

THE ROMAN MAGISTERIUM AND ANTI-MODERNISM¹

With the opening of the Archives of the Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1998, the former Holy Office of the Roman Inquisition and its adjunct, the Congregation of the Index, have ceased to be ‘black boxes’, where input – in the form of denunciations and questions – goes in, and output – in the form of decrees, excommunications, responses, etc. – comes out. Although we have always had some insight into the interior processes of decision-making in the Roman curia,² we can now reconstruct many things more precisely and subtly than before.³ This is, on the one hand, a deep joy out of sheer positivistic curiosity, which may be allowed for the historian; on the other hand, old and new questions can be addressed on a fresh basis. For the historian-theologian, the institutional treatment of truth bears special interest. What were the concrete historical conditions for the formulation of magisterial decisions?⁴ Which influences, which persons, which networks, which theologies, and which ideologies were at work, and how were they implemented, mediated, moderated or sharpened within the Holy Office and the Roman curia? Who succeeded, who lost, who achieved only limited influence? How were considerations of doctrinal purity and political opportunity weighed against each other? These questions concern not only the Modernist Crisis (1893-1914), but the entire space of time

1. This article tries to present a succinct summary of my recent research in the project “Antimodernismus und römisches Lehramt” of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). Notes have been reduced to a minimum. For a more complete treatment see my contributions cited below.

2. Cf. François Jankowiak, *La Curie romaine de Pie IX à Pie X: Le gouvernement central de l'Église et la fin des États pontificaux (1846-1914)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2007) (lit.).

3. Helpful tools for this research are the volumes “Grundlagenforschung” edited by Hubert Wolf in his series “Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation.” For the biographies of all curial officials mentioned below see Herman H. Schwedt with Tobias Lagatz, *Prosopographie von Römischer Inquisition und Indexkongregation 1814-1917*, ed. Hubert Wolf, 2 vols. (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005).

4. For the making of the modern Roman magisterium see now the seminal study of Klaus Unterburger, *Vom Lehramt der Theologen zum Lehramt der Päpste? Pius XI., die Apostolische Konstitution „Deus scientiarum Dominus“ und die Reform der Universitätstheologie* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2010). Cf. also Hubert Wolf, “‘Wahr ist, was gelehrt wird’ statt ‘Gelehrt ist, was wahr ist’? Zur ‘Erfindung’ des ‘ordentlichen’ Lehramts,” in *Neutestamentliche Ämtermodelle im Kontext*, ed. Thomas Schmeller, Martin Ebner, Rudolf Hoppe, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 239 (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2010) 236-259.

between 1542 and 1939, the documents for which are now available. The institutional implementation of theology is a theme that may also have resonances in the area of Protestantism, although those institutions seem to be, at least at a first glance, less strict and less centralised than in the Roman Church. But I hope that also this seemingly all too Catholic topic may open some lines of comparisons.⁵

The questions raised above will be studied here at length, and I would like to begin with a short example from the sixteenth century. The works by two cardinals, Tommaso de Vio, OP (Cajetan) and Gasparo Contarini, were subjected to attempts of posthumous expurgation by the Inquisition and Index between the years 1558 and 1601, without all too much coming out of it. Concerning Cajetan, Pope Pius V and the Dominicans in the Holy Office and the Index had to realize that it was theologically impossible to extinguish all his criticism of Saint Thomas Aquinas and thus to impose a complete Thomist uniformity. Neither did they find a consistent solution to deal with Cajetan's critique of the Vulgate and of Patristic exegesis. The prominent controversialist, Ambrosius Catharinus, and his criticism of Cajetan found only a very limited reception within the curia. The same was true in the case of Contarini, whose expurgation was rather mild and did not, for instance, impose the strict Counter-Reformation view of Church history, as was envisaged by one of the censors. On the whole, questions of a Dominican and curial nature and benign Venetian influence for Contarini played a major role in the decision-making.⁶

Turning now to the period of anti-modernism,⁷ one of the most interesting questions is how far did the conceptions of leading anti-modernist theologians and integralist campaigners influence the curia's decisions. Which theological strains were present within the congregations; which centres of influence are distinguishable? The case of Alfred Loisy is of fundamental importance in this context, and I would like to start by summarizing some of its relevant points.⁸ The first concerns shifts in

5. Cf. for instance the introduction of the 'Irrlehregesetz' in 1909 (Fall Jatho); Johanna Jantsch (ed.), *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Adolf von Harnack und Martin Rade: Theologie auf dem öffentlichen Markt* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996) 66-74.

6. Claus Arnold, *Die römische Zensur der Werke Cajetans und Contarinis (1558-1601): Grenzen der theologischen Konfessionalisierung* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008).

7. Hubert Wolf and Judith Schepers (eds.), "In wilder zügelloser Jagd nach Neuem": *100 Jahre Modernismus und Antimodernismus in der katholischen Kirche* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008).

8. Cf. Claus Arnold and Giacomo Losito (eds.), *La censure d'Alfred Loisy (1903): Les documents des Congrégations de l'Index et du Saint Office*, *Fontes archivi Sancti Officii romani*, 4 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009).

institutional policies: During the Pontificate of Leo XIII, the Congregation of the Index, under its prefect, Camillo Mazzella, SJ, was at the centre of activities against Loisy and the 'école large' in France, as illustrated by the Index inquiry of Loisy's *Livre de Job* in 1893. Loisy was demasked as a rationalist, and the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, drafted by Mazzella, imposed a strict doctrine of divine Inspiration.⁹ After Mazzella's death and the reform of the Index in 1900, which went back to the precepts of Benedict XIV, things began to change. The new secretary, German Dominican Thomas Esser, initially withstood French pressure to start a new inquiry against Loisy, and when he had to submit in 1901, he staged about the only Index Inquiry that really conformed to the norms of Benedict XIV. Enrico Gismondi, SJ, a friend of Loisy, was practically his defendant within the Congregation. He tried to defend Loisy against the brilliant but intransigent critique of Louis Billot, SJ, who had been made, against the will of Esser, extraordinary censor by his fellow, Jesuit Andreas Cardinal Steinhuber, the Prefect of the Index. Loisy's writings were censured twice or thrice, and the process went on and on. Loisy's position became untenable, less so because of the inner developments in the Congregation, but because of the negative public echo on his *L'Évangile et l'Église*. At the death of Leo XIII, the Congregation of the Index was close to a condemnation, but not entirely. Pius X, under French pressure, withdrew the case from the Index and handed it over to the 'Supreme' Congregation of the Inquisition.

On the theological level, Esser, a Thomist, was open for literal exegesis as long as it did not imply dogmatic changes. The Franciscan David Fleming, secretary of the Biblical Commission, who had been made, in an institutional compromise, extraordinary censor for the Index as well, first tried to contain the discussion on Loisy, because he feared it would compromise the entire new exegesis. In his internal paper for the Congregation of the Index, he went so far as to call the Bible 'literature' and not a handbook of geology and history. When he realised that Loisy, whom he personally disliked and thought of as a rationalist, had to be sacrificed, he called for a special papal letter against him in order to make

9. Francesco Beretta, "Dalla messa all'Indice di Lenormant all'Enciclica *Providentissimus Deus* (1887-1893): il Magistero Romano di fronte alla *Question biblique*," in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici: Un cantiere aperto: Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della conferenza annuale della ricerca (Roma, 24-25 giugno 1999)*, Atti dei convegni Lincei, 162 (Rome: Lincei, 2000) 245-260; Harvey Hill, "Leo XIII, Loisy, and the 'Broad School': An Early Round of the Modernist Crisis," *The Catholic Historical Review* 89 (2003) 39-59.

the most out of this sacrifice.¹⁰ His tactics were to censure the material dogmatic errors of Loisy concerning Christology, etc., and to steer clear from any judgment on the modern exegesis as such. The versatile Benedictine dogmatician, Laurent Janssens, started off with some sympathy for Loisy's exegesis and wanted only to cool down over-enthusiastic exegetes. But he then joined the general neo-Scholastic turn against Loisy, without becoming an integralist. In contrast, Louis Billot's polemic against Loisy¹¹ is an early and singular appearance of this leading integralist in a Roman Congregation. (Billot had nothing to do with the drafting of *Pascendi* in 1907 and became a Consultor of the Inquisition only in 1909.) In his *Index Votum*, his explication of Loisy's implicit criticism of scholastic doctrine had shown that the new exegesis and the old theology were, after all, incompatible. Enrico Gismondi, Loisy's defender, failed to wipe out this bad impression by insisting on the apologetic character of *L'Évangile et l'Église* and by addressing Billot's exaggerations. Billot's kind of reasoning became successful under Pius X and showed, already in 1902, an integralist undertone and a political agenda, when he put the assertion into the mouth of Loisy that the apostolic Church had been *democratic* – which Loisy had not said explicitly.¹² Billot's position was echoed by a short votum of the young consultor, Merry del Val, who stated bluntly that Loisy simply destroyed the supernatural character of divine revelation.

The making of the new Syllabus, *Lamentabili sane exitu*, which grew directly out of the censuring of Loisy's works in December 1903, is another example of modified anti-modernist influence.¹³ The task of compiling the Syllabus was originally given to two consultors of the Inquisition: Jesuit Domenico Palmieri and Capuchin Pie de Langogne. The latter was a close collaborator with the famous Cardinal Vives y Tuto and Pius X. He had already compiled the very unfavourable *Relatio* on Loisy's works, which had led to their censure in December 1903. Pie had taken up the argumentations of Billot and made short work of the

10. Claus Arnold, "Alfred Loisy als taktisches 'Opfer' gemäßiger Kräfte in der römischen Kurie?," in *"In wilder zügelloser Jagd nach Neuem,"* ed. Wolf and Schepers (n. 7), 261-269.

11. Edited in Arnold and Losito, *La censure d'Alfred Loisy* (n. 8), 153-170.

12. The political and cultural context of the Modernist crisis has been studied intensively by the *American Working Group on Roman Catholic Modernism* within the *American Academy of Religion*; cf. as a synthesis: Darrell Jodock (ed.), *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

13. Claus Arnold and Giacomo Losito (eds.), *"Lamentabili sane exitu" (1907): Les documents préparatoires du Saint Office* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2011).

defence of Fleming and Gismondi. Pie's "Elenchus complectens prae-cipuos hodierni rationalismi theologici errores" was also an eclectic work and took up the argumentations of Billot, the public criticism of Loisy by Bishop Émile-Paul Le Camus and Cardinal Adolphe Perraud and, last but not least, the French Syllabus handed over to Pius X by Cardinal Richard. Pie tried to enlarge the project and turn it into an antidote against the entire 'école large' (namely Charles Denis, Albert Houtin and Eudoxe-Irénée Mignot), whose presumed leader was, according to him and Billot, Loisy. Like Billot, Pie explicated the doctrinal implications of Loisy's writings. For him, Loisy and his School were "Neoterici": Like the Reformers, they had to be opposed as Richard Simon had been by Bossuet, and their rationalism and scientific approach reminded him of Frohschammer¹⁴ and Döllinger.¹⁵ Pie attacked the newly founded Pontifical Biblical Commission (with David Fleming as secretary) and laid the foundation for the initial propositions of *Lamentabili*, which established magisterial control over exegesis.

Palmieri's Elenchus was more original; he was able to use his published study against Loisy. In two points he went beyond Pie de Langogne: Palmieri wanted to fix doctrinally an absolute textual authenticity of the Vulgate, and he qualified most of his propositions with "haeretica," which would have established a considerable number of new dogmatic truths. With the help of a third consultor, the later "great cardinal of the Netherlands", Willem van Rossum,¹⁶ the two *elenchi* were amalgamated and presented to their fellow consultors.

During the consultors' conference on Monday ("feria secunda"), June 19, 1905, the project of the "elenchus unicus" was almost brought to a halt. The colleagues were not satisfied with the work of the three and had postponed a decision. Pie de Langogne complained about this in a letter to the Cardinal Secretary of the Inquisition (the acting head of the Congregation, which was nominally directed by the Pope himself) and informs us about the arguments of his adversaries: The majority of the consultors were of the opinion that the entire question was not ripe for

14. Elke Pahud de Mortanges, *Philosophie und kirchliche Autorität: Der Fall Jakob Frohschammer vor der römischen Indexkongregation (1855-1864)* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005).

15. On the importance of Döllinger's case for the evolution of the ordinary Magisterium see Wolf, "'Wahr ist, was gelehrt wird' statt 'Gelehrt ist, was wahr ist'?" (n. 4).

16. Joop Vernooij, "Cardinal Willem Van Rossum, C.S.S.R., The Great Cardinal of the Small Netherlands (1854-1932)," *Spicilegium Historicum Congregationis SSmi Redemptoris* 55 (2007) 401-472; Otto Weiss, "Der Glaubenswächter Van Rossum: Willem Marinus Van Rossum im Heiligen Offizium und in der Indexkongregation," *Spicilegium Historicum Congregationis SSmi Redemptoris* 58 (2010) 85-138.

decision. At the same time, they showed a remarkable historical consciousness and recurred to the “respectable traditions” of the Holy Office, which had acted in comparable cases as those of the Syllabi against Fénelon (1699)¹⁷ and Quesnel (1713)¹⁸ only with utter diligence and on the basis of a most extensive documentation, whereas in the present case they were supposed to decide on the basis of a “single votum.” As a caution against such premature decisions, the case of the (in)famous condemnation of the Italian philosopher-priest, Antonio Rosmini¹⁹ (rehabilitated under John Paul II²⁰), was mentioned. The qualification of the propositions was criticised as leading indirectly to new dogmatic decisions, which should be reserved to the Pope himself. Last but not least, Germany and the USA were similarly ‘infected’ by the new doctrines, and the inquest would have to be extended to writings coming from these countries. The brain behind these suggestions was the Master of the Holy Palace, Fr. Alberto Lepidi, OP, the senior consultor of the Inquisition. Lepidi clearly wanted to delay the project or make it impracticable altogether. Like Fleming, he was no friend of Loisy and had even made the suggestion of a Syllabus against him, but he obviously disliked the turn the project had taken in the hands of Langogne, Palmieri and Van Rossum.

Langogne, on the other hand, was completely surprised by this “strangulation” of the Elenchi’s discussion. He told the Cardinal Secretary that initially he had opted against the qualification of the propositions and that the Syllabus should be directed primarily against Loisy. Thus, Pie de Langogne reduced himself the dogmatic importance of his project. Afterwards, a slow process of redaction of three years accompanied by a constant halting resistance from Lepidi, brought various attenuations to the Syllabus, which cannot be presented in detail here, but which created some loopholes in *Lamentabili* and failed to make it the desired antidote against all modern exegesis, let alone modernism. Therefore, I agree with Gabriel Daly’s judgment: “*Lamentabili* was a singularly inept instrument for the purposes envisaged by the Pope and curia. When the smoke of

17. DH 2351-2374

18. DH 2400-2502.

19. Luciano Malusa (ed.), *Antonio Rosmini e la Congregazione dell’Indice: Il decreto del 30 maggio 1849, la sua genesi ed i suoi echi* (Stresa: Ed. Rosminiane, 1999); id. and Paolo De Lucia (eds.), *Rosmini e Roma* (Stresa: Ed. Rosminiane; Rome: Fondazione Capograssi, 2000).

20. Cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, “Note on the Force of the Doctrinal Decrees Concerning the Thought and Work of Fr Antonio Rosmini Serbati,” 1 July 2001 (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20010701_rosmini_en.html).

the explosion had lifted and the rubble settled, only Loisy was seen to have sustained a direct hit.”²¹

If *Lamentabili* (July 3, 1907) did not quite turn out as intended, the encyclical *Pascendi* (September 8, 1907) certainly did.²² One may compare here the slow magisterium of the Holy Office with the fast magisterium of the Holy Father. *Pascendi* was the product of direct inspiration by integralist theologians. The fundamental idea of not addressing this or that incorrect proposition but of characterising synthetically the habitus of the modernist heresy, which presented a new quality in the history of heresy, came early in 1907 from Bavarian Dominican, Albert Maria Weiss:²³

I. Primo quidem Haeresis, quae nunc spiritibus dominari minatur, non est haeresis ut antiquae haereses erant, scil. congeries aliquarum propositionum, sed est compendium, imo magis adhuc succus et *spiritus* omnium haeresium, quasi ultimum verbum omnium, quae singulae haereses usque modo per suos proprios errores ut finem ultimum intendebant.

Ob hoc ergo nunc jam non sufficit, *singulos errores* (quorum non parvum numerum in libro meo recensui) notare sed multo majoris momenti est, ipsum *spiritum generalem* totius hujus motus seditiosi et *habitum permanentem*, ex quo omnia haec procedunt, cognoscere et notare.

At hoc difficillimum est ex duplici ratione. Nam ideae modernae ex ipsa natura tam ambiguae sunt, ut vix determinari possint. Insuper nostrates, qui illas pendere gestiunt, *consulto* nebulis et incertis luminibus omnia confundunt, callidiores ipsis Jansenistis ut ipsi tutius damnationem evadant et tamen incautos laqueis suis capiunt.

Quamvis vix unum caput doctrinae christianae sit, quod non ab aliquo aut prorsus aut ex parte in dubium vocetur vel saltem enervetur, certum est tamen, illorum errores quasi omnia, quae ad *fundamenta fidei* et ad *principia theologiae* spectant, praecipue tangere. In hac re haeresis *Modernismi* essentialiter differt ab omnibus haeresibus priorum temporum, nam ne Protestantismus quidem primitivus usque adeo progressus est ac eius alumni extra et intra Ecclesiam nunc existentes.

21. Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980) 194.

22. Cf. for a detailed analysis Claus Arnold, “Absage an die Moderne? Papst Pius X. und die Entstehung der Enzyklika *Pascendi* (1907),” *Theologie und Philosophie* 80 (2005) 201-224; revised version: id., “P. Joseph Lemius OMI und die Entstehung der Enzyklika ‘*Pascendi*,’” in *Kirchengeschichte: Alte und neue Wege: Festschrift für Christoph Weber*, ed. Gisela Fleckenstein, Michael Klöcker and Norbert Schloßmacher (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008) 299-320. Italian version: Claus Arnold, “Antimodernismo e magistero romano: La redazione della *Pascendi*,” *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 5 (2008) 345-364.

23. On him see Otto Weiss, *Modernismus und Antimodernismus im Dominikanerorden: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum „Sodalitium Pianum“* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1998) 133-203 and *passim*.

II. Quoad S. *Scripturam* vel apud ipsos Catholicos *Inspiratio* aut ita restringitur, ut non differat ab inspiratione poetica Aeschyli et Homeri, aut redigitur ad doctrinas stricte dogmaticas, exclusis omnibus locis non *pure* theologicis.²⁴

The special character of modernism, as the synthetic heresy of modernity, was thus formulated. In the first place, A.M. Weiss was not a dogmatic theologian, but an apologist who knew the *Zeitgeist* around 1900 intimately, studied Protestant theology, and had seen, as a disciple of Döllinger, the ‘abysmal’ effects of disloyalty to the Roman Pontiff. Typical for an integralist, he had a great interest in social and political matters, worked for the hierarchical control over the Christian Social Movement, and addressed the catholic masses in popular tracts.

Weiss provided the fundamental idea for *Pascendi*. Cardinal Vives y Tuto, OFM Cap, a member of the inner circle of Pius X, then sketched the disciplinary part of the encyclical. But Weiss’s exposé was too dry and scholastic as to function as a text for an encyclical. Finally, it has long been known that Joseph Lemius, OMI²⁵ was the draftsman for the doctrinal part of the encyclical;²⁶ and the Roman material accessible today shows that he wrote the moral part, most of the introduction, and the end as well. Lemius directed *Pascendi* in the first place against Loisy: his personal interest was to make explicit the philosophical implications and preconditions of Loisy’s exegesis. Apart from Loisy’s writings, he used primarily Laberthonnière and the Italian *Quello che vogliamo*. He was not familiar with Tyrrell’s writings – as most of the Roman anti-modernists were not either. His case was solved entirely on the disciplinary level by Merry del Val.²⁷ In spite of the all-encompassing character of *Pascendi*, the documentation at its core was far from covering the entire “modernist landscape.”

Lemius appears today not only as a rather normal anti-modernist scholastic, but as an integralist: successful defender of Charles Maurras in

24. *Initium* of Weiss’s exposé, which reached Pius X by the intermediary Prof. Giuseppe Toniolo, published in Arnold, “Absage” (n. 22), 220-224.

25. On him cf. Robrecht Boudens, “Le P. Joseph Lemius O.M.I. et ‘L’Affaire Lahitton’ (1909-1912),” *Vie oblate/Oblate Life* 40 (1981) 61-76. Harry E. Winter, “Joseph Lemius O.M.I. Liberal or Conservative?,” *Vie oblate/Oblate Life* 52/2 (1993) 70-76 (lit.) (<http://www.omiworld.org/vie.asp?L=1>).

26. Jean Rivière, “Qui rédigea l’encyclique ‘Pascendi’,” *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 47 (1946) 143-161.

27. Gary Lease, “Merry del Val and Tyrrell: A Modernist Struggle,” *Downside Review* 102 (1984) 133-156; David G. Schultenover, *A View from Rome: On the Eve of the Modernist Crisis* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1993).

1913-14,²⁸ principal censor of Bremond's *Sainte Chantal* in 1913,²⁹ where he found the divine immanence he had defined in *Pascendi*, and a rather outspoken anti-Judaist in 1921.³⁰ Merry del Val oversaw the last corrections of the encyclical. Vincenzo Sardi, the secretary for the Lettere ai Principi, procured the Latin translation and wrote the *initium* of the encyclical, for which he used a short exposé of the Pope himself, who in a typically dualistic manner stressed the demonic quality of modernism.

Pascendi, the multi-tool against all modern heresies (in theory and in practice), and not *Lamentabili*, was what the Pope and his anti-modernist circle (Vives, Merry del Val, de Lai) needed. Their concept of a conservative modernization of the Church,³¹ of centralised and effective rule, control, and swift action against dissidents was not all that compatible with the slow workings of the Congregations of Index and Inquisition. The checks and balances of the old curial system were now regarded as obstacles.

Some examples of this: In 1906, Pius X wanted to put Fogazzaro's *Santo* on the Index without further discussion. Thomas Esser had to convince him to follow the *règlement* of Benedict XIV.³² In 1913, the Pope wanted to simplify the latter *règlement* fundamentally, but met with sharp opposition by moderate anti-modernists like Lorenzo Cardinal Lorenzelli, a notable 'Leontreiziste', who insisted vehemently on the old mode of procedure.³³ Against this background, it becomes understandable

28. See the exemplary study by Jacques Prévotat, *Les catholiques et l'Action française: Histoire d'une condamnation 1899-1939* (Paris: Fayard 2001); cf. Claus Arnold, "Der Antimodernismus unter Pius X.: Von Alfred Loisy zu Charles Maurras," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 125 (2005) 153-168.

29. François Trémolières, "L'abbé Bremond à l'Index," *MEFR: Italie et Méditerranée* 121-2 (2009) 463-483.

30. Cf. Joseph Lemius to Léopold Trabaud, 28 April 1921; Archivio Generale OMI, Fondo Lemius, PF-XVIII-4, Lettres I: "En conclusion la thèse ne me paraît pas juste. Et en tout cas, elle est très inopportune à cette heure où se produit, si accentué, le mouvement sionniste. Ce qu'il faut entretenir aujourd'hui dans l'âme des fidèles c'est la détestation des Juifs; qui sont l'âme de toute persécution contre l'Église. Dans le travail du cher Père on sent au contraire un courant de sympathie très vive. Il ne paraît pas bon que cette sympathie soit partagée. Sauf meilleur avis et avec le regret de ne pouvoir donner ma modeste approbation au travail d'un ami très cher."

31. Cf. the seminal study of Carlo Fantappiè, *Chiesa Romana e Modernità Giuridica*, 2 vols. (Milan: Giuffrè, 2008), and the critique by Giovanni Vian, "Pio X grande riformatore? La discutibile tesi di una recente pubblicazione," *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 30 (2009) 167-189.

32. ACDF Indice Diarii 1894-1907 (I.22), pp. 215-219. Cf. Ilario Tolomio, *Dimenticare l'antimodernismo: Filosofia e cultura censoria nell'età di Pio X* (Padova: CLEUP, 2007) 107-117; 219-227.

33. Guido Verucci, *L'eresia del Novecento: La Chiesa e la repressione del modernismo in Italia* (Turin: Einaudi, 2010) 59f.

why Cardinal de Lai's Consistorial Congregation started to 'assist' the Index with the prohibition of books for use in seminaries.³⁴ When the anti-modernist, but not integralist, majority of consultors and cardinals in the Index voted for the censuring of Charles Maurras's 'Action française' in 1913, integralist consultors and members like Pie de Langogne, Van Rossum, and Joseph Lemius had to appeal directly to the pope in order to make him suspend the publication of the condemnation.³⁵

But the most notable defeat of leading integralists in a Roman Congregation under Pius X has been recently reconstructed by Judith Schepers.³⁶ Louis Billot and Willem van Rossum had drafted the Anti-modernist Oath (1910) as consultors of the Congregation. When it came to a later discussion on the doctrinal character of the oath and the consequences for dissidents (simple suspension or excommunication), they attributed to it the character of a *professio fidei*. The cardinals of the Inquisition overruled this interpretation and declared the Oath a disciplinary declaration of adherence to the magisterium of the Church. Ironically, the entire situation in the Holy Office changed after the death of Pius X, when – in a typical curial shuffle – Merry del Val became Secretary of the Holy Office. With the help of collaborators like Nicola Canali, he turned the Holy Office into the centre of anti-modernist activity,³⁷ which it remained until the times of Cardinal Ottaviani.

These were only some glimpses into the 'black box' of the Roman magisterium in the times of anti-modernism. I hope to have shown at least some degree of discussion and theological diversity within the Roman curia. Naturally, in spite of all the small attempts at resistance, Pius X imposed his agenda on the Roman Church, and installed an anti-historis-

34. On de Lai: Giovanni Vian, *La riforma della Chiesa per la Restaurazione cristiana della società: Le visite apostoliche delle diocesi e dei seminari d'Italia promosse durante il pontificato di Pio X (1903-1914)*, 2 vols. (Rome: Herder Editrice e Libreria, 1998).

35. Prévotat, *Les catholiques* (n. 28), 189f; Arnold, "Der Antimodernismus unter Pius X.: Von Alfred Loisy zu Charles Maurras" (n. 28).

36. Judith Schepers, "'So viel und so rasch wie in der Modernistenverfolgung hat die Kurie lange nicht gearbeitet...': Zur kurialen Interpretation des Antimodernisteneides," in *"In wilder zügelloser Jagd nach Neuem,"* ed. Wolf and Schepers (n. 7), 337-367; Italian version in *La condanna del modernismo: Documenti, interpretazioni, conseguenze*, ed. Claus Arnold and Giovanni Vian (Rome: Viella, 2010) 175-206.

37. Cf. for instance Verucci, *L'eresia* (n. 33); or the major role played by Merry del Val in the condemnation of the 'amici Israel': Hubert Wolf, "'Pro perfidis Judaeis': Die Amici Israel und ihr Antrag auf eine Reform der Karfreitagsfürbitte für die Juden (1928): Oder Bemerkungen zum Thema katholische Kirche und Antisemitismus," *Historische Zeitschrift* 279 (2004) 611-658; English version in Hubert Wolf, *Pope and Devil: The Vatican's Archives and the Third Reich* (Cambridge, MA/London: Belknap Press of Harvard, 2010).

tic, anti-relativistic, modern – anti-modern pragmatic which even became acceptable to the ‘Zeitgeist’ after World War I, and may be understood as *analogous* (in the full sense of the word) to the anti-historicist turn in Protestant theology after 1918.³⁸

Goethe-Universität
Fachbereich Katholische Theologie
D-60629 Frankfurt am Main
Germany
email: C.Arnold@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Claus ARNOLD

38. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Die antihistoristische Revolution in der protestantischen Theologie der zwanziger Jahre,” in *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre*. FS Wolfhart Pannenberg, ed. Jan Rohls and Gunther Wenz (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988) 377-405. – For the problematic of ‘modernist’ continuities after 1918 see Claus Arnold, “Ripercussioni della crisi modernista all’epoca del nazionalsocialismo?,” in *Il modernismo in Italia e in Germania nel contesto europeo*, ed. Michele Nicoletti and Otto Weiss, *Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento: Quaderni*, 79 (Bologna: Mulino, 2010) 61-78.