Catholic), but by reason of its promotion, of its being rendered more explicit and then more effectively incorporated into the life of the Church, as St. Maximilian Kolbe would say.

<sup>26</sup>Aračić, *La dottrina...*, 147 and 261, in particular the testimony of Card. P. Parente in note 2, p. 147.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Fr. Juniper's studies, "Recent Literature on Mary's Assumption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 120 (1949): 376-387, and "The Apostolic Constitution 'Munificentissimus Deus' and Our Lady's Co-redemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 125 (1951): 255-273. Aračić, *La dottrina...*, 169-170, notes that the Bull does not explicitly endorse Fr. Juniper's point.

The structure of Fr. Juniper's *opus magnum* follows logically. A preliminary chapter deals with the guiding principle of the entire demonstration, viz., recirculation-association (*retroversio-consortium*): whether or not such a principle is an aspect of Catholic doctrine. A first section then treats of the coredemption in terms of that principle in Sacred Scripture, specifically in the protoevangelium. Some of the reviewers<sup>28</sup> of this study wondered why its author had not utilized other texts of the Bible, especially the Johannine texts, pertinent to this mystery. In his contribution to the second volume of *Mariology*,<sup>29</sup> Fr. Juniper did just this, because there he was concerned *inter alia* with a commentary on the coredemption in Scripture. Here, on the other hand, his objective was limited to showing that the principle was formally in Scripture, was basic to the entire economy of salvation, and directly touched the central act of redemption. Insofar as a biblical warrant may be claimed for the subsequent elaboration of his thesis, the interpretation of Genesis 3,15 is absolutely crucial.

A second section, the longest, marshals the evidence showing that indeed the teaching on the coredemption, clearly and expressly accepted by more and more theologians from the beginning of the seventeenth century, had been implicit, i.e., *a parte rei* objectively present and operative, in the tradition of the Church from patristic times, and so is a *theological fact*. That fact, only implicit in the writings of the Fathers (chapter one), becomes from the ninth century more and more explicit, although the use of the term coredemption to designate this does not appear to antedate the sixteenth century (chapter 2). The third, fourth and fifth chapters deal respectively with the theologians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries who

<sup>28</sup>N. García Garcés, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 2 (1952): 132-133. R. Laurentin, *La Vie Spirituelle* 86 (1952): 188-189, claims the biblical section of *De Corredemptione* is theological rather than exegetical in method. In fact, his method in that section is better described a theology of exegesis, because his concern there is not the analysis of biblical texts, but the discussion of a theological principle imbedded in Scripture and presupposed for its correct exposition.

<sup>29</sup>*Mariology* (ed. J. B. Carol) 2: 377-425.

treat this doctrine—arranged either by religious order or by nationality—so as to illustrate how universally this fact was given express recognition by trustworthy theologians. A sixth chapter provides a systematic overview of the content of this teaching.

The final section examines this theme in the documents of the ecclesiastical Magisterium, episcopal as well as papal, from the time of Pius IX when, for the first time, the coredemption was formally recognized in some way by the Magisterium as a part of the deposit of faith.

Fr. Juniper concluded that, on the basis of the evidence adduced, it is certain that the coredemption, as defined for the purposes of his study, is not a theological innovation of contemporary mariology, a mere opinion, but a *sententia pia* attested by the faith of the Church as formally a part of the deposit of faith. In view of this, those denying Our Lady's direct and immediate role in the objective redemption are the innovators, whose opinion, in the final analysis, cannot be reconciled with the sources of Revelation.

\*\*\*

Fr. Juniper's massive study of the coredemption appeared only months before the solemn definition of the Assumption by Pope Pius XII. How was it received, and what impact did it have?

Many chapters of this work had—in partial, preliminary form—already been published as articles in learned journals between 1939 and 1950, mainly in *Miscellanea Francescana* and *Marianum*, and the principles governing its argumentation, as well as the notion of formal implicit revelation, had already been aired, sometimes in polemical form.<sup>30</sup> The publication of the full research, thus, benefited from the discussion of these chapters, and scholars were in a sense prepared to critique the result. The critique was not long in forthcoming. There were many long reviews by leading theologians of the time, expert especially in marian and/or franciscan

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Fr. Juniper's study "De Sanctorum Patrum Doctrina circa Beatae Virginis Corredemptionem," *Marianum* 2 (1940): 256–266, and his polemic with Canon Smith, "Method in Mariology: An Open Letter to the Very Rev. Dr. Smith Concerning Mary's Coredemption," *Clergy Review* 18 (1940): 371–375.

studies. Among these scholarly reviewers are found such names as De Aldama, García Garcés, Roschini, Di Fonzo, Sericoli, Philips, Gy, Melchior a Pobladora, Kaup, Kloppenburg, Bertetto, Smith, Marcotte, Fenton, Vollert, and Laurentin.<sup>31</sup> Curiously, no mention of this monumental study appeared in the *Gregorianum*, though it was one of the main periodicals featuring articles contrary to our Lady's immediate participation in what Fr. Lennerz termed the "objective" redemption.<sup>32</sup>

The reviewers were not without critical observations: some noted factual errors; others saw a tendency to cite documents without relating them to their historical setting and without sufficient assessment of them as doctrinal texts or of

<sup>31</sup>J. De Aldama, S.J., *Archivo Teológico Granadino* 14 (1951): 306–307, and *Estudios Ecclesiasticos* 26 (1952): 239–241; N. García Garcés, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Martologicae* 2 (1952): 132–133; G. Roschini, O.S.M., *Martianum* 14 (1952): 129–133; L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv., *Miscellanea Franciscana* 52 (1952): 604–605; C. Sericoli, O.F.M., *Antonianum* 27 (1952): 390–392; G. Philips, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 27 (1951): 537–538; P.-M. Gy, O.P., *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 37 (1953): 524; Melchior a Pobladora, O.F.M.Cap., *Collectanea Franciscana* 21 (1951): 444–446; J. Kaup, O.F.M., *Franziskanische Studien* 34 (1952): 432–434; B. Kloppenburg, O.F.M., *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* 11 (1951): 776–778; D. Bertetto, S.D.B., *Salesianum* 14 (1952): 160–161; G. D. Smith, *Clergy Review* 37 (1952): 239–240; E. Marcotte, O.M.I., *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 22 (1952): 250–251; J. C. Fenton, *American Ecclesiastical Review* 126 (1952): 79–80; C. Vollert, S.J., *Theological Studies* 13 (1952): 442–444; R. Laurentin, *La Vie Spirituelle* 86 (1952): 188–189, and *Bulletin Thomiste* 8, no. 2155: 1097–1098.

<sup>32</sup>In an article discussing recent publications of mariological interest, "Ex Mariologia," *Gregorianum* 33 (1952): 305–321, Fr. Lennerz gives considerable space to C. Dillenschneider, *Pour une corédemption mariale bien comprise* (Rome, 1949), but makes no mention of Fr. Juniper's volume. With the exception of one review (in a Franciscan journal), Fr. Carol's massive study on the coredeemption was greeted by the German Catholic theological world with total silence. In his review of *De Corredemptione*, R. Laurentin suggests this germanic indifference to the coredeemption as presented by scholars such as Fr. Juniper tells us something about those scholars' theology. But it is also possible that it tells us something about the prejudices of a certain kind of fashionable theology favored by the critics. The 1937 publication in *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* of Fr. Balić's study of Carlos del Moral on the coredeemption met similar opposition, sometimes violent. Cf. G. Baraúna, O.F.M., *De Natura Corredemptionis Marianae in Theologia Hodierne* (1921–1958). Bibliotheca Mediationis B. V. Mariae, 2 (Romae, 1960), 29.

their authors' importance as theologians. Some questioned the degree of certainty assigned by Fr. Juniper to his conclusions, while others, agreeing with his overall conclusions, felt a number of texts, particularly from the medieval period, were considerably more ambiguous than Fr. Juniper would concede.<sup>33</sup> Some of these comments were subsequently acknowledged as valid by Fr. Juniper.<sup>34</sup> They need not detain us here, for not a single reviewer thought any of the defects seriously detracted from the study as a valid and substantial contribution to our understanding of the mystery of Mary, a study, therefore, acknowledgedly indispensable to any subsequent reflection on this theme.<sup>35</sup>

While all reviews conceded that Fr. Juniper had more than sufficiently demonstrated objective grounds for the possibility of regarding the coredemption as a revealed truth, not all ascribed to the coredemption the degree of certitude Fr. Juniper did. Here are the chief reasons adduced for the hesitation.

1) It is not certain that the protoevangelium is marian in other than an accommodated sense.<sup>36</sup> Fr. Juniper continued to maintain that those who denied the inspired marian sense of that prophecy were out of harmony with the Magisterium. He relied mainly on *Ineffabilis Deus*, an interpretation then

<sup>33</sup>The principal critics among the reviewers were García Garcés, G. Philips, C. Sericoli, Melchior a Pobladora, J. Kaup, B. Kloppenburg, and R. Laurentin (in the course of a study on the origin of the title "Coredemptrix," "Le titre de Corédemptrice. Étude historique," *Marianum* 13 [1951]: 399 ss.). G. Colasanti, O.F.M.Conv., *La corredenzione mariana nel "De Laudibus B.M.V." di Riccardo da San Lorenzo (saec. XIII)* (Roma, 1957), 35–36, while agreeing with Fr. Juniper's overview of 13th-century theology on this question, faults him for reading too much into texts of Richard of St. Lawrence not entirely free of ambiguity and for not meeting fully the criticisms of Fr. Lennerz.

<sup>34</sup>E.g., those of Laurentin concerning the spurious character of the texts Fr. Juniper had adduced to establish the earliest use of the title "Coredemptrix." Cf. "Our Lady's Coredemption," in *Martology*, 2:398, n. 84.

<sup>35</sup>The judgment of the Dominican P.-M. Gy, author of the last of the reviews to be published, summarizes fairly well the general assessment: "Cet ouvrage sera accueilli avec un réel intérêt par tous les théologiens, même ceux qui ne croiraient pas pouvoir admettre tel quel le jugement théologique final" (*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 37 [1953]: 524).

<sup>36</sup>E.G., Sericoli.



controverted. But the evident sense of a text of *Lumen Gentium*, chapter 8 (no. 55), dealing with the same point, would seem to confirm the position taken by Fr. Juniper: Genesis 3, 15 is marian in some inspired sense.

2) The patristic texts adduced to illustrate the coredemption as implicit in tradition often were cited apart from their original context, and could often be explained equally well by opponents of Fr. Juniper's thesis. Similarly, many of the texts from the post-reformation period were introduced without sufficient evaluation of their import for the doctrine in question or of the relative standing of their authors.<sup>37</sup>

It seems to me that the criticism does touch one of the relatively weaker aspects of the study. I think the documentation adduced by Fr. Juniper is on the whole pertinent, but its demonstrative character vis-a-vis the criticism of the use of patristic texts might have been rendered more convincing by introducing the theme of Mary as New Eve and recognizing, as Fr. Pozo notes,<sup>38</sup> the difference between the Church as New Eve and Mary as New Eve in the mind of those Fathers whose writings include texts objectively coredemptive in thrust. The Church as the New Eve, or maternal mediatrix, in the teaching of the Fathers refers to the distribution of graces on completion of the work of redemption. New Eve as a title for Mary, the maternal mediatrix, is to be explained, not in reference to the distribution of graces, but to her involvement in their acquisition, viz., in the very completion of that work. Thus, the texts adduced by Fr. Juniper ought to be read in view of the acquisition of grace, not of its distribution. Thus, in the opinion of competent theologians, there does exist in the writings of the Fathers, as Fr. Juniper insisted, an objective basis for reading out of and not merely into these texts the doctrine now commonly known as the coredemption.

3) Some critics<sup>39</sup> opined that no adequate explanation was given for a period of nearly three centuries between

<sup>37</sup>For instance, Philips, García Garcés, Laurentin, Kloppenburg.

<sup>38</sup>C. Pozo, S.J., *Maria en la obra de la Salvación* (Madrid, 1974) p. 35.

<sup>39</sup>E.G., García Garcés, Melchior a Pobladora, Kaup, Kloppenburg.

Duns Scotus and the Counter-Reformation when there appeared to have been no significant theological interest in the coredemption, and the only major element of interest cited by Fr. Juniper was the introduction of the terms coredemption and Coredemptrix, a point on which he subsequently admitted error.

This is perhaps the most serious criticism of his reconstruction of the history of the doctrine of the coredemption. As far as I could discover, Fr. Juniper never fully addressed the problem in general, as he never attempted to resolve the ambivalence surrounding the position of St. Bonaventure vis-a-vis the coredemption.<sup>40</sup> Perhaps inconsistency would better describe the status of the doctrine, both in the Seraphic Doctor's writings and throughout the period from Scotus to the Counter-Reformation. The Seraphic Doctor did indeed affirm the coredemption (without the name), an affirmation not entirely consistent with his denial of the Immaculate Conception. But before the doctrine of the coredemption could be developed further or effectively denied, it would be necessary to resolve theologically the question of the Immaculate Conception. Its positive resolution, practically achieved before the Reformation, and its subsequent cultivation as a cornerstone of Catholic renewal after the Reformation would also bring in its wake a clearer and more explicit avowal of the coredemption. Fr. Juniper did not expressly deal with this aspect of the problem, and his failure to address directly the question of the correlation between the history of the

<sup>40</sup>In his *Doctrina Sancti Bonaventurae de universali mediatione B. Virginis Mariae* (Romae, 1938), Fr. L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv., held that the Seraphic Doctor did indeed understand the universal mediation of the Virgin to include an active participation in the redemptive sacrifice of Christ, and this *expressis verbis*. Several years later, Fr. E. Chietini, O.F.M., in his *Mariologia S. Bonaventurae* (Sibenici, 1941), denied he could have understood anything of the kind, because such a view at that time was quite unusual and for the rest quite inconsistent with the Seraphic Doctor's denial of the Immaculate Conception. The dispute has continued to the present among experts on the theology of St. Bonaventure. Fr. Carol, though sympathetic to the position of Fr. Di Fonzo, abstained from a critical assessment of the two positions and was faulted for this by Fr. Sericoli in his *Antonianum* review.

doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and of the core-demption lies at the root of the criticism.<sup>41</sup>

4) Some critics<sup>42</sup> observed that, short of an express prohibition against its denial from the Magisterium, no one, whatever his personal certainty about the coredeemption, would be entitled to label the contrary view as uncatholic. Fr. Juniper, anticipating the objection, remarked that the negative position was not gaining adherents and that the Magisterium appeared already on the way to such a declaration, the obvious parallel being the history of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception after the intervention of Sixtus IV.<sup>43</sup> In fact, by the time of Vatican II no major theologian defended the position of Fr. Lennerz, although it has been observed that there is little, practically-speaking, to differentiate the position of the leading contemporary ecclesiotypologists toward the coredeemption from that of Fr. Lennerz.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup>Fr. Balić, "Die Corredemptrixfrage innerhalb der franziskanischen Theologie," *Franziskanische Studien* 39 (1957): 222–232, notes how St. Bonaventure's affirmation of the universal mediation of Mary logically tends to conflict with his denial of the Immaculate Conception, a conflict casting a pall of ambiguity over texts which at first blush seem to favor the coredeemption as defended by Fr. Juniper. John Duns Scotus, though writing little or nothing about the coredeemption, contributed significantly to the subsequent development of this doctrine by removing a main obstacle to its development: denial of the Immaculate Conception.

<sup>42</sup>García Garcés, Sericoli, Melchior a Pobladora, and Kaup. Laurentin, together with García Garcés, raised questions concerning Fr. Juniper's use of certain magisterial documents, in particular a prayer to the Coredeptrix indulged by some 300 bishops at Fr. Juniper's request, to bolster his conclusions. The critics rather bluntly suggested that Fr. Carol was confusing his roles as scholarly theologian and crusader for the solemn definition of the coredeemption, a suggestion they justified by reference to an inquiry made of many Spanish Bishops who had approved the prayer, but had not by that act intended to take any stand vis-a-vis the doctrinal dispute over the coredeemption. Naturally, Fr. Juniper responded vigorously to these criticisms; cf. his "El Episcopado y el problema de la Corredención (Carta abierta al Rdo P.N. García)," *Marianum* 15 (1953): 375–383. Briefly, Fr. Juniper held that his methods as regards the solicitation and use of said prayer were legitimate, that said indulged prayer had its interest and value (conceded by the critics), and for the rest did not constitute the only or principal basis for his assessment of the mind of the Magisterium on the coredeemption.

<sup>43</sup>*De Corredemptione*, 620–621.

<sup>44</sup>Baraúna, *De natura corredemptionis*..., 156–158.

Certainly, the publication of this work definitively established Fr. Juniper's reputation as a leading mariologist. The precise degree to which this volume affected subsequent study of marian mediation and the coredemption in particular is more difficult to assess. It is, however, a fact that, between the publication of Fr. Carol's study in 1950 and the mariological congress of Lourdes in 1958, the center of interest (1930s) shifted from the discussion-debate on whether or not Our Lady's part in the "objective" redemption was mediate or immediate, remote or proximate, to a discussion mainly of how such immediate participation might be explained: on a christotypological or on an ecclesiotypological basis. The shift might have taken place without Fr. Juniper's study.<sup>45</sup> Nonetheless, his scholarly work provided a secure, if not absolutely perfect, justification for that shift. And chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium* (nos. 61–62) may be read as a kind of confirmation of that shift.

*De Corredemptione* left the discussion of twentieth-century theologians and of questions touching the interpretation of coredemption as a doctrinal fact (viz., the speculative questions) for a second volume, one which was never published and apparently never written. The positions Fr. Juniper might have taken may be divined, however, from the long chapter on coredemption he contributed to the second volume of *Mariology*.<sup>46</sup> Although described by him merely as a sketch and not breaking new ground, this essay is a particularly lucid and well-organized exposition of the

<sup>45</sup>Baraúna, *De natura corredemptionis* . . . , 7. Together with Fr. Juniper, the author of this history cites the work of C. Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., *Marie au service de notre Rédemption* (Haguenau, 1947), as equally significant for this shift. It is also remarked by G. Philips, "Sommes-nous entré dans une phase mariologique? Les publications mariales de 1948 à 1951," *Marianum* 14 (1952):1–48, and "Perspectives mariologiques: Marie et l'Eglise. Essai bibliographique, 1951–1953," *Marianum* 15 (1953):436–511.

<sup>46</sup>*Mariology*, 2:377–425. Fr. Sericoli's remarks in his review that the views of 20th-century theologians should have been studied in a chapter apart misses the precise point of Fr. Juniper's research: not the documentation of a theological controversy, but of the gradual recognition by the Church that the doctrine known as the coredemption is part of the deposit of faith, a fact clearly certified by the end of the 19th century and consistently ratified by the Magisterium thereafter.

then-current state of the question and still valuable as a scholarly introduction to the speculative dimensions of the theme.<sup>47</sup> In general, he takes a christotypological approach, is substantially in agreement with the views of Fr. Balić, and is sympathetic to the ideas of the Spanish mariologists concerning the modalities of the coredeemption (but not in every detail—e.g., the proposal of many Spanish Dominicans to ascribe to our Lady a special priestly character qualitatively diverse from the royal priesthood of the laity, or that of others [not exclusively Spanish] proposing a kind of “physical” causality of the Virgin in the acquisition and distribution of graces). Loyal to the scotistic tradition, Fr. Juniper preferred to speak of a “moral” causality.

\* \* \*

During this period of his scholarly work, Fr. Juniper also wrote on other mariological themes, mainly the death and Assumption of Mary.<sup>48</sup> These contributions are still valuable for their exposition of current discussion and debate, for the fairly complete bibliographical information they provide, and for illustrating how such questions as the death and Assumption involve a “theological fact,” one which truly occurred, but which, to be known as factual, need not be demonstrated historically. A theological proof suffices, although more historical evidence in support of this may still be discovered. The various polemics, relatively short-lived, in which he was involved between 1936 and 1958, help to

<sup>47</sup>G. Philips, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 31 (1955): 441; A. Rivera, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 8 (1958): 506–508. D. Flanagan, the only reviewer to proffer serious reservations about this essay (cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 95 [1961]: 212), questioned not the scholarly competence or utility of the essay, but the adequacy of the approach taken by Fr. Juniper for a final resolution. At the time of writing this review, Flanagan was of the ecclesiotypological persuasion, and, subsequently, he came to regard Fr. Juniper's approach as anti-liberal and unecumenical; hence his strictures must be taken with more than a few grains of salt.

<sup>48</sup>*The Immaculate Conception and Mary's Death* (Dayton, 1954 = A Marian Reprint, 27), reprinted in S. G. Mathews, *Queen of the Universe* (St. Meinrad, 1957), under the title “Mary's Death” (pp. 44–54). Curiously, Fr. Juniper makes no mention of the contributions of C. De Koninck to the discussion of our Lady's death, ideas first published in various articles ca. 1950, and then collected in *La Piété du Fils. Études sur l'Assomption* (Québec, 1954).

identify his position more precisely, but hardly introduce any new elements into the debate.

Fr. Juniper wrote only one mariological synthesis, his *Fundamentals of Mariology*.<sup>49</sup> At the time of publication it was considered by some *sui generis* in the English-speaking world.<sup>50</sup> It is still a useful textbook for beginners, but it can hardly be given, even as a textbook, the designation of major work. It is clearly written, balanced in its evaluations, up-to-date (for its time) bibliographically. Unfortunately, Fr. Juniper utilized Fr. Roschini's outline, surely a commendable one for a book conceived primarily as a learning tool, but not especially suited to setting in relief the profounder roots of the "Franciscan thesis," the inspiration of the exposition as synthesis.

The founding of the Mariological Society of America; the publication of the latter's proceedings, *Marian Studies*; and the organization and editing of the three-volume mariological-marian encyclopedia *Mariology* (Bruce, 1955, 1957, 1961) constitute a more far-reaching and long-term contribution to marian scholarship. Fr. Juniper shared with Fr. Balić the ability to organize and edit this kind of work, the indispensable complement of the textbook for scholarly tyros. In the reviews,<sup>51</sup> *Mariology* generally received high

<sup>49</sup>*Fundamentals of Mariology* (New York, 1956).

<sup>50</sup>"There is nothing remotely approaching it in English" (J. F. Sweeney, S.J., review in *Theological Studies* 17 [1956]: 432-433). But T. O'Shaunessy, O.P., in review in *Thomist* 20 (1957): 101-103, while praising many features, seriously doubted the wisdom of using this as a textbook because excessive, unilateral attention was given to one theological position in the organization of the synthesis and in the treatment of disputed questions, and a patronizing attitude was shown toward St. Thomas. E. Weisenberg, S.J., reviewing in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 57 (1957): 676-679, praised the work in general, but, because of its highly technical and scholastic character, judged it useful as a manual only in courses directed to seminarians and priests.

<sup>51</sup>Vol. 1: A. Rivera, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 6 (1956): 241; G. Philips, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 31 (1955): 441; L. M. Peretto, O.S.M., *Marianum* 18 (1956): 365; W. G. Most, *Theological Studies* 16 (1955): 293-295; C. Davis, *Clergy Review* 40 (1955): 608-610 (the only negative review of volume one); G. Van Ackeren, S.J., *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 55 (1955): 711-714; M. Montague, S.J., *Review for Religious* 14 (1955): 268-269; J. Galot, S.J., *Nouvelle*

praise, and many of its chapters, like studies in du Manoir's *Maria* and Straeter's *Katholische Marienkunde*, continue to be cited in scholarly essays. A few of the contributions in each volume were criticized on grounds of defective scholarship (sometimes the same essay blamed by one reviewer would be precisely the one most praised by another); but on the whole most of the studies were positively assessed by most of the reviewers. Those few reviewers who questioned the biblical or historical or ecumenical adequacy of the editorial approach did so for reasons themselves subject to dispute, and so their strictures can hardly be regarded as grounds for not recognizing the permanent value of the *Carol Mariology*.

\* \* \*

Another key mariological theme to the understanding of which Fr. Juniper made a significant contribution concerns the absolute primacy of Jesus and Mary. He had written briefly on the so-called *debitum peccati* for *Marian Studies*

*Revue Théologique* 78 (1956): 1091; E. Tonna, O.Carm., *Carmelus* 3 (1956): 300–302; Melchior a Pobladora, O.F.M.Cap, *Collectanea Franciscana* 26 (1956): 209–210; L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv., *Miscellanea Franciscana* 57 (1957): 121–124.

Vol. 2: W. G. Most, *Theological Studies* 19 (1958): 109–110; A. Rivera, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 8 (1958): (506–508); G. Philips, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniense* 34 (1958): 70–71; T. Savage, S.J., *Review for Religious* 17 (1958): 112–113; J. Galot, S.J., *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 80 (1958): 549–550; R. Masson, O.P., *Marianum* 21 (1959): 398–400; W. F. Hogan, *Thomist* 22 (1959): 135–137; D. F[lanagan], *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 95 (1961): 212 (generally positive, but in disagreement with Fr. Juniper's views on coredemption).

Vol. 3: J. F. Sweeney, S.J., *Theological Studies* 23 (1962): 159; A. F. Kaiser, C.P.P.S., *American Ecclesiastical Review* 146 (1962): 281; D. F[lanagan], *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 97 (1962): 344 (mostly negative; faulting editor and majority of contributors as "unecumenical" and "unhistorical"); C. Wessels, O.P., *Priest* 18 (1962): 161–163; J. Cummings, O.F.M.Conv., *Worship* 36 (1962): 417–418; A. Kemper, S.J., *Review for Religious* 21 (1962): 488–490; J. Galot, S.J., *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 85 (1963): 649; A. Rivera, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 13 (1963): 178–179; J. Ryska, O.S.M., *Marianum* 26 (1964): 249 (very critical of scholarship).

Spanish edition: P. Franquesa, C.M.F., *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 15 (1965): 343–344; G. Besutti, O.S.M., *Marianum* 27 (1965): 474–477; M. C. Bueno, O.P., *Ciencia Tomista* 92 (1965): 685–686; A. Rivera, C.M.F., *Revista Española de Teología* 25 (1966): 109–111.

in the mid-50s,<sup>52</sup> but only after 1975 did he devote his full attention to the "anti-debitist" crusade, whose promotion he believed intimately linked to the crusade on behalf of the coredeption. Anti-debitism is but the corollary of the absolute primacy of Christ as defended by the scotistic school of theology. In the mind of Fr. Juniper it was also a useful stepping-stone toward completing the work of Risi and Urrutibéhéty<sup>53</sup> on the history of the absolute primacy before the time of Scotus and showing how the "Franciscan thesis" so-called, though promoted by the Franciscan Order in all its branches, is hardly monopolized by it. Indeed, this thesis is supported by a majority of theologians and spiritual writers today and is, perhaps, on the way to being recognized as the Catholic view.

Fr. Juniper's research took the form of a series of articles and books, culminating in another massive tome, *Why Jesus Christ?* (published in 1986).<sup>54</sup> Unlike the *disquisitio positiva* on the coredeption, this volume does not pretend to demonstrate the theological fact of the absolute primacy. It is rather a fairly complete dossier showing how the weight of theological opinion continues to move, as it has in the past, toward a recognition that the thesis associated historically with the name of Scotus is grounded in revelation. Rather than a theological demonstration of the primacy, this study, then, is more an exhaustive annotated bibliography, basic to any future research on the question. It may be consulted for its rather extensive summaries of the thomistic and scotistic positions, each with its own variants. For his

<sup>52</sup>"Our Lady's Immunity from the Debt of Sin," *Marian Studies* 6 (1955): 164-168.

<sup>53</sup>F. M. Risi, *Sul motivo primario della Incarnazione del Verbo...*, 4 vols. (Roma, 1897-1898); C. Urrutibéhéty, O.F.M., *Christus Alpha et Omega, seu de Christi universalis regno* (2 ed., Lille, 1910).

<sup>54</sup>*Why Jesus Christ? Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives* (Manassas, VA, 1986). The two book-length studies published previously were: *A History of the Controversy over the "debitum peccati"* (St. Bonaventure, NY, 1978) and *The Absolute Primacy and Predestination of Jesus and His Virgin Mother* (Chicago, 1981). Among the articles of particular importance is: "Reflections on the Problem of Mary's Preservative Redemption," *Marian Studies* 20 (1979): 19-88.



personal opinion on this disputed point, Fr. Juniper depended substantially on the views of Fr. J.-F. Bonnefoy and, toward the end of his life, indicated considerable sympathy for the approach of Fr. F. S. Pancheri.<sup>55</sup>

These works of Fr. Juniper were not as extensively reviewed, even in franciscan journals, as his earlier work on the coredemption. And the reaction of the general public to these studies, and even to the question itself, was fairly well expressed by J. Sheets who described the Pancheri volume as uninspiring, of interest only to scholars concerned with the minutiae of historical theology.<sup>56</sup>

Nonetheless, the reviews which did appear, except for one, generally praised the scholarship and noted the utility of this volume (and of the articles and books preparing it).<sup>57</sup> The one exception, an unsigned review in the *Rassegna di Letteratura Tomistica*,<sup>58</sup> on the basis of some poorly phrased arguments against the *debitum* and a few defective interpretations of St. Thomas, cast doubt on the scholarly reliability of the entire work, a position hardly justified by the number or character of the instances of

<sup>55</sup>Fr. Juniper translated F. S. Pancheri, O.F.M.Conv., *The Universal Primacy of Christ* (Front Royal, VA, 1984). The preface which he contributed to M. Meilach, O.F.M., *Mary Immaculate in the Divine Plan* (Wilmington, DE, 1981), like the thesis of Meilach, reflects the views of Bonnefoy.

<sup>56</sup>J. Sheets, S.J. review in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 86 (Feb. 1986): 77.

<sup>57</sup>*History of the Controversy*: J. M. Dowd, O.S.M., *Marianum* 48 (1986): 360–362; *Rassegna di Letteratura Tomistica* 14 (1978): 275; C. Bérube, O.F.M.Cap., *Collectanea Franciscana* 49 (1979): 116–117; D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., 40 (1979): 212; M. O'Carroll, C.S.S.P., *Irish Theological Quarterly* 46 (1979): 296–297; E. Carroll, O.Carm., *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 81 (Oct. 1980): 75; A. Vanneste, *Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 75 (1980): 678–679.

*Absolute Primacy*: J. M. Dowd, O.S.M., *Marianum* 48 (1986) 360–362; E. R. Carroll, O.Carm., *Theological Studies* 43 (1982): 558–559; J. Galot, S.J., *Gregorianum* 64 (1983): 181; G. Marcil, O.F.M. *Antonianum* 58 (1983): 500–502; C. Bérube, O.F.M.Cap., *Collectanea Franciscana* 52 (1982): 499.

*Why Jesus Christ?*: Bernardino de Armellada, O.F.M.Cap., *Collectanea Franciscana* 58 (1988): 382–383; P. D. Fehlner, O.F.M.Conv., *Miles Immaculatae* 24 (1988): 253; G. M. Fagin, S.J., *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 742–743; J. Dupuis, S.J., *Gregorianum* 69 (1988): 724–726.

<sup>58</sup>*Rassegna di Letteratura Tomistica* 14 (1978): 275.

faulty scholarship cited. For the rest, the anonymous critic was inclined to agree with Fr. Juniper's general conclusions.

Three reviewers questioned not the scholarship, but the soundness of Fr. Juniper's formulation of the problematic. The first two (reviewing *History of the Controversy*)<sup>59</sup> admitted the accuracy of the research, but declared that a) it was fruitless effort, because Fr. Juniper failed to show the relevance of such research for contemporary theology (and probably could not, since not only the concept of the *debitum*, but also that of "original sin" itself was outdated, derived like the *debitum* not from divine Revelation, but from an incorrectly formulated problematic); and b) it was wasted effort, because the question of the primacy was no longer formulated in scholastic terms and was so obscure as to be intractable.

Another critic,<sup>60</sup> also conceding the scholarly accuracy displayed in *Why Jesus Christ?*, nonetheless is amazed that Fr. Carol did not realize this whole problematic is now transcended in the formation of a new synthesis in which the primary purpose of the Incarnation is neither the greatest glory of God nor the redemption, but (in the wake of Hegel and Teilhard de Chardin) the deepest possible immanence of God in his creation.

<sup>59</sup>D. Fernández, reviewing *History of the Controversy* in *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 29 (1979): 136–137 (repeated in his review of *Marian Studies*, vol. 30, in *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 30 [1980]: 117); and *Absolute Primacy* in *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 32 (1982): 351. For his remarks about the relevance of original sin as defined by Trent and of the *debitum* controversy Fr. Fernández relies on Alejandro de Villalmonste, *El pecado original; veinticinco años de controversia, 1950–1975* (Salamanca, 1979), a historian of pronounced anti-augustinian and -pelagian sympathies. The criticisms of Fr. Fernandez were echoed by A. Vanneste, *Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 75 (1980): 678–679, himself a proponent of a "new approach" to original sin—and, hence, to the Immaculate Conception. On the relevance of the *debitum* discussion, cf. W. H. Marshner, "A Critique of Marian Counterfactual Formulae: A Report of Results," *Marian Studies* 30 (1979): 108–139.

<sup>60</sup>J. Dupuis, S.J., reviewing *Why Jesus Christ?* in *Gregorianum* 69 (1988): 724–726. The criticisms reflect the influence of Hegel (the transcendental approach) and of Teilhard de Chardin (immanentist interpretation of the Incarnation). The reviewer claims to be surprised this new approach did not even occur to Fr. Carol. But why should he have considered in this kind of work an approach which could not be anything but the perfect theological dead-end?

Astounding assessments, they repudiate not the admittedly impeccable work of Fr. Juniper, but the traditional premises underlying his concept of theological research, in order to avoid the implications of the research and, so, underscore in their own way the enduring importance of this research for Catholic theological scholarship. In documenting its "cloud of witnesses," Fr. Juniper attests the intrinsic appeal of the scotistic position on the absolute primacy of Christ and Mary, so basic to a right interpretation of the coredemption.

\* \* \*

Fr. Juniper had a flair for controversy as well as scholarly research, a reflection perhaps of the ardor of his love for the Virgin Mother. He was quite willing to defend what he deeply believed to be the truth about our Lady and challenge publicly those who denied or misrepresented this mystery. Sometimes his ardent style of expression, no longer universally in favor (particularly in the non-Latin countries), unintentionally gave offense, as in the case of his polemic with Canon George Smith in 1940.<sup>61</sup> A German confrere, Fr. Julian Kaup, in his review of *De Corredemptione*,<sup>62</sup> chided him for describing Fr. H. Lennerz in a work of detached scholarship as the coredemption's *hostis acerrimus*. This sort of thing permitted his critics to depict him on occasion as one whose devotion to the Virgin dictated the conclusions of his scholarship, i.e., he was a maximalist in the pejorative sense of that term.<sup>63</sup> This is unfair, for if anyone was rigorously scientific,

<sup>61</sup>"Method in Mariology: An Open Letter to the Very Rev. Dr. Smith Concerning Mary's Coredemption," *Clergy Review* 18 (1940): 371-375.

<sup>62</sup>*Franziskanische Studien* 34 (1952): 433. Canon Smith, with whom Fr. Juniper as a young priest had once engaged in polemics, in his very generous review of *De Corredemptione*, gently noted the same tendency to employ condemnatory terminology where only legitimate disagreement was really meant.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. the remarks of R. Laurentin, "Le problème initial de méthodologie mariale," in Du Manoir, *Marie*, 1: 698; and in his review of *De Corredemptione* in *La Vie Spirituelle* 86 (1952): 188-189. Pietistic theologians there have been in the history of theology, as there have been rationalist theologians as well. But to be partial to the *ratio pia* in theological reflection no more makes one a pietist, than to indulge one's critical faculties *per se* makes one a rationalist in theology. Otherwise we should have to condemn such luminaries as Saints Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas. That his works had many imperfections was admitted first of all by Fr. Juniper [cf. his

keeping the mariological and marian almost in air-tight compartments, it was Fr. Juniper.<sup>64</sup> His assessment of controverted points (e.g., the Coredemptrix's merit *de condigno* and the sacerdotal character claimed for her by some),<sup>65</sup> his defense of moral rather than physical causality as an explanation of Mary's mediation,<sup>66</sup> and his suggestions for improving the terminology commonly employed to discuss the mystery of the coredeemption were eminently judicious.<sup>67</sup>

But his readiness for controversy and rebuttal was not merely indulgence of polemics. He was quite capable of making some controversy the occasion of a lucid exposition of the *status quaestionis*, as in his analysis of the objections of Msgr. Coppens and others to the definibility of the Assumption<sup>68</sup> or of the Abbé Michel's to the coredeemption as an active participation by Mary in the acquisition of grace (and not merely a consent to the redemption),<sup>69</sup> or, again, in his critique of Fr. Alonso's concessions to theological fashion on the subject of marian mediation.<sup>70</sup>

That ability surely indicates something more than mere cleverness in the practice of dialectics or in the use of

"Notas marginales a la respuesta del Padre Alonso," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 26 (1976): 176]. But, that his concept of theology and theological method were unbalanced is a charge still to be documented.

<sup>64</sup>"... distingue fort soigneusement entre la littérature édifiante et la théologie proprement dite." Thus G. Philips wrote, reviewing *De Corredemptione*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 27 (1951): 538.

<sup>65</sup>"Our Lady's Co-redemption," in *Mariology* 2: 410-414. Fr. Juniper personally favored a form of condign merit, *non ex rigore iustitiae, sed ex mera condignitate*. He was against ascribing to the Virgin any sacerdotal titles, because such practices only confused the discussion of coredeemption.

<sup>66</sup>*Fundamentals of Mariology*, p. 66, n. 115; "Mary, Mediatrix of all Graces," *Our Lady's Digest* 6 (March 1952): 410.

<sup>67</sup>Fr. Baraúna, *De Natura Corredemptionis*... , p. 219, commends the consistency of his analysis of the problem of coredeemption in "The Problem of Our Lady's Coredeemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 123 (1950): 32-51.

<sup>68</sup>"The Definibility of Mary's Assumption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 118 (1948): 161-177.

<sup>69</sup>"The Problem of Our Lady's Coredeemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 123 (1950): 32-51.

<sup>70</sup>"Dr. J. M. Alonso on Mary's Mediation" and "Notas marginales a la respuesta del Padre Alonso," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 26 (1976): 159-167; 172-176.

scholarly method: that something more consisting in a love of the truth about the one God and the one Mediator of God and humankind and in the skill to discover and communicate it. Those who have questioned the utility and value of Fr. Carol's study of the coredeemption and of the primacy of Jesus and Mary, its root foundation, have done so not on the basis of inadequate scholarship or faulty argumentation, but in terms of a concept of theology and of theological method and in terms of a reconstruction of the history of theology resting on pelagian premises. Fr. Juniper's vision of theology, by contrast, is one inspired by the augustinian-franciscan-scotistic tradition, one certainly Catholic. Notwithstanding the current crop of apologists for the theological naturalism and relativism of Pelagius, the same cannot be said for the assumptions of those critics who, on grounds indistinguishable from those of Pelagius, assess the work of Fr. Juniper as irrelevant to post-conciliar theology.

Once it is seen how the resolution of so many current theological disputes is, in practice, affected by an affirmation or denial of original sin as defined by the Council of Trent (a definition only grasped to the extent it is related to the privilege of the Immaculate Conception), we can better appreciate why the time spent pondering so abstruse a point as the *debitum peccati* is not time wasted. It is necessary to show the possibility (the *potuit*) and the fittingness (the *deuit*) of what otherwise is known to be a fact: the coredeemption.

It is curious that the ancient battle between augustinianism and pelagianism (naturalism) should today be rejoined at the foot of the cross, where it first began, and that the affirmation or denial of the absolute necessity for salvation of grace, of the Church, and of Christ crucified should converge on the affirmation or denial of the coredeemption. There are, of course, voices to be heard in denial of this. Yet it is difficult, in the face of the profound teachings of Pope John Paul II on the maternal mediation of Mary at the foot of the cross, to give much credence to such denials.

\*\*\*

Sooner or later, there will be a renewed interest in the mystery of the coredemption (under this or some other heading), and the major work of Fr. Juniper will continue to enjoy the recognition foretold for it on its publication. It is not the last word; no theologian, however great, may pretend to have the last word on the great sacrament or mystery of salvation. Like that of his towering master, Fr. Balić, Fr. Carol's mariology may also be described as sometimes overstressing the "scientific" or "scholastic" or "academic" over against prayer and devotion, the witness of the saints and spiritual writers, and as giving too little consideration to the pneumatological and ecclesiological aspects stressed by Vatican II.<sup>71</sup> Whatever the justice of these complaints, they are not defects of commission, but of omission. Whatever new orientations chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium* sanctions for mariologists, there is also (in significant measure due to the work of Fr. Balić) a ringing reaffirmation of the premises on which the franciscan mariological tradition rests.

Nor is it impossible to fill such lacunae from within that tradition. The thought and work of a slightly older franciscan contemporary of Fr. Balić, St. Maximilian Kolbe (1894–1941), who had little if any direct influence on the work either of Fr. Balić or Fr. Carol, can help to redress the balance and complete the presentation of Mary Immaculate, Spouse of the Holy Spirit, as Coredemptrix.<sup>72</sup>

St. Maximilian's efforts to incorporate the mystery of the Immaculate Conception into the life of the Church and of all believers, indeed of all souls, represent another side of the franciscan marian tradition, one evident in St. Francis' Invocation of Mary as "Spouse of the Holy Spirit" and "Virgin made Church."<sup>73</sup> The point where these two titles

<sup>71</sup>Aračić, *La dottrina...*, pp. 261–267.

<sup>72</sup>Cf. E. Piacentini, O.F.M.Conv., *Dottrina mariologica del P. Massimiliano Kolbe* (Roma, 1971); *La mariologia di San Massimiliano Kolbe*, ed. F.S. Pancheri, O.F.M.Conv., *Miscellanea Francescana* 85 (1985): 1–751.

<sup>73</sup>Respectively, from the Antiphon of the *Office of the Passion*, and from the *Salute to the Virgin*, composed by St. Francis of Assisi. Cf. the critical edition by K. Esser, O.F.M., *Die Opuscula des Hl. Franziskus von Assisi*. *Spicilegium Bonaventurinum*, 13 (Grottaferrata, 1976), 339, 418; or *Opuscula Sancti Patris Francisci*

compenetrate is the coredemption. For, in virtue of her preservation from original sin, Mary is the Virgin Mother of God and spiritual Mother of the Church and of all believers; therefore, she is the maternal mediatrix, whose mediation is consummated by her unique sharing in the mystery of the cross and resurrection. And, thus, the coredemption is the point where the mariologist passes into the mystic and learning is put fully at the service of devotion.

That is why Fr. Kolbe's martyrdom on the vigil of the Assumption is so significant, not only for our practice of virtue, but also for the progress of our mariology. It is a further proof of the primacy of Jesus and Mary, of their triumph over the serpent, and, hence, of the significance of the franciscan thesis in its three key moments for Catholic theology: the Immaculate Conception, the Incarnation-Coredemption, and the Assumption.

Because he advanced the scholarly appreciation of the "Franciscan thesis" in an important way, Fr. Juniper's massive study of the coredemption and his painstaking research on the primacy and *debitum* have secured for him a lasting place in the annals of mariology. As Fr. James McCurry remarked last year,<sup>74</sup> it is not so much on the "originality of his analysis" (for which he was largely indebted to the franciscan tradition), as in "the integrity of his synthesis" (grounded in meticulous scholarship, faithful to the teaching of the Church, for the greatest glory of Christ the King) that his real contribution to mariology consists and enduring reputation rests.

And to judge from the wide-ranging reviews in journals of all kinds and from the continued use of his works or reference and popularization, he did indeed make a lasting impression on the consciousness of the faithful, lay as well as clerical. Surely, he realized in his life what St. Francis desired

*Assistentis*, cura C. Esser, O.F.M., Bibliotheca Franciscana Ascetica Medii Aevi, 12 (Grottaferrata, 1978) 193, 300.

<sup>74</sup>James McCurry, O.F.M.Conv., "Fr. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., 1911-1990: *Vir Catholicus et Totus Apostolicus*," *Marian Studies* 42 (1991): 9-14.

of all his followers: that they be the faithful servants (*servi*, in the sense of slaves) of Mary, so as to be perfectly conformed to their crucified Savior and exalted King.

PETER D. FEHLNER, O.F.M.Conv.  
*Rensselaer, NY*



BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS<sup>75</sup> OF  
FR. JUNIPER B. CAROL, O.F.M.

1936

"In Defense of the Title of Co-redemptrix," *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* 36 (1936): 1197-1199.<sup>76</sup>

1937

"The Theological Concept of Mediation and Co-redemption," *Ephemeri-des Theologicae Lovanienses* 14 (1937): 642-650. [Rev.: *Marianum* 1 (1939): 469.]

*The Blessed Virgin's Co-redemption Vindicated. Short Observations on a Recent Work.*<sup>77</sup> (Quaracchi [Florence], 1937), pp. 30. [Rev.: *Month* 17 (1938): 558-559; *Miscellanea Franciscana* 39 (1939): 334-335; *Marianum* 1 (1939) 468.]

"The Holy See and the Title of 'Co-redemptrix,'" *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* 37 (1937): 746-748.<sup>78</sup>

1939

"De fundamento proximo Co-redemptionis Marianae," *Marianum* 1 (1939): 173-187.

"Utrum Beatae Virginis Co-redemptio sit in S. Scriptura formaliter revelata," *Marianum* 1 (1939): 283-326.

"Pio XII e la corredenzione di Maria," *Marianum* 1 (1939): 361-364.

<sup>75</sup>For a period of about 15 years, from the late 1950s through the early 1970s, Fr. Juniper was a frequent contributor to *The Wanderer*. The present bibliography does not include these articles, as I was unable to obtain sufficiently precise bibliographical information about them.

<sup>76</sup>A letter in criticism of Albert E. Kaiser, C.PPS., "Mary's Relation to Us: Her Mediocrity," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 36 (1936): 927-933.

<sup>77</sup>L. E. Bellanti, S.J., "Mary, Co-redemptrix and Mediatrix," in *Our Blessed Lady*, Cambridge Summer School of Catholic Studies, 1933 (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1934), 207-227.

<sup>78</sup>Letter in reply to Albert E. Kaiser, C.PPS., "Use of 'Co-redemptrix' in Papal Documents," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 37 (1937): 69-72.

"The Nature of the Blessed Virgin's Ontological Mediation," *Miscellanea Franciscana* 39 (1939): 449-470. [Rev.: *Marianum* 2 (1940): 205-206.]

"Episcopatus catholicus et Beatae Virginis Co-redemption," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 10 (1939): 801-828.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Hermann SEILER, S.J., *Corredemptrix*, in *Marianum* 1 (1939): 237-240.

Hermann SEILER, S.J., *Corredemptrix*, in *Antonianum* 14 (1939): 412.

## 1940

"Pater H. Lennerz et problema de Co-redemptione Mariana," *Marianum* 2 (1940): 194-200.<sup>79</sup>

"De Sanctorum Patrum Doctrina circa Beatae Virginis Corredemptionem," *Marianum* 2 (1940): 256-266.

"Method in Mariology: An Open Letter to the Very Rev. Dr. Smith concerning Mary's Co-redemption," *Clergy Review* 18 (1940): 371-375.<sup>80</sup>

## BOOK REVIEWS

Paul STRÄTER, S.J., *Die Seele der Gottesmutter*; Father CANICE, O.F.M.Cap., *Mary: A Study of the Mother of God*; Luis COLOMER, O.F.M., *La Virgen María*; Serapio DE IRAGUI, O.F.M.Cap., *La meditación de la Virgen en la himnografía latina del la Edad Media*, in *Marianum* 2 (1940): 203-205.

## 1941

"Doctrina de Beatae Virginis Co-redemptione ab ortu usque ad prolapsus aetatis Scholasticorum," *Miscellanea Franciscana* 41 (1941): 248-266. [Rev.: *Marianum* 4 (1942): 137-138.]

## 1943

"Our Lady's Part in the Redemption According to Seventeenth-century Writers," *Franciscan Studies* 24 (1943): 3-20; 143-158.

<sup>79</sup>A discussion of the third edition of H. Lennerz, S.J., *De Beata Virgine* (Rome, 1939).

<sup>80</sup>A letter in criticism of G. D. Smith, "Method in Mariology," *Clergy Review* 17 (1939): 499-513.

50 J. B. Carol: His Mariology and Scholarly Achievement

1946

"Adnotationes in opus 'Mater corredeptrix' a Patre N. Garcia conscriptum," *Marianum* 8 (1946): 277-283.

1947

"Testimonia saeculi XVIII de Beata Virgine Co-redemptrice," *Marianum* 9 (1947): 37-63.

"Romanorum Pontificum doctrina de Beata Virgine Co-redemptrice," *Marianum* 9 (1947): 161-183.

1948

"De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae in quibusdam postulatis ad sanctam Sedem delatis," *Miscellanea Francescana* 48 (1948): 85-90.

"The Definability of Mary's Assumption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 118 (1948): 161-177.<sup>81</sup>

"Episcoporum doctrina de Beata Virgine Corredemptrice," *Marianum* 10 (1948): 211-258.

BOOK REVIEW

Clement DILLENSCHNEIDER, C.S.S.R., *Marie au service de notre rédemption*, in *Marianum* 10 (1948): 307-308.

1949

"Verso la definizione dogmatica dell'Assunta," *Marianum* 11 (1949): 88-94.<sup>82</sup>

"Recent Literature on Mary's Assumption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 120 (1949): 376-387.

"Mary's Co-redemption According to Nineteenth-century Italian Writers," *Marianum* 11 (1949): 407-422.

"Mary's Co-redemption in the Teaching of Pope Pius XII," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 121 (1949): 353-361.

<sup>81</sup>In reference to the views of J. Ernst, M. Jugie and J. Coppens.

<sup>82</sup>A review of *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal: Fides, 1949).

1950

*De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae apud scriptores saeculi XVII*, Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum de Urbe. Facultas Theologica. Dissertatio ad lauream, no. 61 (Civitas Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950), v, 198–322.<sup>83</sup>

*De Corredemptione Beatae Virginis Mariae. Disquisitio positiva*. Franciscan Institute Publications. Theology Series, no. 2 (Civitas Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950), 643 pp. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 27 (1951): 537–538; *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* 11 (1951): 776–778; *Collectanea Franciscana* 21 (1951): 444–446; *Archivo Teologico Granadino* 14 (1951): 306–307; *Marianum* 14 (1952): 129–133; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 2 (1952): 132–133; *American Ecclesiastical Review* 126 (1952): 79–80; *Clergy Review* 37 (1952): 239–240; *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 22 (1952): 250–251; *Salesianum* 14 (1952): 160–161; *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 26 (1952): 239–241; *La Vie Spirituelle* 86 (1952): 188–189; *Theological Studies* 13 (1952): 442–444; *Antonianum* 27 (1952): 390–392; *Miscellanea Franciscana* 52 (1952): 604–605; *Franziskanische Studien* 34 (1952): 432–434; *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 37 (1953): 524; *Bulletin Thomiste* 8, no. 2155: 1097–1098; *Bibliographia Franciscana* 9, no. 474: 137–138.

"The Mariological Movement in the World Today," *Marian Studies* 1 (1950): 25–45. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 1 (1951): 301.]

"The Problem of Our Lady's Coredeemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 123 (1950): 32–51.<sup>84</sup> [Rev.: *Marianum* 13 (1951): 199.]

"The Recent Marian Congress at Pay-en Velay," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 123 (1950): 273–283.

1951

"A Bibliography on the Assumption," *Thomist* 14 (1951): 133–160.

"The Apostolic Constitution 'Munificentissimus Deus' and Our Blessed Lady's Coredeemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 125 (1951): 255–273. [Rev.: *Marianum* 14 (1952) 348–349.]

<sup>83</sup>This is part 2, chapter 3, of the following work (the section defended for the Doctorate in Theology).

<sup>84</sup>A critique of A. Michel, "Mary's Co-redemption," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 122 (1950): 183–192.

52 J. B. Carol: *His Mariology and Scholarly Achievement*

"The Apostolic Constitution 'Munificentissimus Deus' and Our Lady's Coredemption," *Marianum* 13 (1951): 237-256.<sup>85</sup>

BOOK REVIEWS

Dominic J. UNGER, O.F.M.Cap., *Cardinal Newman and Apocalypse XII*, in *Marianum* 13 (1951): 198.

Eligius M. BUYTAERT, O.F.M., *The Immaculate Conception in the Writings of Ockham*, in *Marianum* 13 (1951): 200-201.

1952

"Mary's Co-redemption in the Teaching of Pope Pius XII," in J. C. Fenton and E. D. Bedard, *Studies in Praise of Our Blessed Mother: Selections from the American Ecclesiastical Review* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1952), 162-170.<sup>86</sup>

"Report on the New York Convention," *Marian Studies* 3 (1952): 5-8.

"Our Lady's Coredemption in the Marian Literature of Nineteenth Century America," *Marianum* 14 (1952): 49-63.

"Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces," *Our Lady's Digest* 6 (March 1952): 417-426.

1953

"Report on the Cleveland Convention," *Marian Studies* 4 (1953): 5-9.

"El Episcopado y el problema de la Corredención (Carta abierta al Rdo. P. N. García)," *Marianum* 15 (1953): 375-383.<sup>87</sup>

"Mary's Universal Queenship," *Our Lady's Digest* 8 (May 1953): 5-10.

1954

*The Immaculate Conception and Mary's Death*. Marian Reprint, 27 (Dayton, Ohio: Marian Library, 1954), 8 pp.

"Report on the Washington [D.C.] Convention," *Marian Studies* 5 (1954): 5-12.

<sup>85</sup>Identical with preceding entry.

<sup>86</sup>A reprint of 1949 article with same title.

<sup>87</sup>A reply to the criticisms of N. García Garcés, "Es sentencia bastante firme y universal del Magistero Ordinario la Corredención objetiva inmediata?" *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 3 (1953): 245-256.

"The Definition of the Immaculate Conception: Reflections on a Centenary," *Our Lady's Digest* 9 (Aug.-Sept. 1954): 108-111.

"On Mary's Virginity *in partu*: Rev. Dr. Carol on Dr. Henry's Article: The Virgin Birth," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 54 (1954): 446-447.<sup>88</sup>

## 1955

*Mariology*, ed. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., vol. 1 (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1955), xvi, 1-434 [Rev.: *Theological Studies* 16 (1955): 293-295; *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 31 (1955): 441; *Books on Trial* 13 (1955): 314; *Catholic World* 181 (1955): 74; *Clergy Review* 40 (1955): 608-610; *Dominicana* 40 (1955): 187; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 55 (1955): 711-714; *Month* 14 n.s. (1955): 190; *Review for Religious* 14 (1955): 268-269; *Sponsa* 27 (1955): 55; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 6 (1956): 241; *Marianum* 18 (1956): 365; *Our Lady's Digest* 10 (1956): 255; *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 78 (1956): 1091; *Carmelus* 3 (1956): 300-302; *Collectanea Franciscana* 26 (1956): 209-210; *Miscellanea Franciscana* 57 (1957): 121-124.]

"Mary, Coredemptrix," in *In Praise of Mary*, ed. R. J. Treece (St. Meinrad, IN, 1955), 108-120.

"Report on the St. Louis Convention," *Marian Studies* 6 (1955): 5-10.

"Our Lady's Immunity from the Debt of Sin," *Marian Studies* 6 (1955): 164-168. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 7 (1957): 501.]

"On 'Dangerous Marian Year Reefs,'" *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 55 (1955): 698-699.<sup>89</sup>

## 1956

*Fundamentals of Mariology* (New York: Benziger, 1956), xx, 1-203. [Rev.: *Theological Studies* 17 (1956): 432-433; *Marianum* 18 (1956): 369-370; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 7 (1957): 504; *Thomist* 20 (1957): 101-103; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 57 (1957): 676-679.]

"Report on the New York Convention," *Marian Studies* 7 (1956): 5-11.

"Mary, the Mother of God," *Our Lady's Digest* 11 (Dec. 1956): 207-211.

<sup>88</sup>A letter in criticism of Clifford E. L. Henry, "A Doctor Considers the Birth of Jesus," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 54 (1954): 219-223. A confrere of Fr. Juniper, Fr. Bernard Ambrozic, continued the exchange in "Concerning Dr. Henry's and Rev. Dr. Carol's Discussion," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 54 (1954): 636-638.

<sup>89</sup>A letter in criticism of Robert Kekeisen, "Dangerous Marian Year Reefs," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 55 (1955): 287-290.

1957

- Mariology*, ed. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., vol. 2 (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1957), xii, 1–606. [Rev.: *Catholic Educator* 28 (1957): 230; *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 34 (1958): 70–71; *Theological Studies* 19 (1958): 109–110; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 8 (1958): 506–508; *Books on Trial* 16 (Dec. 1958): 49; *Catholic World* 186 (1958): 320–321; *Review for Religious* 17 (1958): 112–113; *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 80 (1958): 549–550; *Thomist* 22 (1959): 135–137; *Marianum* 21 (1959): 398–400; *Worship* 33 (1959): 69–70; *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 95 (1961): 212; *Bibliographia Franciscana* 10, no. 790: 199.]
- "Our Lady's Co-redemption," in *Mariology*, ed. J. B. Carol (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1957), 2: 377–425.
- "Mary's Death," in *Queen of the Universe*, ed. Stanley G. Mathews (Saint Meinrad, IN, 1957), 44–54.<sup>90</sup>
- "Report on the Chicago Convention," *Marian Studies* 8 (1957): 5–12.
- "Catholic Teaching on Mary Explained to Non-Catholics," *Our Lady's Digest* 11 (March 1957): 326–330.

1958

- "Report on the Dayton Convention," *Marian Studies* 9 (1958): 5–14.
- "Maria y la Iglesia. Raseña de una importante publicación," *Marianum* 20 (1958): 95–104.<sup>91</sup>
- "Spiritual Lessons of Lourdes," *Our Lady's Digest* 13 (May 1958): 5–9.

1959

- "Report on the Paterson Convention," *Marian Studies* 10 (1959): 5–12.

1960

- "Report on the Detroit Convention," *Marian Studies* 11 (1960): 5–12.

1961

- Mariology*, ed. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., vol. 3 (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1961), xiv, 1–456. [Rev.: *America* 106 (1961): 25; *Dominicana* 46 (1961): 326; *American Ecclesiastical Review* 146 (1962): 281; *Theological Studies*

<sup>90</sup>Identical with the 1954 brochure, *The Immaculate Conception and Mary's Death*.

<sup>91</sup>A review of *Estudios Marianos* 18 (1956).

23 (1962): 159; *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 97 (1962): 344; *Priest* 18 (1962): 161–163; *Review for Religious* 21 (1962): 488–490; *Worship* 36 (1962): 417–418; *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 85 (1963): 649; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 13 (1963): 178–179; *Marianum* 26 (1964): 249.]

"Immaculate Conception," in *American People's Encyclopedia* (20 vols.; Chicago: Spenser Press, 1961), 10: 954.

"Report on the Pittsburgh Convention," *Marian Studies* 12 (1961): 15–20.

#### 1962

"Report on the New Orleans Convention," *Marian Studies* 13 (1962): 13–16.

#### 1963

"Report on the Boston Convention," *Marian Studies* 14 (1963): 7–16.

#### 1964

*Mariologia*, por una comisión internacional de especialistas bajo la presidencia de J. B. Carol. Traducción de Maria Angeles G. Careaga. Prólogo sobre la mariología en el Concilio Vaticano II, por Narciso García Garcés (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1964), xlvii, 1–997 (= Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, sección II, Teología y Canones, 242).<sup>92</sup> [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 15 (1965): 343–344; *Marianum* 27 (1965): 474–477; *Ciencia Tomista* 92 (1965): 685–686; *Revista Española de Teología* 26 (1966): 109–111.]

"Corredención de Nuestra Señora," in *Mariologia* (Madrid, 1964), 760–804.

"Report on the Kansas City Convention," *Marian Studies* 15 (1964): 7–11.

"The History Behind May: Mary's Month," *Our Lady's Digest* 19 (1964): 22–25.

#### 1965

"Immaculate Conception," in *Encyclopedia Britannica* (24 vols.; Chicago, 1965), 11: 1101.

"Report on the Philadelphia Convention," *Marian Studies* 16 (1965): 7–10.

<sup>92</sup>Spanish translation of *Mariology*, vols. 1 and 2.



1966

"Report on the Louisville Convention," *Marian Studies* 17 (1966): 7-12.

1967

"Immaculate Conception, Missionary Sisters of (SMIC)," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (15 vols.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 7: 382.

"Mariological Societies," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (15 vols.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 9: 223.

"Mary, Blessed Virgin, II (in theology) [Mediatrice of All Graces]," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (15 vols.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 9: 359-364.

"Report on the North Palm Beach Convention," *Marian Studies* 18 (1967): 7-11.

1968

"Report on the Dayton Convention," *Marian Studies* 19 (1968): 14-19.

1969

"Report on the Tampa Convention," *Marian Studies* 20 (1969): 14-21.

1971

"Report on the St. Petersburg Beach Convention," *Marian Studies* 22 (1971): 7-12.

1972

"Report on the San Antonio Convention," *Marian Studies* 23 (1972): 7-11.

1973

"Report on the St. Louis Convention," in *Marian Studies* 24 (1973): 5-11.

1974

"Presentation" [for the Silver Jubilee of the Mariological Society of America, and Report on the St. Petersburg Beach Convention], *Marian Studies* 25 (1974): 5-7.

1975

"Report on the Atlanta Convention," *Marian Studies* 26 (1975): 5–8.

1976

"Report on the Washington, D.C., Convention," *Marian Studies* 27 (1976): 5–10.

"Religious Congregation Honors Mary as Co-redemptrix," *Marianum* 38 (1976): 529–530.

"Dr. J. M. Alonso on Mary's Mediation,"<sup>93</sup> *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 26 (1976): 159–167.

"Notas marginales a la respuesta del Padre Alonso," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 26 (1976): 172–176.<sup>94</sup>

1977

"Report on the North Palm Beach Convention," *Marian Studies* 28 (1977): 5–9.

"The Blessed Virgin and the 'Debitum Peccati': A Bibliographical Conspectus," *Marian Studies* 28 (1977): 181–256. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 28 (1978): 112.]

1978

*A History of the Controversy over the "Debitum Peccati."* Franciscan Institute Publications. Theology Series, no. 9 (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: The Franciscan Institute, 1978), xiii, 1–260. [Rev.: *Rassegna di Letteratura Tomistica* 14 (1978): 275; *Collectanea Franciscana* 49 (1979): 116–117; *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 29 (1979): 136–137; *Irish Theological Quarterly* 46 (1979): 296–297; *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 212; *Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 75 (1980): 678–679; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 81 (Oct. 1980): 75; *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* 40 (1980): 812; *Marianum* 48 (1986): 360–362.]

"A Towering Figure," in P. Carlo Balić, O.F.M. *Profilo, impressioni, ricordi*, a cura di P. Paolo Melada, O.F.M., e P. Dinko Aračić, O.F.M. (Roma: Pontificia Accademia Mariana Internazionale, 1978), 136–137.

"Mary's Co-redemption in a Petition of the Cuban Hierarchy to Pius XII," *Marianum* 40 (1978): 440–444.

<sup>93</sup>Criticism of J. M. Alonso, "Mediación de Maria—Mediación de la Iglesia," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 25 (1975): 23–50.

<sup>94</sup>A reply to Fr. Alonso's rejoinder: "Respuesta al P. Carol," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 26 (1976): 167–172.

58 J. B. Carol: His Mariology and Scholarly Achievement

"Report on the Baltimore, Md., Convention," *Marian Studies* 29 (1978): 5-11.

1979

"Reflections on the Problem of Mary's Preservative Redemption," *Marian Studies* 30 (1979): 19-88. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 30 (1980): 117.]

1980

"Memorial Tribute to Cardinal John J. Wright (+ 1979)," *Marian Studies* 31 (1980): 36-39.

"The Absolute Predestination of the Blessed Virgin Mary," *Marian Studies* 31 (1980): 172-238. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 31 (1981): 319.]

1981

*The Absolute Primacy and Predestination of Jesus and His Virgin Mother* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981), xiii, 1-177. [Rev.: *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 32 (1982): 351; *Collectanea Franciscana* 52 (1982): 499; *Theological Studies* 43 (1982): 558-559; *Gregorianum* 64 (1983): 181; *Antonianum* 58 (1983): 500-502; *Marianum* 48 (1986): 360-362.]

Michael D. Meilach, O.F.M., *Mary Immaculate in the Divine Plan*. The Mary Library, 1 (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1981) vi, 1-96. Preface by J. B. CAROL, O.F.M., pp. v-vi. [Rev.: *The Cord* 31 (1981): 313-315; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 82 (Jan. 1982): 78-79.]

1982

"Cur Deus Homo?" *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 82 (Aug.-Sept. 1982): 8-9.<sup>95</sup>

1983

"Duns Scotus on the Incarnation," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 83 (June 1983): 4.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>95</sup>A letter in criticism of the review of M. Meilach, *Mary Immaculate in the Divine Plan*, by K. Baker, S.J.: *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 82 (Jan. 1982): 78-79.

<sup>96</sup>A letter in reply to the observations of M. Schulzetenberg: *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 83 (Feb. 1983): 6-7, on Fr. Carol's 1982 letter.

1984

Francesco Saverio Pancheri, O.F.M.Conv., *The Universal Primacy of Christ*, translated and adapted from the Italian edition by Juniper B. CAROL, O.F.M. (Front Royal, VA: Christendom, 1984), x, 1–144. [Rev.: *Collectanea Franciscana* 54 (1984): 352–353; *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 385; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 86 (Feb. 1986): 77.]

1985

“Predestination of Mary,” in *Dictionary of Mary: “Behold Your Mother,”* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1985), 273–275.

1986

*Why Jesus Christ? Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Communications, 1986), xvii, 1–531. [Rev.: *Collectanea Franciscana* 58 (1988): 382–383; *Miles Immaculatae* 24 (1988): 253; *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 742–743; *Gregorianum* 69 (1988): 724–726.]

PETER D. FEHLNER, O.F.M.Conv.  
*St. Anthony-on-Hudson*  
*Rensselaer, NY*