


# The “Third Way” of the Modernist Crisis, Precursor of *Nouvelle Théologie*: Ambroise Gardeil, O.P., and Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J.

Theological Studies  
2014, Vol. 75(4) 774–794  
© Theological Studies, Inc. 2014  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0040563914548653  
tsj.sagepub.com  


**Jürgen Mettepenningen**

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

[Translated by Charles T. Kestermeier, S.J.,  
Creighton University, USA]

## Abstract

The article focuses on what connects the Modernist crisis and the crisis surrounding *la nouvelle théologie*. Focusing mainly on the work of Ambroise Gardeil, O.P., and Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J., the author shows that representatives of a so-called “third way” (between Modernism and anti-Modernism) were the spiritual fathers of the protagonists of *la nouvelle théologie*.

## Keywords

Ambroise Gardeil anti-Modernism, Dominicans, Jesuits, Léonce de Grandmaison, Marie-Joseph Lagrange, Modernism, neo-Scholasticism, *nouvelle théologie*, new theology, Pierre Rousselot

In searching for the concrete reality hidden behind the term *nouvelle théologie*—a crisis in theological reform stretching from ca. 1935 to ca. 1965—this term seems often and regularly linked to the reform crisis in which Catholic theology crossed

---

## Corresponding author:

Jürgen Mettepenningen

Email: [jurgen.mettepenningen@theo.kuleuven.be](mailto:jurgen.mettepenningen@theo.kuleuven.be)

into the 20th century: the crisis of so-called Modernism—“so-called” since, just as for *nouvelle théologie*, it concerns a term created by the magisterium, which took an adversarial stance toward both movements.

This article focuses on what connects the two theological crises: *la nouvelle théologie* stands in the extension of a theological current flowing between Modernism on the one hand and anti-Modernism on the other.<sup>1</sup> I try to show that those who represent a “third way” were the spiritual fathers of such theologians as Marie-Dominique Chenu and Henri de Lubac, who contributed to Catholic theology’s “return to the sources” in regard to its nature, methodology, and goals.

I do not attempt to offer an exhaustive presentation in the framework of this article; rather, I simply illustrate my thesis on a concrete basis, working from archival documents and primary and secondary literature.

After several preliminary remarks I discuss a third way, a *via media* between Modernism and anti-Modernism, as it revealed itself at the heart of the Jesuit and Dominican orders. As to Jesuits, I look more closely at the contribution of Léonce de Grandmaison and touch briefly on that of Pierre Rousselot; for the Dominicans I consider the contributions of Ambroise Gardeil and Marie-Joseph Lagrange. The magisterium condemned none of these theologians as Modernists. After the discussion of these four giants, I discuss how this third way nonetheless appears questionable at several points of the *nouvelle théologie* crisis. I close with several considerations.

## Preliminary Notes

I have touched on certain issues that call for some explanation. First of all is the question of what one understands by the words “Modernism” and “anti-Modernism” from a theological viewpoint. These words, commonly used today, are but labels that seem to offer more information about those who chose these words than about the reality they represent. One might notice a remarkable evolution here: since Vatican II the negative connotation of “Modernism” has turned upside down and become a positive valorization of the central aim of Modernism.

During the preconciliar period the anti-Modernists were considered to be the “good guys” who wanted to protect the Church and the Faith against the venom that, according to the magisterium, was being spread everywhere by the “bad guys,” who were for the most part members of the clergy. Different studies and developments rooted in Vatican II have reevaluated this point of view: the so-called Modernists, just like those who worked at being anti-Modernists, had good intentions. It would be incorrect to include them all under the same label, whether “Modernist” or “anti-Modernist.”

- 
1. Rosino Gibellini also speaks of a “middle current” without, however, developing this in detail: Rosino Gibellini, *Panorama de la théologie au XXe siècle* (Paris: Cerf, 2004) 187. Evangelista Vilanova speaks of a “middle way” (Vilanova, *Histoire des théologies chrétiennes*, vol. 3: *XVIIIe–XXe siècle* [Paris: Cerf, 1997] 685). Jean Daniélou speaks of a “*via media*” (Daniélou, “Grandmaison,” in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 6:770–73).

On the basis of this key understanding, each comment concerning Modernism and anti-Modernism can be critically analyzed and must consequently be nuanced. To put it bluntly, not all the Modernists fit the category as coined by the magisterium. In spite of a clear resemblance among the Modernists, it is not possible to present Modernism as a uniform system or organization as the magisterium claimed.

We can nonetheless point to two questions that were at the center of the Modernist crisis. In the first place, the Modernists strongly favored a wholesale introduction of history into theology: consider the attention we give to the development of dogma and the recognition we give to the critical-historical method in biblical studies. The second major question concerns the Modernists' refusal to let themselves be limited to neo-Scholasticism in the practice of theology.

My work on these two questions is complementary: the second is the logical outcome of the first, since neo-Scholasticism is ahistorical or, rather, metahistorical. The *philosophia perennis* of Thomas Aquinas had truly been, since the commentators of his work in the 16th and 17th centuries, reduced to a system that did not take into account religious events, developments, experiences, and feelings. This neo-Scholasticism had become the exclusive intellectual framework for the anti-Modernist hierarchy of the Church, and it was the magisterium's cudgel against anyone who seemed (in regard to doctrine) to be Modernist and even against all who were considered insufficiently anti-Modernist.

On the other hand, let us take care to acknowledge that neo-Scholasticism also bore good fruits for the Church, such as the improved formation of seminarians and university faculty, and the wave of intellectual converts from about 1905 to 1915 in France was not only a reaction against the anticlerical politics but also a response to the attraction of Thomism.<sup>2</sup> Neo-Scholasticism also formed the basis of thought for the Church, a sort of philosophical orthodoxy.

A second point that needs some preliminary explanation also concerns the term *nouvelle théologie*. One might well wonder what can be new about theology,<sup>3</sup> as the very name is paradoxical: this *new* theology is marked essentially by a turning back to the earlier sources of faith, theology, and Catholicism. In the face of neo-Scholastic theology, founded on the commentators of Aquinas in the 16th and 17th centuries, a theology of sources was arising, founded on the Bible, the liturgy, and the writings of the Church Fathers. The *nouvelle théologie* movement situated itself as the foremost representative of a broader movement, notably that of a return to our origins.

In the course of the various phases of *la nouvelle théologie*'s development it became clear that the theologians were progressively distancing themselves from the classical form of theology, which seemed to have an "exclusive contract" with the magisterium's vision of orthodoxy, and that this *nouvelle théologie* was growing into a theology that

2. See Frédéric Gugelot, *La conversion des intellectuels au Catholicisme en France (1885–1935)* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 2000).

3. Here I refer to Wolfgang W. Müller, "Was kann an der Theologie neu sein? Der Beitrag der Dominikaner zur 'Nouvelle Théologie,'" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 110 (1999) 86–104.

reestablished contact with the reality of the faith by returning to its roots.<sup>4</sup> Like Modernism, *la nouvelle théologie* constituted neither a structured network nor a movement to which these practitioners overtly claimed to belong. And just as for Modernism, the term *nouvelle théologie* has, since Vatican II, gained a positive connotation.<sup>5</sup>

Moreover, what was at stake in the crisis surrounding *la nouvelle théologie* was located in the prolongation of the Modernist crisis. The *nouveaux théologiens* also argued in favor of a rather radical introduction of history and of historicity into theology as well as for the opening up of a neo-Thomism that had become at that point closed in upon itself.

My third preliminary point concerns theological methodology. It is important to give this element a certain prominence because the whole question—beyond the different themes, but without neglecting the specificity of each of them—is at root a methodological discussion, closely linked to a certain tension between a closed neo-Scholasticism and an open Thomism. We can speak of an “official” neo-Thomist theology during the period between two encyclicals, Pope Pius X’s *Pascendi dominici gregis* (1907) and Pope Pius XII’s *Humani generis* (1950), a combination of “Denzinger theology” and a “theology of conclusion.” “Denzinger theology”—I refer to the catalogue of magisterial texts published by Heinrich Denzinger for the first time in 1854—is rooted in the teachings of the magisterium rather than in Sacred Scripture or the Fathers, whereas a “theology of conclusion” reduces theology to a mechanical affair, a manner of reasoning.

The Modernists sought an opening from without for neo-Thomism but produced the contrary, whereas the *nouveaux théologiens* tried to create from within an opening into the Thomas of the 13th century, the so-called “paleo-Thomism.” Those representing *la nouvelle théologie* argued for a form of prudent inductive method that could be considered as enriching and complementing the speculative neo-Scholastic method. Moreover, they seemed to find a supplementary stimulus in *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943), Pius XII’s encyclical that authorized the application of the critical-historical method to biblical studies, although this opening turned out to be minimal and rarely pursued.<sup>6</sup>

In any case, next to the reigning deductive method of neo-Scholasticism, from then on an inductive method arose, based on concrete reality and on its history. In short, beside speculative theology reduced to its neo-Scholastic form there now appeared a model of positive-speculative theology in which the order of the sequence of words is

4. For the different phases, see Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2010) 31–38.

5. Compare the explanations of the expression “nouvelle théologie” in the second and third editions of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*: Adolf Darlapp, “Nouvelle Théologie” 1060–61; Albert Raffelt, “Nouvelle Théologie” 935–37.

6. See, among others, Karim Schelkens, “Perceiving Orthodoxy: A Comparative Analysis of the Roman Controversy in Catholic Exegesis (1960–1961),” in *Theology and the Quest for Truth: Historical- and Systematic-Theological Studies*, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts, Lieven Boeve, and Terrence Merrigan (Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2006) 143–64.

important: positive theology won out over speculative theology. The return to the sources of faith, as well as to the critical considerations that are equally important, takes the leading role in the positive-speculative model of theology and serves as the cornerstone. At the opening of the 20th century, however, the magisterium was not prepared to accept such a model. Several Dominicans and Jesuits stood out as important initiators of what we might call “the third way.”

On the basis of these preliminary notions, I can now consider the “third way” at the time of the Modernist crisis. This third way defined itself as an attempt to achieve four objectives: (1) to remain faithful to what the magisterium stipulates (orthodoxy); (2) to remain faithful to the sources of the faith (tradition); (3) to establish a connection with modern scientific thought (“academization,” in opening to the critical-historical method); and (4) to get beyond the polemics between Modernists and anti-Modernists—to proceed along a “middle way.” I limit myself here to considering the contribution of Léonce de Grandmaison and Ambroise Gardeil. In my overview of their contributions to the third way, I also take into brief account the relevant aspects of the historical background of their religious orders at that time.

## The “Third Way” of the Dominicans

Different members of the Dominican order at this moment stood out as representative of the third way. This was certainly unexpected in the order that was traditionally oriented toward Thomas Aquinas, the foundational thinker for the neo-Thomism of the anti-Modernists. Among the more visible participants in this third way are Marie-Joseph Lagrange, who had acquired a certain reputation with his foundation of the École Biblique in Jerusalem in 1890, and Ambroise Gardeil, the founder and first director of Le Saulchoir, the formation center for the Dominicans of the Paris province. Before looking in detail at some of Gardeil’s contributions to the third way, however, I will briefly look at Le Saulchoir, analyze the tensions within the French Dominican family, and summarize Lagrange’s work and some difficulties he encountered.

### Historical Context

Le Saulchoir, the Dominican house of studies in Paris, was founded toward the end of 1903 and opened its doors in October 1904.<sup>7</sup> This beginning did not happen without difficulty, considering the anti-Catholic political bias in France at the time, the result of which was the expulsion of religious orders and congregations from

7. On Le Saulchoir, see Marie-Dominique Chenu, “Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir,” in *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo et al. (Paris: Cerf, 1985) 91–173; Étienne Fouilloux, *Une Église en quête de liberté: La pensée catholique française entre modernisme et Vatican II, 1914–1962* (Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1998) 124–28; Guy Bedouelle, “Le Saulchoir,” in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed. (2006) 6:705–6; and Guy Bedouelle, “Les provinces dominicaines de langue française en Europe au XIXe et au XXe siècle,” in *Les Dominicains en Europe* (Paris: Cerf, 1996) 41–50.

France; consequently Le Saulchoir remained in Belgium, north of Tournai in the commune of Kain. Ambroise Gardeil was the first director of the house of studies. The faculty and the students knew that on top of this exile they were faced with the problem of the Modernism question and the different positions taken toward it. Le Saulchoir would become a major center of the third way, a place where Gardeil and the other professors distinguished themselves from the anti-Modernist line promoted by the *Revue thomiste*, a journal of the Dominican province of Toulouse. Let us look at this tension more closely.

*La revue thomiste*. A discussion arose concerning the direction taken by the *Revue thomiste* since about 1903,<sup>8</sup> when Thomas Pègues took control of the journal. He was openly anti-Modernist and opposed to any form of theological renovation; he was the "phantom" editor in chief, the champion of a conservative Thomism that he imposed on the whole journal. He gave explicit voice to this attitude especially in his reviews of books and implicit voice in his refusal to publish certain articles, such as one by Marie-Benoît Schwalm on positive theology.

When Thomas Coconnier, the official editor in chief of *La revue thomiste*, died on April 8, 1908, Pègues felt called to take his place. The head of the order, Hyacinthe-Marie Cormier, blocked his accession to the post on the counsel of Ambroise Gardeil, among others. Cormier finally named the moderate Ambroise Montagne to be the new editor in chief; Montagne formally received from Cormier the mission of restoring *La revue* to its original role, as presented in the charter of 1893, the year of *La revue*'s foundation.<sup>9</sup>

The spirit of divergence toward anti-Modernism that had shown itself since about 1903 nonetheless left some traces. The most important of these concerned the founding of a new Dominican journal, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, whose first issue appeared in January 1907. Its founding owed itself in great part to Gardeil, the director of Le Saulchoir. He had also helped found the *La revue thomiste*, but 15 years later he would react against its characteristic *thomisme conservateur* by founding *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, which was rooted in a *thomisme progressiste*. As a result it is not surprising that Schwalm, in the journal's second year, could publish an article entitled "Les deux théologies: La scolastique et la positive."<sup>10</sup> This title fit perfectly the aim of the new journal, the plural of whose

8. In 1903 the Dominican house of studies of the Toulouse province was expelled and moved to Italy. This left only three Dominicans—Thomas Coconnier, Thomas Pègues, and François Cazes—to produce the journal. See Henry Donneaud, "La 'Revue thomiste' et la crise Moderniste," in *Saint Thomas au XXe siècle: Actes du colloque du Centenaire de la 'Revue thomiste,' 25–28 mars 1993, Toulouse*, ed. S. T. Bonino (Paris: Saint-Paul, 1994) 76–94, at 80.

9. Montagne took this charge seriously; see his detailed plan in Ambroise Montagne, "Notre programme," *Revue thomiste* 17 (1909) 5–37. Surprisingly, nowhere does Montagne use the word "Modernism."

10. Marie-Benoît Schwalm, "Les deux théologies: La scolastique et la positive," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 2 (1908) 674–703.

title points to the necessity of a space open to pluralism and, consequently, discussion. This being the case, Gardeil distanced himself from the closed anti-Modernism so very characteristic of Pègues. The opposition to *La revue thomiste* shown by the foundation of a new periodical allows us to see how Gardeil remained faithful to the idea of an open theological conversation on the fundamentals, methodology, specificity, and goals of Catholic theology.

Beyond that, after the reorganization of 1908 *La revue thomiste* rediscovered its original spirit and in turn became more attractive to Gardeil. During the 1940s *La revue thomiste* would nonetheless become quite active in the struggle against a “new Modernism,” the so-called *nouvelle théologie*.

**Marie-Joseph Lagrange.** The Dominican Marie-Joseph Lagrange was just as influential as Gardeil.<sup>11</sup> In the fall of 1890 he founded the École Biblique. It began with himself, a specialist in the Old Testament, three other professors, and five students. Lagrange’s dynamism helped the center grow rapidly and become an important focus of biblical studies. Lagrange emphasized the historical-critical analysis of texts and the relationship of texts to their contexts. To achieve this goal he enlisted the tools of geography, ethnology, and archeology. The results of these studies were published in *Revue biblique* and *Études bibliques*, both founded by Lagrange. Although Rome cast a wary eye on these studies, during the pontificate of Leo XIII Lagrange was named a consultant for the Pontifical Biblical Commission, founded in 1902.

Leo’s successor, Pius X, however, was considerably less favorable to Lagrange. Hyacinthe-Marie Cormier, only recently elected head of the Dominican order, would serve as a buffer between the pope and Lagrange, but he would also complicate Lagrange’s life by curtailing his actions, publications, and the dissemination of his opinions. On top of that there was the “rivalry” of the Jesuits, who had founded in Rome an institute for biblical research under the direction of Léopold Fonck and with the support of Pius X; they later established themselves in Palestine as well, which was a trial for Lagrange.

Latent conflicts had the effect of forcing Lagrange to resign in 1912 and return to Paris. A year later he returned to Jerusalem in 1913, but World War I put an end to his desire and he moved back to Paris, where he resided until the end of the war. Afterward, with the support of the new pope, Benedict XV, Lagrange returned to Jerusalem, but that did not signal the end of his problems, since neither he nor his École were able to free themselves from suspicions of Modernism despite the fact that Lagrange was never condemned.

### Ambroise Gardeil

In 1909, after a series of articles on the reform of Catholic theology that had appeared in *La revue thomiste* in 1903–1904, Gardeil published a work entitled *Le donné révélé*

11. On Lagrange, see Bernard Montagnes, *Marie-Joseph Lagrange: Une biographie critique* (Paris: Cerf, 2004).

*et la théologie*, the derivative of ten classes he had given at the Institut Catholique of Paris during the preceding academic year—a work that synthesized the series of *Revue* articles.<sup>12</sup> The second edition of this work appeared in 1932 with a preface by Marie-Dominique Chenu, who had just resumed the directorship of Le Saulchoir, following Antoine Lemonnier and Pierre Mandonnet. The importance of this work lies in its profound reflection on revelation, the faith, the interpretation of the faith, and the exercise of theology, the central themes of theological Modernism. I find here one of the reasons why *Le donné révélé et la théologie*, written at the height of the Modernist crisis, is generally considered a sublime contribution to the Catholic theology of the first half of the 20th century.<sup>13</sup>

In *Le donné révélé et la théologie*, Gardeil took a stand against Modernism, which, according to him, was attacking the different stages in the double movement going first from immediate divine revelation to the Church's dogma and then to theological conclusions.<sup>14</sup> The Modernists denied that this double movement happens in perfect congruency with divine revelation, and Gardeil focused on proving the contrary. In the first part of his book he shows the homogeneity between revelation and dogma, while in the second part he discusses the congruence between dogmas and theological conclusions. Following is a summary of how he works out these two parts.

The first part of *Le donné révélé et la théologie* is devoted to what God has revealed and to its homogeneity with dogma as "a substitute equivalent to the pure word of God."<sup>15</sup> In his presentation Gardeil foregrounds to an examination of dogma considered as the intermediary between revelation and theology. For him the immediate point of departure for theology is not the original revelation but dogma, the form of the official affirmation of this revelation transmitted by the Church. It is important here to show that dogmas are much more than metaphors and symbols, and that they are truly capable of standing in for divine realities. With the aid of the rule of *analogia entis*, Gardeil manages to justify the representational value of dogmas.

The director of Le Saulchoir also looks into the central problem of theological Modernism, that of the development of dogma, understood by some Modernists as a heterogeneous or transforming evolution; Gardeil accepts the ideas of John Henry Newman

12. Ambroise Gardeil, *Le donné révélé et la théologie* (Paris: Cerf, 1909).

13. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, who had previously been a student of Gardeil, wrote at his teacher's death in 1931, "Among the Thomist theologians of these 50 years there are few who exerted an influence as profound as his" (Garrigou-Lagrange, "In memoriam: Le Père A. Gardeil," *Revue thomiste* 36 [1931] 797–808, at 797). The fact that *Le donné révélé et la théologie* had a constant market was pointed out by M.-D. Chenu in his preface to its second edition ("Préface pour la deuxième édition" vii). More than 25 years later Chenu described the work as still valuable and of current interest (Chenu, "Foi et théologie d'après le P. A. Gardeil," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 40 [1956] 645–51, at 645).

14. Gardeil, *Donné révélé et la théologie* xxii.

15. Ibid. xxv.

and develops his own theory under the influence of the ideas of de Grandmaison.<sup>16</sup> Gardeil distinguishes three phases in the development of doctrine: in the first phase (“the global intuition of the faith”), in an all-encompassing perception, faith grasps what is not yet defined or expressed as a revealed truth.<sup>17</sup> This truth presents itself to us as a rich given that cannot yet be expressed in a precise manner; this happens during the second phase, the “mental fermentation,” in which a theological consensus happens, one that at a certain moment becomes “ripe” for an ecclesiastical formulation. This formulation by the Church constitutes the third phase, “the supreme effort to integrate the theological dogmatic development with the revealed given.” Thus is born a “new” dogma at the heart of the Church.

In part two, Gardeil treats of the second stage in the progress of revealed truth, which leads from dogmatic formulation toward theological conclusions. Can Catholic theology develop in homogeneity with revealed truth? According to Gardeil, theology (either speculative or Scholastic) can actually be considered an authentic expression of the revealed given itself. Here, however, it is necessary to distinguish theological *science* from theological *system*. Gardeil claims this homogeneity only in the case of theological *science*, which makes use exclusively of the *philosophia perennis*. In addition, this *philosophia perennis* is applied only as a rational instrument in theological reasoning, which is as such completely subordinate to the faith. This means that theological conclusions owe their truth not to the premises of reason but to revelation, and that they are religious truths rather than truth deduced in a scientific manner. In this way, Gardeil manages to refute the thesis of the Modernists, according to which the intervention of reason and philosophy constitutes an unavoidable obstacle to the homogeneity of theological conclusions and of dogma.

In his work, Gardeil elaborated a middle way between Modernism and integrism, which was not obvious considering that all the delicate questions of that epoch were burgeoning either explicitly or implicitly. Nonetheless, he was not considered a Modernist by the magisterium and, as a result, was not condemned.

## The “Third Way” of the Jesuits

In the years between *Pascendi dominici gregis* (1907) and the opening of World War I, one finds, next to the Dominicans, several Jesuits representing the third way. Gardeil and Lagrange typically expressed themselves polemically on the subject of Modernism. But while this approach for Lagrange led to difficulties within the Dominican order itself, the Jesuits of the third way, with their quite open position toward Modernism, suffered opposition from public opinion rather than from within their order.

I pause here to consider these Jesuits, particularly Léonce de Grandmaison. I do not examine his theological position but rather the polemic in which he as editor in chief of *Études* was embroiled.

16. Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le développement du dogme chrétienne,” *Revue d’apologétique* 5 (1908) 521–42; 6 (1908) 5–33, 81–104, 401–36, 881–905.

17. See Gardeil, *Donné révélé et la théologie* 159–68.

## Historical Context

**Rome: “White pope and black pope.”** With the choice of Luis García Martín as the 24th general of the Society of Jesus in 1892 the Jesuits took an anti-Modernist line. The development and the expansion of Modernist ideas, however, engendered internal tensions at the very heart of the order; one might think here of George Tyrrell, for example, who published his works under various pseudonyms as well as under his own name. As the “black pope”—what some people informally called the Jesuit general—Martín acted as the “white pope” wished: faithful and obedient in the struggle against each menace of contamination of Catholic thought by Modern and Modernist ideas and methods.

After Martín’s death on April 18, 1906, the 25th General Congregation elected the German Franz-Xavier Wernz to succeed him.<sup>18</sup> Wernz was of a different stripe: he was of the opinion that the anti-Modernist tendency (or, better, integrism) was “going off the rails” and was not leaving enough place for scientific study and open discussion. The tension between the liberal “black pope” and the integrist “white pope” reached its climax in 1911–1912. At that time, a chair fell vacant at the Gregorian, the Jesuit university in Rome, and the pope, to whom the Jesuits owe obedience by their fundamental law (their fourth vow), asked the general to name a Jesuit of integrist leanings to take the place of the Jesuit Louis Billot, whom the pope had made cardinal in 1911. Wernz refused, and Pius X went ahead and named Guido Mattiussi, the author of the well-known 24 Thomistic theses.<sup>19</sup> This move did not allay anti-Jesuit animosities, and after the publication in *La Civiltà Cattolica* (founded by the Jesuits in 1850 and since 1905 directed by Salvatore Brandi) of several articles against integrism, Brandi resigned “for reasons of health.” In September 1913 Pius X, seeing Wernz’s hand in these articles, named Giuseppe Chiaudano, a fully integrist Jesuit, to the post of editor in chief.<sup>20</sup>

**“Mascarades” of bad taste in the newspapers.** The question of the position of the Jesuits at the time of the Modernist crisis arose not only in terms of the Vatican’s assignments to important positions. After *Pascendi*, various Jesuits found themselves at the heart of the conflict and often enough in opposition to certain of their own brothers.

In France the struggle played itself out in public principally among Catholic newspapers and journals: on the one side *L’Univers* (edited by Canon Constantin Lecigne),

18. This General Congregation ran from September 1 through October 18, 1906.

19. See Fouilloux, *Une Église en quête de liberté* 41–42.

20. Chiaudano was the author of *Il giornalismo cattolico: Criteri e norme* (Sienna: S. Bernardino, 1913), which was translated into French and Dutch: *Le journalisme catholique* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1910); *Katholiek journalistiek: Wenken en voorschriften* (Rotterdam: De Maasbode, 1910). For the notification of Chiaudano’s nomination to this post see *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu* (Rome: Vatican, 1914) 134–35. See also the appendix in Giuseppe de Rosa, S.J., *La Civiltà Cattolica: 150 anni al servizio della Chiesa, 1850–1999* (Rome: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1999) 199–200.

*Vigie* (edited by layman Henri Merlier), and *Le critique du libéralisme* (edited by abbé Emmanuel Barbier), and on the other side *Études*. *Études* was then and remains an organ of the French Jesuits, appearing every two weeks at the time and under the editorship of de Grandmaison. A reaction to the positions of the other periodicals and a call from the staff of *Études* appeared as an editorial in the first issue of *Études* in 1914, responding to all the criticisms of *Études* in the other periodicals. This editorial fueled the polemics and moved the debate to the international level in, among other places, the Italian press.

The argument, however, was not simply a Franco–Roman matter. Thus, for example, Viktor Kolb, an influential Jesuit, gave a talk in Vienna in 1913 for the Pius-Verein, an important Austrian Catholic association. He vigorously criticized the integrists by citing, among others, Cardinal János Csernoch, the primate of Hungary, who had declared that the “true Catholic integrists were not acting like Christians.” That was enough to get Kolb accused of Modernism.<sup>21</sup> In 1914 he wrote an apology, *Offene Antwort auf offene Angriffe*.<sup>22</sup> Beyond that the *Sonntagsblatt*, an integrist newspaper in Austria-Hungary, accused the Jesuits of “an anti-Modernism that was too weak.” The provincial of the Jesuits responded by turning to the ecclesiastical tribunal of the archdiocese of Vienna; he won the case and obtained an apology from the editor in chief.

**Pierre Rousselot.** Along with Grandmaison, Rousselot was the most important Jesuit representing the third way during the Modernist controversy. In the year Gardeil’s *Le donné révélé et la théologie* appeared, Rousselot began his first year as a professor in theology at the Sorbonne in Paris; a year before that he had been named a doctor in philosophy with a dissertation on intellectualism in Thomas Aquinas.<sup>23</sup> While his fellow Jesuits Joseph Kleutgen and Matteo Liberatore engaged in the papally mandated restoration of Thomism, Rousselot introduced pluralism to the world of Jesuit neo-Thomism.<sup>24</sup> For him as for Gardeil, neo-Thomist thought needed to open itself from within to get theology involved with reality. To this end he published a two-part article entitled “Les yeux de la foi” in *Recherches de science*

21. See Ludwig Koch, *Jesuiten-Lexikon: Die Gesellschaft Jesu einst und jetzt* (Louvain–Heverlee: Bibliothèque des Jésuites, 1962) 1006.

22. Viktor Kolb, *Offene Antwort auf offene Angriffe* (Vienna: Mayer, 1914).

23. Pierre Rousselot, *L’Intellectualisme de saint Thomas* (Paris: Alcan, 1908). On Rousselot and the propagation of his ideas see Roger Aubert, *Le problème de l’acte de foi: Données traditionnelles et résultats des controverses récentes* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1969) 451–511; and David Berger, “Rousselot,” in *Biographisch–Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 22 (2003) 1165–69.

24. Rousselot’s work had a great influence on, among others, Joseph Maréchal, Karl Rahner, and Henri de Lubac. See Albert Raffelt, “Rousselot, Pierre,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (2006) 8:1333–34, at 1333; John M. McDermott, “De Lubac and Rousselot,” *Gregorianum* 78 (1997) 735–59, at 735; and Adolf Kolping, *Katholische Theologie gestern und heute: Thematik und Entfaltung deutscher katholischer Theologie vom I. Vatikanum bis zur Gegenwart* (Bremen: Schönewald, 1964) 250.

religieuse, a journal for which he served as assistant editor.<sup>25</sup> In 1953 Maurice Nédoncelle declared this article "the most stimulating work of the first half of the 20th century."<sup>26</sup>

### Léonce de Grandmaison

Léonce de Grandmaison is little known to the general public. The only available publication on him is a 1935 biography by his fellow Jesuit Jules Lebreton.<sup>27</sup> Here I review a selection of de Grandmaison's contributions in the context of the Modernist conflict. Relying on Henri Holstein, I summarize these developments in three stages.<sup>28</sup> The first stage (1899–1904) concerns the incubation of the Modernist controversy, during which the first clear and well-known positions of Alfred Loisy circulated. The second stage (1904–1907) marked the flowering and high point of Modernism; it ended with the decree *Lamentabili sane exitu* and the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*. The third stage (1907–1914) "should have been that of the subsiding of spirits in obedience"; "alas," Holstein observed, "it was a time of suspicions and of taking even more extravagant positions, which poisoned the atmosphere right up until the war of 1914."<sup>29</sup>

During the first two stages, between 1899 and 1908, de Grandmaison was in England, in exile with the French Jesuits because of the French government's anticlerical policies against religious orders and congregations. At this time de Grandmaison engaged—as a book reviewer—in the controversy over Modernism. Since the end of the 19th century he had written pieces on the ideas and publications of the Modernists and the Protestants, and now he also wrote articles on the works of Alfred Loisy (*L'Évangile et l'Église*<sup>30</sup> and *Le quatrième Évangile*<sup>31</sup>) and—at the request of Pierre Battifol—on Édouard Le Roy's article "Quest-ce qu'un dogme?"<sup>32</sup> Through his articles de Grandmaison answered two Modernists whose ideas were condemned by *Lamentabili sane exitu*. On the Protestant side, de Grandmaison commented on the

25. Pierre Rousselot, "Les yeux de la foi," *Recherches de science religieuse* 1 (1910) 241–59, 444–75.

26. Maurice Nédoncelle, "L'influence de Newman sur les 'yeux de la foi' de Rousselot" 321–32, at 322. In 1935 Nédoncelle published an important pioneering study of Modernism, *La pensée religieuse de Friedrich von Hügel* (Paris: Vrin, 1935; ET, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel: A Study of His Life and Thought*, trans. Marjorie Vervon [New York: Longmans, Green, 1937]); following that of Jean Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Église: Étude d'histoire religieuse contemporaine* (Paris: Letouzey, 1929).

27. Jules Lebreton, *Le Père Léonce de Grandmaison* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1935).

28. See Henri Holstein, "Au temps du modernisme," *Études* 290 (1956) 212–33, at 214.

29. *Ibid.*

30. Léonce de Grandmaison, review of *L'Évangile et l'Église*, *Études* 94 (1903) 145–74.

31. Léonce de Grandmaison, "Le quatrième Évangile: En marge de son plus récent commentaire," *Études* 186 (1926) 641–63.

32. Léonce de Grandmaison, review of "Quest-ce qu'un dogme?" *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 7 (1905) 187–221.

work of Adolf von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*,<sup>33</sup> and on the work of Auguste Sabatier, *Les religions d'autorité et la religion d'Esprit*.<sup>34</sup> De Grandmaison did not have a hidden agenda, either Modernist or anti-Modernist; his contributions were characterized by an opening toward what was worthwhile. This would lead Loisy to say in his memoirs of 1931 that "Father de Grandmaison was quite a straightforward man, one with whom I could have conversed."<sup>35</sup>

At the end of 1906 and the beginning of 1907 appeared the two parts of an article by de Grandmaison on Cardinal John Henry Newman.<sup>36</sup> I cannot here treat the article in depth. I cite it, however, because it shows that de Grandmaison was drawing attention to Newman's authority in the midst of the Modernist debate. In so doing he recommended to those concerned the higher vocation of theology and of those who practice it, while situating himself above the polemic.

In September 1908, one year after the appearance of *Pascendi* and the excommunication of ex-Jesuit George Tyrrell, de Grandmaison was sent to Paris to serve as superior of the Jesuit community of *Études* and to become the journal's editor in chief. He remained in that community until his death in 1927, although the term "community" in this context must be taken broadly, as the state had closed religious houses; the members of the *Études* community lived in apartments scattered across Paris, gathering together each day in the "main house"—where de Grandmaison lived—to pray, eat, and turn out the journal.

Beyond the consequences of the difficult political context, de Grandmaison had a good grasp of the problems inherent in the Modernist situation. His primary concern was for the readers of *Études*, those troubled Catholics who, looking at the forest, could not see the trees. De Grandmaison felt called to furnish a trustworthy theological point of view and some encouragement for this public. To achieve this, in an article of November 1908 he looked to the figure of Pope Pius X, whom he praised on the occasion of his priestly jubilee for his foreign policies (especially in regard to France) and for his policies concerning the Church (especially in regard to Modernism).<sup>37</sup> Regarding Modernism, de Grandmaison's major concern was for the "immense mass of Catholics" who found themselves caught between two radically opposed groups.<sup>38</sup> In order to uphold Catholic theology and promote orthodoxy, de Grandmaison gave life to a project that he had conceived of seven years before: the foundation of a journal, *Les recherches de science religieuse*, in which would be published more developed articles; it would be like a "technical-theological big sister" for *Études*. Right up until his death de Grandmaison kept his position as editor in chief of *Recherches*.

33. Léonce de Grandmaison, "Le Christ de M. Harnack," *Études* 90 (1902) 737–62.

34. Léonce de Grandmaison, "La religion de l'esprit," *Études* 100 (1904) 5–23, 164–83.

35. Alfred Loisy, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, 3 vols. (Paris: Nourry, 1931) 2:193.

36. Léonce de Grandmaison, "John Henry Newman considéré comme maître," *Études* 109 (1906) 721–50; 110 (1907) 39–69.

37. Léonce de Grandmaison, "Pie X, Pape," *Études* 117 (1908) 289–307.

38. Ibid. 305–6.

As to the Modernist crisis de Grandmaison had grave doubts about the anti-Modernist movement, especially integrism. It seemed to him that the remedies integrism proposed and the severity of such remedies were more harmful than the malady itself; integrism was taking on a truly grotesque appearance. Outside the measures and decrees emanating from the magisterium against clerics—and especially against university professors and authors—new channels of communication were being used in the direction of the “masses” in order to serve the principal aim of integrism. Thus in 1908 two former Jesuits each founded his own journal: *La foi catholique* of Bernard Gaudeau and *Le critique du libéralisme* of Emmanuel Barbier. In the succeeding years both journals published critiques and commentaries, as did *L’Univers* and *Vigie*. Another former Jesuit, Julien Fontaine, wrote two influential works, *Le modernisme sociologique* (1909) and *Le modernisme social* (1911).<sup>39</sup> The latter carries a congratulatory letter from Cardinal Rafael Merry del Val that in the name of the pope praises Fontaine’s *Le modernisme sociologique*.<sup>40</sup> In the September 1913 issue of *Vigie*, Baudoin attacked *Études*’s critique of Fontaine.<sup>41</sup>

In the period between *Pascendi dominici gregis* and the beginning of World War I, *Études* was increasingly criticized in the public forum for being insufficiently anti-Modernist or indeed Modernist. On May 1, 1913, editor in chief de Grandmaison wrote in his annual report to the “Patronage Committee of *Études*,” among others, about a letter he had recently received from his superior general, Franz-Xavier Wernz: “[He] wished to assure me that no one had called attention to anything in [our] journals that might have given rise to suspicions of laxism or liberalism. These accusations should thus not . . . much bother the editors of *Études*.”<sup>42</sup> Nonetheless, in the face of growing irritation caused by the negative criticism, de Grandmaison decided in the name of the editorial board to devote the lead article of the first issue of *Études* of 1914 to an article on the subject of this polemic. Under the title of “Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires,” he treated the wave of unfounded criticisms and the necessity of a scientific practice and of a general attitude that should be just as critical as they were honest.<sup>43</sup>

Writing for his editorial staff, de Grandmaison deplored the “*critiques négatives*,” the continuous irritating criticisms formulated by people who did not know what they were writing about (de Grandmaison did not give names) and who lacked all respect

39. Julien Fontaine, *Le modernisme sociologique: Décadence ou régénération?* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1909); Fontaine, *Le modernisme social: Décadence ou régénération?* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1911).

40. See Fontaine, *Modernisme social*.

41. Archives françaises de la Compagnie de Jésus, Paris (hereafter AFSJ), E Pa 729.

42. See the report in AFSJ, E Pa 726, May 1, 1913, p. 11. In a letter of June 7, 1913, from Wernz to de Grandmaison the general indicates his satisfaction in regard to the report (ibid.).

43. Léonce de Grandmaison, “Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires,” *Études* 138 (1914) 5–25. Correspondence to and from de Grandmaison and a contribution about this article can be found in AFSJ, E Pa 729.

for carefully considered, nuanced, and prudent ideas and viewpoints. He also deplored the fact that these negative commentaries were broadcast to the general public to influence opinion, a practice opposite his own careful presentation for average readers. Next he called into question the credentials of commentators who passed themselves off as the only true disciples and interpreters of the magisterium and repudiated their constant depiction of “good” people versus “bad,” whereas all of them were earnest Catholics. Finally, de Grandmaison pointed out, the shower of negative criticisms affirmed that alongside integrism there existed an important orthodox movement that had the right to exist, and whose attitude was more positive than that of those who devoted themselves too much to exposing heterodoxy and its supposed protagonists.

In writing of the “*tâches nécessaires*” (of his title), de Grandmaison invited readers to join in the pope’s battle for the faith and orthodox thought—which was not equivalent to assuming a blind docility. De Grandmaison and his staff argued for space open to broad discussion and a scientific approach, and for a method that avoided raising suspicions of people on the basis of an integrist framework but that begins from the teaching of Christ and his Church. It was therefore not a question of a “blind tactic” of accusations based on superficialities but of the method of Christ, of Aquinas, and of Church Fathers.<sup>44</sup> This latter method does not operate by attention-getting public declarations nor by newspaper articles but in the calm of deep scientific research supported by a broad range of auxiliary methods: linguistic, paleographic, epigraphic, and so forth. This range, characteristic of the positive method, should be used to root out the heterodox core of Modernism, a goal impossible to attain by intellectual inertia or purely negative and superficial accusations or commentaries. And, still reacting directly to the criticisms, the *Études* staff concluded that true defenders of orthodoxy owed one another mutual respect: “to defend the integrity of Catholic doctrine does not dispense us from moral integrity.”<sup>45</sup>

This article unleashed a storm of reactions, both negative and positive. Thirty-eight French bishops, including Cardinal Léon-Adolphe Amette of Paris, sent de Grandmaison congratulatory letters,<sup>46</sup> and a good number of prelates from outside France expressed their gratitude and support. Appreciative reactions also came from certain intellectuals, such as Albert de Mun, influential member of the French Parliament, and from Joseph Maréchal and Joseph de Ghellinck, Jesuit professors from the University of Louvain.<sup>47</sup> Maréchal wrote, “Your manifesto is courageous and moderate, incisive and nuanced. It says admirably, with an indignation that remains master of itself and does not turn to bitterness, what many were thinking silently with anger or depression.”<sup>48</sup> The article did not pass unnoticed by the international press, where many praises appeared for the “courageous article that encouraged so many”—thus the Belgian daily *Journal de Bruxelles* urged reading the article.<sup>49</sup> Rome’s *Italie*

44. De Grandmaison, “Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires” 14.

45. De Grandmaison (1914) 25.

46. See AFSJ, H Gra 30/11.

47. See AFSJ, E Pa 729.

48. See *ibid.*

49. “Contre les dissolvants: Intégrisme, intégralisme,” *Journal de Bruxelles*, January 14, 1914.

confirmed that the *Études* editorial defended ideas that *Italie* itself had always supported.<sup>50</sup>

A fair number of negative commentaries, especially from integrist circles, also appeared. The most notable retort came from Giovanni Boccardo, editor of *Liguria del popolo*, whose front-page banner placed it under the patronage of Cardinal Rafael Merry del Val. Boccardo's article was also published as the twelfth brochure in the series "Opuscoli popolari antimodernisti"—1,000 copies were printed.<sup>51</sup> In France the polemic was stronger and the editors in chief of various newspapers of an integrist leaning leaped to the barricades: Henri Merlier wrote angrily in *Vigie*, asking for the facts and names to which the *Études* editors referred.<sup>52</sup> Two articles signed, not without irony, "an integrist Catholic" appeared in *Le block Catholique*, generously displaying facts and names and detailing every error in *Études*'s critique.<sup>53</sup> Barbier, for his part, also published two articles, in *Le critique du libéralisme*, responding to *Études*.<sup>54</sup>

Despite all the contrary and sometimes heated exchanges, however, the conflicts concerning the *Études* article subsided, and misunderstandings were clarified. Following an exchange of correspondence between the editor in chief of *L'Univers* and de Grandmaison, in which the latter sometimes used a rather truculent tone,<sup>55</sup> a "notice of reconciliation" appeared in both *Études* and *L'Univers*; the two editors in chief emphasized their concord on the promotion of Catholic thought.<sup>56</sup> The editors of *La Croix* admitted having made mistakes regarding the content and interpretation of several *Études* articles.

Nevertheless, public polemic carried the day over positive developments. In "Note des *Études*" appearing in the January 14, 1914, issue of *Études*—the first one published

50. "La crise de l'église catholique: Un article très important des *Études*, revue des Jésuites français," *Italie*, January 12, 1914.

51. Giovanni Boccardo, *Di fronte alle aggressioni degli "Études" e del "Trust," Opuscoli popolari antimodernisti* (Florence: S. Maria Novella, 1914) 12. The article had also appeared January 29, 1914, in *Unità Cattolica* with "a calm and serene word" as its subtitle. The Austrian periodical *Trust* published a German translation of the *Études* editorial.

52. Henri Merlier, "Des faits! Des noms!," *Vigie*, January 22, 1914.

53. Un catholique intégral, "Les aménités des *Études*," *Le bloc catholique* 137 (March 1914) 102–11; 138 (April, 1914) 129–47.

54. Emmanuel Barbier, "Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires," *Critique du libéralisme* (February 1, 1914) 3–15; (March 1, 1914) 16–64.

55. See AFSJ, E Pa 729.

56. The editor of *L'Univers* wrote, "Reverend Father Léonce de Grandmaison, editor of *Études religieuses*, writes me that he never dreamed of attacking *L'Univers* in the article to which I felt it necessary to make a rather lively reference. Father de Grandmaison will understand how words can get away from an author and will forgive me, all the more readily since he himself knows from experience that defense has its rights, and that the honor of a house sometimes requires one to use those rights. It does not cost me more to admit regret at my mistake than it costs Father de Grandmaison to declare his respect and sympathy for *L'Univers*" ("Rectification," *L'Univers*, January 28, 1914).

after Barbier's "Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires"—the editors thanked all who had endorsed their January 5 editorial:

The numerous friends of *Études*—cardinals, bishops, religious superiors, and professors in the major seminaries, religious of various orders, editors of journals or of Catholic newspapers, eminent laypeople—who gave us the strength of their support at a moment when there may have been some benefit in doing so.<sup>57</sup>

Given the agitation provoked by the article, the editors of *Études* delineated the purpose of their January 5 editorial:

Since it is never a bad idea to be too clear, we recall that our aim was (1) to defend the rights and the peaceful exercise, in France, of the work of doctrinal and pastoral edification in the face of incessant and irritating criticisms that are often without any real knowledge of the issues and are sometimes unjust; (2) to forestall a depressing and exaggeratedly pessimistic impression, in remembering that there exists among us a sizeable orthodox movement that is ready to follow papal leadership—since it has already given, on the double front of religious sciences and action, much more than mere promises; and (3) to ward off the discredit that these criticisms tended to cast upon persons and to forestall the divisions that these criticisms would create among considerably diverse associations, social works, and Catholic bodies that in the past were praiseworthy and in the present nearly indispensable for the defense of the Church.<sup>58</sup>

Despite the efforts of the *Études* staff, however, the storm did not abate. On February 24, 1914, Barbier received a censure from Charles-Paul Sagot du Vauroux, bishop of Agen. Basing himself on various motives but especially on Barbier's misuse of *Pascendi* and his attitude toward Bishop Sagot du Vauroux, the latter wrote, "For these reasons and in virtue of our office, We impose the censure they merit on M. Barbier, editor of *Le critique du libéralisme*, and on each and every one of those who belong to Our diocese who are in solidarity with him."<sup>59</sup> This censure did not, however, keep Barbier from publishing the second part of his article. The bishop of Agen had already sent his congratulations to de Grandmaison for his editorial: "Bravo!"<sup>60</sup>

On February 23, 1914, the date of Barbier's censure, Merlier alluded in *Vigie* to division within the Jesuit order itself: "One thing is certain, that the Society of Jesus, which for more than three centuries presented the world an example of admirable unity, seems to have strayed from that unity, and this is a sadness for its many friends."<sup>61</sup> Merlier was probably thinking not only of the vicissitudes of the nominations Pius X had made but also of the anti-Modernist article of Giuseppe Chiaudano, the new editor

57. "Note des 'Études,'" *Études* 138 (1914) 272–73.

58. "Une mise au point nécessaire," *Études* 138 (1914) 494–97, at 494.

59. See AFSJ, E Pa 729.

60. Ibid.

61. Henri Merlier, "La crise catholique: Tout se tient," *Vigie*, February 24, 1914.

in chief of *Civiltà Cattolica*, on *Sindicalismo cristiano*.<sup>62</sup> Chiaudano had reacted against certain people's view of syndicalism, a view that, according to him, was distancing itself from the social movement inaugurated by Pope Leo XIII in *Rerum novarum* (1891). But Chiaudano had jumbled together a number of ideas, including orthodoxy, orthopraxis, and submission to Christian doctrine and solidarity.

De Grandmaison had raised this point in his January 5 editorial. In this context it is worth mentioning the "personal and discreet action of Léonce de Grandmaison" and, among other things, his connection to Albert de Mun.<sup>63</sup> The note that de Mun had prepared "around May 1914" was composed jointly with de Grandmaison; the note—preserved in the de Grandmaison archives—shows clear parallels with certain passages of the *Études* editorial.<sup>64</sup>

The debate on the editorial position of *Études* found its way to German-speaking and Dutch-speaking countries, as is evident from articles published in two periodicals. The first is the Jesuit journal *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* (currently *Stimmen der Zeit*), which was on the same wavelength as *Études*; the other was the Dutch periodical *Roma*, an integrist newspaper against which de Grandmaison reacted strongly in a letter to the editor of *De Tijd* because of false insinuations and interpretations.<sup>65</sup>

Pius X also entered into action. On May 10, 1914, for the centenary of the restoration of the Society of Jesus, Father Wernz "had received a brief word from Pius X in which rather broad praise was accompanied by an exhortation to avoid the contagion of the world, indulgence for its mistakes, and a taste for rash novelties. *Études* did not mention this note."<sup>66</sup> A contribution of Joseph Brucker, assistant editor of *Études*, appeared in June 1914, probably, for the sake of prudence, not in *Études* but as a separate brochure entitled "Les *Études* contre le modernisme" and treating the period 1888 through 1907.<sup>67</sup> In his first footnote, Brucker acknowledged that "the editors of *Études* are willing, at my request, to allow me to respond to M. Gaudeau,"<sup>68</sup> and he spelled out

62. Giuseppe Chiaudano, "Sindicalismo cristiano," *Civiltà Cattolica*, 65th year, 1 (1914) 385–99, 546–59.

63. Yves de la Brière, "Un deuil pour l'Église en France," *Semaine religieuse de Paris*, June 25, 1927, 909–13, at 911.

64. See AFSJ, H Gra 30/10. The handwritten dating comes from de Grandmaison, who indicates (also in his own handwriting) his modest contribution.

65. Letter from Léonce de Grandmaison to the editors of *De Tijd*, February 12, 1914, p. 4, in reaction to a letter from the rector of a Jesuit house of studies in Maastricht (letter of February 11, 1914) in which de Grandmaison expresses his concern that the Dutch-speaking Jesuits should not involve themselves in the debate in spite of the attacks of *Roma*.

66. Émile Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral: Un réseau secret international antimoderniste: La "Sapinière" (1909–1921)* 391. For the letter of Pope Pius X to F.-X. Wernz, see *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu* 1.6 (1914) 13–15.

67. Joseph Brucker, *Les "Études" contre le modernisme: De 1888 à 1907* (Paris: Études, 1914).

68. Ibid. 3 n. 1.

why he chose this particular time frame. In his *La foi catholique*, Brucker had seriously criticized *Études*, charging that the Jesuit journal had not reacted against Modernism firmly enough during the previous 15 years: “*Études* neither saw [the threat] nor pointed it out in due time, nor fought it with the necessary energy.”<sup>69</sup>

The polemic against *Études* persisted until the summer of 1914: the beginning of World War I at the end of July of that year, the deaths of Father General Franz-Xavier Wernz and Pope Pius X on August 19 and 20 respectively moved these debates to the background. In Pope Benedict XV's first encyclical, *Ad beatissimi Apostolorum* (November 1, 1914), one sees a clear disapproval of all that encouraged and fed the polemic among Catholics, leading a good number of people into confusion and error. In France the Modernists and the moderates detected in this encyclical a first step toward the ideas proposed by the editors of *Études* at the beginning of that year. Benedict XV, however, also spoke unequivocally of the “monstrous errors of Modernism” and explicitly supported his predecessor's condemnation of the movement.<sup>70</sup>

On Saturday, June 25, 1927, ten days after the death of Léonce de Grandmaison, fellow Jesuit Yves de la Brière wrote in *La semaine religieuse de Paris* about his late fellow Jesuit and the goal he pursued during the long 15 years of the Modernist crisis (ca. 1898–1914):<sup>71</sup>

Léonce de Grandmaison exercised a personal and discrete influence (in the most salutary sense) on a fair number of distinguished thinkers. In addition he opposed Modernism using effective tactics, not those of negative criticisms but those of necessary tasks. He showed, both in his works and his teaching, what the renewal of religious sciences could and should accomplish while following the strictest demands of contemporary analysis and within the precise framework of the most faithful and traditional orthodoxy. He masterfully contrasted superficial reasons for doubting with profound reasons to believe.

## Final Considerations: The “Third Way” as “Spiritual Father” of *La Nouvelle Théologie*

In 1923, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the beginning of Pius X's pontificate, de Grandmaison published an article on a question put to him: “Is a new Modernist crisis possible?”<sup>72</sup> He replied that this was no longer possible but that meanwhile a new crisis had actually taken place and was being at least perceived as a second Modernist crisis. Here I am referring to the crisis of *la nouvelle théologie*, which explains both the title of my article and my second preliminary note.

69. Ibid. 3.

70. Benedict XV, *Ad beatissimi Apostolorum*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 6 (1914) 565–83, at 577.

71. Yves de la Brière, “Un deuil pour l'Église de France,” *Semaine religieuse de Paris*, June 25, 1927, 909–13, at 911.

72. Léonce de Grandmaison, “Une nouvelle crise moderniste est-elle possible: Pour le XXe anniversaire de l'avènement de Pie X,” *Études* 176 (1923) 641–57.

Because of the different historical contexts and of the specificity of the Modernist crisis up to World War I, and because of the *ressourcement* movement, which emerged from the second half of the years between the wars onward and is considered the theological context of *la nouvelle théologie*, it is absolutely necessary to consider in a very nuanced manner any identification of the two crises. Yet there are reasons to consider *la nouvelle théologie* an extension of the Modernist conflict. I refer back to the attitude of the magisterium, which opposed whatever seemed to distance itself from neo-Scholasticism. One might also point to the emphasis placed by both Modernism and *la nouvelle théologie* on positive theology. I limited myself here to considering *la nouvelle théologie* as heir to "the third way" that appeared at the time of the Modernist crisis. I did so because the representatives of *nouvelle théologie* characterize themselves as heirs of their "masters," namely, the representatives of this "third way."

In this article I have focused on two eminent representatives of this third way, namely, the Dominican Ambroise Gardeil and the Jesuit Léonce de Grandmaison. Marie-Dominique Chenu, in his preface to the second edition of Gardeil's *Le donné révélé et la théologie* (1932), praised his fellow Dominican. In his own book, *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir* (1937), Chenu hailed Gardeil as the founder and permanent guide for the practice of theology at Le Saulchoir. This makes clear why figures such as Yves Congar and Henri-Marie Féret, two colleagues of Chenu during the 1930s at Le Saulchoir, are considered heirs to Gardeil's vision, and why we must consider Chenu, Congar, and Féret to be *nouveaux théologiens*.<sup>73</sup>

For the Jesuit order, Léonce de Grandmaison took on a role similar to Gardeil's. At the heart of his order, he was for the generation of Jesuits following him an example and a master. Personalities such as Henri Bouillard, Jean Daniélou, and especially Henri de Lubac considered themselves disciples of de Grandmaison and of his "soul-mate" Pierre Rousselot. Thus de Lubac, Bouillard, and Daniélou must also be considered *nouveaux théologiens*.<sup>74</sup>

That said, a nuance is immediately cast on the vigorous reactions to *la nouvelle théologie* on the part of the Dominican Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, long-time professor in Rome. In 1947 he had described *la nouvelle théologie* as a reversion to Modernism,<sup>75</sup> and he added that *la nouvelle théologie* should be battled with the same arms that had defeated Modernism. This leaves little room for the imagination when one takes into account that Rome, at the moment of the Modernist conflict, had promulgated all sorts of documents and condemnations and had removed many people from office and placed many works on the Index. Garrigou-Lagrange's comparison, however, was not completely off the mark, because *nouvelle théologie* is historically situated, as far as content, methods, and people involved are concerned, in the line of Modernism.

73. See Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology* 41–82.

74. See *ibid.* 83–114.

75. Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, "La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?," *Angelicum* 23 (1946) 126–45.

On the other hand, Garrigou-Lagrange equated the “first way,” Modernism, with *la nouvelle théologie*, and the “second way” with anti-Modernism. In my view, however, the representatives of *nouvelle théologie* are heirs not of the first way but of the “third way.”

The *nouveaux théologiens* formed the generation of theologians who were the link between the Modernist crisis and Vatican II. Thanks to their direct filiation with the masters of the third way, they were able to cause the undercurrents of theology, hidden below the surface for 200 years, to become the dominating currents.

### Author biography

Jürgen Mettepenningen received his ThD at Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium, where he is guest lecturer in the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies. He is also Director of the Identity Service of the Vicariate of Education for the Archdiocese of Malines-Brussels. Specializing in the history of the Roman Catholic Church and Catholic thought from Vatican I to Vatican II, he has recently published: *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (2010); *Welke kerk? Vandaag en morgen* (2011); “Nouvelle Théologie: Four Historical Stages of Theological Reform towards *Ressourcement* (1935–1965),” in *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (2010); *Toegepaste Blijde Boodschap* (2012); *Kan een nieuw concilie de kerk redden? Vragen bij de verjaardag van Vaticanum II* (2012); and (with Karim Schelkens and John A. Dick) *Aggiornamento? Catholicism from Gregory XVI to Benedict XVI* (2013). Expected to appear in 2015 are two works: a biography of Cardinal Godfried Danneels (with Karim Schelkens) and a monograph entitled *The World Book of Faith*.