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Jesuit Père Léonce de Grandmaison (1868–1927) was a leading Catholic apologist in France during the Modernist crisis. In 1908, the year after *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* was published, he became editor of *Études*; in 1910, he founded *Recherches de Science Religieuse*. Never losing sight of his lifelong ambition to write a work on Christ, Grandmaison treated in occasional writings the crucial issues raised by Modernists: historical criticism of the Bible, the philosophy of religion, development of dogma, religious psychology, and religious ethnology.

The dissertation aims to show that “personal religion” was the linchpin of Grandmaison’s apologetic Christology. Relevant occasional works by Grandmaison are examined, particularly a series of articles in *Études* (1913) entitled “La religion personnelle,” an article on Christ in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la Foi catholique* (1914), and Grandmaison’s chief work, *Jésus Christ: sa personnage, son message, ses preuves* (1927).

Chapter one gives a biographical introduction and an overview of Grandmaison’s formative influences and qualities as an apologist. Chapter two examines the challenges posed by Modernism as Grandmaison saw them. In Grandmaison’s eyes, Modernism has rendered Christ inaccessible. Although Modernists strove to understand anew the subjectivity of faith, their misguided approaches and teachings attacked the foundations of Christianity. Chapter three explores how he answered these challenges regarding Catholicism. For Grandmaison, personal religion referred to the commerce of God and believer. Personal religion also referred to the Church that Christ founded, the Catholic Church, which was the true religion of the Spirit. Chapter four examines
Grandmaison’s Christology vis-à-vis the notion of personal religion, which, in its fundamental sense, is Jesus’ relationship to the Father in the Holy Spirit. Grandmaison tried to demonstrate by a direct examination of biblical texts that Jesus was, and knew himself to be, the Son of God.

The dissertation concludes that Grandmaison’s apologetic Christology presented a convincing answer to many issues posed by Modernism. Taking their questions seriously, he managed to show how the traditional belief in Jesus as the Son of God could secure the subjectivity of true religion as found in Catholicism.
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INTRODUCTION

In the synoptic gospels, Jesus Christ posed this question to his disciples: “But who do you say that I am?” (Mt. 16:15; Mk. 8:28; Lk. 9:20). He sought to know not only what the disciples heard by way of report about him, but also about what they professed him and his mission to be. The mystery of Jesus was not merely a question of academic inquiry. The truth about Jesus was relevant to the truth about God, the Church, and the individual believer. Indeed, the entire analogy—the unity—of faith depended upon the answer to the question. The disciples’ personal profession of faith in Christ also animated their following of him. Heartfelt worship and a good life were meant to follow from the declaration that “Jesus is Lord!” (1 Cor. 12: 3). The Church’s worship, discipleship, and express beliefs in turn were meant to give witness to the truth about Jesus.

A. Modernist Crisis

The interrelationship between Christ, the Church, and the Christian were concerns of many decrees of the Second Vatican Council. Yet the urgency of these concerns was keenly felt decades earlier during the modernist controversy. As a broad intellectual and social movement within the Catholic Church in Western Europe, modernism extended roughly from the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the first quarter of the twentieth century. The crisis that modernism precipitated within the Catholic Church, especially in France, its geographical epicenter, was most intense from around the time of the publication of Loisy’s *L’Évangile et L’Église* in 1902 till shortly after the interventions of the Vatican in 1907.

During the modernist era, Catholic biblical scholars, historians, and theologians delved into biblical exegesis, the development of doctrine, and the comparative study of religions in ways that aroused controversy. The process of researching the origins of Christianity raised a number of

---

1 Unless otherwise indicated, all biblical quotations will be from the Revised Standard Version.

fundamental questions about Christianity and religious faith in general. How much should research about the history of Christianity, the human sciences, and the comparative study of the history of religions influence the formulation and reception of doctrine and biblical exegesis? What was the permanent value of Christian Scripture and doctrine (on faith and morals) in the light of the contingency of history? What was the value of individual religious experience vis-à-vis Church dogma? What was the interrelationship between ecclesiastical authority and the liberty of the individual believer proper to the Gospel?

Modernism as a whole is notoriously difficult to define. It has often been observed that there are as many modernisms as there are modernists. Modernist thinkers initiated, advanced, and deepened many important controversies, especially those concerning the origins of Christianity. Gabriel Daly defined the modernist controversy thus: “The conflict between the concept of Christian doctrines as immutable and perennially valid, on the one hand, and, on the other, as culturally limited expressions of truths which are antecedent to their formulation constitutes the theological core of the Modernist crisis which occurred in the Roman Catholic Church between c. 1890 and 1914.”

Pierre Colin characterized the main problem a little more broadly: “how to conceive the relation between the human spirit and Christian truth in such a way that it harmonizes recognition of a magisterial doctrinal authority linked to Revelation, and the freedom of adherence, and intellectual research with respect to the realities of the faith.” However one defined and

---


4 “comment concevoir le rapport de l’esprit humain à la vérité chrétienne de telle sorte que s’accordent la reconnaissance d’une autorité doctrinale, magistérielle, liée à la Révélation, et la liberté de l’adhésion et de la recherché intellectuelle au
understood it, the modernist movement was fraught with consequences for Christian doctrine, conduct, and worship.

For those who identified themselves as orthodox Catholic thinkers over against the modernists, the philosophical presuppositions and theological conclusions of modernists represented a sharp discontinuity with traditional teaching. The movement was most immediately threatening in the area of biblical exegesis. Modernists were accused of calling into question the traditional teaching that Jesus was the Son of God, consubstantial and equal in dignity with the Father and the Holy Spirit; obscured the identity and dignity of the Catholic Church as the religion founded by Christ; and, worst of all, attacked not only the content of the Catholic faith, but also the possibility of any religious faith whatsoever.\(^5\)

**B. Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J.**

An especially astute participant in the modernist controversies was Jesuit Père Léonce de Grandmaison (1868–1927), director of *Études religieuses, philosophiques, historiques et littéraires*, from 1908 to 1919, founder of *Recherches de Science Religieuse* in 1910, and director of it till his death in 1927. *Études*, founded in 1856, was the Jesuit journal of record in France; *Recherches de Science Religieuse* dealt solely with matters having to do with fundamental theology. As journalist and apologist, his occasional writings—numbering over one hundred and forty five articles—addressed the theological controversies of the day, and, additionally, matters having to do with politics, culture, and art—especially literature.\(^6\) He touched on many important issues that were raised by modernism.


However, according to Jesuit Père Jules Lebreton, Grandmaison’s closest collaborator in his work as editor of *Études* and RSR, “these studies are fragmentary; they were done by a good worker, but by one who did not have the leisure to construct an all-encompassing synthesis.” Although Grandmaison and his writings are relatively unknown today, he was, according to François Laplanche, the “apostle among French [Catholic] intellectual circles.” He was respected on all sides of the modernist disputes for his sound judgment, benevolence, equanimity, and nobility of spirit. He was, moreover, a zealous pastoral minister who exerted a wide spiritual influence on Catholics in France and throughout the world. His unexpected death on June 15, 1927 was considered by orthodox and modernist Catholics alike to be a tremendous loss. Grandmaison’s colleague and close friend Mgr. Pierre Battifol, a prominent Church historian, wrote: “I considered him one of the most

---

6 Jean de Geuser, “Bibliographie [du P. Léonce de Grandmaison],” *Recherches de science religieuse* 18 (1928), 281–95. Geuser mentions that Grandmaison wrote other articles in popular journals, but does not cite them. With one exception, the books (three in all) that appeared posthumously were compilations of various articles of his that were published during his lifetime. [Henceforth, *Recherches de Science religieuse* will be designated as RSR.]


open and competent intellects that I ever met; he was as informed as any apologist today and so welcoming of the ideas of others!”

Abbé Henri Bremond, former Jesuit, member of the French Academy, and modernist sympathizer, wrote the following concerning Grandmaison’s death: “It is an irreparable loss. The good that he did, and even more, the evil that he prevented!”

In Bremond’s eyes, Grandmaison was one of the few serene, praiseworthy interlocutors in the anti-modernist camp.

C. Question

From his time as a Jesuit novice, Grandmaison’s ambition was to write an apologetic treatise on Jesus Christ. Grandmaison’s life-long ambition was realized in two influential works on Christ: the article “Jésus Christ” that appeared in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* in 1914, and the two-volume work, *Jésus Christ: sa personne, son message, ses preuves*, which was published shortly after Grandmaison’s death in 1927. It would become one of three lives of Christ that Walter

---

10 “Je [lui] comptais comme une intelligence parmi les plus ouvertes et les plus sûres que j’ai rencontré; il était informé comme aucun autre apologiste d’aujourd’hui et si accueillant pour les idées d’autrui!” (Pierre Batiffol, letter, June 16, 1927, in *Lebreton, Grandmaison*, 408n1.)


12 *Lebreton, Grandmaison*, 37, 40–3.

13 Léonce de Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *Dictionnaire apologétique de la Foi catholique: contenant les preuves de la vérité de la religion et les réponses aux objections tirées des sciences humaines*, vol. 2, ed. Adhémar d’Alès (Paris: Beauchesne, 1914), 1288-538. (From now on, the *Dictionnaire* will be referred to as *DAFC*.)


Weaver considered to be the best French Catholic scholarly contributions to the quest for the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{16}

Grandmaison’s ambition happened to coincide with the controversies of the day. As mentioned above, the most hotly contested dogmatic issue during the time of modernism was the divinity of Christ. During the last two and half centuries, the Church had been exposed to the charge that its views about Christ were at odds with the Jesus of history. So Grandmaison’s writings responded to the issues that modernism raised. What was at stake for him was nothing less than the doctrines of the transcendence, immanence, and personhood of God.

The theme of personal religion framed Grandmaison’s exposition of the identity of Christ, the Catholic Church, and the individual believer, respectively. Recognizing the importance of religious psychology to the modern temperament, he wrote extensively on the study of religion in general and on Christian religious experience. An especially well-received work of his was a four-part article published in Études in 1913 on personal religion.\textsuperscript{17} The term referred to a believer’s relationship with God—to the sum of what was involved in the imitation or following of Christ and to what constituted normative Christian experience.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16} Walter P. Weaver, \textit{The Historical Jesus in the Twentieth Century, 1900–1950} (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999), 304. The other two were Marie-Joseph Lagrange, \textit{L’Évangile de Jésus-Christ} (J. Gabalda, 1928), and Jules Lebreton \textit{La vie et enseignement de Jésus Christ notre Seigneur} (Paris: Beauchesne, 1934). While the former “was not an attempt to do a ‘life,’ but rather to allow the gospels to speak as the only kind of life that can be written,” the latter was “a commentary on texts from all four gospels, arranged according to the author’s chronological scheme” (Weaver, \textit{ibid.}, 307, 309).
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17} Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 (1913): 289–309, 601-26; and 135 (1913): 33–56, 309–35. This article was collected posthumously and published as \textit{La religion personnelle} (Paris: Gabalda, 1927). In the estimation of Grandmaison’s colleagues, these were some of his very best writings; Lebreton, Foreword, \textit{Jésus Christ}, vol. 1, xxiii.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{18} Passage, “Grandmaison,” 16–17.
\end{flushleft}
things: The first was "the personal religion of Jesus." Grandmaison appealed to this notion to elucidate his understanding of the divinity of Christ, whose relationship to the Father Grandmaison called his personal religion. Second, "The personal religion of Jesus" also referred to the Catholic Church, the religion founded by Jesus. The personal religion of the believer and of the Church were not mere human constructs, but founded on and sustained by Christ’s relationship with the Father.

Grandmaison believed that the challenges of modernism were posed far more forcefully by a popular work such as Ernest Renan’s *Vie de Christ* than by the scholarly studies of exegetes, historians, or theologians. Although it was customary in Grandmaison’s time for orthodox Christian scholars to dismiss Renan as a “mere popularizer of the work of German biblical scholarship,” he exercised a deep and pernicious influence. In fact, his life of Christ was the singular irritant and stimulant in Grandmaison’s reading of modernism; he never ceased criticizing the work.

This dissertation will consider how Grandmaison addressed the challenges so radically posed by modernism. The dissertation’s central claim is that personal religion was the integrating factor of his Christology. It will be shown that Grandmaison tried to make a compelling case for orthodox

---

Christology against modernism largely through various uses of the motif of personal religion. A study of the content and method of his apologetic Christology will be especially useful in coming to terms with the interrelationships between Christ, the Church, and the individual religion of the believer.

**D. Methodology**

The basic approach of this dissertation will be to examine central texts of Grandmaison’s that deal especially with Christ and personal religion so as to arrive at a synthesis of his apologetic Christology. Grandmaison was not a systematic thinker. As was the case with the works of Augustine or of Newman, his writings were occasional ones. Nonetheless, Grandmaison did try to arrive at a theological synthesis that was modern, comprehensive, and coherent. In his eyes, the work of a theologian, who sought understanding of what he believed, was incomplete without a synthesis.26 The age called for the measured response of an apologist who was in touch with an enormous range of new topics and facts uncovered or recovered about the history of dogma, biblical exegesis, ethnology, and the psychology of religion; it also demanded a mastery of the philosophy of religion. A survey of his positions from various writings will show that his theological positions were consistent, comprehensive, and insightful; and that he made significant contributions in Christology and other fields.

The central texts that this dissertation will examine are Grandmaison’s *DAFC* article about Jesus Christ, the book *Jésus Christ*, his articles on personal religion, and other articles that deal with these subjects. Given that Grandmaison wrote a great deal on the areas of religious psychology, the

philosophy of religion, and the comparative study of religions, special attention will be paid as to how his insights on these topics contributed to his theological positions and method.

Chapter one takes up two tasks. The first is a biographical sketch of Grandmaison, including consideration of his engagement with modernism. The second is to give a survey of the cultural, philosophical, theological and spiritual influences that shaped him as an apologist.

Chapter two will be a presentation of Grandmaison’s diagnosis of modernism’s damage to personal religion. The first part of this chapter will survey the consequences of the two principal mindsets that he thought governed modernism: rationalism and sentimentalist religion. The second section of the chapter will examine how modernism’s principal philosophical tenets affected the underpinnings of personal religion. The third section will take stock of modernism’s principal effects on the beliefs and practices of Catholicism.

The third chapter will explore how Grandmaison responded to the challenge of modernism through the notion of personal religion. The focus there will be on his case for Catholicism as the true religion that Christ founded—the religion of the Spirit. The first section will set forth the basic form of Grandmaison’s argument for Catholicism as the personal religion that Christ founded. The second section presents his doctrine of the Holy Spirit as a principle of individual personal religion. The third section shows how Catholicism, in resolving the apparent antinomies about Catholicism that modernism raised, fulfilled and exceeded the felt exigencies of individual, personal religion. The fifth section treats how Grandmaison understood the social dimension of Catholicism to be an indispensable complement of individual personal religion.

The fourth chapter will provide a survey of Grandmaison’s apologetic vision of Jesus Christ through the lens of personal religion. The first part—entitled “Grandmaison’s Wager,” after Pascal’s
Wager—gives an overview of the aims, objectives, and strategy of Grandmaison’s Christology. The next three sections of the chapter will then treat the personal religion of Jesus and its implications for personal religion in the two other two senses—first, as the Church, as the religion established by Christ, and, second, as the piety of the individual believer. An important verification of the truth that Jesus is the Messiah and the Son of God, for Grandmaison, was the witness that believers gave to Christ throughout the ages in the life of the Church.

The conclusion will evaluate Grandmaison’s motif of personal religion as an integrating principle of his Christology. The first section will evaluate how successful he was. Did he achieve what he set out to accomplish in his main Christological writings? The second section will then consider some implications of Grandmaison’s Christology for theology today with respect to Christology, Pneumatology, ecclesiology, and anthropology, even though this study cannot explore such areas exhaustively. The breadth and depth of his intellectual engagement and his pastoral work also make it possible and worthwhile to consider more practical implications.
CHAPTER ONE
The Making and Marks of an Apologist

This chapter contains a biography of Léonce de Grandmaison interwoven with an account of the hallmarks of his theological sensibility.¹ Such an overview will prepare us to understand how personal religion functions in his Christology. The chapter will be organized according to the principal periods of his life. Special attention will be paid to how Grandmaison was involved in the modernist crisis in France as it unfolded. His works, most of them articles, were by and large occasional ones. It was largely in the course of his engagement in controversies that he first proposed his apologetic Christology.

A. Childhood, 1868-1884

Léonce Loiseau de Grandmaison was born on December 31, 1868, in Le Mans in the province of Poitiers, France, the seventh and youngest child of François and Marthe de Grandmaison. François de Grandmaison was a lawyer much respected for his honorable character and good judgment.² Léonce’s mother, born Marthe Ravot,—distinguished for her goodness and uprightness,—married François, twenty years her elder, for “the firmness and fervor of his religious convictions.”³ Both parents, devout Catholics, presided over a happy home. Public service and patriotism were an important part of the family ethos. Léonce’s brother, François-Jules-Louis Loiseau de Grandmaison, later distinguished himself in the French army and advanced to the rank

¹ Biographical details about Grandmaison that follow are borrowed from Jules Lebreton, Le Père Léonce de Grandmaison (Paris: Beauchesne, 1932). The book is also an irreplaceable guide to primary sources that were either unpublished, or lost, or destroyed at Grandmaison’s own request.

² Lebreton, Grandmaison, 2-3.

³ Lebreton, Grandmaison, 4-5.
of general during World War I. He was killed in battle along with two nephews at Soissons in 1915.4 Two of Léonce’s sisters married and became mothers of nineteen children altogether.5 One of his sisters, Françoise, became a Carmelite nun. A niece, Marie-Antoinette de Geuser (1889-1918) also became a Carmelite nun; her mystical writings, and biography were published by Jesuit Père Raoul Plus.6 One of Léonce’s brothers, Anatole, entered the Jesuits a year before him.

Two of Grandmaison’s traits that were apparent from an early age were central to his theological sensibility: a precocious Christocentric piety,7 and a love for beauty and of excellence, especially as found in literature.8 In high school, he assembled a band of schoolmates who received holy communion at Mass once or twice during the week (as acts of reparation to Christ) in addition to their Sunday communion.9 A member of the group recalled years later: “There was, throughout this group, an intense and profound spiritual life, a great spirit of apostolate, of mortification and of sacrifice, a real love for our Lord, and many graces bestowed by the good God.”10 Grandmaison’s devotion to Jesus was complemented by a Christocentric view of creation, for he saw the world and humanity as beloved by their Lord.11

---

4 For a stirring account of his funeral, see Léonce de Grandmaison, “Impressions de Guerre: La Mort du Chef,” Études 142 (1915): 347-54.
7 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 8-14.
8 For an appreciation of Grandmaison’s love of literature and ear for style, see Larivière, Apôtre humaniste, 27-30, 70-9.
9 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 9.
10 “Il y avait, dans toute cette bande, une vie spirituelle intense et profonde, un grand esprit d’apostolat, de mortification et de sacrifice, un réel amour de notre Seigneur et beaucoup de grâces répandus par le bon Dieu.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 9.)
11 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 11-2.
Grandmaison was also an avid reader of French literature and an admirer and conscious imitator of the French classical style. Novelist and literary critic Paul Bourget pointed out that Grandmaison “read Racine, read Corneille, but above all, the moderns.”\textsuperscript{12} From his youth he tried his hand at poetry; later as a Jesuit, he would be renowned for the poetry he composed on various occasions.\textsuperscript{13}

**B. Jesuit Formation, Professor of Fundamental Theology, and Tertianship, 1886-1901**

*Intellectual and Spiritual Formation*

An outcome of the French government’s Article 7, passed on March 29, 1880, having to do with the reform of education, was that the Jesuit order had to leave its premises in France in the next three months.\textsuperscript{14} Given such straits, the French Jesuits were forced eventually to relocate their novitiate in 1884 to Slough in England.\textsuperscript{15} Grandmaison entered the novitiate there on November 20, 1886.\textsuperscript{16} It was during a retreat there that he resolved to write an apologetic treatise on Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{17}

As a Jesuit novice, Grandmaison wrote:

> Life is short, my dear friend, we have beautiful plans, but will we achieve them? For me too, I have concentrated, collected, gathered all my efforts, all my cares, all my labors on the person of Jesus Christ alone. I am a man of this one thing. Now, having an idea in your head boosts its power tenfold.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Paul Bourget, “Le Pére Léonce de Grandmaison,” *Revue Littéraire* 14 (1933), 449. Bourget was a novelist and literary critic who was accepted into the Académie Française in 1894. He returned to the Catholic Church in 1901. (“Bourget, Paul,” *Dictionnaire des littératures de langue française*, eds. J.-P. de Beaumarchais, Daniel Couty, and Alain Rey [Paris: Bordas, 1984], 312.)
\item \textsuperscript{13} Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 58.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 24.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 25.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 37, 40-3.
\end{itemize}
Christ was for Grandmaison, as he was for St. Paul, everything. The depth and tenderness of this piety was manifested in a renowned prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary that he composed as a Jesuit that began, “Holy Mary, Mother of God, keep in me the heart of a child.” When four young Jesuits died during his novitiate, Grandmaison wrote during a retreat soon after: “A loss for the Company [Society of Jesus], for the Church; but Jesus Christ has need of no one.” Such an assertion should not be taken to mean that his brother Jesuits were irrelevant, for Grandmaison was ever a devoted brother to his fellow Jesuits. Rather, he meant that Christ was all-powerful in accomplishing his designs.

In 1888, Grandmaison pronounced solemn vows as a Jesuit, and then began the next phase of his formation, the juniorate, also at Slough. There he came under the spiritual and intellectual influence of his principal professor, Père Georges Longhaye, S.J. (1839-1920). Longhaye gave instruction in literature and in history, Latin and Greek, catechism, and preaching. He may also have been the most admired formator in the Jesuit province of Paris. His rhetorical and literary

---

18 “La vie est courte, mon cher ami; nous avons de beaux projets, mais les réaliserons-nous? Aussi, pour moi, j’ai concentré, réuni, ramassé tous mes efforts, tous mes soins, tous mes travaux vers la seule personne de Jésus-Christ. Je suis l’homme de cette seule chose. Or, quand on a une idée en tête, cela décuple la puissance.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, letter to a friend, November, 1888, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 37.)

19 “Sainte Marie, Mère de Dieu, gardez-moi un cœur d’enfant.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, hymn, cited in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 29.)

20 Léonce de Grandmaison, unpublished notes, Lebreton, Grandmaison, 34.

21 The juniorate is the period of Jesuit formation that follows after the novitiate. In Grandmaison’s time, the juniorate was a time dedicated, in the first year, to the study of philosophy and in the second year, to the study of the humanities, which included the classical languages of ancient Greek and Latin, French literature, and history. (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 37.)


23 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 37.
talents were considerable. Before being assigned to teach at the juniorate, he had been a high school
teacher and author of collections of student dramas that drew on the French classical tradition. His
first work of literary criticism, *Théorie des belles lettres*, was hailed as a masterpiece. His four-volume
history of seventeenth century French literature later won recognition from the French Academy.
Grandmaison shared Longhaye’s love for literature and for the French classical tradition.

Longhaye’s legacy to Grandmaison was threefold: a strong Christocentrism, an expansive
sense of the “catholic,” and a practical knowledge of the discernment of spirits as taught in the
*Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius of Loyola. (The *Exercises* are the template for what later came to be
known as the retreat. Their aim is to dispose the retreatant to discover the will of God in prayer so
as to obtain the grace and the desire to carry out that will.) At the end of Grandmaison’s juniorate in
1890, Longhaye encouraged him to pursue his ambition to write a work on Jesus Christ: “Let us not
forget at least this precious gift of a governing idea, of a precise goal toward which all your work
must go. And what idea is better in any way than yours, than setting before our eyes the adorable
person of Jesus Christ?” Longhaye’s exhortation looked beyond this particular project: he urged
Grandmaison to direct and connect “every object of study” directly to Christ:

If this testament had—which it does not—an obligatory force, I would enjoin on you one
thing, only one thing: to seek in every object of study its relation to Jesus Christ, the way that
is more or less direct, but always existing, to make of all acquired knowledge a testimony in

---


27 Léonce de Grandmaison, “‘Théorie des belles lettres,’” *Études* 85 (1900): 404-10.

28 “N’oublions pas au moins ce don précieux d’une idée maîtresse, d’un but précis où doit aller tout votre travail. Et
quelle idée de tout point meilleure que la vôtre, que la mise en lumière de la personne adorable de Jésus-Christ?”
(Georges Longhaye, letter to Léonce de Grandmaison, cited in Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 39.) See also Lebreton,
*Grandmaison*, 35.
favor of Jesus Christ. All the rest is curiosity, more or less incomplete or base. And if God
gives you another fifty or sixty years or more of intellectual vigor, that would still be too little
to study Jesus Christ himself and the relationship of all things divine and human to Jesus
Christ.29

There was no area in Grandmaison’s life that this concentration on Christ did not touch. The
appearance of the word “testimony” should also be noted: this was to be a constant theme of his
Christology.

Many important elements of Grandmaison’s intellectual sensibility coalesced during his
education as a Jesuit scholastic.30 Grandmaison’s philosophical studies for ordination as a Roman
Catholic priest took place in 1890 to 1893 at the French Jesuit house of formation in Jersey.31 There
began his lifelong interest in the works of eminent Anglican exegetes such as William Sanday and
Joseph Lightfoot.32

He loved their respect for religious traditions, and their sense of human realities; it is true
that, to attain this, they would somewhat defy all logic, a little like messenger pigeons that,
leaving poor humans to guide their airplanes by following railroad tracks, trust in their
instinct and fly directly to their destination across mountains and valleys.33

29 “Si ce testament avait-ce qu’il n’a pas—une force obligatoire, je vous y enjoindrais une chose, une seule chose: chercher
en tout objet d'étude la rapport à Jésus-Christ, le moyen plus ou moins direct, mais toujours existant de faire de toute
connaissance acquise témoignage en faveur de Jésus-Christ. Toute la reste est curiosité plus ou moins incomplète ou
ravale. Et si Dieu vous donne encore quarante ou cinquante ans de vigueur intellectuelle, ce sera toujours trop peu pour
étudier Jésus-Christ même et le rapport de toutes choses divines et humaines à Jésus-Christ.” (Georges Longhayè, letter
to Léonce de Grandmaison, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 40.)

30 A scholastic is a Jesuit, a member of the Society of Jesus, who has pronounced vows of poverty, chastity, and
obedience and is preparing for the priesthood.

31 The isle of Jersey is located just off the coast of Normandy and is a direct protectorate of the English crown.

32 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 100-1. See also Lebreton, Grandmaison, 145-6.

33 “Il aimait chez eux le respect des traditions religieuses, et les sens des réalités humaines; il est vrai que, pour y
atteindre, ils dédaignent parfois toute logique, un peu comme ces pigeons voyageurs qui, laissant les pauvres humaines
guider leurs avions en suivant les lignes de chemins de fer, se fient à leur l’instinct et volent droit au but à travers monts
et vallées.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 25.)
More importantly, Grandmaison came under the influence of John Henry Cardinal Newman.\textsuperscript{34} According to Lebreton, Grandmaison conceived a great admiration for the thought of Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas Aquinas\textsuperscript{35} and was drawn to the study of the history of religion.\textsuperscript{36} Grandmaison’s interest in world religions was prompted in part by the conviction that the Incarnation compelled a scholar to seek vestiges of the divine in all forms of human religion.\textsuperscript{37}

As part of their formation, Jesuit scholastics undergo a period of prolonged apostolic work between philosophy and theology studies called regency. Grandmaison’s assignment, from 1893-1895, was to teach in his native Le Mans at the high school he himself had attended, Notre-Dame de Sainte-Croix.\textsuperscript{38} In 1895 he returned once again to the scholasticate at Jersey for theological studies. He was ordained deacon there on August 23, 1897. In August 1898, he was ordained priest at Le Mans, one month after his elder brother Anatole.\textsuperscript{39}

There were four essential aspects of Grandmaison’s Jesuit apostolic spirituality: an orientation toward action, particularly charity; the practice of the discernment of spirits; indifference; and reserve.

Grandmaison’s spiritual temperament was decidedly apostolic. He was emphatic that the apostolic sensibility was oriented toward action.\textsuperscript{40} After all, the main purpose of the \textit{Exercises} as


\textsuperscript{35} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 50-1, 83.

\textsuperscript{36} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 229.

\textsuperscript{37} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 100, 233.

\textsuperscript{38} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 8.

\textsuperscript{39} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 108.

\textsuperscript{40} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 (1913), 615-6.
stated by Ignatius was to free oneself to know the will of God so as to carry it out.\(^\text{41}\) More specifically, the perpetual orientation of the apostle was toward carrying out a discerning love; the Exercises exhorted the retreatant “to love and serve in all things the Divine Majesty.”\(^\text{42}\) Commenting on his spiritual writings, Cardinal Jean Daniélou wrote that Grandmaison’s Jesuit spirituality had a “purely Pauline accent.”\(^\text{43}\) Grandmaison’s favorite book in the Bible was the Acts of Apostles, followed by the Gospel according to Luke,\(^\text{44}\) the most touching of the Gospels for him.\(^\text{45}\) Paul formulated as well as any the “great divine instincts of the spiritual life, universal and very certain,” which are due to the interior law of love.\(^\text{46}\) From his high school days, Grandmaison saluted love as “[t]he essence of the Trinity, the cause of the Incarnation, the supreme end of the redemption. Creation is the work of love; every creation, every work of art proceeds from this faculty of loving, which is the governing idea of man and the characteristic of his superiority.”\(^\text{47}\) Both Pascal and Newman, whom Grandmaison greatly admired, also “ultimately understood the order of charity; they placed it in its place, the first.”\(^\text{48}\) He often described charity in familial terms; he often used the

---


\(^{42}\) *SpEx*, [233].

\(^{43}\) Jean Daniélou, “Grandmaison (Léonce de),” 772.

\(^{44}\) Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 403.

\(^{45}\) Grandmaison, “[Jésus Christ],” *D.AFC*, 1301.

\(^{46}\) Léonce de Grandmaison, note, August 27, 1919, in Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 314.)

\(^{47}\) “l’essence de la Trinité, la cause de l’Incarnation, la fin suprême de la Rédemption. La création est l’oeuvre de l’amour; et toute création, tout oeuvre d’art procède de cette faculté d’aimer, qui est la maîtresse de l’homme et la caractéristique de sa supériorité.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, letter to a friend, in Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 11.)

\(^{48}\) Grandmaison, “Newman,” *Études* 110 (1907), 68.
image of brother or sister to convey his thinking about ecclesial realities and the relations of Christians to one another.49

Practically speaking, Grandmaison was solicitous in his writings and in his pastoral ministry for the good of a wide range of people, clergy and lay people, Catholics and non-Catholics, and especially the young, for the French Catholic Church and the universal Church. Moreover, his respect for his interlocutors flowed from his charity. His basic attitude toward his polemical adversaries was a concrete application of the “Presupposition” of the *Exercises*.

To assure better cooperation between the one who is giving the *Exercises* and the exercitant, and more beneficial results for both, it is necessary to suppose that every good Christian is more ready to put a good interpretation on another’s statement than to condemn it as false. If an orthodox construction cannot be put on a proposition, the one who made it should be asked how he understands it. If he is in error, he should be corrected with all kindness. If this does not suffice, all appropriate means should be used to bring him to a correct interpretation, and so defend the proposition from error.50

Apologetics was for him above all an act of charity, both for the apologist and for his interlocutor—especially if the latter was in error.51

The second component of Grandmaison’s Jesuit sensibility was his constant recourse to the practice of the discernment of spirits in his theological method.52 He considered that the fundamental questions about literature and philosophy were essentially religious ones. Scripture and the Christian tradition recognized that there were external and internal influences on the believer

---


50 *SpEx*, [22].


that inclined him either to bad or good, or to “good” or “better.” The charism of the discernment of spirits helped a Christian and the Church to sift influences in making decisions, to see whether they were from the Holy Spirit or whether they were evil—being from “the world, the flesh, and the devil.” The charism enabled the individual believer to be able to carry out the will of God. In order to understand hearts and minds, one needed at least one thing:

From the beginning one needs what Pascal calls the spirit of finesse, that is, the ability to distinguish, to classify, to subordinate some notions and indications whose complexity misleads those who see things globally. One must seize on the accent that modifies, that dominates, that sometimes contradicts the sense of a clear declaration; one must discern, beneath the mass of the intellectual reasons put forward, the secret movement, unavowed, unknown perhaps by the one who speaks, and which nonetheless motivates all his activity. One must observe the steps of this sinuous logic, which defies the rectilinear deductions of elementary logic…And the history of doctrines, or their interpretation, needs this divination hardly less than the intelligence of the soul.\(^53\)

This spirit of finesse figured prominently in the way in which Grandmaison understood the development of doctrine. This capability to recognize the voice of the Spirit was cultivated by his novice master, Père Platel,\(^54\) and by his juniorate professor Père Longhaye. Thus, Grandmaison recovered a sure sense of the apostolic spirituality of the Exercises well ahead of the revival of academic interest in them after World War I.\(^55\)

A third element of Grandmaison’s Jesuit spirituality was indifference. It is easy to misunderstand what he, the Spiritual Exercises, and the Christian tradition of the East and West,

---

\(^{53}\) “il faut d’abord ce que Pascal appelle l’esprit de finesse, c’est-à-dire l’aptitude à distinguer, à sérier, à subordonner des notions et des indices dont la complexité déroute ceux qui voient les choses en gros. Il faut saisir l’accent qui modifie, qui majore, qui contredit parfois le sens d’une déclaration d’apparence claire; il faut deviner, sous l’amas des raisons de tête mises en avant, le mobile secret, inavoué, inconnu peut-être de celui qui parle, et qui pourtant met en branle toute son activité. Il faut marquer des étapes de cette logique sinueuse, qui se moque des déductions rectilignes de la logique scolaire…Et l’histoire des doctrines, ou leur interprétation, n’exige guère moins de cette divination que l’intelligence de l’âme.” (Grandmaison, “Newman,” Œtudes 109 [1906], 725-6.)

\(^{54}\) Lebreton, Grandmaison, 26-8.

meant by the term. Christian indifference is not a merely stoic attitude that refuses to renounce one’s duty due to the influence of any external reality. Christian indifference (in Greek, *apatheia*), rather, was a pre-condition for the discernment of spirits; it was readiness for a truly sacrificial service of God and neighbor. The indifferent apostle preferred created things only in so far as they helped to realize his vocation to love and serve God in all things, according to the particulars of his vocation.66

“This spiritual doctrine, both demanding and free, places all the accent on the Holy Spirit and on purification along with the disappropriation of self in the apostolic life.”57 The apostle for Grandmaison united the maximum of exterior liberty with an interior dependence on the Holy Spirit, and self-abnegation with agreement and bonhomie.58 Docile to the Holy Spirit, an apostle guarded his personal qualities and used them as the violin makes use of wood.59

Finally, Grandmaison’s sensibility could be summed up in “réserve.”60 In the eyes of his closest collaborator, Jesuit Père Jules Lebreton, this was “the profound inspiration” that governed Grandmaison’s life.61 Prompted by a complete forgetfulness of self and a sacrificial love of others, and trusting in the ever-victorious action of God, such reserve allowed the apostle to work silently and efficaciously for the good of his neighbor.

Blaise Pascal was an especially important stimulant for Grandmaison’s sense of personal religion and for his Christology. Grandmaison admired him as a preeminent modern Christian

---

56 See the “First Principle and Foundation,” *SpEx*, [23].


61 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 182.
thinker who had confronted the problem of unbelief. His thought inspired orthodox and modernist alike in France. Indeed, he was nearly the patron saint of modern Catholic thinkers. As thinker and religious man, Pascal “owed his incomparable ascendency to his personal devotion to Jesus.” The section of his *Pensées* entitled “Le Mystère de Jésus,” impressed Grandmaison as one of most touching testimonies ever rendered to Christ and the most valuable of all writings in the French language. Grandmaison’s later Christological writings referred to what Pascal called the mystery of Jesus as the personal religion of Jesus.

Pascal was a master of the psychology of religion. Appealing often to Pascal’s personal God, “the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” as opposed to the God of the philosophers, Grandmaison found in Pascal what he found in Bourget, an “experiential apologetics.” Such an approach favored the reasonable character of Catholic Christianity: “No one is as blessed as a true Christian, nor as reasonable, virtuous, nor amiable.” Christianity satisfied the deepest demands for regard for the truth and for the reasons of the heart.

Although Grandmaison saw a good deal of the blessedness of humanity, he was also aware of the tragic dimension of the human situation under sin. Pascal had a lively sense of the paradox of

---

62 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 592n1, 655.
68 Blaise Pascal, pensée 541, in Grandmaison, “Idées Religieuses de Paul Bourget,” 293.
man’s standing in the universe before God in a state compounded of misery and of grandeur.69 Pascal wrote eloquently of the yawning double abyss between God and creature: that of man’s finitude in the face of the divine infinity, and of man’s sinfulness in the face of God’s holiness.70 This breach was described most eloquently in one of the passages of Pascal’s to which Grandmaison alluded most often: ”Christianity is strange. It orders man to recognize that he is vile, and even abominable, and orders him to want to be like God. Without such a counterweight, this elevation would render him horribly vain, or this abasement would render him horribly abject.”71 This truth was especially evident for Grandmaison in the experience of mystics.

Yet, the human person, at his best, healed of the breach of sin and elevated to be a “partaker of the divine nature” (2 Pt.1: 4), reflected the divine glory. The Catholic faith never hesitated to acknowledge this truth. For if Christ was indeed the center and head of all things, in that all things are related to him as their origin and goal, then all things were effected by Christ, their Lord and Creator.72 No created reality, moreover, was so directly touched by the Incarnation as humanity itself.

An Apologist’s Debut and an Apologist’s Manifesto

At Jersey, Grandmaison wrote his first articles for publication in Études. As was the case with many articles he wrote throughout his career, these were extensive book reviews. Both reviews showed an appreciation for and adroitness at critical scholarship. The first article was on the

69 Léonce de Grandmaison, letter, March 18, 1918, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 359.


72 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 660.
authorship and dating of the works of Pseudo-Dionysus,\textsuperscript{73} while the second was about an epitaph to Abercius, a bishop of Hierapolis (161-180).\textsuperscript{74} The former demonstrated an interest in mysticism, the latter, in the comparative history of religions.\textsuperscript{73} A short enthusiastic encomium of Pseudo-Dionysius gave a glimpse of the qualities that Grandmaison would later find lacking in modernism; he praised the Dionysian opus as a “work of a time where the theological exactitude of terms and a culture imbued with a philosophical spirit permitted one to treat the highest and thorniest questions with confidence.”\textsuperscript{76} This passage also reflected Grandmaison’s appreciation for the precision of dogma and the contribution of philosophy in speculative or dogmatic theology.

Grandmaison willingly discounted some of what went by the name of tradition. The article also reflected his early, signature concentration on the critical study of the history of religions, as well as his pastoral concern for his audience. The article on the epitaph of Abercius began: “The edification of the faithful, like the faith of the Church, needs only the truth.”\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, overly zealous hagiographers who elaborated indiscreetly the simple acts of the saints failed to understand this point.

The most significant of Grandmaison’s early articles was the fourth, entitled “Théologiens scolastiques et théologiens critiques.”\textsuperscript{78} These two terms were admittedly inexact designations for the

\textsuperscript{73} Léonce de Grandmaison, “La question dionysienne,” \textit{Études} 70 (1897), 34-48.


\textsuperscript{75} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 82-3.

\textsuperscript{76} “oeuvre d’un temps où l’exactitude théologique des termes et la culture affinée de l’esprit philosophique permettait de traiter avec sûreté les questions les plus hautes et les plus épineuses.” (Grandmaison, “Question dionysienne,” 48.)

\textsuperscript{77} Grandmaison, “Épitaphe d’Abercius,” 433.

\textsuperscript{78} Léonce de Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques et théologiens critiques,” \textit{Études} 74 (1898): 27-50.
divergent tendencies within the Catholic theology of his day.79 Critical, or positive, theology encompassed all those fields that helped to establish the historical facts upon which scholastic theology exercised itself. These fields included biblical exegesis, history of dogma, ecclesiastical history, archeology, experimental psychology, and the study of religions. Scholastic theology, or speculative theology, concerned itself with deepening an understanding of the Christian faith. The article diagnosed the breach that had opened in Catholicism between critical (or positive) and scholastic theology. Indeed, according to Jean Daniélou, Grandmaison’s theological writings—and especially his work on Jesus Christ—were devoted in large part to healing this divide.80

The problem of the study of dogma was first raised for him not by the modernist controversies, but by the method of theological instruction that he had received; in his judgment, it had given too much importance to the rationalistic explication of dogma.81 The fact of dogma mattered more to Grandmaison than the reasoning behind it. (As will be seen later, an approach to dogma that was obsessed with ascertaining the reasons for a particular belief could undermine the mystery of the reality that dogma described; it could also undermine the act of faith required by the believer.) He affirmed the facticity of dogma in unpublished remarks about the necessity of positive theology:

It is a grave methodological error to teach dogma as if it doesn’t have a history…. A dogma is in effect not a theorem rationally deduced from terms considered in themselves. It is a fact, taught by God in human language, in a form that is almost always imaged and particular, sometimes obscure and metaphorical. It might be about a property implied by the essence of things: for example, the necessity that God, the only true God, is Triune, is taught us from without, by the voice of authority. No mind, however penetrating as one might imagine, could discover in the notion of God that reason conceives that this God has the

81 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 83.
property of being three persons. How much more is it the case that it is necessary to know, check, defend the fact of revelation when it concerns dogmas such as the Incarnation, original sin, the elevation to the order of grace, which all depend on a free will, divine or human. It is history that teaches us here, by documents written or passed on, what we ought to believe. Neglecting it is to build on a foundation that we have neither seen nor verified; it is to apply to all of theology the basic procedure: ‘let’s suppose that the problem is resolved and see the consequences’: and that is sometimes useful, or necessary, but who would dare to establish it as a general rule?  

The study of the history of dogma was necessary to inform believers as to what the Church actually believed. A narrow scholastic approach to the faith was insufficient and even untraditional. This nuanced position about critical inquiry informed Grandmaison’s whole work, especially his Christology. Indeed, according to Jesuit Père Henri de Lubac, Grandmaison later tried to win over the “pure” scholastics among his Jesuit students by his example.  

Yet Grandmaison noted that an overreaction had taken place: critical scholarship now predominated among theologians. This new divide came about in large part because of the perceived needs in apologetics. Contemporary thinkers and the general public had an appetite for

---

82 “Enseigner le dogme comme s’il n’avait pas d’histoire est une erreur grave de méthode...Un dogme en effet n’est pas un théorème rationnellement déduit des termes considérés en eux-mêmes. C’est un fait, enseigné par Dieu dans un langage humain, sous une forme presque toujours imagée et particulière, parfois obscur ou métaphorique. Qu’il s’agisse même d’une propriété impliquée par l’essence des choses: que Dieu, par exemple, le seul vrai Dieu, est Trine et Un, cette nécessité nous est enseignée du dehors, par voie d’autorité. Nul esprit, si pénétrant qu’on le suppose, ne saurait découvrir dans la notion de Dieu que la raison fait concevoir, la propriété qu’a ce Dieu d’être triple dans ses personnes. À plus forte raison, le fait de la révélation est-il nécessaire à connaître, à contrôler, à défendre, quand il s’agit de dogmes dépendant d’une volonté libre, divine ou humaine, tels que l’Incarnation, la déchéance originelle, l’élévation à l’ordre de grâce. C’est l’histoire qui nous apprend ici, par ses documents écrits ou transmis, ce que nous devons croire. La négliger, c’est bâtir sur un fondement que nous n’avons pas vu, ni vérifié, c’est appliquer à toute la théologie le procédé scolaire: ‘supposons le problème résolu, et voyons les conséquences’: et cela est parfois utile, ou nécessaire, mais qui oserait l’ériger en règle générale?” (léonce de Grandmaison, unpublished essay, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 84.)

83 “Le P. de Grandmaison faisait une part trop grande à l’étude des auteurs contemporains et à l’examen de leurs problèmes pour obtenir toujours la pleine sympathie des purs ‘scolastiques,’ dont certains sembles prendre plaisirs à enfermer la théologie dans un ghetto bien verrouillé.” (Lubac, Questions disputées, 43.)

84 Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 30-1.

historical research in philosophy, experimental psychology, applied logic, and the history of ideas. Grandmaison portrayed such a mentality as it played out in critical theological scholarship:

The struggle is on the terrain of facts; therefore, we must go there to engage our adversaries; there one will find the arms to fortify believers and to convince the doubtful. So let us leave the writings of the old doctors to the respect and the study of Catholic schools, and, passing resolutely beyond medieval scholasticism, go directly to the positive foundations of the Christian religion, to its venerable monuments, to these primitive texts that are now studied, as the saying goes, ‘sans gloss, sans gloss, sans gloss!’

Catholic theology needed to take account of the history and of the development of dogma. But scholastic theology should take precedence in the training of clergy because of its content and relative ease of pedagogy. The main purpose of historical research was to prepare one to engage in speculative theology.

The trouble was that both sides were not careful enough about their respective one-sidedness. Dogmatic theologians charged that the critical studies often took liberties with Church teaching, especially in mistaking the precise limits of dogma. Critical theologians preferred to eschew traditional positions in favor of risky, liberal, or even heterodox positions. Critical scholars had their own complaints. Why was there such concern about their orthodoxy? Theirs was difficult

87 “La lutte est sur les terrains des faits; et donc, c’est là qu’il faut aller pour joindre nos adversaires; c’est là qu’on trouvera des armes pour fortifier les croyants et convaincre ceux qui doutent. Laissons donc au respect et à l’étude des écoles catholiques les écrits des vieux docteurs, et, passant résolument par-dessus le moyen age scolastique, allons directement aux fondements positifs de la religion chrétienne, à ces monuments vénérables, à ces textes primitifs étudiés, selon le mot connu ‘sans glose, sans glose, sans glose!’” (Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 31.)
90 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 51.
work. Moreover, critical research did not always yield false doctrines. Should temerity make Catholics cede the field to scholars who have no respect for Catholic doctrine whatsoever? Some theologians remained too much in the ivory tower of their metaphysical studies: “The spirit of tradition is not ‘conservatism.’” Such a breach needed to be healed.

According to Emile Poulat, there were three Catholic parties that had differing views on the intellectual conversion needed to deal with the confrontation of faith and science:

- The *progressistes* persuade themselves that [this conversion] will be limited to the mastery of a discipline, without jeopardizing the theological edifice (Mgr. Battifol, P. Lagrange, P. de Grandmaison); the *modernists* think that it will require a profound revision of received ideas, and, correlative of the ‘regime of the intellectual life in the Church’ (Alfred Loisy, Édouard Le Roy); the *rationalists*, refusing to make what they consider to be illusory compromises, judge that it means the end of Catholic beliefs and even of all spiritual belief (Joseph Turmel, Albert Houtin).

As a *progressiste*, Grandmaison believed that the legitimate demands of critical, or positive science, could be harmoniously executed in conjunction with traditional Catholic dogmatic positions.

_The application of the two methods, scholastic and critical, to religious sciences is necessary for their progress. The first ought to pay attention to its preponderant role in the intellectual formation of theologians, and then give a larger part to the other. Both ultimately owe each other frank sincerity from the start, and then benevolent interest and mutual aid._

---


94 “les *progressistes* se persuaderont qu’elle se limiter à la maîtrise d’une discipline, sans mettre en cause l’édifice théologique (Mgr. Battifol, le P. Lagrange, le P. de Grandmaison); les *modernistes* penseront qu’elle impose une révision profonde des idées reçues, et, correlative, du ‘régime intellectuel dans l’Eglise’ (Alfred Loisy, Édouard Le Roy); les *rationalistes*, refusant ce qu’ils estiment un illusoire compromis, jugeront qu’elle signifie la fin des croyances catholiques et même de toute croyance spiritualiste (Joseph Turmel, Albert Houtin).” (Emile Poulat, Modernistica: Horizons, Physionomies, Debats [Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1982], 38, 39.)

95 “L’application des deux méthodes, scolastique et critique, aux sciences religieuses est nécessaire à leur progrès. La première doit garder son rôle prépondérant dans la formation intellectuelle des théologiens, et faire ensuite une part plus large à l’autre. Toutes deux enfin se doivent la sincérité franche d’abord, l’intérêt bienveillant et l’aide mutuelle ensuite.” (Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 34-5.)
The service of the critical scholar was to supply a secure Catholic historical and positive foundation concerning texts upon which dogmatic theology could then exercise itself. In turn, it would help the reputation for orthodoxy of critical scholars if they would be more interested in the dogmatic work that took critical findings to their ultimate conclusions.

Whence did the confidence for a rapprochement derive? —“faith in practice and the divinity of the Church. Truth does not oppose truth.” These beliefs founded what some of his adversaries mistook for irenicism. Grandmaison always recognized that there was a pressing need to catch up with Protestants in the critical study of Sacred Scripture. This need was all the more pressing in view of the Quest for the historical Jesus. The movement was launched in Germany towards the end of the eighteenth century when the philosopher Gotthold Ephraim Lessing published selections from the anonymous writings of Hermann Samuel Reimarus. The third of his Fragments on the aims of Christ and his disciples, denied most of the traditional doctrines about Christ and the Church. Most of Christian apologetics concerning Christ’s miracles and resurrection was the invention of the disciples. Remairus depicted Christ as a deluded prophet. The challenge presented by rationalist critics since the beginning of the quest for the historical Jesus had had a salubrious effect. An ancient adage born of the Church’s historical experience declared: “It is necessary that

99 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 175-6.
there be heresies’ [1 Cor. 11:19].” They had always permitted the Church to come to a new, richer, and deeper understanding of the Christian faith. In exposing the poverty of Catholic scholarship in biblical studies, the attacks of the rationalists reinvigorated Catholic research in this and other areas. Hence, modernism presented a good opportunity for orthodox Christian theology to develop.

For Grandmaison, two things were needed for the rapprochement between scholastic and critical theologians to take place: charity among them, and second, the advance of Christian philosophy. The more important thing was frank and charitable fraternal correction. Historians recognized that there are different degrees of probability concerning theological propositions; so should there be an honest assessment of the degree of probability for historical facts. The positions of adversaries needed to be represented fairly; they need to be treated in good faith. Grandmaison pointed out the misrepresentation of the ideas and method of a critical scholar such as Abbé Louis Duchesne. On the other hand, dogmatic theologians were unfairly caricatured for their polemics against the work of prominent Protestant theologians such as Auguste Sabatier (1839-1901) and Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930); Catholic critical scholars had accused their dogmatic

106 Louis Duchesne (1843-1922) was a pioneer in the application of the critical method to Church history; he distinguished himself in the areas of early Christianity, liturgy, and hagiography. The controversial book to which Grandmaison referred is Duchesne’s *Histoire du culte Chrétien: étude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne* (Toulouse: Chauvin et Fils, 1889). In 1910, Duchesne was appointed to the French Academy. In 1912, his *Histoire ancienne de l’Église*, 3 vols. (Paris: Fontemoing, 1906-11) was placed on the Index of Forbidden Books on the judgment that they exhibited modernist errors.
confreres of having merely “syllogized” against their Protestant opponents in complete ignorance of the facts.\footnote{107}

Secondly, speculative Christian philosophy needed to keep pace with critical scholarship. Recognizing the rights of reason accorded with respect for scholasticism; did not the critical scholar also depend on some elements common to traditional Christian philosophy?\footnote{108} Maurice Blondel (1861-1949)\footnote{109}—whose thought Grandmaison admired\footnote{110}—held that until philosophy formulated “one true science of action, capable of extracting lessons drawn from history through life for the benefit of an experiential and progressive theology, there will only be ever emerging conflicts and attempts at exclusion or at mutual ostracism” between dogmatic theology and historical-critical exegesis.\footnote{111}

Grandmaison took up the question of the development of doctrine in his article, “L’élasticité des formules de foi; ses causes et ses limites.”\footnote{112} Written when he was still a student of theology, the article was his first fully polemical work. It was in Lebreton’s judgment a clairvoyant work because it anticipated the issues that later precipitated the modernist crisis.\footnote{113} The article was a response in large part to Auguste Sabatier’s *Esquisse d’une philosophie de la religion d’après la psychologie et l’histoire*,\footnote{114} and his

\footnote{107} Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 41.

\footnote{108} Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 41.

\footnote{109} A leading Catholic philosopher of his time, Blondel was one of the central figures in the modernist crisis France.

\footnote{110} Augustine Valensin, letter to Maurice Blondel, June 27, 1907, in Blondel-Valensin, *Correspondance*, 1, 330.

\footnote{111} “une science de l’action, capable de dégager au profit d’une théologie expérimentale et progressives leçons tirées de l’histoire par la vie, il n’y a que conflits toujours renaissants et tentatives d’impiétèmes ou d’ostracisme mutuel.” (Maurice Blondel, “Histoire et dogme: les lacunes philosophiques de l’exégèse moderne.” *La Quinzaine* 56 [1904], 458.)


\footnote{113} Lebreton, Foreword, *Jésus Christ*, 1, xvii.

posthumous Les Religions d’autorité et la Religion de l’Esprit. Sabatier was professor of theology at University of Strasbourg from 1868-1873. As dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris until his death in 1902, and the leading liberal Protestant theologian in Europe, Auguste Sabatier was “the greatest theorist of the Reformation since Calvin.” His influence was so great that Grandmaison later dubbed him “the pope of Protestants.” Sabatier’s brilliance was all the more to be lamented, as he was the father of modernism in France.

Reformed theologians argued that the immutability of dogma in Catholicism condemned it to impotent and outdated institutional forms. Grandmaison had a great respect for dogma. [Those] who love the truth of God, and the Church, which is the Body of Christ, who can prefer neither the authority nor the friendship, nor the talent, nor the eloquence, nor the philosophy of anyone whatsoever to the divine religion and faith of Catholicism mistrust all these things in order to attach themselves to the faith so as to remain inviolably faithful to it.

Saint Vincent of Lérins’s Commonitorium expressed the attitude of fidelity with which Grandmaison approached the adherence to dogma. Moreover, Cardinals Franzelin and Newman had shown that “if the Catholic Church rejected doctrinal disarray, the crumbling in desolate and crippled souls of the living body of the faithful that she is, she offers to the contrary a perfect example of vital

---

116 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 185.
117 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 185.
119 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 185.
120 Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 342.
121 “qui aiment la vérité de Dieu, et l’Église, qui est le corps du Christ, qui ne peuvent préférer à la religion divine et à la foi catholique, ni l’autorité d’un homme, quel qu’il soit, ni son amitié, ni son talent, ni son éloquence, ni sa philosophie, …méprisent tout cela pour s’attacher à la foi y demeurer inviolablement fidèles.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 169n2.)
development in the history of her dogma.”123 Both these passages indicate that the issue of dogma always involved an element of pastoral concern for Grandmaison. Religious ideas mattered in the personal lives of believers.

What concerned him especially was the supposition among many Catholic and non-Catholics alike that dogmas were in fact mutable. Here he took issue with Loisy, who had written approvingly of Sabatier’s claim—“God is the only thing that theology recognizes as immutable.”124 Grandmaison recognized that doctrine developed and that theology could not exhaust the reality of God. The formulas of dogmas also had a permissible—but not infinite—elasticity.125

Grandmaison never ceased to tout the importance of philosophy and metaphysics in particular. “To speak frankly, I am persuaded that one accepts the faith or that one rejects it for reasons that are above all philosophical.”126 He wrote: “It seems, besides, that in counseling the study of St. Thomas, Leo XIII had less in view the dogmatic substance contained in the Summa,—substance that one easily finds elsewhere—than the happy adaptation of traditional philosophy to revealed truths.”127 Exercising his usual balance, Grandmaison maintained that the Church’s

123 “si l’Église catholique repoussait la désarroi doctrinale, l’émiettement en âmes désolées et désenharées du corps vivant de fidèles qu’elle est, elle offre au contraire, dans l’histoire de son dogme, un exemple parfait du développement vital.” (Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 342.)


126 Léonce de Grandmaison, unpublished manuscript, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 93. For the importance of philosophy to speculative theology, see Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 27. He was so convinced of the need to develop a philosophy of religion that he often lectured on the subject. He was able to write only a sketch of a work on the history of the philosophy of religion; Lebreton, Grandmaison, 229, 282-9. These notes formed the basis for a set of lectures that Grandmaison delivered which he later published, “La pensée hors de l’Église, au XIXe siècle,” Bulletin de l’Institut catholique de Paris (1912): 217-24; (1913): 8-15, 35-39, 56-59, 73-81, 102.

127 “Il semble d’ailleurs qu’en conseillant l’étude de saint Thomas, Léon XIII avait moins en vue la substance dogmatique contenue dans les ‘Sommes,’—substance qui se trouve sans peine ailleurs,—que l’heureuse adaptation de la philosophie traditionnelle aux vérités révélées.” (Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 481.)
dogmatic pronouncements made use of philosophical (and other) concepts without importing their systems as necessary components of the faith.\textsuperscript{128} He quoted Loisy, for instance, who said that the Johannine use of \textit{logos} did not imply that the term was being used in a non-Christian, philosophical sense.\textsuperscript{129} Likewise, saying that the hypostatic union involved the direct assumption of human nature safeguarded an essential dogma of the faith without adopting Aristotelianism as the official philosophy of the Church.\textsuperscript{130}

In principle, it seemed that one could prescind from using any specifically scholastic concepts. In reality, however, such an exercise was not so easy. Such a prohibition seemed too absolute.\textsuperscript{131} It would hardly ever have occurred to the Doctors of the Church to study dogma in a way that many critical scholars did—“to reduce to a minimum the philosophical doctrine that was needed as a necessary support of [dogmatic] affirmations, to eliminate from its formulas all that did not constitute their substance.”\textsuperscript{132} Such an atmosphere limited the open discussion necessary to the authentic development of dogma. Grandmaison concluded:

the Church supposes, by some formulas of faith, philosophical notions whose general character it is impossible to establish directly. The legitimacy of this practice of ecclesiastical authority imposes itself on every Christian: it is explained by the fact that certain conceptions, which Christian tradition holds to be indubitable, are separable from all taint of error only if one supposes that the philosophical notions are objectively true, and which (though at first sight simply scholastic) would otherwise be open to discussion.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{128} Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 349-51.


\textsuperscript{130} Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 490.

\textsuperscript{131} Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 486-7.

\textsuperscript{132} “réduire à son minimum la doctrine philosophique qu'il exige comme soutien nécessaire de ses affirmations, éliminer de ses formules tout ce qui n'en constitue pas la substance.” (Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 491.)

\textsuperscript{133} “l’Église supose, par quelques-unes de formules de foi, des notions philosophiques dont on est impuissant à établir directement le caractère général. La légitimité de cette conduite du magistère ecclésiastique s’impose à tout chrétien: elle s’explique par ce fait que certaines conceptions, données indubitables par la tradition chrétienne, ne sont séparables de
He then asked if importing scholastic notions in this way constituted a kind of rationalism. The Church’s formulation of dogma was like the occasional intervention of ecclesiastical power in temporal affairs to safeguard the interests of the faithful. Moreover, scholasticism had many advantages, which included the fact that it was the most eclectic of philosophies, being the fruit of many thinkers. Ultimately, Grandmaison expressed confidence that the Holy Spirit superintended the vital evolution of dogma.

On the eve of his ordination, Grandmaison envisioned that his first assignment as a priest would be to minister to young lay adults—according to Lebreton, such was his desire. It would turn out otherwise. He was sent instead to teach apologetics for the academic year 1899-1900 at the scholasticate (for the Paris and Lyon Jesuit provinces) at Fourvière. At the end of a mémoire written sometimes during 1899, he addressed the issue treated in “Théologiens scolastiques et critiques”: how to maintain a proper balance between positive theology and dogmatic theology. He was concerned above all to allow the voices of Scripture, the Fathers, and Thomas to “rise up at tout alliage d’erreur qu’en supposant objectivement vraies des notions philosophiques, à première vue simplement scolastiques, et qui autrement fussent restées discutables.” (Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 487.)


135 Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 351. He quoted Cardinal Manning, who considered the Holy Spirit to be the soul of the Church; ibid., 351n1.

136 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 106.

137 Grandmaison had been advised of the possibility of such a mission during his philosophy studies. At that time, rector Père Gilbert steered him toward the field of apologetics rather than speculative theology; Lebreton, Grandmaison, 52–3. Lebreton, 52n1, speculates that an incident during Grandmaison’s studies may have checked his future pursuit of studies in speculative theology. Jesuit censors required him to cut three pages of his thesis on Aquinas’ understanding of transcendence as part of human nature.

once, live again, speak in their turn, each bringing its witness to the truth of the faith.”

Grandmaison was quite aware of the deficiencies of the neo-scholastic manuals. More importantly, though, he considered the Church’s intellectual life to be an act of testimony to Christ; the theme of testimony later figured prominently in his Christological writings.

Grandmaison’s tenure as professor of apologetics was interrupted by his year of tertianship formation at Angers, near Fourvière, for 1900-1901. His Christology was deepened by the way in which his director Père René de Maumigny presented the Christ of the Gospels and the riches of the *Spiritual Exercises*. In them, Jesus was the one to whom the apostle referred all things.

Grandmaison’s Christocentrism also founded his sense of the dignity of the human person. “In the course of Grandmaison’s principal work, the person of Jesus Christ is finally revealed as the cornerstone of a secular building, that of Christian humanism.” One of his favorite passages from Scripture was Phil. 4: 8-9, a charter text for the Christian appreciation of all that is genuinely human: “Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is gracious, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things. What you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, do; and the God of peace will be with you.” Such a verse aimed at the sense of the ‘catholic’ that Longhaye helped to inculcate in Grandmaison. Whether applied to human affairs or to

---


142 *SpEx*, [54], [53], [95–8, 138], [98].


144 Laplanche, *Crise*, 160-1.

the Catholic Church, the word referred to the widest possible comprehension of all that made for the goodness proper to humanity or to the Church. He respected and appreciated the presence of the divine in all things authentically human. Jesuit colleague Père Henri du Passage wrote of Grandmaison after his death: “Nothing that concerned the soul was foreign to him.”146 This breadth of his sensibility accorded with his devotion to the Catholic Church as the religion that Christ had founded.

C. Professor of Fundamental Theology, 1901-1908

In 1901, Grandmaison was sent to the scholasticate at Canterbury, England, to teach fundamental theology. (It should be noted that at that time fundamental theology was synonymous with apologetics.147) His tenure there helped him to make a good deal of the remote preparation for his 1927 work on Jesus Christ. The seeds of his Christological doctrine were developed partly through his teaching and partly through articles that he contributed to scholarly theological journals—and through his prayer, preaching and conferences, and friendships.148 His initial acquaintance with English Christianity and its theological riches was also deepened during this time.149

Coursework

During each of his seven years in England, Grandmaison taught the courses, or treatises, *De religione vera* and *De Ecclesia*.150 Both courses anticipated many of the themes of future works.151 The

150 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 151.
first treatise established the superiority of Catholicism as a religion, while the second established the Church as the reliable witness to the truth of the faith.

Grandmaison’s treatment of *De religione vera* began with his insistence on the very fact of religion. The best starting point for an apologetic work, in his estimation, was not “the theses of theodicy and natural morality that establish the essential dependence that connects man to God,” but an undeniable “fact that awakened the spirit and provoked study.” The first section of the course gave a detailed sketch of the evolution of the philosophy of religion as a preamble to the study of religion. The apologetic anxieties of the day, such as those having to do with biblical exegesis, could be ultimately reduced to problems concerning one’s philosophy of religion. Yet the study of the philosophy of religion was so often neglected. The second section of the course was on Christianity, while the third section covered non-Christian religions. The course engaged one of his dearest interests, religious ethnology. Ethnology is the social science that studies human cultures; religious ethnology studies the phenomenon of religion. These lectures formed the basis of his studies of religion.

Grandmaison engaged liberal Protestant adversaries as part of the second course, on the church; he was particularly concerned in this course to refute Sabatier’s claims that Catholicism was the Religion of Authority and (liberal) Protestantism was the Religion of the Spirit.

Two new vistas—the history of religious philosophy and the comparative history of religions—transformed Grandmaison’s presentation of the classical treatment:

---

154 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 152.
the first [the history of the philosophy of religion] revealed to the student the profound roots from which sprouted so many systems; the fact of religion did not impose or even suggest many ambitious and contradictory interpretations; whosoever has understood the design of these human constructions is no longer bedazzled or disconcerted by them. And [second] the history of religions also protected him against the disarray that this confused mix of superstitions and of rites provokes among superficial observers. [Grandmaison] is moved by all these human efforts at seeking in the shadows a God so close, and when he takes the Gospel in hand, he recognizes the transcendence of this revelation: ‘no one has ever seen God; the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known to us.’

This revelation of the Son of God is the luminous focal point that illuminates all Christian apologetics. The entire effort of Père de Grandmaison was bent on contemplating this divine splendor, to turn the souls of men toward it, so as to make all those that he could reach sons of light.155

In short, Jesus, the Son of God, and his relationship to the Father would be the center of Grandmaison’s thought, pastoral work, and life. Moreover, we see his solicitude for the people who sought God “gropingly”—a favorite expression of his.

The typical apologetic approach of Grandmaison’s time—contained in the treatise De Christo Legato—was to appeal “to the infallible truth of Scriptures or the Catholic Tradition,” then to argue step-by-step for the claim that Christ was the Messiah, the one sent by God.156 The claim that Jesus was divine, the Son of God, fell under the domain of dogmatic theology, and was argued for in the course on De Verbo incarnato157; it was the task of a professor of dogmatic theology to demonstrate

---

155 “le premier révélé à l’étudiant les racines profondes d’où pullulent tant de systèmes; ce n’est point le fait religieux qui impose ni même suggère tant d’interprétations ambitieuses et contradictoires; quiconque a compris le dessin de ces constructions humaines n’en est plus ébloui ni déconcerté. Et l’histoire des religions le prémunit aussi contre le désarroi que provoque, chez les observateurs superficiels, cette mêlée confuse de superstitions et de rites; il est ému de tous ces efforts des hommes cherchant à tâtons un Dieu si proche, et quand il prend en main l’évangile, il reconnaît la transcendance de cette révélation: ‘Personne n’a jamais vu Dieu: le Fils unique qui est dans le sein du Père, nous l’a fait connaître.’ Cette révélation du Fils de Dieu, c’est le foyer lumineux qui éclaire toute l’apologétique chrétienne. Contempler cette splendeur divine, tourner vers elle les âmes des hommes, pour faire de tous ceux qu’il pouvait atteindre, les fils de lumière, ce fut tout l’effort du P. de Grandmaison.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 153.)

156 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1291.

157 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 153.
that Jesus was the Son of God and then to reconcile this fact with the unity of God.\textsuperscript{158} But Grandmaison was uncomfortable with the compartmentalization of Christ’s identity as Messiah and as Son of God—an approach so at odds with that used by the evangelists.\textsuperscript{159} He eventually decided that it would make more sense to present the two claims at once: that Jesus was (and knew himself to be) both Messiah and the Son of God. According to Lebreton, this ground-breaking insight came to him about mid-way through his career as professor of apologetics. In the meantime, though, he continued to teach according to the manuals and according to the example of his teachers.

\textit{Confronting modernists from afar}

Grandmaison distinguished himself quickly as an apologist and polemicist by his reviews in \textit{Études} of the works of Adolf Harnack\textsuperscript{160} and Alfred Loisy (1857-1940).\textsuperscript{161} The former was the leading liberal Protestant scholar, while the latter was the most prominent Catholic modernist biblical scholar. The argument between them was over the origins of Christianity and of the Church; the implicit central issue was Christological doctrine. Loisy’s response to Harnack’s attack on traditional Christianity provoked the modernist crisis.\textsuperscript{162}

In his review of Harnack’s \textit{Das Wesen des Christentums}, Grandmaison followed his usual method of proceeding.\textsuperscript{163} The first half of his review summarized the author’s work without

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{158} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 153.
  \item \textsuperscript{159} There are indications of this change in Léonce de Grandmaison, “Qu’est–ce qu’un dogme,” \textit{Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique} 7 (1905): 187-22; Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 154.
  \item \textsuperscript{160} The two works were: Adolf von Harnack, \textit{Das Wesen des Christentums: sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Facultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin gehalten} (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900); translated into French as \textit{L’Essence du Christianisme} (Paris: Fischbacher, 1902) translated into English by Thomas Bailey Saunders as \textit{What is Christianity?} (New York: Harper, 1957); and \textit{Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in ersten drei Jahrhunderten} (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902).
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Alfred Loisy, \textit{L’Évangile et l’Église} (Bellevue: [published by author], 1902).
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Colin, \textit{Audace}, 25.
\end{itemize}
commentary, then the second half critiqued the work. Harnack considered many elements of institutional Catholicism and indeed of Protestantism as superfluous. Ritual, dogma, hierarchy—all these were accretions that obscured the original nature of Christianity. The true Gospel authorized a community of individuals united by charity.\footnote{Harnack, \textit{Christianity}, 275.} He recognized that religion was not merely a private affair, or, at the very least, that Christ did indeed found a community of disciples.\footnote{Harnack, \textit{L’essence du Christianisme}, 162, cited in Colin, \textit{Audace}, 154-5.} The problem with Catholicism for Harnack lay elsewhere, namely in her dogma and hierarchy. These elements did exist in the early Church in legitimate ways. However, after the middle of the third century such elements of regulation and control became exaggerated and oppressive. These obstacles to piety betrayed the intentions of the Church’s founder.

The principal issue for which Grandmaison took Harnack to task was his understanding of the divinity of Christ.\footnote{Léonce de Grandmaison “L’essence du Christianisme,” \textit{Études} 92 (1902): 696-700.} This dogma was the cornerstone of the Catholic Church. Grandmaison later criticized Harnack for his treatment of traditional Christological doctrine. “One ends up with a precarious, an elusive transcendence! He makes Christ into a personality \textit{sui generis}, neither God, nor simply human. Harnack attempts compromises that closely resemble the heretics of the ancient Arian persuasion.”\footnote{“On conclut à une transcendance précaire, insaisissable! On fait du Christ une personnalité \textit{sui generis}, ni Dieu, ni simplement homme. On essaie des compromis qui rapprochent beaucoup leurs auteurs de l’arianisme ancien.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 191.)} Hence, his sentimental philosophy of religion logically concluded with a rationalist position.
In 1902, Grandmaison reviewed Loisy’s *L’Évangile et L’Église.*\(^{168}\) This review may have been the first time that the expression “the religion of Jesus”\(^{169}\) appeared in his writings. The phrase was actually used by Loisy to describe Christianity.\(^{170}\) Loisy, on the one hand, defended the Catholic faith by focusing on the divine origin of the Catholic Church. “Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom, it was the Church that came.”\(^{171}\) Primitive Christianity was neither an interior and individualistic movement, nor did it exclude the development of dogma.\(^{172}\) In Loisy’s eyes, Harnack widened the gap between the Church and Christ and thereby diminished her status as well. Harnack also diminished Christ who established the Church.\(^{173}\)

Grandmaison did not disagree so much with Loisy’s distinction between Christ and the Church as with his division of the Christ known through history from the Christ known through dogma.\(^{174}\) Later, in his *Autour d’un petit livre,* Loisy wrote: “The historical Christ, in the humility of his ‘service,’ is great enough to justify Christology, and Christology does not need to be taught expressly by Jesus to be true.”\(^{175}\) Grandmaison affirmed Loisy’s first claim—Jesus has no need of any thing or of any person.”\(^{176}\) But he denied the second. The Church needed teaching—and much more—from

---


169 Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 147, 149.


176 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ,* 1, 364; *Jesus Christ,* 2, 63.
Christ. Moreover, Loisy underestimated the value of the authoritative status of Scripture by attributing too many of the words of Christ solely to the religious experience of the first generation of Christians.\textsuperscript{177}

Church historian and Dominican priest Guy Bedouelle commended Grandmaison’s review of Loisy’s \textit{L’Évangile et l’Église} over those of his contemporaries. First, the \textit{Études} article lacked a polemical tone. Secondly, Grandmaison proved himself to be the most exegetically astute of Loisy’s critics.\textsuperscript{178} Third, and most originally, he pointed out that there were Synoptic gospel passages (Mt. 11:27 and its parallel Lk. 10-21-2) that supported the claim that Jesus thought himself divine and said so. Loisy dismissed the texts as glosses of the evangelists rather than accepting them as words of Christ—despite the fact that there were Old Testament texts such as Ecclesiastes 51: 1-30 that resembled Christ’s words in the Synoptic passages cited above. Grandmaison made ample use of this same strategy in his later major Christological works: he began with the facts as attested to by the scriptural record.\textsuperscript{179}

More generally, some of Loisy’s claims were ambiguous about or even contradicted traditional doctrine about the person of Christ.\textsuperscript{180} “It is true that M. Loisy does not present his hypothesis as certain, but when he has told us that ‘Jesus did not pronounce any dogmatic formula…about himself,’ he in fact endorses gospel texts that identify Christ as the wisdom of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{177}{Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 162-3.}
\footnotetext{178}{Guy Bedouelle, “La Contestation du divinité du Christ par Loisy, selon la critique antimoderniste en 1903 et 1904,” \textit{Anuario de la historia de la Iglesia} 13 (2004), 240.}
\footnotetext{179}{Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 162.}
\footnotetext{180}{E.g., “n’y a-t-il pas aussi quelque ambiguïté à représenter les mystères chrétiens comme opposés à une ‘logique,’ même ‘abstraite,’ et ‘comme si des affirmations qui semblent contradictoires devaient être tenues pour compatibles à la limite de l’infini?’ La formule est sans doute susceptible d’être interprétée correctement, et M. Loisy sait qu’il y a des signes pour discerner, avant de les projeter à l’infini, les antimonies qu’on ne peut démontrer réelles, de celles où la contradiction est manifeste. On regrettera seulement sa discrétion.” (Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 162.)}
\end{footnotes}
God.”

Loisy’s Jesus was ultimately the Christ neither of theology nor of history. At the root of Loisy’s errors were terminology and philosophical ideas that skirted Hegelian error.

The theory that subordinates all revelation to this law of the necessary progress of the idea, at the very least renders improbable, if not impossible, the manifestation made by Christ himself of his divinity… no consideration comes to mind that could justify silence on this point of opportuneness. Was Jesus Christ God without knowing it, or without having manifested it? A vital question, and which it seems no Catholic theologian should avoid answering precisely.

The material claims about Christ’s divinity and his human consciousness of it were central concerns of Grandmaison’s Christology.

Loisy received the review quite favorably. All other reviewers of his work nauseated Loisy. But he found Grandmaison to be a person with whom he would have liked to have had a conversation. (This approval did not preclude Loisy from taking issue with him for some of his criticisms.) Abbé Joseph Bricout, editor of Revue du Clergé français, and modernist, said of an article Grandmaison had written on Loisy’s “little book”: “This judgment, the most moderate of all those that we have read in French periodicals, seems to us the fairest of all.” Blondel and his


183 “La théorie qui subordonne toute révélation à cette loi du progresse nécessaire de l’idée, ne va à rien moins qu’à rendre improbable, sinon impossible, la manifestation faite par Jésus-Christ lui-même de sa divinité… aucune considération d’opportunité ne saurait justifier le silence sur ce point. Jésus-Christ, fut-il Dieu, sans le savoir, ou avoir manifesté qu’il était? Question capitale, et qu’il semble qu’un théologien catholique ne devrait pas soulever sans y répondre nettement.” (Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 288.)


185 Loisy, Mémoires, 1, 198-9.

collaborator Abbé Joannès Wehrlé (1865-1938) concurred with this judgment about the review. Grandmaison was so even-handed that the Jesuit provincial of Champagne confided to another superior that many had criticized him for his “courtesy and excessive long-suffering toward M. Loisy” to the point that he should no longer be considered as a candidate for the editorship of *Recherches de science religieuse*. On the staff of *Études*, fellow Jesuit Père Albert Condamin was taken aback that the journal did not criticize Loisy’s *Autour un petit livre* much sooner than it did.

It was not so clear to Grandmaison at the time of Alfred Loisy’s *L’Évangile et L’Église* that Loisy’s position was heterodox; nor was Grandmaison certain where Loisy was headed, no matter how objectionable his first claims and method were: “The case of M. Loisy is quite complex. I believe that one must, in order to appreciate him correctly, keep in mind the circumstances of the time, which were so unfavorable to young Catholic scholars, above all, in the area of the Scriptures. They found encouragement, but little real direction.” In reading the works of modernists such as Loisy, he showed compassion for the struggle that they were undergoing. Desiring Loisy’s return to Church, it pained Grandmaison to think that he could not be of more help to him.


188 Wehrlé wrote to Blondel quite approvingly of Grandmaison’s review, finding it “biennelle, équitable et suffisamment judicieuse.” (Joannès Wehrlé, letter to Maurice Blondel, February 14, 1903, *Correspondance*, 151.) Blondel approved of Grandmaison’s review: “L'article des *Études* m'a fait la même impression qu'à vous. Cela ne va pas jusqu'aux profondes causes, mais c'est censé et modéré.” (Maurice Blondel, letter to Joannès Wehrlé, February 16, 1903, *Correspondance*, 153.)


190 Condamin letter to Portalié, November 25, 1903, AFSJ Fond Portalié, P1 3/2a, Laplanche, *Crise*, 57n4.

Grandmaison often struggled between the need to be vigilant against the harm done by heresy and his love for souls with whom he was obliged to disagree forthrightly.

Grandmaison had a heartfelt pity for those who left the Church; but above all, he was solicitous for those who remained faithful and whom the apologist had to defend. And through that, this large human sympathy that could have endangered his constancy, became its support.193

His attachment to Christ helped him to guard against indulging pity to the loss of the errant as well as the faithful soul. In Lebreton’s estimation, Grandmaison was sincere, loyal, simply human and at the same time profoundly religious; any adversary worthy of being heard found an audience; every objection made in good faith was discussed; the apologist, indulging human errors, was merciless only toward disloyalty. Attached with all his soul to the Christian faith, taken by all that is beautiful and noble in man, he suffered as a Christian and as a man from the baseness of certain attacks... no one could bring to the discussion of these great problems a more severe loyalty, a livelier sentiment for the needs of souls, a more penetrating intuition of the divine mystery and its proofs. Thus considered, apologetics was no longer the arguing of a case, but a witness.194

As an intellectual, Grandmaison was a witness, a person of faith who worked within the Christian tradition. Moreover, his Catholicism made him truly catholic, open to the truth wherever he found it.

While Grandmaison recognized that the Church of his day could attain a more precise grasp of teaching than hitherto possible, he was also dismayed by the atmosphere in which critical

---

192 Léonce de Grandmaison, letter to abbé Louis Venard, November 18, 1903, in Blondel-Wehrlé, *Correspondance*, 1, 153-4n54.

193 “Grandmaison avait pour ceux qui quittaient l’Église une pitié émue; mais avant tout, il avait souci de ceux qui restent fidèles et que l’apologiste devait défendre. Et par là, cette large sympathie humaine qui eut pu menacer sa constance, en devenait le soutien.” (Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 150.)

194 “sincère, loyale, simplement humaine et en même temps profondément religieuse; tout religieuse; tout adverse, digne d’être entendu, trouvait audience; tout objection de bonne foi était discuté; l’apologiste, indulgent aux erreurs humaines, n’était impitoyable qu’à la déloyauté. Attaché par toute son âme à sa foi chrétienne, épris de tout ce qu’il y a dans de beau et de noble, il souffrait comme chrétienne et comme homme de la bassesse de certaines attaques;... nul ne pouvait apporter à la discussion de ces grands problèmes, une loyauté plus sévère, un sentiment plus vif du besoin des âmes, une intuition plus pénétrante du mystère divin et des preuves. Ainsi traitée, l’apologétique n’était plus un plaidoyer, mais un témoignage.” (Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 150-1.)
scholarship was often conducted. While teaching at Jersey, he sensed from afar the disquiet among French Catholic thinkers: when the new critical scholarship was taken up in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there first came a fevered excitement, or even intoxication, and then a subsequent disquiet. As early as 1902-1903, during his time as professor of fundamental theology in England, he saw that the imbalance between critical and dogmatic thought was becoming more pronounced. In a letter to Jesuit Père Jean Vincent Bainvel, progressiste professor at the Institut Catholique in Paris, Grandmaison wrote: “It is an incontestable fact that studies of positive theology excite a lot of interest in our time and provoke numerous works: there would be nothing abnormal or disquieting about it if this interest was not too often exclusive and the studies insufficiently prepared.” In principle, he was in favor of all these critical studies. However, the manner in which they were generally practiced left much to be desired: “Unfortunately, it is equally certain that among many minds, the mistrust of scholastic theology goes hand in hand with esteem for the positive and that a profound ignorance of dogmatic positions allies itself with a very rich historical science.” This was especially true in the field of religious ethnology. Genuine theological understanding, for Grandmaison, always involved the practice of the discernment of spirits. But there was little discernment in the use of critical methods.


196 “C’est un fait incontestable que les études de théologie positive excitent de nos jours beaucoup d’intérêt et provoquent de nombreux travaux; il n’y a aurait rien d’anormal, ni d’inquiétant, si cet intérêt n’était trop souvent exclusif et ces études insuffisamment préparés.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, letter to Jean Vincent Bainvel, in Lecler, “Cinquantenaire,” 9.)

197 “Malheureusement il est également certain que chez beaucoup d’esprits, le mépris de la théologie scholastique va de pair avec l’estime de la positive et qu’une profonde ignorance des positions dogmatiques s’allie à une science historique très riche.” (Grandmaison, letter to Bainvel, in Lecler, “Cinquantenaire,” 9.)
Grandmaison was an especially calm, sure voice in the midst of the modernist crisis in France to which both orthodox and modernist could refer for a judicious assessment. This finely balanced attitude, so difficult and so costly to attain in reality, was in his estimation an important characteristic of St. Thomas Aquinas’ apologetics. “One must raise oneself to the spirit beyond the letter of St. Thomas; a spirit that was the most open ever, the most tranquil, the aptest to discern, take, and assimilate the good wherever he found it.”\(^{198}\) In a lecture series given to theologians and students at the École normale supérieure de Sevrès in 1905, he asked how best to prepare for the “positive work of doctrinal reconstruction”: “Not, to be sure, that it would be necessary to write off as non-existent, not just Descartes and Leibniz, Kant, Hegel and Bergson, but also Scotus and Suarez, Pascal and Newman. That’s not the thinking of the ecclesiastical magisterium; all that is true is Catholic.”\(^{199}\) For Grandmaison, not all modernist theologians were cut from the same cloth. His disagreements with liberal Protestant scholars such as Harnack\(^ {200}\) or modernists such as Loisy did not make him ignore their questions or reject all their critical findings. As Jean Daniélou wrote:

“Very open to the problems of religious psychology and biblical criticism, he knew how to find a *via media* which retained the best of the research of a George Tyrrell, of an Alfred Loisy, of an Édouard Le Roy, while rejecting their errors.”\(^ {201}\) Grandmaison continued his engagement with modernists, listening patiently to their arguments, refuting their errors with generosity of spirit, and trying to

---

198 “À travers la lettre de saint Thomas, c’est jusqu’à son esprit qu’il faut se hausser; esprit le plus ouvert qui fut jamais, le plus tranquille, le plus apte à discerner, à prendre, à s’assimiler son bien partout où il le trouvait.” (Grandmaison, “Pensée hors de l’Église,” [1913], 106.)

199 “Non, bien entendu, qu’il faille biffer comme non-existants, je ne dis pas Descartes et Leibniz, Kant, Hegel et Bergson, mais encore Scot et Suarez, Pascal et Newman. Telle n’est pas la pensée du magistère ecclésiastique: tout ce qui est véritable est catholique.” (Grandmaison, “Pensée hors de l’Église,” [1913], 106.)


201 “Très ouvert aux problèmes de psychologie religieuse et aux questions de critique biblique, il sut trouver une *via media* qui retenait le meilleur de la recherche d’un George Tyrrell, d’un Alfred Loisy, d’un Édouard Le Roy, tout en rejetant leurs erreurs.” (Jean Daniélou, “Grandmaison,” 770.)
rescue the grain of truth from what he considered to be the most objectionable of their writings. Moreover, he was not afraid to acknowledge whenever he was in the wrong.

Grandmaison’s uneasiness with Loisy grew further when he reviewed the latter’s monograph on the gospel of John in 1904. Grandmaison complimented Loisy for his gifts as an exegete. Moreover, he recognized that it was within the pale of orthodoxy to think that the gospel according to John was not entirely stenographic in recording the words of Christ; even though the gospel was certainly based on fact, it also included allegorical commentary. But Loisy used these conclusions to take the unjustifiable leap of saying that the gospel was mostly a work of the early Church and not of the apostle. Grandmaison began to question Loisy’s sincerity as a Catholic theologian. Soon afterward, Loisy’s works were put on the Index by the Holy See on December 16, 1903.

This article, or Bulletin, was Grandmaison’s first contribution to the Revue biblique, founded by the Dominican Marie-Joseph Lagrange. Similar Bulletins were published mostly in Études and...

---


203 Blondel considered Grandmaison a holy religious and a gentleman of singular probity. Blondel once made an appeal to Grandmaison to correct mistaken representations made by Jesuits writing for Études (Pères Joseph Tonquedoc and Marcel Chossat) of certain of Blondel’s views: “J’avais envoyé au P. de G. mes Explications nécessaires, qui ont suffi à éclairer sa bonne foi. L’aveu qu’il m’en donne en sa lettre m’est particulièrement précieux, venant d’une telle conscience de saint religieux et de galant homme. Au cours de longues controverses, je n’ai eu qu’une ou deux fois une rencontre semblable de courageuse sincérité dans le désaveu d’une erreur reconnue.” (Maurice Blondel, letter to Auguste Valensin, September, 1924, Correspondance, III, 111.)

204 Alfred Loisy, Le Quatrième Évangile (Paris: Picard, 1903).


207 Grandmaison, “Recensions,” 443.

208 Grandmaison, “Recensions,” 434.

209 Colin, Audace, 152.

RSR and covered several works that pursued common themes.\textsuperscript{211} These Bulletins exposed him and his readership to a wide range of issues and works. These articles were so successful that as of 1923 they became regular annual features of RSR, organized under such topics as religious philosophy, the history of religions, the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments, the early Church, and patristic theology.\textsuperscript{212}

Édouard Le Roy raised the more limited question of the epistemological status of dogma in an article entitled “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme?”\textsuperscript{213} He asked: How could one justify the certitude of dogma in a society dominated by anti-dogmatic philosophical attitudes?\textsuperscript{214} Grandmaison responded to the uproar caused by Le Roy in an article of his own, also entitled “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme?”\textsuperscript{215} His main thesis was that there was no real opposition between the credibility of dogma and modern thought.\textsuperscript{216} Dogma’s comprehensibility and credibility were confirmed when seen in the light of its relationship, respectively, to history, the human spirit, and action. He emphasized the link between the certitude of dogma and the possibility of faith itself.\textsuperscript{217} In doing so, Grandmaison sounded a

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{211} 

\item\textsuperscript{212} “À nos lecteurs,” RSR 13 (1923): 1-2.

\item\textsuperscript{213} Édouard Le Roy, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” \textit{Quinzaine} 5 (1905): 495-527.

\item\textsuperscript{214} Le Roy, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 496, 505.


\item\textsuperscript{216} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 187.

\item\textsuperscript{217} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 202.
\end{footnotes}
theme dear to John Henry Newman in his *Grammar of Assent*: one was obliged to accept a convergence of probabilities as a sufficient motive of faith’s credibility.\textsuperscript{218}

The specific dogma that he cited was that God was personal. To assert that contemporary common sense epistemology would make such a dogma unknowable or incomprehensible would be tantamount to espousing agnosticism.\textsuperscript{219} Moreover, an improper notion of the divine immanence compromised the credibility of this important truth.\textsuperscript{220} Errors about the content of doctrine or about the act of faith that prevented the acceptance of dogma humiliated both spirit and intellect\textsuperscript{221}; this could be seen from a spiritual or a psychological point of view.\textsuperscript{222} In the end, Le Roy’s way of treating the relationship between dogma and action could be tantamount\textsuperscript{223} to a kind of “doctrinal utilitarianism” that endangered the basic truths of faith.\textsuperscript{224}

It is difficult to overestimate the influence on Grandmaison of Newman, whom he ranked with Johann Adam Möhler of the Tübingen School\textsuperscript{225} as one of the two great Catholic theologians of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{226} Like Pascal, Newman “spoke magnificently of Jesus Christ.”\textsuperscript{227}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[218]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 209.}
\footnotetext[219]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 197.}
\footnotetext[220]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 202.}
\footnotetext[221]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 204.}
\footnotetext[222]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 205.}
\footnotetext[223]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 218.}
\footnotetext[224]{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 220.}
\footnotetext[226]{Grandmaison, “Möhler,” 389.}
\footnotetext[227]{Grandmaison, “Newman,” *Études* 110 (1907), 68.}
\end{footnotes}
Grandmaison devoted a two-part article to Newman in 1906-1907.\textsuperscript{228} The first part focused on Newman as initiator or apologist, while the second part focused on him as formator. Newman was the “master psychologist” of religion.\textsuperscript{229} (Grandmaison began to write on religious psychology in 1900.\textsuperscript{230}) Like Pascal, Newman was a great inspiration to orthodox and modernist Catholics alike. They were “two men in whom unquestionable genius has been united with a marked spiritual insight.”\textsuperscript{231} But their influence was sometimes troublesome.\textsuperscript{232} Grandmaison was alert to the misuse that could be made of the writings of these thinkers, whom modernists too looked upon as heroes. So part of his aim in writing the article about Newman was to refute claims that his work contained proto-modernist tendencies.\textsuperscript{233}

Newman and Pascal helped to shape what Grandmaison understood as personal religion. Newman set great store by the commonly used word “personal”. He wrote: “though it cannot mean precisely the same when used of God as when it is used of man, yet it is sufficiently explained by that common use, to allow of its being intelligibly applied to the Divine Nature.”\textsuperscript{234} Newman’s more

\begin{footnotes}
\item[230] Léonce de Grandmaison, “La psychologie des religions,” Études 84 (1900), 594-616.
\item[233] See also Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 978-80.
\end{footnotes}
specific use of the term reflected an important distinction that he often made between real and notional assent.\textsuperscript{235} Notions “tend to be mere assertions without any personal hold on them on the part of those who make them.”\textsuperscript{236} Real assent, on the other hand, worked powerfully on the emotions and stirred the one who assented to action.\textsuperscript{237} Notional assent was merely intellectual. Real assent, however, roused the imagination and the affections as well as the intellect. Being unconditional, it conditioned all other judgments, and involved an existential commitment on the part of the believer. The personal had to do with the real.

Like Newman, Grandmaison acknowledged the importance of personal influence. He remarked that modernists such as Loisy, in addition to holding erroneous ideas, were unable to provide the charisma that made convincing religious guides or penetrating theologians.\textsuperscript{238}

An essential element of individual personal religion and of Catholicism for Grandmaison was what Newman called the dogmatic principle.\textsuperscript{239} Many of Newman’s writings were dedicated to defending the Catholic faith against the liberal, or anti-dogmatic, bent of modern thought, which denied the worth of unconditional adherence to the fundamental propositions of faith.\textsuperscript{240}

Confronting the questions of his time, Grandmaison too insisted on the need for and validity of


\textsuperscript{236} Newman, Grammar of Assent, 40.

\textsuperscript{237} Newman, Grammar of Assent, 86-7.

\textsuperscript{238} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 281n1.


\textsuperscript{240} Newman, Apologia, 48.
dogma. It was a safeguard of the foundational, concrete facts of faith. The modernist crisis was for him not fundamentally an intellectual crisis, but a crisis of faith. Only the truth could found faith. For Grandmaison as for Newman, faith and theology proceeded not from a theory or concept, but from a fact: the Incarnation. The objectivity of this fact was essential to ground the proper subjectivity of the Church and of the believer. Otherwise, personal worship of a personal God would be impossible.

Newman’s *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* made a capital point: the “doctrinal evolution that results in Catholic Christianity as we know it today carries within itself all the signs of a legitimate development, and no signs of corruption.” The *Essay* made the point in large part by effectively refuted a Hegelian understanding of the development of doctrine:

The original value of the *Essay* seems to me above all to consist in the choice and the determination of the notes which will permit one to defeat the Hegelian conception, by distinguishing authentic, legitimate doctrinal development from the merely historical development which is unfaithful to the first Idea of the Master and to his certain intentions.

---


242 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 84, 151.


246 “La valeur originale de l’*Essay* me semble surtout consister dans le choix et la détermination des notes qui permettront de faire échec à la conception hégélienne, en distinguant le développement doctrinal légitime, authentique, d’évolution seulement historique infidèle à l’Idée première du Maître et à ces intentions certaines.” (Grandmaison, “Newman,” *Études* 109 [1906], 747.)
The method itself was not new: Bellarmine and other theologians of the late sixteenth century had tried to ascertain the notes of the true Church. But Newman’s solution was so “particular” that it constituted a new solution.

However, Grandmaison faulted Newman in one important respect. Although he was the master psychologist of faith, he had deficiencies as an “initiator.”247 (This term was roughly equivalent to that of apologist.) This judgment fell on Newman because, in Grandmaison’s eyes, he had slighted a traditional mainstay of Catholic apologetics, the appeal to reason.248 In The Grammar of Assent, Newman acknowledged that there were arguments for the existence of God that were more intellectual (involving notional assent) than moral (and hence, involving real assent).249 But intellectual appeals as such did not interest him: the argument from conscience was the most persuasive and in the end the only approach that seemed to matter to him. According to Grandmaison, such a position failed to acknowledge the value of reason, albeit under grace, in attaining to some knowledge of God. Much harm had been caused by downplaying scholastic theology. It was an urgent task of modern apologetics to defend the value of the human ability to know and to understand reality.250

St. Thomas Aquinas was the more dependable speculative thinker as “the Master, the intellectual initiator, the incomparable formator.”251 Grandmaison’s two articles devoted to him— “Sur l’apologétique de S. Thomas,”252 published in 1907-1908, and “Saint Thomas apologiste et

251 Léonce de Grandmaison, unpublished mémoire, 1899, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 94.
constructeur,” published in 1921—showed how he supplied Newman’s deficiencies. Grandmaison expressed his admiration for Thomas as early as 1898, when he called him the master of the Scholastics. This attitude was made manifest in an anecdote reported by Columba Cary-Elwes, monk of Ampleforth, to his friend Arnold J. Toynbee. Cary-Elwes had a Jesuit uncle who had studied with Grandmaison in the scholasticate at Ore Place:

I told my S.J. uncle I was reading Léonce de Grandmaison’s book *Jesus Christ* vol. ii and it turned out they had been great friends. In fact the four inseparables in their student days were de la Taille, Grandmaison, and Lebreton [and his Jesuit uncle]. He has a great opinion of the sanctity of Grandmaison. Even then, he said, Grandmaison seemed to have read every book on his subject, Catholic and otherwise….They, all four, talked metaphysics all day and were ardent Thomists (please note) of the Dominican persuasion, leaving Suarez high and dry. When the exams came round there was a great set to on the subject, but they held their own—and were not cast out of the Society! All this is partly just gossip, partly to persuade you one day to read vol. ii of Grandmaison’s good book.

This story shows, among other things, his constant dedication to writing a work on Christ as well as his devotion to the renewed study of St. Thomas. The Jesuits had traditionally considered Francisco Suarez to be the true interpreter of Thomas. Taking Pope Leo XIII’s *Aeterni Patris* to heart, however, Grandmaison and his companions bucked the order’s tradition by their adoption of a Dominican interpretation of Thomas.

---


256 Francisco Suarez (1548–1617) was an eminent Spanish Jesuit theologian and metaphysician who attempted to synthesize the doctrines of St. Thomas with those of Bl. Duns Scotus and certain positions of nominalism.

Thomas was the consummate apologist. He represented not only sound doctrine and a sure way of discovery and argumentation, but also the ideal temperament of the apologist. Three qualities of his thought were its coherence, moderation, and balance. The secret of his apologetics was his ability to recognize the truth in his adversaries’ positions, Christian or not. About the difficulties that Thomas’ faced in his time, Grandmaison wrote:

One could suspected, even proscribe, Aristotelianism; but one could not stem the passionate taste of scholars, even less that the yet unknown works of that immense treasure came into circulation by way of translations and new commentaries. The peripatetic dialectic thus became—a little like the critical method today—the seal that alone stamped one’s work as a work of genuine science.

Thomas submitted to the temper of his times and mastered dialectics. For Thomas and Grandmaison, a good apologetic was a stimulant to good dogmatic.

Thomas was an even greater speculative theologian. One found in his writings the “firmness that reconciles life and its reflection.” Part of his greatness lay in his being able to discern what was of value in the intellectual synthesis that he inherited from Aristotle. Moreover, Thomas was fearless in trying to reconcile opposites in tension with one another, especially the


261 “On avait pu suspecter, voire proscrire, l’aristotélisme; l’on n’avait pas pu en détourner le goût passionné des gens d’études, et d’autant moins que des pièces encore inconnues de cet immense trésor entraient sans cesse en circulation par l’intermédiaire de traductions et de gloses nouvelles. La dialectique peripatétique était ainsi devenue—un peu comme la méthode critique aujourd’hui—le cachet qui donnait seul droit de cité aux œuvres de science.” (Grandmaison, “Saint Thomas apologiste,” 64.)

262 Grandmaison, “Saint Thomas apologiste,” 64.

263 Léonce de Grandmaison, unpublished memoire, Lebreton, Grandmaison, 93.

264 Grandmaison, “Saint Thomas apologiste,” 64.
tensions between theology and philosophy. Grandmaison emulated this reconciliation of opposites in his own writings. The misapplication of Aristotelian philosophy to theology had threatened to hold faith captive to the disordered demands of discursive reason. Thomas’ success was due in part to the scholastic approach, which employed methodical study and followed data furnished by the councils, which were in turn founded on Scripture.

Instructed by Thomas’ example, Grandmaison was not threatened by his adversaries. On the one hand, he was aware of the danger that had been done in the immediate past in France by intellectual dilettantism in trying to correct the insufficiencies in philosophy and theology. However zealous, even the best Catholic apologists of the recent past had been overwhelmed, ill-formed, or superficially brilliant; they had not been possessed of “a confident philosophy of religion, of a theology steeped in the sources of faith, of an acquaintance with history through long and methodical effort.” “Talent might suffice for the innovator to make for himself a group of disciples and to trace original derivations through the floodwaters of freethinking; it does not suffice for the one who has to rally minds to an established doctrine, to defend a religion of authority, to clear or enlarge the bed of the great river of tradition.” On the other hand, Grandmaison recognized the benefits of the rationalist attacks and saw the value and the necessity of positive

---

269 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 966.
270 “Le talent peut suffire au novateur pour se faire un groupe de disciples et tracer, à travers les alluvions de la libre-pensée, des dérivations originales: il ne suffit pas à qui doit rallier les esprits à une doctrine établie, défendre une religion d’autorité, déblayer ou élargir le lit du grand fleuve traditionnel.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 966-7.)
theological sciences. Both Thomas and Grandmaison could turn the arguments of their opponents against them to good effect. But each also avoided a narrowly partisan attitude that sought only to destroy the positions of their opponents, in part so as to win their goodwill.

Grandmaison lamented: “Metaphysics, in official courses, in programs of study, in the choice of the theses of doctorates, is ceding territory more and more to experimental psychology, to social applications of morality, and above all to the history of schools and of systems.” What Catholicism in Europe needed most was the free, loyal, and creative work of theological synthesis, not only historical studies or analysis. The first constructive or synthetic task of theology was to arrive at an account of what Newman called “reasoning upon reasoning.” This task included arriving at a rigorous understanding of the act of faith in dogma. Modern philosophies fell short of providing a synthesis on this point that was truly Christian. They failed to do justice to the working and value of knowledge. Error on this point spilled over into other areas. That was why the syntheses of modern philosophy, “containing considerable parts of accurate observations—positivism for example—were incompatible with a Catholic view of the world.” The serene complacency of metaphysicians within the Church had also failed to rise to the occasion. A retrieval

271 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1401.
272 “La métaphysique, dans les cours officiels, dans les programmes d’études, dans le choix des thèses de doctorat, cède de plus en plus la place à la psychologie expérimentale, aux applications social de la morale, surtout à l’histoire des écoles et des systèmes.” (Grandmaison, “Théologiens scolastiques,” 30.)
273 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 50-2, 94.
of Thomas’ thought such as that advocated by Leo’s *Aeterni Patris* would help redress the balance between positive and speculative theology, and prepare the way for genuine progress in both.277

Moreover, Thomas defended the value of human reason, or what was critically called by some “intellectualism.”278 Like Kant, he recognized the limits and errors of reason; he also submitted the intellect to the judgment of a higher light. But Thomas did not consider man, as Luther did, a phantom at the mercy of the extremes of the devil and all-powerful grace.279 Luther’s anthropological position had led to the bifurcation of reason and faith. Shorn of the Catholic respect for the human intellect, one was left with the individualism, anti-intellectualism, and sentimental religion that Grandmaison insisted were at the root of modernism. Thomas, on the other hand, gave the correct, nuanced, and positive view of the human intellect of which modernism had lost sight:

The intellectualism of saint Thomas is resolutely ‘gnostic’: without erecting our intellect as the unique source of knowledge, without misunderstanding the power of intuitive, affective faculties, or their effect on our reasoning, without bringing back all certitude to formal and abstract types, he vindicated for man the power of knowing surely that God exists, a good and infinite God, ‘living and seeing.’ 280

Thomas’ intellectualism preserved the truth that the human person was capable of knowing God.

Another important common cause that Grandmaison held with Thomas was the defense against the Averroists of the doctrine of the uniqueness and value of every human person.281 They had maintained that the human mind—taken as a collective—was the only rational soul, while the


280 “L’intellectualisme de saint Thomas est résolument ‘gnostique’: sans ériger notre intelligence en source unique du savoir, sans méconnaître la puissance des facultés intuitives, affectives, ou leur réaction sur nos connaissances, sans ramener toute certitude aux types formels et abstraits, il revendique pour l’homme le pouvoir de connaître sûrement que Dieu existe, un Dieu infini et bon, ‘vivant et voyant.’” (Grandmaison, “Pensée hors de l’Église,” [1913], 107.)

individual human soul was merely “sensible, corruptible, and mortal.” Thomas’ intellectualism safeguarded the doctrine of the human desire for the truth while upholding the worth of the human person in his material individuality.

Roman interventions of 1907

On July 3, 1907, the Congregation of the Holy Office issued the anti-modernist syllabus of errors entitled Lamentabili sane exitu; on September 9, Pope St. Pius X issued the anti-modernist encyclical Pascendi dominici gregis. Grandmaison had anticipated the main lines of the encyclical’s judgments in the many articles he had written since his “Théologiens scolastiques.”

According to biographical writings by Huby to which Laplanche alludes, the promulgation of the Roman documents precipitated a crisis among the scholastics at Ore Place. But Grandmaison was successful in keeping the scholastics there faithful to the Church during the tumult.

To the very end of his life, Grandmaison neither ceased to praise Pope Pius X nor questioned the necessity of his taking action. He wrote two articles on Pius; the first appeared in 1907, and the second, after Pius’ death in 1914. The first article spoke of the necessity of Pascendi. “the grandeur of Pius X—and all those not blinded by party-spirit know it—consists above all in that he saw, that he demanded, and that he obtained the sacrifice that had to be made.”


285 AFSJ, Fonds Huby, carton 1, in Laplanche, Crise, 58.


288 “le grandeur de Pie X—et tous ceux que n’aveugle pas l’espirit de parti l’ont connu—consiste surtout en ceci qu’il a vu, qu’il a demandé, qu’il a obtenu le sacrifice a faire.” (Grandmaison, “Pie X, Pape,” 298.)
1914 article, Grandmaison wrote: “Extremely intelligent, whatever imbecile legend says about it, but in no way ‘intellectual,’ engaged for a long time with realities, people, and works, not with books or scientific currents, the patriarch of Venice seized with a strong and almost rough hand, the running of the ship that is the Church.” 289 The modernist challenge was a trial worse than persecution. 290 It was spontaneous anarchy. 291

At one end of the spectrum were Catholics who renounced purposely their traditional faith for a more liberal one. At the other end were Catholics of good faith who did not realize the dangers into which they were straying. Often it was hard to tell the difference between the two tendencies. It was characteristic of Grandmaison’s pastoral and intellectual acumen that he did not issue blanket condemnations of those who fell into modernist error. He was particularly sympathetic to the suffering of young French Catholics who were in a sense misled by the modernists. 292 Moreover, he was quick to excuse the errant on account of poor formation or intellectual inexperience. He understood well the backward state of Catholic philosophy at that time. 293 Such a condition made it difficult to discern the wheat from the chaff of critical methods of scholarship. 294

Grandmaison recognized that there had been many flaws in the anti-modernist campaign—extreme measures, self-important ecclesiastical bureaucrats throwing their weight around, mistaken

289 “Fort intelligent, quoi qu’en ait dit une imbécile légende, mais nullement ‘intellectuel,’ occupé depuis longtemps des réalités, hommes et œuvres, non des livres ou des courants scientifiques, le patriarche de Venise saisit d’une main ferme, et presque rude [present author’s emphasis], le gouvernail du vaisseau de l’Église.” (Grandmaison, “Pie X et son oeuvre,” 434.)

290 Grandmaison, “Pie X, Pape,” 299.


293 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 984.

accusations, an exaggerated siege mentality; but they were negligible in comparison with the immense service that Pius had performed—one that benefited millions. Grandmaison excused somewhat the errors made by overzealous anti-modernists. Not every foot soldier acted from the purest of motives: “What just cause does not have its lost children?”295 At the very least, blaming Pius X for all such faults would have been unjust and would have showed a lack of filial submission.

In the aftermath of the encyclical, many of the Catholic theologians that dealt with modernism wrote in the abstract; the few that understood the problems legitimately posed by modernism responded simplistically.296 “Among the laudable exceptions in France were the articles of the Jesuits Lebreton and de Grandmaison, as well as the Lettres sur les études ecclésiastiques by Eudoxe Irénée Mignot, Bishop of Albi, in which he tried to prove to what extent the condemnation of modernism justified new scholarly articles.”297 François Laplanche had this to say about Grandmaison’s reaction to the content of the Roman anti-modernist interventions:

The most balanced explanations of the pontifical act can be read in a letter of Grandmaison addressed December 10, 1907 to his confrère Victor Poucel. He admits the uncustomary harshness of the antimodernist documents emanating from Rome. But he legitimates them as an indispensable surgical procedure. Now it was necessary to reassure, appease in holding language such as the following:

‘There is still something to be done; science is not condemned; the good methods are not proscribed; use is not abuse. It was impossible not to make it known precisely, to stem the evil of naturalism without striking a blow that rings loud and clear to those who want to hear it. That which the Holy Father wanted to produce was the meeting of minds by means of an unambiguous document. Once done, it is now necessary to take up the march forward, certain now of being safe.”298


297 Hubert Jedin and John Dolan, eds., The Church in the Industrial Age, vol. 9, 463.

298 “Les explications les plus balancés sur l’acte pontifical se lisent dans une lettre de Grandmaison adressée le 10 décembre 1907 à son confrère Victor Poucel. Il admet la dureté inhabituelle des documents antimodernistes émanés de Rome. Mais il les légitime comme une indispensable opération de salubrité. Il faut maintenant rassurer, apaiser en tenant un langage tel que celui-ci:
In Grandmaison’s estimation, discipline was precisely what was needed, no matter how painful. His equanimity of spirit arose from his faith: “Only the Church, strengthened by the authority of assisted teaching and of a religious experience of twenty centuries, guards the deposit of faith without discouraging research.” That faith was all the more convincing in that it did not prevent him from acknowledging the real suffering that even orthodox Catholic intellectuals underwent.

Grandmaison asked no more of his adversaries than he asked of himself. There were times, he recognized without any anger, when intellectuals were called to make “sacrifices of the intellect.” He himself practiced habitually the exercise of giving up his views in order to perfect his obedience, in questions that sometimes were outside the proper domain of religious observance, even those that were strictly intellectual. De Lubac later praised him and Lebreton for, among other things, their balanced sense of Christian tradition, concern not to compromise the essential by getting lost in debatable side-issues, and willingness to keep a certain distance from their own cherished ideas.

*The Deposit of Faith and the Development of Doctrine*

---

299 “L’Église seule, forte de l’autorité d’un enseignement assisté et d’une expérience religieuse de vingt siècles, garde le dépôt sacré sans décourager les recherches.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1533.)


302 De Lubac, *Questions disputées*, 111.
From 1898-1901, Loisy—using the pseudonym A. Firmin—had written a series of five articles in the *Revue du Clergé Français* about the development of dogma, revelation, and the Pentateuch. In 1907-1908, Grandmaison responded more fully to the challenges that Loisy, Le Roy, and Tyrrell raised with his article “Le développement du dogme chrétien.”

Of the few theologians trying to find a positive answer to the questions raised by Loisy, Tyrrell, and Le Roy, two merit special attention: Father de Grandmaison, S.J., who in this difficult time, helped with his moderate and reasonable (in the opinion of Blondel and Loisy) articles to lead the confused public through the treacherous cliffs of modernism and integrism, however without totally penetrating the problems.

The four-part article dealt respectively with “Notions Générales,” “Les théories du développement au xixe siècle,” “Les limites du développement,” and “Le développement proprement dit.” Grandmaison critiqued Loisy’s and Tyrrell’s views about the development of doctrine in the second part of the article. Then he presented Blondel’s views as a reasonable, Catholic resolution to the problem. Finally, Grandmaison presented his own ideas on the subject, which are among the most important of his contributions to speculative theology. His criticism of the modernists will be

---


reported in chapter two, while his own views on the development of doctrine will be reported in chapter three.

D. Editor, Apologist, Formator, and Theologian, 1908-1927

Director of Études and Founder of Recherches de Science Religieuse

In 1901, the French Chamber of Deputies passed the Associations Bill, which was meant to guarantee the freedom of association against the intimidation of powerful monarchist coteries.\textsuperscript{312} When the militantly anti-Catholic Émile Combes became premier in 1902, he refused to authorize any religious associations whatsoever. He ordered the closing of thousands of Catholic schools and the exile of religious congregations from France.\textsuperscript{313} Prohibited from teaching at any schools, many Jesuits who might otherwise have been assigned to the work of education were employed at Études.

It was in the midst of this climate that in 1908 Grandmaison began his tenure as editor-in-chief of Études and superior, on and off, of Place Saint-François-Xavier, the House of Writers in Paris, the community of Jesuits connected with Études and later with RSR.\textsuperscript{314} He soon secured a place of preeminence among the Catholic progressistes in the struggle with the modernists. “Thanks to his collaboration at Études (the revue which he directed from 1910 to 1919), he exerted a kind of magisterium for the elite of the Catholic public and did not refrain from descending into the political arena if circumstances demanded it: legislative elections of 1919, debates on the reestablishment of the embassy to the Vatican. Moreover, his sense of the needs of the times gained

\textsuperscript{312} The bill had been championed as early as 1883 by then interior minister Pierre Waldeck-Rousseau to limit the power of wealthy religious associations with monarchist sympathies, for the sake of the stability of the republic. He became prime minister in 1899, and was able to see through this most significant measure of his administration.

\textsuperscript{313} So drastic were the measures that the Holy See broke off diplomatic relations with France. The former premier, Pierre Waldeck-Rousseau, had resigned for reasons of health in 1902. He returned from retirement to protest the harsh measures, which he considered a betrayal of the original intent of the Associations Bill.

\textsuperscript{314} Lebreton, Grandmaison, 183.
him an important correspondence.”

He also imparted his broadminded sensibility to Études through articles written on a wide range of topics, on art (especially literature), culture, history, and politics, partly in order to broaden the scope of the journal and increase its readership. Indeed, over a quarter of the articles that he wrote for Études reviewed either fiction or works having to do with everything from aviation, to the plight of the Acadians in the New World, to the ethics of Olympic sports and of journalism. These articles were often signed “Louis de Brandes.”

This kind of writing gave Grandmaison a break from the constant press of his editorial duties and from the demands of more abstract thought. But the engagement with art, politics, and culture was not only for relaxation. The apologist needed to judiciously use all that was worthy of humanity: “the cause of the faith needs complete men” and no honest talent is irrelevant to its defense. Poetry, rhetoric, literature, and art in general were worthy instruments for an apologist who was judicious in his use of them. Most importantly, Grandmaison’s broad interests also reflected a lively awareness of the presence of God within all of creation. Meditating on the writings

---

315 “Grâce à sa collaboration à l’Études (revue qu’il a dirigé de 1910 à 1919), il exerce une sorte de magistère sur l’élite du public catholique et il ne refuse pas de descendre dans l’arène politique si les circonstances le demandent: élections législatives de 1919, débats sur la rétablissement de l’ambassade au Vatican. Par ailleurs, sa sensibilité aux besoins du temps lui a valu une importante correspondance.” (Laplanche, Crise, 159-60.)


318 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 218.

319 Passage, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 16.

320 Léonce de Grandmaison, draft of a letter to an unknown correspondent, May 2, 1897, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 57.

321 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 53-7, 293.
of St. John of the Cross, for example, he perceived that poetry could be a vehicle of a profound Christian mysticism.\textsuperscript{322}

As director of \textit{Études}, Grandmaison also wrote many homages or tributes about people from various walks of life. This interest of his showed a deliberate concentration on the human person—so threatened by the individualism of the modern world. Grandmaison acknowledged the divine immanence within the human person by devoting much time to consideration of a wide range of human experience both sacred and secular. Many of his subjects were people renowned for using their human genius for Christian witness.\textsuperscript{323} These lives, especially in the case of saints,\textsuperscript{324} were both examples of human excellence and testimonies of the truth regarding Christ.\textsuperscript{325}

There were many projects that Grandmaison had in mind by the time he arrived in Paris. “Grandmaison was present in his era not only through his writings and word, but also set in motion very important initiatives.”\textsuperscript{326} First among them was the founding of a journal that addressed the more specialized, technical issues that liberal Protestantism and Catholic modernism raised in the

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{322} Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 59.
\textsuperscript{323} For a homage to a saint, see Léonce de Grandmaison, “Un homme d’aujourd’hui: Le Père Charles de Foucauld,” \textit{Études} 169 (1921): 408-32. The article was a review of Rene Bazin’s \textit{Charles de Foucauld, explorateur au Maroc, ermite au Sahara} (Paris: Plon, 1921). Grandmaison ended his article with the following testimony: “Dormez à l’ombre de votre ‘croix de mission,’ cher Père de Foucauld. Plus littéralement qu’aucun ami de Dieu, en votre temps, vous avez rempli les conditions de la promesse évangélique. Grain de froment, cloîtré dans votre austérité surhumaine, vous êtes longtemps reste seul, sur cette terre ingrate et bien-aimé. Immolé, ‘enseveli,’ semé désormais, ‘vous porterez beaucoup de fruits.’ Votre exemple suscitera des vocations apostoliques; et nous-mêmes, du fond de notre médiocrité spirituelle, nous soupirerons, en pensant à vous, vers un amour du Christ plus réel, vers un service de Dieu moins partagé.” (Grandmaison, \textit{ibid.}, 432.)
\textsuperscript{324} For a homage to a devout French Catholic who was a politician and social reformer, see Léonce de Grandmaison, “Comte Albert de Mun,” \textit{Études}, 141 (1914): 25-52.
\textsuperscript{325} Larivière, \textit{Apôtre humaniste}, 40-51.
\textsuperscript{326} Laplanche, \textit{Crise}, 167.
\end{flushright}
history of doctrine and in religious history and literature. In 1910, he succeeded in founding *Recherches de science religieuse*. Père Jean Bainvel, professor at the Institut catholique and co-founder of the *Bibliothèque de théologie historique*, had proposed the project to Grandmaison in 1903, shortly after his appointment as professor of fundamental theology. From then on, he showed persistent leadership in a process that took seven years till the publication of the first issue of *RSR* in January, 1910. There were many other clerics, secular and religious, who sensed the urgency of such a venture and took a keen interest in it. But the venture was never a foregone conclusion. There were delays due to a lack of consensus as to whether such a journal was feasible and whether it was possible to find spiritually mature and competent staff among the Jesuits for the undertaking. Grandmaison was not the unanimous first choice. Some involved in founding the journal doubted his suitability for the post of editor-in-chief. In the end, though, he prevailed and the journal was established.

The serene confidence in the credibility of dogma and the anticipated fruits of critical scholarship that was expressed in his article “Théologiens scolastiques” also animated the first page of the journal.

---


331 Grandmaison’s general superior in Rome was apprehensive about the difficulty of collaborating with laymen: their teaching could easily compromise the orthodoxy that clergy and religious were trying to safeguard. Moreover, he wondered whether there were enough Jesuits sufficiently formed for such a spiritually perilous work; Lecler, “Cinquantenaire,” 15. In 1923, Grandmaison began to widen the circle of contributors to *RSR* to include Catholic laymen; Lecler, “Cinquantenaire,” 28.

The spirit which will animate us is a spirit of full submission to the authorized teachings of the Catholic Church, and, at the same time, of exact fidelity to good scientific methods….Assured that their faith needs only the truth, the collaborators of *Recherches* will apply themselves, in complete serenity, to the work in which they are competent. They also hold that no writer has the power—much less the duty—to deliberately bracket the light of the beliefs that orient his life from his scholarly activity. Poorly rooted in philosophy, such a pretension seems to them to be unsustainable in practice.333

This passage reflects Grandmaison’s convictions that there is harmony between the Church’s magisterium and the results of critical study. The passage also underlines the conviction that a scholar’s philosophical presuppositions influenced the way in which his studies were conducted.

Religious ethnology and the genesis of personal religion

Grandmaison’s pursuit of religious ethnology figured largely in his Christology. While yet a seminarian, he saw the need for the rigorous study of religion, especially given the dilettantism to which it was prone in his day.334 During his tenure as professor of fundamental theology at Fourvière, Grandmaison undertook the comparative study of world religions.335 Such an interest imposed itself upon him in part because of the apologetic needs of the time. In his 1904 review of Sabatier’s *Religions d’autorité et la Religion de l’Esprit*, Grandmaison questioned his ideas about a non-hierarchical Christianity: “Nonetheless, authority, disrobed of its universally infallible character, could protect its value, limited to religious matters. But, could Christ remain in this domain the

333 “L’esprit qui nous animera est un esprit d’entièere soumission aux enseignements autorisés de l’Eglise catholique, et, en même temps, d’exacte fidélité aux bonnes méthodes scientifiques….Assures que leur foi n’a besoin que de la vérité, les collaborateurs des *Recherches* s’appliqueront, en toute sérénité, aux travaux de leur compétence. Ils tiennent d’ailleurs qu’aucun écrivain n’a le pouvoir—loin qu’il en ait le devoir—de soustraire délibérément son activité littéraire de la lumière des croyances qui orient sa vie. Mal fondée en philosophie, une pareille prétention leur semble insoutenable en pratique.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, “Avis,” *RJR* 1 [1910], 1.)


335 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 403.
unshakeable witness that would found our personal religion?" Sabatier linked the religion of the individual believer, Christianity, and Christ’s religion. Grandmaison did the same in his Christology.

As director of Études, Grandmaison’s interest in religion began to bear fruit almost immediately. In 1909, there appeared Orpheus: Histoire générale des religions, a work written by the prominent French archeologist Salmon Reinach (1858-1932). In the furor that followed—what Reinach quipped had become the “Bello Orphico”—the judgment against the book was universal. Although Reinach was not a modernist, the work typified how the modernist use of religious psychology eroded the foundations provided by dogma. His forays into religious ethnology outraged Grandmaison for their dilettantism. Grandmaison was especially alarmed by Reinach’s reduction of Christ to another instance of the archetype that was present in the myth of Orpheus. “Finally, by what right does M. Reinach define religion to the absence of reasonable control over infantile fears, and an unfettered imagination?” His very notion of religion lacked rigor: “Not only does [the book] eliminate (so he says) from the notion of religion all that humanity has placed in it (God, spiritual beings, the infinite); but it is replaced by a definition that is so vague, so little

336 “Cependant l’autorité, dépouillé de son caractère infaillible universel, pourrait garder sa valeur, limitées aux choses religieuses. Dans ce domaine le Christ resterait l’irréfragable témoin qui fonderait notre religion personnelle?” (Léonce de Grandmaison, “La religion de l’Esprit,” Études 100 [1904], 8.)


338 Loisy eventually entered the lists against Reinach’s work. Gabriel Monod, a historian, quipped that Reinach had thrown out religion from the history of religions, without knowing what religion was; Laplanche, Crise, 82-3.


comprehensive, so little specific, that it could also be said of any government or police.”

Hence, Grandmaison sought to help build a more secure basis for the competent exercise of both Christology and religious ethnology.

In 1910, he undertook a systematic foray into religious ethnology with “L’étude de religions.” It began by describing the nature and conditions of personal religion:

The word religion, common to all the languages of Western Europe, is a Roman form of the Latin word religio. The most probable etymology of this word ties it to the word legere (re-legere, re-ligere: to recollect, to go over in one’s spirit, to reflect with a nuance of concentration, and, sometimes, of disquiet). However, and so difficult as it might be to defend philologically, the popular etymology which, after Lactantius at least, derives religio from ligare (re-ligare: relier, to rejoin, unite), has the advantage of expressing better the true and actual sense of the term.

The article then outlined the main characteristics of religion:

there is religion wherever and only where is found, implicitly perhaps, but certainly present, and displaying its natural effects of seriousness, of submission, the transcendent character of the Being whom prayer, ritual, and, sacrifice intend.

Religion will be defined therefore by the ensemble of beliefs, sentiments, rules and rites, individual or collective, directed toward [or imposed by] a Power that man actually holds as sovereign, on which he consequently depends, with whom he can enter, [or better: has entered] into personal relationships. More briefly, religion is the intercourse of man, individual and social, with his God.

342 “Non seulement elle l’amène à éliminer (il l’avoue), de la notion de religion, ce que toute l’humanité y a toujours placé: Dieu, les êtres spirituels, l’infini; mais elle l’accule à une définition si vague, si peu compréhensive, si peu spécifique, qu’elle vaut aussi bien d’un gouvernement, d’une police quelconque.” (Grandmaison, “Orpheus,” 31.)


344 “Le mot de religion, commun à toutes les langues de l’Europe occidentale, est une forme romane du mot latin religio. L’étymologie la plus probable de ce nom le rapporte au verbe legere (re-legere, re-ligere: recueillir, repasser dans son esprit, réfléchir avec une nuance de concentration, et, parfois, d’inquiétude). Toutefois, et si malaisée qu’elle soit à défendre philologiquement, l’étymologie vulgaire qui, depuis Lactance au moins, dérive religio de ligare (re-ligare: relier, rejoindre, unir), a l’avantage d’exprimer mieux le sens véritable et actuel du terme.” (Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 721.)

345 “il y a religion partout et seulement où se trouvera, implicite peut-être, mais certainement présent, et sortissant ses effets naturels de sérieux, de soumission, de crainte, le caractère transcendant de l’Être qui visent la prière, le rite et le sacrifice.

What Grandmaison was describing here was personal religion, which implied social as well as individual dimensions.

The first condition of true religion was a transcendent God: “Experience confirms these views in showing that the religious attitude itself is complete and durable only in so far the object it sees participates in the attributes of an infinite Power.” Anything less would mark such a deity as unworthy of positive, or revealed, religion. Moreover, such a God must be personal: “One will speak of God if the ultimate Power, on which man recognizes his dependence, is known as personal, by analogy with the human person; one will speak of the divine if one conceives of it obscurely by a sort of indefinite apprehension, without specifying the way in which it is what it is.” The three elements that were common to natural and revealed religions were morality, “cult and of conscious dependence,” and beliefs.

Grandmaison frankly conceded that Catholics had not given the comparative study of religion as such as much attention as it deserved. When poorly carried out, such study tended to dissolve dogmas such as the uniqueness of Christ, and hence a personal sense of true religion, the Church, Scripture, and tradition. Contrary to the approach taken by the historians of religions

---

346 “L’expérience confirme ces vues en montrant que l’attitude religieuse elle-même n’est complète et durable qu’autant que l’objet qu’elle vise participe aux attributs d’un Pouvoir infini.” (Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 727.)

347 “L’on parlera de Dieu si la Puissance ultime, de laquelle l’homme se reconnaît dépendant, est connue comme personnelle, par analogie avec la personne humaine; on parlera de divin si on la conçoit obscurément par une sorte d’appréhension indéfinie, sans préciser la façon dont elle est ce qu’elle est.” (Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 727.)


during the nineteenth century,\textsuperscript{351} the new comparativists tended to ignore the particularities of the various religions and to reduce them to a least common denominator, to a totalizing idea.\textsuperscript{352}

The study of religion often advanced other philosophical presuppositions that were antithetical to Christian teaching about revelation. The rationalist scholar

1) does not admit that there had been, or that there can be revelation in the full and real sense of the word, that is to say, of immediate commerce between a personal, transcendent God, and humanity. At the most he can admit that one calls ‘revelation’ the result of the divine force that is immanent, diffused throughout humanity, that brings all that exists toward another state, or (but even that is a hypothesis that all cannot admit) toward a final End. 2) As everything that this force provokes, religious progress, ‘revelation,’ operates by ways of \textit{evolution} properly speaking, from the lesser to the greater, from the depths to the heights, from the simple to the complex, starting with primitive animality, and perceptibly in the same direction (except for possible regressions). 3) As a result, all religions, whose object is the ideal, or at least, unknowable, follow in an order of increasing ascent.\textsuperscript{353}

Grandmaison insisted throughout his Christological works that God was “personal, provident, and transcendent.”\textsuperscript{354} Such qualities were necessary for revelation in the true sense of the word. The rationalist’s sense of immanence was not immanent enough: the divine immanence in all creatures was a necessary corollary only on account of the divine transcendence.\textsuperscript{355} The study of religion in itself was an exercise in discerning the catholic. “In order to build, we will have a large foundation:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{351} See Laplanche, \textit{Cris}, 33-5.
\item \textsuperscript{352} Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 736-41.
\item \textsuperscript{353} “1\textsuperscript{o} n’admet pas qu’il y ait eu, ou qu’il puisse y avoir de \textit{révélation} au sens plein et réel du mot, c’est-à-dire de commerce immédiat entre un Dieu personnel, provident, et transcendant, et l’humanité. Tout au plus peut-il admettre qu’on appelle ‘révélation’ les résultats de la force divine, immanente, diffuse dans le monde et l’humanité, qui mène tout ce qui existe, vers un autre état, ou (mais cela même est une hypothèse que tous n’admettent point) vers un But dernier. 2\textsuperscript{o} Comme tout ce que provoque cette force immanente, le progrès religieux, la ‘révélation’ s’opère par \textit{évolution} proprement dite, du moins au plus, de bas en haut, du simple au complexe, en partant de l’animalité primitive, et sensiblement dans le même sens (sauf des régressions possibles). 3\textsuperscript{o} En conséquence, toutes les religieux, dont l’objet est idéal, ou, du moins, inconnaisable, se suivent dans uns ordre d’ascension croissante.” (Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 745.)
\item \textsuperscript{354} Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 196. The fundamental doctrine of Christianity had been monotheism; “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 883.
\item \textsuperscript{355} “Transcendant est employée ici pour la pureté de l’Etre divin, et sa séparation essentielle d’avec tout autre être, non pour exclure la présence intime de Dieu dans tout ce qui existe, Il y a, dans ce premier sens, une affirmation de l’immanence divine non seulement orthodoxe, mais imposée.” (Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 745n1.)
\end{itemize}
stable, verifiable, uncontested, and universal facts. There will hardly be the need, therefore, to interpret these facts. They will convey to us by themselves the principal, specific characteristics of that which humanity has always meant, means still by the name of religion: securus judicat orbis terrarum.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{Contra epistulam Parmeniani}, iii, 24, in Grandmaison, “Étude des religions,” 723.} Grandmaison often repeated this phrase of Augustine’s as a summation of the collective experience of the Catholic Church as a complement to the individual experience that so dominated modern life.

There had emerged in France at the end of the nineteenth century a great popular interest in mysticism both within and without the Catholic Church. The leading theologians of the day, progressiste and modernist alike, were fascinated with the subject.\footnote{André Boland, “Modernisme,” In \textit{Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire} (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980), vol. 10, 1424.} Grandmaison shared an interest in and a respect for the mystical life.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 186. See Léonce de Grandmaison, “The Revival of the Study of Mysticism among French Catholics,” \textit{Constructive Quarterly} (1921): 596-608.} He reviewed Baron Friedrich von Hügel’s \textit{The Mystical Element of Religion} and was taken by Jesuit philosopher Joseph Maréchal’s works, most especially his studies collected in \textit{Études sur la psychologie des mystiques}.\footnote{Friedrich von. Hügel, \textit{The Mystical Element of Religion, as studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and her Friends}, 1st. ed., 1904, 2nd. ed. (New York: Crossroad, 1999).}

Grandmaison wrote extensively on mysticism of all kinds before coming to Paris. On the one hand, authentic Christian mysticism was a great grace for the individual and for the Church.

\footnote{Joseph Maréchal, \textit{Études sur la psychologie des mystiques}, 2 vols., Museum Lassianum-Section philosophique (Bruges: Charles Beyaert; Paris: F. Alcan, 1924).}
Mysticism was part of the fullness of perfect religion. Some of the extraordinary gifts that mystics enjoyed included a more intense awareness both of the soul’s distance from God and of its union with him, as well as visions, inner locutions, and even levitation. On the other hand, Grandmaison one ought to guard against glorifying false mysticism. The mainstream of Jesuit spiritual formation and writings had always demonstrated a strong preference for ascetical theology to the point of almost passing over mystical theology in silence. Ascetical theology dealt with the active practice of one’s faith through prayer, self-denial, and growth in virtue, while mystical theology concerned itself with the study of states of prayer that were considered to be extraordinary gifts of God.

So Grandmaison admonished the public concerning the abuse of mysticism. He exposed the errors of theosophy in “Le lotus bleu,” (1905) and in “Une théosophie catholique” (1906). The movement was a Western hybrid of philosophy and religion, much of it remotely inspired by Hinduism. This pseudo-religious movement exercised a powerful fascination in France and in the West. He would exercise a lifelong vigilance about this movement.

A preoccupation with altered states of consciousness (dreams, visions, ecstasies, etc.)—in other words, with religious experience for its own sake—could easily distract the Christian from the normal means to sanctity. Hügel was well aware of the dangerous consequences of such an obsession: “predominance of the subjective element; disdain, to the point of hatred, of the body and

---

of matter; quietism and passivity; disinterest in love”—all of which could ultimately lead one into “exclusivism, error, and heresy.” Asceticism, the practice of the virtues and the avoidance of the vices, disposed one to receive these gifts in the proper way. Moreover, a hankering after mystical experience could downplay the value of intellectual truth. More will be said of this last error in the next chapter.

The perceived need for studies in religious ethnology spurred Grandmaison to co-found and contribute to the Semaines internationales d’ethnologie religieuse. Established in 1911, the Semaine brought together Catholic missionaries, prelates, clergy, religious, scholars, professors, and various other professionals engaged in the comparative study of religion and in missiology. At the first Semaine in the late summer of 1912 at Louvain, Grandmaison gave two conferences entitled “La religion et le culte social” and “La religion et la piété personnelle.” These talks were later published as part of the same article in the proceedings of the seminar. These talks may be the earliest instances in which Grandmaison used the term “personal religion” extensively.

In a prologue to the talks, Grandmaison presented his own method of religious ethnology as a counterproposal to the immature forms of comparative religion. Recognizing the scientific impartiality of the field, he pleaded guilty to the objection that professing a certain religion could hinder his impartiality as an ethnologist. Catholicism was the only religion that the attendees knew

---


367 Semaine d’ethnologie religieuse: Compte rendu analytique de la 1ʳᵉ session tenue à Louvain, 27 août–4 septembre 1912 (Paris: Beauchesne; Brussels: Dewit, 1913). The prominent ethnologist Pater Wilhelm Schmidt, S.V.D. was the main initiator of the project, and Père Frédéric Bouvier, S.J. the chief organizer; Grandmaison provided intellectual and tactical support; Actes du colloque conjoint du CREDIC et de l’AFOM: Anthropologie et missiologie, xixe et xxᵉ siècles, tenu à Doorn (Utrecht), 14–18 août 2003 (Paris, Editions Karthala, 2004), 100-1.

368 Léonce de Grandmaison, “La religion, le culte social et la piété personnelle,” Semaine d’ethnologie religieuse: Compte rendu analytique de la 1ʳᵉ session tenue à Louvain, 27 août–4 septembre 1912 (Paris, Beauchesne; Bruxelles, Dewit, 1913), 156-64.

well and so could serve as basis for conscious and intelligent comparisons to other religions; moreover, such an approach would make one cautious about making facile analogies between Catholicism and other religions. In defense of his partiality, he also asserted the relative transcendence of Catholicism. The object of the conference as Grandmaison saw it was to focus on the specific acts of man’s conversation with God, which included adoration and sacrifice. The first was “the interior or expressed act by which man recognized and confessed the sovereign and unique dignity of God,” while the second, sacrifice,—“the most notable exterior manifestation of the sentiment of admiration”—comprised a costly offering that sanctified the adorer with some sort of rites “commanded or at least deemed acceptable by the Divinity.” The first talk addressed the topic of religion in terms of individual piety, the second, in terms of corporate worship.

The first conference—“La Religion et le Culte social”—addressed the importance of the social element in religion. Seeking a via media between liberal Protestantism and sociological positivism, Grandmaison wrote: “Religion, which is personal (contra Durkheim), ought not to be individualistic (contra Sabatier).” One could discern four elements of worship in order of importance: “(1) the efficacious power of intervention and of religious mediation of this worship; (2) its pedagogical value for the formulation and the transmission of religion; (3) the force of religious suggestion; (4) the richness and the coherence of its symbolism, as well as its aptitude to satisfy the

---

370 Grandmaison, “La religion, le culte social et la pieté personnelle,” 158.
372 Sociological positivism is the philosophical doctrine that human relations are reducible to collective phenomena.
affective needs of humanity, all in safeguarding the spiritual character of religion.” Grandmaison saw these qualities in their most comprehensive form in Catholicism.

The second conference was entitled “La Religion et la Piète personnelle.” The first section treated the “Normal characteristics of personal religion.” The typical aspects of personal religion were twofold. First, it was “pure and comprehensive”; it had nothing to do with self-interest, as manifested in magic, superstition, or self-interested religion. It was also “spiritual and incarnate” when carried out appropriately; in Johannine terms, it was ‘adoration in spirit and in truth’ (John 4: 24).” The second half of the lecture covered “the support and culture of personal piety.” Personal piety was nourished by ascesis, “the practice of spiritual exercises.” Ascesis was necessary for the believer. “In order to unite oneself with the pure and infinitely Holy Spirit (who knows him or urges him thus), man experiences the need: being flesh, to spiritualize himself; being a sinner, to purify himself.” No matter how indispensable, ascesis is a means, or “letter,” to the spirit: it must be animated by a proper interiority, regulated by doctrine, and subject to discretion, social duties, and fraternal charity. In mentioning objections to heroic ascesis, the third section underlined the best reason for it: “the ‘configuration’ to a suffering Christ.” Grandmaison’s writings as a whole gave at least as much space to his teaching on ascesis as to his teaching on contemplation.

374 “(1) la puissance efficace d’intervention et de médiation religieuse de ce culte; (2) sa valeur pédagogique pour la formulation et le transmission de la religion; (3) sa force de suggestion religieuse; (4) la richesse et la cohérence de son symbolisme, ainsi que son aptitude à contenter les exigences sensibles de l’humanité, tout en sauvegardant le caractère spirituel de la religion.” (Grandmaison, “La religion, le culte social et la piété personnelle,” 159.)


378 Grandmaison, “La religion, le culte social et la piété personnelle,” 162.

379 Grandmaison, “La religion, le culte social et la piété personnelle,” 162.
Alarmed that works such as Reinach’s *Orpheus* were undermining the sense of the uniqueness of Catholicism, Grandmaison directed Jesuit colleagues Père Joseph Huby and Père Pierre Rousselot (1878–1915)\(^\text{380}\) to collaborate on writing and editing *Christus: Manuel d’histoire des religions*\(^\text{381}\). Grandmaison’s two contributions to the work were “L’étude des religions”\(^\text{382}\) and “La religion catholique au XIX\(^{e}\) siècle.”\(^\text{383}\) The latter chapter, co-authored with Rousselot, dealt with social Christianity—modern Catholic notions of the Church’s engagement in the contemporary world and the struggles that it underwent since the eighteenth century in Europe.

Grandmaison made further presentations of his notion of personal religion in 1913 in talks given at an international conference and in a series of articles in *Études*. At the second Semaine internationale d’ethnologie religieuse in late summer 1913, at Louvain, he presented a paper entitled “Introduction à l’étude psychologique des religions (Étude techno-pratique): L’observateur, le sujet, les observations.”\(^\text{384}\) The article dealt with “The observer,” “The individual and collective subject,” and “The way in which to make and use these observations.”\(^\text{385}\) The observer was “not tabula rasa.”\(^\text{386}\)


He had his own set of intellectual, religious, philosophical, and methodological presuppositions which “serve to comprehend and interpret that which he is going to bear, or that which he is going to observe, in the course of his inquiry, but not to assimilate one to the other.” Accurate observation and interpretation on the part of the observer required deep, practiced personal religion. While Christianity was an integrally moralized religion, the two aspects of religion and morality were seldom separated in any positive religion. However, one had to admit that there were religious acts that are shocking because they are ridiculous, obscene, or criminal.

We are *a priori* tempted, either to exclude them from the religious domain, or to refuse ANY value to religious sincerity.

In reality, many of these poor people received these symbols and these rites by tradition, and considered them exempt, by their very character, from any moral valuation. Thus were they able to render sincere worship despite this forest of impure symbols. If these sad aberrations debase both the moral level and the conception of the Divinity of these peoples, they do not abolish for all that the intention of honoring, adoring, and persuading the Divinity.

Passages such as these show Grandmaison’s sympathy for the personal religion of all of humanity, no matter what form such religion took.

The 1913 series of articles entitled “La religion personnelle” were longer versions of Grandmaison’s 1912 conference on “La Religion et la Pièce personnelle.” The topics of the four

---

390 “Nous sommes a priori tentés, ou de les exclure du domaine religieux, ou de refuser TOUTE valeur de religiosité sincère. En réalité, beaucoup de ces pauvres gens ont reçu ces symboles et ces rites par tradition, et les considèrent comme soustraits, par leur caractère même, à toute appréciation morale. Ainsi peuvent-ils rendre un culte sincère à travers cette forêt d’impurs symboles. Si ces tristes aberrations abaissent également et le niveau moral, et la conception de la Divinité de ces peuples, ils n’en abolissent pas pour autant l’intention d’honorer, d’adorer, de fléchir la Divinité.” (Grandmaison, “Introduction à l’étude psychologique,” 194.)
sections were “La piété,”392 “La devotion et les oeuvres des devotion,”393 “L’effort ascétique,”394 and “L’élan mystique.”395

The first article defined personal religion as the individual believer’s participation in religion as a whole. Religion in general was the conversation, in the sense of total commerce or interchange, between God and man.396 What he called—as did so many of his contemporaries—personal religion was available in principle to all human beings.397 Grandmaison acknowledged the importance that his contemporaries attached to piety, or individual religious experience.398 He had a great admiration for William James’ Varieties of Religion Experience,399 “which remains, despite all its lacunae, errors, and misunderstandings, the most penetrating and the most useful of non-Catholic works on the matter.”400 Yet he disagreed with James’ claim that individual religious experience such as piety stood for the entirety of true religion.401 As important as individual experience was, sentimental religion

395 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 309-35. Some of what was written in Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” was incorporated into this article.
and its heir modernism placed an excessive amount of emphasis on it. Such an imbalance was the ultimate result of Protestantism.\textsuperscript{402}

Piety was not the totality of true, revealed religion, but its center and heart.\textsuperscript{403}

In reflecting a moment on our life, we perceive without a doubt, that besides some religious acts that we perform in union with our brethren and as members of a body, there are other more spontaneous acts, which neither seek nor at first seem to suppose the support of any human milieu whatsoever. But these intimate élan\'s of the soul, which go on multiplying and exhausting themselves as we progress in our union with God, in any event occur rarely.\textsuperscript{404}

Since unbidden and deep spiritual experiences were rare, there was need for the social dimension.

Our \textit{personal} life, in the strong sense of the word, is after all very restricted; the religious man, just like any man pure and simple, is made to live in society. He is taught, framed, an imitator, “sheep-like,” very dependent on the traits that he inherits, on the education he receives, on the environment which embraces him.

The conversation of man with his God that constitutes religion…implicates precisely this human character. Historically, each cult presents itself from the start as an institution of a family or a tribe, of a race or a clan, as a social and collective thing. Ordinarily, man adores, implores, sacrifices with, in, and through his group.\textsuperscript{405}

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{403} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 (1913), 294.

\textsuperscript{404} “En réfléchissant un moment sur notre vie, nous apercevons sans doute, à côté des actes religieux accomplis par nous en union avec nos frères, et comme membres d’un corps, d’autres actes plus spontanés, qui ne recherchent, ni se semblent d’abord supposer, l’appui d’un milieu humain quelconque. Mais ces élan\’s intimes de l’âme, qui vont se multipliant et s’épuisant avec nos progrès dans l’union divine, restent en tout état de cause assez rares.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 [1913], 289.)

\textsuperscript{405} “Notre vie personnelle, au sens fort du mot, est après-tout fort restreinte; l’homme religieux, comme l’homme tout court, est fait pour vivre en société. Il est enseigné, encadré, imitateur, “moutonnier,” très dépendant des hérédités qu’il subit, de l’éducation qu’il reçut, du milieu qui l’enserre.

La conversation de l’homme avec son Dieu qui constitue la religion…accuse nettement ce caractère humain.

Historiquement, tout culte se présente d’abord comme une institution de famille ou de tribu, de race ou de clan, comme une chose sociale et collective. L’homme adore, implore, sacrifice ordinairement avec, dans et par son groupe.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 [1913], 289.)
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
The religious man required a community, a place where he was planted and flourished and where the conversation with God took place in the fullest sense. The historical dimension of culture was also very important. There were variations in authentic piety given different cultural contexts.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 306.}

The believer had to negotiate between the truly spiritual and the merely fleshly, such as the superstitious\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 299.} the puritanical,\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 305.} or hypocrites.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 307.} Grandmaison wrote: “when it comes to devotion, it’s either all or nothing.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 307.} “The religious man, the one in whom the interior spirit will transform the letter, will animate the formulas, actions, and steps, will thus pass, according to the lovely motto of Cardinal Newman, \textit{ex umbris ad veritatem}.”\footnote{“L’homme vraiment religieux, celui dans lequel l’esprit intérieur transformera la lettre, animera les formules, les gestes et les démarches, passera ainsi, conformément à la belle devise du cardinal Newman, \textit{ex umbris ad veritatem}.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 [1913], 307.)} The spirit of one’s observance of the cult made a great difference. \textit{Réserve}—the most important quality of Grandmaison’s appropriation of Jesuit spirituality—was closely connected to the balance that suffused his understanding of personal religion.

Elsewhere, Grandmaison wrote that devotions of all kinds, and, most importantly, one’s participation in the Eucharist, were essential to personal piety. The practice of personal religion had developed along with dogma in the time since the Reformation and the Enlightenment. The most
original devotion in the nineteenth century with respect to love for the Church was the devotion to the pope.\textsuperscript{413} The growth of the institution of the pilgrimage took second place for novelty:

Without speaking of pilgrimages to the Holy Places, in which there is a peaceful but not ineffective crusade and a concrete reminder of the life of Christ, supernatural manifestations over the course of the century created centers of attraction for which immediately preceding centuries offer no analogy. Ancient shrines were once again honored and by divine initiative opened once again.\textsuperscript{414}

He mentioned visits to Ars, Lourdes, and Notre Dame des Victoires in Paris. The healings at these and other places had created an “atmosphere of enthusiasm, confident faith, and hope.”\textsuperscript{415} Such devotions had rejuvenated the faith after the ravages of the Revolution and the malaise of the Restoration.

The supernatural inserted itself into Catholic life in a somewhat more intimate way. For the true faithful (Newman noted it well) the heavenly world is familiar and \textit{real} as his company and his mission. ‘Naturalized to supernatural things’…From there comes the case with which he accepts the religious practices and this heartfelt simplicity when he speaks of God.\textsuperscript{416}

Such examples—to name a few—showed that the Catholic Church, the personal religion that Christ founded, fulfilled the individual believer’s piety in ever-new ways.

The most important movement involving piety concerned the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{417} The liturgy was not empty ritual, but a sower of spiritual interiority.\textsuperscript{418} Möhler’s understanding of the Eucharist

\textsuperscript{413} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 990-2.

\textsuperscript{414} “Sans parler des pèlerinages aux Lieux Saints, croisade pacifique, mais non pas inefficace, rappel concrète de l’oeuvre et de la vie du Christ, des manifestations surnaturelles créèrent au cours du siècle, des centres d’attraction dont les siècles immédiatement antérieurs n’offrent pas analogie. Les sanctuaires anciens furent remis en honneur: de nouveaux, sur initiative divine, s’ouvrirent.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 992.)

\textsuperscript{415} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 992.

\textsuperscript{416} “Le surnaturel se mêla, de la sorte, plus intimement à la vie catholique. Pour le vrai fidèle (Newman le remarquait justement) le monde céleste est familier et \textit{réel} comme son entourage et sa mission. ‘Naturalisées aux choses surnaturelles’…De là cette aisance avec laquelle il accepte ses pratiques religieuses, et cette simplicité cordiale quand il parle de Dieu.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 992-3.)

\textsuperscript{417} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 997.
guarded against both “a frozen and dead formalism” and “a troubled mysticism that savored of pantheism.”

The growth of devotions such as Eucharistic adoration in various forms and the growth of confraternities had inspired the laity. Pope Pius X’s decrees on frequent and daily communion and on lowering the age of first communion to seven, respectively, had mobilized priests to catechize children at a much earlier age than when first communion took place at twelve. Grandmaison had great expectations for the unexpected blessings that this change would bring the Church.

The second article treated “dévouement” in general, which consisted of devotions (forms of prayer), and works of devotion. Following Aquinas, Grandmaison defined this dedication as “a certain willingness to act promptly in what concerns the service of God.” Whereas piety focused on the expression of sentiment, especially in prayer, devotion focused on performing works of service. This article was concerned mainly with acts of worship and works of spiritual and temporal mercy. Jesus Christ was the initiator, motive, and reward of acts of devotion:

It is to remain in the pure tradition to group the works of devotion around the Body, real or mystical, of the Lord.… No one comes to the Father except through him. Recompense for the annihilation freely undertaken in his Incarnation, Jesus became, for humanity that prays, the center and first object of worship. It is around his body, really present on the altar, it is for the offering and mystical immolation of this very body that edifices have been raised, churches decorated,
rites developed, and liturgies ordained. One can also relate to the body of the Lord, not only the offices and the works that have for their object the *Corpus Domini* and carry that name, but all the works of Catholic devotion, by which the first commandment is accomplished.\textsuperscript{425}

It is clear that the liturgy held central place in Grandmaison’s sense of devotion. The acts of mercy were linked to it. The glory of God inspired not only apostolic generosity, but “the passion for the decency, that is, the splendor of worship.”\textsuperscript{426} The priority of the liturgy helped to prevent the believer falling into Pelagianism.

Grandmaison spent much time on Christ’s commandment to love him in one’s neighbor (Matt. 25: 30). One could have an acute sense of the real presence of Christ in those who are physically needy, especially the suffering.\textsuperscript{427} In speaking of spiritual works of mercy, Grandmaison wrote:

It’s always about bringing to life or reviving Christ in one of our brethren. In each man, in effect, even if he is the last one, if only he is capable, or can become capable, of acts that are truly human, if he has a responsibility, a spiritual destiny, there is in germ an elect, a saint, a member of Christ. From these sad chrysalises, a heavenly butterfly can take flight.\textsuperscript{428}

\textsuperscript{425} “C’est rester d’ailleurs dans la pure tradition que de grouper les œuvres de dévotion autour de Corps, réel ou mystique, du Seigneur. …Nul ne vient au Père que par lui. Récompense ainsi de l’anéantissement librement consenti de son incarnation, Jésus est devenu, pour l’humanité qui prie, le centre et l’objet premier du culte. C’est autour de son corps, réellement présent sur l’autel, c’est pour l’offrande et l’immolation mystique de ce même corps que se sont élevés les édifices, ornées les églises, développés les rites et ordonnées les liturgies. Aussi peut-on rapporter au corps du Seigneur, non seulement les offices et les œuvres qui ont pour objet direct le *Corpus Domini* et en portent le nom, mais toutes les œuvres de la dévotion catholique, en tant qu’elles accomplissent le premier commandement.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 [1913], 611.)


\textsuperscript{427} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 (1913), 616.

\textsuperscript{428} “Il s’agit toujours à faire vivre, ou revivre, le Christ en quelqu’un de nos frères. Dans chaque homme en effet, fut-il le dernier des hommes, s’il est seulement capable, ou s’il peut le devenir, d’actes vraiment humains, s’il a une responsabilité, une destinée spirituelle, il y a en germe un élu, un saint, un membre du Christ. De ces tristes chrysalides, un papillon céleste peut prendre vol.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 [1913], 621.)
There are a number of interconnected themes here: fraternal charity inextricably linked to the love of Christ; the possibility of self-transcendence through grace; and the hope of salvation for every person. Grandmaison’s love of letters shows the way in which all these themes are gathered up in the apt, vivid image of the butterfly, symbol of the Resurrection.

The third article underlined that the individual’s personal religion included ascesis, “the ensemble of means apt to exercise and to bring along a human being so as to render him pleasing to his God, and to unite him with Him.” Indeed, among the “most incontestable” facts about positive religion was a thoughtful ascesis. The Church proposed discretion in choosing additional exercises that fitted with one’s station in life. Such spiritual exercises consisted of those that either corrected the old Adam or those that formed the interior man of Eph. 3. They were part of what made a person pray effectively, serve faithfully, and love purely—“the entirety of religion.”

The foundation of ascesis was the “folly of the Cross,” the (prudent) choice of an extraordinary mortification, which many non-Christians of modern times found so objectionable, in part because such a practice ran up against one’s sense of control. Practices such as purification, the acceptance of trials and suffering, self-abnegation, and mortification guarded against the dangers of false mysticism, such as succumbing to illusions, indecency, and indiscretion.

---

432 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 34.
435 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 356.
436 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 651-2.
Having cleared the ground, so to speak, Grandmaison then wrote of mysticism in the fourth and last article in the series. The article incorporated material from his review of Hügel’s *Mystical Element*. Mysticism, like dedication, was “in truth accessible with difficulty, and partly ineffable.”

The original meaning of mysticism, consonant with how it was understood by the mystery religions, was “knowledge obtained not in a didactic way, but by a sort of intuition, of perception that is at once immediate but still obscure, of more direct visual suggestion, but altogether less precise and less communicable than a formulated lesson.” What most believers knew of God came through authoritative teachings. “These traditional beliefs are different (if one permits me to to transpose an economic metaphor), an offer that responds to the inevitable demand of the human soul. But this first foundation assimilates and enriches itself by study, personal reflection.”

Grandmaison contrasted Pseudo–Dionysus’ *triplix via* of the ascent to God—affirmation, negation, and transcendence in meditating on the mysteries of faith—with another way, the mystical way.

The second meaning of mysticism involved “the instinctive gestures, the sudden views, the immediate sentiments, which seem to be the material or the outline of a mode of direct, instinctive understanding, instinctive, engaging at one time all the human faculties.” Such extraordinary

---

437 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 (1913), 309. Accepted by the Académie française only in 1878, the word “mysticism” often had a pejorative sense.

438 “Connaissance obtenues non par voie didactique, mais par une sorte d’intuition, de perception à la fois immédiate et encore obscure, de suggestion visuelle plus directe, mais tout ensemble moins précise et moins communicable qu’une leçon formulée.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 [1913], 309.)


440 “Ces croyances traditionnelles sont d’ailleurs (si l’on me permet de transposer la métaphore économique), une offre qui répond à la demande inévitable de l’âme humaine. Mais ce premier fonds s’assimile et s’enrichit par l’étude, la réflexion personnelle.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 [1913], 312.)

441 “Des gestes instinctifs, des vues soudaines, des sentiments immédiats, qui semblent les débris ou l’ébauche d’un mode de connaître direct, instinctif, intéressant à la fois toutes les facultés humaines.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 [1913], 312-3.)
experience could be desired and sought after, but was not available on demand to the believer.442 There were extraordinary natural and supernatural mystical states. Natural mystical experiences could arrive from the hidden workings of the intellect.443

As much as Grandmaison lauded mysticism, he also insisted on the value of the ordinary religious experience of most believers.444 The fascination with mysticism risked downplaying the accessibility to the ordinary believer of the Christ of the Gospels. Christ, not mystical experience, was the “one, necessary thing” (Lk.10:42).

Here, with the help of Maréchal, Grandmaison outlined the conditions and the qualities of actual mystical union with God.445 The first stages of real mystical experience began with a savoring of God, whether found in divine truths, vocal prayers, reading the Scriptures, or simply a prayer of presence. There were occasions when there was an immediate felt awareness of the presence of God.446 Grandmaison’s own synthesis regarding mystical union referred to Saint Teresa of Avila, Saint Ignatius Loyola, Pascal, and Saint John of the Cross.447 Finally, he inquired as to the general role of mystics in the Church.448 Ultimately, knowing God as witnesses, mystics experience “the joy

of admiring” him. So ended Grandmaison’s magisterial overview of the individual believer’s religion.

It is important to note that Grandmaison used “personal religion” in three main senses. The primary commonsense meaning of personal religion was the individual believer’s relationship with God. A second sense of personal religion was the actual social religion in which the individual participated. Specifically and concretely, then, personal religion referred to the Catholic Church, the religion that Jesus Christ had founded and that was animated by the Holy Spirit. The third sense was the religious life of Jesus himself, which consisted principally in his relationship to the Father, in the Holy Spirit. As shall be seen in chapter four, this was the normative sense of personal religion, its primary analogate.

Personal religion had to take place in the context of positive, or revealed, religion. Divine revelation was the measure of religion, not the converse. The divine transcendence too had to be respected. Yet Christianity, this true religion, did not worship an impersonal Absolute. The believer could not settle for a cold distant relationship with such a God. Charity, or friendship, characterized the right relationship of God and man. Revealed religion was quintessentially personal. On the message of Christ

is founded the very idea of religion as that of filial exchange among persons. There, the exigencies of a nature at once spiritual and needy, made for the infinite and incapable by itself of the possession of it, are satisfied because from the start God has been set in his

---

450 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 598–9.
452 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1399.
453 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 399-401.
place and man in his. And that is all there is: this is religion pure and simple! Its unique
trait!

The personal element of religion took the social nature of humanity seriously. After all, the God of
Christianity revealed himself as Love itself. Finally, the transcendence of God necessarily entailed his
immanence to his beloved creation. As will be seen in the next chapter, Grandmaison believed that
modernism destroyed the true religion, Christianity, because it threatened both the revelation
contained in positive religion and the possibility of any religious faith whatsoever.

_Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique_ Article on Jesus Christ

After _Pascendi_ and after becoming director of _Études_, Grandmaison took up a more explicitly
historical-critical and exegetical defense of the divinity of Christ. Grandmaison was writing the first
version of his Christological synthesis at about the same time that he was writing about personal
religion. The article “Jésus Christ” was submitted for publication in 1912 and appeared in 1914 in the
_Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique_. The apologetic Christology that he had previously used
as a seminary teacher would no longer do. Many of Grandmaison’s adversaries would not allow a
direct appeal to the divine authority of the Church or of Scripture. Such authority was in play

---

454 “est fondée l'idée même de religion, comme celle d'une commerce filiale entre personnes. Là, les exigences d'une
nature à la foi spirituelle et indigente, faite pour l'infini et incapable à elle seule de s'en assurer la possession, sont
satisfaites, parce que d'abord Dieu a été mis à sa place, et l'homme à la sienne. Et il n'y a que cela: c'est religion toute
pure! Trait unique!” (Grandmaison, _Jésus Christ_, 1, 402.)

455 Grandmaison _Jésus Christ_, 1, 401.

456 Hughes Beylard, “Grandmaison (Léonce Loyzeau de),” _Dictionnaire de Biographie Française_, vol. 16 (Letouzey et Ané,
1985), 983.

457 The article was based on his lecture notes as professor of apologetics, previous articles, and lectures that he gave at
Versailles from 1910 to 1912; Lebreton, _Grandmaison_, 280-1. Portions of the _DAFC_ entry were then slightly revised and
published as separate articles between 1912-1914. See, for example, Léonce de Grandmaison, “Jésus prophète,” _Revue
pratique d'apologétique_ 17 (1914): 801-16; and 18 (1914): 161-72; and “Le problème du Christ,” _Études_ 138 (1914): 26-46,

precisely because the identity and mission of Christ were so disputed. Grandmaison’s approach also sought to overcome a dichotomy that was at the root of the modernist controversy, that between “two patterns of education, the one largely philosophical, the other literary and scientific.” His defense of Christianity had to satisfy the demand for historical credibility, but, above all, for the contemporary interest in experimental psychology and in other religions.

Moreover, like Newman, Grandmaison placed less emphasis on the prevailing neoscholastic mindset of the day and preferred a method that was non-systematic and intuitive. The most pronounced step toward this intuitive method occurred in the DAFC article on Jesus Christ. The compartmentalization in the manuals of Christ’s identity as Messiah and as God did not sit well with him. It was a procedure at odds with Christ’s own way of revealing himself in the gospels.

He presented himself as Messiah, but at the same time and with even greater insistence, as the Son of God, as he who alone knew the Father, who was one in being with him, who is so perfectly united with him that whoever sees him, sees the Father. The affirmations of Jesus are not limited to these juridical assertions that apologists careful to stop at the threshold of faith present to their catechumens; they tend immediately to the revelation of the divinity: *apparuit benignitas et humanitas Salvatoris Nostri Dei* [Titus 3: 4].

---


461 Newman’s fundamental sources were Scripture and the Fathers. As for Grandmaison, he was ill-suited by temperament to the method of the neoscholastic manuals; Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 83. See John Henry Newman, *Implicit and Explicit Reason*, 256-7, for the image of the mountain-climber as a metaphor for the ascent to truth.


464 “Il s’est présenté comme le Messie, mais en même temps et avec plus d’insistance encore, comme le Fils de Dieu, comme celui qui seul connaît le Père, qui n’est qu’une seule chose avec lui, qui lui est si parfaitement uni que quiconque le voit, voit le Père. Les affirmations de Jésus ne se limitent point à ces revendications juridiques que les apologistes soucieux de s’arrêter au seuil de la foi, présentent à leurs catéchumènes; elles tendent immédiatement à la révélation de la divinité: *apparuit benignitas et humanitas Salvatoris Nostri Dei* [Titus 3: 4].” (Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 154.)
So the *DAFC* article introduced an innovation. Given the basic outline of the historical witness of Scripture, Grandmaison argued *simultaneously* that Jesus was both Messiah and the Son of God. Jesus also had the beatific vision and knew himself to be God. That Christ was the Son of God in the fully Christian sense, Grandmaison asserted, could be arrived at without a precise account of philosophy and doctrine, but on the basis of literal exegesis alone. The article appealed directly to the Scriptures not as divinely inspired but as “invested with an authority that is simply human.” He was convinced that calling to mind the Scriptural portrait of Christ would help to rescue Christological doctrine from the diminution it had suffered at the hands of liberal Protestants and Catholic modernists. The faithful needed to see the figure of Christ in his fullness as Scripture presented him. As shall be seen below and in later chapters, Grandmaison’s Christology applied the term of personal religion to the religious life of Jesus himself, the relationship of Jesus Christ, the Son of God to the Father, in the Holy Spirit. “The penetrating attention that [Grandmaison] gives to the religious fact, to the reality of the Gospel already leads beyond overly limited frameworks concerning the person of the Son of God seized in his total truth, in full light.” The personal religion of Jesus was the existential origin and root of the personal religion of the individual and of


466 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1292. See *ibid.*, 1535.


468 Newman too had recognized the intimate connection between the perception of Christ in the gospels and the personal religion of the Catholic; see John Henry Newman, *Discussion and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Longman, Greens, and Co., 1907), 387.


470 “l’attention pénétrante qu’il donne au fait religieux, à la réalité de l’Évangile l’entraîne déjà par delà des cadres trop étroites vers la personne du Fils de Dieu saisie dans sa vérité totale, en pleine lumière.” (Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 154.)
the Church. The article was warmly received by the public and led to the return of many lapsed Catholics to the practice of the faith. The Struggle with the Integralists

There were many types of modernists and anti-modernists. Anti-modernists were either progressistes or integristes. In France, the integralists called themselves ‘integral Catholics.’ Some few like Léon Bloy were intransigent Catholics battling to defend their faith. According to Michael Richards, integralists of the religious or literary vein rejected critical thought for its stranglehold on the spiritual and cultural life of the West. The movement was in part a misconceived response by some Catholics to combat atheistic rationalism—which, Grandmaison acknowledged early on, infiltrated even the seminary education of the time. From the time of his earliest writings, he considered integralism to be a form of Catholic anti-intellectualism, in that the movement refused to

---

471 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 405.

472 According to Poulat: “Qu’est-ce alors que l’intégrisme? En sens strict et premier, un parti politique espagnol fondé vers 1890 sous l’invocation du Syllabus, avec lequel, cependant, Benigni ne veut avoir aucun lien parce que Pie X lui-même le juge excessif. Au début du siècle, du temps même de Léon XIII, le mot s’oppose en France à progressisme en matière d’exégèse biblique; dans les dernières années de Pie X, il désignera tous ceux qui combattent l’ouverture politique et sociale du catholicisme par n’importe quel moyen, y compris la délation; plus tard, les adversaires de toute ouverture, qui confondent ‘la dévotion au passé avec la fidélité à l’éternel’ [Étienne Borne, ‘Éléments d’une oraison funèbre,” L’aube {1940}]. En Espagne, ce sont les intégristes eux-mêmes qui se sont choisi ce nom; en France, il ne s’applique jamais qu’à des adversaires. Hors de ces deux pays, on l’ignore, bien qu’il commence à faire ça et là son apparition, et par exemple en Italie.” (Émile Poulat, “‘Modernisme’ et Intégrisme: Du concept polémique à l’irénisme critique,” Archives de sociologie des religions 27 [1969], 25.)

The first time that the term was used in an official ecclesiastical document was by Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris, in his 1947 pastoral letter “Essor ou déclin de l’Église?” which analyzed integralism as the inverse error of modernism. “Since then it has been used relatively seldom by bishops, but never so far by a pope.” (Daniel-Rops, A Fight for God, 1, 290-1.) The English equivalent of intégrisme is “integralism.”

473 Daniel-Rops, A Fight for God, 1, 289-91.

474 Michael Richards, “Historical Background,” 121-2.

learn anything from the emerging sciences. Referring to integralist accusations, Grandmaison wrote:

The history of philosophy teaches us to consider these integralist declarations with some detachment. Reality, it is said, isn’t made of distinct juxtaposed pieces; everything is interior to everything; in the least detail of nature or of science, analysis rediscovers all science and all nature; each of our states and acts envelopes our entire soul and the totality of its powers; thought, in a word, implicates itself entirely in each of its moments or degrees.

But integralists erred by refusing to give any credence to the methods of the new religious sciences that both the progressistes and the modernists employed.

In the judgment of Daniel-Rops, the vast majority of the integralists thought themselves in complete possession of the truth, and more Catholic than the pope.

This new orthodoxy had three basic flaws. First, there was horror of all novelty, all modernity, identified purposely or not with Modernists. Second, the cult of integrity and purity of faith led to serious confusion between revealed truths and academic theories, between the constituent elements of the Church or customs or traditions whose value lay in their antiquity alone. Third, in every field there was a taste for authoritarianism and forceful methods, which explains the frequent recourse to the Holy Office and the reprobation of democracy in any shape or form.

Most integralists relied on what they considered to be the Church’s tradition to provide a secure intellectual base for Catholic political action in society. But the depreciation of the rationality of revelation lent itself to a distorted adherence to ecclesiastical authority. Such an attitude could also lead to a sectarian attitude in politics.

---


477 “L’histoire de la philosophie nous apprend à considérer avec quelque détachement ces déclarations intégristes. ‘La réalité, nous dit-on, n’est pas faite des pièces distinctes juxtaposées; tout est intérieur à tout; dans le moindre détail de la nature ou de la science, l’analyse retrouve toute la science et toute la nature; chacun de nos états et de nos actes enveloppe notre âme entière et la totalité de ses puissances; la pensée, en un mot, s’implique elle-même tout entière à chacun de ses moments ou degrés.’” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 202-3.) See also Gabriel Daly, Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), 187.

478 Daniel-Rops, A Fight for God, 1, 290.

479 André Boland, “Modernisme,” 1461.
Although the integralists were a smaller group than either the progressives or modernists, their baleful influence far outweighed their numbers.\footnote{Daniel-Rops, \textit{A Fight for God}, 1, 289-91.} Integralism was not, strictly speaking, heretical.

It was nevertheless extremely dangerous to the Church; it tied her hand and foot, rendering her absolutely incapable of keeping contact with the changing world of men, and it delivered her up to be rent interminably by mutual denunciations and reprisals in defiance of that precept which stands first in Christ's teaching—charity.\footnote{Daniel-Rops, \textit{A Fight for God}, 1, 290.}

As heresy-hunters, integralists conducted campaigns orally or in print against or delated to Rome anyone who carried the least suspicion of being modernist. The integralist attacks occurred mostly in articles and pamphlets, and were often launched simultaneously, with the same wording. It was discovered after World War I that many such attacks were initiated in Rome by Mgr. Umberto Benigni, Sub-Secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs.\footnote{Carl Russell Fish, “Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and Other Italian Archives,” \textit{Papers of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington} 128, ed. J. Franklin Jameson (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., 1911), iii.} In 1905, he founded the \textit{Sodalite Pianum} (after Pius V); its code name was La Sapinière, the Fir-Grove.\footnote{Daniel-Rops, \textit{A Fight for God}, 291-2. For a full history, see Émile Poulat, \textit{Intégrisme et Catholicisme intégral: Un réseau secret internationale antimoderniste: La 'Sapinière' (1909–1921)} (Paris: Casterman, 1969).} In all likelihood, Pius X approved of the anti-modernist purpose of the society, but knew little of its actual activities.

It was little surprise that Grandmaison and the staff of \textit{Études} displeased the integralists.\footnote{Poulat, \textit{Intégrisme}, 392-7.} Grandmaison tried to steer a course between the Scylla and Charybdis of modernism and integralism. There were a good number of rationalist and modernist exegetes whose works he used
at times to support his arguments.\textsuperscript{485} When Lagrange was called back from Jerusalem to Paris during the academic year 1912-1913 on suspicion of being a modernist, Grandmaison personally supported him.\textsuperscript{486} So integralists deemed the journal’s approach to the anti-modernist fight as being, at best, too irectic. The integralist \textit{La Vigan}, edited by H. Merlier, accused Grandmaison of being “excessively pacific” toward the modernists.\textsuperscript{487} Grandmaison incurred numerous personal attacks from \textit{La Critique du Libéralisme}, a review founded in 1908 and edited by an elderly Jesuit, Père Emmanuel Barbier, with little theological competence. Another elderly Jesuit, Père Bernard Gaudreau, founded the review \textit{la Foi catholique} in 1908, which also attacked \textit{Études}. Although Gaudreau was a passable theologian, he was ill-informed about the matters at hand. (Gaudreau denied, however, that he was an integralist.\textsuperscript{488})

The integralist attacks against Grandmaison and the staff of \textit{Études} reached a fever pitch in 1912–1913.\textsuperscript{489} In 1913, other Jesuit journals had written to protest the integralist onslaught.\textsuperscript{490}

\textsuperscript{485} For an example of his use of Loisy, see Grandmaison, “Orpheus,” 42-3.

\textsuperscript{486} Lagrange was prohibited for a time from writing, as he had come under suspicion of being a modernist and so was forced to return to France from the École Biblique in Jerusalem. Certain Jesuits had opposed him publicly. Grandmaison, on the other hand, was one of a few prominent Jesuit scholars who supported Lagrange, and was the only Jesuit to visit him at the Dominican community at Sèvres: he did so, in Lagrange’s own words, “très affectueusement”; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, \textit{Au Service de la Bible: Souvenirs personnels} (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 206. See also \textit{ibid.}, 201, 208.

\textsuperscript{487} \textit{La Vigan}, August 28, 1913, in Poulat, \textit{Integrisme}, 394. See Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 188n2, for a list of attacks on various members of the Jesuit staff of \textit{Études} from August 8, 1913 till June 5, 1914.


\textsuperscript{489} Peter Bernardi, “Courageous Manifesto: the French Jesuit Response to Intégrisme during the Modernist Crisis,” unpublished paper, American Catholic Historical Association, Boston, January 7, 2011, Boston, MA. Bernardi’s paper is the most extensive commentary on the 1914 \textit{Études} articles to date.

\textsuperscript{490} Correspondent Peter Lippert had written a similar anti-integralist article in 1913; Peter Lippert, \textit{Stimmen aus Maria Laach} 85 (1913), 358-62, in Chantraine, \textit{Lubac}, 285n287. At the request of Pius X, another Jesuit, Pater Muckermann, was delegated instead to write the second article.
Recognizing the severe mistreatment of orthodox clergy and laity alike, all at Études felt obliged to defend themselves. On January 5, 1914, the staff published an editorial entitled “Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires.” Although signed “Études,” the editorial was written by Jesuit Père Émonet Benoît and revised by Grandmaison.

“Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires” acknowledged on the one hand that Études was not exempt from human weakness, and, on the other hand, that it wanted “to remain faithful to the mandate that it had received from their founders, to the confidence of the bishops of France and of the Holy See.” The Études editorial named no adversaries, but rather focused on their methods. It criticized the integralists for upsetting good Catholics without any mandate or any positive vision.

No one was safe, not even Catholic institutes, religious orders, the Catholic Association of French Youth, Catholic social workers, the French Patriotic League, Popular Action of Rheims, the works of M. de Mun’s groups, the efforts of eminent Catholics who have defended the Church in the French Parliament, etc.

The attacks by the integrists were ubiquitous—in the (intra-Catholic) intellectual, ecclesiastical, and political spheres. The integralists appealed to public opinion—fickle, capricious, passionate, and incompetent; disrespectfully bypassed legitimate Church authorities (including the diocesan

491 “Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires,” Études 138 (1914): 5-25. I am indebted to Dr. Joseph A. Komonchak for pointing out that at page 16, the article’s title became “Critiques négatives ou tâches nécessaires.”

492 Blondel-Valensin, Correspondance, ii, 220, 202n2; Chantraine, Henri de Lubac, 284n1-5.

493 Critiques négatives,” 5.

494 “Critiques négatives,” 7.

495 “Critiques négatives,” 5-6.

496 “les institutes catholiques, les Ordres religieux, l’Association Catholique de la Jeunesse française, les œuvres des catholiques sociaux, la Ligue patriotique des Françaises, l’Action Populaire de Reims, œuvres des Cercles de M. de Mun, les efforts des catholiques éminents qui ont défendu l’Église au Parlement français, etc.” (“Critiques négatives,” 6.)

497 “Critiques négatives,” 7.
Vigilance councils required by *Pascendi*; lacked fraternal charity; suppressed legitimate dialogue; senselessly assailed bishops appointed by the Holy Father; and in short made denunciations without discernment—no wonder the confusion among the public and the rejoicing among the real modernists!\textsuperscript{498} “These gentlemen complain that scientific methods have been abused: in truth, they prefer to ignore them completely.”\textsuperscript{499} Although the publicists in question sometimes did the Church a favor by unmasking her enemies, they had done so indiscriminately, even ruthlessly at times.\textsuperscript{500} They stained the reputation of good Catholics by associating them with reprobated ones, and mercilessly attacked fundamentally faithful journals and institutions. Such tactics poisoned the atmosphere in which fruitful discussion could otherwise take place.\textsuperscript{501} Finally, the integralists mistook the nature of the problem and how to counteract it. “Modernism is not an enemy against which more bickering alone will do. Modernist error has penetrated everywhere. It has been at the heart of exegesis, history, and philosophy.”\textsuperscript{502} Attacking one’s allies did not help.

The second part of the article reminded its readers of the mission of *Études* as Grandmaison had set it forth in “Religion catholique” (1912).\textsuperscript{503} For him, the most distinctive quality of the Church was its doctrinal intransigence.\textsuperscript{504}

\textsuperscript{498} “Critiques négatives,” 7-10.

\textsuperscript{499} “Critiques négatives,” 11-12.

\textsuperscript{500} “Critiques négatives,” 13-4.

\textsuperscript{501} “Critiques négatives,” 14-5.

\textsuperscript{502} “Le modernisme n’est pas un ennemi contre lequel il suffise d’escarmoucher. C’est l’erreur moderne qui a pénétré partout. Elle a été à coeur de l’exégèse, de l’histoire, de la philosophie.” (“Critiques négatives,” 17.)

\textsuperscript{503} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1005-6.

\textsuperscript{504} “Critiques négatives,” 15.
Études has dissimulated neither the extent nor the gravity of modernism, liberalism, social utopias and all modernist errors. [Études] has, it is true, been careful in its treatment of people, and that is held against us. It is easy for us to reply. This method is the very same as that of Our Lord.  

Orthodox Catholic thought was needed in order to deliver the final blow to modernism. Here Grandmaison gave an important insight into the problem posed by modernism: “But, as after each heresy, and for greater reason, [the Church] ought to prepare herself to make the deposit of revelation shine with a new brilliance in many areas troubled by the age-old conflict between religious individualism and the religion of authority.”  

Pius X had enlisted many devoted helpers in positive works. Now the integralists had to fall in line: “Get to work!” Otherwise, one risked giving the false impression that the pope was against critical scholarship.

The editorial also expressed some support for the rising social movements that promoted democracy. “Pius X’s program is to restamp the world with Christian principles. In that regard, two tasks still impose themselves on good workers, faithful to the direction of their leader. One, negative: to combat liberalism and social utopias; the other, positive: to mold true Christians.”

There were attempts to create democratic associations at various levels of society that had been inappropriate; these were discreetly discouraged. Still,

---

505 “Du modernisme, du libéralisme, des utopies sociales et de toutes les erreurs modernes—…les Études n’ont dissimulé ni l’étendue ni la gravité. Elles ont, il est vrai, gardé des managements envers les personnes, et de cela on leur fait grief. Il leur est facile de répondre. Cette méthode est celle-même de Notre Seigneur.” (“Critiques négatives,” 16.)

506 “Mais, comme après chaque hérésie, et à plus forte raison, elle doit se préparer à le [dépôt de la révélation] faire briller d’un nouvel éclat à tant de regards, troublés par le conflit séculaire entre l’individualisme religieux et le religion d’autorité.” (”Critiques négatives,” 18.)

507 “Critiques négatives,” 22.

508 “Retremper le monde dans les principes chrétiens, tel est le programme de Pie X. Là encore deux taches s’imposent aux bons ouvriers, fidèles à la direction du chef. L’une, négative: combattre le libéralisme et les utopies sociales; l’autre, positive: façonner de vrais chrétiens.” (“Critiques négatives,” 21.)
should it be necessary, rather, in the face of excessive disquiet, to discredit the entire social movement? There are some who go about repeating today: ‘I myself am antisocial!’ Childish and futile rebuff! What therefore, is more antisocial than the dogma of laicism, the indispensable corollary, M. Poincaré said at Toulouse, of national sovereignty, which is itself the most immediate consequence of the anarchic individualism of J.–J. Rousseau? Absolute independence, autonomy, absence of every natural tie, isn’t that the catechism of laicism? Who, on the contrary, is more solidly intertwined among themselves, in Jesus Christ, with God, than the members of this spiritual society that is the Catholic Church?509

Pius’ program was none other than “the restoration of a public Catholic mentality.”510 True integral Catholicism—not the integralism here criticized—respected both the integrity of doctrine and the integrity of morality.511 The methods that Études had adopted and would continue to follow in defending Rome were “dignity in the struggle, loyalty to the adversary, charity for all.”512 Negative criticism alone would not do.513

Two short editorials were published afterward.514 The first, on January 20: “Notes des Études,” thanked “the numerous friends of Études: cardinals, bishops, superiors and professors of large seminaries, religious of various orders, directors of Catholic reviews or journals, eminent laity” for their support.515 Support for the January editorial was, however, not universal among Catholics or Jesuits. The subsequent editorial, “Une mise au point nécessaire,” sought to make such

509 “faillait-il d’ailleurs, en témoignant un excès d’inquiétude, discréditer tout le mouvement social? Il en est qui s’en vont répétant aujourd’hui: ‘Moi, je suis antisocial!’” Puérile et vaine surenchère! Qu’y a-t-il donc de plus antisocial que le dogme de la laïcité, corollaire indispensable, disait M. Poincaré à Toulouse, de la souveraineté nationale, qui est elle-même la conséquence la plus immédiate de l’individualisme anarchique de J.–J. Rousseau? Indépendance absolue, autonomie, absence de tout lien social naturel, n’est-ce pas le catéchisme de la laïcité? Qu’y a-t-il, au contraire, de plus solidement enchaînés entre eux, en Jésus-Christ, avec Dieu, que les membres de cette société spirituelle qu’est l’Église catholique?” (“Critiques négatives,” 21-2.)

510 “Critiques négatives,” 23.


512 “Critiques négatives,” 25.

513 “Critiques négatives,” 20.


515 “Note des Études,” 272.
conciliatory clarifications in the face of largely mistaken criticism or of distortion without retreating from the aims of the January 5 article.

The editorials had an enormous impact throughout Catholic Europe. On February 12, 1914, *La Vige* complained of “the incredible hostility that was shown everywhere against the Catholic integralist press.” Concerning the January editorial, Chantraine wrote:

this *Études* article was tied to the renewal of philosophical and theological renewal among French Jesuits and to the forceful role of P. Léonce de Grandmaison to promote this renewal. Jean Lacouture noted it well, with a little bit of eloquence: ‘these few pages [of *Études*] de 1914 open the way to a profound reconversion, to an era of intellectual fertility in the heart of the Society of Jesus’; ‘from these open hands’ of Léonce de Grandmaison ‘the Jesuits of the “great generation” of 1930 took flight for ambitious adventures of the spirit’—Fontoynont, Lebreton, Rousselot, Teilhard, Valensin, Charles, Fessard, de Lubac.

Many breathed a sigh of relief when Pope Pius X’s successor, Pope Benedict XV, elected on September 3, 1914, issued an encyclical, *Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum,* which in part admonished those responsible for baseless accusations among Catholics. Grandmaison concurred with Pope Benedict’s emphasis on charity. The more significant adversaries were ever the modernists.

Grandmaison seldom criticized integralism in his writings thereafter. But he was not reticent in protesting the unfairness of integralist attacks against the Jesuits of *Études* and against orthodox writers, professors, and clergy. These interventions, however, were done in private. Along with other


517 Rousselot died in 1915.


Jesuit colleagues, he advocated in 1918 for the liberty proper to Catholic thinkers when he protested the Roman condemnation of the 1906 revision by Sulpician priest Augustin Brassac of the *Manuel Biblique*—a book that had been used in French Catholic seminaries already for twelve years. Grandmaison also intervened on behalf of dogmatic theologian Maurice de la Taille, S.J. In 1924, Grandmaison wrote a lengthy letter complaining to then Cardinal and theologian Louis Billot, professor of dogmatic theology at the Gregorian University in Rome, about the restraint or censure of certain orthodox theologians: Grandmaison “feared that Roman lightening would fall not only on Catholic exegesis, but also on other good workers.” Finally, he wrote Rome to complain of pressure on the RSR. He sent a “quite emphatic” letter to Rome, probably to his Jesuit superiors, but only received “a sympathetic but anodyne response.”

The First World War gave *Études* the opportunity to further expand its horizons. Many priests enlisted as privates in the army, where they functioned as chaplains. This initiative was part of a larger effort of the Catholic clergy in France to win back the faithful in a political and cultural climate that was hostile to Christianity. The review published dispatches from the front written by priest-soldiers in the French army in every issue. Grandmaison later collected and published them,

---

521 Laplanche, *Crise*, 140-1n1.
524 Léonce de Grandmaison, ASFJ, HGra 31/1 2 letters of his (January 3 and February 7 1924), in Laplanche, *Crise*, 142n3.
525 Two Jesuits who served in the French army were Pierre Rousselot and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. The latter was a stretcher-bearer and survived the war. The former served as a soldier-priest and chaplain, and was shot dead by German troops in 1915 as he stepped out of his unit’s trench to sue for terms of surrender to a German unit surrounding his own; Léonce de Grandmaison, “Pierre Rousselot,” preface, *L’intellectualisme de Saint Thomas*, by Pierre Rousselot, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1924), xxxviii–xxxix.
along with photos, in a renowned two-volume mémoire.\(^{526}\) Just as he had shown his ability to understand his intellectual opponents, Grandmaison’s patriotism did not preclude showing sympathy for an erstwhile ally—Quebec—which did not support France in her hour of need.\(^{527}\) But his patriotism cost him at times. Some Jesuits from neutral countries had criticized Études for its French bias.\(^{528}\) In accord with the Jesuit Father General Ledóchowski’s wishes on the matter, the vicar general of the Jesuits, Père Édouard Fine, asked Grandmaison, in the interest of the union of hearts and minds on both sides of the war, “to give less place in Études to anecdotal accounts which could seem patriotic, or anti-German, and to favor some articles on post-war problems (the restoration of the country, the return to religion) and some articles on doctrine.”\(^{529}\) Grandmaison willingly obliged.

Grandmaison enabled and encouraged theological and philosophical renewal. He was a generous promoter of Jesuit thinkers in a variety of fields. He recognized, for example, the seminal work of Père Marcel Jousse, who was a pioneer in the study of oral tradition in biblical composition;\(^{530}\) encouraged the work of Père Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, albeit with some


\(^{528}\) Flagéat, Jésuites français dans la Grande Guerre, 400-1, 400n1, 400n2-4301.


\(^{530}\) Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le style oral,” Études 183 (1925), 685-705.
trepidation\footnote{Jean Daniélou, “Grandmaison,” 771. Teilhard de Chardin cherished Grandmaison—“the divine Léonce”—as the most beloved of his Jesuit formators: “a beautiful figure of a humanist, of broad culture, open to everything; a ‘prince’ who exercised a considerable influence.” (Pierre de Teilhard de Chardin, unspecified work, in Claude Cuénot, 


In January, 1918, Grandmaison co-founded \textit{Nouvelles Religieuses}, a kind of French Catholic press bureau.\footnote{Flagéat, \textit{Jésuites français dans la Grande Guerre}, 380, 387.} Until its close in 1929, it helped the French to understand the positions of the Holy See and to provide essential religious news at the national and global level.\footnote{Flagéat, \textit{Jésuites français dans la Grande Guerre}, 387, 387n1.} He also co-edited this journal and contributed articles to it. Flagéat conjectured that Grandmaison may have contributed an article in n. 2 of the journal that “underlined the loyalty of French Catholics and regretted that the attitude of the public authorities had changed so little in this respect, despite their patriotism and...
actions during the conflict. Nonetheless, the French priest-soldiers did win the Church some goodwill from their countryman.

*From Director of Études to Author of Jésus Christ*

In 1919, Grandmaison was permitted to step down as director of Études, though he continued to contribute extensively to the journal as editor. This change—along with assistance afforded by his personal secretary Père Paul Doncoeur—allowed Grandmaison to devote more time to RSR and to his work on Christ.

(i) Pastoral Ministry

Stepping down as director of Études also allowed Grandmaison to pursue numerous pastoral projects that he had already begun. He had little time to exercise his beloved ministry of individual spiritual direction. But some people did receive spiritual direction from him, such as those in special need or those showing great promise in the spiritual life. Madame Madeleine Daniélou fell into the latter group. Mother of future Jesuit priest and theologian Cardinal Jean Daniélou, she founded l’École Normale Libre to offer a Catholic education for women in 1907. In 1909, she began to gather women high school teachers for spiritual and catechetical formation. After hearing

---


539 Passage, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 5.


543 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 301.
Grandmaison preach a retreat in April, 1909, Daniélou asked him to be her spiritual director. He consented to do so and then served as a vital animator of her association. Later called “La Communauté apostolique Saint-François-Xavier,” the group was approved by Cardinal Amette, Archbishop of Paris, and pronounced their first vows in 1915. The Community was one of many efficacious experiments before Vatican II in the re-discovery of the apostolic dimension of the lay vocation. Grandmaison edited the Directions spirituelles for the group from 1911 till his death. These Directions were probably transcriptions or elaborations of the conferences he gave to the group. After his death, Madeleine Daniélou collected these conferences and published them in anthology form.

Grandmaison was active beyond student circles. He once gave a conference to the French Patriotic League on the “Littérature contemporain ennemie de la famille” and attended the Semaine des Ecrivains catholiques. But he was especially eager to be of help to young Catholic adults. He did an important service in trying to bridge the little-noticed gap between professional and religious

544 Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 73.
545 Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 113.
546 Grandmaison considered Madeleine’s work ahead of her time; Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 164. The Association continues its life and work today in France and in countries in Africa and in Asia; Berger, ibid., 311–2.
548 “Les fragments de ces conférences ont été publiés dans la Revue d’Ascétique et mystique, 1929, 225-58. Nous espérons que l’ensemble ne tardera pas à paraître.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 312n1.)
550 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 294, 296.
551 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 326.
learning by his writing, lectures, retreats, and spiritual direction. Laplanche wrote the following on Grandmaison’s involvement in the religious formation of young adults:

Observers of religious affairs in France in the 1920’s are led in effect to two contradictory constants: on one hand, a movement of conversion and return to the faith in the heart of the intellectual elites; on the other hand, the loss of faith as much among high school students as in the mass of young people who had only a brief schooling. Therefore, Grandmaison diagnoses an imbalance between the scientific or professional formation and the level of religious culture. To be sure, numerous initiatives try to remedy this state of affairs, but all the young people who attend establishments of public instruction, large classes of high schools, écoles supérieures, universities, set aside little time to complete their religious formation. Therefore, it is necessary to acquire in the face of objections and unbelief, a method of reflection and of discussion more than a bunch of responses. Grandmaison pursues this objective in several directions.552

Since 1912, he worked among the engineering students of the École polytechnique and the École central, and offered the students conferences, small group meetings, and retreats.553 “The preacher’s influence was profound: the Polytechnic students love clarity, method, simplicity: they appreciated this unstudied word, entirely nourished by the Gospel, very rich in human experience and in warm sympathy.”554 In October 1915, Protestant pastor Wilfred Monod555 gave conferences at the École normale supérieure de Sevrès to which the Protestant students could invite their Catholic

552 “Les observateurs du fait religieux dans la France des années 1920 sont en effet conduits à deux constats contradictoires: d’une part, un mouvement de conversion et de retour à la foi au sein des élites intellectuelles; de l’autre, la perte de la foi aussi bien chez les lycéens que dans la masse des jeunes n’ayant connu qu’une scolarisation courte. Grandmaison diagnostique alors un déséquilibre entre la formation scientifique ou professionnelle et le niveau de culture religieuse. Certes, de nombreuses initiatives essaient de remédier à cet état de choses, mais tous les jeunes qui fréquentent les établissements de l’enseignement public, grandes classes des lycées, écoles supérieures, universités, disposent de peu de temps pour compléter leur formation religieuse. Il faut donc faire acquérir, face aux objections de l’incrédulité, une méthode de réflexion et de discussion, plus qu’une somme de réponses. Grandmaison poursuit cet objectif dans plusieurs directions.” (Laplanche, Crise, 159.)

553 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 327-33. “À sa mort, huit cent cinquante élèves ou anciens élèves des Écoles polytechnique et centrale offraient chacun une communion, un chapelet, d’autres un suffrage, pour le repos de l’âme de leur bienfaiteur spirituel.” (Bourget, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 452.)

554 “L’action du prédicateur était profonde: les polytechniciens aiment la clarté, la méthode, la simplicité: ils goûtaient cette parole sans apprêt, toute nourrie de l’Évangile, très riche d’expérience humaine et de chaude sympathie.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 328.)

555 See chapter three, p. 307, for an account of his intervention at an ecumenical conference in Stockholm.
schoolmates. Sometime in 1915, Grandmaison also gave a retreat for eight students there, at their request. Afterward, at the suggestion of a Sévrienne student, Mlle. Trouard-Riolle, he organized a series of lectures to which the Catholic students could invite their Protestant schoolmates.

On December 15, 1915, Grandmaison launched an ambitious program of informal courses in theology for the Sévrienne students and faculty. This was the start of the Conférence Saint-Michel. “Some professors of women’s secondary school teaching, from Paris and elsewhere, attend little by little these conferences, of a high level and of a kind that was unique at the time.” He was assisted by fellow Jesuits, and then by other religious.

The article entitled “L’autorité et l’Esprit dans le christianisme antique,” published in 1917-1918, arose from nine weekly lectures that Grandmaison delivered to the Conférence Saint-Michel beginning in November 9, 1916 and ending presumably in January, 1917. The lectures developed material from many of his earlier articles, especially “Le religion de l’Esprit,” and the last section of the DAFC article on Christ dealing with the Testimony of the Spirit. The lectures addressed “the question of the Church” which meant answering the objections by liberal Protestants—and by implication, the modernists—concerning the supposed opposition in the Catholic Church between

---


559 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 336.


ecclesiastical authority and the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. The main topics included: 1) the Kingdom of God in prophecy, in the Gospel, and realized in the Church; 2) apostolic authority as exercised in the gospel according to John, in the emerging Church, among the Gentiles and in the writings of Paul; and 3) apostolic authority realized in the pastoral hierarchy of the apostolic age and in the times of the apostolic Fathers and of St. Irenaeus. Grandmaison later incorporated much of this work in the sixth book of the two-volume *Jésus Christ*.

His first aim in “Autorité et l’Esprit” was to show that there was no time when “authentic, primitive Christianity had been decisively falsified and disfigured.” A second aim was also to show how the antinomy between authority and Spirit was so “sterile, unilateral and false” that it was nearly Manichean. The twin forces of inspiration and conservation were both necessary to the religious man. The present crisis of religion that downplayed authority, dogma, tradition, reason and faith, led to an anarchic individualism that disrupted the harmonious balance of the various elements of a fecund life. The last lecture ended with the injunction—concerning Christ and the Church—that “what God has conjoined, let no man put asunder!”

Grandmaison’s ministry continued to stimulate intellectual reflection on personal religious observance, especially in his serial article entitled “La crise de la foi chez les jeunes.” Roger Aubert commented: “The animator essay writer knew how to observe with finesse, even without special sociological training. The series of articles entitled *La Crise de la foi chez les jeunes* (Études, 1924; posthumous reprint, under the same title, Paris, G. Beauchesne, 1927) is an important milestone in

---

the history of pastoral consciousness in France.” The problem of ministry to young adults had been raised by Cardinal Louis Billot: “Speaking of an infinite number of people apparently outside the normal path to salvation, the eminent theologian was seeking a principle for solving this troubling problem in the providential role of the elite, of all those who are, in different ways, guides, and leaders.” So Grandmaison addressed the pastoral care of young adults in France, drawing on a wide range of written sources as well as on his own pastoral experience. His diagnosis of their predicament and his suggested measures reflected many of the elements of his notion of personal religion.

The article was in three parts respectively entitled “Le Fait et ses causes,” “Crise de croissance ou crise mortelle?” and “Les responsabilités.” There was a growing loss of faith among young adults, especially among young women vis-à-vis young men who had a secondary school education. The phenomenon occurred in all countries, religions, and times, but was happening more rapidly in his time. The two typical causes for the loss of faith in a materialist environment were “awakening of the senses” and “doubts and difficulties of the intellectual order.” As students progressed, their religious education was seen as less important vis-à-vis the authorities found in the secular world. This decline was due in large part to the secularization and secularist ideology among


566 “Parlant du nombre infini d’hommes apparemment hors de la vie normale de salut, l’éminent théologien cherchait à ce troublant problème un principe de solution dans le rôle providentiel de l’élite, de tous ceux qui sont, à titres divers, des guides et des chefs.” (Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 418.)

567 Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 136. This observation was confirmed by Madeleine Daniélou as early as 1912; Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 64-5.

the religiously neutral public schools.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 137.} There were many powerful social influences beyond the control of teachers, and “to the great detriment to their influence.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 146.} Students came to consider abandoning their faith something that was normal and even a kind of emancipation.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 147.} If no other positive religion were substituted for the one abandoned, the damage was irreparable.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 148.}

Then Grandmaison probed the internal attitudes and external influences that vitiated belief or that caused the loss of faith entirely.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 412, 281-3.} His aim was to move the young Catholic from an immature devotion that demanded service “without air, without elevation, without sweetness, expressing itself more as a lesson learned” to a devotion that was founded on “the divine life communicated” to the believer experienced as “filial friendship.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 283.} When the liberty of Christ was missing, what caused the loss of faith were influences that provided a sense of liberation.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 283-4.} At other times the loss of faith happened in the midst of a seemingly benign crisis.

Grandmaison exercised a deft casuistry and showed compassion for the lapsed. Only those who were fully formed by the Church would be fully responsible for renouncing their faith.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 414.} One could not count among that number those were ensnared by the scientific sophistication so prevalent at the university level.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 414-6.} What such a person needed to recall was that apparent intellectual
sufficiency in one matter did not require abandoning the faith and that one could seek help in meeting such an objection.

The best strategy was one of prudent gradualism. Religious formation had to steer a path between being impatient with the decline of piety and indulging an entirely sentimental approach. In general, the best remedy was “to obtain a gradual initiation [into the faith], finely dosed, which admonished without troubling and immunized without poisoning. Everyone agrees at least on that much: the difficulty and the divergences begin in practice.” The study of religion was important, but more important was a sympathetic understanding of religion as it was lived out that inclined the faithful to such study: “a person is not pure intelligence; he is also will, desire, love, inclination, and even body.” The goal most of all was “to develop in adolescents the sense of and the taste for spiritual and divine realities.” To counteract many social forces that could harm one’s faith, a formator needed to offer and to demand. A balance had to be struck. For example, one did need to regard sports as an enemy; a satisfactory arrangement could be worked out that made room for both formation and exercise. What worked best for a troubled youth were friends and priests whose religious experience and culture could encourage such a person to seek them out. Finally, the young had to be encouraged to give as well as to receive.

578 Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 140-1. Grandmaison felt that, given Renan’s expression of his own adult piety, his own personal religion had been compromised by a cozy, sentimental substitute; ibid., 140n2.

579 “à obtenir une initiation graduelle, bien dosée, qui avertisse sans troubler et immuniser sans empoissonner. Tout le monde est d’accord là-dessus: la difficulté et les divergences commencent à la pratique.” (Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 148-9.)

580 Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 411.

581 Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 275.

582 Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 278.
As far as intellectual formation for young minds, “everything or nearly everything needed to be done.”\textsuperscript{583} Public opinion was governed by a thoroughgoing liberalism in politics and religion, which threatened morality more than beliefs. The Catholic Church alone openly opposed this decline. The best hope for Christians educated in public schools was through apologetics.\textsuperscript{584} Some basic catechism was better than none, but enlightened catechists were most important of all.\textsuperscript{585} The important task was to give students well-chosen principles and examples to fortify them against the errors and prejudices of the day.\textsuperscript{586}

The third article, “Les responsabilités,” focused on the responsibilities of the young in their response to influential elites, which included thinkers, politicians, artists, and high culture in general.\textsuperscript{587} Those responsible for forming the young need not despair over the challenges posed by this great evil of the contemporary world—they had the grace of Christ. “One only needs to make each Christian conscious of the divine power that is in him: he needs to be taught to cultivate it.”\textsuperscript{588} Christian education could rise to the occasion.

The crisis of faith among young people involves without a doubt the dangers of a world still penetrated by a Christianity that runs deep, but which is no longer a Christendom, in which the unity of intellects have been bruised as much as or more than the unity of its wills and hearts. But it also involves the lacunae, and sometimes the belief in a real, living, intense Christian formation that is put back in its proper place in the education of children—the first place.\textsuperscript{589}

\textsuperscript{583} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 407.

\textsuperscript{584} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 151.

\textsuperscript{585} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 276.

\textsuperscript{586} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 152.

\textsuperscript{587} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 404-7.

\textsuperscript{588} Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 419.

\textsuperscript{589} “La crise de la foi chez les jeunes accuse sans doute les dangers d’un monde encore pénétré de christianisme en ses profondeurs, mais qui n’est plus une chrétienté, dans lequel l’unité des intelligences a été brisée autant et plus que des
Such was Grandmaison’s and the Church’s concern for the personal religion of young adults in the aftermath of modernism.

(ii) Defending the existence of Jesus

As editor of RSR, Grandmaison continued to write a number of other important articles, many of which had to do with his main work in Christology. Although the influence of modernism had abated considerably, challenges related to the movement persisted. In 1923, Paul-Louis Couchoud, an especially radical scholar of comparative religion, went as far as to deny that Christ had ever existed.\textsuperscript{590} Some scholars put forth the claim that the story of Jesus was a mere myth.

Couchoud’s two articles and his \textit{Mystère de Jésus} argued that Christ was historically impossible; rather, his mystic existence attracted a group of followers.\textsuperscript{591} This thesis was rejected almost universally. “For his part Couchoud tended to give a non-responsive response to all his critics—rather like the Markan Jesus reclining peacefully in a boat beset everywhere by storms.”\textsuperscript{592} Goguel noted that Grandmaison was the only Catholic theologian who bothered to refute Couchoud’s claim:

Father Lagrange,…the most learned French Catholic exegete, has confined himself to a contemptuous allusion to Couchoud’s theories. ‘Sad times are ours,’ he writes, ‘when it can be thought necessary to prove that Jesus existed, not to Iroquois, but to the cultivated and refined readers of the \textit{Mercure de France}.’ When the Club du Quartier Latin, in May 1925, arranged a great public debate on the historical existence of Jesus, several Catholic


\textsuperscript{591} Couchoud, \textit{Mystère de Jésus}, 185, 158-9.

\textsuperscript{592} Weaver, \textit{Historical Jesus}, 300-1.
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theologians who were asked to take part declined the invitation, not one of them spoke, a
fact that pained and scandalized certain sincere Catholics who were present.

Only one Catholic theologian had a direct share in the debate, Father Léonce de
Grandmaison, S.J., editor of the important Catholic review Les Études. Grandmaison replied
in an article and then later in a book to defend the actual existence of Christ.593

Grandmaison’s willingness to respond showed that he took even the most far-fetched claims
seriously. As an apologist, he had the prescience to realize that even such ideas—and worse—were
taken seriously by readers who have no or only some education in the field. That Couchoud created
such a stir showed how even the slightest semblance of scientific learning could influence the public.

Grandmaison wrote on a variety of subjects, while continuing to focus on Christology and
religion. He gave much attention to questions of spirituality and to the renewed interest in mysticism
in France and throughout Catholic Europe.594 A notable article on Sadhu Sundar Singh, a well-
known Indian convert to Christianity, dealt in part with the topic of the salvation of separated
brethren.595 Fittingly, the last article that Grandmaison published under his own name was a review
of Bourget’s novel Nos actes nous suivent.596

(iii) Jésus Christ (1927)

For years, Grandmaison continued to work on what he thought would be his major opus.

Much of the two-volume work incorporated sections from the DAFC article and from articles that

593 Maurice Goguel, “Recent French Discussion of the Historical Existence of Jesus Christ,” Harvard Theological Review 19
(1926): 135–6. The works to which Goguel referred were Léonce de Grandmaison, “Jésus dans l’histoire,” Mercure de
France 166 (1923), 22-48, and a fuller response, Léonce de Grandmaison, Jésus dans l’histoire et dans le mystère (Paris: Bloud
and Gay, 1925).

594 Léonce de Grandmaison, “Revival of the study of mysticism among French Catholics,” Constructive Quarterly 9 (1921):
596-608.

595 Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le Sadhu Sundar Singh et le problème de la sainteté hors de l’Église catholique,” RSR 12
(1921): 1-27.

had been written since the DAFC article. Yet, as the time neared for the completion of the manuscript for the two-volume Jésus Christ, Grandmaison almost gave up on the project.

In the month of January [1926], Father de Grandmaison explained to Mme. Daniélou that he was finding himself at a complete impasse regarding his book Jésus-Christ, sa personne, son message, ses preuves, on which he had been working for twenty years: he was thinking about giving up its publication because the manuscript, thick, made of bits and pieces, was completely illegible. All the people who had until then tried to help him had failed. Even he himself, at the moment he showed some pages to his provincial, couldn’t read them. It was truly a catastrophe. ‘Father, Mme. Daniélou told him, give me the manuscript, we will unravel it together.’ The next day, she went to get a big packet of pages, ‘to try.’

The package arrived in near complete disarray. Madeleine and her community had to reconstruct the text, references, and bibliography from his penmanship, which was faint in places, or trailed off altogether. It took five teams of full-time teachers nearly working around the clock to complete the work. Upon seeing the neatly arranged pile of pages, Grandmaison cried out: “a miracle!” He then spent a month at the library at Jersey revising it, and returned to Paris in January, 1927. After the St. Francis Xavier Community proofread the final draft in March, the book was ready for press in

---

597 An example of this compilation is “Le Christ de l’histoire dans l’oeuvre de Saint Paul,” RSR 16 (1923): 481-91, much of which appeared in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1516-21. Some articles were also published as sections of the two-volume work. For example, “Dieux morts et ressuscités,” RSR 17 (1927), 97-126, also appeared as an appendix in the later work, as Note R, “Dieux morts et ressuscités”; Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 510-32.

598 “Au mois de janvier [1926], le P. de Grandmaison expliquait à Mme Daniélou qu’il se trouvait dans une impasse complète pour son livre Jésus-Christ, sa personne, son message, ses preuves, auquel il travaillait depuis vingt ans: il pensait renoncer à la publication parce que le manuscrit, épais, fait de pièces et de morceaux, était absolument illisible. Toutes les personnes qui avaient jusqu’à présent essayé de l’aider avaient échoué. Lui-même d’ailleurs, au moment d’en montrer quelques pages à son provincial, n’avait pu se relire. C’était vraiment la catastrophe. “Père, lui dit Mme Daniélou, donnez-moi votre manuscrit, nous allons débrouiller cela toutes ensemble.” Le lendemain, on alla chercher un bon paquet de feuilles, ‘pour essayer.’” (Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 167.)


600 Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 167.

601 Berger, Madeleine Daniélou, 166.
May. The work received many reviews; especially insightful articles about the work were written by Grandmaison’s collaborators Joseph Huby and Jules Lebreton.

E. Death and Legacy

Grandmaison was exhausted when the work was finished. On June 9, 1927, he underwent a routine appendectomy. Although the operation itself went well, he expressed some unease that his convalescence would not be as quick as expected. On June 15, a hospital orderly left his side for a few minutes, only to return and find him dead. The strain of having borne so many burdens during the war, the death of relatives and of so many brother priests and compatriots, the editorship of two journals while losing Jesuit collaborators, and the final effort at completing *Jésus Christ*, may have hastened his unexpected death.

The outpouring of public mourning showed how important a public figure Grandmaison had become. A high standard had been set for Catholic apologetics, journalism, exegesis, and theology. Thanks in part to his editorial leadership and his writings, many of the deficiencies of Catholic scholarship vis-à-vis Protestant scholars in the nineteenth century had been overcome. He also left an enduring pastoral legacy.

---


608 Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 420.

Conclusion

Grandmaison resolved to write a work on Jesus Christ from the time of his novitiate. Five of his principal hallmarks as an apologist and theologian were his Christocentrism, Christian humanism, Jesuit sensibility, the mastery of religious psychology after the example of Blaise Pascal and John Henry Newman, and his emulation of Thomas Aquinas as apologist and speculative theologian. The essential aspects of Grandmaison’s Jesuit apostolic sensibility were an orientation toward action, particularly charity; the practice of the discernment of spirits; indifference; and reserve.

From the very beginning of his career as an apologist, Grandmaison had a keen appreciation for the issues raised by modernism, especially in the areas of the development of doctrine and biblical exegesis. While asserting the traditional priority of speculative theology, he recognized the need for Catholic theologians to advance in positive theology. Such progress took place during his tenure as director of Études and director of RSR, of which he was the principal founder.

The study of religious ethnology, religious psychology, and the philosophy of religion, along with his regard for Pascal and Newman, led Grandmaison to the notion of personal religion as a guiding light in his treatment of the questions of the day. All these fields influenced how the Christians of his time regarded the traditional belief in the divinity of Christ, which Grandmaison, among many other Catholic theologians, saw as being threatened by modernism. In particular, he saw a potent challenge in liberal Protestantism’s critique of Catholicism’s claim to be the quintessential religion of the Spirit. Given his pastoral sensibility, Grandmaison also appreciated the spiritual dimension of the modernist crisis.

Personal religion in its root sense referred to Christ’s relationship to the Father; it also referred to the individual believer’s religion in its individual and collective aspects, and to the
Catholic Church, the personal religion that Jesus founded. This notion of personal religion played an explicit role in his two principal Christological works, the *DAFC* article on Jesus Christ and the 1927 two-volume work, *Jésus Christ*. In them, Grandmaison sought to speak well of Christ and to uphold the mystery of Jesus as the Word made flesh.
CHAPTER TWO

The Modernist Challenge to Personal Religion

Grandmaison considered modernism to be a system, that is, a mindset composed of interrelated philosophical principles and affective attitudes.¹ A modernist was someone who held two convictions:

1) that, on defined points concerning the doctrinal or moral basis of the Christian faith, there can be real conflicts between the traditional and the modern position: and 2) that in that case, it is the traditional that ordinarily ought to be adapted to the modern, by way of some revision, and, if needed, radical change or abandonment.²

But the second conviction could allow the innovator to give the slip to any scruples that a modernist had. “The essential points of the modernist program: the total emancipation of scientific research concerning exegesis or history; the denial of the supernatural, at least as an object of certain knowledge; and the absolute immanentism of the divine, and, consequently, of revelation.”³ “The source of the virus of the fever of modernism is its inability to harmonize the notions and hypotheses [of various critical thinkers] with the absolute value of Christian dogma.”⁴ This program had serious repercussions for the life of the Church and of each individual believer.


² “1° que, sur les points définis, intéressant le fonds doctrinal ou moral de la religion chrétienne, il peut y avoir des conflits réels entre la position traditionnelle et la moderne: et 2° que, dans ce cas, c’est le traditionnel qui doit ordinairement être adapté au moderne, par voie de retouche, et au besoin de changement radical, ou d’abandon.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, “Une nouvelle crie moderniste est-elle possible? Pour le XXᵉ anniversaire de l’avènement de Pie X,” Études 176 [1923], 644-5.)

³ “Les points essentiels du programme moderniste: émancipation totale de la recherche scientifique en matière exégétique ou historique; négation du surnaturel, en tant du moins qu’objet de connaissance certaine; immanentisme absolu du divin, et, partant, de la révélation.” (Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 403.)

⁴ Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 402.
This chapter will present a résumé of Grandmaison’s appraisal of the threat that this modernist mindset posed to personal religion. The first section examines the two principal stances that, according to Grandmaison, governed modernists: rationalism and sentimentalist religion. The second part of the chapter will take stock of the damage wrought by modernism’s main philosophical tenets. Along with many other anti-modernists, Grandmaison considered that the roots of the modernist errors in the areas of biblical exegesis, the study of religions, and religious psychology were fundamentally philosophical. He and Rousselot identified these errors as agnosticism, immanentism, and evolutionism⁵—the three errors that Pius X had identified in Pascendi. The third section of the chapter will take stock of what were for Grandmaison two emblematic fruits of the damage that modernism wrought on personal religion: anti-dogmatism coupled with the flight to a false kind of mysticism. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to determine how well he represented the positions of the thinkers with whom he disagreed. As was seen in the last chapter, though, his adversaries generally regarded his understanding of their works as fair, even if they disagreed with him about his judgment of the truth.

A. The Tragic Oscillation of Modernism

Between Rationalism and Sentimental Religion

The Problem

Grandmaison gave the most comprehensive philosophical and historical treatment of the modernist mindset in four works: “La religion catholique au xixe siècle et au début du xxᵉ” (1912);⁶ “Jean-Adam Moehler: L’École catholique de Tübingue et les origines du modernisme”

---

⁵ Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 976, 983.

(1919), a review of a ground-breaking book on the nineteenth century Tübingen School, which had in principle surmounted the difficulties in reconciling critical scholarship and faith; a section of the *DAFC* article entitled *La Problème du Christ*; and a section of *Jésus Christ* entitled *La Crise de la Foi Chrétienne à l’intérieur du Christianisme*.

Following Möhler, Grandmaison thought that the essential core of Catholic tradition had always maintained a dynamic balance between contraries, the “natural and supernatural, divine grace and human liberty, that traditional religion united in a living synthesis.” But a rupture of this balance had occurred during the Renaissance and Reformation: in place of Catholicism’s integration of contraries, there had arisen a dialectical movement between them. Much of modernism’s harm to personal religion stemmed from its participation in this disruption. The genius of Möhler had been to discover the various impulses behind the Reformation and then to re-harmonize such disparate tendencies.

The first of these disruptive tendencies, at work since the Renaissance, tended to assert the complete autonomy of reason from faith. This extreme was the result of a misappropriation of pagan humanism. Protestant Reformer Martin Luther most powerfully launched an opposite

---

14 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 163.
tendency in part as a reaction to the excesses of the Renaissance’s embrace of anthropocentric humanism. Luther held as contradictory the contrary elements of reality that Catholic sensibility held together in relative harmony. “This disruption of balance could be accomplished, and has been accomplished, in effect, in two senses, when one of the two realities was sacrificed to the other.”

For example, reacting to the humanist (over)confidence in reason, Luther rejected the relative power and right of the human intellect to know the truth by reason. His habit of thinking relied on the dialectic of “either/or,” as opposed to the synthetic approach of Catholic “both/and.”

Möhler held that the rejection of the worth of human reason dovetailed with the Protestant doctrine of the relationship of nature and grace. When he contrasted the starting point and basis of the Protestant and Catholic systems of ideas, he asserted that the point on which the two differed most significantly was in their assessment of human nature after the fall:

To the radical pessimism of the Protestant (a pessimism of which fideism and agnosticism are the remedy or the consequence), the Catholic responds that nature is not completely vitiated by sin. From whence it follows that once healed and transformed by grace, [human nature] preserves all its activity, competent in its order, even though it is elevated and supernaturalized from within. Gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit: a fundamental axiom.

This theological doctrine about humanity had many ramifications for other views about the human person and about religion.


16 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1003.

17 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1002.

18 “Au pessimisme radical du protestant (pessimisme dont le fidéisme et l’agnosticisme procèdent à titre de remède ou de conséquence) le catholique répond que la nature n’est pas complètement viciée par le péché. D’où il suit que, une foi guérie et transformée par la grâce, elle garde toute son activité, compétente en son ordre, bien qu’elle soit élevée et supernaturelisée par l’intérieur. Gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit: axiome fondamental.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1002.)
From [this doctrine] comes the care that one has for the body in Catholic worship; rites and ceremonies, liturgical chants and vestments, images and relics, sacred formulas and actions. ‘Matter is susceptible to salvation,’ Saint Irenaeus once said. From there comes the social and hierarchical spirit: religion is not only an interior affair, an affair of the person, but it ought to penetrate nature itself. Now if man, as a person, is closed in on himself, ignored by others, known only by God, as a nature, he is essentially tied to others and dependent on them: ‘the individual [in this sense] is only an abstraction.’—From there, what is sometimes referred to as the rationalism of Catholicism, which believes itself to have both the duty to satisfy reason, and the right to require the assent of every reasonable person; from there, the conviction that there is no salvation unless it is from the start the truth.19

The passage ties together a number of contraries that Protestantism had sundered, but which Catholicism insisted belonged together, especially the first two: matter and spirit, person and nature, social solidarity and hierarchy, reason and faith, salvation and truth. For Grandmaison, the essence of Catholicism consisted of “the sacramental principle, the social principle, the dogmatic principle,” which “coalesces in the often cited axiom: ‘grace does not suppress nature, it perfects it.’”20 To the Catholic, the material world was sacred; religion had a collective dimension that permeated the nature of a person; faith demanded the assent of reason; and there was no salvation without the truth.

Luther’s overly personal, overly subjective Christianity had immense consequences for the Church. In his conversion, he had placed great emphasis on the sentiment of being saved, of feeling the effects of personal justification by faith in the merits of Christ. He placed such

19 “De là vient le souci qu’on a du corps dans le culte catholique; rites et cérémonies, chants et vêtements liturgiques, images et reliques, formules et gestes consacrées. ‘La matière est susceptible de salut,’ disait déjà Saint Irénée. De là vient l’esprit social et hiérarchique: la religion n’est pas seulement une affaire intérieure, une affaire de la personne, mais elle doit pénétrer la nature même. Or si l’homme, en tant que personne, est clos en soi, ignoré des autres, connu seulement de Dieu, en tant que nature, il est essentiellement lié aux autres, et dépendant d’eux: l’individu [en ce sens] n’est qu’une abstraction.’—De là encore ce qu’on appelle parfois le rationalisme du catholicisme, qui se croit et le devoir de satisfaire la raison, et le droit d’exiger l’assentiment de tout homme raisonnable; de là, la conviction de n’être le salut que s’il est d’abord la vérité.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1002-3.)

20 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1003.
emphasis on the experience of the assurance of salvation that the “emancipation from any hierarchy and from the traditional means of grace restricted the essential in religion to the subjective and the invisible, rendering all exterior control, every authority other than the Spirit of God acting immediately in each believer, to be null and void.”

Hence, Luther succumbed—however unwittingly—to anti-dogmatic and anti-sacramental tendencies.

The way in which Luther, according to his own experience, understood and defined religion, the friendly and sanctifying commerce of man with God, opened the path to liberalism by allowing the mind to exercise itself over everything, without excepting the fundamental dogma of the divinity of Christ. Christians had believed from the beginning that God deigned to associate with himself created instruments and visible ministers and rites so as to collaborate with man in the work of salvation. God could have done without these sacramental and personal intermediaries; ordinarily, he used them, and man, instructed in the divine plan, could not do without them without prejudice to his salvation. This economy was attacked at its heart by the Lutheran conception of the justification of the sinner; and, if the thought of the reformer, still working in traditional categories, never conceived the suppression in effect of every sacramental intermediary, he posed the principle that others logically pushed to its ultimate consequences.

Luther effectively opened the way to religious liberalism, which called into question the sacramental and personal intermediaries that were so important to the objective nature of Catholicism. The Reformers’ preferences for their own views and interests ultimately led to the “irreparable fault” of fracturing the unity among Christians:

They weakened the only force capable of maintaining as united and collaborative the elements of liberty and authority, of divine inspiration and human initiative that formed the tissue of a full religious life. In opposing their particular sense with the collective


22 “Ce qui ouvrit la voie au libéralisme en permettant à l’esprit propre de s’exercer sur tout, sans excepter le dogme fondamental de la divinité du Christ, ce fut la manière dont Luther comprit et définit, d’après son expérience à lui, la religion elle-même, le commerce amical et sanctifiant de l’homme avec Dieu. Les chrétiens avaient cru, des l’origine, que Dieu daignait s’associer pour collaborer avec lui, dans l’œuvre du salut, des instruments créés, ministres et rites visibles. Dieu pouvait se passer de ces intermédiaires sacramentels et personnels; il s’en servait ordinairement, et l’homme instruit du dessein divin ne pouvait s’y soustraire sans préjudice pour son salut. C’est au coeur que cette économie est atteinte par la conception luthérienne de la justification du pécheur et, si la pensée du réformateur, encore engagée dans les cadres traditionnels, ne conçut jamais la suppression effective de tout intermédiaire sacramental, il posa le principe que d’autres poussèrent logiquement à ses dernières conséquences.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 166.)
sense inspired by the Spirit of God, they sent off an otherwise desirable and necessary reform down blind paths.\textsuperscript{23}

Grandmaison recognized that the Reformers themselves saw the devaluation of control as problematic. Luther and Calvin’s respect for ecclesiastical authority and control in general would grow in their later years. Yet, as time went on, the restraints on external control and other means of visible communion attenuated in the face of Luther’s emphasis on subjectivity and autonomy.

Although Luther and the other Reformers did not reject traditional Christological doctrine, “their disdain of scholastic theology, their impatience with all authorized control and, above all, the role they assigned, as the last resort, to subjective religious experience, allowed all Christian dogmatics to be discussed and cast into confusion.”\textsuperscript{24} By placing too much emphasis on the otherwise legitimate subjectivity of faith, and by weakening the external structures of Christian religion, Luther also set in motion the process that undermined the dogma of the divinity of Christ. Again, given the dialectic of grace and nature, it was not by accident that Protestantism let go of the traditional doctrine about the natures of Christ:

Luther, remarks Möhler, never understood what is meant by these words: ‘the Word became flesh.’ What, said [Luther], does it mean to me what Christ is in himself? – It means so much to the Church that she attributes her comprehension of all that is human to the just idea of what human nature fundamentally is, ‘splendid human nature,’ the Abbé de Tourville loved to repeat.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} “Le tort, l’irréparable faute de Luther, de Calvin et de leurs émules a été de rompre, pour prévaloir des vues personnelles et des intérêts particuliers, l’unité de l’Église. Ils ont énervé la seule force capable de maintenir unis et collaborant les éléments de liberté et d’autorité, d’inspiration divine et d’initiative humaine qui forment le tissu d’une vie religieuse pleine. En opposant leur sens particulier au sens collectif inspiré par l’Esprit de Dieu, ils ont précipité dans les voies sans issue une reforme d’ailleurs désirables et nécessaire.” (Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 396.)

\textsuperscript{24} “leur dédain de la théologie scolastique, leur impatience de tout contrôle autorisé et, par dessus tout, le rôle assigné par eux, en dernier ressort, à l’expérience religieuse subjective, permirent de discuter et d’ébranler la dogmatique chrétienne entière.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 163.)

\textsuperscript{25} “Luther, remarque Moehler, n’a jamais compris ce que signifie ces mots: ‘le Verbe s’est fait chair.’ Que m’importe, disait-il, ce que le Christ est en soi? – Il importe tellement à l’Église, qu’elle attribue sa compréhension de tout ce qui est humain à la juste idée de ce qu’est, en son fond, la nature humaine, ‘la splendide nature humaine,’ aimait à répéter l’abbé de Tourville.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1003.)
As will be seen, Grandmaison’s sense of personal religion upheld the coordination of grace and nature within the human person, and especially in the supreme example of the hypostatic union.\(^{26}\) The road back to a renewed personal religion lay in Christ.

By the time of eighteenth century, the rationalists made the denial of the supernatural and all positive religion the corollary of scientific discoveries that after two hundred years renewed the conception of the physical world. They fought Christianity as the principal obstacle to the progress of ideas, of the sciences—and a word that dates right from this epoch—of civilization. \(^{27}\)

Many of the most prominent rationalists such as Diderot and Voltaire considered Christianity to be founded on childish fables.\(^{28}\) Many open atheists abandoned natural religion in the second half of the century. The vast majority of the educated broke away from Christianity and became deists. Given its impetus by freethinkers in seventeenth century England, deism denied the existence of the supernatural and reduced Christ to a moralist.\(^{29}\)

The problem of religion had been raised in a particularly intense way by the French Revolution, whose motto was “liberté, égalité, fraternité.”\(^{30}\) The Restoration after the Napoleonic era had been a moment of intellectual promise for the Catholic Church in France and in Europe.\(^{31}\)


\(^{27}\) “font de la négation du surnaturel et de toute religion positive, le corollaire des découvertes scientifiques qui depuis deux cents ans renouvelaient la conception du monde physique. Ils combattent dans le Christianisme le principal obstacle au progrès des idées, des sciences—et un mot qui date justement de cette époque—de la civilisation.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 170.)

\(^{28}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 171.

\(^{29}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 170.

\(^{30}\) Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 958.

\(^{31}\) Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 964.
Yet the Church missed the opportunity to restore the Catholic balance lost since the
Reformation.

The principal cause of this was, not only in France, but everywhere, in the superficial
character of philosophical and theological studies. One let oneself be overwhelmed by
immediate needs that were pressing, by reality: one did not go to the source of the evil.
One did not wish to confront modern thought with the traditional theology that teachers
of the time either knew little of or knew poorly. In order to be effective, apologetics
ought to flourish, as an outgrowth, of a confident religious philosophy, of a theology
stamped by the sources of the faith, of an understanding of history acquired by long and
methodical effort.32

“Since then, there has been among all those who have been separated from unity with the
Catholic Church, a tragic oscillation between unbridled human pride erecting itself as the final
judge of everything, and fideist sentimentalism, fundamentally impotent, which contemporary
agnosticism prolongs.”33 But this oscillation was more evident in Germany rather than France.

Grandmaison asked himself whether Catholic theologians such as George Hermes or Anton
Günther (rather than Newman or Möhler) had been the progenitors of modernism:

The source of contemporary modernism was elsewhere, in the conceptions of religious
philosophy that were preformulated by Herder and Lessing, developed and poeticized by
Schleiermacher, enlarged and made fruitful by Hegel, and finally coined in a thousand
ways in infinitely diverse doses, by their exegetes, critics, and historians of the Protestant
left, from David Strauss to Jules Wellhausen, from F.C. Baur to H.-J. Holtzmann, from
Albert Ritschl to Adolph Harnack, from Edward Scherer to Auguste Sabatier.34

32 “la cause principale en fut, non seulement en France, mais partout, dans le caractère superficiel des études
philosophiques et théologiques. On se laissa éblouir par les besoins immédiats, qui étaient pressants, par l'actualité:
on n'allà pas jusqu'à la source du mal. On ne songea pas à confronter la pensée moderne avec la théologie
traditionnelle que les maîtres d'alors connaissaient peu, ou connaissent mal. Pour être efficace, l'apologétique devrait
fleurir, comme par surcroît, d'une philosophie religieuse assurée, d'une théologie retrempée aux sources de la foi,
d'une connaissance de l'histoire acquise par un long et méthodique effort.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion
catholique,” 966.)

33 “De là, chez tous ceux qui se sont trouvés séparés de l'unité catholique, une oscillation tragique entre l’orgueil
humain débridé, s’érigeant en juge dernier de toute chose, et le sentimentalisme fidéiste, à base d’impuissance, que
prolonge agnosticisme contemporain.” (Grandmaison, “Möhler,” 395.)

34 “La source du modernisme contemporain est ailleurs, dans les conceptions de philosophie religieuse préformées
par Herder et Lessing, développées et poétisées par Schleiermacher, élargies et fécondées par Hegel, monnayées enfin
mille formes à doses infiniment variés, par leurs exégètes, critiques et historiens de la gauche protestante, de David
Liberal exegesis was the fruit of German scholarship and culture.\textsuperscript{35} Simply put, \textit{Germania docet}. The influence of German poets, philosophers, and exegetes will be examined further below.

The poles of this movement of spirits and thought were most clearly represented by the sentimental religion of Auguste Sabatier and the atheistic rationalism of Ernest Renan.\textsuperscript{36} Sabatier was modernism’s consummate philosopher of religion. As the inspiration for French critical biblical scholarship, Renan was the epitome of the vagaries of rationalist exegesis. Neither had been a Catholic modernist. Raised a Catholic, Renan had been, to all appearances, an atheist or believer of some sort \textit{sui generis}, while Sabatier had been a Calvinist. Both were dead by the height of the modernist crisis. Nonetheless, the dynamic of modernist thought was governed by the vacillation between the two fundamental points of view that Renan and Sabatier represented. Critical philosophy had resulted in a detestable moralism at the expense of truth, whether it was the cool rationalistic moralism of Renan\textsuperscript{37} or the heartfelt moralism of Sabatier’s sentimental religion.\textsuperscript{38} The Christologies that corresponded to both these philosophies reduced Christ to a moral model.\textsuperscript{39} Renan and Sabatier had succumbed to both Kant and Hegel’s influence.

Grandmaison considered that the errors of modernism were due to flawed contemporary philosophies, which had failed to attain any stable rooted synthesis.\textsuperscript{40} The

\begin{flushright}

Strauss à Jules Welhaven, de F.C. Baur à H.-J. Holtzmann, d’Albert Ritschl à Adolphe Harnack, d'Éd. Schérer à Auguste Sabatier.” (Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 401-2.)

\textsuperscript{35} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 181-4.

\textsuperscript{36} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 180-1, 186.

\textsuperscript{37} Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le crise religieuse d’Ernest Renan,” \textit{Études} 93 (1902), 604.

\textsuperscript{38} Passage, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 11-2.


\textsuperscript{40} Grandmaison, “Saint Thomas apologiste,” 656.
\end{flushright}
oscillation between “inconsequent rationalism and vague hero-worship”41 (latent in sentimental religion) was manifested by modernism at all levels. Exegetes such as Loisy set out to discover the truth of their faith through critical scholarship. Yet the mistaken use of such scholarship put its practitioners at risk of appropriating unwittingly the hidden ideology of either rationalism or sentimental religion. The movement between the overweening confidence in the human intellect and despair of attaining any real knowledge meant the death of personal religion. Yet these two disparate moments had something in common.

[S]trange as it is, these two movements, starting from opposite points, tended to reunite in a common attitude, *absolute individualism in religious matters*. Man is the sole measure of his conduct. Whether man, in effect, is a law unto himself, or whether he follows thoughtlessly the movements of grace or of concupiscence, the result is always that his *particular* sentiment—entirely autochthonous in the rationalist hypothesis, totally inspired or imposed in the Protestant conception—is finally the sole measure of his conduct. All collective, external authority, the whole teaching Church, is, in this case, a usurper, an intruder. She violates the autonomy of human reason or attacks the liberty of the Spirit of God.42

For Grandmaison, few things were as antithetical to Catholicism as absolute individualism in religious matters. Both Renaissance humanism and Protestantism continued to undermine the forces, respectively, of social, intellectual, and religious cohesion that the Church enjoyed.


42 “[C]hose étrange, partis de points opposés, ces deux mouvements tendent à se rejoindre dans une attitude commune, *l'individualisme absolu, en matière religieuse*. Que l'homme, en effet, soit à lui-même sa règle, ou qu'il suive sans réaction possible les mouvements de la grâce ou de la concupiscence, le résultat est toujours que son sentiment *particulier*—entièrement autochton dans l'hypothèse rationaliste, totalement inspiré ou imposé dans la conception protestante—est finalement la mesure unique de sa conduite. Toute autorité collective, extérieure, toute Église enseignante est, dans l'un et l'autre cas, une usurpatrice, une intruse. Elle viole l'autonomie de la raison humaine, ou attente à la liberté de l'Esprit de Dieu.” (Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 395.)
Sentimental Religion and The Case of Auguste Sabatier

In Grandmaison’s eyes, Sabatier’s philosophy of religion was modernism’s quintessential philosophy.43 To put it bluntly, “No matter how they would have it, [the modernists] sweat Sabatier from every pore.”44 Sabatier was heir to the philosophy of sentimental religious philosophy of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1766-1834).45 Along with many other religious thinkers in the nineteenth century, he too had been in search of a contemporary understanding of personal religion. Liberal Protestants regarded him “as the classical representative of the modern effort to reconcile science and philosophy with religion and theology, and the modern world with the Christian church.”46 However, as the intellectual father of liberal Protestantism and of the modern religious sensibility in the West, Schleiermacher had further degraded the intellectual bases of faith. With respect to Kant and Schleiermacher, Grandmaison wrote: “The criticism of the first led to a lofty morality, where religion is less supported than absorbed; the sentimentalism of [Schleiermacher] is not any less the enemy of intellectual certitudes, foundation and cement of a society of souls.”47 In other words, whereas Kant’s moralism swallowed religion, Schleiermacher’s sentimental religion made religious certitude impossible. “For the doctrinal, intellectualist element chased by Kant from the religious domain, Schleiermacher supplies not ‘faith’ but sentiment. He substitutes an instinctive, vibrant, and

43 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 162-202.

44 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 983-4n1.

45 Grandmaison, “Moechler,” 405.


47 “Le critisme du premier s’achève en une morale hautaine, où la religion vient moins s’appuyer que s’absorber; le sentimentalisme du second [Schleiermacher] n’est moins que ennemi des certitudes intellectuelles, fondement et ciment d’une société d’âmes.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 946.)
profound force for the cold moralism of the philosopher: his doctrine is the romantic form of anti-dogmatism.”\textsuperscript{48} In Schleiermacher, Luther’s denunciation of worldly reason eventually led to the crippling of religious rationality altogether.

With Schleiermacher, the “forms of unbelief or of irreligion…modeled on scientific or literary movements,”\textsuperscript{49} along with the rising belief in an immanent, impersonal Power, found their way into Christology.

The first application of these tendencies to the person of Jesus, the most personal and the most influential, was carried out by Friedrich Schleiermacher in his \textit{Christian Faith} (1821-1822), a paradoxical book if there ever was one, where the author found the means to insert a philosophy derived almost exclusively from sentiment into his dogmatic framework. The result of this is a constant ambivalence, which the profound art and religiosity of the author does not succeed in allaying, between the letter, still engaged with Lutheran orthodoxy, and the spirit, where modernist individualism already breathes. Schleiermacher’s Christ, like Luther’s of old, is someone who is postulated by religious experience, of which dogma is only the symbolic expression. The modern theologian, less impetuous and less of a realist than his great predecessor, found in his Master above all a mediator and an example. By his irreproachable sanctity, Jesus is the way, and he is also the life, because that unconditional surrender to God—the first and last act of the religious life—is accomplished in him and is transmitted by him. From these claims, considered by Schleiermacher as incontestable, the doctrine logically issues: all that is implied by his role as mediator, as perfect type (\textit{Urbild}) of the religious person, of the fruitful ideal, etc., will be true of Christ.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48} “À l’élément doctrinal, intellectualiste, chassé par Kant du domaine religieux, Schleiermacher supplée, non par la ‘foi’ mais par le sentiment. Il substitue ainsi au froid moralisme du philosophe, une force instinctive vibrante et profonde: sa doctrine est la forme romantique de l’anti-dogmatisme.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 974-5.)

\textsuperscript{49} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 178-9.

\textsuperscript{50} “La première application de ces tendances à la personne de Jésus, la plus personnelle et la plus influente, fut faite par Frédéric Schleiermacher dans sa \textit{Foi Chrétienne} (1821-1822), livre paradoxal s’il en fut, où l’auteur trouve moyen de disposer dans des cadres dogmatiques une philosophie relevant à peu près exclusivement du sentiment. Il en résulte une équivoque incessante, que l’art et la religiosité profonde de l’auteur ne parviennent pas à pallier, entre une lettre encore engagée dans l’orthodoxie luthérienne, et un esprit où respire déjà l’individualisme moderniste. Comme jadis celui de Luther, le Christ de Schleiermacher est celui que postule une expérience religieuse dont le dogme ne sera que l’expression symbolique. Moins fougueux, moins réaliste que le grande ancêtre, le théologien a trouvé en son Maître, avant tout, un médiateur et exemple. Jésus, par sa sainteté irréprochable, est la voie, et il est aussi la vie parce qu’en lui s’est accompli et par lui se transmet l’acte de remise inconditionnée à Dieu, premier et dernier de la vie religieuse. De ces constations, admises par Schleiermacher pour indiscutables, un raisonnement va faire sortir la doctrine: sera vrai du Christ tout ce qu’implique son rôle de médiateur, d’exemplaire parfait (\textit{Urbild}) de l’homme religieux, d’idéal fécond, etc...” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 180; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 289.)
This doctrine could be developed in two different ways; first, in an orthodox way, if a normative set of propositions could be established—second, though, “if this point of departure is considered as one Christian experience among many, without substituting for it another of equal value, then Christology is reduced to the critical history of opinions successively put forward about the person of Jesus.”

The first way had informed modern Protestant dogmatics, even if there are great variations in the choice and qualifications of the fundamental given. The second way, however, logically led to modernism.

Sabatier’s first works—*Le témoignage de Jésus-Christ sur sa personne* (1863) and *Jesus de Nazareth* (1867)—earned him a professorship at the Protestant Faculty of Strasbourg. A manifest he published professed the faith of Chalcedon that Jesus was both Son of God and human. But his later masterworks *Esquisse d’une philosophie de la religion d’après la psychologie et l’histoire* and the posthumous *Les Religions d’autorité et la Religion de l’Esprit* contradicted the traditional creed. Echoing Schleiermacher, the second work portrayed Jesus as a superior and sublime prophet who only intended to be “an initiator, a master, an animator in the order of religion”:

The Savior’s assertions and claims must consequently be understood as confidences, as effusions designed to give value to his teaching, to render them more penetrating, more effective. Seeing God his Father in the filial mirror of the most beautiful soul, always conscious of knowing him and loving him more and better than anyone around him, indignant at the literal rigorism that the Pharisees imposed on people under the pretext of keeping the Law, feeling within himself a force and an ardor capable of changing the world, the Nazorean Master could say without blasphemy that which the gospels place in his mouth and take up the attitudes that they attribute to him. Although Jesus, in certain

---

51 “si l’on considère ce point de départ comme l’une des expériences chrétiennes, sans lui en substituer une autre de valeur égale, on réduit christologie à l’histoire critique des opinions successivement professées sur la personne de Jésus.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 180-1.)

of his hopes and errors, was still steeped in the Jewish milieu of his time and in the illusions of his race, he escaped from them by his inner spirit; and the flight of his soul brought him to the highest point that a man, the son of man, could attain. He considered life, despite the hardships that it imposes, the tyranny of material forces to which it is subject, the obsession of moral evil that it imposes, as a divine gift in which all people who would follow him and renewed his experience could participate. ‘Jesus was only a man, but the man in whose heart has been revealed most completely the paternal heart of God.’

Sabatier laid his finger on a vital issue, the personal religion of Christ as based on his relationship with the Father. Like Schleiermacher, Sabatier had held that the essence of religion was the feeling of utter dependence on what was called God. Christ was aware of his divinity through this experience. Jesus enjoyed a vision of the Father in his filial soul. But it was a purely human one. Even though he revealed the “paternal heart of the Father,” he was only a man. Moreover, his Jewishness was more obstacle than blessing.

The main theological deformation that resulted from Sabatier's religious philosophy, according to Grandmaison, was that one lost a sense of the uniqueness of the person of Christ: his mission had priority over his person. Once the sense of Christ’s divinity was lowered to a relative transcendence, it was logical to consider him as only the highest instance of humanity’s

53 “Les déclarations et les revendications du Sauveur devraient, conséquemment, s’entendre comme des confidences, des effusions destinées à faire valoir son enseignement, à le rendre plus pénétrant, plus efficace. Voyant Dieu son Père dans le miroir filial de la plus belle âme qui fût jamais, conscient de le connaître et de l’aimer plus et mieux que ceux qui l’entouraient, indigné du rigorisme littéraliste que les Pharisens imposaient aux hommes sous couleur de garder la Loi, sentant en lui-même une force et une ardeur capables de changer le monde, le Maître Nazaréen a pu sans blasphème dire ce que les évangiles lui font dire et prendre les attitudes qu’ils prétendent. Encore enfoncé par certaines de ses espérances et ses ignorances dans le milieu juif de son temps et les illusions de sa race, Jésus s’en évada par l’esprit intérieur; et le vol de son âme le porta au point le plus haut qu’un homme, fils de l’homme, puisse atteindre. Il considéra la vie, en dépit des duretés qu’elle impose, de la tyrannie des forces matérielles qu’elle subit, de l’obsession du mal moral qui pèse sur elle, comme un don divin dans lequel tous les hommes qui se mettraient à sa suite et referaient son expérience pourraient communiquer. ‘Jésus n’a été qu’un homme, mais l’homme dans le cœur duquel s’est révélé le plus complètement le cœur paternel de Dieu.’” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 186-7; Jésus Christ, 296.)

54 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 975.

relationship to the Father. His consciousness was only an immanent one, or at best, a relatively transcendent one. Although Christ conveyed a kind of revelation and retained a normative status, he was not the figure proclaimed by traditional dogma.

As seen in the passage above, all people could enjoy the personal religion that Jesus enjoyed. Christians shared a similar kind of relationship to the One whom Jesus called Father. All Christians had the same qualitative awareness of God as Jesus had, albeit not in the same degree. What mattered was not belief in propositional truths, but faith, which was the “an entirely moral and exclusively affective disposition, an act of confidence that renders God felt by the heart.” In Grandmaison’s eyes, the core of Sabatier’s “religion of the Spirit” was “religious and moral consciousness”; faith as opposed to belief was so important that it rendered intellectual beliefs almost irrelevant. But the difficult question returned: “What place does the person of Christ occupy in this economy? what bond ought to tie the faithful to him? What ought we to be believe in?” “Sabatier responds: none.” The essence of religion was reduced to two essential sentiments: that of mortal estrangement from God, and “of our interior reconciliation with God and of our divine filiation.” The only novelty of Christianity was the

---

attitude within that cried out: ‘Abba, Father!’ (Rom. 8: 16) There was not even any need for personal act of faith in Christ.  

Being an inspired, the believer only needed to be conformed to Christ, the supreme model of perfect religion, of this filial relationship with God. Believers were Christian to the extent that the personal piety of Jesus, the sentiment of divine affiliation, was reproduced in them.

Sabatier recognized that Christians did not accomplish such a task on their own. The Holy Spirit helped them to achieve this salvation. However, the Spirit of the Father was not personal, but “the immanent action of the living God.” It could be called the Spirit of Jesus only in so far as “it excites every Christian soul to reproduce in itself the religious experience of which Jesus has given us the model.” The authority of revelation that subdued the believer rested in Jesus’ personal qualities. Sentimental religion was dependent on subjective experience animated by an immanent God.

By what criterion did Sabatier recognize an authentic revelation?

Listen, one criterion alone is infallible and sufficient: all divine revelation, every religious experience that is truly good for nourishing and sustaining your soul, should be repeatable and continue as actual revelation and individual experience in your own consciousness. Do not believe, o my brother, that the prophets and the initiators transmitted their experiences so as to exempt you from having your own. Religious truth is never lent like a sum of money, or more, if you happen to borrow it, you will not be richer. The revelations of the past only become effective and real if they render you capable of receiving the personal revelation that God reserves for you. Divine revelation

---

64 Such was also the judgment of Harnack; Grandmaison, “Le Christ de Harnack,” Études 90 (1902), 746.


From a Catholic perspective, such claims are not entirely wrong, but they are one-sided. The claims made in this passage ruled out the role of the hierarchy and the tradition as a whole in discerning revealed truth.

According to Grandmaison, the purpose of theology for Sabatier was to appreciate beliefs—discovered by means of history and psychology—and to discern how well such beliefs contribute to a sense of “the moral law of duty,” the substance of Kant’s categorical imperative. Although accepted docilely at first, no dogma would escape the critique of the theologian. Such scholarship would in turn purify old conceptions and lend itself to “a more rational transcription” of them so as to help believers to appropriate religious sentiment for their needs. Aware that a breach had been opened between critical scholarship and faith, Sabatier was confident that science and piety would one day so interpenetrate that they would unite. On that day, humanity would know that divine law and human law are really one and the same. The faithful would know that, “[i]n the end, the established kingdom of God will coincide perfectly with the broadest and highest ideal of realized human activity.”

---

69 Écoutez, un seul critère est infaillible et suffisant: toute révélation divine, toute expérience religieuse vraiment bonne pour nourrir et sustenter votre âme, doit pouvoir se répéter et se continuer comme révélation actuelle et expérience individuelle dans votre propre conscience. Ne crois pas, ô mon frère, que les prophètes et les initiateurs t’ait transmis leurs expériences pour te dispenser de faire les tiennes. La vérité religieuse ne s’emprunte jamais comme une somme d’argent, ou bien, s’il arrive que tu l’empruntes ainsi, tu n’en seras plus riche. Les révélations du passé ne se démontrent efficaces et réelles que si elles te rendent capable de recevoir la révélation personnelle que Dieu te réserve. La révélation divine qui ne se réalise pas en nous et n’y devient pas immédiate, n’existe point pour nous.” (Sabatier, Esquisse, 58–9, in Grandmaison “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 404.) Grandmaison found such an antimony between revelation and dogma in Tyrrell’s Scylla and Charybdis, Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 404, 404n2.


was that it brought about the liberation of consciousness through the unity of what otherwise seems disparate. In effect, sentimental religion ended in a kind of rationalism.

Liberal Protestantism tended to downplay the existence of the supernatural. For Schleiermacher, a miracle was nothing but the religious name for an event, for Providence perceived as divine. Indeed, one of the blessings of the Reformation, in the eyes of Sabatier, was that it liberated humanity to see and adore God once again in the most familiar things in nature—“to the exclusion of anything that is supernatural.” Even if one added the condition that a miracle was granted only through prayer, one would be hard pressed to show that any event was miraculous.

The question of Christ and of his relationship to humanity in the time of modernism became the question of the Church itself. In as much as Christ was the exemplar and source of the individual Christian’s own consciousness of God, his identity and mission had consequences for the Church. Sabatier’s Religions d’autorité et la Religion de l’Esprit pitted religious sentiment against intellectual dogma, dogma and ecclesiastical authority against freedom of spirit. Authority lost its case before the bar of subjective reason. Salvation resided not in objective religious realities, whether it was the action of grace flowing from Christ to the believer, the mediation of the sacraments, or a distinct hierarchy to administer them. Such intermediaries

---

73 Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 408.
75 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 221.
76 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 950-1.
would have implied that Christ had substituted one form of authority for another. But Sabatier’s anti-dogmatism was emphatic: The God whom Christians worship could just as easily be worshipped under any other name than that of the Trinity. Dogmas were really just the expression of the believer’s religious experience. There was no need for an authorized magisterium to transmit doctrine as Christianity brought no new doctrine about God.

Even worse, for Sabatier, dogmatism separated religion from its true wellspring, piety. Grandmaison noted Sabatier’s accusations against Catholic dogmatism in his *Esquisse d’une philosophie de religion*:

To make of dogma, that is, of an intellectual given, the object of revelation, is to completely remove its religious character by separating it from piety, and consequently to set it in an irreducible conflict with reason, which always progresses. One tears away divine revelation from the heart of religious life, so as to set it up in a body of supernatural truths that is subsistent in itself, and makes it an obligation and a merit to adhere to it, by silencing, if necessary, one’s judgment and one’s conscience. One thinks that orthodoxy can exist outside of piety, that one can attain and possess the object of faith beyond the conditions that faith supposes, and even, in a pinch, serve divine truth even while one is impious within. How many souls reassure themselves, believing themselves faithful according to doctrine, except when the time comes to put their heart and their life in order! ...Fundamentally, this idea of revelation is totally pagan...Let us boldly conclude, therefore, against all traditional orthodoxies, that the object of divine revelation could not be other than God himself, that is, the sentiment of his presence in us, awakening our soul to the life of justice and love.

---


81 “Faire du dogme, c’est-à-dire d’une donnée intellectuelle, l’objet de la révélation, c’est tout d’abord lui enlever son caractère religieux en la séparant de la piété, et c’est ensuite la mettre en un conflit irréductible avec la raison qui progresse toujours. On arrache au sol de la vie religieuse la révélation de Dieu, pour la constituer en un corps de vérités surnaturelles, subsistant par lui-même, et auquel se fait une obligation et un mérite d’adhérer, en faisant se taire, s’il le faut, son jugement et sa conscience. On admet que l’orthodoxie peut exister en dehors de la piété, qu’on peut obtenir et posséder l’objet de la foi suppose, en dehors de les conditions que la foi suppose, et même, à la rigueur, servir la vérité divine, étant intérieurement un impie. Combien d’âmes se rassurent se croyant ainsi fidèles quant la doctrine, sauf, un moment ou l’autre, d’y ranger leur cœur et leur vie! ...Au fond cette idée de la révélation est toute païenne...Concluons donc hardiment, contre toutes les orthodoxies traditionnelles, que l’objet de la révélation de Dieu ne saurait être que Dieu lui-même, c’est-à-dire le sentiment de sa présence en nous, éveillant notre âme à la vie de la justice et de l’amour.” (Sabatier, *Esquisse*, 43, 44, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologétique* 6 [1908], 402-3.)
Modernists tried to address these bifurcations in their own versions of personal religion. So did Grandmaison, as will be seen later, but by showing that these antinomies were false constructions. In his eyes, orthodoxy fed piety, and piety helped to make the truth of faith a living thing.

For Sabatier, scholasticism was itself an important cause of a number of dichotomies in Catholicism.

‘The scholastic notion is not only irreligious, but even anti-psychological. By entering into human understanding, this kind of supernatural knowledge introduces an irreducible dualism there. The sacred sciences stand side by side with the profane sciences, without it being possible to organize them together into a coherent and organic body, because they do not have the same nature, do not proceed using the same method, and do not accept the same regulation…. If, by subtle theology you succeed in rationalizing dogma, don’t you see that you are destroying dogma in its very essence? If you show yourself that it is essentially irrational, don’t you feel that you are instituting an endless war between authority and reason?’ [Sabatier, Ésquisse, 44-5] No, no, revelation is not, cannot be that way! It involves neither an exterior manifestation, nor mystery, nor truth communicated one time for all. ‘It will be interior because God, not having phenomenal existence, can reveal himself only to the spirit and in the piety that he himself inspires…Finally, it will be progressive; God has not let the Gospel fall from the sky.’

82 For references to echoes of Sabatier’s critiques of Catholic notions of revelation and dogma by Tyrrell and Loisy, see Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 402n1, 404n1, 404n2.

83 ‘La notion scolastique n’est pas seulement irréligieuse, elle est encore antipsychologique. En entrant dans l’entendement humain, ces connaissances surnaturelles y introduisent un dualisme irréductible. Les sciences sacrées se dressent à côté des sciences profanes, sans qu’il soit possible de les organiser ensemble en un corps cohérent et harmonique, car elles n’ont pas la même nature, ne procèdent pas de la même méthode et n’acceptent pas le même contrôle…. Si, par une théologie subtile, vous réussissez à rationaliser le dogme, vous ne voyez pas que vous détruisez dans son essence même? Si vous vous démontrez qu’il est essentiellement irrationnel, ne sentez-vous pas que vous instituez une guerre sans fin entre l’autorité et la raison?’[Sabatier, Ésquisse, 52–4, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” [1908], 403.] The caricature of dogma that it seemed “to fall from the sky” was condemned by Lamentabili 22. Grandmaison attributed the insult to Loisy, but without citing a work of his; “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 404n1.
Apparently, a theologian could not make the distinctions that Catholicism did without introducing dualisms of all kinds. Sabatier separated interior revelation from authorized, public communication, reason from mystery, and discrete acts of revelation from the development of doctrine. Revelation itself was the victim of the dualism between the natural and supernatural orders.

Sabatier also thought that Catholicism was opposed to the “vital development” of religion. According to Grandmaison, he accused Catholicism of the following:

Your very immutability, say the Reformed churches, renders you incapable of progress, when change is the very law of that fruitful evolution that is life. You condemn yourself to impotence. You pull back; the world, which lives, advances; and so you are destined to rejoin, in ages to come, but which are announcing themselves already, outdated forms of institutions that refused to adapt to their times.

It would be part of Grandmaison’s task to address how the Catholic Church was distinguished for its development of the unchanging deposit of faith and for the forms of life that made such vital development possible.

Rationalism and the case of Ernest Renan’s Life of Christ

The exegetical question was posed most acutely and vividly of all for Grandmaison by a work that predated modernism, but which anticipated its worst: Ernest Renan’s *Vie de Christ*. Its publication in 1862 marked a watershed in the religious history of France both for critical scholarship and popular religion. Renan’s book was the first compelling French contribution to

84 Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 342.

85 “Votre immutabilité même, dissent-elles [the Reformed churches], vous rend incapable de progrès, quand le changement est la loi même de cette évolution féconde qui est la vie. C’est vous condamner à l’impuissance. Vous demeurez; le monde, qui vit, avance; et donc vous êtes destinée à rejoindre, dans les ages lointains, mais qui s’annoncent déjà, les formes démodées des institutions qui ont refusé de marcher avec leur temps.” (Grandmaison, “Élasticité des formules,” 342.)

the quest for the historical Jesus. The work also ignited in France the bitter controversy over the relationship between biblical scholarship and doctrine that had been raging in Germany. As a pioneer of the historical-critical method in France, Renan had not only captured the popular imagination, but also inspired the liberal Protestant and Catholic modernist exegetes who succeeded him. For Alfred Loisy, dean of the French modernists, “Renan was the first master of the French modernists with respect to biblical criticism and the history of early Christianity.” (Loisy later repudiated Renan’s influence on him.)

 Renan’s book was shocking. A lapsed Catholic, he denied the tenets of the Creed, including the uniqueness of the person and mission of Jesus Christ and the Resurrection. Although Jesus was indeed the founder of true religion, he was no more divine than any other human being. The gospel for Renan was, as all religion, ethically inspiring, but irrational. He refused to acknowledge any beauty in a crucified God, and preferred instead “the truthful, the simple, the natural.” Christ had originally refused the title of Messiah as blasphemous. However, his sentiment for his Father, the history of the prophets, the pressure of

---


89 Poulat, Modernistica, 1982, 93n1.

90 Grandmaison, “Centenaire d’Ernest Renan,” 156.

91 Grandmaison, “Jésus-Christ,” DAFC, 1500-1.

92 Renan, Vie de Christ, 220, 226.


94 Ernest Renan, Patrice, in Fragments intimes et romanesques, 1849, 96–8, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 196.

95 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 194-6.
circumstances, his disciples’ enthusiasm, the logic of success, the need to counter a growing
opposition, lad him finally to accept and vindicate this identity. As his legend grew, he began to
believe that he really was the Messiah. Being a Nietzschean superhuman, Jesus created an idealist
religion. But success killed. The wild enthusiasm whence he generated his vertiginous notions of
the Kingdom of God and being Son of God began to trouble his reason. Being no longer free,
he suffered the tragic fate of a cause gone out of control.

Despite Renan’s disavowal of traditional Christian belief, the work enjoyed an immense
popularity: it was issued eight times in the first three months of its publication.96 Renan’s work
was the most widely read imaginative reconstruction of the life of Christ in mid-nineteenth
century France. It was understandable why this might have been so. Renan had demonstrated
real skill both as imaginative writer and as scholar.97 He was primarily a scholar of the origins of
Christianity; his life of Christ was only the first in a series of his works on the subject. But unlike
the subsequent volumes, the biography was less a scholarly work than an imaginative
reconstruction of the gospel. The historical detail appealed to a public hitherto unexposed to
such an evocative, novelistic treatment.98

Renan was the singular irritant and stimulant in Grandmaison’s reading of modernism.
He gave Renan credit where it was due. Renan had some respect for the truth.99 He had insisted
on taking the life of Christ in its entirety as the New Testament had presented it.100 Grandmaison

---

98 Grandmaison, “Centenaire d’Ernest Renan,” 156.
100 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1371.
also made excuses for Renan’s maladroit results. The modern demand for empirical, scientific rigor that had been brought to bear on scholarship was enormous. Renan could not negotiate the seemingly intractable conflict between faith and critical scholarship: unable to discern with any suppleness the essential teachings of faith, he had substituted the certitude of reason for that of dogmatism. Without the guiding light of dogma, freedom of inquiry in Renan’s case hardened into rigid determinism.

The rationalists of the nineteenth and then the twentieth century could no longer accept the fact that Jesus was more than a fallible man, and therefore “subject as such to all the weakness, errors, and illusions of common humanity, liable to all the limitations of his time and race.” The idea of the Incarnation for such thinkers was pre-Kantian. For many moderns like Renan, the traditional Christian interpretation of Christ was founded on a misinterpretation.

The next step is to make these theses tally with history and the texts, and first of all to explain the initial fact of Christ’s testimony to himself. There are two ways open to the critic to achieve this end. If he adopts the first, accepting the historicity of the principal Gospel documents as a whole, the author uses all his subtlety to reconstruct, with minimum illusion and fraud, the series of the states of soul that would have brought Jesus to believe and to say that he was the Messiah and the Son of God. In spite of the condescending, ironic tone that renders his account shocking, I do not think that any rationalist author has set forth this thesis with more expert virtuosity than Ernest Renan…He retained the least pernicious of the explanations which had been proposed before him, adding his own.

102 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 49.
103 Grandmaison, “Centenaire d’Ernest Renan,” 553.
104 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 193.
105 “Il reste après cela de faire cadrer ces thèses avec l’histoire et les textes, et d’abord d’expliquer le fait générateur qui le témoignage du Christ sur lui-même. Pour y arriver, deux voies sont ouvertes au critique. Dans la première, acceptant l’historicité générale des principaux documents évangéliques, l’auteur met toute sa subtilité à restituer avec un minimum d’illusion et de fraude, la suite des états d’âme qui auraient amené Jésus à croire et à dire qu’il était le Messie, Fils de Dieu. En dépit du ton d’ironie condescendante qui rend son récit choquant, je ne pense qu’aucun
The second course was to avoid trying to make sense of the texts and to “explain away the texts altogether.”¹⁰⁶ No one since Renan had done a more plausible job of such a reconstruction.

Either method discredited Christ’s own testimony to himself.

What Grandmaison chastised most in Renan was the dishonest way in which his life of Christ undermined Christian doctrine.¹⁰⁷ “The perverse art that gives life to these phantoms, the disdainful veneration that envelops his phantoms with a cloud of incense, the indulgence, more injurious than blasphemy, that gives the appearance of pardoning them the very illusions that it lends to them.”¹⁰⁸ Being a “literary production” in the worst sense of the word, Renan’s account violated Grandmaison’s sense of honor and of the Christian faith.

Renan’s brand of rationalism led to a dead end: it could not survive the contradictions that abounded among his fundamental convictions.¹⁰⁹ Renan had started out by seeking confidently the attainment of the infinite through knowledge.¹¹⁰ “Renan held that we will never know anything about the great problems that the world and life poses; that religion is an instinct, an élan toward an unknowable beyond, an evasion toward an ideal—through dreams, intellectual contemplation, hypothesis, the pleasure that makes one forget.”¹¹¹ Such rationalism led to the

---

¹⁰⁶ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 195-6; Jesus Christ, 306.


¹⁰⁸ “L’ars pervers qui donne vie à ces fantômes, la vénération dédaigneuse qui les enveloppe d’un nuage d’encens, l’indulgence, plus injurieuse que le blasphème, qui affecte de leur pardonner les illusions qu’elle leur prête.” (Lebreton, Grandmaison, 80.)


emptiness of complete agnosticism. It was not unusual for disappointed rationalists like him to seek refuge in an ever-contradictory, utterly irrational kind of belief, be it in the moralism of a beautiful life or in the aestheticism of a beautiful lie. In the end, he tried to escape the burden of radical skepticism by escaping into the satisfaction provided by judging life according to the canons of high culture and according to his personal tastes.

Aided by his literary talent, Renan’s capricious skepticism devastated the moral and doctrinal convictions of believers and laid waste the very foundations for any belief in the supernatural. Renan’s seductive style masked his pseudo-historical reduction of Christ to a human being devoid of any supernatural dimension. Dissolving Christ destroyed not only the credibility of Christian belief but also of the Church itself. His real aim was to prove that the origins of the Christianity were purely human, so as to better contest the Church.

B. Modernism’s Philosophical Ruin of Personal Religion

This section will examine how personal religion was threatened by the three underpinnings of modernism: agnosticism, immanentism, and evolutionism. Pascendi named these errors as the essential components of modernist thought. The focus will be mainly on
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111 “nous ne saurons jamais rien des grandes problèmes que posent le monde et la vie; que la religion est un instinct, un élan vers un au-delà inconnaissable, une évasion vers un idéal,—par le rêve, la contemplation intelligent, l’hypothèse, le plaisir qui fait oublier.” (Grandmaison, “Pensée religieuse hors de l’Église,” (1913), 39.)


113 Grandmaison, “Crise religieuse d’ Ernest Renan,” 162.
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118 Pascendi, 34.
the thought of Loisy, with some consideration of that of Tyrrell and of Le Roy. Grandmaison’s
diagnosis of their deficiencies was redolent in many ways of the criticism found later in the anti-
modernist encyclical *Pascendi*. As was seen in the first chapter, though, Grandmaison made ample
use of these terms to criticize modernist thought before *Pascendi* was issued.

The first error, agnosticism, denied that there were truths about reality, and hence about
God, that could be known with certitude. Immanentism conflated revealed religion and natural
religion, and fundamentally, collapsed the divine transcendence, the presence and activity of
God in himself, into the divine immanence, the presence and activity of God in creation. The
third error, vital evolutionism, understood the development of doctrine in such a way that the
stability, trustworthiness, and the continuity of dogma, were lost.

Agnosticism

Orthodox Christian belief has always understood that a certain kind of agnosticism was a
necessary, if not preponderant, dimension of faith. The divine nature was unknowable in the
sense that it could not be exhaustively comprehended by rational concepts and judgments. But,
for Grandmaison, complete agnosticism of God was antithetical to faith.\[119\] It was one thing to
hold the dogma that God was “unknowable” in an exhaustive way; but it was quite another thing
to consider him unthinkable.\[120\] Such a position ruled out the possibility of any divine revelation
whatsoever. Christians knew God, in some adequate way—“with all the necessary
qualifications”\[121\]—as Grandmaison often added to his analogical judgments. He used Pseudo-
Dionysus’ *triplx via*, claiming that we can make true statements about God by way of

---


120 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 198.

affirmation, removal, and eminence. The knowledge of the incomprehensibility of God took place within the light of faith.

Part of the root of modernism’s agnosticism lay in the philosophical denial that God was fully transcendent, immanent, and personal. Without these qualities, revelation would be impossible:

It is not even a wager, but nonsense to say of this God who is ours, first cause and final end, of this God who is our Father, of this God who is Love, that he cannot communicate directly to creatures made by him and endowed by reason. Even if we had to concede—which we do not have to—to the exaggerated agnostic interpretation of some philosophical data that, although incapable of knowing to any degree how God is a Person, we ought to consider him as such, that would still suffice. Penetrated more or less profoundly in the created reality that founds it, the analogy that is imposed on us should reassure us fully of the possibility of a distinct revelation:…

Let us put it another way: Cannot the One who makes people speak himself speak to people?—In revealing God speaks.

God spoke not only because of who he is because of what human beings are. The reality of revelation implied that people were endowed with the capability to hear him.

For Grandmaison, much of contemporary philosophy was seriously defective to the extent that it discouraged the intellectual understanding of faith. Emmanuel Kant was as guilty as any other thinker in this regard, for he had provided the fundamental philosophical

---


124 “De ce Dieu qui est le nôtre, cause première et fin ultime, de ce Dieu qui est notre Père, de ce Dieu qui est Amour, dire qu’il ne peut se communiquer directement au créatures douées de raison qu’il a faites, ce n’est pas une gageure, c’est un non-sens. Dussions-nous concéder—ce qui n’est pas—à l’interprétation exagérément agnostique de certaines données de philosophie que, incapables de connaître à aucun degré comment Dieu est une Personne, nous devons le considérer comme tel, cela suffirait encore ici. Pénétrée plus ou moins profondément dans la réalité créé qui la fonde, l’analogie ainsi imposée devrait nous rassurer pleinement sur la possibilité d’une révélation distincte:… Ajoutons: Celui qui fait parler les hommes ne pourrait parler aux hommes?—En révélant, Dieu parle.” (Grandmaison, “Développment,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 408.)

125 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 328.
underpinnings for modern religious philosophy in general. His critical philosophy operated very much like Luther’s dialectic, such that practical reason supplanted positive religion.\textsuperscript{126}

Just as Lutheran doctrine derives immediately from a sentiment of trust, and not from intellectual illumination, so Kant likewise establishes the certitude of God and the soul that he calls \textit{faith} on moral will, not on rational speculation.\textemdashFinally, therefore, natural faith, dictated by practical reason, absorbs into itself all religious truth.\textsuperscript{127}

Kant in effect cut off access to the truth that made positive religion possible. Ironically, his critical philosophy even allowed some thinkers to substitute anti-intellectualism for the intellectual foundations of faith.\textsuperscript{128} Movements that took their inspiration from liberal Protestantism went further:

All intellectualism was denounced as a danger, all definition as an impoverishment of the real, all precision as butchery. In the place of an incomplete, progressive science, its boundaries undefined, but certain in its principles and irreformable in some of its claims, one imagined a flux of hypotheses, shadowy and symbolic corruptions, precarious attempts of human thought involved with a reality that was evolving and fundamentally unknowable.\textsuperscript{129}

In place of rationalism secure of itself, there arose non-realist epistemologies that were founded on either internal coherence or utility. Both trends would have a significant impact on the credibility of dogma, which depended on the correspondence of propositions to the realities they described.

\textsuperscript{126} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 974.

\textsuperscript{127} “Du même que la doctrine luthérienne dérive à la fois d’un sentiment de confiance, et non d’illumination intellectuelle, de même c’est sur la volonté morale, non sur la spéculation rationnelle, que Kant établit la certitude de Dieu et l’âme qu’il appelle \textit{foi}…Finalement donc, la foi naturelle, dictée par la raison pratique, absorbe en soi toute vérité religieuse.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 974-5.)

\textsuperscript{128} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 974.

\textsuperscript{129} “Tout intellectualisme fut dénoncé comme un danger, toute définition comme un appauvrissement du réel, toute précision comme un morcelage. Au lieu d’une science incomplète, progressive, indéfinie en ses démarches, mais certaine dans ses principes et irréformable en quelques-unes de ses constations, on imagina un flux d’hypothèses, débauches tâtonnantes et symboliques, tentatives précaires de la pensée humaine aux prises avec une réalité en évolution, et d’ailleurs inconnaisable en son fonds.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 982-3.)
Some kinds of agnosticism manifested lukewarmness or even an open hostility toward metaphysics. Other forms even denied that any truth claims could be known unconditionally, that is, with certitude. Finally, much of the new philosophy was tied to an open defiance of any intellectual understanding whatsoever. The agnosticism that Grandmaison most inveighed against had to do with the refusal to believe dogma, to give an unconditional, morally obligatory assent to a fundamental statement of a truth of the Christian faith. As an immutable, irreforable expression of faith, dogma provided a certitude that was indispensable. Atheistic rationalism and liberal Protestantism denied outright either the possibility, desirability, or necessity of dogmatic belief.

In principle many modernists affirmed the possibility and worth of dogma. They certainly did not see themselves as radical skeptics. Weakening of the certitude of dogma did not prevent modernist historians of dogma, exegetes, scholars of comparative religion, and philosophers from believing that they had access to truth. The downplaying of dogma among modernists coexisted with a mania for positivism, which itself was a dogmatism manqué. Indeed, modernism often reduced intellectual inquiry to positivism. It was understandable for this reason that Grandmaison often referred to contemporary exegetes—whether radical rationalists, liberal Protestants, or modernists—as rationalists.

130 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 216.
131 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 209.
But in Grandmaison’s eyes, the various modernist accounts of dogma undermined adherence to it, albeit in subtle ways. The various ways in which modernists understood the essential content and purpose of dogmas discounted the value of the truth claims that they contained. However much modernists erred on the side of a confidence in the human intellect to comprehend the truth, they could not escape the tragic oscillation of rationalism and sentimentalism. Their embrace of positivism only exposed how fragile the rationality of modernism was. Much of the certitude that the various modernisms yielded was restricted to the domain of empirical facts. Even the sentimental religion inherent in modernism sometimes could lead to rationalism.\textsuperscript{137} But in denying the epistemological value of dogma, both tendencies veered toward skepticism; both effectively denied the possibility of any intellectual certitude whatsoever.

A philosophical—and real—solution that reconciled history and dogma seemed neither pressing nor perhaps even possible to modernists such as Loisy. The historical critical approach, whether in exegesis or in the history of dogma, always seemed to have the upper hand. In 1897, a few years before the height of the modernist crisis, Grandmaison had observed the spiritual disorder that happened when speculative theology lost pride of place to positive theology, of which the study of this history of dogma was a part:

In place of furnishing the body of revealed doctrines with its illustration, its human explication, and its adaptation to present needs, it will relegate it to a deplorable inferiority. Deplorable also for the very history of dogma, which, deprived of its guiding principles that theological rules impose on it, will incline the mind to I know not what kind of skepticism, which sometimes allows piety to subsist, but becomes very disquieting to faith.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{137} Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 408.

\textsuperscript{138} “Au lieu de fournir au corps des doctrines révélées son illustration, son explication humaine, son adaptation aux besoins présents, elle le reléguera dans une déplorable infériorité. Déplorable pour l’histoire même du dogme, qui,
The modernist scholar traded the certitude of dogmas for the opaqueness of historical probability. Such a lopsided emphasis was ruinous to faith and reason.

Loisy’s anti-dogmatism, wrote Grandmaison, took a page from Sabatier:

Since 1902, in the short preface of his *Études Evangéliques*, M. Loisy wrote ‘Jésus was much less the representative of a doctrine than the initiator of a religious movement. The movement that he inaugurated has been perpetuated under the normal conditions of any fruitful movement.’ These conditions are described, in *L’Évangile et l’Église*, in terms that discretely echo the theory of Auguste Sabatier. In the course of the sixth Letter meant to interpret the ‘little red book,’ the author recognizes that, in the hypothesis according to which ‘truth in so far as it is accessible to the human spirit is something absolute,’—read: the Catholic hypothesis,—‘its assertions ought to be held not only as rash, but as absurd and impious.’

According to Grandmaison, Loisy excluded the possibility that Christ uttered any truth whatsoever carrying the weight of dogma. Moreover, Loisy denied the very possibility of intellectual certitude.

Modernist anti-dogmatism fed on philosophical antinomies that destroyed faith.

Thinkers such as Oratorian philosopher Père Lucien Laberthonnière insisted on the antinomy between moral and intellectual dogmatism. He saw dogmas exclusively as pragmatic guides of moral action. Grandmaison agreed that dogmas provided rules for moral guidance; but Laberthonnière’s notion of dogma left no room for the essential role of intellectual...
understanding.\textsuperscript{141} His dogmatic moralism repeated Kant’s fideism.\textsuperscript{142} Grandmaison turned to the teaching of Dominican Père Marc–Benoît Schwalm to correct this error. Schwalm acknowledged the interrelationship of the will and the intellect in the act of faith:

by itself, moral dogmatism does not explain certitude well; mental dogmatism is not illusory when one understands it sanely; but it must be completed by morality; both together, based on an integral dogmatism according to the genius of Saint Thomas, give the best answer to the troubling question of certitude.\textsuperscript{143}

According to Grandmaison, human reason was frail and fragmentary enough; the human person had great need of certitude in order to act prudently.\textsuperscript{144} Nonetheless, he also criticized Schwalm for not taking into account some of Laberthonnière’s promising ideas.\textsuperscript{145} As Grandmaison saw it, dogma also had real implications for human action.

Modernists such as Tyrrell insisted on the distance between revelation and theology, experience and expression, continuity and development of doctrine, and magisterium and non-hierarchical charismatics.

When for example M. Tyrrell distinguishes, with respect to revelation, an incommunicable \textit{prophetic} truth, and a \textit{theological} truth, the former not furnishing any judgment, any distinct and formulable knowledge to the other judgment, but only an impulse, an ineffable experience that theology will interpret in terms of a given philosophy; when he delivers to evolution properly speaking all this theology and declares that ‘the Church is mistaken in theological, scientific, and practical matters,’ when he describes revelation as a permanent phenomenon, ‘without personal revelation, no faith; nothing more than a theological or historical assent,’ religiously null; when he

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{141} Grandmaison, “Dogmatisme du coeur,” 846.
\textsuperscript{142} Grandmaison, “Dogmatisme du coeur,” 849.
\textsuperscript{143} “le dogmatisme moral, à lui seule, n’explique pas bien la certitude; le dogmatisme mental n’est pas illusoire quand on l’entend sainement; mais il a besoin d’être complète par le moral; tous deux enfin, fondus dans un dogmatisme intégral par la génie de saint Thomas, donnent à la question troublante de la certitude sa réponse la meilleure.” (Grandmaison, “Dogmatisme du coeur,” 843.)
\textsuperscript{144} Grandmaison, “Dogmatisme du coeur,” 848.
\textsuperscript{145} Grandmaison, Dogmatisme du coeur,” 849.
\end{quote}
replaces the authorized ecclesiastical magisterium with a group of spiritual people to whom the Spirit of God, immanent in humanity, reveals himself more clearly;…is it a Catholic speaking? ¹⁴⁶

For Tyrrell, theological dogma could never express the truth of revelation with any certitude. Dogmatic statements were to be understood rather as the expression of religious experiences whose descriptions were provisional and often inadequate.¹⁴⁷ The essential content of dogma was essentially pre-verbal. The real truth behind dogma was in the personal religious experience that it attempted ever so imperfectly to express. In Grandmaison’s estimation, Tyrrell only recognized in effect a kind of cognitive and affective emotivism; any attempt to articulate revelatory experience was doomed to failure. Moreover, he substituted for the hierarchy’s discernment a band of prophets. But how would one know, according to Tyrrell’s own theory, if they were any more trustworthy than the magisterium? Such an account of revelation precluded the possibility of faith, let alone the role of the hierarchy in safeguarding, formulating, or propagating the deposit of faith. Modernism’s tendencies, especially its agnosticism, were provocations to gnosticism.¹⁴⁸ The mind abhorred a vacuum.

The most plausible modernist challenge to Catholic dogmatism came from Édouard Le Roy, whom Grandmaison lauded as ‘the most original and sincerest thinker among those who

¹⁴⁶ “Quand par exemple M. Tyrrell distingue, à propos de la révélation, une vérité prophétique incommunicable, et une vérité théologique, la première ne fournissant à l’autre aucun jugement, aucune connaissance distincte et formulable, mais seulement une impulsion, une expérience ineffable que la théologie interprétera dans les termes d’une philosophie donnée; quand il livre à l’évolution proprement dite toute cette théologie et déclare que ‘l’Eglise s’est trompée en matière théologique, scientifique, pratique,’ quand il décrit la révélation comme un phénomène permanent et dit que ‘sans révélation personnelle, nulle foi; rien qu’un assentiment théologique ou historique,’ religieusement nul; quand il substitue au magistère ecclésiastique assisté un groupe d’homme spirituels auxquels l’Esprit divin, immanent dans l’humanité, se révélerait plus clairement,…est-ce un catholique qui parle?” (Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 404-5.)

¹⁴⁷ Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 404-5.

most rubbed shoulders with modernism.”

Le Roy had two principal objections to traditional teaching about dogma. The first was that dogmas should not be taken as analogical notions, but as pure symbols. The second questioned the absolute claim of dogma to express the truth.

First, Le Roy claimed that the intellectual knowledge that dogma gave was purely negative: “It excludes and condemns certain errors without positively determining the truth.” Such was the case for example with the dogma God was personal, or that Jesus rose from the dead. Yet, although these statements—even the Creed itself—were inadequate to the objects they purported to describe and did not give real analogical knowledge of them, they did serve a positive, practical purpose. As a pure symbol: “In short, the dogma ‘God is personal’ does not give one any new positive conception and does not even guarantee me the truth of a particular system among those which the history of philosophy shows to have been successively proposed, but it does warn one that such and such forms of pantheism are false and should be rejected.”

This was understandable: but how much real knowledge did it yield?

Much like Laberthonnière, Le Roy held rather that dogmas served positively also as practical rules of action, such that the dogma that “God is personal” can be taken in the positive sense of “Comport yourself in your relations with God as you would in your relations with a

---


150 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 198.


152 Le Roy, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 512.

153 “Bref, le dogme ‘Dieu est personnel’ ne m’apporte aucune conception positive nouvelle et il ne me garantit pas davantage la vérité d’un système particulier parmi ceux que l’histoire de la philosophie montre avoir été successivement proposés, mais il m’avertit que telles et telles formes de panthéisme sont fausses et doivent être rejetées.” (Le Roy, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 512.) Grandmaison agreed with Le Roy that the Church does not adopt a particular philosophy when it uses terms taken from it; Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 199n2. See also Grandmaison, “Elasticité des formules,” 350-2.
human person.”154 Outstanding thinkers such as Grandmaison, Sertillanges and Allo understood Le Roy’s pragmatism, but they were the exception; most theologians reacted adversely to this ‘pragmatism,’ taking it, in ignorance of Le Roy’s constructs, merely as profound agnosticism.”155 But, for Grandmaison, Le Roy’s estimation of dogma’s adequacy to its object still fell far short of the Christian faith.

First, Le Roy’s account of dogma as a rule of action amounted to a kind of “doctrinal utilitarianism.”156 The opposition of the modernist to intellectualism—the “objective conformity of the truth to the things that it sought to express” was such that “The criterion of the true was exclusively sought in internal coherence or the utility of a doctrine.”157 In speaking of the relationship of dogma and action, Grandmaison wrote at some length about the assistance provided by the Holy Spirit to the Christian and the Church in discerning dogma and in living it out.158 He concluded: “Consequently, there is an incessant exchange of reciprocal influences between dogma and action, but in this exchange doctrine gives more than it receives.”159 Moreover, who were we, Grandmaison asked, to gauge the utility of doctrines such as the *Filioque*?160

---


156 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 220.


159 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 218-9.

Le Roy’s second difficulty, in Grandmaison’s judgment, had to do with his notion of immanence, which was tantamount to philosophical integralism.\textsuperscript{161} It was no trouble for Grandmaison to agree with Le Roy that all reality is interior to itself; that it was right to suppose in spite of human intellectual limitations that we should be aware of the interconnection of all things; and that in some sense all truths we hold should \textit{to some extent} be under the control of our reason and conformable to our spirit.\textsuperscript{162} “The difficulty would come either from dogma itself or from the way in which it comes to us: incomprehensible, it burdened our spirit with a dead weight, without value for religious life.\textsuperscript{163}” It was reasonable that there are demonstrations of dogmas that satisfy the “legitimate needs of the spirit.”\textsuperscript{164} Secondly, “imposed from without, [dogma] would do violence to our intellectual autonomy.” This difficulty could be cleared up by proper religious psychology.

all truth that is certainly known as such imposes itself on us, and, whatever the part of the faculties of the subject in the fruitful union from which results understanding, it must be admitted (under pain of absolute idealism) that such truth comes, in large measure, from outside...Only, when direct evidence is missing, that which supplies for it leaves a much larger place for good will, liberty, and merit. Will one call this a lapse? Does it really humiliate the spirit to assent to that which otherwise is assuredly true, because it is \textit{good} to believe it? Let us recognize at least that this humiliation is necessary in our present life, and that our moral and social life is founded for the most part on inevident certitudes.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{161} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 202.

\textsuperscript{162} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 202-3.

\textsuperscript{163} “La difficulté viendrait ou du dogme lui-même, ou du mode par lequel il nous arrive: incompréhensible, il chargeait notre esprit d’un poids mort.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 204.)

\textsuperscript{164} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 213.

\textsuperscript{165} “toute vérité certainement connue comme telle s’impose à nous, et, quelle que soit la part des facultés du sujet dans l’union seconde d’où résulte la connaissance, il faut avouer (sous peine d’idéalisme absolu) que cette vérité vient, dans une large mesure, du dehors...Seulement, quand l’évidence directe est absente, ce qui la supplée laisse une place beaucoup plus large à la bonne volonté, à la liberté, au mérite. Dira-t-on que c’est là une déchéance? et qu’un assentiment donné à ce qui d’ailleurs est assurément vrai, parce qu’il est \textit{bon} de le croire, humilié l’esprit? Qu’on reconnaisse du moins que cette humiliation est nécessaire dans notre condition présente, et que notre vie
Dogma was credible and obligatory even when many demonstrations for the truth of the doctrine were extreme or even impossible. Contrary to Le Roy’s assertions, it was altogether natural psychologically for the Christian to be freely docile to the truths of the faith, no matter how immense their import.¹⁶⁶

Towards the end of “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” Grandmaison summarized the philosophical objections to dogma and gave his balanced solution to it.

We are told that contemporary philosophy opposes irrefutable objections to the ‘common’ notion of dogma as it exists among Catholics; that it is necessary to profoundly change methods, even traditional positions; that every intellectual influence is in the process of escaping from the Church…To shut up one’s soul in a cry of alarm, to refuse to examine the reasons that are alleged in support of these complaints, to treat all progress a priori as temerity, all development as perversion, would be an error and a fault. The history of theology does not authorize such an attitude, nor does concern for souls permit it. But history also puts us on guard against radical solutions, the concern for souls forbids us summary innovations, and sudden innovations, and excessive confidence in systems made by the hand of man.¹⁶⁷

Grandmaison’s ideas about the interrelationship of dogma and critical study hearken back to his article “Theologiens scolastiques.” Even the most fraught exchanges with modernists did not cause Grandmaison to dismiss the development of dogma. Intellectual integrity and pastoral
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¹⁶⁶ Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 205-6.

¹⁶⁷ “Ce que je voudrais combattre en finissant, c’est l’impression d’inquiétude qui dégagera, je le crains, pour plusieurs, de la lecture des pages qui ont donné d’occasion à ces notes. On nous dit qu’à la notion ‘commune’ du dogme, telle qu’existe chez les catholiques, la philosophie contemporaine oppose des objections irréfutables; qu’il faut changer profondément les méthodes, voire les positions traditionnelles; que toute influence intellectuelle est en train d’échapper à l’Eglise…Fermer son âme à ce cri d’alarme, refuser examiner les raisons qu’on allègue à l’appui de ces doléances, traiter a priori tout progrès de témérité, tout développement de perversion, serait une erreur et une faute. Ni l’histoire de la théologie n’autorise une pareille attitude, ni le souci des âmes ne la permet. Mais c’est l’histoire aussi qui nous met en garde contre les solutions radicales, c’est le souci des âmes qui nous interdit les innovations sommaires, et la confiance excessive dans les systèmes faits de main d’homme.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 220-1.) See also Léonce de Grandmaison, letter, May 8, 1917, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 357.
solicitude set him on guard against ecclesiastical obscurantism. But he was also vigilant against purely human, rational scrutiny in matters of faith. A believer should not base his beliefs on human systems; nor should reason be the final arbiter of the certitude of dogma.

**Immanentism**

The principal philosophical issue that modernism raised, according to Grandmaison, was the most fundamental religious question of all, the divine transcendence. The idea of the immanence of God had been used during the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century. Orthodox Christian thinkers sought to safeguard against the Sabellian heresy the doctrine that there are three real Persons in the Trinity and not merely three appearances of a monadic God. So they made the distinction between the economic Trinity (God as involved in the economy of salvation)—and the immanent Trinity (the three Persons in themselves without reference to the created order). The main issue in religion for Grandmaison was the proper understanding of the interconnection between God’s transcendence and his relationship to his creation.

Loisy recognized that Christianity posed most acutely the problem of the relation of the divine transcendence and immanence. Grandmaison agreed.

The real problem... in religious matters is posed on Christian terrain. I know of no other place that has even mentioned the conception of the true God, God as Spirit, God as Charity, God as incomprehensible, at once transcendent in his Being and immanent to all his works. Nowhere else have been resolved the delicate problems of the relative autonomy of our spirit and of the unconditional submission demanded by faith, without sacrificing one of these two powers—not to mention the delicate problems of the interior life, of asceticism and the gift of the self.


169 Loisy, Autour d’un petit livre, 154.

170 “Le problème véritable... se pose donc en matière religieuse, sur le terrain chrétien. Nulle part ailleurs, que je sache, la conception du Dieu véritable, du Dieu Esprit, du Dieu Charité, du Dieu incompréhensible, à la fois transcendant en son Être et immanent à son œuvre, n’a été même énoncée. Nulle part ailleurs, les problèmes délicats de l’autonomie relative de notre esprit et de sa soumission inconditionnée par la foi, n’ont été résolus sans le
Loisy also agreed that the doctrine of the divine transcendence was in play in his time. Loisy wrote: “The dogmas of the Trinity and of the Incarnation were founded from earliest times, as a doctrine of religious philosophy, on the sole idea of the divine transcendence. Nonetheless the evolution of modern philosophy tends more and more to the idea of an immanent God.”

Grandmaison recognized that there had been a profound change such that the modern philosophies of religion found the divine immanence more credible than the divine transcendence.

In Grandmaison’s estimation, modernists such as Loisy did not respect the distance between God and his creatures. The sentimentalist tendency in modernism tended to confuse or elide the distinction between the divine transcendence and the immanence of God within creation. This immanentism could be traced back to German idealism, to Schleiermacher’s sentimental philosophy and to Hegel's idealism. While some saw God as the God of Aristotle, transcendent and distinct from all things, others saw him as purely immanent, as the God of Hegel, “the Idea that seeks to express itself in the absolute, as the obscure and infinite Force which tends to realize itself in light, as the diffuse Consciousness aspires to concentrate itself in


174 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAF France, 1294; Jésus Christ, 2, 60.

175 Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 408.

176 Grandmaison, “Pensée religieuse hors de l’Église,” (1913), 77.
Hegel’s claim that absolute Spirit had to constantly express itself over against itself in order to become itself was incompatible with the traditional notion of the absolute, transcendent freedom of God vis-à-vis his creation. Such a philosophy could lead the most intransigently rationalist of the modernists to reject any form of positive religion whatsoever. Indeed, Loisy eventually came to regard the notion of God as “an ideal projection of the human personality,’ and theology—meaning the entire doctrine of a personal God—‘a more distilled mythology.’ The one God was nothing but a human ideal.

The immanentist, evolutionist, and agnostic philosophy of modernism often led to the complete denial of the supernatural; such an error was commonly called naturalism. The modernist tendency to reduce revealed religion to natural religion went hand-in-hand with the denial of the miracles from the Gospels. While Harnack divided the miracle accounts into various categories of likelihood, Strauss rejected them tout court. To Loisy, Jesus himself had been a wonder worker almost “despite himself.” But Grandmaison found rationalist criticism of miracles to be as embarrassed as the criticism of the miracles in Jesus’ day. Modernist exegetes discounted or excluded outright the possibility of the miraculous in the Gospels on

---

177 “comme l’Idée qui cherche à s’exprimer dans l’absolu, comme la Force obscure et infinie qui tend se réaliser dans la lumière, comme la Conscience diffuse qui aspire à se concentrer dans l’esprit.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 407-8.)


180 Loisy, La Religion (Paris, 1917), 313, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 594n2.


183 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 323.

184 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 199.

185 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 322.
philosophical grounds.\textsuperscript{186} Some objected that miracles transgressed the laws of nature; others even denied miracles that they had seen themselves. Some identified a miracle with a merely natural occurrence:\textsuperscript{187} healing from within the patient,\textsuperscript{188} the presence of hidden forces of all kinds, or the use of hypnotic suggestion.\textsuperscript{189}

The new school of comparative religion added its own objection: “the accounts of miracles could be the spontaneous and normal creation of a community of simple believers engaged in magnifying the objects of its worship: early Christianity presents an interesting case of this general law.”\textsuperscript{190} Huby wrote the following in his review of Grandmaison’s \textit{Jésus Christ}:

One of the theses that most often shows up in the discussion of the apologist, is that of the young German school, still little known in France, of R. Bultmann, M. Dibelius, and K.L. Schmidt. In certain respects, these theories converge with those of Durkheim’s school of sociology. The theory notably explains our synoptic Gospels as impersonal works of the creative collectivity and reduces the original contribution of the evangelists to nothing.\textsuperscript{191}

Grandmaison was eager to refute the claim that the gospels were the product more of the community than of the individual writers. Unable to understand the balance of the individual


\textsuperscript{187} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 241.

\textsuperscript{188} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 335.

\textsuperscript{189} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 355-7.

\textsuperscript{190} “Les récits merveilleux seraient…la création spontanée et normale d’une communauté de simples croyants, occupée à magnifier l’objet de son culte: de cette loi générale, les origines chrétiennes présente un cas intéressant.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 328.)

\textsuperscript{191} “L’une des thèses, qui s’est le plus souvent imposée à la discussion de l’apologiste, est celle de la jeune école allemande, encore peu connue en France, des R. Bultmann, M. Dibelius, K.L. Schmidt. Par certains côtés, ses théories rejoignent celles de l’école sociologique de Durkheim. Elle explique notamment nos évangiles synoptiques comme des œuvres impersonnelles de la collectivité créatrice et réduit à rien la part originale des évangélistes.” (Huby, “Le Jésus Christ” 134.)
and the collective in personal religion, these thinkers undermined what one thought of the personal religion of Jesus and of the Church, the personal religion that he founded.

This collectivism was at root a symptom of the ultimate philosophical rationale for denying the reality of the miracles: “materialist monism.” This idea was tantamount to a denial of the foundation of the belief in miracles: the transcendence, immanence, and personhood of God. Modernists tended to displace a sense of the supernatural with a sense of naturalism that could explain (away) the mystery. But if one believed in a personal, provident, benevolent, and loving God, then religious miracles were possible. The fundamental credibility of a miracle did not lie in subtle reasoning: “But the sign addresses itself to every religious man and does not need, to be considered worthy, this abstruse and very delicate research.” The traditional notion of the miracle involved, subjectively speaking, the ability of the viewer to perceive the miracle; objectively speaking, a physically transcendent event, religious and moral value, and apologetic readability. Grandmaison went so far to conclude that in so far as a miracle revealed the providence of a personal God for his creatures, a miracle in the Christian sense of the word was not extraordinary.

Modernist philosophy downplayed or denied the supernatural nature of another group of Christ’s works. Grandmaison defined the traditional notion of prophet and prophecy thus:

The prophet is the man empowered by God and acting as such, a messenger inspired by the Divinity. The gift that confers this high prerogative in the transitory or habitual state

192 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 234.
194 Grandmaison, “Jesus Christ,” DAFC, 1408.
196 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 246-7.
is of the intellectual order, but it often doubles as an action on the will that makes the 
inspiré conscious of his duty to transmit and proclaim.
The communications thus made from on high, can exceed in themselves and in fact always do exceed in the mode of their apprehension the information that is received by the common way of knowing.\footnote{\textit{Le prophète, c’est l’homme en puissance de dieu et agissant comme tel, porte-parole inspiré de la Divinité. Le don qui confère, à l’état passager ou habituel, cette haute prérogative, est de l’ordre intellectuel, mais il se double très souvent d’une action sur la volonté, donnant a l’inspiré conscience d’un devoir de transmissions et de proclamation. Les communications ainsi communiqués d’en haut peuvent dépasser en elles-mêmes, et dépassent toujours par leur mode d’appréhension, celles que l’homme acquiert par la voie commune. Elles participent ainsi, d’une façon inégale mais certaine, aux révélations divines dont le Prophète est normalement instrument.”} (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 246.)}

Grandmaison thought that the apprehension of prophecy transcended natural capabilities, and that the mode of the prophet’s participation in the knowledge of divine revelations was unequal. However:

This is not to say—far from it—that communications violate to some degree the intellectual processes of the one who benefits by them; let us not be deceived by the obscurities and equivocations piled up by Modernist criticism, the faint echo of the Hegelian doctrine of immanence. All this confusion results, in this case as in that concerning the miracle, because the modernists mistakenly insert traditional formulas and notions in a hypothesis of general philosophy that is incompatible with the realities supposed by these formulas and notions. These depart from the existence of a personal God who is simultaneously transendent and immanent. Once you abandon this idea for that of a purely immanent, impersonal God, a sort of world soul and hidden root of things, as conceived according to each man’s preference—\footnote{\textit{Ce qui ne veut pas dire (et bien au contraire) que ses connaissances violentent à quelque degré l’esprit de celui qui en bénéficie. Les obscurités, les équivoques, accumulées par la polémique moderniste, écho confus de l’immanentisme hégélien, ne doivent pas donner le change. Tout ce brouillamini résulte, dans ce cas comme dans celui du miracle, de l’intrusion, par les modernistes, des formules et notions traditionnelles, dans une hypothèse de philosophie générale incompatible avec les réalités supposées par ces formules et notions. Celles-ci partent de l’existence d’un Dieu personnel, transendent à la fois et immanent. Abandonnez cette conception pour celle d’un Divin purement immanent, impersonnel, sorte d’âme de l’univers et de racine caché des choses, conçu, selon les opinions de chacun.”} (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 246-7; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 23.) On this point, see also Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologetique} 6 (1908), 402-414, which shows the dependence of Sabatier, Tyrrell, and Loisy on Hegel; Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 247n1.}

would not such a conception give a new sense to prophecy, debase, or even abolish it altogether?

Modernists rejected the existence of divine signs—miracles or prophecies—because they

manifested the transcendence and personhood inherent in Christ. Sometimes the objections to
these signs were that they violated the laws of nature, at other times, that they violated the limits of pure reason. Yet even the most current ethnology and psychology had shown the religious value of prophecy.

Grandmaison saw in this distortion or even rejection of belief in Christ’s prophecies the philosophical core of the modernist errors: the transcendence and concurrent immanence of God to all his creatures, and the existence of a personal God, and the philosophical assumptions behind critical study of Scripture. “That Jesus de Nazareth was endowed with a higher grace, an inspiration of the prophetic kind but with a unique intensity, is no new mystery, properly speaking, added to that which is already implied in the friendly intercourse of the Creator with his rational creatures.”

Grandmaison also criticized overreactions by some orthodox apologists. Flinching at the modernist denial of the supernatural, they too had fallen into the same naturalism. These orthodox scholars saw a prophet simply as the right man at the right time: he was in effect a divine puppet, speaking and acting exactly as identifiable circumstances dictated. No, Grandmaison objected, the prophet was an active, responsible, real instrument of the divinity. The rationalist bent of the modernists, on the other hand, ruled out the supernatural dimension of prophecy altogether.

Immanentism threatened to do away with the Chalcedonian distinction between the divine and human natures of Christ. Hegel had reduced the Paschal mystery to the mere form of the dialectical progress of absolute Spirit through history. As a result, the transcendent God of Christianity was considered in effect to be a captive of his involvement with the world.

---

199 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 251.

200 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 210; Jesus Christ, 3, 21.
This heterodoxy was in part the result of a scholar’s faulty personal religion.

Grandmaison said of the rationalist that he was able to reject the teaching about the divinity of Christ in so far as each “makes his spirit the measure of everything, and of God himself.”

At bottom, we see yet another time that the conflict precedes historical and critical study: It is the discomfort felt by many at the mere thought of the positive intervention of God, it is the fear of a breach in rationalist autonomy, which inclines them from the start to the purely natural interpretation of philosophical evidence.

For Pascendi, while agnosticism was “only the negative part of the system of the Modernist: the positive side of it consists in what they call vital immanence....faith, which is the basis and the foundation of religion, consists in a sentiment which originates from a need for the divine.”

Such presumption might have been evident in the following query made by a supporter of Loisy’s: “The divine Person was there: yes! But was he the Person who spoke?” Although the human desire for God was essential to religion, it could not be considered the cause of divine self-revelation; such a position would limit the divine liberty.

---

201 The truth within all reality was absolute Spirit, which was thought thinking itself. Each reality was superseded by a successor which then preserved and carried forward its predecessor in a new movement forward of the Spirit. The content of Christianity, therefore, was superseded. (Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller and J. N. Findlay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 525-7). See Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 158-9; “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologetique* 5 (1907), 542.


203 “Sur le fond, nous observerons une fois de plus que le conflit est antérieur à l’étude historique et critique: c’est l’inconfort produit chez beaucoup par la seule pensée d’une intervention positive de Dieu, c’est la crainte d’une irruption dans l’autonomie rationaliste, qui les incline d’avance à l’interprétation purement naturelle des données philosophiques.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 251-2.)

204 *Pascendi*, 7.

Evolutionism

Caught in the tension between the contingency of history and the permanence of dogma, modernist theories of the development of dogma inclined toward a preoccupation with the contingencies and discontinuities rather than the continuities of development within traditional Christianity. *Pascendi* had identified evolution as the chief doctrine of the modernists.206 Grandmaison concurred: “The notion of evolution could furnish the boldest key to all problems and the word to solve all enigmas.”207 Although many modernists acknowledged that dogma had some value, they also thought of solemnly defined formulations as only vehicles or husks of the truths contained within. As humanity evolved, so did the truth.208 Being answerable to the findings of critical scholarship, dogmatic formulas were subject to reinterpretation, restatement, correction, or even rejection. Anti-modernist Catholic theologians often called this error evolutionism.209 Grandmaison attacked this idea a decade before *Pascendi* in “L’Élasticité des formules de foi” (and a little later in his review of Loisy’s *L’Èvangile et l’Èglise*).210

Mistaken understandings of the development of doctrine were for Grandmaison the fruit of the metaphysics that privileged becoming over being.211

One would be completely mistaken in believing that the principal modernists had the intention of Protestantizing the Catholic religion. It was not to support, but to combat *The Essence of Christianity* of M. Harnack, that M. Loisy wrote *L’Èvangile et l’Èglise*, and the last book of G. Tyrrell (*Christianity at the Crossroads*) witnesses again, and vividly, the same

---

211 Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 408.
disposition of spirit. We believe that one will have a more exact idea of the modernist spirit if one would say that its makers—who despaired of dogmatic truth in the traditional sense, but were very struck by the failure of all the thought of the nineteenth century to give a response to the religious individualism of Protestants—strve to maintain the *psychology* and the *sociology* of Catholicism, by sacrificing that which one should not be afraid to call its *metaphysics*.

A true reconciliation—involving a coincidence of the opposites of *esse* and *fieri*—could be found in a proper understanding of the development of doctrine. But modernists fell prey to the idealist philosophy of Hegel and of the left-wing Hegelians, influential proponents for the evolutionist theories of revelation.

Hegelianism had dominated the quest for the historical Jesus for decades (1850-1925). Herder’s philosophy of becoming, “unified abstractly and powerfully by Hegel,” further secularized the interpretation of the person and mission of Jesus such that one could study him as an object of pure science with the detachment that one could study “the subdivison of Vertebrates.” Faith was no longer required in order to understand God. For Lessing, Herder, and Goethe, history was

---

212 “On se tromperait du tout au tout en croyant que les principaux modernistes ont eu l'intention de protestantiser la religion catholique. Ce n’est pas pour appuyer, c’est pour combattre, l’*Essence de Christianisme* de M. Harnack, que M. Loisy écrivait *l’Évangile et l’Église*, et le dernier livre de G. Tyrrell (*Christianity at the Crossmad*) témoigne encore, et vivement, de la même disposition d’esprit. Nous croyons qu'on se ferait une idée plus exacte de l'esprit moderniste, si l'on disait que ses fauteurs, désespérant de la vérité dogmatique au sens traditionnel, mais très frappés du démenti sans réplique donné par toute la pensée du XIXe siècle à l'individualisme religieux des protestants, s’efforcent de maintenir la *psychologie* et la *sociologie* du catholicisme, en sacrifiant ce qu’il ne faut pas craindre d’appeler sa *métaphysique.*” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 983n1-4.)


a continuous, progressive development, ‘the divine education of humanity.’ General and a little vague, these views tended to substitute spontaneous action of collectivities for individual influences, the former being supposed an organ that was best fitted to the nature of the great, immanent, impersonal, divine Force which moved humanity toward its end.

Moreover, a false sense of the social dimension of human nature went hand in hand with a falsification of the traditional doctrine about God.

Hegel thought that, in order to become itself, absolute Spirit had to express itself over against itself. The progress of Spirit ultimately overcame the self-identity of anything that was not itself. All realities could become what they were not. The combined result of German idealism and romanticism was that the notions of divine immanentism, evolutionism, and impersonality eventually found their way into the doctrine of God.

One could not consider Christ as a person, but only as “a link in the immense chain” of becoming. For right wing Hegelians, evolution as a whole was divine, and Jesus was an instantiation of it. Left wing Hegelians such as Feuerbach held that Jesus never really existed, but was “the image under which the unity of the species presented itself to popular consciousness.” In either case, the pure Hegelian privileged philosophical causes at the expense of facts.

---

217 This was the title of book by Lessing published in 1780; Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 179n2.

218 “Ils sont étroitement liés aux hypothèses que Lessing, Herder et Goethe ont appliquées à l'histoire, considérée par eux comme celle d'un développement continu, progressif, 'l'éducation divine de l'humanité.' Générales et un peu vagues, ces vues tendaient à substituer l'action spontanée des collectivités aux influences individuelles, la première étant censée un organe mieux approprié à la nature de la grande Force divine, immanente, impersonnelle, qui meut l'humanité vers sa fin.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 179.)


220 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 179.

221 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 182.

222 L. Feuerbach, L'Essence du Christianisme, 1841, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 182.
Hegel’s most important disciple in terms of religious thought was David Friedrich Strauss. According to Grandmaison, Strauss and Schleiermacher were the great progenitors of the search for the historical Jesus among liberal Protestants, modernists, and rationalists alike. Independent exegete Maurice Goguel claimed that Strauss “was the first to attack the problem [of reconstructing the story of Jesus], entirely without theological bias.” Strauss and those who followed in his line sought to rescue the literal truth of Scripture by de-mythologizing certain parts of the New Testament and by appreciating the truth contained in the gospel’s mythological dimensions.

But, for Grandmaison, Strauss’ life of Christ (1835-1836) was anything but unbiased:

Composed in full Hegelian intoxication, he audaciously mixed the views that were most systematic with the critique of texts and of facts; ‘there is no attempt to establish the interconnection [of these], to link them with the general narrative; they are merely reviewed each in its turn.’ [Marie-Josèphe Lagrange, Le Sens du Christianisme dans l’exégèse allemande (Paris, 1918), 142]….steeped in the confused but forceful ideas of his master Hegel, he uses a rich imagination and an ingenuity that the majority of his successors lack in constructing these hypotheses. These gifts explain the scandalous success provoked by his Life of Jesus and its enduring influence. In accord with the Hegelian scheme, which tends to reduce superior personalities to simple moments of development of the Idea, the person of Christ in the work of Strauss remains singularly pale and unreal. To tell the truth, Jesus of Nazareth interests the author only as a symbol of the true Christ, Humanity…All of Strauss’s effort strives to replace the real facts of the life of Jesus with what he calls ‘the Gospel myth,’ that is, ideal conceptions that are translated subsequently in terms of history.

---

223 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 181, 183. David Friedrich Strauss Leben Jesu: kritisch arbeite, 2 vols. (Tübingen: C. F. Osiander, 1837). Both Strauss’ work and Renan’s Vie de Christ were cited by Grandmaison in the first pages of his DAFC article, “Jésus Christ” (1401) and of his Jésus Christ (4-5).


226 “composé en pleine intoxication hégélienne, il mêle audacieusement les vues les plus systématiques à la critique des textes et des faits; ‘aucune tentative pour établir l’enchaînement (de ceux-ci), pour les rattacher à l’histoire générale; ils sont seulement passés en revue chacun à son tour.’ [Marie-Josèphe Lagrange, Le Sens du Christianisme dans l’exégèse allemande (Paris, 1918), 142, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 183-4]….plein de la pensée fumeuse mais forte de son maître Hegel, il déploie dans la construction de ses hypothèses une richesse d’imagination et une
Grandmaison did give Strauss credit for his accomplishments, especially for attempting to re-establish the literal sense of the gospel texts. He had tried to resolve the question of the origin of the gospel history, but without recourse to either the supernatural or to the fraud hypothesized by Reimarus and Voltaire. But he so ruthlessly applied the Hegelian dialectic that people, stripped of their particular reality, were made into moments of an idea.

Hegel’s idealism fatally weakened both the stability and the distinctiveness of any truth that was part of the deposit of revelation. Hegel, for whom “That which is rational is real, and that which is real is rational,” tended to reduce the complexities of discernment involved in understanding the history of dogma to simplistic solutions. “Hegel’s mistake, according to [Drey and Möhler], was to simplify too much, to push to the extreme, to the point of contradiction, the opposition of elements that are really different, contrary, antonymic, and apparently irreconcilable, which life re-connects, reunites, uses, and transcends by enriching itself with their respective contribution.” The dialectic of Spirit in history swept away all difference. All ideas were susceptible to ceaseless development. Such an eventuality ruled out the possibility

---

228 Grandmaison, “L’Évangile et l’Église,” 156.
229 Grandmaison, “Möhler,” 393.
230 Johann Sebastian von Drey (1777-1853) was co-founder with Möhler of the Tübingen School.
231 “Le tort de Hegel est, d’après eux de simplifier trop, de pousser à bout, jusqu’à la contradiction proprement dite, l’opposition des éléments réellement divers, contraires, antinomiques, et apparemment inconciliables, que la vie rapproche, réunit, utilise, et dépasse en s’enrichant de leur apport respectif.” (Grandmaison, “Möhler,” 392.)
of attaining to any certainties. As a result, the stability, the trustworthiness, and the authentic development of dogma were lost.

Grandmaison freely acknowledged, along with the Tübingen School, the truth and utility of Hegel’s schema of the progress of the history of ideas. The development of doctrine was an ancient fact. On the one hand, the Church could not pass on what it had not received in the deposit of faith: “Non datur nova revelatio in Ecclesia.” Public revelation had ended with the end of the apostolic age. Nonetheless, there was development of doctrine that accorded with the Church’s deposit of faith. Thinkers such as Newman had already given a correct idea of the vital development of dogma. He had written: “In a higher world it is otherwise, but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.” The Church had to constantly change to remain itself.

Yet it was of little avail to the modernists that they tried to wrap themselves with the mantle of Newman. Although Grandmaison recognized that Newman’s notion of the development of doctrine lent itself to serious misinterpretation, Newman was no modernist.

238 Newman, Development of Christian Doctrine, 41.
240 Newman had occasionally shown tendencies such as a certain fear of rationalism and discounting of traditional apologetics that his self-proclaimed disciples exaggerated; Grandmaison, “Newman,” Études 110 (1907), 58-67.
241 Grandmaison, “Moehler.” 403-4, 408.
Nor did Newman compromise the personal and transcendent nature of God in the name of immanence.242 “There is the whole religious question” that distinguished the Tübingen School243 and Newman from the modernists.244 Newman’s principal adversary was, after all, (religious) liberalism, or anti-dogmatism. While accounting for the twists and turns of the history of dogma was a complex affair, the decision whether to affirm Christian dogmas was a simple matter. In the end, either one believed or one did not.245 Newman held that the dogmatic principle was so fundamental and unique to Catholicism that the fundamental religious decision was finally between Catholicism and atheism.246

One of the dangers of evolutionism for Grandmaison was that it undermined the personal dimension of revelation, which often undermined the value of the individual at the expense of the collective. As he put it, these theories erased from history “the commanding trace of strong individuals, personal values, and heroes. These theories do not distinguish between a vague power or the order of real sentiment that is radically insufficient to itself, and the power of determination and choice, and the intellectual order, which is always personal.”247 Whether in Church life or doctrine, evolutionism, like revolution, had a habit of devouring all her children.


244 Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 407.


247 “la trace impérieuse des individualistes fortes, des valeurs personnelles, des héros. Elles ne distinguent pas d’une puissance vague, d’ordre sentimental réelle, mais radicalement insuffisante à elle seule, la puissance de détermination et d’élection, d’ordre intellectuel, qui est toujours personnelle.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, “La collectivité créatrice,” Note B, 199.)
In the cases of Loisy and Tyrrell, the obsession with the fieri of history made modernists lose sight of the stable ground of the esse of history. Modernist theories of the development of doctrine were often tantamount to agnosticism, in so far as they rejected virtually any stable content to be believed. Loisy had introduced an element of disconcerting ambiguity toward traditional dogmatism when he wrote in his review of Sabatier’s La religion et la culture moderne, that “[t]heology recognizes that nothing is unchangeable except God.”

Though well aware of the limitations of dogmatic propositions, Grandmaison would not relinquish belief in their fundamental, immutable certitude. But Loisy’s thought on the development of doctrine, though still in flux, bore the general characteristics of an evolutionist agnosticism. By the time he finished paring down Jesus’ claims about the Kingdom of God and the Church, one was left merely with ideals that arose from the impulse of Christ’s race and of humanity.

The development of dogma is therefore, in the proper sense of the word, an evolution and as such means, additions, changes, losses: by way of imperceptible amendment, dogmas correct themselves, transform themselves, succeed one another. That would apply without a doubt if our transcriptions of the divine could (and it has been a great error to believe so) be anything else but pure symbols. But if ‘faith concerns itself with immutable truth,’ with the divine, it is ‘by means of the formula, necessarily inadequate, susceptible to improvement, consequent to change.’ Thus, agnosticism permits one to maintain a certain immutability—that of the object—in a dogmatics that is always evolving.

250 Alfred Loisy, Revue Critique (1898), 5 in Grandmaison, “Élasticité,” 343n2.
252 “Le développement du dogme est donc, au sens propre du mot, une évolution, et comporte, comme tel, des additions, des changements, des pertes: par voie d’amendement insensible les dogmes se corrigent, se transforment, se succèdent. Cela importerait sans doute si nos transcriptions du divin pouvaient (et c’a été la grande erreur de le croire) être autre chose que de purs symboles. Mais si ‘la foi s’adresse à la vérité immuable,’ au divin, c’est à travers
Grandmaison found Loisy’s ideas about the nature and development of dogma to be slippery. Given the modernist mania for positivism, it seemed that the history of dogma often came to matter more than the content of dogma itself.253

For Tyrrell—“avowed chief of the modernists”—there was no use trying to reconcile liberal notions with “reactionary” scholastic ones.254 Revelation was immutable; but dogmas changed.255 “As a result, revelation is much less understanding than an object of understanding; it is an impression, not an expression.”256 The first translation of this religious experience is “prophetic,” while the next is theological.

The great error has been—always according to M. Tyrrell, and up until him—to confound prophetic expressions—translation that is spontaneous, instinctive, dependent on the psychological antecedents of the prophet, of his incommunicable experience—with a theological given, which would be covered by divine authority, with a judgment communicated by God. This error concerning dogmatic formulas has been repeated by confounding their value of protecting with their value of signifying.257

---

253 Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 393.

254 George Tyrrell, Through Scylla and Charybdis, or The Old Theology and the New, 4, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 90.


257 “La grande erreur a été—selon toujours M.Tyrrell, et jusqu’à lui—de confondre des expressions prophétiques, traduction spontanée, instinctive, dépendante des antécédents psychologiques du prophète, de son expérience incommunicable, avec une donnée théologique, qui serait couverte par l’autorité divine, avec un jugement communiqué par Dieu. Cette erreur, on l’a répétée, à l’égard des formules dogmatiques, en confondant leur valeur de protection avec une valeur de signification.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 95.)
Theological interpretations called dogmas only protected the prophetic experience. Moral and mystical élan—the latter much more than the former—reinforced one another, and were the heart of religion. Given Tyrrell’s emphasis on the prophetic and mystic dimensions of revelation, it was no surprise that Grandmaison referred to him later in the two-volume _Jésus Christ_ as “the prophet of modernism.”

Grandmaison often remarked that the ideas of the modernists were self-contradictory. According to Tyrrell, for example, the Christian received the revelation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of Scriptures and doctrinal formulas. At the same time, “the sole infallible Master of the religious man is the Spirit of God, who, immanent in the entire community, reveals himself more clearly, however, to an elite of spiritual men, ahead of the mass of Christians.” The notion that the Holy Spirit was the principle of immanence was orthodox enough. Yet, Tyrrell erred, as did Loisy, by substituting the divine immanence for the divine transcendence. So one should not be surprised that the Bride of Christ, so stripped of the authority her Spouse gave her, should respond with the “infallible instinct of conservation that M. Tyrrell still recognized.” Tyrrell in effect played off Christ’s authority against the Spirit’s.

---


260 Grandmaison, _Jesus Christ_, 2, 192.


262 “Le seul Maitre infallible de l’homme religieux, est-il l’Esprit de Dieu qui, immanent dans la communauté entière, se révèle pourtant plus clairement à une élite d’hommes spirituels, en avance sur la masse chrétienne.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologétique* 6 [1908], 97.)

C. Modernism’s Intellectual and Pastoral Devastation of Personal Religion

Devastation of the Deposit of Faith: Fragmented Christ, Church, and Believer

Modernism amounted, for Grandmaison, to an attack on Christianity in all three senses of personal religion: it was indeed, as Pascendi charged, “the synthesis of all heresies.”

Grandmaison spoke of personal religion in three ways. First, it was religion in the most fitting sense of the human person, as founded on the revelation of a personal God. Worthy of belief and observance, such religion respected man’s individuality and fulfilled his social nature.

Second, personal religion referred to the relationship of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Father in the Holy Spirit as manifested in the economy of salvation. Third, it referred to the Catholic Church, the religion directly established by Jesus Christ and animated by the Holy Spirit. Catholicism alone fulfilled the requirements of personal religion.

Dissolution of the form and content of Christian doctrines

Personal religion had to take place within the context of positive, or revealed religion. But modernism made the personal religion of the believer and of the Church as a whole impossible because it destroyed an essential form of Christian revelation: dogma. In Grandmaison’s estimation, the maximum objectivity of dogma made possible the maximum subjectivity of personal religion. (Conversely, the objectivity of dogma thrived on the subjectivity of personal religion.) With respect to the form of Christian revelation, modernism failed to attain this optimal subjectivity because it compromised the objectivity of faith. The triple philosophical
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complex of agnosticism, immanentism, and evolution made formulation, maintenance, and belief in dogma impossible. Modernists privileged the subjective over the objective dimension of religion by undermining or even denying the possibility, reality, and value of dogma. Yet teaching without the magisterium of Jesus deprived the soul of the real food it needed to assuage its hungers, put salvation on shifting sands, and elevated the superman “with a pietist nuance” to the level of the ideal. In this way, modernism brought about the death of fraternal love and of the believer’s filial love for God and of friendship with him.

Modernism destroyed the possibility of individual personal religion in that it undermined fundamental teachings that were implicit in any revealed religion. The true positive religion, Christianity, gave God full due with respect to his absolute transcendence. It was this absolute transcendence that allowed the Triune God to be fully present to and in his creatures. Grandmaison wrote:

there is the true God, absolutely transcendent by all that he is, incommensurable to all being…—but by his transcendence present in his entirety to each of his works, and is so intimate to each of us that we can finally explain ourselves only by finding ourselves in him; and, in this sense, he is immanent to all the imperfect beings that he maintains, at each moment, from within.268

Another such teaching was the fundamental doctrine of monotheism.269 Another was the personhood of God. Some modernists regarded the deepest truths of religion as provisional expressions of evanescent experiences of God. If that were so, then he was insufficiently transcendent to manifest himself credibly as a God who was unique, personal and provident.270

---

268 “il y a le vrai Dieu, absolument transcendent par tout ce qu’il est, incommensurable à tout être…—mais tout ensemble, et de par sa transcendance même, présent à toute son oeuvre, si intime à chacun de nous, que nous ne pouvons nous expliquer finalement qu’en nous trouvant en lui, et, dans ce sens, immanent à tous les êtres déficients qu’il soutient, à chaque instant, par le dedans.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 408.)

269 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 883.
Such a god would be the god of the monists, reason itself, whose reflection within our ephemeral soul would be but the blind, immense, impersonal fulfillment of evolution.271

Mistaken formulations of the relationship between the divine transcendence and immanence played out in a number of areas of creedal doctrine. No fundamental truth of the Christian Creed was safe. The shift to an emphasis on the divine immanence, in Loisy’s eyes, ruled out the dogmas of the Trinity, the Incarnation, redemption, the Resurrection, and the virginal birth of Christ.272 Modernism misrepresented or denied these fundamental beliefs about the personal religion of Christ—understood first as the relationship of the Son and the Father in the Holy Spirit, and, second, as the Catholic Church, the religion established and guaranteed by Christ.

The area of dogma most openly under attack was Christology, “the most arduous and most passionate problem of all.”273 For Grandmaison, individual personal religion in general as well as that of the credibility of Catholicism rose and fell with the person of Jesus Christ. “The mystery of Jesus introduces us to the mystery of God”274; Christ “opens us to the Triune God, Father, Son and Spirit.”275 But modern theology generally weakened the belief in the divinity of Christ to the point where “The very notion of the divinity is weakened and disappears.”276 The predominance of practical over speculative reason in Kant’s philosophy had deep implications
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274 Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 201. See Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 600.


276 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 658.
for Christology. His *Religion within the Limits of Reason* gave the most coherent and rigorous philosophical justification for the image of Christ as a merely human sage.277

All that is historical or doctrinal in Christianity (and other positive religions), outside the *dictamen* of practical Reason, preserves in this conception only the precarious, pedagogical value of symbol or of myth. The only true, sanctifying religion is moral faith, of which Christ was only the most eloquent and persuasive preacher. His teaching therefore did not need any signs, as if he added something to that which reason revealed to each human being; as for his person, one can say that it represented ‘the ideal of humanity that was agreeable to God,’ moral man par excellence. “The simple still needed historical beliefs, but they should be taught little by little to go beyond them.”278

As a result, Jesus was a persuasive witness, but only to moral faith. Some thinkers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau claimed that the Gospel was the work of humans and that Christ was the noblest of superhuman mortals.279 Given the state of exegesis and Christology in Europe, Grandmaison recognized: “for the man of our time, Jesus is an inspiration and a guide, because he told that truth that he had to about the kingdom of God, and set his life on it.”280 The rest, it seemed, was up for grabs.

As the heir of rationalism and sentimental religion, modernism too frayed the tapestry of Scripture’s image of Christ.281 Imbibing the rationalist, secularist comparative study of religion,
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278 “Tout ce qui, dans le christianisme (et les autres religions positives) est historique ou doctrinal, en dehors de *dictamen* de la Raison pratique, ne garde dans cette conception qu’une valeur précaire, pédagogique, de symbole ou de mythe. La seule religion véritable, sanctifiante, est la foi morale dont le Christ n’a été que le prédicateur le plus éloquent et le témoin le plus persuasif. Son enseignement n’a donc pas besoin de signes, comme s’il surajoutait quelque chose à ce que la raison révélé à tout humain; quant à sa personne, on peut dire qu’elle représente ‘l’idéal de l’humanité agréable à Dieu,’ l’homme moral par excellence. ‘Les simples ont encore besoin de croyances historiques, mais on doit leur apprendre peu à peu à s’en passer.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 174, with quotes from Emmanuel Kant, *La Religion dans les limites de la raison*, 1793, trans. Temesaygues [Paris, 1915], III, 2, 252–4, and Emmanuel Kant, *Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung*, in *Berlinische Monatschrift* [1784], in *Werke*, ed. Ernst Cassirer, IV [Berlin, 1913], 169.)

279 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 177.


modernist exegetes such as Alfred Loisy in his later works attenuated the sense of the uniqueness of Christ or wiped it out altogether. By simplifying facts and multiplying conjectures, reductive approaches only destroyed the moral grandeur that they were trying to rescue from the so-called encrustations of mythology. Modernists so distinguished the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith that they reduced his moral dignity. As a result, the enigma of Christ persisted without yielding any consolation: it remained a mere abstraction. The example of Loisy’s Christology confirmed the unreality of many contemporary Christologies: “Critic before all, otherwise an analyst to excess, M. Alfred Loisy does not succeed, in the works of his maturity, in furnishing a consistent solution to the problem of Christ.” Grandmaison likened Loisy’s attempt to an evanescent painting on a catacomb wall that lasted only if one kept conserving it. At the end of his life, Loisy understood Jesus Christ, as Renan did, only as the highest expression of the human spirit. As a result of misguided attempts at modernizing Christology, the traditional understanding of the relationship of the Son and the Father—which was for Grandmaison the most important sense of the personal religion—was gone. The “unconscious rationalism” of such thinkers also destroyed the mystery of Christ.

The question of Christ’s self-awareness of his divinity came back, for Grandmaison and his contemporaries, to the general challenge to dogma that modernism had posed. The
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283 “Critic avant tout, d’ailleurs analyste à outrance, M. Alfred Loisy ne réussit pas, dans les ouvrages de sa maturité, à fournir une solution consistante du problème du Christ.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 198.)

284 Alfred Loisy, Religion et humanité (Paris: Nourry, 1926), 111. See also Loisy, Autour d’un petit livre, 190, 192, in Grandmaison “Moehler”, 406.

285 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 210; Jesus Christ, 3, 21.

credibility of the act of faith in dogma in general depended on the material truth of the dogma.

For Grandmaison, the rule of faith in turn found its unity in the hypostatic union; the ultimate unity of the doctrine about Christ was founded on the unity of his person.²⁸⁷

Even contemporary theologians who tried to be orthodox sensed the need to reformulate the distinction between the human and the divine natures in Christ. Yet many of these attempts fell short of affirming that Christ was fully divine.²⁸⁸ Renouncing both the evolutionist hypothesis and the Chalcedonian symbol, many conservative Protestant and Anglican theologians seemed content with positions that saw Christ’s divinity in his being the greatest of the prophets.²⁸⁹ Writing in 1913, Lutheran theologian Friedrich Loofs did not think that there was a single German Protestant theologian who upheld orthodox Christology. Neither England nor America found it credible to do so either. Some of the qualifications that otherwise conservative theologians made slipped into the rationalist denial of his full divinity, though most were compatible with liberal Protestantism. These theologians were unable to define what was transcendent about him.

One approach made much of Christ’s kenosis, that act by which Christ assumed his human nature. There were orthodox understandings of kenoticism inspired by scriptural passages such as Phil. 2: 5-11.²⁹⁰ Grandmaison thought that it was difficult to formulate orthodox versions of such an approach.

²⁸⁷ Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 890; “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1521. Lebreton himself held to the same in his exposition of the Trinity; Lebreton, Doctrine de la Trinité, 375.


²⁸⁹ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 203-4.

²⁹⁰ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 200.
If it is a question of a limitation in the usage and exercise of certain divine prerogatives, there is nothing to prevent us from admitting the ‘stripping,’ and the ‘humiliation,’ the annihilation’ which the practice of a real human life made necessary. But if we want to go further (and every genuine kenotic theory does so), and maintain that the Incarnate Word actually renounced and abandoned any one of the properties constituting his divine nature, or consequent upon his possession of it, one places oneself outside the Christian religion altogether.  

False understandings of kenoticism held that Christ renounced aspects of his divinity in an ontological rather than a moral way.  
The use of kenoticism was especially prominent among Anglican theologians. Many permutations were possible. “Each one measures the sacrifice to which the Word apparently consented by the needs of his particular philosophy.”  

For some, Jesus ceased during his human life to be divine. Other theologians claimed that Jesus temporarily gave up the extrinsic rather than the intrinsic qualities that pertained to the form of God rather than the form of man. “In its extreme form, it presents us with a person who strips himself of all that makes him a person.” Attempting to avoid the mystery of Jesus, these theories foundered on contradiction. Hence, many conservative Protestants shunned it, and sought other ways to express the interrelationship of Christ’s divinity and humanity.  

Yet, Grandmaison warned, it was not easy to avoid ancient errors such as adoptionism or monophysitism once a theologian shunned Chalcedonian dogma.  

---  

291 “S’il agit d’une limitation dans l’usage et l’exercice de certaines prérogatives divines, on n’aura nulle difficulté à reconnaître ce ‘dépouillement,’ cette ‘humiliation.’ Cet ‘anéantissement’ qu’imposait la pratique d’une vie humaine réelle. Si l’on veut aller plus loin (et toute véritable théorie de la kénose va jusqu’là) en soutenant que le Verbe incarné renonça en fait, abandonna quelqu’une des propriétés constitutives de sa nature divine, ou consécutives à la possession de cette nature, on se met hors du terrain de la religion chrétienne.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 206; Jesus Christ, 2, 317.)  


293 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 205.  

294 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 206; Jesus Christ, 2, 317.
There were other less informed attempts by continental Protestants that used traditional elements. Loofs thought that Christ was inhabited by the Spirit of God, who made him Son of God and indispensable mediator. Jesus was in fact a divinized man. Yet another idea, “more radical and faithful to the spirit of Kantianism,” of the Reformed theologian Wilhelm Herrmann, renounced all attempts at explaining the Incarnation. The individual believer found in the historical Jesus the only spiritual Power to whom he could possibly submit unconditionally, the only solution to the otherwise intractable moral problems that weak human beings faced. In turn, the Christian believed him to be divine because he was the revelation of God and his unique mediator before God. But the categories of religion and morality were incommensurable with the intellectual. So any attempt to formulate doctrine would end in error. Rather than speak of adoring the divinity of Christ, one should speak of adoring the divinity in Christ.

More original were the theories based on contemporary philosophy and psychology. In general, modernists generally made the mistake of exaggerating the otherwise legitimate importance of human subjectivity, particularly human consciousness. This lopsided emphasis played out in Christology. The theory “that defines the person by psychological consciousness, has made many victims.” Grandmaison made much of the example of the Christology of William Sanday, a conservative Anglican whom he admired as an exegete. Sanday found it
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artificial to conceive of Christ’s two natures and operations and the communication of attributes therein. Moreover, the traditional notion of person was for him “rigid, atomistic” for its insistence on the person as “an entity that is totally irreducible, enclosed, impenetrable.”

Terms such as “person” smacked of antiquated intellectualism.

The subconscious was, for Sanday (as for James and Hügel, Grandmaison added), not merely

one of the psychological provinces where our religious acts are prepared, emerge, are reinforced, retained and inscribed. It is the *proper* and privileged place of religious acts and (if it’s a case of ‘mystical union’) the *unique* place where God makes himself present and known to man. Thus, the union of the spirit of man with the Spirit of Christ, who is the Spirit of God…would be achieved in the subliminal region of our soul.

Such strong claims departed from traditional Christology by laying much more emphasis on the psychological than the ontological. Grandmaison drew the following doctrinal conclusions about Sanday’s understanding of Christ’s consciousness:

According to him, the clear consciousness of Christ would have been entirely, exclusively human; but this consciousness was not the measure of the human being, and much less of Christ. Beneath this surface *ego* extends the depths of the subconscious *ego*, and it is there, in this subliminal foundation of the whole being, that would have resided the inexhaustible divine treasures which Saint Paul tells us were hidden in Christ. All that consciousness, thought, and human speech could contain and transmit of the divinity present in Jesus must thence have found its way upwards little by little—in the form of presentiments, partial views, anticipations—to distinct knowledge and expressions. This theory…has found its way blocked by a serious objection that, in this case, Jesus cannot have been conscious of being God, although he was actually God; that therefore our
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304 “une des provinces psychologiques où nos actes religieux se préparent, se ébauchent, se renforcent, retentissent et s’inscrivent. Il est le lieu *propre* et privilégié de ces actes, et (s’il s’agit d’union mystique) le lieu *unique* où Dieu se fait sentir présent à l’homme. Ainsi, l’union de l’esprit de l’homme avec l’Esprit du Christ, qui est aussi l’Esprit de Dieu ‘s’accomplirait dans la région subliminale de notre âme.” (Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne, 194.)
judgment about Jesus of Nazareth exceeds what he himself could have held, and did in fact hold, about his person; that our profession of faith, ‘Jesus is God,’ should be expressed thus: ‘Beneath the surface, conscious ego there existed, in Jesus of Nazareth, integrating his whole human self, a profound, ineffable, subconscious self, the place and seat of a Deity, in continuity with the infinity of divinity.’ [William Sanday, Christologies, p. 166ff.] Even among those who hadn’t determined the incompatibility of such an idea with traditional Catholic understandings, many considered, not without good reason, that it was an attempt to explain obscurum per obscurius.305

This kind of Christology sold short the doctrine of Chalcedon in many ways. Jesus was no longer fully divine and fully human. Rather, his divinity resided in his subconscious and his humanity in his explicit consciousness. The knowledge of God and of his own divinity erupted into full consciousness as needed. Sanday’s theory found many elements from conjectures made in the quest for the historical Jesus. (Such a configuration had appeared in Renan’s description of the states of the soul of Christ.) Grandmaison believed that it was important for the disciples and for contemporary Christians that Jesus was in fact God and knew himself to be so during his earthly life. So, refuting modernism’s assault on personal religion focused a good deal on the topic of the consciousness of Christ.

305 D’après lui, la conscience claire du Christ aurait été entièrement, exclusivement d’humaine; mais cette conscience n’est pas la mesure de l’être humain, et beaucoup moins du Christ. Au-dessous de moi superficiel s’étend en profondeur la moi subconscient, et c’est là, dans ce fonds subliminal de tout l’être, qu’auraient résidé ces trésors divines inépuisables dont saint Paul nous dit qu’ils étaient cachés dans le Christ. C’est de là que serait monté peu à peu, jusqu’à la connaissance et manifestation distinctes, sous forme de pressentiments, de vues partielles, d’anticipations, tout ce qu’une conscience, une pensée, une parole humaine, pouvaient porter et transmettre du divin, présent en Jésus. Cette théorie…vient se briser contre cette difficulté majeure qu’en ce cas, Jésus n’eût pas conscience d’être Dieu quoiqu’il le fût; que ni sa parole, ni sa pensée distincte, n’allèrent jusque-là; que notre jugement sur Jésus de Nazareth dépasse donc celui que lui-même pouvait porter, et porter en fait, sur sa personne; que notre jugement de foi: ‘Jésus est Dieu’ doit s’expliquer ainsi: ‘Au-dessous du moi superficiel, conscient, s’étendait en Jésus de Nazareth, intégrant le moi humain total, un moi profond, ineffable, subconscient, lieu et siège d’une Déité, en continuité avec l’infini de la divinité.’ [William Sanday, Christologies, p. 166ff.] Même parmi ceux qui n’eût pas décidé de l’incompatibilité de cette conjecture avec les positions catholiques traditionnelles, bien des gens ont pensé, non sans raison, que c’était la expliquer obscurum per obscurius.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 207; Jesus Christ, 2, 318.)

But personhood, divine or human, was much larger for Grandmaison than human consciousness.307 “In short, subliminal activity, if it is the most notable (on account of its results) among eminent thinkers, retains an auxiliary, secondary, and conditional role.”308 The subconscious was, even in heroes and saints, a function of the weaknesses, needs, and depredations of the body. Therefore, reducing Christ’s full awareness of his divinity to his subconscious led to the denial of the distinction between the fully divine and fully human natures of Jesus.309 Such reductionism also weakened the sense of the ontological unity of the two natures of the Incarnate Son of God.310

As seen in the previous section, modernists undermined belief in the existence of divine signs, whether the miracles or prophecies. The fault that could be laid at the feet of liberal or rationalist exegetes was twofold:

First, in simplifying the Gospel texts and the historical data of ancient Christianity in an unjustifiable way; second, in multiplying the least plausible conjectures: pagan infiltrations, literary pastiche, complicated redactions, suppositions concerning the first versions of the documents to which is attributed whatever one wants to conserve as authentic, followed by tendentious leftovers to which one attributes undesirable traits.311

When these methods were taken to the extreme, nothing survived this atomization of the original gospel accounts.

307 Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 204-5.
310 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 207.
311 “Premièrement à simplifier indûment aux textes évangéliques et les données historiques du christianisme ancien, deuxièmement à multiplier parallèlement les conjectures les moins plausibles: infiltrations païennes, pastiche littéraire, rédaction compliquée, supposition d’un premier état des documents auquel on attribue ce qu’on veut conserver comme authentique, suivi de remaniements tendancieux où l’on relégué les traits indésirables.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 202.)
With respect to prophecy, for example, the Suffering Servant prophecies of Isaiah were a stumbling block to some modernists—as they were to ancient Israel and Christ’s own disciples. Some critics saw Jesus’ predictions of his death as retrojections of the early Church. Such judgments were emblematic to Grandmaison of the method incorrectly used by liberal critics of the gospels. “One barely asks if these conjectures, taken as a whole, remain plausible when returning to the framework of certain facts without breaking it apart. It is enough that each fact seems possible in its time and that it helps to effectively eliminate troublesome texts. But one must not look at them too closely.” Most liberal exegetes wondered how the disciples could then have possibly been surprised by his passion and death. Grandmaison countered that these exegetes ignored what psychology might tell them—that the disciples could have remembered the prophecies after the fact, or that it was unlikely that the disciples would invent and put words into the mouths of the Master after his death.

Finally, the modernists diminished faith in the Resurrection. Loisy went so far as to argue that the empty tomb was a fiction. As for the apparitions, the tendency in general for most rationalist exegetes was to accept at least one apparition as real (that it actually happened), but to disregard practically all of the information from the texts, and reconstruct what ought to have happened. Some exegetes thought that the faith in the Resurrection was

312 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 258-60.

313 “On ne se demande guère si ces conjectures, prises toutes ensemble, restent vraisemblables en rentrant, sans le faire éclater, dans le cadre des faits certains. Il suffit que chacune, à son heure, paraisse possible, tout en servant efficacement à éliminer les textes gênants. Mail il ne faut pas y regarder de trop près.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 261.)
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spontaneously generated. Finally, the school of comparative religion approached the Resurrection stories psychologically rather than historically. One way or another, modernists left little room for thinking of the Resurrection as the personal act of a transcendent God who vindicated Christ’s claim to be the Son of God.

With respect to soteriology, the consideration of the saving work of Jesus Christ, modernism led to a weakened sense of his identity as omnipotent savior. At best, salvation for humanity would come about through the force of his personality to instill a life dedicated to God. Such a person might be worthy of humanistic veneration, but not of worship.

The question of Christ was tied to the question of the Church. Indeed, for Loisy as for Harnack, the question of religion was framed most directly in terms of the Church rather than Christ. The death of dogma yielded a fragmented image of Christ and divided the Church from Christ. Unwittingly at first, Loisy had widened the gap between the Church and Christ and thereby diminished the status of both. Loisy posited a similar caesura in the Church’s consciousness before and after the Resurrection, such that the disciples later figured out that Jesus was divine. Many liberal critics had postulated the “creative inventiveness of the primitive community,” without being very concrete about how this process unfolded and as if it happened after a long period in which the apostolic witnesses had died.

317 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 426.
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Therefore, the diminution of Christ’s divinity jeopardized the Church’s dignity. The allegiance of Catholics to the visible Church was assaulted in that modernism discounted the Church as the infallible authoritative witness to Christ and to his mission.\textsuperscript{323} Philosophers such as Kant, Schleiermacher, and Hegel pushed the consequences of Protestantism to its necessary result: the rejection of any obligatory intermediary in religion.\textsuperscript{324} Following in their footsteps, modernists had fractured the unity of the Church by making religion more and more an individual affair. Under modernism, it was no longer held that Jesus communicated real sanctification to the members of his Body, the Church. She no longer offered much in the way of objective means of salvation. If Christ were not divine, then the Church was a human invention—a mere humanly inspired enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{325} Without the certitude of Christ’s transcendence, there could be no assurance of salvation for the individual believer. The Church was merely a cult of remembrance without the living and active presence of Jesus.\textsuperscript{326} Christ was reduced to the highest exemplar of an abstract spirit, and the Church to a collection of all too disconnected individuals.\textsuperscript{327}

The diminishment of the Church led in turn to the further obscuring of the figure of Christ.\textsuperscript{328} Although not all modernists dismissed the need for dogma and for ecclesiastical
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authority, they undermined the certitude of the guidance provided by both. Sabatier himself had asked “would Christ still remain as the unbreakable witness who founded our personal religion” if the authority of the Church were despoiled of its infallibility? Grandmaison answered in the negative. The form and the content of Christian belief were inseparable. The death of dogma meant the death of personal religion. The credibility of Catholicism could not be divorced from the nature of its Revealer and of the content of the revelation. Jesus presented himself through many signs, and on account of them, as worthy of being believed. But such agnostic subjectivism alone made personal, positive religion impossible. The anti-dogmatism of modernism entailed the denial of fundamental teachings about Christ, the Church, and the regenerated believer; conversely, modernism’s deficient understanding of the consciousness of Christ in turn made dogmatism implausible. The link of Christ to the Church through the means of any stable, articulable revelation was lost.

In his later works, Loisy held, as did liberal Protestants, that Christ did not leave behind a Church that had a tradition that in part consisted of formal propositional teaching and a hierarchy who were authoritative teachers of that tradition. In place of the Church’s collective understanding of Christ, modernism substituted the various fancies of its authors. Grandmaison published this about a month before his death:

Not only are the doctrines which assure a foundation of common beliefs for the particular views of each Christian being set aside a priori by a growing number of men of our time because this foundation muddies a clear view of the facts. But the fantasies of writers twist sometimes and deform the most certain lines of the Gospel narrative. A


liberty that only novelists permit themselves concerning the heroes of antiquity seems authorized when it concerns Jesus of Nazareth. It is as if individualism wanted to underline its victory over the unanimity of yesterday.

There was little hope of rescuing the dogma of Christ’s divinity by a theory of the development of doctrine. Rather, modernism would die on its own sword: evolutionism’s relentless dialectic would overtake even the best of its ideas.

Given that any generation’s ideas would be overtaken by the progress of history, what was left for someone who believed in Christ?

[a] doctrine of incertitude, of dissolution, of nothingness, mutilating the natural development of human thought, and in place of the certain knowledge of divine things that these errors take from us, giving us in return only probabilities or haphazardly substituted hypotheses that are inadequate remedies. These arrogant doctrines can be contemplated, then, in their nudity: succumbing to their internal weakness, incapable of furnishing souls with food, they will be ready for the graveyards of the history of philosophy. And we will appreciate, with greater understanding, the value of the traditional Christian doctrines that, according to the beau mot of Mgr. d’Hulst, ‘guard our hopes.’

The disintegration of Christological dogma under modernism contributed to the disintegration of the unity of the Church.

333 “Non seulement les doctrines qui assuraient aux vues particulières de chaque chrétien un fonds de croyances communes sont, par un nombre croissant d’hommes de notre temps, antérieurement mises de côté, comme troublant la claire vision des faits, mais la fantaisie des écrivains gauchit parfois et déforme les lignes les plus certaines de l’histoire évangélique. Une liberté que, seuls, des romanciers se permettent à l’endroit des héros de l’antiquité, semble autorisée quand il est question de Jésus de Nazareth. Comme si l’individualisme voulait souligner sa victoire sur l’unanimité d’autant!” (Léonce de Grandmaison, “Trois portraits du Fils de l’homme,” Études 191 (1927), 276.)


335 “doctrine d’incertitude, de dissolution, de néant, mutilant l’essor naturel de la pensée humaine, et, pour la connaissance certaine des choses divines qu’elles nous arrachement, ne nous rendant que des probabilités ou des hypothèses, succédanées de fortune, suppléances indignes. On pourra contempler alors, dans leur nudité, ces doctrines orgueilleuses, succombant sous leur faiblesse interne, incapables de fournir aux âmes un aliment, elles seront prêtes pour les nécropoles de l’histoire de la philosophie. Et nous apprécierons, en meilleure connaissance de la cause, la valeur des doctrines chrétiennes traditionnelles qui selon le beau mot de Mgr d’Hulst ‘gardent nos espérances.’” (Grandmaison, “Pensée religieuse hors de l’Église,” [1912], 218.)

The sentimental religious philosophy of modernism diminished the importance of the Catholic Church’s hierarchy, which served the Church’s objective doctrinal authority.\textsuperscript{337} In his talks on authority and the Spirit, Grandmaison had asked whether the ordinary hierarchy of bishop, priest, and deacon was “in continuity by right—not merely by fact;—in organic and legitimate continuity—not only accidental and historical—with apostolic authority?”\textsuperscript{338} A line of argument made by liberal Protestants answered in the negative. They claimed that in the beginning of the life of the Church, charismatic inspiration was so universal that it ruled out the need for an ordinary hierarchy other than that of the Twelve or the “Brothers” of the Lord.\textsuperscript{339} Second, various crises created the need for an organ that tended to unify many diverse functions. “The names and the prerogatives of these functions were borrowed, adapted this way and that, according to the Jewish or Hellenic milieu.”\textsuperscript{340} Gradually, the hierarchy monopolized ordinary ministerial functions. Given such a strong discontinuity of Church and Christ, believers could barely say that they knew Jesus at all. Third, this kind of religious individualism threatened the connection between the sacraments and the hierarchy present from the time of St. Paul.\textsuperscript{341}

Grandmaison believed that Sabatier had rightly put his finger on the root of the quarrel when he argued that the authority of the Catholic Church had quenched the Spirit and its fecundity in the Church.\textsuperscript{342} Tyrrell had underlined the antimony between institutional religion

\textsuperscript{337} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 592n1.
\textsuperscript{338} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 40.
\textsuperscript{339} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 40-1.
\textsuperscript{341} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 607.
\textsuperscript{342} Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 7.
and individual spirituality in the final pages of *Through Scylla and Charybdis*: “there can be no faith without personal revelation, only theological or historical assent. Revelation cannot be placed inside us from the outside….God must echo the message of the prophet from within the soul.”

The doctrinal intransigence that Grandmaison thought so essential to Catholicism was for Tyrrell nothing but the crucifixion of Christ.

But Grandmaison echoed Cyprian’s “extra ecclesiam nulla salus,” “Hors le l’Église, pas de salut” as follows: “Hors le dogme, pas de salut pour la foi.” Sentiment alone could not found personal religion.

We need to place our religious life beyond the dynamism of our desires and of our very weaknesses, so that it may keep us faithful in the midst of fear in the hours when love weakens in our hearts…Everything else is precarious, and, with whatever lovely name that one disguises it, offers to the thinking being only that we are the shelter of fortune, only a provisional and ever-endangered religion.

Grandmaison wrote at the end of his article on Sabatier’s religion of the Spirit: “we must hold to the fundamental objectivity of religious knowledge, defend jealously the only possible base of a faith that is more than a dream, of a life worthy of being lived.” Laying the intolerable yoke of faith without dogma on believers led not to emancipation, “but [to] religious indifference, the

---

343 “Sans révélation personnelle il ne peut donc y avoir foi, mais seulement assentiment théologique ou historique. La Révélation ne peut être mise en nous du dehors…Dieu doit faire écho, du dedans de l’âme, au message du prophète, et le sien, etc.” (Tyrrell, *Through Scylla and Charybdis*, 306-7, in Grandmaison “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologétique* 6 [1908], 404n2.)


347 ‘Nous avons besoin de mettre notre vie religieuse à l’abri des entraînements de nos désirs, à l’abri de nos propres faiblesses, et qu’elle nous garde fidèles par la crainte aux heures où l’amour faiblit dans nos cœurs…Tout le reste est précaire, et, de quelque beau nom qu’on le déguise, n’offre à l’être pensant que nous sommes qu’un abri de fortune, qu’une religion provisoire et toujours menacée. (Grandmaison, “Le Christ de Harnack,” 761.)

348 “Il nous reste à maintenir l’objectivité fondamentale de la connaissance religieuse, à défendre jalousement la seule base possible d’une foi qui est plus qu’un rêve, d’une vie digne d’être vécue.” (Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 182-3.)
debasement of the ideal, a backsliding toward barbarism.” Sabatier’s philosophy yielded only ruin: “Religion without authority, faith without beliefs, Christianity without Incarnation, Protestantism without Book! The adoration of Jesus Christ, idolatry; the hierarchy, pagan survival; theology, precarious classification of symbolic transcriptions; the kingdom of God, human ideal; the admission of a personal God, useless even to the religious man.” What was left that was worthy of personal religion?

For Grandmaison, there was a grain of truth in liberal Protestant attempts to flesh out personal religion. The Catholic Tübingen School had shown a genuine openness to their insights. Liberal Protestants rightly tried to counteract a purely rationalist approach to religious belief. Grandmaison agreed with Sabatier that dogma and piety had become disconnected—though the diagnosis and cure were quite different for each of them. Like Sabatier and Loisy, Grandmaison had sought to promote the interiority and universality of religion. A Christian desired filial communion with God; the sentiment of the forgiven sinner was born of the interior witness of a personal Spirit.

350 “Religion sans autorité, foi sans croyances, christianisme sans Incarnation, protestantisme sans Livre! L’adoration de Jésus-Christ, idolâtrie; la hiérarchie, survie païenne; la théologie, classement précaire de transcriptions symboliques; le règne de Dieu, idéal humain; l’admission d’un Dieu personnel, inutile même à l’homme religieux.” (Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 19.)
351 Grandmaison, “Moehler,” 390-1, 408.
But the worst of the cumulative effects of radical exegesis and the incoherent philosophy of liberal Protestantism touched on the relationship of the believer to God and to neighbor.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Le Christ de M. Harnack,” 760.} As “the logical fulfillment of Protestantism and the basis of its bastard heir,”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Pensée religieuse hors de l’Église,” (1913), 222.} modernism resulted in “a religion without a personal God, a Christianity without a Savior, a piety without positive faith, complete religious individualism.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Pensée religieuse hors de l’Église,” (1913), 222.} So Grandmaison asked: “Can I really base my life on such shifting soil?”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 179.} The memory of past religious sentiment was not enough to strengthen believers when they were attacked by opposing sentiments. Their religious life had to be sheltered from the impulses of their desires and weaknesses. The lack of dogma vitiated the moral life too. For Grandmaison, however, when charity cooled, believers were kept faithful through the salubrious fear that religion aroused. Once recalled, a dogma could bring to mind “the sweet or terrible light that bathes anew, by the spirit, the entire soul.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Le Christ de M. Harnack,” 761.} Otherwise religion was ever provisional and at risk.

Modernism’s metaphysics of becoming also effaced any real sense of the individuality both of Christ and of human beings. Both positivism and idealism were at fault in this respect. Anti-individualism—or at least a very impoverished metaphysical sense of the person—was consistently maintained by August Comte\footnote{French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) was a proponent of positivism.}: “The individual is merely an abstraction.”\footnote{French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) was a proponent of positivism.} In the end, philosophers who reacted against the
rationalist and pietist individualism of the great Protestants of the 18th century, have swung, in reaction, to excesses of the contrary kind. They refuse the human person, suddenly demoted from on high, the modest but indispensable place that is rightfully his. The individual man, for them, is no more than an ephemeral moment, a transition, a link in the immense chain of beings which evolve from the virtual to the real, from the inorganic to the organized, from the atom to the superman. The notion of development, of becoming, this powerful ferment that exercised all thinking heads after Hegel, and brought about the theories of evolution which, in a thousand forms, permit one to see in man as he actually is, though the inheritor of an immemorial past, only a rough sketch of the future.363

The status of the individual underwent a tragic fall: he was nothing but an atomized link in the chain of evolutionary progress.

Theologically speaking, modernism’s denial of the truth about Christ’s relationship to the Father and of the Church’s objectively discernible divine commission degraded the dignity of the human person. Grandmaison found this insight in Pascal364:

Not only do we know God by Jesus Christ alone, but we know ourselves only by Jesus Christ. We know life and death only through Jesus Christ. Apart from Jesus Christ, we do not know what is our life, nor our death, nor God, nor ourselves.

Thus without the Scripture, which has Jesus Christ alone for its object, we know nothing, and see only darkness and confusion in God’s nature and in nature itself.365

---


363 “L’individualisme rationaliste et piétiste des grands protestants du xviiié siècle, sont amenés, par réaction, à des excès en sens contraire. Ils refusent à la personne humaine, tout à l’heure déclassée par en haut, la place modeste mais indispensable qui lui vient de plein droit. Pour eux, l’homme individuel n’est plus qu’un moment éphémère, une transition, un maillon de l’immense chaîne des êtres qui évoluent du virtuel au réel, de l’inorganique à l’organisé, de l’atome au surhomme. La notion du développement, du devenir, ce puissant ferment qui a fait travailler, depuis Hegel, toutes les têtes pensantes, et les théories de l’évolution qui, sous mille formes, en éclorant, ne permettent de voir dans l’homme actuel, héritier pourtant d’un immémorial passé, qu’une ébauche grossière de l’avenir.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 948.)


Only Christ could give the fullness of knowledge about God, the world, and ourselves. Scripture gave us knowledge of Christ; without it human beings were darkened in their minds. By undermining the Church’s teaching about Christ and the trustworthiness of Scripture, modernism consigned its victims to the antithesis of the personal religion of Christ, to the antithesis of any personal religion whatsoever.

*Flight to False Mysticism: Modernism’s Failed Spiritual Escape*

In Grandmaison’s eyes, modernists were inclined to make more of mysticism than it could bear.366 They tended to resort to ideas about mystical experience in order to fully explain revelation. This was done at the expense of adherence to traditional dogma and to the teaching authority of the Church. As mentioned in chapter one, Grandmaison eschewed the neo-scholastic approach to Christology in favor of a more meditative, affective, biblical Christology that also respected critical scholarship. But he also refused to divorce mysticism from dogma.

Protestant and modernist thinkers misunderstood a concept such as the deposit of faith because they misunderstood prophecy and revelation.367 “Liberal Protestants from Schleiermacher to Sabatier and, and closer to us, modernist theologians—George Tyrrell first of all—define and describe all revelation and all religion by means of these images and this language borrowed from the mystics.”368 At the worst, their theories reduced the deposit of faith to mystical experience: “For their part, it is, to start off, a strange reversal, analogous to the

368 “C’est au moyen de ces images, c’est avec ce langage emprunté aux mystiques que les protestants libéraux, de Schleiermacher à Auguste Sabatier, et, plus près de nous, les théologiens modernistes—George Tyrrell le premier—définissent et décrivent toute révélation et toute religion.” (Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 203.)
abuse that consists in judging normal human psychology by cases of rudimentary or infantile psychology, that reduces all revelation to instinct, taste and mystical contact with God.”

Contemporary ethnologists made a similar mistake by deriving the essence of religion from simplistic or aberrant manifestations of it. “But the essential thing about revelation is not this communication of images, the direct or indirect evocation, in the prophetic spirit, of more or less direct notions. It is above all the communication of truth—what feeds and enriches the soul consists in distinct judgments, in affirmations.” The believer needed propositional truth.

In 1905, Loisy rejected orthodoxy as a “chimera for people who have never done any thinking.”

‘Mysticism, religion, the spirit of human solidarity are probably and by nature one and the same thing.’ [Alfred Loisy, *La Religion*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1924), 14]

‘Basically, all these proceed from human nature: before all the rudiments of the scientific method, not only the faculty, the need and the desire to know, but with and in this very faculty, this need and this desire, the mystical sense, the sense of the spirit, foundation of knowledge, source of religion, of morality and of art, and the root of humanity.’ [Loisy, *ibid.*, 48] Thus specified, mysticism is none other than millenarial religious experience, made of myths, words and acts that are evidence with a documentary value.

---

369 “C’est tout abord, de leur part, un étrange renversement, analogue à l’abus qui consiste à juger de la psychologie normale de l’homme fait par des cas de psychologie rudimentaire ou infantile, que celui qui réduit toute révélation à l’instinct, au goût, au contact mystique de Dieu.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologétique* 6 [1908], 412.)

370 “Mais l’essentiel de révélation n’est pas cette communication d’images, cette évocation directe ou indirecte, dans l’esprit du prophète, de notions plus ou moins directes. Elle est avant tout communication de vérité—celle qui alimente l’âme et enrichit consiste en jugements distincts, en affirmations.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologétique* 6 [1908], 410.)


372 “Le mysticisme, la religion, l’esprit de solidarité humaine sont probablement et par nature une seule et même chose.’ [Alfred Loisy, *La Religion*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924), 14] ‘C’est du fond de nature humaine que procèdent, avant tout rudiment de science méthodique, non seulement la faculté, le besoin et le désir de connaître, mais avec et dans cette faculté même, ce besoin et ce désir, le sens mystique, le sens d’esprit, fondement de la connaissance, source de la religion, de la morale et de l’art, racine de l’humanité.’ [Loisy, *La Religion*, 48] Ainsi précisé, le mysticisme n’est pas autre chose que l’expérience religieuse millénaire, faite de mythes, paroles et actes qui sont de témoignages à valeur documentaire.” (Boland, “Modernisme,” 1427.)
Mysticism was in effect both religion and the pre-condition of all human knowledge. Loisy was in effect re-envisioning religion altogether. “The religion of humanity is post-Christian, but safeguards Christian mysticism. Rather than priests, whose role is essentially cultic, this demands ‘a corporation of high mystics’...engaged in raising up the new humanity.”\textsuperscript{373} The call for an elite of mystics was not far from Tyrrell’s own.

Loisy was trying to save the authentic mysticism of the Church from its rigid anti-dogmatism: he was in the truer sense not anti-dogmatic, but adogmatic.\textsuperscript{374} He wrote:

‘A transcendent principle of religion and of Christianity is not excluded; it still remains as acquired from the start, but it is recognized as incomprehensible and indefinable, as all the great mystics recognized. Judaism, the Gospel, and Christianity remain facts of singular importance, revelations of the spirit in the truest sense of the word, but relatively limited and imperfect in their realizations.’\textsuperscript{375}

Such mystical knowledge of the transcendent would be available, of course, to individuals, but incommunicable. Grandmaison agreed that there was a legitimate place for such agnosticism—fitting as it was in speaking reverentially of the divine nature—provided that it did not contradict the fact that God desired to reveal himself and in fact had done so.\textsuperscript{376} Personal religion could never survive if it traveled the way of the \textit{via negativa} alone. In as much as such a virtually pure

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{373} “La religion de l’humanité est post chrétienne, mais sauvegarde le mysticisme chrétien. Plus que de prêtres, dont le rôle est essentiellement cultuel, elle demande ‘une corporation de hauts mystiques’...s’employant à élever l’humanité nouvelle.” (Alfred Loisy, \textit{Tyrrell et Bremond} (Paris: Nourry, 1936), 147, in Boland, “Modernisme,” 1427.)

\textsuperscript{374} Emile Poulat ed., \textit{Une Oeuvre Clandestine d’Henri Bremond, ‘Sylvain LeBlanc, Un clerc qui n’a pas trahi,” Alfred Loisy d’après ses mémoires, 1931} (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1972), 161, in Boland, “Modernisme” 1427.)


\textsuperscript{376} Grandmaison, “Élément, mystique,” 206.
\end{flushright}
agnosticism exasperated the soul by depriving it of rightful knowledge, the soul desired to take
refuge in some path to knowledge.

The modernists were also trying in effect to use natural, mystical experiences to
reconstruct the truths of the deposit of faith. But true Christian mysticism rarely involved the
revelation of new doctrines.\textsuperscript{377} It gave the mystic, rather, a ray of illumination, and, more
importantly, a taste of the divine friendship.

One engages in the evil ways of illuminism and chimeras by unjustifiably extending the
competence of mystical knowledge, by wanting to make it discerning, infallible, and
conquering, by delegating to it all the powers that one takes away from intellectual
knowledge. With the same blow, one deprives it of real value, which is to make us know
better—know otherwise, know to the point of possessing them and of being possessed
in turn by them—the truths first received, defined, and formulated by the clear light of
the intelligence. In fact, you will seek in vain in the highest mystical states (unless a new
and different element, that of ‘prophecy,’ comes into play) an extension of our doctrines
of faith. You will find there instead another and better fruit.\textsuperscript{378}

For modernists, natural mysticism would provide new revelations, new ideas, and a new
infallibility. Yet this natural mysticism could no more substitute for supernatural mysticism than
it could supplant discursive knowledge. The modernist overestimation of mystical knowledge
frustrated the discursive intellect, projecting it on the road to illuminism and illusion. Ironically,
such an erroneous approach did a disservice to truly illuminating and blissful mystical
experience. The false route to intellectual certitude through mysticism substituted for an

\textsuperscript{377} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 325.

\textsuperscript{378} “À étendre indûment la compétence de la connaissance mystique, à vouloir la rendre discrétive, infaillible, et
conquérante, à lui déléguer tous les pouvoirs qu’on retire à la connaissance intellectuelle, on engage celle-là les voies
mauvaises de l’illuminisme et des chimères. On la frustre du même coup de sa valeur réelle qui est de nous faire
mieux connaître, autrement connaître, connaître jusqu’à les posséder et à en être à notre tour possédés, des vérités
premièrement admises, définies et formulées à claire lumière de l’intelligence. En fait, vous chercherez en vain dans
les plus hauts états mystiques (à moins qu’un élément nouveau et différent, celui de ‘prophétie,’ s’y fasse jour) une
extension à nos doctrines de foi. Vous y trouverez un autre fruit, et meilleur.” (Grandmaison, “Religion
personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 [1913], 314-5.)
encounter with the personal God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, an encounter with the God of
the philosophers and scientists.  

Grandmaison admitted that a merely notional adherence to the teachings of faith was
soulless. But a hankering after religious experience in place of dogma had harmful consequences
too.

It is also true that by wanting to reject [the deposit of faith] as if it were a dead weight
imposed by human ambition; by attempting to reduce all religion to a sentiment, all
possible revelation to a confused experience, to a taste that is simply ineffable, and all
direct divine intervention to a mythological illusion, one assumes all the ruinous
postulates of monist immanentism and all its consequences; one destroys the high
simplicity of the divine Being for the vague apperception of an obscure and
subconscious force; and one sacrifices the certain duty of submission to the mirage of
absolute intellectual autonomy.  

This passage recapitulates all the movements within modernism’s oscillation between
sentimental religion and rationalism that were damaging to personal religion. God himself was
truth. But modernism blocked access to him by way of dogma by its overemphasis on religious
experience and by its prideful exaltation of the human intellect. Such an approach to revelation
ultimately reduced the isolated human person to “the proud or mystical monad” left to fend for
himself. It led quickly to “the most typical religious individualism”:

The spiritual man, that is, according to M. G. Tyrrell, the one in whose consciousness
the divine force immanent in humanity breaks through to the surface, truly judges all,
and is judged by no one; if he is confronted with the consensus of the Christian people, he

---


380 “il est véritable aussi qu’à vouloir le rejeter comme un poids mort, imposé par une ambition humaine, qu’à
prétendre réduire toute religion à un sentiment, toute révélation possible à une expérience confuse, à un goût
simplement ineffable, toute intervention directe de Dieu à une illusion mythologique, on assume tous les postulats
ruineux de l’immanentiste moniste, et toutes se conséquences, l’on abîme la haute simplicité de l’Être divine dans
l’aperception vague d’une force obscure et subconscious, l’on sacrifice au mirage d’une autonomie intellectuelle
absolue le devoir certain de la soumission.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908],
413-4.)

381 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 946.
declares that he is more advanced than the mass of the faithful; if ecclesiastical authority slaps him with an anathema, he appeals to the Spirit, who will judge his judges: if he is excommunicated, he considers this measure to be a passing trial and the sign of a future good.\textsuperscript{382}

Refusing the collective guidance of the Church, modernism’s anti-dogmatism eroded the organic social unity of Catholicism.

More importantly, the misuse of mysticism also compromised correct ideas about the perfection of the humanity of Christ.\textsuperscript{383} There were metaphysical grounds for this judgment. Modernist theologians generally substituted images of mystical union for traditional metaphysical concepts such as nature, substance, and person.\textsuperscript{384} This tendency to elide the traditional distinction between nature and person (what distinguished an individual from other individuals), and between what Christ held in common with and what distinguished him from other human beings.\textsuperscript{385} In short, the reduction of revelation to mystical states led to grave Christological reductions “these metaphors and descriptions…applied to Christ, describe only a greater, privileged, ‘divine’, case, but fundamentally \textit{of the same order} as that of all sincere religious people! The mystery of Incarnation would be clarified, but the faith of Nicaea would perish.”\textsuperscript{386} It would be unthinkable, for example, that Christ’s intellect was subject to passions.

\textsuperscript{382} “L’homme spirituel, c’est-à-dire, au sens de M. G. Tyrrell, celui dans la conscience duquel affleure la poussée divine immanente à l’humanité, juge vraiment de tout, et n’est jugé par personne; si on lui oppose le consensus du peuple chrétien, il se déclare en avance sur la masse des fidèles: si l’autorité ecclésiastique le frappe d’anathème, il en appelle à l’Esprit qui jugera ses juges; si on l’excommunie, il voie dans cette mesure une épreuve transitoire et le gage d’un bien future.” (Tyrrell, \textit{Through Scylla and Charybdis}, 381, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apolologétique} 6 [1908], 98.)

\textsuperscript{383} Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 200.

\textsuperscript{384} Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 203.

\textsuperscript{385} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1002.

\textsuperscript{386} “ces métaphores et ces descriptions…appliqués au Christ, elles ne prétendaient exposer qu’un cas majeur, privilégié, divin,’ mais au fond \textit{du même ordre} que celui de tout homme sincèrement religieux! Alors le mystère de l’Incarnation serait éclairci, mais la foi de Nicée périrait.” (Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 203.)
Grandmaison ruled out such an idea on the grounds of religious psychology. The obscurity and the ineffability of much mystical phenomena did not constitute their foundation and dignity. To the contrary, these characteristics manifested the finitude and the weakness of the human consciousness and the human body. The fact such frailties were lessened in the cases of the great mystics did not blur an important distinction:

The powerlessness, languish, and darkness that prepare the mystic for ecstasy, and lead him to it, are very distant from the level of the contemplatives. Surely, there is grandeur in these things, but only to a certain point! These high operations are carried out in obscurity and escape the control and the gaze of the eye of the spirit because our spiritual powers are bound to sensible images, conditioned to a large extent by bodily circumstances and setbacks, and dependent on material organs.  

This recognition of the psychological factors involved in mystical experience had implications for Christology. Although one could make useful comparisons of such moments “to respectfully decipher some traits of the psychology of Christ,” it was still necessary to recall that obscurity alone was not the measure of the dignity of such experiences.

The itinerary of contemplative souls crosses the night of the senses only to make these noble pilgrims endure purification and trial: thence they mount toward greater light. The analogy that one draws from the exceptional states of the saints, far from recommending the extension of the obscure and sublime element in the very pure soul of Christ, would tend rather to restrain its exercise there.

Preliminary mystical states were inadequate measures of Christ’s human consciousness. An imperfect human consciousness subject to transitional, mystical perturbations would vitiate his

---

387 “Les impuissances, les langueurs, les ténèbres qui préparent l’extase, et lui font cortège, sont fort éloignées de la cime des contemplatifs. Grandeur assurément, mais jusqu’à un certain point seulement! C’est parce que nos puissances spirituelles sont liées aux images sensibles, solidaires dans une large mesure des conditions et des contrecoups corporels, dépendants d’organes matériels, que ces hautes opérations s’accomplissent dans l’obscurité, échappent au contrôle et au perçant de l’œil de l’esprit.” (Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 201.)

388 “L’itinéraire des âmes contemplatives ne traverse la nuit du sens que pour y faire subir aux nobles pèlerins une purification et une épreuve: il monte ensuite vers plus de lumière. L’analogue qu’on tire des états exceptionnels des saints, loin de favoriser l’extension de l’élément obscur et subliminal dans l’âme, très pure du Christ, tendrait donc plutôt à en restreindre l’exercice.” (Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 201.)
awareness of his mission.\textsuperscript{389} The attempt to make Christ more accessible at the expense of downplaying or even denying his divinity only rendered him less accessible.\textsuperscript{390} Hence, as shall be seen later, Grandmaison’s depiction of Christ avoided the attribution of any mystical phenomena to his consciousness that implied any imperfection in either his humanity or his divinity.

\textbf{Conclusion}

In Grandmaison’s eyes, modernism was the culmination of an intellectual and spiritual movement that had been in play within Western civilization since the Renaissance and the Reformation: the tragic oscillation between rationalism and sentimental religion. This destructive flux threatened the possibility of dogmatic truth and the belief in the divinity of Christ in particular. The tri–fold religious philosophy at the heart of modernism was agnosticism, immanentism, and evolutionism. Agnosticism constituted modernism’s fundamentally negative epistemological stance, while immanentism was the movement’s fundamental philosophical doctrine. Modernism’s overemphasis on immanentism eroded the bedrock of monotheism, the belief in the absolute transcendence of God. Ironically, a compromised understanding of the divine transcendence actually vitiated confidence in God’s presence and activity within his creation. Evolutionism summed up modernism’s understanding of the development of doctrine. Such progress happened less as a result of a personal, divine initiative with which human beings knowingly and deliberately cooperated, and more as the result of an impersonal process of evolution. The ecclesiastical hierarchy did not have a normative role in shaping this development.

\textsuperscript{389} Grandmaison, “Christologie moderne,” 205.

\textsuperscript{390} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 210. See also Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 166.
In Grandmaison’s estimation, modernist exegesis first of all attacked traditional beliefs about Jesus Christ as Son of God and Messiah: specifically, it denied his full divinity. Second, modernism undermined the Catholic Church by attacking its reliability as repository and developer of the deposit of the faith, its sacramental life, and its hierarchical authority. Third, modernism cut away at the very possibility of individual personal religion since the possession of the fundamental truth about Christ, the Trinity, and the Church was made insecure or threatened. The individual was left with a religion that was atomized and sentimental, or, worse, reduced by positivism to a cipher.

The inclination of modernists such as Tyrrell and Loisy to explain revelation by relying heavily on mystical notions encapsulated much of the havoc that the movement wreaked on the life of Catholics and on the Church as a whole. The flight to mysticism yielded more mystification than mysticism, more alienation than communion. The undiscerning, unnuanced recourse to mysticism brought about the antithesis of personal religion.
CHAPTER THREE

Catholicism, the Personal Religion that Jesus Founded

Grandmaison’s constructive response to modernism led in part to making the case for Catholicism as the personal religion that Christ founded. Nineteenth century Christianity had tried to defend “social Christianity, the ideal of the social reign of Jesus Christ,” which had been challenged by the vicissitudes of that time:

The religious problem was posed most often in these terms: ‘What do you think of the Church of Christ? What should its relations with society be?’—This was the new form—adapted to the lacunae, the progress, the errors, and the aspirations of our time—of the eternal question: What do you think of Christ, and what should his relations be with humanity?1

For many of Grandmaison’s contemporaries in France, the fundamental religious problems that modernism (as well as philosophy and the historical religions) tried to address took the form of “the social question, and in particular, that of the role of individual initiative in religion. Is there a place for it? What place?”2 The modernist challenge had much to do with the question of the Catholic Church.3

After the height of the modernist crisis, Grandmaison used two complementary apologetic approaches to make the case for Catholicism. The first depended chiefly on Pneumatology, the second, on Christology. This chapter takes up the first approach. As noted in the previous chapter, Sabatier had framed the religious question in its most insistent, pervasive form: was Christianity a religion of the Spirit or the religion of authority? For Grandmaison, the individual’s personal religion

---

1 “Le problème religieux s’est posé, le plus souvent en ces termes: ‘Que pensez-vous de l’Église de Christ? Quels doivent être ses rapports avec la société?’—Forme nouvelle, adaptée aux lacunes, aux progrès, aux erreurs, aux aspirations de notre temps, de l’éternelle question: Que pensez-vous du Christ, et quels doivent être ses rapports avec l’humanité?” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 951.)


3 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 973.
found its home in Catholicism—and only there—as *the* religion of the Spirit. As we shall see in chapter four, the theme of personal religion so prominent in this approach was not abandoned, but subsumed and integrated into his Christology.

The first section of this chapter will outline Grandmaison’s Pneumatological approach to Catholicism in terms of personal religion. The second section presents his doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the principle of personal religion. The third section will set forth Grandmaison’s case for the claim that Catholicism, the religion that Christ had founded, fulfilled and even exceeded the contemporary demands placed upon individual, personal religion. The fourth section treats how Grandmaison saw the interrelationship of Church and society as an indispensable proof of Catholicism as the true personal religion.

**A. The Form of Grandmaison’s Case for Catholicism**

Grandmaison began making the case for Catholicism early in his career. His doctrine about the Spirit permeated his works, and appeared as early as 1898 in “Elasticité des formules de foi”; there he called the Spirit the soul of the Church, without wishing to attribute to him a vague or pantheist role. His Pneumatological case for Catholicism as the fulfillment of personal religion emerged before *Pascendi* in the review of Sabatier’s *Les Religions d’autorité et la Religion de l’Esprit*, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme?” (1906), and “Newman” (1907), and then after *Pascendi* in “Le développement du dogme chrétien” (1907-1908). The synthesis on personal religion that first appeared in “Études des religions” (1910) was developed during his engagement with rationalist and modernist scholars of comparative religion in: “Elément mystique” (1910); “La religion et la piété personnelle” and “La religion et le culte social” (1912); “La religion catholique” (1912); conferences and retreat talks given since 1912 to the Communauté Saint-François-Xavier (later collected in his

---

Écrits Spirituels; “Religion personnelle (1913), the DAF article on Christ, “Moehler” (1919), but most especially in “L’autorité et l’Esprit dans le Christianisme antique” (1917). This material later found its way into Jésus Christ.

For Grandmaison, “living and conquering Christianity had been, in fact, and from the start, the religion of Christ.” There was no doubt that “Jesus distinctly foresaw and wanted this perfect religious society, this ‘Church.’” Christianity has been from the beginning the religion of Christ and able to supply the truth about him. Moreover, while it was true that there was no Church without Christ, it was also true that there was no Christ without the Church. One was either for or against the Church, “a sign of contradiction and of discernment”: the decision for the individual believer was fraught with consequences. Deny as its opponents might the divine authority of the Church, they had to admit, at the very least, that the Church was almost as great an enigma as Jesus Christ her Lord. No one could ever mistake any other institution for her.

Grandmaison’s DAF article on Christ argued from Christ’s divinity to the divine—and eminently human—authority of the Church. Yet, in 1917, Grandmaison asked: Would appealing to the authority of the Church as carrying the divine authority of its Master meet the challenges of sentimental religionists, many of whom did not even recognize the personal transcendence of Christ

---

and the precarious truth provided by the Gospels?\textsuperscript{12} The answer was negative. The argument from authority would not have convinced Catholic modernists who, perhaps unwittingly, were strongly influenced by sentimental religion, or who chaffed under the exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

Liberal Protestants had a double objection against the authenticity of the hierarchy. First, there was the historical question: If Jesus did not institute the hierarchy, when did it come into being, and, with it, the Catholic Church? For Sabatier, that historical moment came during the time of St. Irenaeus of Lyons (130-c.190).\textsuperscript{13} To the contrary, Grandmaison answered, there was in fact an “organic, essential, and legitimate” continuity between the second century Church and the thought of Jesus and his apostles. Indeed, the typical Catholic apology for the Church since the Reformation as the societas perfecta (the society with all necessary means for salvation) had been to show the essential continuity of the contemporary Church with early Christianity.\textsuperscript{14}

But the question of the continuity of authority in Christianity was not the most important consideration for liberal Protestants and modernists. A second, more fundamental set of questions arose:

One must also show that the spiritual element of liberation, of religious autonomy, of filial piety, which constitutes for them the prize of ancient Christianity and constitutes the right of Jesus Christ to be heard as the unequaled Master,—one must show that this element, far from being opposed to the Catholic element of authority lends this element its stability, force of transmission, of conservation and its control. One must show that, if there were authority without Spirit (following our opponents, we qualify thus, as interior element), piety would be only a formality and a husk; in turn, that the Spirit without an authority that incarnates, controls, and contains it would degenerate into fanaticism, individualism without check, particularism without a future. In short, one must show that that which attracts and keeps our adversaries in ancient Christianity, that which makes them proclaim themselves disciples of Jesus, disciples of saint Paul and saint John, the divine and liberating element, the

\textsuperscript{12} Grandmaison, “Religion de l’Esprit,” 27.

\textsuperscript{13} Grandmaison, “Authorité et l’Esprit,” 27.

\textsuperscript{14} The basic outlines of the tract \textit{De vera religione} had been in place since the seventeenth century; Colin, \textit{Audace}, 120.
revelation of the Spirit, was not burdened, quenched, adulterated by the development of Catholic Christianity, by its hierarchy, its dogmatism and its liturgy, but was fixed, incorporated, and rendered assimilable to all souls, and made them participants in the revelation worked by God and his Son.\textsuperscript{15}

That Catholicism was the religion of the Spirit was supported by two negative claims made in the middle of the paragraph quoted above. First, authority without the Spirit would render individual personal religion a pure formality. Indeed, the antinomy between authority and Spirit was a sterile, even Manichean, one.\textsuperscript{16} The second claim was that appealing to the Spirit without authority would dissolve Church life into toxic forms of the spirit of the world, such as fanaticism, religious individualism, or any kind of particularity that cut off the believer or various factions from the whole of the Body of Christ.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}[\textsuperscript{15}]
\item “Il faut encore montrer que l’élément spirituel, de libération, d’autonomie religieuse, de piété filiale, qui fait pour eux le prix du christianisme antique et constitue le droit de Jésus-Christ à être écouté comme Maître inégalé,—il faut montrer que cet élément, loin de s’opposer à l’élément catholique d’autorité, emprunte à cet élément sa stabilité, sa force de transmission, de conservation et son contrôle. Il faut montrer que, si l’autorité sans Esprit (nous qualifions ainsi, à la suite de nos adversaires, l’élément intérieur) la piété ne serait que formalisme et écorce; l’Esprit, à son tour, sans une autorité qui l’incarne, le contrôle et le contient, dégénérerait en fanatisme, en individualisme sans frein, en particularisme sans avenir. Bref, il faut montrer que ce qui attirait et retient nos adversaires dans le christianisme antique, ce que les fait se proclamer disciples de Jésus, disciples de saint Paul et de saint Jean, l’élément libérateur et divin, la révélation de l’Esprit, n’a pas été alourdi, étouffé, adultéré par le développement du christianisme catholique, par sa hiérarchie, sa dogmatique et sa liturgie, mais a été fixé, incorporé, rendu assimilable à toutes les âmes, et les a faites participantes de la révélation opérée par Dieu et son Fils.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 27-8.)

\item Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 28.

\item The two statements from the passage above that Grandmaison sought to prove paralleled the two theses that formed the backbone of his argument for Catholicism during his years as teacher: the existence of God and the divinity of the Church. One could regard such truths as logically complementary moments or as the stages by which the sincere unbeliever came to faith. (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 211-3).

The first stage, mostly philosophical and moral, led the sincere seeker to affirm essential aspects of personal religion: “existence d’un Dieu unique et tout puissant, distinct du monde qu’il a créé librement, et qu’il gouverne par sa Providence infaillible, bien que respectueuse de la liberté humaine.” (ibid., 210.) The strategy here was to appeal to the credibility of God the Revealer, and to the intrinsic rationality of the Christian faith. Some seekers studied the evidence for a rational Final Cause, others, a secure base for moral action (ibid). Only after being convinced by the fundamental truths of the first stage, whether by intuition of the spirit or secret call of the heart, could one know that only in the Church could one find the revelation of Pascal’s “living and seeing God.” (Pascal, Pensées, VIII, 581, referred to in Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 211.)

The second stage led the seeker to faith in the Church, the people to whom he had revealed himself. Here one considered the historical, positive data of Christian revelation, especially with regard to the Church. The apologist argued for the credibility of the Church, which was then invoked to lead one to belief in Christ as the Son of God. (Belief in Christ was more terminus than ground of this overall approach.) Taken together, these two strategies showed that Catholicism fulfilled both the individual and social demands of religion.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Grandmaison’s argument on these two points was to prove their contra-positives. His Pneumatological approach tried to demonstrate that the Church fulfilled two conditions. First, since individual personal religion was at its most vibrant in the Catholic Church, then one could not say that it was deadened by the dogmatism, the infallible magisterium, and sacramental life that supported it. Grandmaison acknowledged the legitimate and sometimes contrary demands of personal religion; therefore, he tried to show that what the liberal Protestants and modernists found objectionable about Catholicism in fact constituted the religion of the Spirit that they desired. Secondly, Grandmaison tried to demonstrate that Catholicism was the place where man’s social nature was fulfilled. He marshaled evidence that the Church had already transformed the world in positive ways.

A good deal of the intrinsic attractiveness of Catholicism for Grandmaison lay in its balance of its various elements. According to Madeleine Daniélou, he loved solutions ‘in three moments,’ thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, supposing an optimistic start, a painful experience, and finally, the antinomy resolved with a personal and profound intuition of that which is essential and of that which one might call the complementary and corrective elements of thought, such that things were set in their proper place.

Therefore, his argument for Catholicism took the form of reconciling the apparent antinomies posed by modernism. The balance of these coincidences of opposites formed in effect the

---

18 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 946.
20 “aimait les solutions ‘en trois temps,’ thèse, antithèse, et synthèse, supposant un départ optimiste, une expérience douloureuse et finalement l’antinomie résolue dans une intuition personnelle et profonde de ce qui est essentiel et de ce qu’on pourrait appeler les éléments de complément et de correction de la pensée, toutes choses étant mises à leur place.” (Madeleine Daniélou, introduction to Léonce de Grandmaison, Conférences [Paris: Beauchesne, 1932], vii.)
backbone of his presentation of individual personal religion. “One of the profoundest traits of authentic Catholicism” was “its organic realism, its religious respect of all that is real, its refusal to choose between complementary points of view, even if they be very different and superficially antagonistic.” Catholicism was the only religion that could fulfill the legitimate aspirations that were one-sidedly represented by rationalism and sentimental religion—or at least strike a means between extremes at work in religious belief, life, and worship.

Examples of this reconciliation of opposites abounded within Catholicism. The Church balanced doctrinal rigidity with the incessant progress of minds; moral austerity with human needs; the unity of all in faith and love with the almost infinite differences of heredity, education, intelligence and interests; the rights of the person with the good of the social body; the spirit that frees with the literal practice which preserves it by incarnating it.

Catholicism was the religion of true liberty, in large part because it was also a religion of authority. Elsewhere, Grandmaison wrote that every thought and action worthy of an apostle needed to manifest a balance between opposing tendencies; such was the case for example concerning the relation between zeal and asceticism. Catholicism balanced the individual and the social. Even contemporaries of Grandmaison who did not stigmatize Catholicism made a strong distinction between spirituality and the trappings and strictures of institutional religion. Casting aside the latter

---

22 Léonce de Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1356; Jésus Christ, 1, 175, 240; 2, 475.

23 “son réalisme organique, son respect religieux de tout le donné, son refus de choisir entre des points de vue complémentaires, fussent-ils très différents et superficiellement antagonistes.” (Grandmaison, “Bulletin de Littérature Religieuse,” RLYR 16 (1926), 170.)

24 “la rigidité doctrinal avec l’incessant progrès des esprits; l’austérité morale ave les nécessités humaines; l’unité de tous dans la foi et l’amour avec les différences comme infinies des hérédités, des éducations, des intelligences et des intérêts: les droits de la personne avec le bien du corps social; l’esprit qui rend libre avec la pratique littérale qui le préserve en l’incarnant.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 212.)

25 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 321.

aspects, William James characterized religion as “the feeling, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they consider the divine.”

But such a definition of personal religion was unacceptable to Grandmaison because it opened up a chasm between the individual and collective dimensions of religion. Only orthodox Christianity could negotiate the mean between the two.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Church manifested the three-fold Catholic principle, which was dogmatic, social, and sacramental. Modernism vitiated the mutuality between Catholicism’s dogmatic and social dimensions. But Grandmaison laid special emphasis on their interdependence. According to Möhler, Christianity had not been disseminated first by Scripture, but by the living word. “It is for this fundamental principle that the disciple had to remain invariably attached to his Master, the unit with the whole. The need was unconsciously felt that the individual is nothing without the whole.”

The Church’s intransigent dogmatism was an essential part of the social aspect of personal religion. (Indeed, to modernize the Creed’s words about the Church—that it was “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic”—one should call it today “intransigent, heroic, comprehensive, and hierarchical.”) Catholicism satisfied the innate human desire for the truth. Yes, it was true that one could not reduce Christianity to conviction in intellectual formulas. But who would deny that [this conviction] is reasonable, or hold that an indirect demonstration thus supported does not do justice to the legitimate needs of the spirit? Isn’t

---

27 James, Religious Experience, 42.


29 “C’était pour faire prévaloir ce principe fondamental que le disciple devait rester invariablement attaché à son Maître, et l’unité au tout. La nécessité fit insensiblement sentir que l’individu n’est rien sans le tout.” (Johann-Adam Möhler, L’unité dans l’Église, 55, in Georges Goyau, Moehler [Paris, 1905], 85, 86, in Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 951.)

30 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1000.
it reason itself that demands, unconsciously at first, then with increasing desire, and a purer light, the liberating submission where before it saw only scandal and slavery?\textsuperscript{31}

Christian interiority or spirituality and the external aspects of the Christian religion were not at odds with one another; rather, the Church’s power to transmit, conserve, and control the faith was necessary to ensure these legitimate fruits of the Gospel. In this way and in others, the Catholic Church promoted the liberty of spirit that modernism had sought to achieve.

The sacramental element was also important as a source of the Church’s fundamental beliefs.\textsuperscript{32} It was also a motivator for the Christian’s involvement in society. Most important of all, though, the sacraments created communion between God and man, and solidarity among believers.\textsuperscript{33}

Grandmaison often drew on personal metaphors to describe the Church’s excellence in reconciling opposites. He often portrayed the harmonious relationship that obtained in Catholicism between authority and freedom in terms of the concord between sisters.\textsuperscript{34} The Scriptural image of the Catholic Church as the Bride of Christ was used to highlight the Church’s personal relationship with Christ and her ability to reconcile contraries of all kinds.

Spouse of Christ, she knows, through her Spouse and like him [with all the necessary qualifications made], ‘what there is in man.’ Knowing him under all aspects, she helps him in all needs. This comprehensive sense of the human synthesis has often been underlined by the apologists of later generations. ‘Catholicism…is the religion that supernaturally enlightens all aspects of human nature: it reconciles in a fundamental way authority and liberty, nature and grace, faith and reason, spiritual interiority and exterior means of

\textsuperscript{31} “Mais qui nierà qu’elle [this conviction] soit raisonnable, ou tiendra qu’une démonstration indirecte ainsi appuyée ne fût pas justice aux exigences légitimes de l’esprit? N’est-ce pas plutôt la raison elle-même qui a réclamé, inconsciemment d’abord, puis avec un désir croissant, et dans une lumière plus pure, la soumission libératrice où elle ne voyait auparavant que scandale et servitude?” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 213.)

\textsuperscript{32} Grandmaison, “Développement, Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 892.

\textsuperscript{33} Léonce de Grandmaison, “Les idées religieuses de Paul Bourget,” Revue hebdomadaire s.n. (1923), 294.

\textsuperscript{34} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 28.
salvation, immutability and living progress.’ [Hermann Schell, *Die neue Zeit und der alter Glaube*, 6.]

This Catholic balance was personal rather than abstract and involved everything that was human. This passage also supports the idea that the Church had both remained faithful to Christ’s teaching and developed it through the ages.

Now let us turn to the Holy Spirit, an indispensable personal principle of communal and individual personal religion.

**B. The Holy Spirit as Principle of Personal Religion**

In order to make his case for Catholicism, Grandmaison had to give an account of the person of the Holy Spirit. Although Grandmaison referred all topics he discussed implicitly or explicitly to the person of Christ, and with him, to the Father, there was no lack of an extensive treatment of the Holy Spirit. This concentration on the Spirit was one of the most distinctive if not startling aspects of his theological and pastoral sensibility. An anecdote recounted by Madeleine Daniélou illustrated the significance of the Spirit for Grandmaison:

At the next gathering, in 1919, during the first conference for the Community, P. de Grandmaison decided to present this famous text on docility to God. He read it, then, all of a sudden, setting his glasses on the table, quieting himself for a moment, he began to say this after a little while, with a tone of authority completely surprising in him: ‘Well then, know, in the Saint Francis Xavier Community, everything depends and will continue to depend on the Holy Spirit and on Him alone…’ This declaration, a witness recounted, ‘was a bombshell.’…The idea that docility to the Holy Spirit founded the apostolic life at Saint Francis Xavier came to be made explicit by P. de Grandmaison from his experience with the community. This would be the point of departure for a new spiritual élan.36

---

35 “Épouse de Christ, elle sait, (proportion gardée), ‘ce qu’il y a dans l’homme.’ Le connaissant sous tous ses aspects, elle le secourt en tous les besoins. Ce sens compréhensif de la synthèse humaine a souvent été souligné par les apologistes des dernières générations. ‘Le catholicisme, écrivait l’un entre d’eux, souvent moins bien inspiré, est la religion qui éclaire surnaturellement tous les aspects de l’homme naturel: il réconcilie fondamentalement autorité et liberté, nature et grâce, foi et raison, intériorité spirituelle et moyens extérieurs de salut, immutabilité et progrès vivant’ [Hermann Schell, *Die neue Zeit und der alter Glaube*, 6].” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1004.)

36 “À la rentrée suivante, en 1919, lors de la première conférence à la Communauté, le P. de Grandmaison décida de présenter ce fameux texte de la docilité à Dieu. Il le lut puis, tout à coup, posant ses lunettes sur la table, se taisant un
Although Christianity held that the entire Trinity indwelled the believer, the Holy Spirit was commonly acknowledged by appropriation as the divine Person who did so. Serving as a kind of motto for the Saint Francis Xavier Community, “dociles Dei” underlined the centrality of the lay apostle’s attentiveness to the promptings of the Spirit within.37

Grandmaison’s teachings about the Holy Spirit focused mostly on his role in the economy of salvation rather than on his place within the immanent Trinity. The Spirit was Love itself within the Trinity.38 As will be seen in the next chapter, Grandmaison was a thorough-going Filioquist when he wrote about the relationship of the Spirit to the Father and the Son: The Spirit was the personal and mutual gift exchanged by the Father and the Son. The Spirit was also Giver of gifts in the economy,39 and the very Giver himself as the Gift.40

Grandmaison’s Pneumatology drew inspiration in part from the renowned seventeenth century French Jesuit mystical school, the most prominent writers of which were Pères Louis Lallement (1587–1635) and Jean-Joseph Surin (1600-1665).41 Such a ressourcement accorded with the temper of the times, which was so fascinated with mysticism.42 “These two great men were dear to

---


38 Grandmaison, Conferences, 39.

39 Grandmaison, Conferences, 39.

40 Grandmaison, Conferences, 41.

41 Léonce de Grandmaison, “La vie religieuse au grand siècle: la tradition mystique dans la Compagnie de Jésus,” Études 166 (1921), 130.

42 Grandmaison, “Vie religieuse,” 133.
P. de Grandmaison for a long time: he read and reread them, but, even while venerating them, he expressed some reservations concerning their teaching.”

Although Surin had been an especially acute observer of psychological states, Lallement was generally considered to be the more dependable and more original thinker.

Lallement was an important representative of the contemplative dimension of Jesuit spirituality that accorded a central role to the Holy Spirit. Lallement’s *Doctrine spirituelle* counteracted somewhat the influence among Jesuits of the much more frequently read *Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection* of Jesuit father Alphonsus Rodriguez. The latter’s doctrine emphasized the active, ascetic side of spirituality almost to the exclusion of mysticism—an attitude that many Jesuits worldwide had favored for nearly four centuries. But French Jesuits such as Lallement and Grandmaison were inclined toward the minority position within the order that gave a good deal of attention to contemplative prayer and mysticism. According to Lallement, the gift of at least a rudimentary form of mystical prayer was available more widely than thought to those who disposed themselves to such prayer. For Grandmaison, “Everyone who is desirous of maintaining a serious spiritual life ought to strive in develop in himself these mystical seeds.”

---

43 “Ces deux grandes hommes étaient longtemps chers au P. de Grandmaison: il avait lus et relues, mais, tout en les vénérant, il formulait à leur sujet quelques réserves.” (Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 210.)


47 Grandmaison, “Vie religieuse,” 110, 147.

spiritual exercises, Grandmaison wrote of “mystical exercises”—to put oneself as intimately as possible in the presence of God.\textsuperscript{49} Jean Daniélou considered Grandmaison’s Écrits Spirituels to have been the most important representative of Ignatian spirituality of our time. Overcoming at the same time the ascetic tendencies of certain Jesuits of the nineteenth century, and the contemplative orientation of the spirituals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, he recovered instinctively the great current of apostolic mysticism which had been that of St. Ignatius and of his first companions, Francis Xavier, Pierre Favre, and Jerome Nadal.’’\textsuperscript{50}

As scholarship would later establish, Grandmaison’s inclination toward the minority position was presciently faithful to the mainstream Jesuit tradition.

Luther’s antinomies of interior inspiration and external authority, flesh and spirit, and law and gospel were unreal.\textsuperscript{51} In Scripture, while Christ was the source of peace, the Spirit was the divine Person who made it a reality, resolving the various contraries, especially that of the one and the many.\textsuperscript{52} The Church preserved a healthful sense, of the personhood of the Spirit and second, of the individual believer vis-à-vis Christ and the Spirit. The Holy Spirit was also an indispensable principle of personal religion both at the individual as well as at the social level.\textsuperscript{53} He animated the Church as a whole and its individual believers (I Cor. 12: 12–14).

The Spirit helped to provide the existential, personal unity that personal religion required.\textsuperscript{54} He was at work in the formation of dogma, the exercise of ecclesiastical authority, acts of worship,
and forms of life within the Church. Often called “the Interior Master” by Grandmaison, the Spirit was also at work interiorly in the individual believer, who was the beneficiary of the Spirit’s gifts and charisms. The faithful, each inspired by their interior Master, could in turn play their own part in the Church. The exercise of the gifts of the Spirit was to be encouraged, so long as the believer deferred to the judgment and control of ecclesial authorities. The ministers of the Church were also empowered by the same Spirit. The Church discerned in a careful, balanced, and clear way, through Paul and other authoritative leaders, the reality and the use of the charisms of the Holy Spirit. The justification for submission to ecclesiastical authority was fundamentally theological: drawing on the imagery of chapters 19 to 21 of the book of Revelation, Grandmaison constantly returned to the union already realized between the Spirit, Christ, and the Church his Bride.

The Holy Spirit inspired man’s native desire for the liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8: 14, 23). He also enabled the free submission to the will of a loving God. In sum, the Spirit was responsible for resolving all seeming antinomies having to do with the social and the individual:

In turn, the Spirit gives witness to the religion of the Father and the Son by inspiring superhuman virtues, by reconciling doctrinal immutability with the incessant progress of minds, moral austerity with human necessities; unity in faith and in love with the nearly infinite differences in heredity, education, inclinations, and interests; the rights of the person with the needs of the social body; the purity of adoration with the riches of worship and literal practice.

55 Grandmaison, *Conférences*, 45, 49; *Dernières Retraites*, 192.

56 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 216-7; *Conférences*, viii.

57 Grandmaison, *Dernières retraites*, 265.

58 Grandmaison, *Vie Intérieure*, 106.


60 “À son tour, en inspirant des vertus surhumaines, en conciliant l’immutilabilité doctrinale avec l’incessant progrès des intelligences, l’austérité morale avec les nécessités humaines; l’unité dans la foi et dans l’amour avec les différences comme infinies des hérédités, des éducations, des initiatives et des intérêts; les droits de la personne avec les besoins du
The Spirit’s comprehensive reconciliation of opposites rendered testimony to the relationship of the Son and the Father.

C. How Catholicism Resolved the Contraries of Personal Religion

This section will address the pairs of antinomies raised by modernism: the relationships between the divine transcendence vis-à-vis the divine immanence; grace vis-à-vis nature (or the supernatural vis-à-vis the natural); the social vis-à-vis the individual; the development of dogma vis-à-vis the conservation of the deposit of faith; the Spirit vis-à-vis ecclesiastical authority; and asceticism vis-à-vis mysticism.

Divine transcendence vis-à-vis the divine immanence

As seen in the two previous chapters, a proper sense of the divine transcendence was, for Grandmaison, the first mark of true personal religion. Personal religion was revealed religion, wherein the divine transcendence was respected: a question was posed of man rather than questions posed of God.61 As noted before, true religion set God “from the start in his place and man in his.”62 Human awe of a personal God had been present in the most rudimentary civilizations.63 Religion in general required the transcendent God of Christianity—

a God who gives himself without diminishing himself, who communicates himself without measure, but not without discernment, who reveals himself without losing the supreme nobility of the mystery; a God to whom one can pray, whom one can bend, but whom one can neither break or elude; a God who is Truth, a God who is charity, and a God who is Father; ‘a God of love and consolation, this is a God who fills the soul and the heart of those he possesses, this is a God who makes them feel within their misery and his infinite

62 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 402.
63 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 293.
Grandmaison never thought that God’s transcendence compromised his immanence, or vice versa. However, he resolutely asserted the priority of the divine transcendence as the indispensable condition of the divine immanence.

It will be seen in subsequent sections of this chapter how the co-penetration of the divine transcendence and immanence played out in the individual’s personal religion.

Grace vis-à-vis Nature, the Supernatural vis-à-vis the Natural

God’s uniqueness and transcendence were complemented by his personhood. Revealed religion could not be reduced to natural religion, where God did not relate to humanity as Person to person. Whether speaking of the divine transcendence or of the divine immanence, Grandmaison was careful to maintain the personhood of the believer vis-à-vis Christ and the Spirit. True personal religion ruled out a deluded sense of the divine immanence that wiped out the distinction between Creator and creature.

Heavy as is the responsibility for the one who attempts to evade it, the service of God remains, one sees, an active, living, and filial service. It never assumes the nuance of passivity that binds Muslims to the inclination toward fatalism. Among the great historical religions, Christianity alone escapes the divine transcendence without sacrificing anything of the rights of the latter.65

---

64 “un Dieu qui se donne sans se diminuer, qui se communique sans mesure, mais non sans discernement, qui se révèle sans perdre la noblesse suprême du mystère; un Dieu qu’on peut prier, qu’on peut fléchir, mais qu’on ne peut ni rompre ni éloigner; un Dieu qui est Vérité, un Dieu qui est charité, un Dieu qui est Père; ‘un Dieu d’amour et de consolation, c’est un Dieu qui remplit l’âme et le cœur de ceux qu’il possède, c’est un Dieu qui leur fait sentir intérieurement leur misère, et sa miséricorde infinie; qui s’unit au fond de leur âme; qui les remplit d’humilité, de joie, de confiance, d’amour;' [Pascal, Pensées, 8, 556] Cette haute conception, et les secrets qui l’accompagnent dans le dogme chrétien, nous les devons à la bénignité, à la ‘philanthropie’ [Titus 3:4], de Dieu.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique, 1009. See also Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D’ARC, 1294.)

65 “Lourd de responsabilité pour celui qui prétend s’y soustraire, le service de Dieu reste, on le voit, un service actif, vivant, filial. Il ne revêt jamais cette nuance de passivité qui engage sur la pente du fatalisme les croyants de l’Islam. Seul des grandes religions historiques, le christianisme échappe de la transcendance divine sans rien sacrifier des droits de celle-ci.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 365; Jesus Christ, 2, 63.)
Christianity did not proclaim monism, whereby the Absolute annihilated the essence of personal religion, the *conversatio* of Creator and creature.\(^\text{66}\)

Acknowledging that grace was built on nature, Grandmaison strove to maintain at all times the proper calibration of the ontological relationship between the supernatural and natural orders. He was on guard against the bifurcation that Baianism made between the natural and the supernatural, and recognized the universal appeal of the gospel announced by St. Paul to the Athenians (Acts 17: 24, 27).\(^\text{67}\) The supernatural and the natural dimensions formed a dynamic unity in the human person.

Given that personal religion was commerce with an utterly transcendent God who was immanent in all, personal piety corresponded with human nature. The believer had to be humble on account of his finitude. At the psychological level, human beings experienced themselves as fragmented, inaccessible to themselves except through dreams and strenuous mental effort.\(^\text{68}\) Grandmaison’s case for Catholicism as the religion of the Spirit emphasized the way in which the divine love made it possible for human beings to attain their end.

The very idea of personal religion is founded [on the message of Jesus Christ], as a filial commerce among persons. There, the exigencies of a nature both spiritual and needy, made for the infinite and incapable by itself to insure itself of possessing it, are satisfied, because right from the start God has been put in his place, and man in his. And that is all there is: this is religion pure and simple! Its unique trait.\(^\text{69}\)

---

66 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 400.


69 “est fondée l'idée même de religion, comme celle d'une commerce filiale entre personnes. Là, les exigences d'une nature à la foi spirituelle et indigente, faite pour l'infini et incapable à elle seule de s'en assurer la possession, sont satisfaites, parce que d'abord Dieu a été mis à sa place, et l'homme à la sienne. Et il n'y a que cela: c'est religion toute pure! Trait unique!” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 402.)
There are two important things to note from this passage. The first is that Grandmaison singled out filial commerce among divine and human persons as the specific trait of true religion. The filial love of God was the highest love of all.\textsuperscript{70} Ontologically speaking, the fact that human nature was “at once spiritual and needy, made for the infinite and incapable by itself to insure itself of possession of it,” indicated the proper ontological conditions for the fulfillment of the human person. The passage gave a nod to Thomas’ metaphysical theme of the greatness and the poverty of being in general.\textsuperscript{71} Indeed, the fact that any creature existed at all was itself a sign of the condescension of divine love.\textsuperscript{72} The human person was made for God, but was incapable of fulfilling that desire. Such a teaching safeguarded the absolute transcendence of God, while positing a desire for God that could not be fulfilled by natural means.

Second, personal religion fulfilled the need of believers to know the truth and to live a moral life so as to become more like their Creator. Man was created for self-transcendence. For Grandmaison, as seen in chapter two, the doctrine about the relationship of grace and nature was more profound than that of original sin and was one of the most important doctrines that separated Catholicism from much of Protestantism.\textsuperscript{73} Affirming this doctrine, Catholicism gave rise to an authentic humanism: it conveyed the possibility of human self-transcendence through knowledge and love. On the one hand, given the poverty of finite being, such a noble aim was not possible without the divine favor. All good was from the grace of Christ.\textsuperscript{74} On the other hand, there was a

\textsuperscript{70} Grandmaison, \textit{Conférences}, 22-3.

\textsuperscript{71} Thomas, \textit{ST}, I, 4, 1, ad 3 and 8, I, I.

\textsuperscript{72} Léonce de Grandmaison, letter to a friend of his youth, August, 1885, in Lebreton, \textit{Grandmaison}, 11-2.

\textsuperscript{73} Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1003.

\textsuperscript{74} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 622.
real alliance between the human and the divine. Personal religion respected the human person: in the words of the scholastic adage, grace perfected nature. God’s intimate presence to his creature did not efface human responsibility. The working of divine Providence was such that usually one’s efforts do make a difference in one’s relationship to God, in the merit possible therein.

Grandmaison also acknowledged the divine immanence within the human person: his interest in a wide range of human experience—in art, culture, politics, and to some extent, the natural world—reflected a lively awareness of the presence of God within all of creation.

More importantly, personal religion took into account the chasm between God and man created by the rupture of sin. As noted in chapter one, there was the matter of human evil. People of all faiths experienced themselves as guilty of sin. Indeed, Christianity posed the problem of guilt more emphatically than any other religion did. Moreover, Grandmaison recognized a kind of evil in the facile natural optimism that denied man’s sinfulness and that was a presumption of the advocacy for social utopias. The saints were the normative personal exemplars after Christ. Yet their frailty too stood as a reminder of the fundamental frailty of human beings, in their limitations and sinfulness.

The knowledge of the divine transcendence particularly with respect to human sinfulness was disclosed for Grandmaison in a special way in mystical prayer:

The transcendence of God, his incomprehensibility, and his infinite distance from sinful man are seen by mystics in a light so vivid that the danger here would be discouragement of the will, emerging from the exhausted bewilderment of the spirit. In this perspective, human personality seems to founder. In this first moment, the soul learns to measure, otherwise than by even purified concepts, even concepts pushed to an extreme, the abyss that

---


separates him who is and him who is not. But another moment follows the first: this creature so miserable is called to the divine friendship; this great God renders himself present to this ‘shell of an atom.’ One would despair of seeking him so high, so far away: but here he is in us, more present than any other to us.78

Paradoxically, human frailty was eminently compatible with a strong sense of the divine immanence: divinely initiated, the personal religion that awakened a lively sense of human guilt had for its aim friendship with God.79 Moreover, authentic mystical experience did not promote the annihilation of the worth of the individual. Rather, as Pascal wrote, the distance of the sinful creature from the holiness of God was itself an occasion for the divine initiative. The absoluteness of God’s transcendence—the sovereignty of his love—disposed him to extend his friendship to the sinner. The divine initiative in befriending humanity gave the believer faith that the double abyss had been bridged. “In short, the Christian religion assures the conditions of the exercise of desire in presenting us with a view of an inaccessible ideal.”80 As the divine revelation entrusted to the Church maintained, Christ had answered and he alone could have done so. Inversely, without Christ, man became unknown to himself.81

For Grandmaison, the Catholic notion of the relationship of nature and grace had implications for the continuity and discontinuity of natural and revealed religion. It must be kept in mind that Grandmaison’s treatment of personal religion presupposed the Christian faith. As much

78 “La transcendance de Dieu, son incompréhensibilité, son éloignement infini pour l’homme pécheur, sont vus par les mystiques dans une lumière si vive que le danger serait ici, naissant de l’éblouissement lassé de l’esprit, le découragement de la volonté. Dans cette perspective, la personnalité humaine semble fondre. À ce premier moment, l’âme apprend à mesurer, autrement que par concepts mêmes épurés, mêmes poussés à bout, l’abîme qui sépare Celui qui est de celui qui n’est pas. Mais un autre moment succède au premier: cette créature si misérable est appelée à l’amitié divine que grand Dieu se rend présent à ce raccourci d’atome.’ On désespèrait de le chercher si haut, si loin: le voici en nous, plus présent à nous-mêmes que nul autre!” (Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 207-8.)


80 Pascal, Pensées, 527.

as he attempted to appeal to believer, fallen-away believer, and non-believer alike, he did not want to reduce personal religion to a philosophical or religious construct of the lowest common denominator. Grandmaison was defending the uniqueness of Christianity. Only the God of Christianity could have revealed, established, and sustained personal religion in its fullness. The Catholic Church alone answered the human demand for the truth because it was only there “that the inevitable problems received a less precarious response, which suppresses the scandal without denying the mystery.”82 Catholicism was the summit and norm of all religion.83 Christianity, after all, had taken the spoils of Egypt in appropriating the natural wisdom of humankind.84 Another proof of Catholicism’s truth and originality lay precisely in the fact, conversely, that religions such as Hinduism had tried to appropriate distinctly Catholic truths and morality.85

The uniqueness of Christ and of Christianity was not incompatible with natural revelation. The fact of creation meant that humanity had a common nature.86 All people, even if inchoately, desired the vision of and union with God.87 Given that man was created in the image of God and was made for God, there was also certain continuity of natural and revealed religion (Acts 17: 24, 27). Revealed religion assumed natural religion: “Gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit.”88 Christianity was

---

82 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 211.


84 But personal religion was not based on vital immanentism, such as found in the thought of Félicité de Lamennais, wherein the deposit of faith was identified with a kind of natural revelation; Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 967.


88 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1002.
anticipated, however incompletely, by natural religion.\textsuperscript{89} Moreover, there were vestiges of Christianity in other religions.\textsuperscript{90} Finally, Grandmaison affirmed continually, as Catholic doctrine did, the possibility of salvation for those who were not visibly members of the Church.\textsuperscript{91} The Church’s intransigent dogmatism was quite compatible with its comprehensiveness, its catholicism.

The interrelationship of natural and revealed religion had implications for the personal religion of the individual believer. There was, for example, the matter of human conscience. The Holy Spirit acted in tandem with legitimate authority as the Master for the individual believer in the realm of conscience. Going further, Grandmaison raised the question as to whether there was a positive religious moral law in religions outside Judaism and Christianity that could contradict the natural law.\textsuperscript{92} To the Catholic, faith and reason, distinct from one another, were still in essential harmony. The workings of conscience demonstrated as much. Conscience was normative, but not ultimate: the command of God or his legitimate interpreters could go beyond the dictates of the natural law. God tried to make his religious demands of us as conformable to our reason as possible. But he could also make demands of us that surpassed the natural law. God gave us the wisdom to carry out religious acts that were not evil. Such precisions helped Christians to avoid both proud individualism and an amoral religious fideism that is poorly enlightened.

Finally, the divine condescension to humanity in friendship made the experience of human love possible. There was no competition between love of God and love of neighbor; rather, without such divinely motivated love, no noble human love was either possible or pure:

\textsuperscript{89} Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1922), 387.

\textsuperscript{90} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 401.

\textsuperscript{91} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” 297n1.

\textsuperscript{92} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 134 (1913), 605-6.
Who loves me for God’s sake loves me all the more, he loves me in truth, because I am no longer loved in an egotistical way, superficially and grudgingly; he loves me as a person, not as a rare plant or as an agreeable animal; he wants and procures my good, in temporal things and in the eternal; he unites himself to me, and gives himself to me without my fearing any withdrawal, without inflicting any remorse on me. I am not for him a pretext for loving God. I am loved rather without expectation of return, without cruel demands, without the inevitable disgusts of human love.93

This delicate appreciation of the dignity of love of neighbor in God dovetailed with another essential dimension of personal religion for Grandmaison: fraternal charity.94

The Social vis-à-vis the Individual

The communion of human beings with one another was a necessary part of personal religion. The human race was not merely a collection of disparate individuals, but shared a common nature. There was a law of solidarity that tied humanity together in an ultimate destiny that was not merely biological, but moral, spiritual and religious as well.95

What do you think of the Church?—Catholic thought and life during the 19th century converged splendidly to articulate the response. They proclaimed the notion of the Church, fortified love, and enlarged the place held by the Spouse of Christ in the religious concerns of Christians…the German Adam Möhler, a meditative and profound theologian, taught that it was never necessary to consider the religious man outside of religious society—the faithful outside the Church.96

93 “Qui m’aime ‘pour Dieu,’ m’aime encore; il m’aime davantage en vérité, car il ne m’aime plus à la manière égoïste, en image et en grimace; il m’aime comme une personne, non comme une plante rare ou comme un animal agréable; il veut et procure mon bien, en choses temporelles et en chose éternelle; il s’unit à moi, et se donne à moi sans me faire craindre aucune reprise, sans m’infliger aucun remords. Je ne suis pas pour lui un prétexte à aimer Dieu: seulement je suis aimé sans les retours intéressés, sans les exigences cruelles, sans les dégoûts inévitables des amours humaines.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 [1913], 626.)


96 “Que pensez-vous de l’Église?—La réflexion et la vie catholique, au xixe siècle, ont merveilleusement concouru à préciser la réponse. Elles ont déclaré la notion de l’Église, elles ont fortifié l’amour, elles ont élargi la place tenue par l’Épouse de Christ dans les préoccupations religieuses des chrétiens…l’allemand Adam Moehler, théologien méditatif et profond, enseignait qu’il ne fallait jamais considérer l’homme religieux en dehors de la société religieuse—le fidèle en dehors de l’Église.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 951.)
It was precisely the social dimension of Catholicism that was one of the chief marks that distinguished it from Protestantism and from its heir, modernism. Downplayed by Protestantism and modernism, the elements of worship, teaching, and authority were essential to the flourishing of Christianity—a position that some Protestants of Grandmaison’s time were coming to see.  

On the other hand, Grandmaison warned against subsuming the individual into the collective, an error which one found in idealism and its evolutionist doctrine. Each person found his place in the personal religion founded by Christ without creating anarchy. The believer enjoyed a personal transformation in the Church that did not suppress his individuality, but rather outfitted him interiorly as well as exteriorly for witness to Christ and for fraternal charity.

As an essential element of personal religion, fraternal charity was a prominent theme in Grandmaison’s theological and spiritual works. The Church was the privileged place where this fraternity was enjoyed. The human desire for fraternity found its fulfillment only in the Catholic Church, wherein, by the grace of God, this natural solidarity was oriented toward a fellowship of the supernatural order. This supernatural fraternity, already realized by Christ and an ongoing miracle of the Holy Spirit, was open to all humankind. Christians were obliged to receive Christ in their brothers, all alike in powerlessness. Grandmaison expressed the utter necessity of this solidarity

98 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 950.
101 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1009.
102 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 958.
103 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 961.
when he wrote about the spiritual gifts of mercy: “To give Christ or to render Christ is their aim and their all: where He is missing, He is not a stranger; but an absence. The place is not empty; it is depeopled.” The goal of all human acts was Christ.

Grandmaison sounded the theme of friendship with God in an unusually strong way. This friendship was the greatest form of blessing of the divine transcendence: He continuously invoked it as the preferred form of charity. Christianity realized the possibility of divine friendship in a way beyond all imagining. Friendship rather than *amor* best captured the believer’s relationship with Christ. It almost went without saying that the fact that Christians were the adopted children of God was itself the greatest sign possible that they enjoyed the divine friendship (Rom 8; 16-17, 21; 1 John 3:2). The highest gift that the Triune God could give to a human being was a likeness to one of its Persons.

This emphasis on friendship was consonant with Grandmaison’s experience of the *Spiritual Exercises*. In them, Ignatius Loyola suggested a form of prayer, a colloquy with Christ crucified. “The colloquy is made by speaking exactly as one friend speaks to another, or as a servant speaks to a master, now asking him for a favor, now blaming himself for some misdeed, now making known his affairs to him, and seeking advice in them.” The dialectic by which one spoke to Christ now as

---

104 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 (1913), 621.


107 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 (1913), 308. See Grandmaison, *Dernières Retraites*, 212. *Amor* is the Latin equivalent of the Greek *eros*, which denoted the longing for union with God. Such a longing might be disordered in that sense that it aims for what had already given by God through sanctifying grace. Considered in this light, *amor* could be construed as a kind of possessiveness. More will be said about this longing later in the discussion of the place of mysticism within faith.


109 *SpEx*, [54].
Friend, now as Lord, ran throughout the course of the Exercises. Maurice Blondel was grateful to Grandmaison for having helped him to be aware of this friendship, that “the adoptive love of God transfigures the natural point of view, without abolishing it.” Like Thomas and Ignatius, Grandmaison understood that divine friendship went together with the servanthood of the creature. Again, divine immanence—the presence and activity of God in humanity—was compatible with divine transcendence.

Grandmaison frequently used nuptial imagery to describe the Church, the personal religion that Christ founded. The image of Bride described the transcendent friendship that lover and beloved enjoyed. One can infer some reasons for this usage. First, it was a traditional biblical image dear to both Paul and John, who were important guides for Grandmaison. Such usage underlined strongly the intimate personal union of Christ with his Church and with Christ and each individual believer. It also emphasized that that the Church had an active, personal role: at a minimum, she was the normal channel of grace of Christ in worship and prayer.

Any offering that does not pass through the hands of the Bride of Christ is disdained: all bread that is not leavened by the yeast that She ‘mixes into three measures of wheat’ is insipid. Every prayer that is not animated by the sap for which she is the normally indispensable channel is dead. And that is all we need to know to disabuse us of the illusion that might make us believe in the existence of a religion that is totally personal.

---


113 “Dédaignée, toute offrande qui ne passe pas par les mains de l’Épouse du Christ: insipide, tout pain où ne ferment le levain qu’Elle ‘mêle à trois mesures de farine.’ Morte, toute prière que n’anime pas la sève dont Elle est le canal normalement indispensable. Et voilà pour guérir de l’illusion qui nous ferait croire à l’existence d’une religion totalement personnelle.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 [1913], 290.)
The great evil of Protestantism was in thinking that one could remain faithful to the Bridegroom without being faithful to the Bride.\textsuperscript{114} The use of such imagery reinforced the idea that true personal religion was always mediated by the Church.

The Church was also the pre-eminent human society.\textsuperscript{115} It was in continuity with the Kingdom of God promised to the people of the Old Covenant.\textsuperscript{116} One of the most striking points of the prophecies about the Kingdom was “the social, corporate, and communitarian character of the Kingdom of God. The gifts of God are always promised collegially.”\textsuperscript{117} Being judge, master, and pastor, the Messiah would act as mediator—hence, the anticipated Kingdom would be hierarchical too.\textsuperscript{118}

There were two novelties of the Kingdom as proclaimed by Christ.\textsuperscript{119} First, it would involve a new revelation, and hence a revealer; and second, it would be in continuity with Israel of old, with its Law and prophets. Moreover, the Kingdom of God is “universal in right, catholic in essence, open to all that the human heart carries,” and “accessible without distinctions based on race or ancestry.”\textsuperscript{120} However, this universal call to the Messianic banquet required human cooperation. Given these traits, Grandmaison asked, what real, concrete society could this be but the Catholic

\textsuperscript{114} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ,” *D.AfC*, 1531.

\textsuperscript{115} Grandmaison, “Religion catholique,” 956.

\textsuperscript{116} Grandmaison underlined that the revelation that the Judaism of the Old Testament carried had a great degree of continuity with the revelation of Jesus Christ; Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1922), 387.

\textsuperscript{117} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l'Esprit,” (1917), 30.

\textsuperscript{118} See also Grandmaison, “Autorité et l'Esprit,” (1917), 81.


\textsuperscript{120} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l'Esprit,” (1917), 82.
Church. There are instances when Grandmaison wrote that the Kingdom and the Church were virtually the same; most times, however, he kept the distinction between the two.

The saints recognized by Catholicism allowed the Church to cultivate the holiness whose ideal was charity, particularly fraternal charity. The supreme instance of human fraternity was the communion of saints. “The solidarity of mankind among themselves was a law of Providence, so that the first Love did not refuse, even in the order of salvation, to give to generous wills the merit and the dignity of causes.” Christian fraternal charity brought Grandmaison back to the interrelationship of grace and nature.

The Deposit of Faith vis-à-vis the Development of Doctrine

An especially thorny issue for modernists and for Catholics in general was the tension between a stable, fixed, eternal deposit of faith, and the ongoing development of dogma.

Grandmaison presented his own ideas on these topics in the last two sections of the 1907-1908 article of that name, entitled “Les limites du développement” and “Le développement du dogme chrétienne.” He defended the traditional notion of the deposit of faith and advanced his own notions about the development of doctrine by appealing to elements of personal religion. What was at stake was not only the credibility of the Church and her dogma, but also a fundamental confidence in the divine charity.

123 “Cette solidarité des hommes entre eux une loi providentielle, le premier Amour n’ayant pas dédaigné de conférer, dans l’ordre même du salut, aux bonnes volontés généreuses, le mérite et la dignité de causes.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 [1913], 622.)
The deposit of faith was an ensemble of truths communicated by a fully transcendent, personal God who was fully immanent to his creatures. Simply put: “In revealing, God speaks.” Divine revelation implied certitude and clarity. Taken as a whole, the clarity and certitude of revelation from Father, Son, and Spirit in the Incarnation testified to the charity of God, who desired to make himself known and loved. Among God’s commands was the obligation to believe the truth that he has revealed to humankind. Clarity was needed if the truths proposed by faith were to be embraced freely. Such a manner of revelation respected the human capacity for knowledge and for free choice, man’s unity and weakness.

Having the sense of Christ, the Church was able to receive dogmatic truth directly from him. The fixity of this deposit was witnessed by the continuity of the tradition. According to the traditional notion of the deposit of faith, “No new dogma, no dogma left behind, no reformulated dogma.” But the stability of the deposit of faith did not rule out the development of doctrine. The apostolic generation had special assistance from God in this regard:

They had that which one of them calls the sense of Christ, understood that which he said, that which he was;—and that which they saw, they had the grace to transmit, as they were missioned to do. Living words of the Gospel preached, writings edited by themselves or their immediate disciples, theological interpretations, institutions, liturgical customs, and

---

130 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 246; 2, 172.
131 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 167.
practices, established or approved, even attitudes and decisions adopted under the pressure of new problems, all these served them in this task.\textsuperscript{135}

In an earlier article, Grandmaison stated that it was to the Church’s advantage to encourage the development of doctrine, albeit in the proper way: “let us strive to distinguish what is durable and genuine in the evolution of philosophical ideas and in the severest study of the facts; let us seek to bring to light what in the Christian tradition responds to the needs of souls in our time.”\textsuperscript{136} The development of doctrine for him was meant to serve both the truth and personal religion.

The first question that Grandmaison dealt with was establishing the deposit as it has been defined in dogma. “It is one thing to recognize the existence of the revealed deposit, and the doctrinal rule that allows one to determine it (whatever difficulty or discussion might be raised by the application of this rule)—it is another thing to delimit the deposit in an exact way.”\textsuperscript{137} Where did these limits lie? Grandmaison began his answer by explaining the Catholic notion of revelation in a way that answered Sabatier’s caricature of it:

For us, revelation is communication made by God by means of a human (mark well this epithet!) instrument of judgments, of certain pieces of information touching on divine realities whose knowledge, desire, presence in us, and possession are fitting to nourish, promote in us, and transform our religious life. One already sees by this description that revelation in its proper sense is nowise the mechanical transmission or transfusion, by an extra-human mode, of purely theoretical data, to be accepted passively,—something like a series of theorems imposed by force in the memory of an infant! It is the conscious initiation into the participation (to an extent that, surpassing by far our natural capacities and our

\textsuperscript{135} “Ils eurent ce que l’un deux appelle le sens du Christ, comprirent ce qu’il avait dit, ce qu’il était;—et ce qu’ils virent, ils eurent grâce pour le transmettre, comme ils en avaient mission. Paroles vivantes de l’Evangile prêché, écrits rédigés par eux-mêmes ou leurs disciples immédiats, interprétations théologiques, institutions, gestes et habitudes liturgiques établis ou approuvés, attitudes même et décisions adoptées sous la pression des problèmes nouveaux, tous les servit dans cette tâche.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 413.)

\textsuperscript{136} “efforçons-nous de distinguer, dans l’évolution des idées philosophiques, et l’étude plus sévère des faits, ce qui est durable et de bon aloi; chercherons, pur le mettre en lumière, ce qui dans la tradition chrétienne répond aux besoins des âmes, en notre temps.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 217.)

\textsuperscript{137} “Autre chose est l’existence reconnue d’un dépôt révélé, et d’une règle doctrinale qui permette de le déterminer (quelque difficulté d’ailleurs et quelque discussion que doive soulever l’application de cette règle)—autre chose est la délimitation exacte du dépôt.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 418-9.)
hopes, remains human) in the divine life itself. As the explicit announcement of this admirable transformation, which God deigns thus to work in us, partly, in the light, revelation becomes an integrated part of it by the free and meritorious adherence that it demands of us: our spirit responds to the confidences whose direct proof is refused it, whose sublimity astonishes it, through a submission that is the supreme homage.  

Revelation required an absolutely independent, perfect, and incomprehensible, and most of all, personal God. Moreover, the act of receiving and passing on revelation was a personal human act that involved the intellect and the will. In the case of the prophet, someone received truths from God, expressed them, and then verified them. The believer’s acceptance of the prophet’s revelation involved free and meritorious personal acts of submission to revealed truths.

This personal God also purified human ideas about him from imperfect ideas of personhood itself. A person was

[a] subsistent, spiritual, incommunicable ego,—an ego which abides, which subordinates itself in view of an end of activities which would otherwise be dispersed, which possesses and governs itself,—a living, knowing, willing, and loving ego that one cannot, without doing it an injustice, treat as a thing, and which cannot consider itself as such a thing without lowering itself.  

---

138 "Révélation, c’est pour nous communication faite par Dieu, moyennant un instrument humain (qu’on veuille bien marquer l’épithète) de jugements, d’informations certaines touchant les réalités divines dont la connaissance, le désir, la présence en nous, la possession sont propres à nourrir, à promouvoir en nous, à transformer notre vie religieuse. L’on voit déjà par cette description, que la révélation proprement dite n’est nullement la transmission, la transfusion mécanique, par un mode extra-humain, de données purement théoriques, à accepter passivement,—quelque chose comme une série de théorèmes imposée de force à la mémoire d’un enfant! Elle est l’initiation consciente à la participation (dans une mesure qui, tout en dépassant de très loin nos capacités naturelles et nos espoirs, reste humaine) de la vie divine elle-même. Annonce explicite de cette admirable transformation, que Dieu daigne ainsi opérer en nous, pour une part, dans la lumière, la révélation en devient, par l’adhésion libre et méritoire qu’elle exige de nous, partie intégrante: notre esprit répond aux confidences dont l’évidence directe lui est refusée, dont la sublimité l’étonne, par une soumission que est l’hommage suprême.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 406.)

139 “Un ego subsistant, spirituel, incommunicable,—un ego qui demeure, qui se subordonne en vue d’une fin des activités autrement dispersées, qui se possède lui-même et se gouverne,—un ego vivant, connaissant, voulant et aimant, qu’on ne peut, sans lui faire injustice, traiter comme une chose, qui ne peut, sans se ravaler, se considérer comme tel.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 407.)
God was both transcendent and most intimate to all his creatures. This God, our Father and the God of love, who endowed human beings with reason, also gave them the ability to distinguish between various kinds of revelation so as to avoid anthropomorphic interpretations of divine communications.

Thomas’ treatment of prophecy was a helpful guide here. There were two forms of divine communication that the prophet can receive. The first, imperfect as the second was perfect, was a divine call in the form of instinct, mystical contact, ineffable savor of God. The second type of revelation carried with it certitude and clarity. It contained two moments: “the presentation to the spirit of elements generally taken from sensible things, and the certain judgment which pronounces, by means of these elements, on the truth that God wants to make known.” God made appropriate use as needed of the spirit of the prophet as he was, in his particular circumstances; but the prophet remained free as a human instrument. The essential part of revelation was not images, but truths that were distinct judgments about religious truths.

From there comes the insistence of Saint Thomas on teaching that revelation is from the start, and sometimes exclusively, the impression on the spirit of man of an intellectual light that provokes a certain judgment about the realities that concern the religious life. This light (which can even bear upon prophetic elements from others that are submitted to the prophet) works two indispensable effects: it imposes on the one who receives it a definite

140 Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 408.


142 “la présentation à l’esprit d’éléments pris généralement du sensible, et le jugement certain qui prononce, moyennant ces éléments, sur la vérité que Dieu veut intimer.” (Thomas, ST II-II, 171, 5, in Grandmaison, Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], “Développement,” 408-9.)

143 “De là l’insistance de saint Thomas à enseigner que la révélation est d’abord, et parfois exclusivement, l’impression dans l’esprit de l’homme d’une lumière intellectuelle qui provoque un jugement certain sur les réalités qui intéressent la vie religieuse. Cette lumière (qui peut même porter sur des éléments prophétiques à d’autres, et soumis par eux au prophète) opère deux effets indispensables: elle impose à celui qui la reçoit une vérité déterminée comme certaine, elle la lui présente comme positivement couverte par l’autorité divine.” (Thomas, ST II-II, 172, 3; II-II 173, 2, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 409.)
truth that is certain, and, second, presents it to him as positively guaranteed by divine authority.\textsuperscript{144}

In the Old Testament, these judgments were interpreted with a potent authority without making them seem unreal and beyond the pale of the audience’s human experience.

Grandmaison went further and drew the analogy between the Old Testament prophecy and Jesus’ enunciation of the deposit of faith in its fullness:

It is ultimately a privileged case of revelation that benefits from an immediate human analogy. In whatever way the divine action illuminated the human soul of Jesus (let us allow for a sacred silence, according to Carlyle, to meditate on this mystery), it is certain for those who identify themselves as Christians, that ‘God was in him, reconciling the world.’…It is our faith as Christians, and we do not have to defend the idea of the revealed deposit independently of this faith. But this faith is no less explicit about the fact that Jesus spoke as a man, in language that fittingly communicates definite and certain judgments. Gathered from the Master’s lips, then penetrated and understood more and more by the disciples, then belatedly, and partially articulated in writing, at the moment when the living echo of the word was weakening in the Church, these judgments formed the last part (last in the order of time, supreme in the order of dignity) of the revealed truths.\textsuperscript{145}

God’s revelation did not abolish human nature, and certainly not in the case of Christ. The divine action illuminated the prophet to be able to announce the revelation infallibly in both cases.\textsuperscript{146} There were historical stages of revelation that culminated with that made by Jesus Christ. There were degrees of expression: sometimes the prophet’s communication was not the best possible; still, it

\textsuperscript{144} Thomas, \textit{ST} II–II, 173, 2; 171, 5, in Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologétique} 6 (1908), 410.

\textsuperscript{145} “Il est enfin un cas privilégié de révélation, qui bénéficie d’une analogie humaine immédiate. De quelque façon que l’action divine illuminant l’âme humaine de Jésus (laissons un silence sacré méditer, selon le mot de Carlyle, ce mystère), il est certain, pour tous ceux qui se réclament du titre de chrétiens, que ‘Dieu étaient en lui, réconciliant le monde.’…C’est notre foi de chrétiens, et nous n’avons pas défendre, indépendamment d’elle, l’idée du dépôt révélé. Mais cette foi n’est moins explicite sur le fait que Jésus parlait comme un homme, dans la langage propre à communiquer des jugements définis et certains. Recueillis sur les lèvres du Maître, puis pénétrées et compris de plus en plus par les disciples, enfin tardivement, et partiellement formulés par écrit, au moment où l’écho vivant de la parole allait s’affaiblissant dans l’Église, ces jugements ont formé la partie ultime (à la fois dernière dans l’ordre du temps, suprême dans l’ordre de dignité) des vérités révélées.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologétique} 6 [1908], 410.)

\textsuperscript{146} Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologétique} 6 (1908), 412.
was good enough to communicate the first judgment. Nonetheless, the divine intervention was achieved not only by passive impression (as Tyrrell taught), but also by the expression of truth and by the assistance given to the prophet to interpret public revelation. The reception and expression of revelation engaged the whole person.

The apostolic charism was necessary in doctrinal matters to preserve the early Church from error. Jesus promised to send the Holy Spirit, who would lead the disciples into all truth. (John 16:12). But Jesus told the apostles that he had already told them everything that the Father had told him (John 15:15). Knowing Jesus personally, they knew the truth already: “The apostles possessed this knowledge, which was not dry and exclusively theoretical, but informed their whole life: in truth all was said, although everything, or nearly everything, remained to be understood.”

Subsequent Christians did not understand more than the Apostles. No knowledge could equal the living, personal contact that they had with Christ. They did not express consciously every notion they knew. “It is enough to allow that the apostles, confronted with these legitimate developments, would have recognized in them under a more explicit and detailed form what they believed from the beginning.” The modernists were right in saying that dogma had to involve an encounter with the living God. But, for Grandmaison, such an encounter did not rule out dogma.

147 Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 413.
149 “Cette connaissance, non pas sèche et exclusivement théorique, mais informant la vie entière, les apôtres possèdent: en vérité tout est dit, encore que tout, ou presque tout, reste à entendre.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 415.)
As for the members of the apostolic generation, they had an infused knowledge of dogmas necessary for their time, rather than of “still confused auxiliary notions” that awaited the time for their definition and pronouncement.\textsuperscript{152} Through the immense work of the Holy Spirit promised by the Master, the apostolic generation perfected the doctrinal treasure by the sense of Christ that had been personally communicated to them.

Thus, [the words of the Gospel] expressed in formulas, gathered from the lips of the Savior or suggested by his Spirit, were made concrete in narratives, actions and symbols, were involved in convergences and antitheses, and realized in invocations, prayers, precepts. The judgments which inform us even today about divine realities. The ensemble of these teachings, hidden or explicit, formed ‘the revealed deposit.’\textsuperscript{153}

St. Paul urged St. Timothy to guard the deposit (2 Tim. 1:14); in other places Paul warned against teaching another gospel. John too was concerned to keep the teachings free of human alloy.\textsuperscript{154} At the very end of the book of Revelation, Jesus, the Son of Man, cursed anyone adding or subtracting from the revelation contained therein. The immutability of the deposit of faith had been affirmed by uninterrupted personal witness throughout the history of Christianity: “Stronger nevertheless than the agreement among these explicit formulas is the general, unexpressed consensus in the name of which one proscribed all novelty, change, or abandonment in matters of dogma.”\textsuperscript{155} While the terms in which dogmas were expressed do have human limitations, “the judgments themselves are, to the very last ones that the assisted magisterium will ever proclaim, preformed and determined in

\textsuperscript{152} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 901. See also ibid., 903.

\textsuperscript{153} “Alors s’exprimèrent en formules, recueillies sur les lèvres du Seigneur ou suggérées par son Esprit, se concrétèrent en récits, en actions, en symboles, s’impliquèrent en rapprochements et en antithèses, se réalisèrent en invocations, en prières, en préceptes. Les jugements qui nous informent, encore aujourd’hui, des réalités divines. C’est l’ensemble de ces enseignements, enveloppés ou explicites, qui forma le dépôt révélé.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 413-4.)

\textsuperscript{154} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 417.

\textsuperscript{155} “Plus fort cependant que l’accord de ces formules explicites, est le consensus général inexprimé au nom duquel on a proscrire, en matière dogmatique, toute nouveauté, tout changement, tout abandon.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 418.)
advance by the infallible virtue of divine communication.”

Again, revelation was the act of a personal God made in ways that fully respected and engaged the human person.

In beginning to discuss the development of doctrine, Grandmaison asked: “Should one consider religious truths communicated in this way to humanity as a foundation that would augment itself progressively without a determinable limit, or as a closed treasure and sealed at a given era?”

He affirmed the latter, traditional position. The infallibility of the development of dogma true to its divine origin was ruined by “the evolutionist mirage” of the modernists. Grandmaison cited various passages from the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins to support his case for the fixity of the deposit of faith. If one allowed novelty on just one point of dogma: “nothing in the Church will remain intact, inviolate, whole, and immaculate: the chaste sanctuary of incorruptible truth will be changed into a den of errors and impieties.”

One could not find stronger words in favor of the immutability of the deposit of faith.

Given this position, what was the rule by which the Church was to determine if something did not belong in the deposit of faith? Sabatier and Tyrrell had written that the repeatability of divine revelation in one’s own consciousness was the criterion by which to judge revelation. For Grandmaison, the charism of the discernment of spirits helped the Church to discern the particular

156 Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 (1908), 904.

157 “Doit-on considérer les vérités religieuses ainsi communiqués à l’humanité comme un fonds qui s’accroîtrait progressivement sans limite assignable, ou comme un trésor clos et scellé à une époque donnée?” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 414.)


160 “rien dans l’Église ne restera intact, inviolé, intègre, immaculé: l’on changera en une repaire d’erreurs et d’impiétés le sanctuaire chaste de incorruptible vérité.” (Vincent of Lérins, Commonitorium XXIII [31-2], 36, ed. A Jülicher [Leipzig, 1895], in Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 429.)
truths contained within the deposit of faith.\textsuperscript{161} “Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God,” the first letter of John exhorted (1 Jn. 4: 1). But such a charism was not freewheeling. It depended on the guidance of doctrinal orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{162}

Like Paul at other times, John places the criterion that will permit the discernment of spirits in orthodoxy of doctrine, conformity with apostolic precedent, and docility to legitimate authorities: ‘every spirit that confesses Jesus Christ who came in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that does not confess this Jesus is not of God…[1 John 4:2].’ The gravest consequences of this notion of orthodoxy so firmly established are drawn out in the second Letter. ‘Whoever goes beyond, and does not remain within the limits of the doctrine of Christ—that which the faithful received from the beginning—does not possess God; whoever abides there has the Father and the Son…[2 John 9-11].\textsuperscript{163}

Grandmaison recognized that the criterion was so general that the Church needed personal guidance in applying it in particular circumstances.\textsuperscript{164}

One needed the personal guidance of the tradition to determine the exact limits of the deposit. Grandmaison appealed to the general rule: “To reject a single certainly and universally recognized point as belonging to the apostolic tradition is a heresy for Saint Justin as for Saint Irenaeus; but it is otherwise with a point that is contested in the Church, even if it seemed evidently traditional to a particular doctor.”\textsuperscript{165} The magisterium also had an essential role to play at any time in the Church’s history:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{161} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 423.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Grandmaison, Dernières retraites, 252.
\item \textsuperscript{163} “Jean, comme Paul autrefois, place dans l’orthodoxie de la doctrine, dans sa conformité avec les données apostoliques, aussi bien que dans la docilité aux autorités légitimes, le critérium, qui permettra de discerner les esprits: ‘tout esprit qui confesse Jésus-Christ venu en chair est de Dieu, et tout esprit qui ne confesse pas que ce Jésus n’est pas de Dieu…[1 John 4:2].’ De cette notion d’orthodoxie si fermement établie, les conséquences plus graves sont tirées dans la seconde Epître. ‘Quiconque va au-delà, et ne reste pas dans [les limites de] la doctrine de Christ—celle que les fidèles ont reçue dès le commencement] ne possède pas Dieu; celui qui y demeure, celui a le Père et le Fils…[2 John 9-11].’” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 418.)
\item \textsuperscript{164} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 418-9.
\item \textsuperscript{165} “Rejeter un seul point sûrement et universellement reconnu comme appartenant à la tradition apostolique est une hérésie pour saint Justin comme pour saint Irénée; mais il en est autrement d’un point contesté en fait dans l’Église, parût-il
The Catholic method, by which I mean that method used in all Catholic schools, evidently supposes that the Church is judge of the limits of her doctrinal magisterium, and, finally, that she is the normal, necessary, authorized, intermediary between God and the Christian soul. This point, but that alone, is presupposed; if you refuse to admit it, if you lay claim to the right to choose, to accept in the official teaching of the Church only what agrees with you, that which accords with your philosophical conclusions and personal critiques, —then you are a partisan of religious individualism, you are Protestant. The Church for you is no more than an organ of transmission, a providential principle of unity, necessary, perhaps, at least for lesser souls, but fallible, human, and subordinate (far from having to submit to it) to the believer’s private judgment.166

In refusing to submit to ecclesiastical authority, modernists only substituted the shifting sands of the evolutionist fieri for the stable foundation of the esse of dogma.167

Was the development of doctrine possible and had it in fact happened before?168 If so, what were its cause and modalities?169 In responding to these questions, Grandmaison underlined the personal nature of the development of doctrine. Grandmaison quoted a passage of Vincent’s, cited by Vatican I, that acknowledged the development of doctrine:

‘Increase therefore…and progress much and intensely, in each faithful and in all the faithful, according to the progress of the ages and the centuries, the intelligence, science, and savor that every particular dogma, and above all, that the whole Church has,— but in the only way that is fitting to this development, which is in the unity of the same dogma itself, the same meaning, and the same sentiment!’170

évidemment traditionnel à un docteur particulier.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 420-1.)

166 “La méthode catholique, j’entends celle employée dans toutes les écoles catholiques, suppose évidemment que l’Église est juge des limites de son magistère doctrinal, et, en fin du compte, qu’elle est l’intermédiaire normal, nécessaire, autorisé, entre Dieu et l’âme chrétienne. Ce point, mais celui-là seul, est présupposé; si vous refusez de l’admettre, si vous revendiquez le droit de choisir, de n’accepter, dans l’enseignement officiel et défini de l’Église, que ce qui vous agrée, ce qui cadre avec vos conclusions philosophiques et critiques personnelles, —alors vous êtes partisan de l’individualisme religieuse, vous êtes protestant. L’Église n’est plus pour vous qu’un organe de transmission, un principe d’unité providentiel, nécessaire, peut-être, du moins aux âmes mineures, mais faillible, mais humain, mais subordonné (loin qu’il doive s’y soumettre) au jugement privé du fidèle.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 435.)


170 “Croisse donc…et progresse beaucoup et intensément, en chaque fidèle et dans tous les fidèles, selon le progrès des ages et des siècles, l’intelligence, la science, le goût savoureux qu’a du dogme chaque particulier et, tout autant, l’Église
So Vincent recognized that there was organic development of dogma within the immutable deposit of faith—and even encouraged it. Standing on the bedrock of faith, everyone in the Church working as a whole, each had a role in this development. Granted, such development was not linear and cumulative: “the truths of Christian revelation unfolded all their content only little by little.”

But Catholicism was not a religion stuck in its past.

The development of doctrine was a result of providential, divine intervention that was respectful of human freedom. The first Cause was the action of the Holy Spirit of Christ, building up the Church through secondary causes. “He is the one who animates and guides by assisting the ecclesiastical magisterium.” However, this development was also prompted by many human occasions. Infallible Providence left man free to act as he chose, and incorporated human actions into its designs. As was the case in the Trinitarian and Christological controversies of the first eight centuries, heresies and controversies led to further study and doctrinal enrichment. The obstacles that doctrines encountered served to incite developments, projecting outward, and “on the obscure foundation of human knowledge, the diversity and the infinite variety of their original richness.”

---


174 Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 883-4. “Comme une barque sollicitée par des courants opposés se sert de tous les deux sans s’abandonner à aucun, et se trace une voie sûre entre des récifs affrontés, la doctrine catholique est à la fois tentée et mise en péril, mais aussi provoquée à avancer et aidée dans son progrès, par l’inquiète activité de l’esprit humain cherchant, pour exprimer sa foi, à en concilier les termes dans une synthèse harmonieuse.” (Ibid., 884.)

From the conflict of opinions, texts, liturgical facts, and analogies; from this confused mix of arguments and of influences where politics and human interests seem to sometimes play the preponderant role; from these obscurities, where the eye of the most penetrating theologians is troubled, where the skill of the most subtle dialecticians is warped, a coherent ensemble issues forth in a vital continuity which reunites, without doing violence to them, the apparently irreconcilable terms of the most arduous problems,—there is a spectacle which gives the impression of being an intuition of the divine.\textsuperscript{176}

The first kind of occasion happened when there were new questions or difficulties to be resolved, raised in either calm or calamitous circumstances.\textsuperscript{177} An instance of this kind was the controversy concerning the rebaptism of schismatics or heretics.\textsuperscript{178} The process was no mere blind vital evolutionism.

On the other hand, Grandmaison also affirmed that there often was a connection between worldly human evolution and the development of doctrine. Cases arose in which there were problems concerning practice—or more exteriorly, “that which proceeds from the change of institutions, the advancement of the sciences, and the needs of the faithful.”\textsuperscript{179} The definitions of papal infallibility and of the Immaculate Conception were examples of this kind of development.

the proclamation of papal infallibility had been (considering secondary causes) the natural result of the centralization and strengthening of authority generally operative outside the Church and by counterattack in the Church during recent centuries….Add to this evolution of human institutions the growing liberty allowed to the expression of thought and to individual initiatives, and you will sense the need of the counterweight of a recognized and indisputable authority,—one that is infallible in doctrinal and moral matters. Wouldn’t it set asunder what God united to not see a strict connection between the political and social

\textsuperscript{176} “De conflit d’opinions, de textes, de faits liturgiques et d’analogies; de cette mêlée confuse d’arguments et d’influences où la politique et les intérêts humains semblent jouer parfois un rôle prépondérant; de ces obscurités où se trouble l’œil des théologiens les plus pénétrants, où gauchit la dextérité des dialecticiens les plus subtils, voir sortir un ensemble cohérent, en continuité vitale qui réunit sans le violenter les termes apparemment irréconciliables des problèmes les plus ardu,—c’est là un spectacle qui donne l’impression, et comme l’intuition du Divin.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 882.)

\textsuperscript{177} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 883.

\textsuperscript{178} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 884-7.

\textsuperscript{179} Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 (1908), 887.
conditions of the human race, and the solemn definition of the Fathers of the Vatican Council? God metes out the remedies for needs, and is not absent from his Church.

Grandmaison had no difficulty seeing divine Providence at work in the human aspirations and circumstances that prompted the definition of the doctrine of papal infallibility. Seeing the finger of God in worldly realities did not necessarily mean that one was succumbing to a reductionist understanding of the development of doctrine. But Christian discernment involved reading the signs of the times.

The definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception represented the victory of piety—“like the unfolding of an autumn rose.” One might raise the objection, according to Grandmaison, that piety is sometimes blind, exclusive, and unilateral. But Catholic piety had always been required to answer to the double authority of revealed dogma and of the magisterium. The failures of Montanism and its many forms showed that, although piety had the power to conserve, propose, or divine, no matter how bold or generous it was, it ultimately had to submit to revealed doctrine and ancient tradition.

The theological problems directly raised by the activities of the human spirit seeking to penetrate, organize and defend its beliefs, to define them in view of its other knowledge; these same problems brought about by new difficulties, and resolved in various ways, in ecclesiastical practice; the changes that take place in institutions, the sciences, and human philosophies; the profound instincts and heartfelt intuitions of piety,—all these elements working at the same time have their part in this great movement. And always, moreover, the enigmas thus posed, slowly matured by controversies, ecclesiastical usage, and the precisions

---

180 “la proclamation de l’infaillibilité pontificale ait été (à considérer les causes secondes) la suite naturelle de la centralisation, du resserrement de l’autorité, généralement opéré hors de l’Église, et par contre-coup dans l’Église, durant les derniers siècle…. Ajoutez à cette évolution des institutions humaines la liberté croissante laissée à la manifestation de la pensée, des initiatives individuelles, et vous sentirez le besoin d’un contre-poids d’autorité reconnue, indiscutable, — en matière doctrinale et morale, infaillible. Ne serait-ce pas séparé ce que Dieux a uni, que de ne pas voir une connexion étroite entre ce changement dans les conditions politiques et sociales de la race humaine, et la définition solennelle des Pères du Vatican? Dieu mesure les secours aux besoins, et ne manque pas à son Église.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 887.)

of doctors, have ended by bringing forth their divine word, as from themselves, under the efficacious but profound action—respectful of human activities—of the Holy Spirit.\footnote{Les problèmes théologiques directement soulevés par l'activité de l'esprit humain cherchant à pénétrer, à organiser, à défendre ses croyances, à les définir en fonction de ses autres connaissances; ces mêmes problèmes impliqués par des difficultés nouvelles, et diversément résolus, de pratique ecclésiastique; les changements survenus dans les institutions, les sciences et les philosophies humaines; les instincts profonds et les divinations cordiales de la piété,—tous ces éléments à la fois ont leur part dans ce grand mouvement. Et toujours aussi les énigmes ainsi posées, lentement mûries par les controverses, l'usage ecclésiastique, les précisions des docteurs, ont fini par livrer, comme d'elles-mêmes, leur mot divin, sous l'action efficace mais profonde, respectueuse des activités humaines, du Saint-Esprit.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d'apologetique 6 [1908], 889.)}

The Catholic view of the interrelationship of grace and nature led made it plausible that the Holy Spirit worked harmoniously with the human spirit such that the truth ultimately prevailed.

In trying to settle on a model for doctrinal development, Grandmaison inclined at times towards the model of biological development—the model preferred by Vincent of Lérins.\footnote{Vincent of Lérins, Commonitorium, xxiii [29], in Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d'apologetique 6 [1908], 891.} Dogma appropriated elements from culture, such as philosophical concepts, as a living being depended upon elements assimilated from its environment for its growth.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d'apologetique 6 (1908), 902.} There was a suppleness and unexpectedness about personal growth that was appropriate. But Grandmaison finally settled on the analogy of the scientific method.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d'apologetique 6 (1908), 889.} The most compelling reason for this preference had to do with the involvement of the entire faithful:

In both cases, the object is given once and for all, and progress lies less in the matter that is known than in the manner in which the ensemble of scientists here and there and the ensemble of the faithful become conscious of it and know it. Here and there, the progress of connected or auxiliary sciences, the exactness of observations, the perfection of terminology, the proposal of new hypotheses, and the conflict of opinions provoke and activate the way forward. This activity finds its parallel in some measure in the instinct of Christian piety and the analogy of faith, and in the divination and confident anticipations of particular seekers.\footnote{“Des deux parts l'objet est donné, en quelque façon, une fois pour toute, et le progrès git moins dans la matière que dans la manière dont l'ensemble des savants ici et là, l'ensemble des fidèles, en prend conscience et connaissance. Ici et là, le progrès des sciences connexes ou auxiliaires, l'exactitude des observations, le perfectionnement de la terminologie, la proposition d'hypothèses nouvelles, le conflit des opinions, provoquent et activent la marche en avant. Il n'est pas}
The analogy of natural science was appealing to Grandmaison because science, like religion, was a social venture. A scientist’s work needed to be elaborated. There were precisions, clarifications and further conclusions to be made, all of which a disciple faithful to the indications and methods left by his master could make. So it was with

the activity of the ecclesiastical magisterium in relation to the deposit of faith. To express the matter in classical theological terms: definitions of disputed points; illuminating points that remained or became obscure; explanations of points which remained implicit. In this way, there is progress in the formulation, determination, proposition, and very number of dogmas.\(^{187}\)

As was the case with the believer’s act of faith, development involved decision-making. “The progress of a living science is made by way of an acceptance, an indubitable elaboration, but it issues in an incorporation, or a definitive elimination.”\(^{188}\) But definition, classification, and deduction by themselves were insufficient to explain doctrinal development. Dogmas were living thoughts, “elaborated under the divine influence in the spirit of the apostles.”\(^{189}\) The personal element was intensified and guaranteed in an extraordinary way by the Holy Spirit.

Ultimately, though, the development of doctrine was a transcendent process unlike any other.\(^{190}\) There was a certain provisional character about it.

\(^{187}\) “L’activité du magistère ecclésiastique par rapport au dépôt révélé. Pour énoncer la chose dans les termes classiques de la théologie: définitions des points discutés; mise en lumière de ceux qui sont demeurés, ou devenus obscurs; explications de ceux qui étaient restes implicites. Il y a ainsi progrès dans la formulation et la fixation, dans la proposition, dans le nombre même des dogmes.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologetique* 6 [1908], 889-90.)

\(^{188}\) Grandmaison, “Développement,” *Revue pratique d’apologetique* 6 (1908), 902.


Development will perhaps never be completed, systematization will remain precarious, synthesis is always in fieri: the relationships of fact which serve as the basis of this synthesis remain, if they were observed well, as irremovable data. One will change perhaps their place, one will complete them by experiences which will make one see their complexity as infinite, but no one will have the right to neglect them, or to forget them in their later attempts at total systematization.191

Grandmaison recognized that science both made definitive decisions and also resisted final systematization. Facts remain, but their interrelationships sometimes shift. So it was with the development of doctrine. Moreover, all human science was subject to a certain indeterminacy and change, and hence the weakness common to all living things. Although the terms in which dogmas were expressed did have human limitations—“the words only matter here in the measure in which their received sense sufficiently expresses a truth which precedes them, limits them, and will surpass them forever,”192 it also had to be be recalled that “the judgments themselves are, up until the last of them declared by the assisted magisterium, preformed and determined in advance through the infallible virtue of the divine communication.”193 From first to last, dogma was the result of a transcendent, divine Providence. Dogma also protected the inexhaustible mystery of the truths of faith.

The resolution of antinomies figured prominently in Grandmaison’s enumeration of the kinds of dogmatic development. The first kind was the very definition of a dogma.194 As might have

191 “Le développement ne sera peut-être jamais achevé, la systématisation restera précaire, la synthèse in fieri: les rapports de fait qui servent de base à cette synthèse restent, s’ils ont été bien observés, comme des données intangibles. On en changera peut-être la place, on les complétera par des expériences qui en feront voir la complexité comme infinie, mais nul n’aura le droit de les négliger, de les oublier dans ses essais ultérieurs de systématisation totale.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 902.)

192 “les mots n’importent ici que dans la mesure où leur sens, actuellement reçu, exprime suffisamment une vérité qui les précède, les déborde, et les dépassera toujours.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 191.)

193 “les jugements eux-mêmes sont, jusqu’au dernier de ceux que proclamera le magistère assisté, préformés et déterminés d’avance par l’infaillible vertu de la communication divine.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 904.)

been expected, the material example that Grandmaison chose was Christological dogma. From the
beginning, before dogmatic definitions, Christians had expressed their belief in the indivisibility of
Christ and in his divinity by means of symbols, practices, and liturgy.

Christ Jesus appeared to men as a unique subject, an indivisible and sovereign \( \text{ego} \) to which
one had to attribute the diversity of his works, those through which shone the majesty of
God, those which were experienced as human infirmity; that one should not ‘divide Christ,’
that he ‘who was in the form of God emptied himself’ without losing himself, and was made
flesh without doubling himself; that the formulas of adoration that united him to the Father
were addressed to this unique divine Person, Son of God through and through and Son of
Man.\(^{195}\)

But the truth of the dogma was not possessed securely until defined, nor did it have the highest
administrative and judicial prerogatives till then. Eventually, the unity of implicit belief gave way to
the complexities of further theological reflection upon dogma.

When apparent antinomies broke out, the duality of the elements united in Jesus (Lord Jesus,
the Incarnate Word, the God-Man) was affirmed. Simplifications emerged which, under the
pretext of explaining traditional data, extenuated one or other of the elements in reducing it
to a conception or verbal entity, or built them with difficulty on metaphors taken from
material things (confusion, crasis, mixture)…. Who does not see in such an occurrence a definition, for the conservation of the Catholic
faith, which is equivalent to, if not a revelation, then at least a new promulgation, a step
forward, or a victory? The two realities, the human and the divine, affirmed anew, sheltered
from rash enterprises, their distinction recognized, their union in Christ expressed by means
of the profoundest and most actual analogy that it was possible to imagine (that of the
transparent unity of our own person), such were the results of the ecclesiastical definitions of
the fifth century.\(^{196}\)

---

195 “le Christ Jésus ait apparu aux hommes comme un sujet unique, un \( \text{ego} \) indivisible et souverain, auquel on dût
attribuer la diversité de ses œuvres, celles où transparaissait la majesté du Dieu, celles qui se sentaient de l’infirmité
humaine; qu’on ne dût pas ‘diviser le Christ,’ que celui ‘qui était en forme de Dieu se soi anéanti’ sans se perdre, et
incarné sans se dédoubler; que les formules d’adoration qui l’unissaient au Père se soient adressées à cette Personne
(1908), 890.)

196 “Alors les antinomies apparentes éclatèrent, la dualité des éléments unis en Jésus (Seigneur Jésus, le Verbe incarné,
l’Homme-Dieu) s’affirma. Des simplifications se firent jour qui, sous couleur d’expliquer les données traditionnelles,
etant eu l’un ou l’autre des éléments en réduisant à une entité conceptuelle ou verbale, ou les fondaient lourdement
dans les métaphores prises des choses matérielles (confusion, crase, mixtion). Qui ne voit qu’en pareille occurrence une définition équivalant, pour la conservation de la foi catholique, sinon à une
rélévation, du moins à une promulgation nouvelle? à un progrès? à une victoire? Les deux réalités, l’humaine et divine,
affirmées à nouveau, mises à l’abri d’entreprises téméraires, leur distinction reconnue, leur union dans le Christ exprimée
Grandmaison delights here in the resolution of Christological contraries in terms of personhood. Given his understanding of the hypostatic union, the dogmatic definition of the union and the distinction of the natures within the person of Christ made possible the resolution of antinomies concerning the Church.

Second, there were obscure dogmas that were brought back to light. Grandmaison asked “if, among those truths that we ought to be ready to believe since they would appear to be uttered by God, there are not some whose explicit knowledge might be ignored, and even obscured, for a time in the entire Church without serious damage for many of the faithful.” According to Thomas, there were dogmas that Christians believed because of their relationship to others. Given this fact, Grandmaison accepted the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. Grandmaison’s intention was not to downgrade particular truths, but to safeguard the trustworthiness of doctrine in cases where a certain truth is disputed. The development of doctrine sometimes required setting aside disputed questions in order to let a correct judgment on them mature. These cases carried the modest importance of a determination or a delimitation. The clearest example of this kind of development was the long process of sorting out of the canon of Scripture.

The bulk of Grandmaison’s own treatment of doctrinal development focused on perhaps the most difficult instance of all, the delicate case where implicit dogmas were made explicit. These

---


198 “si, parmi ces vérités que nous devons être prêts à croire dès qu’elles nous apparaîtront dites par Dieu, il n’y en a pas dont la connaissance explicite puisse être ignorée, sans dommage grave, par beaucoup de fidèles, et obscurcies même, pour un temps, dans l’Eglise entière. C’est ce dernier point qui, seul, doit retenir ici notre attention.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 892.)

199 Thomas, ST II-II, 1, 1, ad 1.
passages contain some of his most penetrating speculative thought. Being implicit implied an object being in another, but in an imperfect way. In order for the making explicit of a dogma to be truly development, one must establish an intrinsic connection between the new and the old state, such that the former thing developed itself, fulfilled itself, and expressed itself in the other.

Grandmaison recognized that one thing could become another. But could such an event be called development—could it be reconciled with the immutability of dogma? In answering the question, one had to recognize that one was dealing with human concepts and judgments—albeit proposed by the magisterium—concerning divinely revealed truths about divine realities.

Inferences and deductions were not dogmas, because there intervened a commonly known middle term that was involved in a logical discourse that went beyond the mere explications of terms. None of these so-called “theological conclusions” could be considered instances of theological development, which applied exclusively to the explication of the truths spoken by God. The period of revelation of such truths ended with the close of the apostolic age.

There were also many dogmas implicit in the deposit of faith. These might be implicit in relatively obscure beliefs and practices. Here Grandmaison made a very important distinction. Besides explicitly proposed dogmas from the apostolic age, there were two other kinds of truths contained in the deposit of faith: those that were formally present, and those that were virtually present. The first type referred simply to truths that issued from “the simple exposition of terms

---


without any intervention of middle terms that are taken from outside and active.” An example of this would be that “Paul was conceived with original sin.” A dogma was virtually present “if any process whatsoever—quasi-intuitive, dialectical or practical—discloses that a truth is really contained in the doctrines or the institutions transmitted by the apostles.” An example of this kind of dogmatic truth was that Christ’s resurrection implied our own resurrection. A formal derivation was called a simple extension, while a virtual derivation was a real development.

Coming to the heart of the matter, Grandmaison asked, first, whether virtual developments of dogma were possible after the death of the apostles and, second, whether developments of the implicit formal type were the only ones admissible. Some theologians of great note considered the second type to be theological conclusions, but not dogmas. At this point, Grandmaison innovated somewhat by claiming that there was another kind of real development: the virtually implicit. The Church had rightly exercised throughout its history “the power to discern, and to define as a dogma of divine faith, truths whose formal appearance in the deposit of faith is not manifest. In a word: the Church can proclaim as dogma a truth which would always remain, as far as we are concerned, virtually implicit in the apostolic tradition.” The examples that he gave were the doctrines that the soul was the form of the body, the definition of the number of sacraments, and the doctrine of the

---


209 “le pouvoir de discerner, et de définir comme dogme de foi divine, des vérités dont la contenance formelle dans le dépôt révélé n’est pas manifeste. D’un mot: l’Eglise peut proclamer comme dogme une vérité qui serait toujours rester par rapport à nous, virtuellement implicite dans la tradition apostolique.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 896.)
Immaculate Conception.\textsuperscript{210} In 1617, St. Robert Bellarmine championed this last teaching about the Virgin Mary, but only as a pious belief. He refused to call anyone a heretic who denied it, as there were theological reasons against the belief. Humanly speaking, the dogma seemed probable, but also sufficiently indeterminate to warrant postponing a decision.

Bellarmine’s remarks occasioned Grandmaison’s recourse to personal terms. “But the Church knows, better than the beloved disciple, how to recognize her Lord; she has the power to discern the voice of her Spouse there where the human ear perceives only a weak or indistinct echo.”\textsuperscript{211} The development of doctrine happened because of the Bride’s intimate attention to Christ, her Spouse. This remark occasioned the following commentary by Jesuit Father John Walsh on Grandmaison’s selection of the proper analogy for the development of doctrine:

\textbf{The true analogy then, does not seem to lie merely between dogmatic progress and scientific progress, but also between dogmatic progress and the progress in knowledge which really takes place among two friends, where one can read volumes in the other’s slightest word, smallest gesture, and faintest smile, Such a knowledge does exist; it can be and often is infallible; it is also unanalyzable.}\textsuperscript{212}

Grandmaison’s predilection for the image of the friend and the Church as Bride was echoed in the way he recapitulated the process of doctrinal development. This process can ultimately be properly described only in terms of interpersonal relationships.

This personalist understanding of doctrinal development was expressed as Grandmaison reaffirmed the infallibility of the Church’s dogmatic pronouncements.

The Church, which is in effect a ‘social and supernatural being,’ according to the felicitous expression of M. Bainvel, is not constrained in its actions by the limitations that impose

\textsuperscript{210} Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologetique} 6 (1908), 898.

\textsuperscript{211} “Mais l’Église sait, mieux que le disciple bien-aimé, reconnaître son Seigneur, elle a le pouvoir de discerner la voix de son Époux là où l’oreille humaine n’en perçoit qu’un écho affaibli ou indistinct.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologetique} 6 [1908], 898.)

\textsuperscript{212} Walsh, “De Grandmaison and Gardeil,” 89.
themselves on the individual seeker in a purely human, critical sense, the lacunae of
documents, uncertainties of the past, and textual ambiguities. We might even be tempted to
forget this, that works and profound discussions precede and prepare the definition of
dogmas: from there on, it is easy to establish a relation of cause and effect between the
reasons proposed by councils and popes and their infallible decisions. One knows that
nothing could be further from the truth; and that these reasons (which are the fruit of long
thological and historical study) express—insufficiently still—only a part of the motives that
have rendered a decision wise, reasonable, and irreproachable, a decision whose infallibility
does not depend on the motives.213

Here Grandmaison defended the inerrancy of dogma in terms of the Church’s corporate nature.
One could not locate the supernatural certitude of a dogma in its human preparation. Such
antecedents were necessary but insufficient causes of the decisions that were eventually made. The
history of dogma could not be rationalized. The Church’s intuition of the truth was more mysterious
than the sum of her members thinking and acting individually. Rather, “progress consists here in
discerning these revealed truths less by way of strict logic than by way of an analogy that is natural,
historical, and liturgical, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit; then to propose them with
authority.”214 The supra-logic of doctrinal development transcended logic and history, while making
use of them, and depended above all on divine guidance.

Development was real above all because of the grace at work in the Church. The infallibility
of the magisterium “comes from a higher place. Reasonable and responsible instruments of divine

---

213 “L’Église en effet, ‘être social et surnaturel,’ selon l'heureuse expression de M. Bainvel, n’est pas entravée dans son
action par les limitations qu’imposent au chercheur individuel, au sens critique purement humain, les lacunes des
documents, les incertitudes du passé, l’ambiguïté des textes. Nous serions d’autant plus tentés de l’oublier que des
travaux, des discussions approfondis, précédent et préparent la définition des dogmes: il est dèrs lors aisé d’établir une
relation de cause à effet contre les raisons alléguées par les conseiles et les papes, et leurs décisions infallibles. L’on sait
qu’il n’en est rien; et que ces raisons (où se résument de longues recherches théologiques et historiques) n’expriment—
encore insuffisamment—qu’une partie des motifs qui ont rendue sage, raisonnable, irréprochable, une décision dont
l’infallibilité ne dépend pas.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 898.)

214 “le progrès consiste ici à discerner, moins par voie strictement logique que par voie d’analogie naturelle, historique, et
liturgique, avec l’assistance du Saint-Esprit, ces vérités révélées; puis à les proposer avec autorité.” (Grandmaison,
Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 5 [1907], 527.)
Providence, voice of the Church, ‘mouth of Christ,’ they speak in the name of the Lord, and a portion of apostolic grace is in them.”

This power to overstep, for reasons that cannot be systematically explained, in certain cases the natural scope of the historical and logical ‘discourse’ which prepares a definition; this superior gift of intuition which makes the Church obtain a clear awareness of truths that no demonstrative argumentation has manifestly shown present in the deposit of faith; this kind of divine instinct which little by little inclines the ecclesiastical magisterium in the sense of analogy, aptness to the faith, and the heartfelt propensity of the Christian people, and which consequently makes the necessary distinctions and the triumphant responses—this is the work of the Holy Spirit, the accomplishment of the Master’s promises, the mover of dogmatic development….one doesn’t need to find an exact proportion between the dogmatic definitions and the inquiries made and the motives alleged by those who pronounced it in the name of God. Sometimes, it is true, the implicit content of the dogma in the deposit will be rendered manifest by research; at other times it’s not this way, and the dogma appears only as a probable or morally certain interpretation, of the explicit data of the faith. It is the infallibility of the Church that has never claimed any power to add to revelation and that has forcefully justified the right to define infallibly. The reasons alleged by the organs of the magisterium are so little the measure of this infallibility that theologians admit that the considerations involved in a definition of faith might be erroneous.

This notion of the Church’s awareness of the truth accorded well with his personal image of the Church as Bride listening to her Bridegroom—an image often used by Grandmaison in his Christology. The development of dogma was not merely a matter of syllogistic development or critical scholarship alone. A dogma was worthy of unconditional belief beyond a reckoning of the

---


216 “Ce pouvoir de dépasser en certains cas, sur des indices irréductibles à une exposition systématique, la portée naturelle du ‘discours’ historique et logique qui prépare la définition; ce don supérieur d’intuition qui fait prendre à l’Église une conscience claire de vérités qu’aucune argumentation démonstrative n’a montrées évidemment présentes dans le dépôt révélé; cette sorte d’instinct divin qui incline peu à peu, le magistère ecclésiastique dans le sens d’analogie, d’une convenance de la foi, d’une propension cordiale du people chrétien, et lui fait ensuite les distinctions nécessaires et les réponses triomphantes—c’est l’œuvre du Saint-Esprit dans l’Église, l’accomplissement des promesses du Maitre, le moteur du développement dogmatique….il n y a pas à chercher de proportion exacte entre les définitions dogmatiques, et les enquêtes faites, les motifs allégués par ceux qui, au nom de Dieu, les prononcent. Quelquefois, il est vrai, la contenance implicite du dogme dans le dépôt sera rendue manifeste par ces recherches; d’autres fois il n’en est pas ainsi, et le dogme n’apparait que comme une interprétation probable, ou moralement certaine, des données explicites de la foi. C’est infaillibilité de l’Église, qui ne s’est jamais reconnu le pouvoir d’ajouter à la révélation, a revendiqué hautement le droit de la définir infailliblement. Les raisons alléguées par les organes du magistère sont si peu la mesure de cette infaillibilité, que les théologiens admettent la possibilité d’une erreur dans les considérations exprimées d’une définition de foi.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologétique 6 [1908], 899-90.)
reasons for it and the process by which it came to be defined. The reasons for the genesis of a
dogma could not explain away—or be used to downgrade—its credibility.

Speaking of the infallibility of dogmatic judgments made in the face of human
powerlessness, Grandmaison insisted: “if this transcendent prerogative is incapable of rigorous and
direct demonstration, if it presents itself as an object of faith and not as a motive of belief, the
development of doctrine does not elude, for all that, an apologetic defense.”

His confidence as both theologian and apologist came from faith. He asserted that, in response to charges that the
Church suffered

from immobility, sterility, and death, the Catholic Church opposes her dogmatism that is
both coherent and progressive, immutable and living. She repudiates nothing of the heritage
of the past; she refuses to surrender to an eternal fieri, to the flow of illusory forms, the
truths that she knows from God to hold fast to, and the very fruitfulness of which requires
stability. Being tranquil, she passes by the evolutionist mirage at work in doctrines that
postpone to an indefinite future promises that she cannot hold in the present. Even more,
she knows how to draw out new things from ancient treasure, and to accommodate herself
to the needs of the times during her pilgrimage in time.

Newman had discovered the unity, consistency, and logic of this development as proof of its
legitimacy against corruption:

Only Christian dogma renews itself without contradicting itself, evolves without mutilating
itself, remains itself without merely surviving. Dominating from the height of its mysteries
the truths of natural religion and morality that found and orient all human life, it shows itself
to be the surest and only guardian of these necessary truths. And its glory is that one can

---

217 “si cette prérogative transcendante est incapable de démonstration rigoureuse et directe, si elle se présente comme
objet de foi, et non comme motif de croire, le développement dogmatique n’échappe pas, pour autant, à l’apologétique.”
(Grandmaison, Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6 [1908], 904.)

218 “d’immobilité, de stérilité, de mort, l’Église catholique oppose sa dogmatique à la fois cohérente et progressive,
immuable et vivante. Elle ne répudie rien de l’héritage du passé, elle refuse de livrer à un éternel fieri, à l’écoulement de
formes illusoires, des vérités qu’elle sait tenir de Dieu, et dont la fecondité même a pour condition nécessaire la stabilité.
Tranquille, elle laisse le mirage évolutionniste aux doctrines qui remettent à un avenir indéfini les promesses qu’elles ne
can tenir dans le présent. Mais encore elle sait tirer du trésor ancien des choses nouvelles, et s’accommoder, durant
son pèlerinage temporel, aux nécessités du temps.” (Grandmaison, “Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetique 6
[1908], 904-5.)
hardly find these truths unless one accepts the divine gift of Revelation, which conserves them in transcending them.\textsuperscript{219}

Grandmaison’s awareness of the limitations of human speech in no way devalued the unconditional stability and trustworthiness of dogma for him. The divine gift of revelation embraced and guaranteed all dogmatic definitions.

Ecclesiastical Authority \textit{vis-à-vis} The Holy Spirit

As seen in previous chapters, one of the most important tensions during the modernist era was that between the Catholic exercise of ecclesiastical authority and the presence and activity of the Spirit in the individual believer. At the beginning of the last lecture on “L’autorité et l’Esprit dans le Christianisme antique,” Grandmaison took up the question again as to whether Catholicism was truly the “Religion of the Spirit.”

At the heart of these Lectures, I would have liked to show in their accord and mutual assistance, at this most poignant moment in Christian history, the two forces that are indispensable for the profession and the practice of a religion that is rich, pure, powerful and maintained outside of excess and deviation. The first of these forces is \textit{divine inspiration}, the bursting force that teaches every human spirit how sweet the Lord is, how great he is, and how the one thing necessary above all is to praise him, serve him, and make him known! The second is a force of control and mastery, \textit{the legitimate authority} which guards inspiration from any intrusion in the proper sense, any invasion of human and diabolical counterfeits, any absorption in what is chimerical, useless or erroneous.

Instead of that, I have often had to plead the cause of this latter force, the less pleasant, the less sympathetic, which all its good works and its unavoidable necessity do not succeed in acquitting among minds intoxicated with independence, or overwrought to the point of deafness by pride and particularism.\textsuperscript{220}

\textsuperscript{219}“Seul, le dogme chrétien se rajeunit sans se contredire, évolue sans se mutiler, reste lui-même sans se survivre. Dominant, de toute la hauteur de ses mystères, les vérités de la religion et de morale naturelle qui fondent et orient toute la vie humaine, il se montre, de ces vérités nécessaires, le plus sûr et parfois le seul – gardien. Et c’est sa gloire qu’on ne puisse guère actuellement trouver celles-ci sans accepter le don divin de la Révélation, qui les conserve en les dépassant.” (Grandmaison, Développement,” Revue pratique d’apologetic 6 [1908], 905.)

\textsuperscript{220}“Au cours de ces Leçons, j’eusse voulu montrer, dans leur accord, dans leur entr’aide fraternelle, au moment le plus touchant de notre histoire chrétienne, les deux forces indispensables à la profession et la pratique d’une religion riche et pure, puissante et maintenue en dehors de tous les excès, de toutes les déviations. La première de ces forces est l’\textit{inspiration divine}, la force de jaillissement qui apprend à chaque esprit d’homme combien le Seigneur est doux, combien il est grand, et que l’unique chose après tout nécessaire est de le louer, de le servir et de le faire connaître! La seconde est une force de contrôle et de maîtrise, l’\textit{autorité légitime} qui garde l’inspiration de toute intrusion du sens propre, de toute invasion de contrefaçons humaines et diaboliques, de toute absorption dans la chimérique, l’inutile ou l’erroné.
Grandmaison was stranger to neither the promotion of spiritual gifts nor the demands of legitimate authority. Many of his spiritual writings were dedicated to the charisms and fruits of the Spirit.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 216-8.}

Grandmaison held out at least the possibility of harmony between interiority and hierarchical authority, such that the believer “accepts control without feeling for all that restrained or unjustly constricted.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 68.} Newman’s hypothesis that a divine Power manifested itself in the voice of conscience bolstered Grandmaison’s sense of “the social nature of Christianity” in as much as it strengthened the expectation that Christianity had “a legitimate, infallible, and living authority.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologetique} 6 (1908), 28.}

There were many benefits provided by the hierarchy, whose purpose was to teach, lead, and sanctify the faithful.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1917), 139-40.}

The presence of the Spirit in legitimate authority was apparent in the Old Testament and in early Christianity. One of the first signs of the continuity of Christ and the new Church appeared after Pentecost in a certain continuity between Judaism and Christianity. Christ himself had submitted to the Law and the Temple worship. His disciples did likewise even after his death. As Jesus told the Samaritan woman, “Salvation is from the Jews (John 4:22).” “We see there a major application of organic continuity, of vital development.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1917), 141.} Throughout the Acts of the Apostles, a time

---

\begin{quote}
Au lieu de cela, j’ai dû souvent plaider la cause de cette dernière force, la moins agréable, la moins sympathique, celle que tous ses bienfaits et son inévitable nécessité ne parviennent pas à absoudre près des esprits enivrés d’indépendance, ou sourdement travaillés d’orgueil et de particularisme.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1918], 67-8.)
\end{quote}
of full and almost constant effusions of the Spirit, in the epoch of charisms, miracles, and inspiration of all the faithful, there existed a recognized authority which was definitive in matters of doctrine, disciple, and rites, incarnate in visible men who were appointed! To resist such an authority was to resist God; to not accept the right of these Pastors was to eliminate the flock of Christ!226

In spite of and because of Jewish opposition, the Church lived and grew as a sign that it was an autonomous community. The second sign of the continuity of Christ and the Church was that the foundations of the Church’s autonomy went back to Christ himself. As Jesus was the indispensable Revealer of the Father and the source and paragon of personal religion, it became clear eventually that the symbolism and value of the Law rested on Jesus. Hence, when the Christians were finally sundered from Judaism, they were truly free.

The apostles received extraordinary graces in part because they had special roles in the emergent Church. Such leaders began to be chosen by Christ during his earthly existence.

Jesus did not ordinarily address everyone equally and immediately. Universal Master, sole, fully authorized intermediary, and in a sense (by the effectiveness of his intervention), unique, between his Father and men, he will substitute for himself in the preaching and the distribution of graces, certain selected people who are delegated and provided thereby with considerable powers. In short, Christ intended to have between his Father and souls ordinary, authorized intermediaries:—Him first, but not him alone.227

Many were chosen during Jesus’ ministry for various apostolic tasks, as the “implicit, but real and complete preparation, in the formal element (that of a distinct authority) of an autonomous

226 “d’effusion spirituelle plénière et quasi-constante, à l’époque des charismes, des miracles et de l’inspiration de tous les fidèles, il existe une autorité reconnue, définitive en matière de doctrine, et discipline et rites, incarnée en des hommes visibles, déterminés! Une autorité telle que résister, c’est résister à Dieu; ne pas connaître le droit de ses Pasteurs, c’est s’est éliminé du berceau du Christ!” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 141.)

227 “Jésus ne s’adressa pas ordinairement à tous, également et immédiatement. Maître universel, intermédiaire seul pleinement autorisé et, dans un sens (par l’efficacité de l’intervention), unique, entre son Père et les hommes, il se substituera dans la prédication et la distribution des grâces, certaines personnes choisies, déléguées et pourvues à cet effet de pouvoirs considérables. Bref, la conception du Christ comporte, entre son Père et les âmes, des intermédiaires ordinaires autorisés:—Lui d’abord; mais pas Lui seul.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 83.)
The fierce resistance that the apostles of the Church encountered also witnessed to their standing. In order to propagate the means of salvation, men were chosen to assist the apostles and their delegates. Their formation was the work of the Holy Spirit.

Grandmaison wrote of the co-existence in the early Church of a double series of charisms having to do with authority: those having to do with regular exercise of office, and those gifts received by the faithful immediately from God. The second category included the charisms such as the discernment of spirits, glossolalia, prophecy, inspired catechesis (teaching), and healing, which attracted the notice and boosted the notice of witnesses. The spiritually eminent had a wide influence; in fact, these ministries were a kind of “hierarchie extraordinaire,” albeit a subordinate one, distinct from the regular apostolic hierarchy. But the bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit of Christ did not come without problems to be resolved. There were abuses associated with these gifts: the “danger of fanaticism, illusion, and deviation. From which came the necessity of discernment and control.” Paul exercised his apostolic authority vis-à-vis the members who were given these charisms (indeed, the ordinary authorities were charismatics of the highest order). In fact, Grandmaison concluded: “Authority, such as it was actually practiced in the Catholic Church,

---

was canonized in the practice and by the doctrine of Saint Paul.” In pointing out the criterion for authentic gifts (1 Cor. 12:3), Paul was doing theology and even psychology. His ministry showed that the two sets of charisms for authority were ordered in a hierarchy and were exercised in harmony.

John’s gospel made an even stronger case in some ways, in Grandmaison’s eyes, for the communal, hierarchical, and sacramental nature of the Church than did the synoptics.

There was the universality of Christ’s call (Jn. 12:20 ff.), the communion of the faithful (Jn. 11: 49-54) and the necessary mediation of the sacraments (Jn. 3:3ff., Jn. 6:51-57, Jn. 20:21-24). Second, there was the ecclesial communion that was visible and mystical (as in that of the vine and the branches in John 15; Jn. 17:20 ff.). Third, there was the mediation of the hierarchy (“implying the

238 Grandmaison, Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1917), 221.
239 “Fidèle à sa méthode antithétique (et parfois apparemment antinomique) l’évangéliste juxtapose avec une égale vigueur des notions complémentaires, sans se préoccuper de montrer leur convergence ou même leur compatibilité. Il est donc relativement aisé à nos adversaires, mais il n’est ni sage ni juste, d’accentuer le côté spirituel du quatrième évangile jusqu’à l’exténuation et presque l’annulation de l’élément d’autorité humain, providentielle et indispensable, entre l’Esprit de Dieu et le fidèle. Ce second élément est pourtant très reconnaissable, et même fortement accusé, à qui sait comprendre, dans l’œuvre johannique.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 138.)
necessity of a personal, priestly, and apostolic intermediary” [Jn. 10:11 ff., Jn. 13:1 ff.]). The apostles were also unsurpassable masters of doctrine, permanent organs of the Spirit. They assured the outpouring and control of the Spirit among the faithful. Finally, there was Peter, who was to assure “the unity of the flock and the stability of the ecclesial body.” As in the synoptics, the religion of Jesus overcame the apparent antimony of Spirit and authority. This arrangement promoted the genesis, sustenance, and flourishing of the individual personal religion of the faithful:

John unites that which many others wrongly separate or oppose, the two complementary conditions which assure to religious life its truth, effectiveness and force: on one hand, the purity of the spiritual element, without admixture of ‘flesh and blood,’ without a mélange of that which is base, shadowy, deceitful, illusory, fictive, without concession to that which is the ‘world,’ to that which is gross, bestial, diabolical, practically impermeable to the Spirit of God; and, on the other hand, the putting into real contact of real people (who do not have a pure spirit, but an incarnate spirit, a sensible, educable, and sociable being) by appropriate means and invested with a supernatural virtue, with the new and divine Life brought to the world by Christ.

John was especially dedicated to reconciling antinomies, especially, above all, that between the spirit and the flesh. One might have license from this observation to call the gospel according to John the anti-modernist gospel.

Grandmaison gave attention to the development of the ordinary hierarchy between about 60 to 110 A.D. because the hierarchy was an essential institution of continuity between Christ and the

---


243 “Jean unit ce que tant d’autres séparent ou opposent à tort, les deux conditions complémentaires assurant à la vie religieuse sa vérité, son efficacité et sa force: d’une part la pureté de l’élément spirituel, sans admixtion de ‘chair et de sang,’ sans mélange de ce qui est bas, ténébreux, mensonger, illusoire, fictive, sans concession à ce qui est le ‘monde,’ à ce qui est grossier, animal, diabolique, imperméable en pratique à l’Esprit de Dieu; et, d’autre part, la mise en contact réel de l’homme réel (qui n’est pas un pur esprit, mais un esprit incarné, un être sensible, éducable et sociable) par des moyens appropriés et investis d’une vertu surnaturelle, avec la Vie nouvelle et divine apportée au monde par le Christ.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 140.)
The authority expressed in the tri-fold ranks of bishop, presbyter, and deacon was received by the apostles from Christ. With the waning of the extraordinary charisms, the ordinary hierarchy assumed greater prominence. The important question raised by Grandmaison was: “all this beautiful order, keeping the faithful familial, is it truly the heir of the promises of Christ and of the Religion of the Spirit?” The question more specifically was whether the present ordinary hierarchy was in organic and legitimate continuity with Christ. Just as Jesus passed on the authority he received from his Father to the apostles, so “[n]ow, they transmitted this power themselves to ordinary, immortal [sic] ministers, heirs of their mission. It is the essential fact, the cornerstone on which was built the hierarchical Church of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.” The *a priori* basis of the argument was the indefectibility of the work of Christ, predicted by the prophets, and in a certain continuity with the Law. More important was the argument from the facts, attested to by the New Testament, of the institution of such a hierarchy from the beginning.

To this sparse literature, one could add the decisive witness of the churches—as recorded by bishops such as Pope Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, and as seen in the lists of bishops in the ancient churches that trace back to an apostle.

---


247 “Or, ce pouvoir, ils l’ont transmis eux-mêmes à des ministères ordinaires, immortels, héritiers de leur mission. C’est le fait essentiel, la pierre d’angle sur laquelle est construite l’Église hiérarchique d’hier, d’aujourd’hui et de demain.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1918], 41.)


249 “Concluons avec Mgr Duchesne, à sa façon un peu réticente et enveloppée: ‘Que l’épiscopat représente la tradition des apôtres, c’est une idée qui correspond exactement à l’ensemble des faits connus, etc.…qu’elles (les jeunes communautés chrétiennes) eussent un seul évêque à leur tête, ou qu’elles en eussent plusieurs, l’épiscopat recueillit la succession apostolique. Que par les apôtres qui l’avaient instituée, cette hiérarchie remontant aux origines mêmes de
How were the powers of office transmitted? There were three stages of the development of the hierarchy. First, there was the power of the apostles—“unlimited, ecumenical, immediate or delegated temporarily”—and the extraordinary, charismatic authorities, or those whose authority came from direct knowledge of Christ. Second, there developed presbyteral councils, whether delegated by apostles or accepted by them, and the ‘spiritual’ authorities, prophets and teachers, who assisted the presbyters. There was a chief presbyter who presided over the council of presbyters (who were also called bishops), and who by apostolic designation and by the imposition of hands received “the ordinary apostolic powers over a church or a group of churches.” Finally, at the end of the apostolic age, when the charism had weakened, the churches had expanded, and there were heresies to fight, “the division of powers was accentuated in the presbyterium.” Above the churches, more or less, was the authority of the great churches, and above all, the church of Rome, place of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul. To this history “honestly consulted,” Grandmaison added the special care that Paul had before his ‘consummation’ for the churches, the designation and formation of the clergy, and the guarding of the deposit of faith.

The first part of the second century was an especially fortunate time for the harmony of extraordinary charisms and legitimate authority. Although the age was poorly documented, not even the most demanding independent critics could deny the authenticity of the seven letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch. Were we dealing “with an inspiré, a ‘charismatic,’ an itinerant prophet greatly favored by the Spirit of God,—or a priest, a bishop, or a presbyter, a bishop, a pastor solicitous

---


251 Grandmaison, “Autorité et l'Esprit,” (1918), 44.

252 Grandmaison, “Autorité et l'Esprit,” (1918), 68.
above all to guard the unity among the faithful and to maintain the rights of the hierarchy?—It is
difficult to say, and that’s the beautiful thing about it!”\textsuperscript{253} Being all of these, “this champion of the
religion of the Spirit” was

the first theologian of episcopal authority and of the unity of the Church. He was the first
one we know of who joins the epithet of Catholic to the Church (Smyrn. 8). The Church
constitutes for him the ‘very system of salvation for all times, without excepting the past of
the history of Israel,’ [Henri de Genouillac, L’Église chrétienne au temps de saint Ignace d’Antioche
{Paris: Beauchesne, 1907}, 106] and this Church was the hierarchical Church.

For [Ignatius of Antioch], the great Church was the continuous and permanent Incarnation
of the Son of God; and it is the bishop who is each church, member of the body of Christ, and
Stone [Pierre] of the universal cathedral!\textsuperscript{254}

Ignatius’ witness was all the more a confirmation of the primacy of the bishop given Grandmaison’s
predilection for the heroism of martyrdom.

Another important second-century witness to the hierarchy was St. Irenaeus of Lyons—“the
premier apostle of his epoch.”\textsuperscript{255} His witness was of special importance because he was reported to
have sat at the feet of Polycarp, disciple of John. Irenaeus was an equally strong extoller of the gifts
of the Spirit as he was of the hierarchy.

Ultimately one must remember that Irenaeus, far from being a blind partisan of authority,
was a spiritual in the strongest sense of the word. If he is severe with the Gnostics, he is, as
the enemy of troubled exaltations and of a false enveloping mysticism, all the more inclined
to praise and exalt the works of the Spirit, to proclaim their excellence, to recall that every
good flows from the great Consoler.\textsuperscript{256}

\textsuperscript{253} “à un inspire, à un ‘charismatique,’ à un prophète itinérant tout envie de l’Esprit de Dieu,—ou à un presbytre, à un
evêque, à un pasteur soucieux avant tout de garder l’unité entre les fidèles et de maintenir les droits de la hiérarchie? —Il
est difficile de le dire, et là est le beau!” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1918], 69.)

\textsuperscript{254} “le premier théologien de l’autorité épiscopale et de l’unité de l’Église. C’est lui qui, le premier que nous sachions,
joignit l’épithète de catholique à l’Église (Smyrn. 8). Pour lui, l’Église constitue le système même du salut dans tous les
temps, sans en excepter le passé de l’histoire de l’Israël,’ et cette Église, c’est l’Église hiérarchique.
La grande Église, c’est pour lui [Ignatius of Antioch] l’Incarnation continuée et permanente du Fils de Dieu; et chaque
église, membre du corps du Christ, Pierre de la cathédrale universelle, c’est l’évêque” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,”
[1918], 69.)

\textsuperscript{255} Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 72.

\textsuperscript{256} “Enfin il faut se souvenir qu’Irénée, loin d’être un aveugle partisan de l’autorité, fut un spirituel au sens le plus fort du
mot. S’il est sévère aux gnostiques, ennemi des exaltations troubles et d’un faux mysticisme enveloppant, il n’en est que
The “Letter on the Martyrs of Lyons” of 177 presented the ideal of the martyr with as little pride as possible on the part of the martyr. The entire account was permeated with exaltation, a mystical tone, sweetness, and good sense. “Such is witness.” For Irenaeus, there was only one Church, the Catholic Church—else one would divide Christ. All the churches had but one heart and soul, one mouth, one Tradition, one faith. As the Church was holy, or the receptacle of holiness, “there was, normally and regularly, no Christ or Holy Spirit outside of the Church.” All charisms of the Holy Spirit, including those of office, are lifeless and lead to evil outside the Church: “Because where there is the Church, there is the Spirit of God; and similarly, where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace—and the Spirit is truth.” The Church was apostolic and Roman. Irenaeus also presented an intriguing argument for the need for the greatest, the most ancient, and universally known Church, that of Rome: it would be impossible to trace back the lists of all the churches to the apostles. The primacy of Rome permitted the faithful to have recourse constantly to the apostolic authority.

Could one doubt, Grandmaison asked, that Irenaeus presented these views as the rule of faith, that we saw the emergence of ecclesiastical authority? Renan himself, noting the heresies of Irenaeus’ time that threatened to divide the Church, could not help writing: “the Church is for the whole world, not the privilege of an aristocracy…Therefore, there are the perfect and the imperfect

---


in the Church; all can take part in it. The martyr, the young, and the celibate are excellent things: but one can be a Christian, and a good one, without heroism.”

It was remarkable that for all the attention that Grandmaison gave to the hierarchy in itself, there was very little trace—if any—of hierarchical triumphalism in his Christology and ecclesiology. “The apostles worked within the respect, or, better, in the cult of unity, in the submission to legitimate authorities—enfleshed nonetheless in men, sometimes all too human—in the visible communion maintained at the cost of hard sacrifices.”

“The Spirit and the Bride,” —the interior Master and the magisterium assisted by it—were to be docile and obedient to the voice of Jesus Christ wherever they discerned it. The hierarchy was essential to the constitution of the Church, as Jesus had created it, for the sake of the faithful.

In summarizing the article’s argument, Grandmaison claimed to have vindicated historically the spiritual and hierarchical traits of Catholic Christianity “anticipated in the Prophets, prophesied by Jesus, established by the Twelve and Paul, attested by their successors.”

this authority, far from extinguishing the Spirit or from extinguishing the direct, immediately divine, interior, and native (even if not autonomous) element of inspiration and life, furnished this element with a weight, a defense, and security. We have seen that she defends this element, in the present, against fanaticism and illusions in the proper sense and against fracturing into sects and opinions;—in the future, against loss, deviation and degeneration. …balancing in the Church the principles of regulation and inspiration, the Spirit and authority, [Christ] has conciliated our infinite aspirations and the needs of our human infirmity in an immortal harmony. Let us sacrifice nothing of what Christ has bestowed on

---

261 “[l’Eglise] est le chose de tout le monde, non le privilège d’une aristocratie…Il y a donc dans l’Eglise les parfaits et les imparfaits; tous peuvent en faire partie. Le martyr, le jeûne, le célibat sont choses excellentes; mais on peut sans héroïsme être chrétien et bon chrétien.” (Ernest Renan, Marc-Aurèle, 407, in Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1918], 74.)

262 “C’est dans le respect, ou, mieux, dans le culte d’unité, dans la soumission aux autorités légitimes—incarnées pourtant en des hommes et parfois bien humaines—dans la communion visible maintenue au prix de durs sacrifices, que les apôtres travaillent. En eux l’Esprit et l’Epouse,’ c’est-à-dire le Maître intérieur et le magistère assisté, ont des élèves dociles, parce qu’en tous deux, c’est l’écho authentique de leur unique Maître qu’ils discerner et auquel ils obéissent.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 622-3.)

us, and permit me to apply one of his sayings, said on a matter where liberty and authority should unite equally under pain of ruining one or the other—‘that which God has united, let no man put asunder’!264

This passage gathers up many themes that have to do with the personal religion of Jesus: nuptial imagery to describe the Spirit’s union with the Church, particularly the hierarchy; the believer and the hierarchy’s docility to the Spirit; evangelical liberty in harmony with Christ’s care for his Church; the balance of complementary aspects in the Church, and the dangers of disturbing it; and asceticism, and implicitly, a savor for the Cross that expresses itself in sacrificial service.

The Spirit exercised a liberating sway over the individual believer by conferring two kinds of gifts that went beyond those conferred at confirmation.265 First came the “great instincts of recollection, humility, abnegation, forgetfulness of self, zeal for souls, penitence, love of Christ and his Mother, that the interior Master inspires in all souls.”266 The second type, however, consisted of the inspirations rendered by the Holy Spirit that were particular to each person. Although the gifts of the first kind were more important than those of the second, the latter were essential for the believer to find his way to God. The Church’s teaching and ecclesiastical authorities promoted Christian freedom of spirit for mystics as well as for theologians, in so far as both were able to apply both sets of criteria.

---

264 “cette autorité, loin d’étendre l’Esprit, loin d’exténuer l’élément direct, immédiatement divin, intérieur et autochtone (bien que non autonome) d’inspiration et de vie, lui fournissait une matière, une défense, et sécurité. Nous avons vu qu’elle défendait cet élément, dans le présent, contre le fanatisme et les illusions du sens propre, et contre émiettement en sectes et en opinions;—dans l’avenir, contre la déperdition, la déviation, la dégénérescence. …équilibrant dans son Église les principes de règle et d’inspiration, l’Esprit et l’autorité, il a concilié, dans une harmonie immortelle, nos aspirations infinies et les besoins de notre humano infirmité. Ne sacrifions rien de ce que le Christ nous a légué, et permettez-moi d’appliquer une de ses paroles, dite en une matière où la liberté et l’autorité doivent également s’unir sous peine de se ruiner l’une ou l’autre—‘ce que Dieu a uni, que l’homme ne le sépare pas!’” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1918], 74.)

265 Grandmaison, Conférences, 48-50.

266 Grandmaison, Conférences, 48.
The revelation guarded and transmitted by Catholicism through dogma and the magisterium helped believers to cultivate these gifts for the benefit of all. The discernment of spirits was impossible without the revelation communicated by dogma and by the pastoral guidance of the clergy. Discernment was not a free-wheeling affair. It required first principles: the discerner could not presume to discern the content of Revelation itself. Ecclesiastical authority was meant to safeguard divine saving truth and the holiness of believers by formulating and passing on the parameters for this discernment.

This attitude of ecclesial docility was summed up by what Ignatius Loyola called “sentire cum ecclesia.” Such an attitude was expressed well in a talk given by Abbé Alfred Baudrillart, rector of the Institut Catholique at Paris, at the fourth congress of the Alliance des grands séminaires on July 23, 1909.

“Sentire cum ecclesia, the conformity with the spirit of the Church, what force, sweetness, and joy, but what a necessity for a priest who teaches! We shall accept with goodwill the decisions of the Holy See,—but, of course, without putting infallibility where it is not, without regarding every decision as definitive,—but without seeking to pass through loopholes, without pretending that a particular measure does not apply to us, that it concerns only a peril that is more or less imaginary, a doctrine that was not well presented, without having recourse, in a word, to these thousand subterfuges which we observe that people use all the time to lessen, to almost practically annihilate the weight of the decrees of the Pope.”

---

267 “grands instincts de recueillement, d’humilité, d’abnégation, d’oubli de soi, de zèle des âmes, de pénitence, d’amour du Christ et de sa Mère, que le Maître intérieur inspire à tous ces fidèles, et qui sont, pour ainsi, classiques dans l’Église de Dieu.” (Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 192.)


269 SpEx [352]; Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 655-6.


271 “Sentire cum ecclesia, la conformité avec l’esprit de l’Église, quelle force, quelle douceur, quelle joie, mais quelle nécessité pour un prêtre qui enseigne! Accepterons de bon cœur les décisions du Saint-Siège,—sans mettre l’infaillibilité où elle n’est pas, sans regarder toute décision comme définitive, c’est évident—mais sans chercher à passer à travers les mailles, sans prétendre que telle mesure ne nous atteint pas, qu’elle ne vise qu’un péripé plus ou moins imaginaire, une doctrine qui n’a pas été bien présentée, sans recourir, en un mot, à ces mille subterfuges dont nous constatons qu’on se sert tous les
Sincere adherence without subterfuge had to be the basis of the attitude with which one received the pope’s teaching. True, one needed to properly delimit what was infallible about papal teaching. But the presumption clearly was in favor of the pope’s declarations. This sentiment was all the more necessary for priests who were professors. Baudrillart’s words were all the more forceful for having been declared two years after Pascendi.

The obedience that flowed from such discernment—or indeed from any decision made from a living faith—was not mere voluntarism. Grandmaison sought to rescue moral decision-making in a believer’s circumstances from the strictures of moralistic determinism along the lines of Kant’s practical philosophy. Such determinism deadened the Spirit. Personal religion was founded not so much on moral imperatives as on the truth. Against Kant, Grandmaison insisted that “is” did precede “ought”: the reality of the world itself dictated moral imperatives. One of the greatest defects of sentimental religion was that its weak attitude toward the truth made religion liable to the worst moral perversions. Without the absolute priority of the truth, freedom actually gave way to license.

A fundamental characteristic of the Holy Spirit was that he acted sweetly with the faithful when they sought to obey Christ. Grandmaison constantly warned the members of the Communauté Saint-François-Xavier against carrying out their duties in a way that did complete

jours pour atténuer, presque pour annihiler pratiquement la portée des actes du Pape.” (Grandmaison, “Enseignement catholique,” 427.)

272 Grandmaison, Retraites, 281-3.

273 Grandmaison, Dernières retraites, 254.


275 Grandmaison, Conférences, 281-3.
violence to themselves. In general, “the Spirit that guides the Church carries it along thus in a way diametrically opposed to the rigorism which chilled so many of the faithful at the beginning of the nineteenth century.” The submission to legitimate authority was meant to lead to an obedience that was spontaneous. This doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit was yet another proof that Catholicism inculcated a Spirit of freedom, and not of slavery. The union of the affective and the intellectual that modernists yearned for, but which in so many instances eluded them, was a reality in Catholicism.

Discernment was also needed by the theologian. The practice of this charism was one way to help the Catholic thinker to acknowledge both the objectivity of dogma and the affectivity of human experience and to form a bridge between them. Grandmaison wrote or spoke of the lack of such discernment as the cause for much of modernist and integrist error. This lack of suppleness afflicted those who were trying to be orthodox. For example, he lamented that young scholars of both stripes often erred in thinking that certain received positions had to be definitive. Such a mistake then set up a false dichotomy in their minds between Church teaching and the truth. Grandmaison’s method of presenting modern thought involved discerning the birth and destiny, and the fruits of ideas. Presupposing false dilemmas could then lead an intellectual to reject his faith. All individual experience—and thought—needed to be discerned.

276 Grandmaison, *Conférences*, 60-5; *Dernières retraites*, 194.

277 “Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 998.

278 Grandmaison, *Conférences*, 65.

279 Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 217.


Asceticism vis-à-vis Mysticism

As seen in chapters one and two, the interest in contemplation and in particular mysticism was especially prominent during the modernist era. But there was also much discussion about the value of asceticism. As a fundamental condition for sanctity, asceticism was traditionally understood in Christianity as the active progress in discipleship in three stages “of purification, elevation (but here ascesis is only a condition), and of transformation.”282 (One can recognize in these steps the more traditional categories of the purgative, illuminative, and unitive stages of spiritual growth.) In the eyes of the progressistes such as Grandmaison, the modernists generally tended to devalue ascetic practices vis-à-vis the practice of contemplation.

The Church’s authoritative mystics experienced the full extent of God’s transcendence as Pascal’s yawning double abyss between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of his creature. Knowledge of this double abyss was the most important experiential knowledge, the highest wisdom that the mystic could convey.283 Such experiential knowledge was available, even necessary for the apostle, and, by extension, for the believer.284 Such an insight was an essential part of the fear of the Lord, the beginning of all wisdom.

In calling Catholics to Christian asceticism in the letter to Cardinal James Gibbons Testem benevolentiae nostrae,285—“a magnificent apology of traditional asceticism”286—Pope Leo XIII had

---

284 Grandmaison, Retraites, 4-5.
reminded Catholics of what was, in Grandmaison’s estimation, the surer way to sanctity. Asceticism was tied to other aspects of the social cohesion of the faith: “Principle of doctrinal cohesion: intransigence; principle of social cohesion: the hierarchy.” Attempting to avoid the errors of Pelagianism and Quietism, Grandmaison praised the passive virtues that Pope Leo XIII had defended so vigorously in *Testem benevolentiae*. Christian ascesis was superior to that found in stoicism or Buddhism, as ascesis was based for Christians on God’s goodness, not justice. Modern psychologists had tried to secularize these virtues—with the exception of William James, the only contemporary psychologist to give spiritual writers the respect they deserved. Practice of the sacraments, especially confession, held pride of place in cultivating such ascesis. The first virtue of mortification was penitence.

For Grandmaison, focusing on asceticism in his pastoral work counteracted an obsession with religious experience and mysticism, which carried within it the threat of the dissipation of the self in quietism. Catholicism respected the necessity and efficacy of human agency as well as the need for grace for virtuous human action. Although contemplative prayer could be a great help in one’s spiritual journey, a believer could make spiritual progress without the extraordinary graces of

---

289 Grandmaison did recognize in some forms of Buddhism a resemblance to the quality of grace inherent in Christian penance; Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 (1913), 35n1.
293 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 (1913), 35.
mystical prayer. Spiritual progress did not come easily or naturally. Thence came the need for asceticism, which all of the great world religions acknowledged as essential for personal religion.\textsuperscript{296} Ascetical practices did dispose one to receive higher graces in prayer. But the goal of these graces was to make the believer as Christ–like as the grace of God permitted.

Asceticism included embracing the passive virtues.\textsuperscript{297} In the controversies of Grandmaison's time about asceticism, modernist versions of personal religion had failed to temper optimism about human nature:

Forgetting the persistence in man of the beast which, if it is tamed in certain cases, charmed by the soul and bubbling over with ardor for the service of the good, nevertheless remains in power and always needs to be disciplined,—some overly optimistic Catholics denounce mortifying penance, the perpetual bonds of vows, and the passive virtues of renunciation as mere survivals, impediments, at best forerunners of the Reign of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{298}

The active pursuit of virtue required penitence and mortification.\textsuperscript{299} One of the insistent themes of Grandmaison's spiritual talks and writings was that of self-abnegation. In fact, he would often warn his charges that they were to avoid self-love, self-will, and self-interest;\textsuperscript{300} the regret of these denials of sacrificial love would exact its toll in purgatory.

\textsuperscript{295} Grandmaison, “Vie religieuse,” 138.

\textsuperscript{296} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 33.


\textsuperscript{298} “Oubliant la persistance dans l'homme, de la bête qui, si elle est à de certains instances domptée, charmée par l'âme et toute frissonnante d'ardeur au service de bien, demeure pourtant en puissance et a toujours besoin d'être disciplinée,—certains catholiques trop optimistes dénonçaient la pénitence afflictive, les liens perpétuels des vœux, les vertus passives de renoncement, comme des survivances, des entraves, tout au plus des avant-coureurs du Règne de l'Esprit.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1004.)

\textsuperscript{299} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 47.

\textsuperscript{300} SpEx, [189]. In fact, the greatest utility of the highest states of mysticism for Grandmaison lay in that “ces expériences divines détachent du crée, des intérêts personnels, des reprises égoïstes. Elles atteignent et consument ces racines d'amour-propre et d'estime de soi qui sont le dernier adversaire de Dieu dans une vie. Moyen d'une efficacité souveraine, ces grâces ne sont pourtant qu'un moyen.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 [1913], 333-4.)
Virtues essential for the apostolic life such as zeal were weakened without the priority of the passive virtues. Moreover, such virtues were applications of “a law whose intransigent support is the glory of Christian morality: do no evil for the sake of good; never buy success by breaching a certain moral law; the end does not justify the means!”

Thus, virtues such as “renunciation, meekness, humble abnegation, obedience, and poverty” were valuable in themselves as acts of heroism. If the Church had privileged the active virtues, it would have risked “misunderstanding Christ as the Church has always loved him, the Christ who is sweet and humble of heart, the humbled and annihilated Christ, the Christ obedient to death on the Cross.”

The cultivation of the passive virtues was a pillar of personal religion because it kept alive the Church’s and the Christian’s likeness to Christ.

As seen in chapter one, the most important quality of Grandmaison’s spirituality was reserve. But the archetypal form of religion for Grandmaison was fundamentally apostolic. Hence, reserve should be understood not as reticence, but as discerning piety, the self-effacing availability of the apostle, who was ready at a moment’s notice to deny his very self and reach out in service of his neighbor. The quality implied a connection with another quality that Grandmaison valued highly: balance. Every worthy thought and action of an apostle needed to manifest a balance between opposing tendencies.

Grandmaison’s own comportment embodied this reserve: according to a

---

301 “une loi dont le maintien intransigeant est la gloire de la morale chrétienne: ne pas faire le mal pour qu’un bien en arrive; ne jamais acheter une réussite pour un acroc donné à une loi morale certaine; la fin ne justifie pas les moyens!” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 [1913], 44.)

302 “méconnaître le Christ tel que l’Église l’avait toujours aimé, le Christ doux et humble de coeur, le Christ humilié et anéanti, le Christ obéissant jusqu’à la mort de la Croix.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, retreat talk for the Communauté Saint-François-Xavier, October, 1911, in Lebreton, Grandmaison, 307.)

303 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 308-9; Lebreton, Grandmaison, 182-3.


305 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 134 (1913), 308.

306 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 321.
member of the Saint Francis Xavier Community, he was “at once so austere and so human, so severe and so delicately reserved and so candid.” 307 Moreover, the personal religion of the apostle is full of reserve in its exterior manifestations: nothing to attract the eye, nothing emphatic or bizarre. It entails effort that is very alert, even instinctive, to dissolve itself into the mass of the faithful, not distinguish oneself from others…. it is ordinarily short, rapid, discontinuous: these are lively and frequent sparks rather than a constant and gleaming flame. 308 Such reserve was also the nexus of many of the passive virtues of the apostle, such as disappropriation, so as to issue in “the gift of self.” 309 The Christian needed to comport himself thus “effortlessly, with an elegance that is in the supernatural order what distinction is in the natural order.” 310 All these traits were oriented toward action and love for Christ.

Personal religion took into account the thorny problems that could arise in the relationship between works and faith, between the active and contemplative dimensions of personal religion. 311 Grandmaison was no quencher of the Spirit. Even given his propensity to make necessary qualifications, he held mystics and mysticism in high esteem. He revered the experience of the mystical dark night of the soul. 312 As mentioned above, he even went as far as to espouse the


308 “est plein de réserve dans ses manifestations extérieures: rien qui tire l’œil, rien de souligné ni de bizarre. Effort très sensible, bien qu’instinctif, pour se fonder dans la masse des fidèles, pour ne se distinguer pas les autres….elle est ordinairement brève, rapide, discontinue; ce sont de vives et fréquentes étincelles plutôt qu’une flamme égale et luisante.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 134 [1913], 308.)


contested view that more people were called to some form of mystical prayer than was commonly acknowledged.313

The essence of mystical experience was an immediate experiential knowledge of God.314 In mystical encounters with God, one saw him personally.315 There God showed himself especially to be truly God, rather than the god deplored by Pascal, the god of the philosophers and scientists.316 Such prayer, an unmerited grace, did not make mystics doctors of the truth, but saints.317 Christian mystics had a role in the expression of doctrine:

That which is seen by philosophers as spirit or theorem becomes, for mystics, blood, life, and thought. They thereby have a role to play in theology that is not really normative, but expressive and complementary. They admirably deploy, by having penetrated and felt them, the truths that they hold in common with all other Christians instructed in their faith. 318

Grandmaison did not see mystics as an exclusive elite, as Tyrrell did: one did not have to be a mystic to be in possession of the whole truth of the faith. Nonetheless, mystical experience helped to slowly substitute “a cordial knowledge, assimilated to its divine object, and of the kind that Saint Thomas called ‘connaturalit’y” for the cold conceptual knowledge in which even an impious person can share.319 Mystical experience properly enjoyed and appreciated enabled one to become a partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1: 4).

313 Grandmaison, “Vie religieuse,” 140.


318 “Ce qui est, chez les philosophes, vue de l’esprit ou théorème, devient chez eux chair et sang, vie et pensée. Par là, ils ont un rôle, non sans doute normatif, mais expressif et complétif, à jouer dans la théologie. Ils utilisent admirablement, pour les avoir pénétrées et senties, les vérités dont ils partagent la connaissance avec tous les chrétiens instruits de leur foi.” (Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 207.)

319 “Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 317. See also Grandmaison, Conférences, 12.
Catholicism’s esteem for mysticism went hand in hand with the priority of contemplative prayer over action.\textsuperscript{320} Such a priority freed the believer from a relentless activism. Indeed, Grandmaison was not ashamed to call his position “intellectualist,” in the Thomist sense, wherein action was subordinated to knowledge.\textsuperscript{321} The confidence in the human ability to know the truth was counterbalanced by a healthy sense of the limitations of human knowledge.\textsuperscript{322} Here Grandmaison’s Thomist epistemology, whereby the creature is understood to know God by his effects, guarded against any hint of illuminism.\textsuperscript{323} Such caution maintained a sense of the gratuity of divine revelation.\textsuperscript{324}

Modernism’s flight to mysticism in search of intellectual knowledge unwittingly sold short the truly excellent nature of authentic mysticism. Dogma and authentic mysticism were two very different things. Yet Grandmaison responded to modernism’s excessive attraction to mysticism and anti-dogmatism with an insight that met modernism halfway.

[T]here is such a difference between God known by the fine point of the spirit, by the merely intellectual faculty, ‘the God of the philosophers and the scientists,’ perceived negatively as distinct from all that is not him, infinite and incomprehensible; positively, as Being, Beauty, supreme Goodness,—and the same God, when one senses the immense attraction to him, when one tastes his adorable mercy, when one hears at the bottom of oneself this voice so different from others! Up until then, there was—or so it seemed—only a resemblance of vital assimilation, a kinship that is discovered, between this pure spirit and our miserable, abstracting spirit that thinks by means of images and is immersed in the sensible.\textsuperscript{325}

\textsuperscript{320} Grandmaison, “Vie religieuse,” 140.

\textsuperscript{321} Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme? Réplique de notre collaborateur,” Bulletin de littérature scolastique (Toulouse) 8 (1906), 24.

\textsuperscript{322} Grandmaison, Dernières retraites, 92.

\textsuperscript{323} Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1924), 460.

\textsuperscript{324} Grandmaison, Dernières retraites, 92.

\textsuperscript{325} “tant il y a de différence entre Dieu connu à la fine pointe de l’esprit, par la seule faculté intellectuelle, ‘le Dieu des philosophes et des savants,’ négativement perçu comme distinct de tout de qui n’est pas lui, infini, incompréhensible;
As much as dogma was important to the beginner in the faith, the experience of mystical union was a foretaste of the joys of heaven that surpassed the highest forms of intellectual knowledge.

The Catholic tradition helped one to locate the proper place of mysticism within the unity of Catholicism and within the mystic’s own life. Grandmaison reminded his readers that the value of extraordinary graces received in prayer was relative. Additionally, there were many ambiguities in contemplation and mystical experience. It was insufficient to immediately identify “the presence of a direct, felt sentiment of the Spirit of God, perceived by the human spirit both as transcendent and immanent” as Christian religious experience. Contemplation could be either a natural or a supernatural experience. Many of the practices that comprised natural mysticism—reflection, repose, meditation, and contemplation—could rightly be regarded as the antechamber to genuine, gratuitous experience of God. However, behind this natural mysticism, there often lurked a Pelagianism that did not acknowledge the necessity of grace or the rupture of sin. A Christian of good will practicing such prayer could reasonably expect some gracious return from the Lord. Even a person of good will who was not Christian might also hope for such a reward; Grandmaison acknowledged the existence of “naturally Christian” religious souls. Still, the gifts received in

positivement comme Être, Beauté, Bonté suprême,—et le même Dieu, quand on en sent obscètement l’immense attrait, quand on en goûte l’adorable miséricorde, quand on écoute au fond de soi cette voix, si différée des autres! Jusque-là il n’y avait, on a l’impression qu’il n’y avait, entre ce pur esprit et notre misérable esprit abstractif, pensant par images, immergé dans le sensible, qu’une ressemblance d’assimilation vitale, et comme une parente qui se découvre.”

(Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 [1913], 315.)

328 Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 197.
329 Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 204.
331 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 348.
mystical prayer, though usually requiring that one persevere in righteous living, were largely an overflow of the divine largesse; enjoying such graces was a mostly receptive activity.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Element mystique,” 198.}

There were other dangers to mysticism. Some experiences were not of God, but demonic. The believer’s personal religion could not thrive on prayer or faith that traded principally in the negation (removal) of kataphatic propositions and images. Such agnosticism was like purification that was taken to the extreme of dualism of body and spirit.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1924), 476.} Personal religion had to promote integration within the person, so that the spirit and flesh were one.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1924), 477. See also Grandmaison, Conférences, viii.} Even if the letter was dead without the Spirit, the Spirit could not exist without the letter. An overemphasis on the apophatic dimension of mystical experience could lead to quietism and vitiate purposeful moral engagement with the world.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 329.}

So the believer needed external and internal criteria for discerning truly Christian experience.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 329.} As the religion of the Spirit, Catholicism was able to provide these criteria, especially in the case of mystical experience. The first set, external ones, consisted of the similarity of one’s experience to that of the saints and “the perfect conformity of suggestions and views with the truths of the faith.”\footnote{Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 186.} Christian mysticism did not contradict fundamental doctrine.\footnote{Grandmaison, “Élément mystique,” 201.} An essential touchstone of genuine mystical experience was whether it led the believer to sense the double abyss
of his own unworthiness, and the sovereign sanctity of God, of the only Good, and the inaccessible
Good. True to his Jesuit calling, Grandmaison spoke as one who sought to be a contemplative in
action. But love was more important than consciousness all by itself. Faith itself was ordered to
charity. The fundamental worth of mystical experience for him was not so much the
communication of truth as the communication of the divine charity. All mystical prayer was first and
foremost an experience of the friendship of God. Ecstatic phenomena were not the essence of
mystical experience, but concomitant to “a unique act: the delicious contact, and (consulting the
impressions of the one experiencing it) without intermediary, of the first Love. There is no mystical
contemplation wherever this feeling of immediate presence is missing; there is mystical
contemplation wherever this feeling exists.” The proper response on the saint’s part to such an
extraordinary gift was love.

The second set of criteria had to with the spiritual fruit in the actual life of the visionary. In
place of self-love and vainglory, there should be humility, disgust for the passing things of this
world, an intense desire to endure redemptive suffering, and a desire to help to realize the kingdom
of God.

Although Grandmaison privileged contemplation over action, he also made it clear that
contemplative religious needed to perform good works to guard against illusions. Their prayer

---

342 “un acte unique: le contact savoureux, et (à consulter l’impression de celui qui l’éprouve) sans intermédiaire, de
l’Amour premier. Là où manque ce sentiment de présence immédiate, il n’y a pas, là où il existe, il y a contemplation
mystique.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 [1913], 328.)
supported the “actives” that cannot give the time to pray as much. Analogously, an apostle needed a certain indifference toward the works in which he was involved, lest egoism corrupt the apostle’s fundamental generosity. The truly holy mystic fused mysticism with charity, while avoiding the excesses or errors of either activism or mysticism.

True mysticism ultimately involved embracing the Cross. Ascesis and penitence were concrete forms of the Cross embraced by “the most authentic disciples of Christ.” A measured asceticism was the folly of the Cross in ordinary life. Indeed, mystics were heroic for seeking God in the trials of everyday life: “for all those who, striving to develop their personal religion, seek their Creator in the shadows in the dryness of daily tasks, for those who have experienced throughout the obscurities of faith a little of the divine sweetness and tasted, even for an instant, that ‘God alone is good,’ the mystics remain witnesses to them and in their rank.” In short the real mystic was attracted to the power of redemptive suffering. This sacrificial love (2 Cor. 1:3-8, 3:12; Col. 1:24; Jn. 15:12-13) could express itself in acts of intercession for others, and of reparation for the punishment due to the temporal punishment of their sins. This inclination was also expressed in virginity for the sake of the Kingdom and in bloody martyrdom.

---

347 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 92.
348 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 94, 343.
350 “pour tous ceux qui, s’efforçant de développer leur religion personnelle, cherchent leur Créateur à tâtons dans l’aridité des tâches quotidiennes, pour ceux qui, à travers les obscurités de la foi, ont éprouvé quelque peu de la douceur divine et goûté, fût-ce un instant, que ‘Dieu seul est bon,’ les mystiques restent, à leur et à leur rang, des témoins.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 [1913], 334-5.)
The humble, almost invisible way in which the saints embraced the Cross was further proof that Catholicism liberated rather than enslaved.\textsuperscript{352} What Grandmaison frequently called “Nietzschean naturalism” ultimately concealed egoism that fed off the will to power.\textsuperscript{353} The decisive motive for the heroism of the saints lay elsewhere, in the taste for the Cross.

Heroic ascesis, because in fact (and whatever the causes) the slide toward sensible pleasure and self-interest are rapid, so slippery, complete self-mastery being so rare, that it is necessary to go beyond the reasonable in order to stay there constantly: an oak branch bent in a direction and assiduously knocked about by a sea wind needs to be reigned in by force and stiffened in order to finally remain straight. ‘The saint is a creature, W. James says well, by his example, he reveals magnificently to humanity that, in order to attain its end, one must overrun the bounds of common wisdom.’ Nothing more need be said.\textsuperscript{354}

This heroism was necessary to satisfy the law of solidarity—expressed in Paul and John—that obtained for all the members of the Body of Christ.\textsuperscript{355} Grandmaison again left the last word to James.

‘On the stage of the world, heroism and heroism alone holds the great roles. It is in heroism, we know well, where one finds the mystery of life hidden. A man does not count when he is incapable of making any sacrifice…It is a mystery of which common sense itself has an intuition, that in embracing death, one lives life most highly, the most intensely, the most perfectly; this is a profound truth of which asceticism has always been the most faithful champion in the world. The folly of the cross preserves a profound and living meaning.’\textsuperscript{356}

\textsuperscript{352} Grandmaison, \textit{Dernières retraites}, 251.

\textsuperscript{353} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 51-2.

\textsuperscript{354} “Ascèse héroïque, parce qu’en fait (et quoiqu’il en soit des causes) la pente vers le plaisir sensible et l’intérêt propre est rapide, si glissante, la pleine maîtrise de soi si rare, qu’il faut aller au delà du raisonnable pour s’y tenir constamment: un rameau d’yeuse courbé dans un sens et assidûment battu par le vent de mer doit être ramené de force et roidi pour rester finalement droit. ‘Le saint est un créateur, dit très bien W. James, par son exemple, il révèle magnifiquement à l’humanité que, pour atteindre le but, il faut franchir les bornes de la sagesse commune.’ [James, \textit{Religious Experience}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 1908, 308] Je ne demande rien de plus.” (Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 [1913], 53.)

\textsuperscript{355} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 (1913), 54-5.

\textsuperscript{356} “Sur la scène du monde, c’est l’héroïsme et l’héroïsme seul qui tient les grands rôles. C’est dans l’héroïsme, nous le sentons bien, que se trouve caché le mystère de la vie. Un homme ne compte pas quand il est incapable de faire aucun sacrifice…C’est un mystère dont le bon sens lui-même a quelque intuition, qu’en embrassant la mort, on vit de la vie la plus haute, la plus intense, et la plus parfaite; profonde vérité dont l’ascéticisme a toujours été dans le monde le fidèle champion. La folie de la croix conserve une signification profonde et vivante.” (James, \textit{Religious Experience}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 1908, 312-3, in Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” \textit{Études} 135 [1913], 55-6.)
As will be seen in chapter four, this kind of heroism was an integral part of the witness of the personal religion that Jesus established.

D. Social Catholicism as a Development of the Social Dimension of Catholicism

According to Pierre Colin, in the modernist crisis, “the Biblical question is the point of the brush and the crystallization of a more global debate.”

Two other questions were raised: What was the relationship between the Church and the contemporary world, both in terms of 1) the Church as a whole and secular society, and more particularly, of the Church and state, and 2) what should be the laity’s involvement in the social life of the nation-state?

Bourget considered Grandmaison a mystic; but he also thought that Grandmaison did not isolate himself from the problems of his time. He recognized the rise of social Catholicism. But it was rooted for him in what should be a deeper matter, that is, in Christological doctrine. Bourget’s own Eucharistic devotion underlined the quintessentially social nature of Catholicism for Grandmaison, as the latter wrote in a letter addressed to Bourget.

The sacramental network of Christianity, this spiritual organism that establishes a solidarity, a kinship, a close communion, of which Christ is the divine artisan, between God and his friends, then among all the friends of God; worship in spirit and in truth founded on the Real Presence, there is the place where the thought of the master to whom the Revue hebdomadaire renders homage today takes delight.

357 Colin, Audace, 115.

358 Colin, Audace, 16.


360 “Le réseau sacramental du christianisme, cet organisme spirituel qui établit entre Dieu et ses amis, puis entre tous les amis de Dieu, une solidarité, une parenté, une communion étroite, dont le Christ est l’artisan divin; le culte en esprit et en vérité fondé sur la présence réelle, voilà où se complait avec prédilection la pensée du maître auquel la Revue hebdomadaire rend hommage aujourd’hui.” (Grandmaison, “Idées religieuses de Paul Bourget,” 294.)
Like his contemporaries, Grandmaison saw the question of the Kingdom of God in terms of “the ideal of the social reign of Jesus Christ.” Examining European Church history and French history in particular, he pointed to the reality of social Catholicism as an argument for Catholicism as the personal religion that Christ founded. Catholicism fulfilled man’s social nature in her engagement ad extra as well as her life ad intra.

*Social Catholicism as the Anticipation of the “Religious Destiny of Humanity”*

For Grandmaison, once set on the imitation of Jesus, Christians and Christian societies advanced in human perfection of all worthy kinds. Inversely, societies regressed when leaving the path of the gospel, It was possible that a secular ideology could be substituted for the ideal of the Kingdom of Heaven. In his study of the expectations of the Kingdom of God and in particular of a Messiah during the time of Christ, Grandmaison underlined the carnal, worldly infiltrations that corrupted the ideal as presented by the prophets. But the Kingdom envisioned by Christ was first religious and spiritual, and superseded all temporal ends, no matter how worthy.

The French Revolution had brought much evil: aided by Rousseau’s philosophy, it had in effect replaced the organic unity of Catholicism with the antinomy of the individual and the collective. Beginning with the appeal to “its religion of equality, its individualist furor,” it gave rise

---

361 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 950.
368 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 946.
to a detestable oligarchy and then to the omnipotence of Robespierre, then to another tyrannical oligarchy (the Directory) followed by the tyranny of an individual, Napoleon. Afterward, by way of reaction to “the rationalist and pietist individualism of the great Protestants of the eighteenth century,” there arose a thoroughgoing individualism, of Protestant origin, which would prolong itself in the social domain in economic liberalism,—evolutionist, positivist, and socialist reaction where the individual to different degrees is absorbed, dissolved, melts away into humanity,—such are the two poles between which separated thought floats helplessly in the 19th century. Is it surprising as a result that the social doctrine of the Kingdom of God takes pride of place in the Christian religion?

Economic liberalism was but a step away from totalitarianism. Only a robust social Catholicism could address this predicament.

There was good reason why the Church was in a sense the last refuge of the social wisdom of the human race.

In short, the conception of Christ implies ordinary, authorized intermediaries between his Father and souls:—Christ first, but not Him alone.

This is capital and argues against the atomistic, individualist conception of religious humanity such as the Protestant Reformation introduced from the start and such as liberal Protestantism pushed to its logical conclusion, and in favor of the familial, social, and Catholic conception, according to which the religious man, all the while keeping the honor and the responsibility of his ultimate destiny, is member of a body, son of a family, citizen of a homeland and of a heavenly Kingdom.

369 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 946.

370 “[I]ndividualisme conséquent, d’origine protestante, qui se prolongera sur le terrain social dans le libéralisme économique, —réaction évolutionniste, positiviste et socialiste où l’individu, à des degrés divers, s’absorbe, se dissout, se fond dans l’humanité,—tels sont les deux pôles entre lesquels flotte, désemparée, la pensée séparée, au xixé siècle. Quoi d’étonnant dès lors si la doctrine sociale du Royaume de Dieu passe, dans la religion chrétienne, au premier plan?” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 949.)

371 “Bref, la conception du Christ comporte, entre son Père et les âmes, des intermédiaires ordinaires autorisées—Lui d’abord, mais pas Lui seul.

Ceci est capital, et donne raison, contre la conception atomique, individualiste, de l’humanité religieuse, telle que l’admet dès le début la Réformation protestante et telle que la pousse logiquement à bout le protestantisme libéral, à la conception familiale, sociale, catholique, d’après laquelle l’homme religieux, tout en gardant l’honneur et la responsabilité de sa destinée ultime, est membre d’un corps, fils d’une famille, citoyen d’une patrie et d’un Royaume céleste.” (Grandmaison, ‘Autorité et l’Esprit,” 1917, 83-4.)
Grandmaison attempted to discern the value of the aspirations at the heart of the Revolution:

“Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité.”\(^{372}\) The first term, freed of the sense of license, was acceptable, while the second was positively “wicked.”\(^{373}\) However, the third term—enlarged in the Pauline spiritual sense of charity—was most admirable.

Catholicism provided the ideal form for social life as an antidote to the Revolution’s misguided egalitarianism. The social aspect of personal religion within the Church was in fact the true realization of the best sense of the Revolution’s ideals.\(^{374}\) Each believer found his place in Catholicism without being sacrificed to an impersonal collectivity.\(^{375}\) As reformer Comte Albert de Mun\(^{376}\) had recognized, the yearning of the masses of his day for freedom, seconded by French liberals and socialists, was really an implicit desire for the unity that only Christianity could provide.\(^{377}\)

As much as some aspects of Grandmaison’s valuation of the Church might seem to incline toward triumphalism, it is important to call to mind first the enormous duress that the Church endured under the secularist French government since the time of the Third Republic.\(^{378}\) The French government’s anti-Catholicism, moreover, continued well into the period after World War I. Anti-clerical administrations often blocked the extensive involvement of the Church in helping to rebuild

\(^{372}\) Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 958.

\(^{373}\) Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 958.

\(^{374}\) Grandmaison, “Albert de Mun,” 39.

\(^{375}\) Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 949.

\(^{376}\) Comte Albert de Mun (1841-1914), after a career as a soldier, was elected to office in the National Assembly. During his time there, and afterward, Mun exerted a wide, profound influence as a reformer who promoted social Catholicism.

\(^{377}\) Grandmaison, “Albert de Mun,” 39.

the nation. Second, Grandmaison was well aware that the argument he was making for the Church was not a self-evident one. One might respect the pope in a merely human way, but to respect him and the visible Church in general as authorized by Christ required faith. Moreover, as noted above, Grandmaison also balanced the Church’s successful visibility with a strong sense of the frailty of her members. In short, he sought with the mainstream of French Catholics—those who neither identified themselves tout court with either modernist or integralist calls for reform—to formulate an integral Catholicism that spoke to the aspirations of the time.

There was objective evidence, according to Grandmaison, that the Church had to some extent carried out the Spirit’s work of reconciliation and thereby helped to realize the unity of humanity (2 Cor 5: 18–19). Within the Church, Catholicism had been a blessing to the world in that Christian solidarity had transcended all particularism.

It is comprehensive, truly catholic…the Catholic Church taken as a whole is the institution that most resembles humanity. There is nothing in it of that confinement to a time and a place, of the ‘provincialism’ and ‘insularity,’ that distinguishes other Churches, and that renders them dear to their faithful only by restraining and diminishing what humanity the Churches have.

Some Protestants of his time were trying to recover this social dimension of Christianity, but were unsuccessful because they lacked the doctrine that helped to undergird it.

Grandmaison’s vision of social Catholicism included a heartfelt concern for ecumenism.

Protestants on the front and in the French seminaries avidly read articles from Études—among them,


381 “Elle est compréhensive, tant catholique…L’Église catholique prise dans son ensemble est l’institution qui ressemble de plus à l’humanité. Rien en elle de ce resserrement à un jour et à un lieu, de ce ‘provincialisme,’ de cette ‘insularité’ qui distinguent d’autres Églises, et ne les rendent chères à leurs fidèles qu’en restreignant, en diminuant ce qu’elles ont d’humanité.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1000.)

articles by Jesuits Dudon, Brière, and Grandmaison—as well as Christus.\textsuperscript{383} These publications also had the effect of giving Protestant pastors and theologians hope for reconciliation with Catholics. In reading the signs of the times, Grandmaison wrote: “what is new is a universal aspiration for union in a Christianity that has been sundered for a long time and cruelly so. The face of unity is so beautiful that it seduces even those whom religious individualism has most grimly locked up in religion that is \textit{exclusively} personal.\textsuperscript{384}” Morally and spiritually speaking, there was a desire, however implicit, for the unity that Christianity once provided in the West. Pastor Wilfred Monod remarked at the Universal Conference of Christianity in Stockholm in 1925:

‘What matters is reforming the Reform, and making an effort at concentrating and remembering; what matters is fighting against anarchy and having a proper sense for the decisive return to the principle of order and unity…In short, a return in the sense of the universality of catholicity…The Conference has wanted to break the current centrifuge of Protestant dispersion and scattering.’\textsuperscript{385}

In \textit{Jésus Christ}, Grandmaison called for an end, at the very least, to the various disputes that rationalism provoked among Christians and that violated the peace that was part of the person and mission of Christ.\textsuperscript{386}

The ethos of Catholicism in the West had helped to check the destructive tendencies of nationalism that had been at play since the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{387} The evils of nationalism had roots in religious error: they were unleashed by the Reformation, most notably by Luther, but even before

\textsuperscript{383} Flagéat, \textit{Les jésuites français dans la Grande Guerre}, 151.

\textsuperscript{384} “ce qui est plus nouveau, c’est, dans la chrétienté longtemps et cruellement déchirée, une aspiration générale à l’union. Le visage de l’unité est si beau qu’il séduit ceux-là même que l’individualisme religieux avait la plus farouchement verrouillés dans une religion toute personnelle.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 659.)


\textsuperscript{386} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 660.

him, by the Wycliffians and the Hussites. In breaking the unity of mankind, the Reformation had given rise to new forms of individual and national vainglory. But Catholicism’s realistic and compassionate understanding of human frailty had helped to prevent believers from demonizing their adversaries. Although Grandmaison deplored the alarming rise of German hegemony and of its actions in World War I, he did not consider Germany’s case to be monstrously unusual.

*Church as Servant of the Temporal Order*

Another question raised since the time of the French Revolution was that of the relationship of Christians and the secular order.

Nineteenth century Catholicism didn’t affirm the social principle only by a more intense and active sense of the unity of the Church. It (and this is a considerable fact that is partly new) became more clearly aware not only of offering in its communion the sole normal means of union with Christ, but also of being the only one to have the power to affirm on earth the faltering foundations of society. Not only did it say: ‘the true spirit of Christ is only in me; I am the sole legitimate sustainer of the Gospel’; it also said: ‘there is no society that can be firmly established outside of the principles of the Gospel, of which I am the depository.’ It did not only say: ‘it is by me alone that individuals can attain eternal salvation.’ It further said: ‘it is by me alone that societies can attain happiness, order, earthly peace, and that which might be called temporal salvation.’

Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) and Louis-Ambrose de Bonald (1754-1840) had tried to respond to the challenge of the Revolution; they reminded the French society of Grandmaison’s day that the idea of social Christianity was not born in their time. “Joseph de Maistre’s book *On the Papacy* marked less a point of departure than a decisive step.”

---

388 “Le principe social n’est pas seulement affirmé, dans le catholicisme du xixe siècle, par un sentiment plus intense et plus agissant de l’unité de l’Église. Celle-ci (et c’est là un fait considérable, en partie nouveau) a prise une conscience plus claire, non seulement d’offrir en sa communion le seul moyen normal d’union au Christ, mais encore d’être seule en puissance d’affirmer sur terre, les bases chancelantes des sociétés. Non seulement elle a dit: ‘le véritable esprit du Christ n’est qu’en moi ; je suis la seule continuatrice légitime de l’Évangile’; elle a dit encore : ‘il n’y a point de société solide et stable dehors des principes de l’Évangile, dont je suis dépositaire.’ Non seulement elle a dit: ‘c’est par moi seule que les individus peuvent parvenir au salut éternel.’ Elle a dit encore: c’est par moi seule que les sociétés peuvent parvenir au bonheur, à l’ordre, à la paix terrestre, à ce qu’on peut appeler leur salut temporel.” (Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 954.)

Napoleon and the Restoration unwittingly marked its death knell in Rome and among the more intelligent and active among the faithful. Unfortunately, de Maistre’s and Bonald’s writings did not receive a thorough hearing in their own time on account of various reasons: indifference and egoism, and even misunderstanding on the part of well-intentioned Catholics. But recent papal encyclicals had affirmed much of their teaching to the point that the idea of social Christianity was now accepted without opposition and with an unprecedented force. To sum up the change that had happened in Europe, Grandmaison wrote: “In this century of nationalities, the Churches became less national, and Catholic unity was tightened.” The international initiatives taken by the papacy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reinforced this claim.

Since the reign of Pope Leo XIII, the Holy See had provided much of the impetus for social Catholicism. The papacy had been a servant of the universal fraternity offered by the Church. Grandmaison was quite laudatory of papal encyclicals on social issues as far back as *Diuturnum Illud* (1881)—he only lamented that such encyclicals were far more admired than read. During the time of the Ralliement in France (1890-1898), Leo had urged Catholics to become more involved in French politics. Believing that Christ was Savior and Lord of all human societies, Leo had eloquently affirmed the independence of temporal power. “Although the Church, he wrote, directly and properly watches over the salvation of souls...nevertheless, even in the temporal order, it produces many very great goods, and it could cause even more of them if its final end were prosperity in this

---


391 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 954.


earthly life.” Such worldly effects were subordinated to a spiritual reality: the solicitude of Christ himself and the Church for temporal society. “If it was Leo XIII who affirmed most solicitously the independence of the temporal power in its sphere, it was also his writings which emphasized, defined, and enriched the doctrine of Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord of human societies.” Social doctrine, for Grandmaison, was rooted in and a fruit of Christology. The temporal good could only be safeguarded by the personal religion of Jesus in all three senses.

Grandmaison went on to specify the ways in which the Church’s social teaching represented a change in its practical orientation toward the world. There were three such developments.

First, “the Church has come to a deeper and a more certain awareness of its social mission in that which the Gospel calls the ‘present age.’ It is not, for all that, a novelty without roots in the most authentic tradition or that supplants ancient ideas. The Church has always believed in the glorious future that will close history.” Eschatological hope undergirded social Catholicism. The new emphasis on social Catholicism did not represent so much a change in doctrine as a change in attitude. A cursory reading of the history of the Church in its first days in the Acts of the Apostles was proof enough. This emphasis on social Catholicism might lead to an “attenuated millenarianism,”—and Rome had intervened when there were excesses. Nonetheless, Leo XIII had

---

395 “Bien que l’Eglise, écrit-il, regarde directement et proprement le salut des âmes..., pourtant, dans l’ordre même des choses temporelles, elle produit spontanément tant et de si grands biens, qu’elle n’en pourrait causer davantage, si elle avait comme fin principale la prospérité de cette vie terrestre.” (Leo XIII, Immortale Dei, [1], in Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 954-5.)

396 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 956.

thought it better not to curb this optimism that both the Gospel and this ideal encouraged in order to realize some of their aspirations.398

The second development concerning social teaching had to do with papal action concerning the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Having formed the project of consecrating, in 1900, the human race to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, Leo XIII asked himself if this sort of patronage which was being exercised on so many people who were not members of the Church either by baptism by water or by baptism by desire was theologically justifiable. He concluded in the affirmative, and the Encyclical of May 25, 1899 gave a kind of official consecration to an idea already expressed by Saint Thomas: everything belongs by right to Christ, even if he does not exercise the fullness of his power [ST III, 59, 4]. More recently, in the letter to the French bishops of August 25, 1910, Pius X declared: ‘To work for the reform of civilization is a religious work of the first order; because there is no true civilization without moral civilization, and no moral civilization without true religion.’399

This theological conclusion is the fruit in part of the Catholic understanding of the interrelationship of grace and nature.

Third, Pius X had been intensely engaged in peacemaking efforts before World War I.400 As co-editor of Nouvelles Religieuses, Grandmaison publicized the positive role played by the papacy in the secular world, especially in reconstructing postwar Europe.401

---


400 Léonce de Grandmaison, “Pie X et son oeuvre,” 433-51.

As seen in the beginning of this section, the Church’s and the individual’s involvement in temporal affairs—a necessary element of personal religion—found its foundation in large part for Grandmaison in the Church’s dogmatic intransigence. Quoting Pope Leo XIII’s *Immortale Dei*, Grandmaison noted that the unity of the Church was not only the result of sentiment but also of its doctrinal intransigence. Some of his contemporaries might have objected that the Church’s insistence on the immutability of dogma opened the door to a kind of gnosticism that held her aloof from true engagement with the world. If the possession of eternal truth was all that mattered, Catholicism would then be guilty of nullifying the value of history. Grandmaison was aware of this objection. But Catholicism’s valuation of dogma did not amount to gnosticism. Establishing the connection of doctrine and action had been a prominent concern for Grandmaison from the beginning of his career. As was noted in the last chapter, knowledge all by itself was not for him the measure of a purposeful human existence. The Church aimed to create not doctors, but saints. By their faithful following of Christ, the saints co-operated with God in realizing the Kingdom. The saints allowed the Church to cultivate the holiness whose ideal was charity, particularly in a fraternal sense.

The dogmatic intransigence of the Church was not oppressive, but, rather, played an essential, liberating role in the life of the believer. Working “in the Spirit” and “in Christ”—in the

---


403 Grandmaison, “Religion catholique,” 954-5.


407 Grandmaison, *Dernières retraites*, 82.
Church—assured the believer that his secular activity enjoyed the truth of the Gospel and the unction of the Spirit. Such liberty allowed them to be engaged confidently in the world.

Speaking plainly, the agnostic sentimentalism upon which modernism was founded can only be the fleeting passion of an age. Man knows well that rational action should rest, at bottom, on true certainty. He knows well that there is, at bottom, no split between the true and the good, and that transferring their junction to the infinite in the future is to do the worst injury to humanity. …After all, what engages us more profoundly than all considerations about religious sentiment, than all the exclamations about the profound life? Isn’t it to know if Jesus Christ is truly God?

The security of dogma gave the believer and the Church as a whole the confidence that the modernists sought to be engaged in the world at Catholics. The foundation and fruitfulness of social Catholicism was the truth that Christ was divine, as traditional Christianity had understood him to be.

This valuation of the Church’s mission to the world was reinforced by an expansive sense of the worldliness of the Church. As the personal religion that Christ had founded, she was not merely a closed society with its eyes turned solely toward heaven. Grandmaison himself was rightly credited for having opened Études, and through it, the Jesuits in France, to a more positive appreciation of the world in general and a more expansive engagement with society, in terms of culture, politics, and

---


410 “Pour parler sans métaphore, le sentimentalisme agnostique sur lequel le modernisme était fondé ne peut être que le fugitif engouement d’un temps. L’homme sait bien que l’action raisonnable doit reposer, au fond, sur la vérité certaine. Il sait bien qu’il n’y a pas, au fond, de coupure entre le vrai et le bien, et que de reporter leur jonction à l’infini dans l’avenir, c’est faire à l’humanité la pire injure. …Après tout, plus profondément que toutes les considérations sur le sentiment religieux, que toutes les exclamations sur la vie profonde, qu’est-ce qui nous intéresse? N’est-ce pas de savoir si vraiment Jésus-Christ est Dieu?” (Grandmaison, and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1006.)
social movements.\textsuperscript{411} Although the Church was not entirely worldly, there was a worldly dimension proper to her.

However, Grandmaison cautioned, the Church’s worldliness was not a carnal one that lost sight of her supernatural character. The authentic humanism that she promoted should never lose its specifically religious character. The Cross of Jesus Christ too was an inescapable part of social Catholicism: the Incarnation and the Redemption were one in the person of Christ.\textsuperscript{412} The fraternal communion bestowed in and through the Church came only at the price of blood, the reparatory expiation that is the highest expression of love.\textsuperscript{413} One had to die to self in order to live for Christ and for one’s neighbor.\textsuperscript{414}

\textbf{E. Conclusion}

The chapter reconstructed the outlines of Grandmaison’s Pneumatological argument for the Church as the personal religion of Christ and as the quintessential personal religion of the individual believer. The basic form of the argument was the demonstration of how Catholicism resolved one apparent antinomy after another. Such antinomies included divine transcendence and divine immanence, grace and nature, the collective and the individual, the stability and integrity of the deposit of faith and the dynamic development of doctrine, asceticism and mysticism, but most especially, ecclesiastical authority and the spiritual liberty of the Gospel accorded to the individual believer. Grandmaison showed how, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, principle of personal religion, Catholicism fulfilled the deepest and truest religious aspirations of humanity since time immemorial.


\textsuperscript{412} Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” (1926), 179.

\textsuperscript{413} Grandmaison, \textit{Vie intérieure}, 151.

\textsuperscript{414} Grandmaison, \textit{Dernières retraites}, 174, 193, 205.
The Spirit, the Interior Master, equipped Christians not only for vibrant participation in the Church’s life *ad intra*, but also for fruitful Christian discipleship in the world. Social Catholicism was yet more proof that Catholicism was the true fulfillment of the human aspirations for personal religion. As anticipation of the religious destiny of humanity, the Church was also solidly planted within the world as servant of the temporal order, and open to the presence of the Spirit within the world. Dogma helped to realize the reign of Christ in the world. The Church’s religious teaching, sealed by hierarchical authority, emboldened the Catholic laity to participate in civil society.

Grandmaison’s second apologetic response to modernism focused on Christology, on a modern defense of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, in the *DAFC* article and by *Jésus Christ* (1927). As shall be seen in the next chapter, Grandmaison did not leave behind his Pneumatological argument for Catholicism while focusing on Christology. Rather, Grandmaison’s Pneumatology informed his Christology, and vice versa. The question of the Church and the believer’s personal religion was taken up into the question of the identity and mission of Christ; the Holy Spirit was understood as witness to Christ through the members of his Body.
CHAPTER FOUR

Jesus Christ as Source and Exemplar of Personal Religion

This fourth chapter will present Grandmaison’s apologetic vision of Jesus Christ through the lens of personal religion. When Grandmaison conceived of his life’s project in the novitiate, that of writing a life of Christ, he had considered it from three perspectives: “Jésus préparé, Jésus sur terre, Jésus continué dans l’Église.” Jésus préparé referred to the anticipation of Christ’s coming by the Old Testament—and also to a smaller extent, by the ancient non-Christian world—and to the real continuity of the earthly Christ with the Israel of old. Jésus sur terre referred to the earthly life of Jesus. Jésus continué dans l’Église referred to the real continuity of the earthly Christ with the Israel of old, and with the New Israel, his Body, the Church.

The first section of this chapter gives an overview of how Grandmaison envisioned the aims, objectives, and strategy of his response to the challenge posed by modernism in the area of Christology. This will include an overview of his methodology, especially his use of the historical-critical method. This section will close with an overview of how personal religion was the integrating principle of Grandmaison’s Christology.

The second section will survey Grandmaison’s treatment of the sources for the life of Christ. The third section will give an exposition of the mystery, or personal religion, of Jesus. In many ways, this treatment represented the heart of Grandmaison’s Christology. The next two sections will then set forth his sketch of the implications of the personal religion of Jesus for the Church, the religion established by Christ, and the piety of the individual believer. An essential verification of the truth

---

1 Grandmaison treated this topic throughout his Christological writings, but especially in the earlier sections of the DAFC article and in the two-volume Jésus Christ. See Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1315-46, 1409-12; Jésus Christ, 2, 239-93, 295-305.
that Jesus was the long-awaited Messiah and the Son of God, for Grandmaison, was the witness that the Church as a whole and individual believers have given to Christ throughout the ages—*Jésus continué dans l’Église*. This witness was possible because the Church was consciously established by Christ during his earthly life. The fourth section of this chapter will deal with the interrelationship of Christ and the Church, while the fifth section will focus on the connections of Grandmaison’s Christology and the personal religion of individual members of the Church. It will also be shown throughout how Grandmaison’s personal religion integrated Pneumatology into his Christology.

A. The Aims, Objectives, and Strategies of Grandmaison’s Christology

*Jésus Christ (1927) vis-à-vis the DAFC article (1914)*

Grandmaison’s two main Christological works were separated by about thirteen years. There were differences between them. As will be seen below, there were a few elements and insights in the article that are obscured in the two-volume work. The methodological preface of the 1914 article was omitted in the 1927 work. Nonetheless, although the DAFC article presented a substantial synthesis, it was only a point of departure for the author.² A singleness of purpose and greater richness characterized the later work. More attention was given in *Jésus Christ* to establishing the basic veracity of the text of the gospels. The later work described the gospel milieu more fully and incorporated material contained in other articles before and since the DAFC article.

The Trinitarian form of the witness to the divinity of Christ was more evident in the titling of the DAFC article than in the two-volume work. The titles of the third to sixth chapters of the article all began with the word Testimony. The corresponding books in the 1927 work were entitled: Jésus—Le Message; La Personne de Jésus; Les Oeuvres du Christ; and La Religion de Jésus Christ.

---

² Lebreton, *Grandmaison*, 404-5.
This division in the later work obscured the insight that the divinity of Jesus involved his relationship with the Father and the Spirit. But the truth of the Spirit’s witness to the Son figured strongly too in the two-volume work.

It seems that by changing the titles of the several sections, Grandmaison wanted to place more emphasis on the witness of Jesus to himself. The later portrait of the personal religion of Christ attempted to maintain the interconnection of truth and truth-bearer.

In 1915, the old professor of apologetics was not yet liberated from his method; his work is a demonstration in form, exposing the witness of Christ and his evidences, prophecies, miracles, and above all his resurrection. All these arguments are excellent, and one finds them developed and enriched in his posthumous work; but there they are illuminated by a livelier light; the progressive development of Christ’s teaching is more faithfully retraced (II, pp. 1-76); his person is described sooner (pp. 77-119) as is his influence (pp. 533-660). In his earlier article, the author had already traced a portrait of this divine model that all his readers recalled; he had placed in it all his faith and love, and also all his natural gifts, as he strove to render this unique beauty of the soul of Christ, this transparent simplicity where the divine light radiated. One finds again these traits making live before us once again the One whom the apostles saw and loved, the One whom the heavenly Father shows to all of humanity: he is the bread of life, the light, the truth; Christian apologetics has no other aim but to reveal to us the sovereign attraction of the beloved Son; God himself cannot present a more decisive motive to our intellect, nor a more powerful charm for our heart.³

It is clear from this passage that whatever the later work may have lost by re-titling, it gained by the much larger fourth book, which concentrated more directly on the personal religion of Christ.

There were many more common elements than differences between the two works. The Christological argument proceeded along very similar lines in both works. Take for example the

³ “En 1915, l’ancien professeur d’apologétique ne s’est pas encore libéré de sa méthode; son oeuvre est une démonstration en forme, exposant le témoignage de Christ et ses preuves, ses prophéties, ses miracles, et surtout sa résurrection. Tous ces arguments sont excellents, et on les retrouve dans l’ouvrage posthume, développés et enrichis; mais ils y sont éclairés d’une lumière plus vive; le développement progressif de l’enseignement du Christ est plus fidèlement retracé (II, pp. 1-76); sa personne est décrite de plus près (pp. 77-119) et aussi son influence (pp. 533-660). Dans son article déjà, l’auteur avait tracé de ce modèle divin un portrait que tous ses lecteurs se rappellent; il y avait mis toute sa foi, tout son amour, et aussi tous ses dons naturels, s’efforçant de rendre cette beauté unique de l’âme du Christ, cette simplicité transparente où rayonne la lumière divine. On retrouve ces traits à faire revivre devant nous Celui que les apôtres ont vu et aimé; Celui que le Père céleste montre à l’humanité tout entière: c’est le pain de vie, c’est la lumière, c’est la vérité; l’apologétique chrétienne n’a pas d’autre but que de nous révéler cet attrait souverain du Fils bien-aimé; Dieu lui-même ne peut proposer à notre intelligence de motif plus décisif, ni à notre cœur de charme plus puissant.” (Joseph Huby, “Bulletin d’histoire des origines chrétiennes,” RSR (1927), 424-5.)
sequence of topics. Both began with a survey of the non-Christian and Christian sources of the life of Christ. This was followed by an evocation of the Gospel milieu; a section on the witness that John the Baptist bore to Christ and on the witness that Christ renders to the Father in his message; and a section on Jesus’ witness to himself. (The two introductory sections on the sources of the life of Jesus and the Gospel milieu were enlarged in the later book.) Grandmaison evoked the mystery of Jesus vis-à-vis the Father, his fellowmen, and himself. He also confronted the various objections that have been proposed against Christ since his life on earth, especially since the Renaissance. Then, fifth, came an exposition of the proofs of Christ’s divinity: his works (e.g., prophecy, miracles) and the Resurrection. Finally, and sixth, there was a section on the witness of the Holy Spirit and the Church to Christ.

Grandmaison attempted to present the personal excellence of Christ as manifested in the gospels. This would dispel what he judged to be an obsession with the historical credibility of the Scriptures. More positively, the DAF article and the longer Jésus Christ sought at points to evoke an encounter with the historical Jesus—the one and the same Risen Christ proclaimed by the Church. Grandmaison’s personal portrait of Christ began from his humanity so as to arrive ultimately at

---

4 These are designated by chapter headings in the DAF article, and as books in the two-volume work.

5 Grandmaison, DAF, 1295-1315; Jésus Christ, 1, 1-236.


7 Grandmaison, DAF, 1337–48; 1374-1400 Jésus Christ, 1, 295-410.

8 Grandmaison, DAF, 1348–74; 1400-4; Jésus Christ, 2, 1-222.


10 Grandmaison, DAF, 1404-514; Jésus Christ, 2, 223-532.

11 Grandmaison, DAF, 1514-34; Jésus Christ, 2, 533-633.
evoking his divine glory, a glory evident both from his own merits and in the history of the Church.\textsuperscript{12}

Grandmaison’s portrait of Christ’s soul reflected a traditional aesthetic sensibility. Christ’s superior humanity and the fact of his divinity were manifested in part by the beauty of his personal religion. There were two qualities of beauty mentioned most often since the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{13} The first class of qualities had to do with proportion, expressed as propriety, shapeliness, fittingness, and balance. The second category of aesthetic criteria had to do with the notion of clarity, also expressed as brilliance, luminosity, and radiance. Thomas too mentioned both categories as criteria of the beautiful.\textsuperscript{14} But he sometimes added a third criterion of which Grandmaison also made extensive use, that of integrity (completeness, wholeness, and perfection).\textsuperscript{15} Using these three criteria, Grandmaison wrote: “The riches of the Gospel, in so far as they can be inventoried, find their order, balance, and completion in the incomparable limpidity of this soul.”\textsuperscript{16} It will be seen below how limpidity was an apt summary of the personal religion of Christ.

*Aims and Objectives*

The main task of Grandmaison’s Christology was to represent, uphold, and reanimate belief in the traditional Catholic dogma that Jesus was divine. By engaging with the quest for the historical Jesus in modern terms, Grandmaison had to involve showing that the Christ of the New Testament

\textsuperscript{12} Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1535.


\textsuperscript{14} Thomas, *ST*, II-II, 180, 2, ad 3.

\textsuperscript{15} Thomas, *ST*, I, 39, ad 8.

\textsuperscript{16} “Les richesses évangéliques, pour autant qu’on peut sommairement les inventorier, trouve leur ordre, leur équilibre et leur achèvement dans l’incomparable limpidité de cette âme.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1391.)
was also the Christ of dogma proclaimed and worshipped by the early Church. In order to answer Sabatier and to refute Reinach, Grandmaison’s account had to be as appealing as Renan’s wildly popular life of Christ. Grandmaison was eager to present the mystery of Jesus in a harmonious, compelling manner: only in this way could he, like Pascal and Newman, speak well of Jesus.17 Moreover, the question of Christ also included the question of the Church. Shoring up the credibility of Catholicism meant having to reestablish the continuity of the Church with his person and mission. As the religion that Jesus established, the Church was an essential confirmation of the divinity of Christ. Conversely, the life and credibility of the Church depended upon the truth about his personal identity and mission.

Grandmaison’s defense of the divinity of Christ had three more or less co-extensive objectives. Personal religion, as shall be seen in succeeding sections, was a common element of all Grandmaison’s approaches to these tasks. The first objective was to reaffirm the transcendence of God vis-à-vis his creation, which for Grandmaison was tantamount to reaffirming the personal nature of the Trinity. Second, he highlighted the uniqueness of Christ. Defending the dogma of the divinity of Christ entailed conveying a proper sense of his personhood as Son vis-à-vis his Father. An essential implication of Christ’s divinity for Grandmaison was that Jesus knew himself to be God. Inasmuch as Jesus Christ was the only and truly divine Son of the Father, he was also the exemplar and author of personal religion—the life in the Spirit normatively embodied in the Catholic Church and realized in each Christian’s life. Third, Grandmaison’s Christology reasserted the uniqueness of Christianity. Defending the divinity of Christ involved clarifying the relationship of Christ and the Father; of Christ and the Church; of the Church and of the individual believer; and

of the individual believer and God. Accomplishing such objectives would heal the breach between history and dogma that modernism had opened.

Grandmaison tried to reach a Christian audience whose belief in Christ as the Son of God had been challenged: “if this study can facilitate access to it, we will follow…the royal road that leads the religious man from the belief in a dependable divine Providence to unconditional adherence to the Lord Jesus.” 18 Most seekers, who already believed in God, would find this belief fulfilled only in the personal religion of Jesus.

But Grandmaison also had another audience in mind: those whose belief in a personal and transcendent God was threatened philosophically or affectively. 19 (As we shall see, this lesser aim motivated a good deal of his Christological works. 20) Keeping these people in mind, he tried to argue from the person of Christ to the existence of God. Such a proof—one that was undertaken more often by Protestants than Catholics—was less effective than beginning from the human desire for truth. 21 Yet Grandmaison did not rule out such an approach. “On the contrary, the positive and concrete apprehension of the divinity of Christ should be assimilated to the general apprehension of the reasons for believing in God. This last task is within reach of everyone and an unbiased mind.

18 “si l’étude qui suit peut en faciliter l’accès, nous suivrons …la route royale qui mène l’homme religieux, de la croyance en une providence divine assurée, à l’adhésion inconditionnée au Seigneur Jésus.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus-Christ,” DAFC, 1295.)

19 Lebreton, Grandmaison, 153-4.

20 Grandmaison cited more than once, but without quoting, section 547 of Pascal’s Pensées: “Tous ceux qui ont prétendu connaître Dieu et le prouver sans Jésus-Christ n’avaient des preuves impuissantes. En lui et par lui, nous connaissons donc Dieu. Hors de là et sans l’Écriture, sans le péché originel, sans Médiateur nécessaire promis et arrivé, on ne peut prouver absolument Dieu, ni enseigner ni bonne doctrine ni bonne morale. Mais par Jésus-Christ et en Jésus-Christ, on prouve Dieu, et on enseigne la morale et la doctrine. Jésus-Christ est donc le véritable Dieu des hommes.” (Pascal, Pensées, 547, referred to in Grandmaison, “Jésus-Christ,” DAFC, 1532.)

21 “il n’est pas inouï de voir, en pays protestants surtout des hommes arriver à la certitude de l’existence de Dieu par l’évidence du divin qui leur est apparu dans la personne de Jésus-Christ. Mais cette marche régressive, qu’il ne serait peut-être pas impossible de justifier en raison, n’est évidemment ni la meilleure, ni la plus commune. C’est la question de Dieu, qui se pose premièrement. . . . pour l’incroyant sincère.” (Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 210.) See also ibid., 212.
accomplishes it spontaneously.” In other words, the demonstration of the divinity of Christ was as reasonable as Christian demonstrations of the existence of God.

Considered only as human, this lofty figure so dominates common humanity that he invites man to follow him so as not to walk in the shadows. Jesus gave to life, to the spiritual life in particular, a sense so elevated, complete, and satisfying, that one can find in his acts and words the attestation of the Divinity that one seeks in vain elsewhere, the solution of difficulties until then impossible. The reasons for belief in God, in a God who is all powerful and an all good Father, becomes in the school of Christ more luminous and more concrete. The God ‘of the philosophers and scientists’ comes close without humanizing himself and reveals himself without losing the indispensable nobility of the mystery, becomes ‘a God of love and consolation, a God who fills the soul and the heart of those whom he possesses; a God who makes them feel interiorly their misery and his infinite mercy: who unites himself to the bottom of their soul; who fills them with humility, joy, confidence, and love; who renders them incapable of any other goal than himself.’ [Blaise Pascal, Pensées, ed. L. Brunschvicg, major, 3, 5-6] In this way the mastery accepted from Jesus leads them to the act of faith in God, the Son leads to the Father.

Put otherwise, in discovering the personal religion of Jesus, the seeker would also discover or re-discover God who is transcendent, immanent, and personal. In a sense, it almost did not matter whether one started from theistic or Christological belief. Grandmaison's hope for a troubled generation of Catholics and of Christians in general was that their desire for personal religion—a desire that could be filled by neither philosophy nor sentiment—might be fulfilled in their discovering the mystery of Jesus, exemplar and font of personal religion.

---

22 “Au contraire, l’appréhension positive et concrète de la divinité du Christ doit être assimilé à l’appréhension générale des raisons de croire en Dieu. Cette dernière tache est à la portée de tout homme et un esprit non prévenu l’accomplit spontanément.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1292. See also Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 596.)

23 “À ne le considérer qu’humainement, cette haute figure domine à ce point l’humanité commune qu’elle invite à la suivre pour ne marcher pas dans les ténèbres. Jésus a donné à la vie, à la vie spirituelle en particulier, un sens si relevé, si complet, si satisfaisant, qu’on peut trouver dans ses actes et dans ses paroles l’attestation de la Divinité vainelement cherché ailleurs, la solution de difficultés jusque-là invincibles. Les raisons de croire en Dieu, en un Dieu Père, tout puissant et tout bon, deviennent à l’école du Christ plus lumineuses et plus concrètes. Le Dieu ‘des philosophes et des savants’ se rapproche sans s’humaniser, se révèle sans perdre l’indispensable noblesse du mystère, devient ‘un Dieu d’amour et de consolation, un Dieu qui remplit l’âme et le coeur de ceux qu’il possède; un Dieu qui leur fait sentir intérieurement leur misère et sa miséricorde infinie; qui s’unit au fond de leur âme; qui les remplit d’humilité, de joie, de confiance, d’amour: qui les rend incapables d’autre fin que de lui-même’ [Blaise Pascal, Pensées, ed. L. Brunschvicg, major, 3, 5-6]. Ainsi la maîtrise acceptée de Jésus conduit à l’acte de foi en Dieu, le Fils mène au Père... Cette voie n’est toutefois ni la plus commune, ni la plus normale.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus-Christ,” D.AFC, 1295.)
Strategy: Grandmaison’s Wager

The basic framework and tone of Grandmaison’s Christological apologetics bears a resemblance to Pascal’s wager. In his *Pensées*, Pascal presented an argument for the existence of God that began by reminding his reader that one had to make a choice for or against believing in God.  

Given the blessing for believing and given the penalty for unbelief, someone who was not convinced of the existence of God would do well to cast aside his doubts and believe.

In imitation of Pascal, Grandmaison tried to confirm, establish, or re-establish in his audience the belief in the divinity of Christ. He did so in part by reminding them of the urgency to accept this claim, for upon it depended their salvation. This forthrightness was much clearer in the *DAFC* article, which contained a methodological prologue that did not appear in the later two-volume work. This preface began with the following questions: “Was Jesus of Nazareth the messenger, herald and indispensable witness of God on earth? Should one go further and confess that he is, in an incommunicable sense, his Son?” Were those who know him well enough obliged to follow him? Did his works justify the claim that he was the Son of God? The acceptance or rejection of Christ’s command to follow him (Lk. 12: 51, 54) entailed “the rupture in the life of a man, or in a society.” Therefore: “The whole point of this article is to render a choice of such great consequence more assured, by confirming this choice if it is already made, or shedding light on it, if

---


26 “Jésus de Nazareth a-t-il été sur la terre l’envoyé, le héraut, l’indispensable témoin de Dieu? Doit-on aller plus loin et confesser qu’il est, dans uns sens unique et incommunicable, son Fils?” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1291.)

it remains to be made.” This dramatic opening, in which one is expected to decide or be confirmed in one’s decision for Christ, paralleled Pascal’s challenge to believe in God.

One could state Grandmaison’s wager thus: Suppose that one doubted the divinity of Christ. One could not, however, deny the facts about him. The modernists had accused the anti-modernists of being too dependent on dogma to the exclusion of rigorous historical research. So Grandmaison depended on a direct examination of the facts. All that the apologist needed to do was to establish the facts and then to appeal to them—as Loisy had professed to do. “Jesus lets the facts speak for him.” The wager worked within severe limits. Grandmaison was willing to grant for the sake of argument that the documents had a merely human authority. But he was convinced that his readers would be so taken with the persuasiveness of Christ’s figure that they would acknowledge his divinity. Even if they regarded the gospels as merely human documents, they might likely find the plain facts to be compelling proofs of his claim to divinity. For even a historical, human portrait of Jesus interpreted himself in a way that no one could reasonably contest: “it remains true that a well-formed mind that applies itself to reading the gospels will discover there a singular beauty, a transparent sincerity, a je-ne-sais-quoi charm which will satisfy the best there is in him. There is, at least, a large presumption of truth: Jacques Bénigne Bossuet rightly remarked, as had Origen: ‘One cannot make this up.’” At the very least, it would be unreasonable to dismiss

---

28 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1292; Jésus Christ, 2, 271. See also Lebreton, Grandmaison, 151, 287.


30 Loisy, Autour d’un petit livre, 115.


32 “il demeure vrai qu’un esprit bien fait, s’appliquant à la lecture des évangiles, y découvrira une beauté singulière, une transparent sincérité, je ne sais quelle charmé où se complaira ce qu’il y a en lui de meilleur. Il y a là, pour le moins, une grande présomption de vérité: après Origène, Bossuet l’a justement observé: ‘On n’invente pas ainsi.’” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1292-3.)
offhand the claim that Christ was divine. At worst, rejecting the plain facts would endanger the salvation of one’s soul.

The one presupposition that Grandmaison did make was that the New Testament writings, chiefly the gospels and the Pauline letters, were fundamentally reliable as historical documents on the main points of the narrative. Such a claim, admittedly, was not accepted by all of his critics. But his criteria for the veracity of scriptural facts were few. For example, he focused on the basic agreements among parallel events reported by the synoptic gospels. His approach examined meticulously both individual pericopes and their accord with the rest of the facts derived from historical-critical study. Moreover, he did not try to paper over the discrepancies between parallel gospel passages.

We will neither insist on an absolute credence with regard to each of their details, nor will we attempt to resolve the difficulties raised by the discordances that result from the minute correspondence of the texts. It will be enough to establish that across these differences (favorable as a whole to the historicity of the works, by their accord on the substance of the facts) the materials used are solid and dependable. For that, we will need only the critical methods in use among those who consider that history—a science that is conjectural in many ways—assures us the possession of real certainties under certain conditions of content, attestation, and continuity of testimony.33

Later, in the two-volume work, Grandmaison insisted that facts related by the gospels, such as Christ’s prophesying, could not be rejected outright; consistency with the rest of the gospel witness argued for their inclusion: “the traces which remain to us persist, moreover, in the framework of history, led by natural paths and factual circumstances against which there can be formulated no

33 “Ni nous réclamerons une créance absolue pour chacun de leurs détails, ni nous entreprendrons de résoudre les difficultés soulevées par les discordances résultant de la correspondance minutieuse des textes. Il suffira d’établir qu’à travers ces différences (favorables en somme, dans le cas d’accord sur la substance des faits, à l’historicité des pièces) les matériaux utilisés sont solides et de bon aloi. Nous n’aurions besoin pour cela que des méthodes critiques en usages parmi ceux qui estiment que l’histoire, science en mainte partie conjecturale, nous assure, dans certaines conditions de teneur, d’attestation et de continuité des témoignages, la possession de réelles certitudes.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1292)
motive for excluding them, and with which facts they form a body.” \(^3\text{4}\) Independent scholars could object, as they did to many Catholic scholars, that Grandmaison sidestepped important issues. He was willing to take this risk. His principal audience consisted of lapsed Catholics and Christians who had been seduced by the incorrect use of historical-criticism.

Was such a narrow reading ill-advised? To the contrary, Lebreton considered that the apologetic gained in weight in accepting such limitations: Grandmaison’s approach made use of broad exegetical erudition without depending entirely on it.\(^3\text{5}\)

Grandmaison was sympathetic to certain aspects of the Quest for the historical Jesus. It had recovered neglected truths:

In order to do full justice to Liberal Protestantism, it must be pointed out that it shows signs of renewal, or rather of a new phase of dissolution, where its conception of the origins of Christianity is concerned. The only common trait among the authors who try to evade classical ‘moralism,’ attributing to Jesus a modern and more or less Kantian conception, is the feeling for the concrete, the desire to set the Gospel in its historical setting once again.\(^3\text{6}\)

Grandmaison too had this feeling for the concrete. But ever since Reimarus had initiated the quest for the historical Jesus, many Christian thinkers had tried to deny or at least to sidestep either Jesus’ messiahship or his divinity or both. Grandmaison faced adversaries on many fronts. First, there were the rationalists. Attempting to situate early Christianity within history, they ended up by diminishing the historical stature of Jesus by imputing pagan infiltrations from mystery religions. Second, there

\(^3\text{4}\) “les traces qui nous en reste s’insistèrent, par ailleurs, dans la trame de l’histoire, amenés par des démarches naturelles, des circonstances de fait, contre lesquelles aucun motif d’exclusion ne peut être formulé, et avec lesquelles elles font corps.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 271.)

\(^3\text{5}\) Lebreton, Grandmaison, 405.

\(^3\text{6}\) “Pour faire pleine justice au protestantisme libéral, il faut noter que des signes d’une rénovation ou plutôt, d’une nouvelle phase de dissolution, se manifestent dans son sein, en ce qui touche de conception des origines du christianisme. Le seul trait commun des auteurs qui tentent de s’évader du ‘moralisme’ classique, prêtant à Jésus une conception moderne et plus ou moins kantienne, est le sentiment du concret, le désir de replacer l’Évangile dans son milieu historique.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 190; Jesus Christ, 2, 299-300.)
were the liberal exegetes, whose best representative he considered to be H.J. Holtzmann.\textsuperscript{37} They “tended to humanize the life of Christ, but also to sublime it to the point of stamping out, even effacing its real traits,” to the point where one saw him simply as an admirable preacher of morality. Other Liberal Protestant exegetes—more respectful than outright rationalists—recognized the superior humanity of Christ, but denied the absolute transcendence of his divinity.\textsuperscript{38}

Third, the proponents of the “thorough-going” eschatological school of the quest for the historical Jesus were fixed on Christ’s seeming failure as prophet of the end-times.\textsuperscript{39} For such scholars, Christ announced the imminent arrival of the kingdom, but it did not happen. This school had done a service to Christology by taking the history of the gospels more at face value rather than trying to rewrite them. The school had rediscovered a hitherto neglected dimension of the Gospel. “Some, with Johannes Weiss and above all, Albert Schweitzer, restore to Christ’s teaching the eschatological, apocalyptic side, which had been arbitrarily diminished by the Liberal conception. But their reaction leads them to excess, and to an absorption of nearly all the other elements in this one.”\textsuperscript{40} The faults of the thoroughgoing eschatological reading were especially evident in the case of Loisy\textsuperscript{41} (in most of his writings between 1900-1910\textsuperscript{42}) and Tyrrell (in \textit{Christianity at the Crossroads}).\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{37} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 293.

\textsuperscript{38} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 191-2.


\textsuperscript{40} “Les uns, avec Johannes Weiss et surtout Albert Schweitzer, restituent dans l’enseignement du Christ le côté eschatologique, apocalyptique, arbitrairement diminué dans la conception libérale. Mais leur réaction les mène jusqu’à l’excès, jusqu’à l’absorption dans cet élément de presque tout le reste.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 190; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 299-300.)

\textsuperscript{41} Loisy first espoused the eschatological school, best represented by Weiss and Schweitzer, but then sided with the “École religionsgeschichtlich,” inspired by scholars such as Holtzmann; Grandmaison, Note E2, “L’École eschatologique: 1890-1915,” \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 455. See also \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 293n2.

\textsuperscript{42} Grandmaison considered that the most influential and most studied part of Loisy’s corpus thus far was written between 1900-1910; Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 293n2.
Their error consists in having gone overboard, to the point of giving this element ‘a preponderant role,’ and presenting the Gospel as ‘a teaching that is essentially eschatological, enthusiastic, and mystical’ [Loisy, *Jesus et la tradition*, 144, 190]. Thence it is only a step to explaining everything by Jesus’ belief in the imminent consummation of all things, to seeking in this absorbing illusion the key of the Master’s attitude toward the Palestinian authorities, the necessities of life, and individual and social duties; and that step has been taken by the ‘thoroughgoing eschatologists.’ In their hypothesis, the predictions that we have just quoted are to be taken in the crudest sense, literally and without interpretation. Jesus would have taught that the end of the world, indissolubly associated by these authors with the coming of the Kingdom of God, was near, within sight. He would have neither declared nor known anything concerning the exact day or hour, but maintained with inflexible obstinacy that a generation of men would not pass away till all was accomplished. Considering how things turned out historically, the critics add, Jesus was mistaken.44

Grandmaison noted that there was an orthodox way to approach the eschatological texts; it was to see them as a mix of preexisting fragments and authentic words of Christ.45 Even such a solution was unacceptable to him, though: ancient Christianity had never made a fuss about this genre of texts at all.

Try as the Questers had to downplay, undermine, or eliminate the dogma of Christ’s divinity, neither his teaching nor his person had been superseded.46 For the rationalist exegete, the enigma of Christ persisted.47 “In the face of the rising flood and leveler of becoming, an obstacle interposes itself:


44 “La faute des champions de la nouvelle École n’est donc pas d’avoir ramené l’attention sur des textes trop négligés, ou revendiqué la présence apocalyptique relativement considérable. Leur erreur est d’avoir abondée dans leur sens, au point de donner à cet élément ‘une part prépondérante,’ et présenter l’Évangile ‘un enseignement essentiellement eschatologique, enthousiaste, et mystique.’ De là à tout expliquer par la croyance de Jésus en la consommation imminente des choses, à chercher dans cette illusion absorbante la clef de l’attitude du Maître en face des autorités palestiniennes, des nécessités de la vie, des devoirs individuels et sociaux, il n’y avait qu’un pas, que les ‘eschatologues conséquents’…ont franchi. Dans leur hypothèse, les prédictions que nous venons de transcrire sont à prendre au sens le plus cru, à la lettre et sans gloire. Jésus aurait enseigné que la fin du monde, indissolublement associé par eux à l’avènement du Règne de Dieu, était prochaine, à portée de vue. Du jour et de l’heure exacte, il aurait avoué ne rien savoir, mais pour maintenir avec une inflexible obstination qu’une génération d’hommes ne passerait pas avant que tout ne fut accompli. A considérer les choses historiquement, ajoutent ces critiques, Jésus s’est trompé.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 293-4; “Jesus Christ,” 75-6.) See Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1433, for a parallel passage.


the person of Jesus.” 48 Although liberal exegetes denied Catholicism’s saving truth about him, they were still fascinated by his personality. 49 “Liberal Protestant exegetes recognize the superior humanity of Christ, but deny his divinity. Almost all take refuge in admiration for the ‘personality’ of Jesus.” 50 Even the rationalists who denied Christ’s divinity were still left with the fact that no other person in history was as compellingly noble a figure. 51 Thence came the “vague-hero worship” that was the result of sentimental religion. 52

Acknowledging this enigma, Grandmaison attempted to show that it contradicted the excellence of Christ’s admirable character to say that he had been deluded or had lied about who he said that he was. 53 The coherent, compelling human portrait of Christ from Scripture demanded a hearing for his claims. Could one understand him merely as a human being? 54 Even the most skeptical thinker who acknowledged the existence of Christ was forced to confront a contradiction: either the Christ of the gospels was who he said he was, or he was, at best, a noble failure, or a madman, or at the worst, a charlatan or blasphemer. 55 Given his personality, could his claim to divinity be denied without also denying the attractiveness of his person? Moreover, could such a person found the unique institution that Christianity was? Grandmaison’s wager asserted that his portrait of Christ was

50 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 190.
53 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 199.
54 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 309.
55 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 83.
more compelling than that of the various modernist reconstructions: Grandmaison was confident that he could show “directly not only that the Catholic position is the best, but that it is the only one that does justice to these texts and to history.”56 Such a straightforward reading would certainly be more convincing than those of the modernists.57

Although Grandmaison’s work was apologetic, it was also an exercise in dogmatics. As apologist, he felt obliged to unmask the falsity of the modernist dissolutions of the figure of Christ.58 For example, as a scholar of comparative religion and psychologist of religion, Grandmaison systematically exposed the comparisons of the gods of the mystery rites with Christ as superficial and specious.59 In Lebreton’s words:

The method followed in these discussions is that of the first of the Christian controversialists, saint Irenaeus, the first of the Christian controversialists, and is in effect the most efficacious: to force the wicked beast out of the thicket in the underbrush of myths and rites where one loses oneself or becomes intoxicated, and to show itself for what it is, a deformed creation of human dreams and passions.60

Grandmaison’s argument for the gospel was as modern as Irenaeus’ was in his time. Grandmaison exposed the false dogma and spirituality of modernism much as Irenaeus did with respect to Gnosticism. The Gnostics of the second century denied the Incarnation because it was incompatible with the ethos of their speculative philosophy. The fascination with critical thought—and with psychology and religious experience—was as potentially dangerous to Christianity in Grandmaison’s

56 Grandmaison, Jésu Christ, 2, 190-1.
57 Grandmaison made such a wager, in fact, in his early articles on dogma; Grandmaison, “Qu’est-ce qu’un dogme,” 212-3.
58 Grandmaison, Jésu Christ, 2, 198-9.
60 “La méthode suivie dans ses discussions est celle du premier des controversistes chrétiens, saint Irénée, et c’est en effet la plus efficace: forcer la bête malfaisante dans le fourré où elle se cache, dans ses broussailles de mythes et de rites où l’on se perd et où l’on s’enivre, et la montrer telle qu’est, création difforme des rêves et des passions humaines.” (Jules Lebreton, Foreword to Jésu Christ: sa personne, son message, ses preuves, 3rd. ed., by Léonce de Grandmaison, 1, xiii-xiv.)
time. While Irenaeus defended the beauty of Christ’s fleshly nature, Grandmaison upheld the excellence of Christ’s consciousness. Both theologians also appropriated the best of contemporary philosophy and advanced the Church’s development of doctrine. In combating their respective adversaries, both thinkers showed a command of the psychology of religion. Grandmaison’s use of spiritual discernment in his Christology was a modern translation of Irenaeus’ own achievement as Christianity’s first great apologist.

Given that Grandmaison treated the gospels as human documents, his strategy depended first and foremost on the exposition of a literal understanding of Scripture. This literal approach tried to rebut the corrosive effects of the search for the historical Jesus without sacrificing any of the valuable insights that the quest had promised. His exegesis of the literal meaning of the gospels was three-tiered, taking into account the historical, literary, theological (or dogmatic) dimensions of the text. Although theological considerations guided his exegesis, he also used the historical-critical method amply. Aided by the light provided by dogma, he attempted to outdo the persuasiveness of Renan’s work in historical–critical and literary terms. Towards the end of *Jésus Christ*, he wrote: “We have seen, to the contrary, that using new chronological precisions, more penetrating analyses, new or better understood texts, and patient comparisons of textual criticism, a growing number of

---

61 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 593.


64 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1536-7; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 183. Renan and Loisy were the exegetes who were most often criticized by Grandmaison in his Christological works.
incontestable facts have been extracted.” Grandmaison’s literary methods included narrative, rhetorical, and reader-response criticism.

His Biblical criticism was far from fundamentalist. His exegesis took into account the best of historical-critical scholarship from rationalists, liberal Protestants, Anglicans, and modernists, and Catholics alike both to build his case positively and also to answer objections against such scholarship. He acknowledged, for example that the words and events reported in the gospels were redacted. He agreed with Loisy that the evangelist John was not entirely stenographic in his recording of the words of Christ (though they were based in fact) and that John’s Gospel was at times allegorical. But, then again, many such conclusions had already been reached by Catholic historical-critical scholarship three centuries before Grandmaison’s time. For example, he held with the “great Maldonat” that words of the gospel according to John, such as John 3:16-22, 31-36 were words added by the evangelist as a kind of gloss.

Philosophical and religious presuppositions had to be acknowledged. As noted elsewhere, Grandmaison thought that the principal reason that many exegetes rejected certain biblical facts depended upon presuppositions having to do with the philosophy of religion. In general,

65 “Nous avons vu, au contraire, que moyennant de nouvelles précisions chronologiques, des analyses plus pénétrantes, des textes nouveaux ou mieux compris, des comparaisons patientes de critique textuelle, un nombre croissant de faits incontestables s’est dégagé.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 662.)

66 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 303.


68 Grandmaison considered many of the conclusions of historical-critical exegesis to have already been arrived at by the Fathers of the fourth century, or by the exegete whom he considered the true founder of historical-critical analysis, Juan Maldonado; “Jésus Christ,” DAFÉ, 1400-1. A Jesuit priest, Maldonado (Juan Maldonado [1533-1583] was a brilliant theologian, exegete, and preacher. Author of the magisterial Commentaries on the Gospels, “[h]e excelled, according to Simon, in explanation of the literal sense”; Antonio Pérez Goyena, "Juan Maldonado," The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 9 (New York: Robert Appleton, 1910), 567.

69 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 47n1.
the questions that are essential and *logically anterior to any historical study* pose themselves [in theology]. A truly thorough study of the Christian religion in theology supposes that these questions are resolved in a particular sense, outside which the facts of religious history are no more than objects of simple curiosity, the question of the objective truth of religion being resolved in advance.\footnote{70} No matter how much human inquiry strived to be dispassionate, “[the scholar’s] mind is not empty: it is a mind already filled with personal categories and with its own content, which is disposed as to see things with a particular bias.”\footnote{71} It was impossible and undesirable for a scholar to be completely disinterested.

It’s not possible, in effect, to pursue a religious inquiry, seeking the roots of things, that is both sincere and completely disinterested. This kind of study is theoretically possible only if, supposing resolved in the negative the fundamental religious problem (that of the objective truth of all religion, or of one religion in particular), one applies oneself to elucidate the intrinsic or historical aspects of the religion. What does it teach? What reasons are presented to people so that they can accept it? etc. If on the contrary the problem of truth remains open, even in a conjectural way, it is psychologically impossible to treat the problem as if it didn’t interest us. But this interest, as keen as one might suppose it, does not vitiate our research any more than the passion of a [Louis] Pasteur to discover the cure for rabies would make him cheat on the rigor of his method.\footnote{72}

The inquiry was religious and existential.

\begin{flushleft}
\footnote{70} “les questions essentielles, et logiquement antérieure à toute étude historique, se posent. Une étude vraiment conséquente de la religion chrétienne de la théologie suppose ces questions résolues dans un sens particulier, hors duquel les faits de l’histoire religieuse ne sont plus que des objets de simple curiosité, la question de la vérité objective de la religion étant résolue par avance.” (Léonce de Grandmaison, “Bulletin,” [1924], 457.)


\footnote{72} “Il n’est pas possible, en effet, de poursuivre une enquête religieuse, portant sur le fond des choses, à la fois sincère et entièrement désintéressée. Une étude de ce genre n’est théoriquement possible que si, supposant résolu par la négative le problème religieux fondamental (celui de la vérité objective de toute religion, ou d’une religion en particulier), on s’applique à en élucider les modalités intrinsèques ou historiques. Qu’enseigne-t-elle? Quelles raisons ont amenées des hommes à l’embrasser? etc. Si au contraire le problème de vérité reste ouvert, même à titre conjectural, il est psychologiquement impossible de le traiter comme s’il ne nous intéressait pas. Mais cet intérêt, pour viv qu’on le suppose, ne vieie pas plus notre recherche que la passion d’un [Louis] Pasteur pour découvrir le remède à la rage ne faisait gauchir la vigueur de sa méthode.” (Grandmaison, “Crise de la foi,” 410n3-411.)
\end{flushleft}
At the conclusion of the two-volume work, Grandmaison underlined the importance of the interrelationship between an accurate assessment of the historical veracity of the biblical texts and the philosophical assumptions that underlie an exegete’s method:

The aim of this work has been to throw a clearer light on the person of Jesus, the great fact in religious history. A long familiarity with the texts of the Gospels and their settings has in effect convinced us that many Christians are only imperfectly acquainted with the force of the motives that support their faith. On the other hand, many sincere unbelievers strangely exaggerate the reasons they believe they have to reject Christ’s message. There has grown up a sort of convention in this matter, and many people conform to it as if it were a demonstrated truth. We hope to have broken this assurance: docile to a narrow-minded philosophy, it reaches its conclusions only by imposing particular hypotheses of the scientific order on observed facts. Fruitful perhaps in their own realm, these hypotheses cannot be applied without abuse to human contingencies. Let us not make history an accomplice or slave to the faults of this method.\(^{73}\)

This passage also echoes Grandmaison’s preoccupation from the start of his career as apologist to reconcile dogmatic and critical methods of theology.

An example of the importance of philosophical assumptions was clear in the disagreement that independent exegete Maurice Goguel had with Grandmaison over the interrelationship of history and dogma. Grandmaison’s historical-critical adroitness was insufficient to overcome Goguel’s philosophical reservations.

Father de Grandmaison is primarily a theologian. He looks at the problems of history from the point of view of a definite theological belief, and lays it down as a principle that only by that doctrine is the solution of the historical problem to be solved. He does not expect the analysis of facts to reveal to him the action of God in history, especially in the history of

\(^{73}\) “L’ambition de cet ouvrage eut été de mettre en meilleure lumière la personne de Jésus, le plus grand fait de l’histoire religieuse. Un long commerce avec les textes évangéliques et leurs entour nous en a en effet persuadé que bien des chrétiens connaissent imparfaitement la force des motifs qui appuient leur foi. Par contre, nombre d’incroyants sincères majorant étrangement les raisons qu’ils croient avoir de rejeter le message du Christ. Une sorte de prescription s’est établie à ce propos, et beaucoup d’hommes s’y plient comme à une vérité démontrée. Nous voudrions avoir ébranlé cette assurance: docile aux exclusives d’une philosophie bornée, elle n’obtient ses conclusions qu’en imposant aux données de fait certain hypothèses de l’ordre scientifique. Fécondes peut-être dans leur domaine propre, ces hypothèses ne peuvent sans abus s’appliquer aux contingences humaines. Ne rendons pas histoire complice, ou serve, de ces fautes de méthode.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 661; Jesus Christ, 3, 482.)
Christianity and its establishment, but on the contrary his prior knowledge of God’s thought, gained through the church, reveals to him the meaning of history.  

Bremond found Grandmaison’s work to be earnest and broadminded, but bogged down in erudite detail and lacking intellectual courage. Bremond thought of Grandmaison as a competent and congenial apologist, but not as an especially profound philosopher.  

It was true that Grandmaison was a theologian. However, despite Goguel’s denial of it, Grandmaison also believed that the study of history could give the critical scholar access to the truth about the historical Jesus. Biblical history did in fact reveal the presence and activity of God to Grandmaison—but not according to Goguel’s presuppositions. He thought that it was impossible to bridge the divide between history and dogma. Therefore, Grandmaison’s apologetic commitments precluded the liberty of spirit needed to write history. “It is not research into the truth whatever it might be, but only special pleading for a truth that is already possessed.” On the other hand, it could be said that history was opaque to independent scholars in a way that it was not for a believer. The eyes of faith might have made Grandmaison see more about both the significance of the framework of history, and the personality of Jesus and his personal significance, than a merely critical eye could.  

For Goguel, Grandmaison’s failure to give any sketch of the basic timeline of Jesus’ life was the most decisive proof that Grandmaison was basically a theologian, and one who did not venture

75 Blondel-Bremond, Correspondance, 3, 328, and Poulat, Une Oeuvre Clandestine d’Henri Bremond, 48n15.  
76 Poulat, Une Oeuvre Clandestine d’Henri Bremond, 48.  
to delve into areas that might challenge the Catholic conclusions about Christ’s life. Bremond remarked that Grandmaison had not said a word about the infancy narratives. Yet Grandmaison did not mean to write a complete biography of Jesus. In the words of Jesuit collaborator Joseph Huby,

> the main effort of P. de Grandmaison in *Jésus Christ* more so than in his [DAFC] article is to introduce his reader to the mystery of Christ; he does it as the Church has done it from the beginning in evangelical catechesis, by repeating to us the teachings of the Son of God, and by making us contemplate his life and works.

Huby’s review of the work enlarged upon Grandmaison’s sense of religious history:

> His aim is to show the ‘economy’ of the revelation of Christ, to follow how Jesus gradually and progressively manifested himself, as well as the diverse reactions that this revelation provoked among his hearers….this history is not for him a mere reconstruction of the past. He always sees it as actual, or, as Saint Augustine says, in its perpetual ‘presence,’ since the divine light is always soliciting souls, some of whom are open to it and others closed.

Grandmaison was writing more than history in the narrow sense of the word. In so far as the work was a historical reconstruction, it did respect the flow of events as described by the Scriptures. But he also held that even a literal interpretation of Scripture allowed him—indeed, required him—to do a kind of reading that was meditative in style.

---

78 Goguel, “The Problem of Jesus,” 100-1. Lebreton, Grandmaison’s colleague, did in fact write such a biography.


80 “l’effort principal du P. de Grandmaison, dans cet ouvrage plus encore que dans son [DAFC] article, est d’introduire son lecteur dans le mystère du Christ; il le fait comme l’Église l’a fait dès le premier jour, dans la catéchèse évangélique, en nous répétant les enseignements du Fils du Dieu, en nous faisant contempler sa vie et ses œuvres.” (Joseph Huby, “Bulletin d’histoire des origines chrétiennes.” RYR [1928], 424. See Lebreton, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 403.)

81 “Son but est de montrer l’‘économie’ de la révélation du Christ, de suivre sa manifestation graduelle et progressive de la part de Jésus, comme aussi les réactions diverses, qu’elle provoquait chez les auditeurs….cette histoire n’est pas pour lui simple restitution du passé. Il la voit toujours actuelle, ou, pour parler comme saint Augustin, dans sa perpétuelle ‘présentialité,’ puisque toujours la lumière divine vient solliciter les âmes, dont les unes s’ouvrent et les autres se ferment.” (Huby, “Le Jésus Christ,” 137.)

82 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1393; *Jésus Christ*, I, 49, 576-8, 656.
The spiritual interpretation of a passage, according to Origen, made sense of a passage by
drawing analogies beyond its literal meaning. Such interpretation used symbolism or allegory to elicit
meanings that had to do with moral or doctrinal teaching. But there was practically no spiritual
exegesis in Grandmaison’s works. Rather, he engaged in a kind of reading that enlarged upon the
literal sense of the passage without transgressing that literal sense. He used a kind of Ignatian
meditation in conjunction with historical-critical and literary methods.83 Even the best historical-
critical or literary analysis would not suffice if it did not involve a reflective reading that went beyond
a technical one:

An intimate and prolonged contact with the acts and words of Jesus such as ‘who
were witnesses to the beginning, and servants of the Word,’ have recounted to us, is the sole
means of rendering the message of Christ real. All the works of specialists are only helpful to
give us access to the source; come before it, that whoever is thirsty may kneel and drink.84

Such a method prompted Grandmaison’s reviewers to speak of his work as a spiritual commentary
on or meditative reading of Scripture. Commenting earlier on the Sermon on the Mount, he wrote:
“One would need the spiritual tact of a Francis of Assisi, in whose life and spirit, to tell the truth,
one reads the best commentary.”85 A reading that entered into the spirit of the gospel as part of its
literal interpretation was necessary to understand Scripture in its fullness. In other words, the

83 Grandmaison’s sense of ‘presentalité’ was similar to the attitude prescribed by the Spiritual Exercises when one
meditated on episodes from the life of Christ. The person meditating on the history at hand was involved in the story
itself: he or she was no neutral spectator. Recalling the episode from the life of Christ was meant to prepare one for an
encounter with Christ. The First Point of Ignatius’ instructions for the meditation on the Nativity read as follows: “This
will consist in seeing the persons, namely, our Lady, St. Joseph, the maid, and the Child Jesus after His birth. I will make
myself a poor little unworthy slave, and as though present, look upon them, contemplate them, and serve them in their
needs with all possible homage and reverence. Then I will reflect on myself that I may reap some fruit.” (SpEx [114].) See also Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 239.

84 “Un contact intime, et prolongé, avec les actes et les paroles de Jésus, tels que nous les ont racontés ‘ceux qui ont été
les témoins des origines, et les serviteurs de la Parole,’ est le seul moyen de rendre réel le message du Christ. Tous les
travaux des spécialistes ne valent que pour nous donner accès à la source: arrive près d’elle, que celui a soif s’agenouille,
et qu’il boive.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 662.)

85 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 367-8.
personal religion of the individual believer and the faith of the Church, the personal religion that Jesus founded, was needed to enter fully into the personal religion of Jesus.

The main philosophical presuppositions of the DAFC article were those of the philosophia perennis.86 As a fundamental wisdom before all systems, this philosophy affirmed divine Providence, which concerned itself with each and every member of the human race. “We will conceive, by analogy with the people we are, this Power as a person, a spiritual self, autonomous, ‘living and seeing,’ immanent to his work, but distinct from it by the purity of his essence and knowable by means of this work, even though he is still fundamentally incomprehensible.”87 This passage encapsulated the concern with the transcendence, immanence, and personhood of God.

Another guiding principle of Grandmaison’s exegesis was that of broadly accepted Catholic theology.88 He specified these criteria in the words of Maurice Blondel:

Thus one discerns in the Church ‘an autonomous principle of discernment’ of doctrines, a principle that neither abolishes nor supplants the others, and does not act except in union with them, but which possesses ‘a proper and inalienable value,’ since this faith furnishes a new and fruitful source of information—‘the proven practice, the habits confirmed by the fruits of sanctity, the lights acquired by piety, prayer and mortification’—while it continues to ‘take account of ideas and known facts’ from history, theology, and philosophy.89


87 “Nous concevrons, par analogie avec la personne que nous sommes, cette Puissance comme une personne, un moi spirituel, autonome, ‘vivant et voyant,’ immanent à son oeuvre, mais distinct d’elle par la pureté de son essence et connaissable par le moyen de cette oeuvre, encore qu’incompréhensible dans son fonds.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1292.)


Grandmaison’s guiding light was a faith that discerned the facts and was in accord with them. It did not prescind from the practice of personal religion. His scientific method appealed neither to “the argument from universal consent: securus indicat orbis terrarum!” nor to the (non-Catholic) direct, common immediate experience of the divine.\(^{90}\) What was left, between the two, was “a faculty of discernment of very high value.”\(^{91}\) Nonetheless: “Without neglecting for our part this kind of intuition which foresees, confirms, and sometimes compensates for the use of slower methods, we will seek in this study to procure for ourselves a direct, historical certitude.”\(^{92}\) This historical certitude was meant to satisfy the concerns of his adversaries for critical scholarship.

Grandmaison did refer to the rule of faith as expressed in the classic conciliar symbols and patristic writings, but without depending directly on them.\(^{93}\) An especially important doctrine that shaped his reading of the gospel was the Chalcedonian settlement concerning the hypostatic union.\(^{94}\) The Symbol was for him the best summary that translated the mystery of Jesus. As shall be seen below, the resolution of the modernist tension between dogma and history—having to do ultimately with the tension between the divine transcendence and immanence—could rest only on the dogma of the hypostatic union,\(^{95}\) and in the actual person of Christ. He had to have been divine in order to be mediator. Only then would he have really been able to communicate the Father’s life to his disciples and to lead his disciples to the Father.

---


\(^{91}\) Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1292.  

\(^{92}\) “Sans négliger pour notre compte cette sorte d’intuition qui prévient, confirme et parfois supplée l’emploi de méthode plus lentes, nous chercherons dans cette étude à nous procurer une certitude historique directe.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1292-3.)  

\(^{93}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 214.  

\(^{94}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 210-1, 218.  

\(^{95}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 357; “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologétique} 5 (1907), 891.
Integrating Principle of Grandmaison’s Christology: Personal Religion

Although the mystery of Jesus was objectively recapitulated by the doctrine of the hypostatic union, the “personal religion of Jesus” was more suitable for Grandmaison’s audience as a description of that mystery. First, the phrase was less technical. “Religion,” on the one hand, referred to the devotion that was owed to God, who is utterly holy. Christ’s “religion” alluded to both the Son’s devotion to his Father and to human devotion to God. “Personal” referred to his personhood, to the personal unity of the human and divine natures of Christ. The core of the personal religion of Jesus was his relationship with the Father.

Second, speaking of personal religion would meet and defeat modernist adversaries on their own terrain. Grandmaison had to answer modernism with the best of modernity. The principal adversary at the back of his mind was often Ernest Renan. Second came Alfred Loisy, who was Grandmaison’s immediate adversary with respect to exegesis. As noted above, his apologetics was committed first of all to an examination of the texts as historical. Exegesis had been heavily influenced by positive science. So his exegesis took the vantage point afforded by religious psychology supplemented by a thorough knowledge of the history of religions. (Such had been the approach in Renan’s life of Christ.)

From the deeds of the Savior, and in particular from the signs performed by him,…shines a light that interprets the declarations and transfusions transcribed above [in book four]. The quality of the Lord and of the Word of God known to the Master of Nazareth does justice to the transcendent and superhuman side of the Gospel. [This transcendence] is a key that opens each of the rooms where the sacred lamp shines in the obscurity of the text. The line of demarcation is clear to the eyes of each man that is not seduced by the pantheist mirage, the luminous torch which in extinguishing itself plunges the spirit once more into obscene

---


Grandmaison believed that not only good exegesis, but also sound psychology, would incline a person of goodwill to belief in Christ’s divinity. 100

Third, Grandmaison had to take the claims of sentimental religion seriously. Jesus was admirably and adorably unique in history for the personal religion that he enjoyed. The appeal to Christ’s personal religion 101 was in part Grandmaison’s counterproposal to Sabatier’s understanding of Christ’s consciousness of the Father. Grandmaison agreed with Sabatier that the central fact to which the gospels witnessed was the personal religion of Jesus, which in large part had to do with his relationship with his Father. This central reality was the most convincing proof of Christ’s divinity. 102 Moreover, the truth of Christ’s relationship to the Father was echoed faithfully by the Church as a whole, by the disciples who knew Christ in his earthly life and by saints ever since.

Personal religion in Christ’s case referred not only to his divine identity as Son of the Father and as sent by the Father, but also to Christ’s awareness of his identity and mission. 103 This use of personal religion was justified for Grandmaison in terms of a simple fact about the portrayal of

99 “Des actes du Saviour, et en particulier des signes accomplis par lui,…ressort une lumière qui interprète les déclarations et les effusions transcrites plus haut. À ce côté transcendant et surhumain de l’Évangile, la qualité de Seigneur et de Verbe divin reconnue au Maître de Nazareth fait justice. Elle est une clef qui ouvre chacune des chambres où luit, dans l’obscurité du texte, la lampe sacrée. La ligne de démarcation claire aux yeux de tout homme que ne séduit pas le mirage panthéiste, le faisceau lumineux qui replonge, en s’éclipsant, l’esprit dans un obscène chaos,—cette ligne laisse décidément Jésus de Nazareth de côté divin. Dans cette perspective, on s’explique que, pour connaître le Fils, il ne faille rien de moins que la science infinie du Père,…Ce n’est pas seulement l’exégèse des textes, ce sont les vraisemblances psychologiques qui nous inclinent en ce sens.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 212.)

100 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 202-3. It must be noted too that Grandmaison placed rigorous exegesis examination of the facts ahead of the use of psychology; Grandmaison, “Trois portraits,” 277.


102 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 211-2.

103 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 85-98.
Christ in the gospels: “One ought therefore to expect to find revelations about the person of Jesus in his message. The originality of the Gospel on this point consists justly in the very close union—going in large part all the way to identification—of the person with the message.”\textsuperscript{104} In the beginning of Christ’s ministry, the kingdom was the subject of his preaching. God for him was above all his Father. Christ’s being “the Son” was the root of his confidence in a mission that exceeded any human mission.\textsuperscript{105}

Much of this defense of the divinity of Christ took the form of defending the unity of the divine and the human in his consciousness. The subject was of particular interest to Grandmaison’s contemporaries, both orthodox and modernist. The contemporary interest in experimental psychology opened the door to such an approach and indeed demanded it.\textsuperscript{106} In order to have been the Christ of faith, the Jesus of history had to have been conscious of himself as the Son of the Father.\textsuperscript{107} Therefore, Grandmaison believed that defending the utter uniqueness of Christ’s consciousness was the proper way to safeguard the claim that Christ was not only the exemplar, but also the source of Christianity. The historical facts established by the gospels would suffice to show that the consciousness of Christ was best explained by traditional Christological doctrine.\textsuperscript{108}

In Grandmaison’s eyes, Christology needed to call upon the implicit Christian understanding of the person so as to avoid the theological and philosophical errors of the day. When speaking of

\textsuperscript{104} “On doit donc s’attendre à trouver dans le message de Jésus des révélations sur sa personne. L’originalité de l’Évangile en ce point consiste justement dans l’étroite union—allant, pour une grand partie, jusqu’à l’identification—de la personne avec le message.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 6.)

\textsuperscript{105} Grandmaison, \textit{“Jésus Christ,”} \textit{DAFC}, 1351, 1354.

\textsuperscript{106} Colin, \textit{Audace}, 355.

\textsuperscript{107} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 434, 613.

\textsuperscript{108} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 211.
the human consciousness of Christ, he reaffirmed traditional understandings about personhood. First formulated by the Latin theologian Tertullian, the idea of person had functioned during the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries as a safeguard of the doctrine of the divinity, respectively, of the Son vis-à-vis the Father, and then of the Spirit vis-à-vis that of the Father and the Son. Personal religion served to safeguard the transcendence as well as the personhood of the divine Persons.109

Fourth, personal religion was a general interest of the public. Therefore, the choice of personal religion afforded Grandmaison a way to demonstrate how the faith of the Church and of the believer was intrinsically connected with the Incarnation of the Son of God.110 On the one hand, such an approach would respect the absolute priority of Christ’s own relationship to the Father both as exemplar and source of personal religion. Personal religion correlated the objectivity of dogma with the subjectivity of the spirit. Religious sentiment needed to be bolstered without having it degenerate into sentimental religion.111 Speaking of the personal religion of Jesus allowed one to contest the modernist overvaluing of the subjective dimension of religion: Christ was the measure of religion rather than vice versa. The form of personal religion advanced by Grandmaison’s Christology was in effect the source and template of the Church’s personal religion and of the individual believer’s piety. On the other hand, it would also show the necessary connection of Christ and Church and believer. As seen in the previous chapter, the notion of personal religion responded to the contemporary search for the proper formulation of religious subjectivity—of the divine immanence in the human person—that was worthy of the human person.

109 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 246.
110 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 592.
111 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 579.
Grandmaison often called personal religion at all three levels by a single biblical word: witness. This theme was found amply in the Pauline, synoptic, and Johannine traditions. As the exemplary practitioners of true, personal religion, the saints were the paradigmatic witnesses to Christ.

But how much greater is the witness of the Son, of Him who alone knows the Father, and who reveals him to whom He wants! Over the course of his final years, the effort of P. de Grandmaison—in his study as in his prayer—was concentrated more and more on this ‘faithful witness.’ During his years of teaching, the principal object of his course was the witness of Jesus Christ, his origin, meaning, and evidence. 112

In speaking of the personal religion of Jesus, Grandmaison tried to demonstrate that there was a fundamental, unbreakable unity between the person and mission of Jesus Christ, Son of God—supreme witness to the Father—and those that witnessed to him: the Father, Spirit, and the Catholic Church. 113 Scripture too was a witness. 114

The witness of Father and Spirit was noted prominently in the DAFC article. Chapters two through five were entitled, respectively, Le témoignage du Fils 115 (Lebreton considered this chapter, ending with the section on “Le Mystère de Jésus,” to be the most profoundly religious and revelatory in Grandmaison’s entire corpus 116); Les preuves du témoignage; 117 Le témoignage du Père

112 “mais combien plus le témoignage du Fils, de Celui qui seul connaît le Père, et qui le révèle à qui Il veut! C’est vers ce ‘témoin fidèle’ que de plus en plus, au cours de ses dernières années, s’est concentrée l’effort du P. de Grandmaison, son étude comme sa prière. Pendant ses années d’enseignement, l’objet principal de son cours était le témoignage de Jésus-Christ, son origine, sa portée, ses preuves.” (Lebreton, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 404.)

113 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 247.

114 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 592-3.


116 Lebreton, “Père Léonce de Grandmaison,” 408.

(here the Resurrection is treated); and Le témoignage du Saint Esprit. The titles highlighted the parallel between the witness of the Father to Christ and of the Spirit to Christ, and between the witness of the Father and the Spirit and the witness of Christians, both collectively and individually.

Use of the historical-critical method

When the 1927 Jésus Christ was published posthumously, French Catholics gave the book a warm reception. Laplanche’s assessment of the work was as follows: “We read in the Jésus-Christ of Grandmaison a clear synthesis, one that was alert to the results acquired by Catholic scholarship in the first quarter of the twentieth century.” Even independent scholar Goguel echoed some of this praise in his critical reviews of the work. He noted the great success of the book and the reasons for it. Grandmaison had a wide, devoted audience.

But above all the book has benefited from the very lively interest of which the problem of Jesus is the object and which is explained both by the disarray that the extreme diversity of theories maintained on the subject has created in many minds, and by the sentiment that if it is not, properly speaking, the fundamental religious problem, it determines very directly at least the way in which this problem is posed, and, consequently, the solution that can be given to it.

---

118 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1472-1514.
119 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1514-34.
120 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1472.
121 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1512.
122 Laplanche, Crin, 166.
123 Laplanche, Crin, 166.
126 “Mais surtout le livre a bénéficié de l’intérêt très vif dont le problème de Jésus est aujourd’hui l’objet et qui s’explique à la fois par le désarroi que l’extrême diversité des théories soutenues à son sujet a créé dans bien des esprits et par le sentiment que s’il n’est pas, à proprement parler le problème religieux fondamental, il détermine au moins très
Goguel complimented him on the breadth of his study of the historical literature and his spirit. His scholarship was erudite and current, and his piety moving, even for those who did not share his religious convictions.127 Goguel faulted Catholic theologians in general for being out of touch with the problems posed by modern exegesis vis-à-vis the life of Christ. But Grandmaison’s work, along with Lagrange’s *L’Évangile de Jésus-Christ*,128 were exceptions as worthy scientific ventures.

They are crowning achievements of industrious careers. Both authors have attentively followed the work of non-Catholic criticism in France as well as abroad. They have explored the wide domain of the history of religions and they know at first hand the religious currents prevailing in the world where Christianity was born and developed.129

This praise was all the more formidable in light of the profound philosophical disagreements that Goguel had with both authors.

Grandmaison dealt with a wide range of historical-critical issues. The bibliographies of the 1914 *DAFC* article already indicated the comprehensiveness and impartiality with which he selected his scholarly support.130 The bibliographies for the 1927 work showed that he kept up his voracious reading of works on exegesis and Christology in the intervening years. Pierre Vallin lauded his technical competence thus: “Grandmaison worked courageously to acquire a competence in exegesis, the history of religions, and the critical study of the Gospel sources, a competence to which his initial theological formation barely introduced him. He ends up with works—but at a less...

---

technical level—similar enough to those of the Dominican [Lagrange].” The principal gospel commentaries that he used were written by Lagrange, whose monographs on the gospels he had reviewed. Grandmaison kept up a brisk and friendly correspondence with him; moreover, he also benefited from the work of his collaborators at Recherches de science religieuse: Bouvier, Huby, Lebreton, Pinard, Rousselot. Without having the time to do research firsthand, he read prodigiously and in different fields (for example, apart from biblical exegesis and the history of religions, the philosophy of religion and the history of literature).


There were forty-two Notes, or Appendices, in the 1927 work, which were interspersed in the two volumes, taking up about 156 out of 1079 pages. The Notes dealt with technical matters

131 “Grandmaison a travaillé avec courage à se faire en exégèse, histoire des religions et critique des sources évangéliques, une compétence à laquelle il n’avait guère été conduit par sa formation théologique initiale. Il a bouts à des travaux assez apparentés, avec un moindre niveau de technicité, à ceux du dominicain [Lagrange].” (Vallin, “Grandmaison,” 295.)


133 “Il a bénéficié aussi des travaux de ses collaborateurs aux Recherches de science religieuse: Bouvier, Huby, Lebreton, Pinard, Rousselot. Sans avoir le temps de faire des recherches de première main, il a lu énormément et en divers domaines (par exemple, outre l’exégèse biblique et l’histoire des religions, la philosophie de la religion et l’histoire de la littérature.)” (Laplanche, Crise, 160.)


135 E. Bernard Allo, L’Apocalypse (Paris: Gabalda, 1921)


whose inclusion would have impeded the flow of his main argument. Some of these notes included subjects treated in previous articles: “La collectivité créatrice”\(^{139}\); “Les Rythmes de style oral dans le Nouveau Testament”\(^{140}\); “L’Église dans l’Évangile”\(^{141}\); “Sur l’hymne de jubilation (Mt: 11:25b-30; Lk. 10: 21-2)”\(^{142}\); and ”Sur la santé mentale de Jésus.”\(^{143}\) Other topics were relatively new, given the literature published in the years intervening since the DAFC article: “La valeur des Épîtres aux Ephésiens et aux Hébreux comme sources d’histoire”\(^{144}\); “L’apocalypse de Jean Le Prophète et L’Évangile de Jean de disciple”\(^{145}\); “Apollonius de Tyane et sa ‘Vie’”\(^{146}\); and “La suggestion victorieuse.”\(^{147}\) Such titles give a sampling of the wide range of issues with which Grandmaison grappled.

**B. Books One and Two of Jésus Christ:**

**The Sources of the Life of Christ and the Gospel Milieu**

The first book (of six) surveyed the non-canonical and canonical sources of the life of Jesus. Throughout, Grandmaison attempted to seek historical answers to historical questions: e.g., the date of the writings, especially the gospels; authorship; the synoptic question, and the nature of the fourth

---

139 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, Note B, 195-200.

140 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, Note C, 201-9. This was a condensation of a review of Albert Jousse’s work; Léonce de Grandmaison, “Le style oral: en marge d’un mémoire de psychologie linguistique,” *Études* 183 (1925): 685-705. In Weaver’s estimation, Grandmaison offered “some interesting and valid comments on the preservation of oral material, its forms and rhythms.” (Weaver, *Historical Jesus*, 305.)


144 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, Note E, 216-8.

145 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, Note I, 228-36.


gospel. In his survey of the scriptural sources on the life of Christ, Grandmaison defended the historical accuracy of the witness of St. Paul and the synoptic gospels.\textsuperscript{148} Grandmaison accepted the so-called deuto-
canonical letters as authentic—he even cited radical critic A. Jülicher in support of his claim.\textsuperscript{149}

Paul was an especially compelling figure.\textsuperscript{150} His devotion to Christ was unequaled: “no one has written as this man has.”\textsuperscript{151} Paul was not the most balanced or limpid of writers, and his thought changed over the years. “But that which does not change, and what is from the source and inimitable, is, with some instinctive methods, the need and the art of conveying through words a powerful sensibility and to charge them, so to speak with passion.”\textsuperscript{152} The uniqueness of his style was unified by his love of Christ, whose Body and Bride the Church was.\textsuperscript{153} Paul’s ardor for Christ, manifested so convincingly in so many moods and in so many tropes, marked the Pauline epistles as historical documents that accurately conveyed his own personal witness to Christ and to the teaching and life of the early Church.\textsuperscript{154}

Paul had an almost direct knowledge of Christ, which manifested itself in a lively sense of the contemporaneity of the Risen Christ so prominent in his epistles.\textsuperscript{155} Although his concrete

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{148} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 19.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 21.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 25. For a preliminary assessment of Paul’s letters as historical documents, see Grandmaison, “Le Christ de l’histoire,” 481-91.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 25; Grandmaison, “Jesus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1299.
\item \textsuperscript{152} “Mais ce qui ne change pas, ce qui est de source et inimitable, c’est, avec certain procédés instinctifs, le besoin et l’art de faire passer dans les mots une sensibilité puissante et de les charger, pour ainsi dire, de passion.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 25.)
\item \textsuperscript{153} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 26.
\item \textsuperscript{154} Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1300.
\end{itemize}
concerns and references showed that he was in accord with the testimony of the rest of the New Testament, "Paul's witness to Christ is powerfully marked by a mystical 'tour d'esprit' and the sensibility of an apostle."\textsuperscript{156} His particularity made him all the more real. The Pauline epistles also gave a sure sense of the fundamental unity of the message and person of Jesus Christ. Commenting on Paul's words about the connection between Christ’s death and resurrection in I Cor. 15, Grandmaison wrote:

Paul does not distinguish between the apologetic and theological elements, object of rational sight and object of faith, that necessities of method have forced us afterward to discern. These elements are presented by him, and by the entire apostolic preaching, in their indissoluble union. The death of Christ is, by its very nature, redemptive death; his resurrection is, by its very nature, his entry into a glorious life. But it is the same Jesus who died and rose, because in describing the resurrection of the just, of which Christ is the premier example, the archetype, the "firstfruits," Paul takes care to note the persistent identity of the glorified."\textsuperscript{157}

This unity of the apologetic and the theological elements was one of the hallmarks of Grandmaison’s Christology. Both elements were centered in the person of Christ.

The gospels too bore the mark of personal religion. What struck Grandmaison about the genre was that it possessed "from the beginning, the power of newness, expansion, and, I dare say, of unlimited explosion."\textsuperscript{158} Moreover, the originality of the gospels’ portrait of Christ showed that he was not a mere product of a collective effort.\textsuperscript{159} While acknowledging the importance of the

\textsuperscript{155} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 30; “Christ de l'histoire,” 487 and 487n3.

\textsuperscript{156} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 27-8, 29.

\textsuperscript{157} Pas plus d’ailleurs, Paul ne distingue des éléments—apologétique et théologique; objet de ‘vue rationnelle’ et objet de ‘foi’—que des nécessités de méthode nous ont forcés depuis de discerner. Ces éléments sont présentées par lui, et par toute la prédication apostolique, dans leur indissoluble union. La mort de Christ est, par identité, mort rédemptrice; sa résurrection est, par identité, son entrée dans une vie glorieuse. Mais c'est le même Jésus qui est mort et qui est ressuscité, car en décrivant la résurrection des justes, dont celle du Christ est le premier exemple, l'archétype, les 'prémices,' Paul prend bien soin de noter l'identité persistante du glorifié.” (Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1476-7.)

\textsuperscript{158} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 46.
communal dimension of the composition of the gospels, Grandmaison privileged the role of the individual evangelist, or final redactor. The unclassifiable gospel genre manifested the personal unity of Christ:

In truth, they inaugurate and form by themselves a new type in the field of doctrinal and apologetic biography; a type that nothing else resembles, even among the works that were also intended to make known and valorize a religious founder. At bottom, the real characteristics peculiar to the Gospels are, together with the complete submission of the author to his subject, the constant fusion, in the religious and moral exposition, of the person and teaching of Jesus, and finally, the constant presupposition that it suffices to recount or to reproduce exactly, in order to obtain the desired effect, the sayings and actions of the Savior, which speak for themselves and which show themselves irreformable.

Thus, the personal religion that presupposed the gospels united Christ to the sacred writer, and the believer to the gospel. The gospels were epiphanies. The words and acts of the Lord were, like dogma, irreformable, and meant to nourish the faith of the reader.

Grandmaison frankly admitted that there were discrepancies among the gospel accounts of the same events. In dealing with the synoptic question, he admitted: “In effect, in a very great number, let us say, in the greatest number, of cases, one can say, with high probability, the reason for these modifications, which seem at first glance to escape any general rule.” He also recognized that

159 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 49.

160 Léonce de Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, “La collectivité créatrice,” Note B, 199.

161 “Ils ouvrent et forment à eux seuls, à vrai dire, dans le genre de la biographie à tendance doctrinale et apologétique, une variété nouvelle à laquelle rien ne ressemble, même dans les ouvrages également destinés à faire connaître et valoir un fondateur religieux. Pour le fond, les caractères propres de la variété évangélique sont, avec la soumission complète de l’auteur par rapport à son objet, la fusion constante, dans l’exposé religieux et moral, de la personne et de l’enseignement de Jésus, enfin le présupposé constant qu’il suffit de raconter ou de reproduire exactement pour obtenir l’effet voulu: les paroles et les actes du Seigneur valant par eux-mêmes et se manifestant comme irréformables.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 52-3; Jesus Christ, 1, 52-3.)

162 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 54-5.

163 “Dans un très grand nombre de cas en effet, disons dans le plus grand nombre, on peut dire, avec une haute probabilité, le pourquoi de modifications qui paraissent d’abord d’échapper à toute loi.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 100.)
there were disparities between accounts of the same event especially in the accounts of the Passion and of the Resurrection.\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 109.}

Such irregularities did not put off Grandmaison: “Far from being astonished by the divergences and lacunae of our canonical accounts, one must rather admire their accord on the essential points, and their literal resemblance in many other points.”\footnote{“Loin de s’étonner des divergences et des lacunes de nos récits canoniques, il faut plutôt admirer leur entente sur les points essentiels, et leur ressemblance littérale en tant d’autres.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 106.)} Given the overall historical reliability of the synoptics, he rejected the difference that some exegetes tried to make between Jesus’ words and his acts.\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 121-2.}

It is, then, on this collection, on the synoptic material in general, that any decision as to historical value can and should be made. If anyone tries to delete from this organic whole an episode, a feature, or a word, the proof of falseness, of innovation, of the lack of authority, falls on him who wishes to disqualify that word, feature, or episode.\footnote{“C’est donc sur cet ensemble, sur la matière synoptique en général, qu’un jugement d’historicité peut et doit être porté. Si l’on prétend soustraire à ce tout organique un épisode, un trait, une parole, la préuve d’inauthenticité, de nouveauté, de moindre autorité, incombe à celui qui veut disqualifier cette parole, ce trait ou cet épisode.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 122.)}

The burden of proof for rejecting any particular detail lay with the objecting scholar because the gospels were “substantially worthy of being believed.” There might have been reasons for the apparent factual weaknesses that did not compromise their factuality. Texts may have been re-edited for the sake of mnemonic purposes: “and so the presence in our gospels of similar versions, partially identical and largely different, of the same fact and of the same development is plausibly explained, \emph{in certain cases} [present author’s emphasis], without our having to appeal to the explanation that they...
were unlikely literary corrections.”\footnote{168 “et voilà expliquée, en certain cas [present author’s emphasis], de façon plausible, sans recourir à l’expédient d’invraisemblables corrections littéraires, la présence dans nos Évangiles de versions semblables, partiellement identiques et nettement différents, d’un même fait, d’un même développement.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 55.)} With the clause “in particular cases,” Grandmaison left room for explanations that did not rely on Jousse’s theory of oral composition, but rather on the appeal to the overall “\textit{concordia discors}”\footnote{169 Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 92.} of the synoptics.\footnote{170 Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 91-118.} Moreover, the discrepancies among the gospels actually bolstered the reliability and persuasiveness of the gospels and of tradition in general.\footnote{171 Grandmaison, “Jésus–Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1292; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 55.}

In the end, Grandmaison put his characteristic confidence in the Holy Spirit for the correct interpretation of Scripture.

The very gifts of the Spirit, this invincible joyfulness, this immediate power that was bestowed upon the faithful to give them a superhuman assurance, to support their testimonies of signs and wonders, to put an end to their hesitations and doubts; far from substituting for the Christ of history, these gifts served him. The Spirit is the witness to the Christ, his lieutenant, the infaillible echo of his lessons, the second Advocate who argued the same cause. The Spirit depends on him, refers himself to him entirely, finds in the transcendence of the Lord the norm that allows one to distinguish his authentic inspiration from counterfeits. It is a constant fact, and, simply from the point of view of history, quite remarkable, that the usage, recognized throughout and sometimes preponderant, of spiritual gifts constantly tended to elevate and glorify the personal mediation of Jesus rather than to supplant or obscure it.\footnote{172 “Les dons mêmes de l’Esprit, cette allégresse conquérante, cette puissance soudaine qui s’emparait des fidèles pour leur donner une assurance surhumaine, pour appuyer leurs témoignages de signes et de merveilles, pour mettre un terme à leurs hésitations et à leurs doutes, loin de se substituer au Christ de l’histoire, le servaient. L’Esprit est le témoin de Christ, son lieutenant, le répétiteur infaillible de ses leçons, l’avocat second qui plaide la même cause. Il dépend de lui, s’y réfère entièrement, trouve dans la confession de la transcendance du Seigneur la norme qui permettra de distinguer son inspiration authentique de ses contrefaçons. C’est un fait constant et, du simple point de l’histoire, bien remarquable, que l’usage, partout reconnu et parfois prépondérant, des dons spirituels ait constamment tendu à rehausser et à glorifier, loin de la supplanter ou de l’obnubiler, la médiation personnelle de Jésus.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 104.)}

Here Grandmaison emphatically rejected any bifurcation between Christ and the Spirit. The Spirit witnessed to Christ’s identity as the Father’s fully divine mediator and supported Christ’s mission.
The gospel according to John was given the longest treatment of all the gospels.\textsuperscript{173} The length of the treatment reflected the fact that it was the most controversial of the gospels for rationalist critics.\textsuperscript{174} “It differs profoundly from the others by its mystical spirit that continually animates it, by its preoccupation with doctrine, classification, very personal style, and the majority of its contents.”\textsuperscript{175} Rationalist critics could reach no consensus about it. Many denied its value as a historical source for the person and teaching of Jesus.\textsuperscript{176} But even both Renan and Loisy came to acknowledge the historical dependability of the Johannine account in their later works.\textsuperscript{177}

Grandmaison himself realized that he could not settle definitively all the problems associated with the fourth gospel.\textsuperscript{178} It was difficult, for example, to give a precise sense of the overall plan of the work.\textsuperscript{179} On the other hand, he incorporated testimony from the gospel because of the respect he had for John on many counts. John was a great apologist. The purpose of the gospel was to bring the reader to faith that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God (John 20: 31).\textsuperscript{180} Although John was not fundamentally or even largely Hellenic in his worldview,\textsuperscript{181} “John made his own this expression ‘Word,’ ‘Logos,’ and it is a bridge uniting the thought of his time and Christian truth. The evangelist

\begin{enumerate}
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 125-83.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 128.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 56.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 125.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 126, 127.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 183.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 172.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 159.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 182-3.
\end{enumerate}
conforms, more by instinct than deliberate choice, to a psychological necessity.”

“Word” summed up the words Christ used to describe himself in John, such as light, truth, and water—words of the Old Testament that Paul and the synoptics reflected. Second, like Paul, John manifested the fundamental unity of apologetics and dogmatics: he developed the faith theologically in defending it, and defended it in proclaiming it, especially in passages such as the Prologue. The gospel presupposed a familiarity with the Christian faith, and defended the foundation of that faith: “Jesus, Messiah and Son of God, spiritual and incarnate, historical and eternal reality.” Grandmaison also accorded John the honor of being the greatest of mystics.

The gospel of John was not to be rejected out of hand as historically inaccurate. Grandmaison relied a great deal on agreements of John with the synoptics and on traditional references to support the authenticity of the gospel, especially Irenaeus’ personal witness, and John’s literary unity and character. His distinctive voice was unmistakable—as well as reliable about the historical tradition regarding Jesus. “[T]he historical part [of John] manifests the solidity

---

182 “Cette expression de Verbe, de Logos, Jean s’en empare donc, et elle est un pont jeté entrée la pensée de son temps et la vérité chrétienne. L’évangéliste se conforme, plus par instinct que par choix délibéré, à une nécessité psychologique.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 168.)

183 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 169-70.

184 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 163-4; Jésus Christ, 1, 168.

185 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 161, 163.

186 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 157.

187 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 187.

188 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 136.

189 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 156-8.

190 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 160.
of his geographical and historical exactitude.” So Grandmaison decided to take the gospel on its own terms. It needed to be handled somewhat differently than the synoptics, but also in conjunction with them.

The gospel reconciled the coincidence of opposites involving personal religion.

This double character—for it is both gospel and personal, independent and authoritative testimony—dictates the use that we make of the fourth gospel. Not to employ it would be to mutilate, impoverish, and to emaciate our exposition; to juxtapose it simply and in all instances with the Synoptics, to treat it on the same footing and with the same method, would be to misunderstand the profound differences that the Christian tradition and an examination of the work equally incline us to consider real. It remained for us to seek in the gospel according to John a supplement or a complement (sometimes very appreciable) to our information; to place it on a second level and at a great depth, so to speak, so as to find in it the inspiration, suggestions, and lines of interpretation that are to be expected from a writing in which a disciple and a personal friend of the Master has left his definitive thought, has gathered and explained those of his recollections that he believed were the most appropriate to communicate faith in Jesus, and the knowledge and love of Jesus.

The concern for historical accuracy was integrated here with the demands of personal religion. The exegete could not ignore the diversity within Christian revelation as found in the gospels. However, the unity of the tradition was enhanced by Christianity’s personal dimension, which, in Grandmaison’s, was instantiated by the close personal relationship between Jesus and John.

Catholicism was the true religion, and its revelation reliable, because it depended on authorized, personal witness.

---

191 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 175.

192 “Ce double caractère d’évangile et de témoignage personnel, indépendant, autorisé, nous dictait l’usage à faire du quatrième évangile. Ne pas l’employer serait mutiler, appauvrir, dessécher notre exposition; le juxtaposer simplement et dans tous les cas aux Synoptiques, le traiter sur le même pied et après la même méthode, serait méconnaitre les profondes différences que la tradition chrétienne et l’examen de l’ouvrage nous inclinent également à considérer comme véritables. Restait de chercher dans l’évangile johannique un supplément, ou un complément (parfois très appréciable) d’information. Restait de le dresser au second plan et pour ainsi dire en profondeur, d’y trouver les inspirations, les suggestions, les lignes d’interprétation qu’on peut attendre d’un écrit où un disciple, un ami personnel du Maître, a livré sa pensée définitive, a réuni et expliqué ceux de ses souvenirs qu’il croyait les plus propres à communiquer la foi en Jésus, l’intelligence et l’amour de Jésus.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 188; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 188-9.)
The Johannine sensibility also integrated the spiritual and earthly dimensions of the Incarnation\textsuperscript{193} and overcame the false opposition between flesh and spirit that was found so often in Gnosticism.\textsuperscript{194} John consecrated himself entirely to the service of a sole cause, a sole love, and a sole faith, and finally on account of all that: service, the Reign of God, the faith that saves, the love that beatifies, the sap that gives life—is for him, one and the same thing, Jesus—of a single Being. To no one is more completely applicable the great saying of the mystics: \textit{Solus Soli} [the Alone with the alone]; the rest doesn’t matter to him.\textsuperscript{195}

Jesus’ declaration that he was in the Father and the Father was in him (John 14: 10)\textsuperscript{196} was “the very definition of the mysticism that is specifically Christian” and summed up the gospel according to John.\textsuperscript{197}

According to Goguel, Grandmaison’s detailed, nuanced, and lively evocation of the Jewish world in book two, “Le milieu évangélique,” showed the expert hand of a historian.\textsuperscript{198} Grandmaison thought on the one hand that the living and active testimony of Christ was “received, kept, and transmitted by the Church”; “but if its effectiveness has not been not diminished, if the ‘presentality’ of this testimony (to take a word from Saint Augustine), while modified, has not been abolished for us, it remains very important, and of supreme interest, to directly study it in its first and authentic

\textsuperscript{193} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 173.

\textsuperscript{194} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 475.

\textsuperscript{195} “au service d’une seule cause, d’un seul amour, d’une seule foi, et finalement—car tout cela: service: Règne de Dieu, foi qui sauve, dilection qui béatifie, sève qui fait vivre, est pour lui, par identité, Jésus—d’un Seul. À personne ne s’applique ne plus complètement le grand mot des mystiques: \textit{Solus Soli}; le reste ne lui est de rien.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 158; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 159.)

\textsuperscript{196} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 158.

\textsuperscript{197} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 158.

\textsuperscript{198} Goguel, “Ouvrages récents sur Jésus,” 63.
In this way, the faithful could be sure that there was no opposition between “the Christ of history” and the “Christ of faith.” So, before establishing the primitive teaching of Christ, Grandmaison thought it necessary to set the historical context in which it was delivered.

We know the outline of the history of the preaching of the Gospel, whether by the Gospels themselves or from writings and monuments of every kind that can be dated with certitude or high probability from the centuries that precede or immediately follow the Christian era. We will try to use of them here, following only the results that one can regard as definite. This included the political background of the Jewish world, in Palestine and in the Diaspora, the various social groups, the intertestamental intellectual literature and governing ideas, and most importantly, the religious environment.

The first important historical elements were the governing notions of the time. “Of these notions, the most active and universally pervasive one (although its potential riches were as yet undeveloped) was that which Jesus was going to adopt as the vehicle of his message while he gave it a more determined and partly novel meaning: that of the Reign of God.” This idea did not merely imply the sovereignty of almighty God that could be found in natural religion. “As a positive and
revealed article of faith, its object is the progressively effective and perfect realization of God’s gracious design for a man, a group of men, and virtually, under particular conditions, all men.”

The Kingdom would be a time of religious and moral judgment. This vision was commingled with a false or carnal element that involved the literal triumph of Israel as a nation. The second and related notion was that of the intermediary appointed by God to bring this Kingdom to fulfillment. By the time of Christ, the expectations of a Messiah exceeded that duly presented by the prophets, the Maccabees, and the intertestamental writings.

Judge of men, liberating King of Israel, Prophet teaching the holy ways of Yahweh: apart from these almost constant characteristics, the image that people have of the Messiah is changeable, diverse, and most often pushed to the extremes of the chimerical or the material. Each chooses and interprets from the ancient prophecies what fits his desires, according to the measure of his soul.

The third prevalent idea was that of Isaiah’s “Suffering Servant,” the Lamb of God who would come to take away the sins of the world, someone about whom “the sources of pre-Christian Jewish theology do not seem to know [Alfred Bertholet, Biblische Théologie des Alten Testaments, beg. von B. Stade II, Tübingen, 911, 450].” These three observations in effect rebutted some of the important claims of the thoroughgoing eschatological school.

---

206 “Croyance positive et révélée, elle a pour objet la réalisation de plus en plus effective et parfaite d’un dessein gracieux de Dieu sur un homme, un groupe d’hommes, et virtuellement, sous certaines conditions, tous les hommes.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 270; Jesus Christ, 1, 282.)

207 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 273.

208 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 274-5.

209 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 276.

210 “Juge des hommes, Roi libérateur d’Israël, Prophète enseignant les voies saintes de Yahvé: à part près constants, l’image qu’on se fait du Messie est ondoyante, diverse, poussée le souvent au chimérique ou au matériel. Chacun, dans les prophéties anciennes, choisit et interprète au gré de ses désirs, à la mesure de son âme.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 277-8; Jesus Christ, 1, 290.)

211 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 278.
The last section of book two dealt with “Les Entours Religieux et Infiltrations Étrangères.”

The Judaism of the Diaspora and of Palestine resisted syncretism despite its contact with many cultures.²¹² Israel’s religion was characterized by an intransigent monotheism and adherence to the Law.²¹³ Although Jesus was sympathetic to the religious aspirations of the Gentiles, he never lost sight of Israel’s place in salvation history.

Outside of any question of borrowings or imitation, the profound needs of the human soul emitted, like an immense cry, the demand to which the divine offer had to respond. Saint Paul recalls that humanity (and all of creation) sought gropingly and called out from its confused desires for a liberator, a guide, a better life. Jesus willingly acknowledged the good dispositions of certain Gentiles and contrasted them with the incredulity of the children of Abraham. But the disciple knew as the Master did that salvation must come from Israel and that, far from borrowing from the religious doctrines of the nations, the Gospel was rightly destined to be for them the light of salvation, to open for them the only door that led to the Father.²¹⁴

Bitterness toward various occupying nations contaminating the Temple since the time of the Maccabees further estranged Israel from Gentile superstitions.²¹⁵ The prophets had consistently delivered two diametrically opposed kinds of reproaches against Israel: first, negligence of single-minded service of the Lord, inclining them to idolatry in imitation of their neighbors; and second, “a formalism, a life-sapping literalism, that locates the essential part of religion in religious practices.”²¹⁶

²¹² Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 279-87.

²¹³ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 283, 285-6.

²¹⁴ “En dehors même de toute question d’emprunt ou d’imitation, les besoins profonds de l’âme humaine exhalaient, comme une plainte immense, la demande à laquelle devait répondre l’offre divine. Saint Paul rappelle que l’humanité (et la création tout entière) cherchait alors à tâtons, appelait de ses désirs confus un libérateur, un guide, une vie meilleure. Jésus constatait volontiers les bonnes dispositions de certains Gentils et les opposait à l’incréduilité des enfants d’Abraham. Mais le disciple comme le Maître savaient aussi que le salut devait venir d’Israël et que, loin d’emprunter aux doctrines religieuses des Nations, l’Évangile était justement destiné à leur être lumière de salut, à leur ouvrir la seule porte qui menât au Père.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 287; Jesus Christ, 1, 300.)

²¹⁵ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 284.

²¹⁶ Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 286.
Christ’s own polemics never mentioned the first kind of danger, but rather, the fanaticism, literalism, and hypocrisy of the Pharisees.217

C. The Message, Person, And Works Of Jesus

The first two books of Jésus Christ were but the antechamber to the temple of the subsequent three books.218 The core of Grandmaison’s Christology proper had to do with the three main topics covered by the two-volume work: Christ’s teaching, person, and works. Book three (Jésus—Le Message) presented his teaching, which focused on the Father and his Kingdom. Book four (La Personne de Jésus) presented the heart of Grandmaison’s Christology. The three main topics of book four were the personal religion of Jesus, his conversation with his brothers and his intimate life. Book five (Les Oeuvres du Christ) presented the works that confirmed his personal identity and mission: the prophecies, miracles, and the Resurrection.

Book three: Jesus—the Message

Before examining the person of Jesus, “before posing to the Master the decisive question and listening to his response, it would benefit us to place ourselves in his school, to harmonize our sentiments with his, and to reform our thoughts about God and about divine things from the models that he has given us.”219 It was necessary to set aright our theological presuppositions. The message of Jesus was the vehicle of his person; but Grandmaison did not want to pass over Christ’s message to jump to his testimony to himself.220

217 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 287.
218 Huby, “Le Jésus Christ,” 137.
219 “avant de poser au Maître la question décisive, et de recueillir sa réponse, il convient de nous mettre à son école, d’accorder nos sentiments aux siens, de reformer nos pensées de Dieu et des choses divines sur les modèles qu’il nous a données.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 347.)
220 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 388.
There were human predecessors who had to be acknowledged. Chapter one of book three, entitle Les Débuts, gave John the Baptist his full due. There were two groups of disciples, one allied to John, the other to Jesus (Acts 19:1-6).

It is this imposing figure of John the Baptist, who, relegated to a doubly mysterious obscurity by the scantiness of our information and his own humility, nonetheless opens the Gospel story, which without him would remain an indecipherable enigma. Jesus did not have to inaugurate the religious movement that he so markedly dominated: a great number of faithful souls had already been touched when he embarked upon his public career.

When Jesus began his public ministry, he reaped a harvest that he did not sow. What stood out about John’s witness—who spoke of Christ as Lamb of God and Spouse—was his disinterested service, a quality that figured largely in Grandmaison’s spirituality of reserve. Jesus’ baptism by John began the official witness of the Father and the Spirit. Jesus’ prayer during his temptation in the desert was the breathing out of his very life; the encounter with evil was fraught with “the finest and most delicate human nature that there ever was.” Jesus eventually struck out on his own, and “in the practice of his ministry, he seems to have let go by the wayside the figurative Baptism to which, with so many others, he himself had submitted.”

---

221 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 302-3.

222 “Cette imposante figure de Jean le Baptiste, dans la pénombre deux fois mystérieuse où la relèguent l’indigence de nos informations et sa propre humilité, n’en ouvre pas moins l’histoire évangélique qui, sans elle, resterait une énigme indéchiffrable. Jésus n’eût pas à inaugurer le mouvement religieux qu’il domina de si haut: des âmes fidèles, en grand nombre, étaient déjà touchées quand il entra dans sa carrière publique.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 303; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 9.)

223 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 303-4.


226 “Il semble avoir laissé tomber, dans la pratique de son ministère personnel, le Baptême figurative auquel, avec tant d’autres, il s’était lui-même soumis.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 310.) Grandmaison raised the question of whether the continuation of John’s baptism by Jesus’ apostles was authorized by him. Grandmaison referred the reader to A. d’Alès, “Initiation chrétienne,” *DAFC*, vol. 11, 799; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 310n2.
In chapter two of book four, in the sections entitled L'Économie du Message and Le Message du Jésus, Grandmaison made some important claims vis-à-vis his modernist adversaries about Jesus’ Messianic consciousness.

From the start, in fact, Jesus united his person with his work. The testimony that he gave of himself, which we must set forth further on, dates from the first days of the ministry in Galilée. Confining ourselves to history, one can maintain that it is impossible to state exactly how and at what time the conviction that he was the Messiah imposed itself on Jesus. But it is certain from history alone that this thought was ripe when the Master began to preach the Gospel.227

Grandmaison showed here and elsewhere in Jésus Christ that he was willing to confine himself by and large to the conclusions granted by the history related by the gospels.

Making such a claim led naturally to a further issue, that of the Messianic secret. Why did Jesus reveal himself as he did? One had to take into account the disquiet that the earthly, nationalist character inflicted on the Messianic hope of Israel.228 Being fully self–possessed, Jesus did everything he could to conceal his true identity so as to avoid the dangerous, ubiquitous web of apocalyptic messianic and warrior expectations.229

That is why Jesus, faithful to the idea of the Kingdom that he was going to describe in the parables of the leaven and the mustard see, adopted a severe economy in his exposition of his personal message….For scenes of prosperity, revenge, exterior glory, he substitutes the most humble, intimate, and personal views. It was an indispensable preparation for understanding, tasting, and accepting the Gospel. Nonetheless, and from the start of his preaching, the Master accomplishes the works of goodness, deliverance, and power predicted by the great seers of the past.

227 “Dès le début, en effet, Jésus mêla sa personne à son oeuvre. Le témoignage qu’il se rendit, et que nous aurons à exposer plus loin, date des premiers jours du ministère en Galilée. À s’en tenir à l’histoire, on peut soutenir qu’il est impossible de préciser comment, et à quelle époque, la conviction qu’il était le Messie s’imposa à la pensée de Jésus. Mais il est certain, pour la seule histoire, que cette pensée était mûre quand le Maître commença de prêcher l’Évangile.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 310 Jésus Christ, 2, 16.)

228 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 311.

229 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 311-3.
...Jesus only had to let the facts speak.\textsuperscript{230}

These views contested the rationalist claim that Jesus believed that he was the Messiah and the Son of God because he was duped by the people’s delusional expectations of him. Rather, he chose a title that inspired without provoking undue expectations, the obscure, ambiguous, enigmatic, and Semitic “Son of Man,”\textsuperscript{231} which he used eighty-one times in the synoptic gospels to designate himself. It does not appear in John except for a passing reference to the title. Being a kind of mashal, the Hebrew word for either rule, or riddle or parable,\textsuperscript{232} the phrase signaled that he was either God’s agent or mortal, or that he was both. Such a title would have made sense only to the people of the Old Covenant. It commonly referred, as in Ezekiel, to a mortal man, a mere human being. In the book of Daniel, however, the term is also applied to a divinely appointed envoy who will judge the world in a final apocalypse, or revelation, of the majesty of God (Dan. 7:13). Other, more explicit titles had to be used later to unpack the meaning of this phrase—the identity of Jesus—for the Gentile world. But the gospels preserved the title in spite of its strangeness, especially in a Gentile context.\textsuperscript{233}

\textsuperscript{230}“C’est pourquoi, fidèle en cela à la conception du Royaume qu’il allait décrire dans les paraboles du levain et du grain de sènevé, Jésus adopte, dans l’exposition de son message personnel, une sévère économie…À des tableaux de prospérité, de revanche, de gloire extérieure, il substitue des vues plus humbles, plus proches, personnelles. C’était une préparation indispensable à l’intelligence, au goût, à l’acceptation de l’Évangile. Cependant, et dès le début de sa prédication, le Maître accomplit les œuvres de bonté, de délivrance et la puissance prédites par les grands voyants du passé.

...Jésus n’a qu’à laisser parler les faits.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 315, 316; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 20-1.)

\textsuperscript{231}Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 317.


\textsuperscript{233}Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1345.
Christ was able to speak more openly of his identity with sincere seekers of the Kingdom of God.234 Yet the resistance he met at Nazareth and nearby from “his own”—from the religious establishment, the crowds, his family—began to foreshadow the mortal opposition he would finally face. “From then on, we see an attitude of stricter reserve—that appeared to be new—in carrying out the work of salvation.”235 Christ’s reserve assured his survival. Hence, he turned to speaking to his audience in parables. Such stories, according to Isaiah 6:9-10, both revealed and concealed the mystery of Jesus.236 (This particular reference to Isaiah was also meant to anticipate the scandal of Israel’s rejection of Christ.237) The parables also manifested Christ’s ability to unite contraries within himself.

Grandmaison’s elucidation of the parables showed that he accepted that there likely were times when the evangelists redacted the words of Christ to make a point that he may not have directly intended. In Jn. 12: 37-41, Jesus decries the unbelief of the people in words taken from the prophet Isaiah that Jesus used in the synoptics to explain why he spoke to the people in parables. Commenting on these verses, Grandmaison wrote:

Redacted in retrospect and echoing the sublime phrases of Saint Paul on the same subject in the Letter to the Romans, these reflections give the citation from Isaiah a bitter taste and the character of a judgment that it does not have on the lips of Christ in connection with parables.238

234 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 326.

235 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 328.

236 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 329, 359.

237 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 330-1.

238 “Rédigées rétrospectivement et faisant écho aux élévations de Saint Paul sur le même sujet dans l’épître aux Romains, ces reflections donnent à la citation d’Isaïe une saveur d’amertume et un caractère de chose jugée qu’elle n’a pas sur les lèvres du Christ, à propos des paraboles.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 331-2; Jesus Christ, 2, 38.)
The Jewish rejection of Christ may also have been reflected in the redaction of Matthew and Luke. Yet Grandmaison was quick to point out that Christ’s positive intention in quoting Isaiah’s prophecy was that the people might yet repent.239 The most important reason for speaking in parables was that they were understood so that they could be accepted. The line between the disciples and the sectarian hardliners was real, but fluid.240

From this time till the end of Christ’s life, there were two circles among his followers for whom Christ adopted two styles of discourse, respectively.241 “One, more superficial, mixed with lights and shadows, proposed heavenly truths in such a way that ill-disposed minds were more intrigued than enlightened, astonished than touched.”242 Nonetheless, there was opportunity for such to become true seekers of God and enter his kingdom. The second circle, parallel to the first, was the intimate circle of the disciples.243 They had received a deeper and richer formation, a more correct one. Yet these same people fell into disbelief and misunderstanding. There was need for a final reckoning as to the true identity and mission of Christ. In both the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions,

it is plain that [the economy of salvation] was chiefly an attempt to delay and set off the great and final claim, while preparing it, adapting it, and making it inevitable once its true meaning was restored. It was a wise precaution against a premature enthusiasm that would have attributed to the Master not only the well-merited titles of prophet, judge, and divine envoy, but also other names that would have been misunderstood or erroneous. It responded to the need to complete the idea and the ideal that men already had of the Kingdom with the

239 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 332-3.
240 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 334-5.
241 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 336.
242 “L’un, plus superficiel, mêlé de rayons et d’ombres, proposait les vérités célestes de telle manière que les esprits mal disposés fussent plus intrigués qu’éclairés, étonnés plutôt que touchés.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 336-7.)
243 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 337-8.
notion of the suffering and redeeming Messiah, by bringing to light the laborious and slowly progressing nature of the Kingdom.

This ‘economy’ is the key that permits us to acquire a profound understanding of the Gospel; without it, a great number of the actions and words of the Savior would remain inexplicable, above all in the period that follows the first preaching in Galilee and the formation of a concerted opposition among its hearers. With it, we can undertake the study of the message of Jesus: the apparently disconcerting traits will blend of themselves into a harmonious image.244

What some thinkers called the Messianic secret was the key in the gospels that clarified the ministry of Jesus—it did not present an insoluble riddle, as it seemed to so many historical critics, e.g. those of the eschatological school or those who doubted Christ’s sanity for other reasons. Rather, the delayed coming of the Kingdom and Christ’s identity as a suffering and victorious Messiah was a necessary part of coming to understand what Jesus and his mission really were. Otherwise, the words and gestures following the Galilean ministry and the nascent opposition would have made no sense.

The three chief topics—especially important for understanding personal religion in its three major senses—were God the Father,245 the Reign of God,246 and the commandment to love one’s

---

244 “on voit qu’elle fut surtout un effort pour ajourner et différer—toute en préparant, en l’orientant, en la rendant inévitable, après lui avoir restitué son véritable sens—la grande et ultime revendication. Elle fut une sage précaution contre une appréciation prématurée, qui eut attribué au Maître avec les qualités très méritées de prophète, de juge, d’envoyé divin, des titres mal compris ou tout à fait erronés. Elle répondit à la nécessité de compléter, par la notion du Messie souffrant et rédempteur, par la mise en lumière des caractères laborieux et lentement progressifs du Royaume, l’idée et l’idéal qu’on faisait alors.

Cette ‘économie’ est la clef qui permet de pénétrer dans l’intelligence de l’Évangile: sans elle, un grand nombre des démarches et paroles du Seigneur, surtout dans la période qui suit la première prédication galiléenne et la formation d’une opposition concertée parmi les auditeurs, restent inexplicables. Avec elle, nous pouvons aborder l’étude du message du Jésus: les traits déconcertants en apparence se fondront d’eux-mêmes dans une image harmonieuse.”

(Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 338; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 44-5.)

245 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 347-76.

246 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 376.
neighbor. As elsewhere in his Christology, Grandmaison made abundant use of religious psychology and comparative religion in elucidating these themes. The children of Israel had already been acquainted with the Fatherhood of God. The peoples surrounding them held sentiments expressing this belief. Moreover, there were vestiges of this belief in classical antiquity. Grandmaison recognized too, as elsewhere, that “a certain number of ‘naturally Christian’ souls paved their way across a forest of degrading symbols. “Faithful to the beliefs of popular religion, understood by them in the most refined sense, Socrates, in so far as we could judge, and surely Plato and Aristotle, spoke exceedingly well of God.” Nonetheless, these philosophical predecessors of the Gospel lacked many of the ingredients of a truly personal religion, even if they respected the divine transcendence. Finally, the newer mystery religions of Asia enjoyed a resurgence in the West before the coming of Christ because of their warm devotion; but they lacked a sense of the divine transcendence. In the religious writings of India such as the Mahabharata, however, one found something close to “a personal piety toward a personal God.” But the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel was neither distant nor impersonal; moreover, he was a jealous God, brooking no idolatry.

247 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 388.

248 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 355.

249 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 347-54.

250 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 348.

251 “Fidèles aux croyances de la religion populaire, entendues par eux dans le sens le plus épuré, Socrate, pour autant que nous en puissions juger, et sûrement Platon, Aristote, ont par surcroit bien parler de Dieu.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 348.)

252 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 350.

253 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 352.

254 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 353.
The idea of God’s holiness needed to be purified. On the one hand, Jesus put in play the transcendence of God: “motivated by his grandeur, goodness, and richness; but also defined by his approval of all that is pure and his reprobation of all that is not so.” On the other hand, God’s command in Lev. 11:44, “Be holy, for I am holy,” implied a certain similarity, however qualified, between the Lord and his people. Such holiness was internalized through external rites of purification and the injunctions of the prophets.

As mentioned above, however, the Judaism of Jesus’ day suffered not from idolatry but from legalism and formalism that reduced religion to ritualism, colonizing all areas of social life. Such religion “tends naturally toward literalism, the abuse of casuistry, and dryness.” Such a tendency weakened the prophetic inspiration of a religion and direct commerce with God. Hence, Jesus was obliged to counteract this error and any other temptation toward polytheism or anthropomorphism: “‘You shall worship the Lord and him only shall you serve’ [Dt. 6: 10, in Mt. 4: 10].”

The Master was not content to recall the lesson, but summed it up in a formula that expresses and surpasses all the others: No one is good but God alone. Everything is said by that; but Jesus makes the lesson concerning the two aspects of this supreme attribute concrete and drives it home: Jesus emphasized goodness, as one considers it in God as the fullness of being that he alone possesses as its origin; benignity, when one grasps it outside him in the gift that he makes to his creatures capable of goodness and happiness. Unfathomable and close, inaccessible and overflowing, forbidding and paternal, this goodness which is a mystery and is adorable as such, is also philanthropy, and therefore very lovable. This is the double lesson that contains in germ all the others.

---

255 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 356.

256 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 357.

257 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 359.

258 “Le Maître ne se contente pas de rappeler, il résume la leçon dans une formule qui explique et prime toutes les autres: Nul n’est bon que Dieu seul. Tout est dit par là; mais Jésus rend la leçon concrète et touchante, les deux aspects de cet attribut suprême: bonté, quand on le considère en Dieu, dans la plénitude d’être qu’il possède seul et d’origine; bénignité, quand on le saisit hors de lui, dans le don qu’il fait à des créatures capables de bien et de bonheur, sont mis en relief par Jésus. Insondable et proche, inaccessible et débordante, redoutable et paternelle, cette bonté qui est mystère et comme telle adorable, est aussi philanthropie, et, partant, très aimable. Double leçon qui contient en germe toutes les autres.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 359; Jesus Christ, 2, 57-8.) “Dans son enseignement, Dieu est infiniment élevé au-dessus de...
Such a Father could be made known only by being revealed. Moreover, what was promised was not oblivion, but a feast, a wedding feast, eternal life, because God was not the God of the dead, but of the living.\textsuperscript{259} God was not jealous of his creature, depriving him of any good on account of “an awkward prayer or a formality that is omitted!”\textsuperscript{260} As important as worship and rites were, it was the heart that mattered much more in rendering the believer pleasing to God. “One must pray and serve.”\textsuperscript{261} The reward one could expect in the active, living, and filial service of God was proportioned to his justice. Although “he has need of nothing and no one, and recompenses royally these paltry services”; yet of him to whom much was given, much would be expected.\textsuperscript{262}

Identifying Christ as the peerless exemplar and source of personal religion allowed Grandmaison the opportunity to correct false notions of morality and spirituality. \textit{Pace} the modernists, religion and moral code were intimately connected.\textsuperscript{263} Yet the standard for morality was personal: Jesus, free of any kind of rigorism or moralism, was the true Law unto himself.\textsuperscript{264} He fulfilled the Law, but in a spiritual way.\textsuperscript{265} Above all, even though the Church was the personal religion established by Christ, nothing was to be preferred to the personal love of Christ.\textsuperscript{266}

tout ce que n’est pas lui, en même temps, plus proche de chacun de nous que notre père selon le chair.” (Grandmaison, \textit{ibid.}, 357.)

\textsuperscript{259} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 361-2.

\textsuperscript{260} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 362.

\textsuperscript{261} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 363.

\textsuperscript{262} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 364.

\textsuperscript{263} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 601.

\textsuperscript{264} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 48n4-49.

\textsuperscript{265} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 16.

\textsuperscript{266} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 622.
Jesus too had to give a fully correct view of the providence of the Father. On the one hand, he praised the serene beauty of the Father’s love for his creatures, a love that the pagans seldom understood. On the other hand, “Jesus ignores nothing and omits nothing of that which God allows in our poor world such as it is.” There was oppression by the powerful, hypocrisy, ingratitude, scandal, persecution, vengeance, and death, whether premeditated or accidental.

It was in this context that one had to understand the counsel of filial abandon of the Sermon on the Mount. The Father watched over the least of his creatures, let alone his faithful.

This Providence will have the last word (and that observation is essential for understanding the message of Jesus), for it has eternal life in which to make its chosen ones blessed. The consummation of the Kingdom of God in endless joy is the keystone of the Gospel notion of Providence. It definitely removes the antinomy that otherwise would remain, on the one hand, between the paternal love of God and the sentiments of filial abandon that this love elicits, and, on the other hand, the hard realities that Jesus neither forgets nor minimizes.

The Father’s love did not abandon his children when they abandoned themselves to him. The wicked would not have their victory over the just. Jesus also promised eternal life. The Messiah made explicit—in the Beatitudes, the “Gospel in its quintessence” the implicit message of the

---

267 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 365.

268 Grandmaison had to qualify along these lines his view of Aristotle; for no matter how lofty a view he had of the divine transcendence, he could not conceive of a God who was involved with his inferior creation or show any love or care for it. Aristotle’s God was definitely a “God of the philosophers.”; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 368n2-369.


271 “Cette Providence aura le dernier mot (et cette observation est capitale pour l’intelligence du message de Jésus), parce qu’elle a, pour béatifier ses élus, la vie éternel. La consumption du Royaume de Dieu dans une joie sans terme est la clef de voûte de la notion évangélique de Providence. Elle lève définitivement l’antinomie qui autrement subsisterait, entre l’amour paternel de Dieu et les sentiments d’abandon filial que cet amour appelle, d’un part, et, d’autre part, les dures réalités que Jésus n’oublie ni n’atténue.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 369; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 68.)

272 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 370-1.
psalms and the prophets that went beyond a carnal view of the vicissitudes of life and of the Kingdom. One such issue was that of theodicy.

This eternal life is the pole toward which the Master constantly turns hearts: he has no use for the inhuman monster of absolute indifference, as if man ought to or could totally and permanently ignore his destiny. To the contrary, the most austere lessons are illuminated by the promise of salvation that, in fulfilling our hopes, will achieve God’s designs for his creatures.273

Again, Jesus, unlike the modernists, could unite and reconcile the most distant contraries. God’s transcendence and his personhood were reconciled even in the case of the cruel death of the just. Moreover, it was not beyond the pale to be concerned for one’s personal happiness, as an extreme Jansenist or Kantian moralist might claim.

The Kingdom was the precursor of the fullness of eternal life. “Two qualities (in as much as one can judge) recommend most of all this idea [the Kingdom of God] to Jesus: its religious character and its very plasticity.”274 The Kingdom, whose reception was so anticipated by national and nationalist aspirations, “would be the work of the right hand of the Most High, and would consist entirely in the recognition of his sovereignty.”275 Envisaged by Jesus in individual and social terms, the Kingdom was the great plan of mercy and grace of God, the unique gift by which he would unite himself to his creatures by a love that was mutual and everlasting. Prepared little by little in every time and place, it would be completed at the end of time here below. Although its growth was visible, discernment was needed to perceive it. The Kingdom would grow gradually, not as a

273 “Cette vie éternelle est le pôle vers lequel le Maître oriente constamment les coeurs: il ne donne pas dans la chimère inhumaine d’un désintérêt absolu, comme si l’homme devait ou pouvait faire abstraction totale et durable de sa destinée. Les leçons les plus austères sont au contraire illuminées sur la promesse du salut qui en comblant nos espérances, achèvera les desseins de Dieu sur sa créature.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 375-6; Jésus Christ, 2, 74.)

274 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 380.

275 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 377-8.
sudden revolution, but as a living thing growing progressively. It was also “The City of Peace, the spiritual Jerusalem.” Again, it was not one’s race, but the disposition of the heart that gained one entrance. This City had doors and keys:

In the course of the Kingdom’s laborious development here below, all people will not be equal as if they were a mere crowd. It will contain sheep and shepherds, pupils and directors. It will be an organized and stable community, a great social edifice, a Church. It could be compared to a building formed by living stones that is being raised on a foundation that ensures its stability and cohesion.

Only God himself knew the hour when it would arrive in its fullness. Here and throughout the section on the Kingdom, Grandmaison was answering those who held that the Kingdom had not come, or that the Church was a poor anticipation of it. The fourth gospel gave a more exact representation of the Kingdom, where Christ spoke of it as eternal life. “Thus one can rightly say that the Kingdom of God is Jesus known, tasted, and possessed. Saint Paul says in the same sense: ‘for me, to live is Christ.’” The message and personal testimony of Christ to himself reinforced one another.

The third main point of the Gospel was love of neighbor: “on no other point is the Gospel written more completely, nor more movingly, perhaps because the Master came into the world

---

276 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 381.
277 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 381.
278 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 382.
279 “Dans la Royaume, au cours de son laborieux développement ici-bas, tous ne seront pas égaux, ce qui l’assimilerait à une foule. Il contiendra des brebis et des pasteurs, des enseignés et des dirigeants. Il sera une communauté organisée et stable: une grandeur d’ordre social: une Église. On peut le comparer à un édifice formé de pierres vivantes et s’élevant sur un fondement qui en assure la stabilité et la cohésion.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 383; Jesus Christ, 2, 82.)
280 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 386.
281 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 387.
282 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 388.
'when men did not love one another,’ more probably because it is always as difficult as it is important for them to love one another from the heart.’” The measure of the Golden Rule was God himself and the love of disciple for his Master—the costliest form of this love being forgiveness. The Rule implied complete, active gift of what one has and of oneself; in short, “disinterest, costly abnegation, magnanimity.” The commandment to love was Christ’s translation of the ancient Law, the most beautiful parable of which was the Good Samaritan. Finally, the injunction to love one’s enemy was realized in martyrdom.

At the very end of the presentation of these three points of Christ’s teaching, Grandmaison turned to comparative religion to underline his claim that lacking any of these tenets—especially the first—would render positive religion illogical. Yes, the teaching of Jesus that the gospels reported was so brief and incomplete. Yet the Sermon on the Mount by itself—only one hundred and ten verses long—was enough to provide the spiritual foundations of religion. The Beatitudes contained the standard of true personal religion above all other human versions. Although it was

283 “‘sur aucune point l’Évangile écrit n’est plus complet, ni plus touchant, peut-être parce que le Maître est venu au monde ‘quand les hommes ne s’aimaient pas,’ plus probablement parce qu’il leur est, dans tous les temps, aussi difficile qu’important, de s’entr’aimer cordialement.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 388n3–389.) Here Grandmaison quotes Emmanuel Kant, Religion dans les limites de la Raison, 1re par, III, trans. A. Tremesaygues (Paris, 1913), 34–38. Grandmaison was so struck by Kant’s insight that he did what he almost never did in his writings: quote Kant in a positive manner.

284 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 389.

285 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 390.

286 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 391.

287 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 392.

288 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 393.

289 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 397.

290 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 401-4.

291 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 399.
true that the fruit of such noble lessons depended on the ground on which the seed fell, and that the
grace of God who desired the salvation of all could find his way through mistaken ideas about him—
it was still important to have “just and profound notions about God,” the worship which befits
him, and the duties that men owed one another.

Book four: The Person of Jesus: His Personal Religion

The titles of the main chapters and sub-chapters in the two-volume work mentioned neither
the Father nor the Spirit; almost all contain either the name of Jesus or Christ. In this way,
Grandmaison upped the ante on his wager that the personality that emerged from Christ’s words
and works was sufficient to unveil his divine identity.

Jesus bore witness to himself: such was the burden of the first chapter – entitled “Le
Témoignage du Christ” of book four of the two-volume work. The second chapter —La
personne de Jésus—dealt with the heart of the mystery of Jesus: his personal religion, his
relationships with his disciples, and his intimate life. The third chapter —Le problème de Jésus—
detailed how pagans, Jews, Muslims, rationalists, liberal Protestants, and modernists dealt with the
mystery of Jesus. It was shown not only that these interpretations were inadequate, but also that the
Church had given the only satisfactory solution to the problem of Jesus.

The testimony of Christ to himself

As mentioned above, Jesus’ person was almost entirely identified with his message. In this
important respect, among others, his prophetic career was unlike that of any other prophets.

---


293 Grandmaison transposed two parts from the DAF article section “Le Témoignage considéré dans le Témoin,” entitled “Le Christ des Évangiles” and “Le mystère du Christ”—wherein was described the witness of Jesus to himself—to the beginning of book four.

294 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 200-16.
Although Grandmaison could have presented Jesus’ testimony to himself along the lines of the “titles given to or justified by the Master: King of the Jews, Prophet, Messiah, Witness to the truth, Son of David, Son of Man, Son of God,” he chose another path:

While reducing as far as possible the element of the arrangement and of personal presentation, we shall aim at extracting from the documents their most immediate direct sense. To use Savanarola’s graphic description in his *Triumphus Crucis*, we shall ‘heap together’ the confessions and acknowledgements of Christ and pick out, in the first place, from the Synoptic gospels, and afterwards from the Fourth, the sayings that constitute the testimony of Christ to his mission, with the minimum of commentary needed to situate them. In our turn we shall ask him the question which, at a first reading of the Gospels, still after nearly two thousand years, holds in breathless suspense every religious soul that is not yet initiated: ‘But who do you say that I am?’

Grandmaison was holding fast to his original plan to make a direct examination of the documents as historical, and with a minimum of interpretation.

There were five respects in which Jesus rendered witness to himself: he spoke and acted as Master of the New Law, affirmed himself, revealed himself, declared himself, and explained himself.

---


296 “Diminuant, dans toute la mesure du possible, la part d’arrangement et de présentation personnelle, nous viserons à donner, des documents, le sentiment le plus immédiat, le plus direct. Selon le mot si expressif de Savonarole, dans son *Triumphus Crucis*, nous ‘mettrons en tas’ les confidences et les aveux du Christ, relevant, dans nos évangiles synoptiques d’abord, puis dans le quatrième, avec un minimum d’interprétation destiné surtout à les situer, les paroles constituant le témoignage rendu par le Maître à sa mission. À notre tour, nous lui posons la question qui tiens en suspens, depuis près de deux millénaires, toute âme religieuse et non encore initiée, abordant pour la première fois la lecture des évangiles: ‘Vous, que dites-vous de moi vous-mêmes?’” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 7; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 129.)


300 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 40-5.

301 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 46-56.
Passages such as the Sermon on the Mount established Jesus within the context of the Torah, which was so prominent in the hearts and minds of the people.\textsuperscript{302} His attitude toward the Law was also very significant.

It is as far from the superficial literalism of the Sadducees as from the decisive formalism of the Pharisees. It repudiates both the neglect of the indifferent and the soulless literalism of the scribes. It unites the greatest respect for the divine inspiration of Scripture—and notably of the Law, with the most singular liberty.\textsuperscript{303}

While Jesus made substitutions for certain aspects of the Law, he did not abrogate it. Woe to him who disregarded an iota of the Law or taught others to disobey the least part of it (Mt. 5: 18-9):

\begin{quote}
The revelation contained in the Scriptures is integrally divine in its inspiration….this rash person [admonished in Matt 5:19] would choose in the divine deposit that which he should guard in its entirety. Nor is he authorized to make casuistic distinctions between the ‘great’ and ‘lesser’ commandment. All are divine, and as such, have an inestimable value.\textsuperscript{304}
\end{quote}

The respect for the integrity of the Christian deposit of faith was a reflection of the respect due to the Law that Christ himself observed in his earthly life. Jesus was not an advocate of anarchy, lawlessness, or carnal liberty among his disciples.\textsuperscript{305} The observance of the spirit of the Gospel would be costlier than the observance of the letter of the Law. “There was no question, then, of reforming this code, or of making a selection from it; it had to be brought to its perfection, to be

\textsuperscript{302} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 9-10.

\textsuperscript{303} “Elle s’écarte autant du littéralisme superficiel des Sadducéens que du formalisme décisif de beaucoup de Pharisiens. Elle répudie à la fois la négligence des indifférents, et le littéralisme sans âme des scribes. Elle concilie le respect le plus entier pour l’inspiration divine de l’Écriture,—et notamment de la Loi, avec la liberté la plus singuli ère.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 11; Jesus Christ, 2, 133.)

\textsuperscript{304} “La révélation contenue dans les Écritures est intégralement divine dans son inspiration….ce téméraire choisirait dans le dépôt divin qu’on doit garder en entier. Qu’il n’aile pas non plus s’autoriser des distinctions casuistiques entre ‘grand’ et ‘moindre’ commandement. Les uns et les autres sont divins. À ce titre, tous ont une valeur inestimable.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 13; Jesus Christ, 2, 135.)

\textsuperscript{305} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 12, 14.
made the law of all peoples, a system under which the letter blossomed into spiritual perfection.”

Jesus resolved the more difficult cases not only with astute casuistry, but also sometimes “by an appeal to the best justice, where he balanced it by the proclamation of the principle that defined a duty by limiting it.” As shall be seen below, this balance was one of the most remarkable aspects of Jesus’ character for Grandmaison.

Jesus affirmed himself: he manifested this sovereign authority in his deeds as well as in his teaching of the New Law. His ability to distinguish between divine and merely human precepts was a telltale demonstration of his personal, divine authority. “He spoke in his own name and with a direct accent that imposed itself, as a son in his father’s house.” All things had been given to him by his Father. This claim was also evident in his call of the disciples, and in his healings and exorcisms. “Jesus performed an action that was even more considerable, when he practically and frequently identified his person with his message, which he delivered as unquestionably divine” (e.g., Mt. 10: 32–3). He demanded of the disciples what no mere prophet or even the Messiah could have done: that they follow him, and more, love him—unconditionally—demands that Renan had detested. “Jesus knows even more that the most legitimate needs of the heart risk encroaching upon other duties, becoming unruly, and isolating a man in a good that is enemy of the better, if they are not tempered, or set or reset in their place in the eternal order of things by the First

---

306 “Il ne s’agit pas de reformer ce code ou d’y faire un choix, mais de le mener à sa perfection, d’en faire la loi de tous les peuples, sous un régime où la lettre s’épanouisse en une religion spirituelle.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 16; Jésus Christ, 2, 139.)

307 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 17.

308 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 19.

309 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 18. See also Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 92.

310 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 22.

311 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 22-4.
Love.”312 The two qualities of Jesus that most demonstrated that he was more than the Messiah—that he was divine—were his forgiveness of sins and his knowledge of the heart of man.313

Jesus revealed himself.314 There was, after all, one greater than Solomon present in him (Mt. 12: 42.). “From whence comes Jesus’ tranquil assurance?”315 Grandmaison attached much importance to the hymns of jubilation found in Mt. 11:25b-30 and Lk. 10: 21-22, where Jesus directly addressed the Father.316 Although God was invoked infrequently as Father in the Old Testament, Jesus spoke as Son in a way that no other human being could. Reading passages, a liberal theologian noted that one found there for the first time “the teaching of Jesus about God reached its perfection, and one could speak for the first time, in the full sense of the word, of the ‘Religion of Jesus.’”317

There were many instances in which the prophetic and wisdom traditions referred to God as Father and Israel as son. Others owed their filiation to their creation rather than to God’s free election.

But the filiation that Jesus invokes here is different and places him in another order: it is a relationship of nature and not of adoption. It places on an equal footing the ones who are joined together. What this Beloved Son is at bottom, the Father knows well, and he alone!...

312 “[Jesus] sait encore que les besoins les plus légitimes du coeur risquent d’entreprendre sur d’autres devoirs, de se dérégler, de cantonner l’homme dans un bien ennemi du mieux, s’ils ne sont pas mesurés, mis ou remis à leur place dans l’ordre éternel par le Premier Amour.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 24; Jésus Christ, 2, 148.)

313 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 19-20.

314 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 26.

315 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 26.

316 For a detailed discussion of the authenticity of these hymns, see Léonce de Grandmaison, Note Q, “Sur l’hymne de jubilation,” Jésus Christ, 2, 60-2.

The Son is also the depositary of all the Father's secrets and participates in his omnipotence. As indispensable initiator of the mystery of the divine life, he has what it takes to console and comfort all those who submit to his teaching.\textsuperscript{318}

This declaration to Christ’s inner circle of disciples, along with signs that confirmed his power and personal dignity, hastened the definitive revelation of his identity and mission. “It was nevertheless essential that their faith, which was practically unbounded, but as yet vague and fragile, should be strengthened by formulation and definition, in order to make it able to bear the burden of the supreme trial.”\textsuperscript{319} Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 16: 16-20)\textsuperscript{320} was an important advance in the apostles’ beliefs.\textsuperscript{321} Then too, Jesus, going beyond this tremendous revelation, exulted in the Father. In preparing the apostles for the trials ahead, he uttered the first of the prophecies recalling the Suffering Servant.\textsuperscript{322} Chastising Peter, he returned to the Father and his will (Mt. 16: 23). “The divine attributes now converged on the appointed victim. Universal intercessor, he will always be present in the midst of those who will pray in his name.”\textsuperscript{323} The Father himself would answer their prayers (Mt. 18:20).

It was no surprise, therefore, that the Son of Man would be universal Judge. What was new, as seen in the parables, was the independence and personal character in which Jesus—no delegate,

\textsuperscript{318} “Mais le titre de filiation qu’invoque ici Jésus, est différent et le met dans un autre ordre: c’est une parenté de nature et non d’adoption. Elle égale ceux qu’elle relic. Quel il est, dans son fonds, ce Fils bien aimé, le Père le sait bien et lui seul... Aussi le Fils est-il dépositaire de tous les secrets paternels, participant de sa toute-puissance. Initiateur indispensable au mystère de la vie divine, il a de quoi consoler et réconforter tous ceux qui se veulent mettre à son école.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 29, 30; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 154-5.)

\textsuperscript{319} “Il importait toutefois d’affermir, en le précisant, en formulant, cette foi pratiquement inconditionnée, mais vague encore et fragile, pour qu’elle pût supporter le poids des suprêmes épreuves.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 30; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 155.)

\textsuperscript{320} For a discussion of the passage, see Léonce de Grandmaison, \textit{Note R, Sur L’authenticité et le sens de Mt. 16:13-20},” Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 63-5.

\textsuperscript{321} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 31.

\textsuperscript{322} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 32.

\textsuperscript{323} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 33; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 159.
but as son of the family—anticipated carrying out this function.\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 34.} King served by the angels, he would be the God who assigned the final sentence.\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 35.} As seen in the parable of the Wicked Tenants (Mt. 21:33-43), Christ’s dignity was more than Messianic.\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 36-7.} Unlike the words of other prophets, his words would not pass away. His very blood would be shed to establish a new Covenant (Mt. 26: 26–28).\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 38.} Against his rationalist adversaries, Grandmaison concluded: “These admirable prophecies are evoked in a manner so judicious that no prejudiced construction of them can be upheld, and so appropriate that when they are presented it is impossible not to recognize their fulfillment.”\footnote{“Ces admirables prophéties sont évoquées d’une façon à la fois si discrète qu’un remaniement tendancieux n’est pas soutenable, et si juste qu’il est impossible, quand on les a présentes, d’en méconnaître le reflet.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 40; Jesus Christ, 2, 167.)} There were many instances of this promise in the Old Testament (Jer, 31: 31-34; Is. 42: 6 and Is. 49:8).\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 39.}

Jesus declared himself:

> In the light of all these sayings—suggestions, statements, promises, and prophecies—we can broach the supreme testimony, that of the martyr (in precisely that sense of the word which the example of Jesus has given to it)...In effect, at the peril of his life, before the High Court of his people, when adjured in the name of God, Jesus was to lay claim to his supreme dignity.\footnote{“À la lumière de ces paroles: suggestions, affirmations, promesses et prophéties, nous pouvons aborder le témoignage suprême, celui du martyr (au sens justement que l’exemple de Jésus a donné au mot),...C’est qu’en effet Jésus va revendiquer, au péril de sa vie, en présence de la Haut de son people, et interrogé au nom de Dieu, sa dignité suprême.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 40; Jesus Christ, 2, 168.)}

Once it was clear in the trial as reported by the synoptics that Jesus thought himself Messiah and Son of Man (or Son of God), it was correct that he incurred the penalty for blasphemy.\footnote{Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 43-5.}
Jesus explained himself: This was true in a special way in the gospel according to John. The synoptics were related to John’s Gospel as the implicit to the explicit. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that John’s Gospel was more accurate than the synoptics on certain historical details and was widely accepted by the ancient Churches.

For John, in effect, it is much less important to recount Jesus’ story than to explain him, to make resplendent in his words and his activity both the transcendent dignity and the truth of the Incarnation of the Son of God, the latter as much as the former; but both preoccupations have less to do with history than with doctrine, even though the doctrine supposes the reality of the history. Although John had a more particular personal style than the authors of the synoptics, it was a style born of persevering personal meditation on the Master. Despite the arrangement, choice, and presentation of material, and the resulting interpretation, the gospel according to John was still the gospel of Christ. “For Saint John, Christ is the Light, the Truth, and the Life.” The sayings of Christ are trustworthily reported by John even if one not need attribute every word of the text to Christ. He not only possessed these qualities in their fullness as their origin, but bestowed them on whomever he wished; for he was the Son of God, “only-begotten, co-eternal with the Father, and consubstantial with Him.” Here Grandmaison was at a loss as to how to select the texts given the embarrassment of riches about the person of Jesus.

332 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 46.
333 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 47.
334 “Pour Jean, en effet, il s’agit de beaucoup moins de raconter Jésus que l’expliquer, de faire resplendir dans sa parole et son activité et la dignité transcendant et la vérité de la chair du Fils de Dieu: celle-ci autant que celle-la, mais pour toutes les deux la préoccupation est moins d’histoire que de doctrine, encore que la doctrine suppose la réalité de l’histoire.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 46; Jesus Christ, 2, 174.)
335 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 47-8; Jesus Christ, 2, 175.
336 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 48.
Jesus was very much the only Son of his Father. As in the synoptic gospels, Jesus maintained the mystery of his identity: the inability of his adversaries to perceive his identity was due to the blindness of their hearts, failing to see the hand of the Father in the Son’s works (Jn. 10:24-26).

Moving past the controversies, Grandmaison focused on Jesus’ presence among the disciples. Before quoting selections from the final discourse and Jesus’ priestly prayer, he remarked: “At this critical and tragic time, within his intimate circle, the tone of the Master’s voice takes on a moving tenderness….woe to him who does not recognize his unique accent!” Jesus’ self-revelation was meant to provoke an affirmative response.

In the conclusion to the chapter on Christ’s testimony to himself, Grandmaison reiterated his global approach to the historical accuracy of Scripture:

It is still permissible after this to dispute isolated texts, or even a whole series of texts. The whole will stand by its own authenticity, mole sua stat, and the substantial historicity of the documents is sufficient to put beyond doubt the sense and the significance of the witness of Jesus. For we are not really dealing with interpolations, details, and embellishments superimposed here and there on the Gospel narrative, but with its fabric as a whole. It is unquestionable that Jesus proclaimed himself as a prophet, a messenger from heaven, a son of God.

First, commissioned by God, the other prophets spoke with men as their servants. Their rights were limited, commensurate with their mission. But Jesus was another kind of prophet, one without limitations. His message did not exceed him, nor was his role temporary.

---

337 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 52-3.

338 “Dans le cercle intime, le ton du Maître se nuance, en ces heures décisives et tragiques, d’une pénétrante douceur….malheur à qui n’en reconnaît l’unique accent!” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 54; Jesus Christ, 2, 182-3.) For a discussion of the Lord’s Supper, see Léonce de Grandmaison, Note T, “Les récits de la cène du Seigneur, et son sens,” Jésus Christ, 2, 69-73.

339 “Il est loisible après cela, de chicaner de tel out tel des textes allégués, voire une série entière. L’ensemble tiendra par sa masse, mole sua stat, et l’historicité substantielle des documents suffit à mettre hors de doute le sens et la portée du témoignage de Jésus. Il ne s’agit pas en effet d’interpolations, de détails, de broderies surchargeant ça et là l’histoire évangélique, mais de sa trame entière. Incontestablement, Jésus s’est donnée pour un prophète, un envoyé d’en-haut, un fils de Dieu.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 57; Jesus Christ, 2, 185.)
In short, the Master is not considered as a means of illumination or of progress, but as the unique and necessary mediator. He is not only the channel, but also the fountainhead. His merit depends not only upon what he teaches, but also upon what he is, upon his personal dignity even more than upon the value of his teaching. He is not a path, but the path.…That is why he makes promises that only God can guarantee; he claims for himself that which God alone can demand.

It was this second kind of mastery that was claimed by one among all the mentally normal of whom history preserves a record, and one only—Jesus of Nazareth.\footnote{“Bref, le Maître n’est pas considéré comme un moyen d’illumination ou de progrès, mais comme le médiateur unique et nécessaire. Il n’est pas seulement canal, mais source. Il vaut par ce qu’il enseigne, par la dignité de sa personne encore plus que l’importance de ses leçons. Il n’est pas une voie, mais la voie…C’est pourquoi il fait des promesses que Dieu seul peut garantir; il réclame pour lui ce que Dieu peut exiger. Cette seconde sorte de maîtrise fut celle que revendiqua, seul des hommes sains d’esprit que nous connaissions par l’histoire, Jésus de Nazareth.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 58-9; Jesus Christ, 2, 187-8.)}

The gospel made it clear that Jesus was the necessary condition of the personal religion of his disciples. There was no caesura between Jesus’ person and his mission as founder of the Church.

Christ’s relationship to the Father (in the Spirit) and the Church that Christ founded through the Holy Spirit was the necessary means to union with the Father. His having claimed the rights of God was not the act of a madman or a deluded visionary.

\textit{The Person of Jesus}

The beginning of chapter two of the fourth book—La Personne de Jésus—openly confronted the problem of Jesus, the quandary that provoked Grandmaison’s wager:

It is important and merits reflection that such a man should adopt, in private as in public, in the expression of his piety as in his endurance of opposition, before his friends no less than before the indifferent or his enemies, the attitude taken up by Jesus de Nazareth and in which he resolutely persisted. Did he really know what he was saying? Did he mean to say it? Does what we are in a position to know of his habits of mind, his character, and his person, justify us in regarding him as a fantastic, extravagant enthusiast, afflicted with hallucinations? That is the problem.\footnote{“Qu’un tel homme ait adopté, en privé comme en public, dans les effusions de sa piété comme sous le coup des contradictions, devant ses intimes comme en face d’indifférents et d’ennemis, l’attitude par Jésus de Nazareth, qu’il s’y soit tenu, qu’il y ait mis à tête, cela est considérable et mérite réflexion. Savait-il réellement ce qu’il disait? Voulait-il vraiment le dire? Ce que nous pouvons connaître de ses habitudes d’esprit, de son caractère, de sa personne, nous autorise-t-il à voir en lui un homme exalté, bizarre, excessif, porte à l’illusion? Voilà le problème.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 83; Jesus Christ, 2, 193.)}
Even though Jesus proclaimed his redemptive role, he also mentioned certain limitations. When Jesus was asked the hour of the coming of the fulfillment of all things, Jesus said that only the Father knew (Mk. 13: 32). Moreover, Jesus distinguished his relation to the Father from the relationship of all else to the Father: he was primarily Jesus’ Father. Finally, Jesus placed religious obligations above those owed to family. “Out of these statements there arises the following dilemma: either Jesus was, and knew that he was, what he proclaimed himself to be, or else he was a pitiable visionary.” Those who chose the second answer were left with some formidable objections to address. Renan saw in him the height of human grandeur. Even the most radical exegetes had similar difficulties. K. L. Schmidt praised Christ for his holiness, for being so completely heroic, so utterly beyond any other human being in the way he set with sovereign clarity the road to be traveled. Jesus could be praised even more for “his most royal triumph,” which was to light the divine spark in sinners by a combination of his moral intransigence and his mercy and tenderness in dealings with them. Finally, in terms of his dignity, he had the clear, certain prophetic awareness of being the final “Consummation.”

---

342 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 79. Jesus also said, “The Father is greater than I” (Jn. 14:28). Grandmaison cited the two patristic interpretations that did not compromise the perfection of Christ. The first, the minority interpretation, attributed this ignorance of Christ’s to his humanity. The second interpretation understood Christ’s sayings as respect show to the Father, who held the primacy of place in the immanent and economic Trinity. Grandmaison thought that both interpretations were valid; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 79n1-80.

343 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 80-81.

344 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 81; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 191.

345 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 82.


Before resolving the enigma of Jesus, Grandmaison set forth some other givens about Christ’s case. The first, contra Renan, was that Jesus did not make up the idea of his own personality during the course of his career. “Above all, the documents exist, and what is known nowadays as the ‘Messianic consciousness’ of Jesus appears in them from the very beginning as something mature and complete.” No specious psychological objection could gain any traction. From the time he starts to preach, Jesus “thinks, speaks, and acts as Messiah.” The temptation in the desert was specifically Messianic: he was “driven by the Spirit” (Mk.1: 12). From Capernaum on, he taught with authority, cited ancient prophecies, exorcised demons, called his disciples, cured the sick, and settled authoritatively questions of the Law:

There is no trace of compromise or fear, not a hint that his mission was vaguely surmised, resisted, and then finally accepted. Even more, it is decisive that Jesus dominates at all times his message; he is not caught up in any way by the hopes, enthusiasm, and opposition that it arouses.

Now Grandmaison could turn to answer the question as to what was the testimony that Jesus rendered to God in deeds. The next three things that Grandmaison went on to examine confirmed Jesus’ divinity: his (personal) religion; his relationships with his friends, namely, his disciples; and his intimate life.

---


349 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 84.

350 “Nul trace d’atermoiement, d’hésitation, de crainte; nul vestige d’une vocation entrevue, combattue, finalement accepté. De plus, et cela est décisif, Jésus domine à tous les moments son message: il n’est entraîné en aucune mesure par les espérances, les enthousiasmes, les oppositions qui se font jour.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 85; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 195.)

The Religion of Jesus

Christ’s singularity was manifested first in his personal religion, which was rooted in his relationship to the Father as his only Son.

This is the key to the understanding of the religious life of Jesus; his bearing towards God was like that of an only and beloved son. No one ever manifested greater reverence for the heavenly Father, no one ever gave a purer, more spiritual and higher idea of him; and this religion was not a lesson that he had learned himself and handed on to others; it was the very soul of his soul, spontaneously manifesting itself on every occasion.

Both John and Paul made known the self-effacement of the transcendent Son before the Father. This profound religion was practiced in prayer, the constant font that nourished his life of activity and marked his unique personal and filial religion. It was in prayer that he chose his apostles; Jesus was in prayer just before the turning point in his public ministry, the moment in which he asked his disciples who people thought the Son of Man was (Lk. 9:18a-19). He encouraged a kind of filial boldness in suppliant prayer to the Father. “Under how many forms did Jesus inculcate the necessity, sublimity, and the sweetness of the prayer of union!” Beyond commentary were the prayer of the Agony in the Garden and the cry of abandonment from the Cross: “My God, my God, why have you abandoned me” (Mt. 27: 46). Then there was the tenderness and acquiescence of

352 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 405.

353 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 212.

354 “Là est la clef qui ouvre l’intelligence de la vie religieuse de Jésus, il en use avec Dieu comme un fils unique et bien-aimé. Nul assurément ne plus ne pousse plus loin le respect du Père céleste, nul ne donne de lui une idée plus épurée, plus spirituelle et plus haute, et cette religion n’est pas une leçon apprise et transmise, c’est l’âme même de son âme, qui s’exprime naïvement à toute occasion.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 85; Jésus Christ, 2, 196.)

355 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 88.

356 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 92.

357 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 89.

358 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 90-1.
“Father, into your hands, I commend my spirit” (Lk. 23:46). These things and much more that made Christ’s prayer *sui generis*.

In his portrait of Jesus’ prayer, Grandmaison took great pains to dispel any hint of weakness that would have clouded Christ’s luminous relationship with his Father. Jesus’ religion excluded all darkness, understood not only as evil, but also as imperfection. Contra many contemporary reconstructions of the consciousness of Christ, darkness had no place in him, even if it was seen as the morally neutral “subconscious” that the exegete William Sanday projected as the seat of Christ’s awareness of his divinity. Jesus’ respect for his Father was not tinged in the least by trouble, by “that fear that made the saints tremble.” There was no bifurcation between the divine transcendence and the divine immanence.

Grandmaison recalled the mystical paradox that fascinated Pascal in order to describe the utter uniqueness of Christ’s prayer. As noted in the last chapter, it was the experience of the great mystics that the closer they became to a holy God, the more formidable the double abyss between them and God became: they experienced both desire for union and an almost overwhelming sense of powerlessness to bridge this abyss. Even the greatest knew that our knowledge of God was precarious on a cognitive level.

And as if this weakness were not of itself enough, Christianity and Judaism before it further intensifies the struggle. Man is not solely a being of flesh, ephemeral, and of no account; he

---

361 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 92, 94.
363 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 93.
is sinful, ungrateful and fallen. God is not only the uncreated God, the Beauty without shadow, the Eternal One; He is the Master and Love—poorly served as Master, and outraged as Love.\textsuperscript{364}

It was only natural then that the thirst to purify oneself arose.\textsuperscript{365} All those desiring union with God redoubled their efforts at ascesis and penitence.

But it was not so with Christ. There was as little trace in him of the conflicted, disturbed working of the subconscious as there was of the guilt that comes from the awareness of evil within. The clarity of Christ’s soul held no darkness within it nor lacked any light that was proper to a good human being and to the divinity.

But—and this is the most amazing characteristic of the personal religion of Jesus,—there is no trace in his soul of that uneasiness, fear, and just anger against self which are engendered on one hand by the sight of our nothingness, and on the other by that of our actual lowliness….He possessed from the start and perfectly this complete purity, this resemblance to and harmony with the divine Friend (in Scholastic terms, one would say this ‘connaturality’ with the God’s Being) towards which tends the spiritual life in its utmost perfection.\textsuperscript{366}

In order to safeguard Christ’s personal transcendence vis-à-vis the Church, Grandmaison took pains at times to show the discontinuities between the religion of Jesus and that of even his best disciples.\textsuperscript{367}

Christ himself was not a mystic in the usual human sense. The Christian convert Sadhu Sundhar Singh had written: “There are those who speak of Christ as the Supreme Mystic….That is the

\textsuperscript{364} “Ce n’est pas assez de cette infirmité. La religion chrétienne, et déjà celle d’Israël, exaspère encore le conflit. L’homme n’est pas seulement un être de chair, un éphémère, un néant, il est un coupable, un ingrat, un déchu. Dieu n’est seulement le Bien incréé, le Beau sans ombre, l’Éternel. Il est le Maître, il est L’Amour, le Maître mal servi, l’Amour offensé.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 93; Jesus Christ, 2, 204.)

\textsuperscript{365} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 94.

\textsuperscript{366} “c’est le trait le plus étonnant de la religion personnelle de Jésus,—il n’y a dans son âme aucune trace de ce trouble, de cette crainte, de cette juste colère contre soi-même qu’engendre d’une part la vue de notre néant, d’autre part celle de notre indignité positive….Il possédait d’emblée en perfection cette pureté complète, cette ressemblance, cet accord avec l’Ami divin (on dirait en termes d’École, cette ‘connaturalité’ avec l’Etre de Dieu) vers laquelle tend l’extrême perfection de la vie intérieure.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 94: Jesus Christ, 2, 205.)

\textsuperscript{367} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 364, 598.
tendency of those who are not inclined to accept the divinity of Christ. Christ is not the Supreme Mystic. He is the Master of Mystics, the Saviour of Mystics.”

For Saint Teresa of Avila, the highest mystical state of all involved seeing all things clearly in the light of eternity and living out the most intimate union with God that is possible on earth. Jesus was not subject to phenomena that so often exercised the modernists, “of the invasion of a divine force, a rupture of interior balance that betrayed itself by rigidity, absorption, and detachment from surrounding things.”

Rather, he exhibited a complete self-possession that kept him from experiencing lesser mystical states such as visions and inner locutions. Such states had no place in the life of one who lived on terms of perfect intimacy and equality with his Father. His consciousness always manifested the most serene luminosity and unity.

Jesus was no more a penitent than an ecstatic. His ascesis was exemplary, even the long fast that set him in the prophetic tradition. But he did no penance as the Bridegroom; he ate and drank. Yes, he did suffer the “sacrifice of affections that were dearest and most sacred; the incessant and exclusive application of his energies to the expansion of the Kingdom in the most trying conditions to the point of exhaustion; the limitless renunciation of his own comfort and pleasure,

---


371 For example, see Léonce de Grandmaison, Note Y, “Jésus fut-il extatique,” *Jésus Christ*, 2, 126-7.


373 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 95.
and the total disregard of his own interests...a singular poverty.”\textsuperscript{374} But Christ took on all these things without hesitation, scruple, repentance, disavowal, fault, or conversion.\textsuperscript{375} He was also a man like any other.

His character was neither brittle nor conventional. One need only look at his confrontations with the Pharisees over healings on the Sabbath or at his ease with children. Although Jesus was the Bread from heaven and light of the world, he was still a man of flesh and blood: “He wept, he prayed, was exhausted with fatigue and hunger, had preferences and agonies, became indignant and was moved, felt enthusiasm and was dismayed.”\textsuperscript{376} On the other hand: “this man to whom nothing human is foreign is yet a stranger to moral evil, regret, and remorse. When there is any question of intercession and pardon, of sin and compunction for it, it is in connection with others.”\textsuperscript{377} Having no need for conversion, Jesus calls others to repent and to save themselves: “his touch purified, his love saved.”\textsuperscript{378} He spoke both as compassionate pardonner of sin and as exigent moralist, a detester of sin.\textsuperscript{379}

\textsuperscript{374} “[sacrifice des affections les plus chères, les plus sacrées; application incessante et exclusive de ses forces à l’expansion du Royaume dans les conditions les plus éprouvantes et jusqu’à l’épuisement; l’abnégation sans limite de ses aises, de son intêt, de son agrément propre…Pauvreté singulièr.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 95; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 206.)

\textsuperscript{375} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 96.

\textsuperscript{376} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 97; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 208.

\textsuperscript{377} “cet homme à qui rien d’humain n’est étranger est étranger au mal moral, au regret, au remords. S’il s’agit d’intercession et de pardon, de péché et de compoconction, c’est à propos des autres.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 97; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 209.)

\textsuperscript{378} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 97.

\textsuperscript{379} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 102.
Finally, his intelligence was at home with the highest divine mysteries. “He spoke as he had to.” As Pascal had written, “the rich man speaks approvingly of riches, the king speaks calmly of a great gift he is going to make, and God speaks fittingly of God.”

This unique alliance of an assured confidence with the most profound religion, of an innate and tender familiarity which has nothing to be pardoned, with the clearest view of the horror of sin and the demands of justice, of an imperturbable security with the infallible sense of who God is and of who we are, this is one of the doors that introduces us to the mystery of Jesus. Let us not attempt to cross its threshold; but let us recognize in the meantime that such a gifted man is not to be reckoned with lightly when he speaks of his Father’s business and of his own.

Jesus mastered the contraries that so taxed ordinary people. Christ’s character, so supremely transcendent of human limitations brought about by sin, was, paradoxically, what brought him into the greatest intimacy with his brothers.

(ii) His conversation with his brothers

This section might have been titled “His conversation with people.” Christ regarded all whom he met as brothers and treated them as such, whether he showed a mother’s tenderness or a moralist’s rigidity. His conversations with people demonstrated “by an analogous contrast, a unique mixture of sweetness and majesty, of conscious authority and total devotion.” His sweetness did not preclude his being peremptory in his demands. This coincidence of opposites in

---

380 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 98.

381 Pascal, Pensées, 799, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 98.

382 “Cette alliance unique d’une confiance assurée avec la religion la plus profonde, d’une familiarité innée et tendre qui n’a rien à se faire pardonner, avec la vue la plus nette de l’horreur du péché et des exigences de la justice, d’une sécurité imperturbable avec le sens infaillible de ce qu’est Dieu et de ce que nous sommes, c’est une des portes qui introduisent au mystère de Jésus. N’essayons pas d’en franchir actuellement le seuil, mais reconnaissons qu’un homme ainsi doué n’est pas à prendre à la légère quand il parle des choses de son Père et des siennes.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 98; Jésus Christ, 2, 210.)

383 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 102-3.

384 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 99.
his character was part of the power of his influence with people of all kinds. He was able to deal
with temperaments of all sorts, saints and sinners, Pharisee and disciple.386

In order to appreciate this union of opposites in Jesus’ dealings with people, Grandmaison
considered first “the demands of the Master, and his presumption that he is to be imitated in all
things, served and loved above all, the royal liberty of his action….It goes without saying that
everything is owed him; that he finds it natural that the forces of inertia against which the most
skilful ingeniousness is dashed to pieces cede to his rule.”387 In admonishing the disciples arguing
among themselves about which disciple was greatest, Christ emphasized the counterexample of his
own service (Lk. 22: 25–27). He was accessible and familiar; the crowds, the sick, and strangers all
elicted his mercy.388 The rigid moralist and severe judge of sin was also the most welcoming of
sinners, to the point of scandalizing the Pharisees.

The personal influence by which Jesus gathered his disciples was unparalleled among world
religions.389 His relationship to the Father allowed him to exercise this influence. He showed extreme
patience with them, a delicacy in correcting them so as not to shame them. Some were quick to learn
his lessons, while others were not. “He loved them nevertheless, these good servants that he little by
little made his friends. He taught them mutual support, humble, fraternal assistance, and the honest

385 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 106-7.
386 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 102-3.
387 “les exigences du Maître, et sa prétention à être imité en tout, servi et aimé par dessus tout, sa liberté royale
d'action….Que tout lui soit dû, cela va sans dire; que les forces d'inertie auxquelles se brise l'ingéniosité des plus habiles
cèdent à son empire, il le trouve naturel.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 99.)
388 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 100-1.
service that humbles without degrading.” 380 Such was the case for example when he taught Peter how many times to forgive his brother.

Grandmaison saw Christ’s singular greatness in terms of the harmony of contraries in his conversation.

These traits, that we could insist on even more, are not merely fitting to nourish the piety of believers: they are singularly important to the inquiry that we are pursuing. The union of his grandeur with simplicity is the fruit of a fine nature perfected by an exquisite education: everyone recognizes in it the hallmark of the highest distinction. The habits of a gentleman are not so much the adornment of human life but a force and an armor providing protection against many compromises and weaknesses. It took balance, a true sense of greatness, discernment of nuances, self-possession and a habitual forgetfulness of self that no amount of drilling or genius can supply. When, in addition to this, such a combination of profound goodness and of sovereign authority stands proof, and does not forget itself either before injustice, calumny, the insufficiency of friends, nor the treachery of enemies; when a man knows how to stoop without degrading himself, to devote himself without losing his influence, to give himself without abandoning himself—must not such a man be proclaimed perfect? Who does not see the abyss that divides this habitual attitude from the malleability due to circumstances and pressures, the naïve presumption, the half-conscious insincerity, the lust and the vertigo of powers that the theories of rationalist exegetes suppose about Jesus—that they are forced to suppose about him? 381

Here Grandmaison mentioned in particular the qualities of balance and self-possession, leitmotifs that permeated his portrait of Christ’s character. Who could cast the least shadow on the perfection of Christ given this equipoise in all situations? His humanity was perfect—one might add that it was

380 “Il les aime cependant, de ces bons serviteurs il fait à peu ses amis. Il leur apprend le support mutuel, l’aide fraternelle, et humble, l’honnête service qui humilie sans dégrader.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 103.)

381 “Ces traits, sur lesquels on pourrait insister, ne sont seulement propres à nourrir la piété des croyants, ils importent singulièrement à l’enquête que nous poursuivons. L’union de sa grandeur avec la simplicité est le fruit d’une heureuse nature affinée par une éducation exquise: chacun y reconnaît la marque de la plus haute distinction. Habitudes de gentilhomme, qui sont moins encore la parure d’une vie humaine qu’une force et une armure, mettant à l’abri de bien des compromissions, au-dessus de certaines faiblesses. C’est qu’il y faut un équilibre, un sens des vraies grandeurs, un discernement des nuances, une possession et un oubli habituel de soi qu’aucun dressage ne procure, qu’aucun génie ne supplée. Quand par surcroît cet alliage de bonté profonde et d’autorité souveraine résiste à l’épreuve, ne se dément ni devant l’injustice, ni devant la calomnie, ni devant l’insuffisance des amis, ni devant la perfidie des adversaires; quand un homme sait condescendre sans s’abaisser, se dévouer sans perdre de son ascendant, se donner sans s’abandonner, ne faut-il pas le proclamer parfait? Qui ne voit l’abîme existant entre cette attitude habituelle et la malléabilité aux circonstances et aux pressions, l’outrecuidance naïve, l’insincérité demi-consciente, l’appétit et le vertige des grandeurs que supposent en Jésus les théories des exégètes rationalistes—qu’elles sont forcées de supposer?” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 103-4; Jésus Christ, 2, 216-7.)
catholic in the sense that it incorporated all that could possibly be reckoned as good. Again, such observations were meant to refute the claim by rationalist exegetes that others convinced Christ that he was divine.

This balance had nothing to do with stoicism. It was always motivated by the love of God for sinners. This love was seen especially in Christ’s exchanges with his adversaries among the religious establishment. Some commentators were scandalized by the language and tone of his reproaches against them. “Jesus did not start this conflict: his respectful precautions concerning the Law, his interpretations concerning it (Mt. 5:17), and his care to treat the doctrinal authority of the scribes gently when it remained within just limits (Mt. 23: 3) prove it sufficiently. But gentleness is not weakness.” As Savior, his mission was to disabuse souls at all cost, denounce erring masters, confound fanatics, and unmask hypocrites. The aim of his language and tone was not to tear down, but to recover the lost. He was able to recover a true vision of the Kingdom, to proclaim the rights of God, and to rescue the grain of divine truth from the entanglements of merely human religious prescriptions. There co-existed in the soul of Jesus a ravishing sweetness and a fierce abnegation. His severity was benevolent.

The fact that he could command, unite, and balance all manner of contrary qualities without contradicting himself was a distinctive sign of Christ’s majesty. One rationalist commentator

---

392 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 104-6.

393 “Ce conflit, Jésus n’en eut pas l’initiative: ses précautions respectueuses envers la Loi, ses explications (Mt. 5:17), son souci de ménager, quand elle se contenait dans de justes limites, l’autorité doctrinale des scribes (Mt. 23: 3), le prouvent assez. Mais douceur n’est pas faiblesse.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 105; Jésus Christ, 2, 218.)

394 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 105-6.

395 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 309.
objected that humility was incompatible with greatness. Grandmaison replied that if one thought that Jesus was Messiah, then one also had admit that he was quite conscious of his dignity and proclaimed it when necessary. “The contrary would cut down the envoy to the measure of an unconscious, animal, instinctive element, or reduce him to a passivity that is altogether unworthy of his mission.” Such a judgment ruled out that Christ was the blind instrument of an impersonal force. Moreover, the glory that would be his from the mission was still ahead: there was much to be suffered yet. Finally, “although he acted freely like a son in his father’s house, not like a servant introduced by grace and although he was endowed with all the riches of Divinity by a total handing over, not by a greater or lesser measure, Jesus held everything as coming from his Father, and referred all honor to him.” Whether rejoicing or suffering, Jesus was at home in his Father’s house.

(iii) The intimate life of Jesus

Limpidity, or purity, was the quality most frequently mentioned in Grandmaison’s portrait of the religion of Jesus and of his inner life. Grandmaison came across the Italian equivalent of

---

396 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 106. Renan himself denied that the many turns that Jesus’ conversation took showed that he was erratic. To the contrary, Jesus needed to be judged by a higher law—that is, himself; see Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 104n1.

397 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 106-7.

398 “[e]ncore qu’il agisse librement comme un fils dans la maison paternelle, non comme un serviteur introduit par grâce; encore qu’il possède en plénitude, par tradition totale, et non selon une mesure plus ou moins grande, les richesses de la Divinité, Jésus tient tout de son Père, et il lui renvoie tout honneur.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 106-7; Jesus Christ, 2, 220.)

399 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 116.
limpidity in the writings of St. Catherine of Genoa. He noted the word in his review of Hügel’s *Mystical Element*.

These indications allow us to sum up our impressions [about Jesus] in the word that the great Genoese mystic, St. Catherine Fiesca Adorna, used deliberately to express all that she beheld in God: *Netteza*! The inner life of Jesus offers the most beautiful picture of the pure plenitude of the divine Being that it has ever been given to man to contemplate. The riches of the Gospels, so far as we can sum them up, find their order, balance, and fulfillment in the incomparable limpidity of this soul.

For Catherine and Grandmaison, to look on Christ was to contemplate God and delight in the rich fullness of his being. *Netteza* was a résumé of the divine perfections in the soul of Christ:

“Sweetness of God, Fullness of God, Purity of God.” The divine essence was pure. The limpidity of Christ’s soul—the mastery of his compassionate and all-seeing goodness—ruled out that he was the failed prophet depicted by the eschatological school.

Purity was the condition for the sight of God in the Beatitudes (Mt. 5: 13). In Grandmaison’s Christology and in many of his other writings, limpidity and purity also referred to the various dimensions of personal religion. Purity was a distinguishing quality of personal religion as the ideal to which the Christian could rightly hope to attain. Purity also referred to freedom

---


402 “Ces indices nous permettent de ramasser nos impressions dans le mot qu’employait de préférence la grande mystique génoise, sainte Catherine Fiesca Adorna, pour rendre tout ce qu’elle contemplait en Dieu: *Netteza*! De la pure plénitude de l’Etre divin, la vie intime de Jésus offre la plus belle image qu’il ait été donné aux hommes de contempler. Les richesses évangéliques, pour autant qu’on sommairement les inventorié, trouvent leur ordre, leur équilibre et leur achemèvement dans l’incomparable limpidity de cette âme.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 121; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 236.)

403 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 121.


from the imperfections of the human consciousness as well as from the effects of sin\textsuperscript{407} and was a requirement for the believer to be one with the Spirit who was pure.\textsuperscript{408} Purity of conscience allowed the believer to have purity of heart, and hence to be free of depression.\textsuperscript{409}

For Grandmaison, it had to be evident from Christ’s personal religion that he was the only Son of God.\textsuperscript{410} The corollary issue at stake in insisting on the limpidity, purity, balance, or coincidentia oppositorum of Christ’s consciousness, words, and deeds— in Thomist terms, their clarity, balance, and integrity— was the credibility of his ministry and of his doctrine. To diminish in any way the perfection of Christ’s soul as the chosen vessel of the Father’s revelation would have been tantamount to calling into question the belief that God revealed doctrine (however implicitly) with clarity and certitude in Jesus. Christ would have neither known the whole truth for himself, nor would have been able to pass it on to his followers.\textsuperscript{411}

With respect to Christ’s religion, purity was a sign of the connaturality of Jesus with the Father.\textsuperscript{412} The peaceful relationship of the Son to the Father was reflected especially in his human consciousness. “An abandonment to Providence that rejects the all temporal concerns in order to concentrate fully on the expansion of the Reign of God.”\textsuperscript{413} In emphasizing the originality of great

\textsuperscript{407} Grandmaison, “Christologie Moderne,” 201-2.

\textsuperscript{408} Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” Études 135 (1913), 326.

\textsuperscript{409} Grandmaison, “Christologie Moderne,” 263.

\textsuperscript{410} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 121, 202; Grandmaison, “Problème de Christ,” 195.

\textsuperscript{411} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 247.

\textsuperscript{412} Grandmaison, “Christologie Moderne” 201.

\textsuperscript{413} Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 119-20; Jesus Christ, 2, 235. See also Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1390-1.
men, one risked isolating them from their milieu.414 Some engage us by their strangeness. The greatest, however, impress us more by their unique gifts.

They see what others see, and apparently in the same perspective; but they see there what others do not see. Their merit is in their profundity: they are less different from their surroundings than raised above them. It is to this latter group—even from the purely human point of view—that Jesus of Nazareth belongs. His mind habitually moved about in the sphere familiar to the religious souls of his time and country.415

“The external world exists for Jesus.”416 The things of nature had their own worth and were signs of his heavenly Father. To teach doctrine, Jesus referred to the images and stories that the Old Testament provided. His dialectic was pervaded by Biblical genres and style, and especially by the prophetic literature.417

All of this might have been part of the sensibility of some of Christ’s Galilean compatriots too. But his originality lay elsewhere:

It is in the way in which the Savior transfigured, transmuted, spiritualized, and consequently universalized these elements. This teaching—so specific, so clearly dated and highly localized, delivered to a few thousand hearers in a corner of the globe which was quite distinctive and not so favorable to foreign ideas or people—has remained comprehensible and triumphant in all ages and countries. The spirit shines forth from it to such an extent that we can almost dispense with its literal and detailed meaning. Unlike the usual mystic utterances, always a little obscure, in which depth is hardly obtainable save at the cost of clarity, where the power of the impression is obtained by violent metaphors and combinations of words that are apparently incompatible, and in which despair of ever rendering the intensity of the experience distorts the language almost to the breaking point, the simple records of the Gospels, full of familiar details, clear imagery, and luminous words

414 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 107-8.

415 “Ils regardent ce que les autres regardent, et semble-t-il dans la même perspective, mais ils y voient ce que les autres ne voient pas. Leur mérite est en profondeur: ils sont moins différents de leur entourage qu’élevés au-dessus de lui. À ne le considérer qu’humainement, c’est à cette dernière famille qu’appartient sans conteste Jésus de Nazareth. Sa pensée habituelle se meut dans la sphère familière aux âmes religieuses de son temps et pays.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 108; Jesus Christ, 2, 221-2.)

416 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 111.

417 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 109.
succeed in kindling and fanning the flame of religion in the hearts of the faithful of all races. No man who is truly a man is either above or below their reach. Nowhere in the whole world has the transparent clearness of a profound soul been mirrored in more tranquil waters.\footnote{“Elle est dans la façon unique dont les éléments sont transfigurés, transmués, spiritualisés et conséquemment universalisés, par le Sauveur. Ces leçons si particulières, si bien datées et localisées, dominées à quelques milliers d’auditeurs, dans un coin du monde aisément reconnaissable et peu hospitalier aux idées et aux gens du dehors, il se trouve qu’elles restes comprises et conquérantes en tous les temps, sous tous les cieux. L’esprit y éclate au point que nous pouvons presque tous passer de leur intelligence et détaillée. À la différence des paroles mystiques ordinaires, toujours un peu troublés, où la profondeur ne s’obtient guère qu’aux dépens de la clarté, où la puissance des impressions se traduit par des métaphores heurtées et des alliances de mots qui semblent s’exclure, où le désespoir de rendre l’intensité du sentiment tend le langage jusqu’à le disloquer, ces simples notations évangéliques, pleines de détails familiers, de visions précises, de mots lumineux, vont allumer et nourrir la flamme religieuse au cœur des croyants de toute race. Aucun homme vraiment homme n’est au-dessus ni au-dessous de leur atteinte. Nulle part au monde la transparence d’une âme profonde ne s’est mirée en une eau plus calme.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 112; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 226.)}

Christ’s words united the particular and the universal in an extraordinary way. The parallelism of the Beatitudes exemplified the calmness of Christ’s expressiveness, which could transform the specific, ordinary material of his environment into clear, concrete, and universal teaching. Asserting this quality, therefore, contradicted the modernist diminishment of Christ’s divinity and the modernist dependence on mysticism as the privileged locus of divine revelation. Being declared with limpidity, with luminous clarity, Christ’s words were unlike the typical mystical utterances, which the modernists overvalued at the expense of Scripture and dogma.

Limpidity was closely related to Christ’s balance: this clarity was linked to the other traditional characteristic of beauty, that of proportion. “He remained master of his words, simple, and perfectly balanced to the point of sublimity. His limpidity of soul was peerless, his innocence, or to say it better, his sanctity imposes itself startlingly on those who expect it most.”\footnote{“Jusque dans le sublime il reste maître de sa parole, simple, parfaitement équilibré. Sa limpidité d’âme est sans exemple, son innocence ou, pour mieux dire, sa sainteté s’impose aux plus prévenus.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 112; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 226.)} All the riches of the gospel “find their order, balance and fulfillment in the incomparable limpidity of his soul.”\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 121.} For
Grandmaison, “the same perfectly balanced sublimity” and “constant goodness” still obtained in Jesus’ prayer and comportment. The most singular quality of the religion of Jesus was his calm of soul. “He was perfectly natural and entirely spontaneous.” In place of ecstasies, babblings, and distraction were deep, interior repose and tranquility, unshakeable certitude, and joy. Again, this quality ruled out any discontinuity between Christ’s person and the fulfillment of his mission that the eschatological school maintained.

Yet what was one to make of less tranquil sayings of Christ’s, such as “turn the other cheek” to one’s aggressors? Were they pedagogical exaggerations or were they to be taken literally? If the latter, were they not the sign of an unbalanced mind? For Grandmaison, it was the former, and such habits of speech revealed important aspects of Jesus’ character.

On the contrary, nothing is more striking than the fashion in which Jesus dominates his subject and remains master of himself even in the most vehement of his discourses. Truly and wholly man, man of an ardent race and age, whose characteristics, save for their narrowness and faults, he made his own; he had his enthusiasms and his holy indignation. He knew the hours when man’s energy swells like a stream, and appears to increase tenfold in order that it might diffuse itself. Yet even these extreme movements remained clear...The waters of a mountain current, even when they swirl and seethe and foam, still remain limpid.

Such a description defied the portraits of Christ as the pale Galilean. Even though he had his enthusiasms and his displeasures, he remained free of self-centered passions, even in moments of crisis. Such calm was seen in the modesty and sobriety of his words, especially when one

---

421 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 116–7; Jesus Christ, 2, 231.

422 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 113-4.

423 “Rien de plus frappant au contraire, que la façon dont Jésus domine sa matière et reste maître de lui jusqu’en ses plus vives apostrophes. Homme véritable, homme complet, homme d’un temps et d’une race passionnés dont il ne refuse pas que les étroitesse et les erreurs, il a ses enthousiasmes et ses saintes colères. Il connaissait ces heures où la force virile s’enflé comme un fleuve et semble se découper pour se répandre. Mais ses mouvements extrêmes restent lucides....Agitées, frémissantes, bouillonnantes, les eaux d’un gave restent limpides.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 116; Jesus Christ, 2, 230.).
compared the apocalyptic passages in the synoptic gospels to the apocalypses of intertestamental literature.

Did Jesus’ deeds accord with the balance manifested by his words? Limpidity encompassed a wide range of virtues in Christ’s inner life: sincerity, magnanimity, purity of intention, and fraternal charity. This calm of soul could be seen most of all in the way in which he endured his passion:

Suffering is a reagent that can set free the fundamental elements of a man’s nature, in destroying the artificial attitudes that a long-sustained effort has made habitual. In the face of suffering, above all when it is intense and lasting, and affects body and soul together, ‘the masks falls, the man remains’… In his boundless ordeal, Jesus remained equally distant from all defiance and weakness; there was no stoicism, no rebellion, and no affectation in his attitude. He neither denied evil not minimized it. Without any deviation of the will, which was settled and determined by the Father’s, his sensibility was stirred and trembled into words that were pure and beautiful, tender or heartrending.

Grandmaison did not shrink back from taking stock of the contrary qualities that left the rationalist stuck in the enigma of Christ’s person. In fact, Grandmaison delighted in these apparent antinomies that had been noted as far back as the early Church. For example, Christ could be rapt in prayer and sweat blood while imploring the Father in the garden of Gethsemane without being any less self-possessed. How could this be so?

---


426 “La douleur est un réactif qui sait mettre en liberté les éléments les plus fonciers d’une nature, en détruisant les attitudes artificielles qu’un long effort à plaques sur nos vies jusqu’à nous les rendre habituelles. En face de la douleur, surtout quand est intense, durable, et atteint à la fois le corps et l’esprit,’le masque tombe, l’homme reste’… Jésus, dans une épreuve sans limites, demeure également éloigné de toute forfanterie et de toute faiblesse; nul stoïcisme, nul défi, nulle attitude composée. Il ne nie pas le mal, il ne l’atténue pas. Sans faire fléchir sa volonté, arrêtée et fixée sur celle du Père, sa sensibilité s’émeut, frémit, rend de beaux sons purs, tendres ou déchirant.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 118; 2, 233.)


Grandmaison found a way to a resolution in Huby’s translation and commentary on Mark. Huby had wondered about an even greater mystery—Christ’s cry of dereliction on the Cross: “how could there have coexisted in the same soul a very high familiarity with God—among mystics, contemplation, intuitive vision in Christ,—and the torment of a terrifying solitude?”

Huby found an analogy, albeit a faint reflection, of Christ’s agony, in Saint Teresa of Avila’s experience of a momentary desire for a distant God utterly separate from the consolation that any creature could give. Such an experience was both consolation and cruel martyrdom beyond words. Finally, Huby offered these words from the Jesuit exegete Juan Maldonado.

In his prayer at Gethsemane, Christ spoke as if he was a man to whom the divine will would have been imperfectly known and who did not have enough strength to stare down death; because he left his human nature on its own, in confining the power of his divinity, so that his humanity could fulfill its role more completely.

However one understood Christ’s suffering of his mortality and of all the sins of the world, the Passion did not compromise the perfection of his consciousness. In short, “[i]n Christ we find perfect poise and the highest manifestation of moral and intellectual health, the limpidity of a very pure soul united with the consciousness of the most extraordinary mission; and all these combine to discredit the theory that Jesus made hyperbolic and sacrilegious claims, which he maintained even to the point of death.”

--

429 “comment peuvent coexister, dans une même âme, une très haute connaissance de Dieu—contemplation chez les mystiques, vision intuitive chez Christ,—et le tourment d’une effroyable solitude.” (Verbum Salutis II: Evangile selon saint Marc, trans. and commentator, Joseph Huby [Paris, Beauchesne, 1924], page unnamed, in Grandmaison, “Commentaire spirituel de l’Évangile selon saint Marc,” 431.)


431 “Le Christ, dans sa prière à Gethsémani, a parlé comme s’il eût été un homme à qui la volonté eût été divine imparfaitement connue et qui n’eût pas eu assez de force pour surmonter la mort; car il laissait la nature humaine comme seule, en contenant la divinité, pour qu’elle pût remplir plus complètement son rôle.” (Jean Maldonat, In Matthaeum, 39, in Grandmaison, “Commentaire spirituel de l’Évangile selon saint Marc,” 432.)
The Problem of Christ: The solutions and the Solution

The very important third section of chapter three of book four, Le Mystère de Jésus, surveyed the Christologies of believers and Grandmaison’s own solution to the problem of Jesus. Grandmaison tried to elicit the grain of truth from various contemporary Christologies that attempted to acknowledge the divinity of Christ. But in the end he showed how they fell short of making a convincing case for the mystery of the Incarnation. They were unable to define what was transcendent about Jesus. But if Jesus was nothing more than a super prophet, then there was no new mystery added to the natural, friendly intercourse of Creator and creature.

The goal of Grandmaison’s study was not to explain away the mystery of the hypostatic union, which surpassed human understanding. The Church itself recognized from the very beginning in her worship, life, and belief that the personal unity of Christ resolved the greatest apparent antinomy of all—that between his divine and human natures. This union and distinction of the divine and the human, expressed in the dogmas of the fifth century, was the most profound—and most real—analogy that one could possibly imagine. Rationalizing the revealed dogma of the Incarnation was impossible. Christ alone can teach the believer this truth. Choosing to meet the modernists on their own ground to regard the Scriptures as historical human documents reinforced the dogmatic position that it is impossible to explain or reconstruct the character of Christ merely

432 “La supériorité dans l’équilibre, la sainte morale et intellectuelle manifestée sur les plus hautes cimes, la limpidité d’une âme très pure unie à la conscience de la plus extraordinaire mission, tous ces traits concourent à l’écarter l’hypothèse de prétentions hyperboliques et sacrilèges, maintenues à la mort inclusivement.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 212; Jesus Christ, 2, 323-4.)

433 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 202-18.

434 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 204.

from his human circumstances. One needed to start with faith in him—the point to which Grandmaison tried to bring his readers, or bring them there again.

The ultimate aim to which this work points is to entrust oneself unconditionally in the matter of religion to Jesus of Nazareth, Lord and Son of God. One step further brings us to the Catholic Christian Church, depository and interpreter of the authentic teaching of Christ, and it is from her that we receive, without fear of error, the dogma of the Incarnation.436

This passage also indicates the existential logic of moving from Christ to the Church as witness. Having been incorporated into Christ, the Church then reinforced the personal religion of the believer. In other words, the personal religion of Jesus led the believer (or the seeker) to faith in the Church, the personal religion that Jesus founded, which in turn bolstered the individual’s personal religion.

At the beginning of the book, Grandmaison refused to appeal to ecclesiastical authority in order to solve the problem of Jesus. Nonetheless, he also asserted that the traditional dogma was in fact the best and only explanation of the problem.

By the admission of Professor Bethune Baker, “No one who accepts as history in the ordinary sense of the word the implications of the fourth Gospel (or even of all the other Gospels) as to our Lord’s consciousness during his life on earth need trouble himself about restatement of the traditional doctrine. If these are the facts of our Lord’s life, and he bases his doctrine on the facts, he is not likely to arrive at any better co-ordination than what Christology offers’ [J. Bethune Baker, “The Person of Jesus Christ,” *Journal of Theological Studies* XV [1913], 111-2].437

436 “Se fier à Jésus de Nazareth, Seigneur et Fils de Dieu, d’une façon inconditionnée en matière religieuse, sera la dernière conclusion de ce travail. Un pas plus avant même à l’Église chrétienne catholique, dépositaire et interprète de la doctrine authentique de Christ, et c’est d’elle que nous recevons, sans crainte d’erreur, le dogme de l’Incarnation.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 211; *Jesu Christ*, 2, 322).

Baker confirmed Grandmaison’s wager: an examination of Scripture merely as a historical document would lead one to no other solution than the doctrine of the hypostatic union. In fact, “every synthesis that refuses to accept it and strives to obscure it condemns itself.”

Christ’s deeds, and, in particular, his signs, form

the key that opens those dim chambers in the textual shrine where the sacred flame yet gleams in the darkness…. From this perspective, one sees that, to understand the Son requires nothing less than the Father’s infinite knowledge of him; one understands the limitless value that Jesus ascribes to his own mediation, his blood, and his work; one adores his extraordinary demands (for in no other way could they be justified), the insistence upon absolute confidence in the Master’s love, which is shown as supreme and purifying by its own virtue. Outside of this perspective, we no longer have anything more than tendentious and forced interpretations, extravagant promises, devouring ambition, and unjustifiable acts.

Grandmaison was not afraid here and throughout his Christology to appeal to the argument from psychological probability as well as to exegesis. He admitted that he was only proclaiming the mystery: yet it was unreasonable to deny it on psychological grounds.

Any diminishment of the divine element in Jesus did not do justice to the documents examined. Yet he was also flesh and blood, a person of his time, country, and race. “This is what Christian dogma affirms against the chimeras of all time…Born of the race of Adam, he is ‘consubstantial’ with us. He is not a God consenting to an ephemeral experience of humanity, to

---


439 “est une clef qui ouvre chacune des chambres où luit, dans l’obscurité du texte, la lampe sacrée…Dans cette perspective, on s’explique que, pour connaître le Fils, il ne faille rien de moins que la science infinie du Père; on comprend la valeur sans limite attribuée par Jésus à sa méditation, à son sang, à son oeuvre; on adore (ce qui est ici seul le seul moyen d’excuser) ses extraordinaires exigences, cette confiance sans condition faite à l’amour du Maître, présentée comme suprême et purifiant par sa propre vertu. Hors de cette perspective nous n’avons plus qu’interprétations tendancieuses et forcées, promesses démesurées, ambition exorbitante, actes injustifiables.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 212; *Jesus Christ*, 2, 323-4.)


441 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 212.
being an *avatar*.” Moreover, there was a personal unity that obtained between his humanity and his divinity:

Through these two widely divergent and seemingly incompatible elements, the divine and the human, there shines forth in the Gospel image of Christ an undeniable unity. This duality does not involve any dualism, as might have been expected. It is the same person who thinks and speaks, contemplates and suffers, heals and weeps, pardons and laments….Nowhere in what we know of Jesus is there to be found a joint into which one could insert a keen blade to sever his uninterrupted activity into two separate parts….Try as you will, you will not reduce his sublime lineaments to human proportions; but you will deprive him of all relief and all probability; you will make of him a vague, incoherent, and impossible entity.

One could understand this subordination of the human nature to the divine nature in terms of the hierarchy of activities within the human person. Such a comparison had also used by the Church Fathers to defend the teaching of Chalcedon. Their main concern was to guard against inexact ideas that threatened what the Church had always held in her unwritten tradition, or only hinted at in the Bible—to define a belief that “lives in the hearts of believers, inspires public devotion, and steadfastly assumes liturgy and worship.” The Chalcedonian formula helped to

---

442 “[E]t c’est aussi ce qu’affirme le dogme chrétien contre les chimères de tous les temps....Né de la race d’Adam, il nous est ‘consubstantiel.’ Il n’est pas un Dieu consentant à une expérience éphémère d’humanité, à un *avatar*.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 213.)

443 “À travers ces éléments si divers et en apparence incompatibles, le divin et l’humain, resplendit dans l’image évangélique du Christ une indéniable unité. Cette dualité n’entraîne pas un dualisme, comme on s’y entendrait. C’est une seul moi qui pense et parle, contemple et souffre, guérit et pleure, pardonne et se plaint….Nulle part dans ce que nous savons de Jésus, on ne trouvera le joint par où s’introduirait la lame aiguë qui ferait, dans cette activité soutenue deux parts.... L’essayez-vous, vous ne ramenez pas cette sublime physionomie aux proportions humains, vous lui enlevez tout relief, toute vraisemblance; vous en faites une entité vague, incohérente, impossible.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 214; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 325.)


guard the Church’s hopes by eliminating “the distortions, the false conjectures, and the arbitrary simplifications” that endangered the Gospel image of Jesus.\textsuperscript{447}

The harmony that was visible in Jesus’ religion put the lie to the modernist dissolution of the figure of Christ. As was the case with all the saints, Christ was “a Person who, despite his obvious humanity, impresses throughout as being at home in two worlds,”\textsuperscript{448} the divine and the human. For Grandmaison, this insight rendered exactly the impression gained from any reading of the gospels; the same truth was expressed in the Chalcedonian formula, “which translates better, for the minds of men, the mystery of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{449}

The clarity and integrity of Christ’s self-revelation was reflected by the complementarity of the gospels. His portrait in both the synoptic gospels and the Johannine writings was remarkable precisely in the way that the otherwise divergent images converged on him.\textsuperscript{450} Unlike the modernists, the gospel writers were able to integrate and even take delight in the various contraries in the Christ. Even given the differences among the gospels—and indeed because of these differences\textsuperscript{451}—what emerged was a remarkably consistent and harmonious portrait of Christ,\textsuperscript{452} who knew himself to be the Son of God and who revealed that truth to his disciples.\textsuperscript{453}

\textsuperscript{447} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 217.


\textsuperscript{449} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 218.

\textsuperscript{450} Grandmaison, “Jesus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1309-10. See also Grandmaison, “Quatrième Évangile: en marge de son plus récent commentaire,” 641-63.

\textsuperscript{451} Grandmaison, “Jesus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1303-4.

\textsuperscript{452} Grandmaison, \textit{Jesus Christ}, 1, 338.

\textsuperscript{453} Grandmaison, “Jesus Christ,” \textit{DAFC}, 1394.
For Grandmaison, there was an important tension between the revelation and the hiddenness of Jesus. His personal religion was part and parcel of the mystery of his person. Such could be seen from the very beginning of his ministry in his teaching. The practice of preaching about the kingdom in parables made clear that the divine truth was transmitted through a dialectic of revelation and hiddenness. This concealment served as reminder of the inaccessibility of the supernatural truth about Christ, the Gospel of God, to natural knowledge. Only revealed truth could suffice. The grace at work in personal religion—whether in the hypostatic union or in the believer’s participation in grace—could only be the work of a God who was fully transcendent and fully personal.

*Book five: The works of Jesus*

Book five drew on more traditional arguments for the divinity of Christ. These confirmations included the prophecies, the miracles and, most important of all, the Resurrection. “Religious men have always thought, in effect, that the Divinity could intervene and really did intervene in human affairs to accredit those who speak in his name.” Such signs from God were necessary even for natural religion and by the person of the most elementary intelligence in order to establish categorical beliefs possessing divine authority. Like the parables, these events both revealed and concealed Christ’s divinity, thereby preserving the mystery of faith.

Book five was divided into four chapters. Introduction à l’étude des miracles évangéliques dealt with the nature of divine signs in general, and the nature of the Christian miracle and of

---


prophets and prophecy. Jésus Prophète\textsuperscript{458} surveyed the prophecies of Christ about himself, the Kingdom of God, and the fulfillment of all things. The last two categories had been especially important in his time in the quest for the historical Jesus. Les Miracles de Jésus\textsuperscript{459} examined the gospel miracles and modern critiques of them; the relationship between Jesus’ miracles and mission and the reality of the miracles. The fourth chapter treated\textsuperscript{460} the Resurrection, natural explanations of it, and its relevance to Christ’s mission.

The gospel miracles

Book five was, in Goguel’s estimation, the most extensive treatment of methodology, and would have been better placed at the head of the book.\textsuperscript{461} Given the intellectual climate of his time, a good part of the first chapter argued against the philosophical objections that had been raised against the possibility, probability, or desirability of miracles understood in a traditional sense. He recognized a new apologetic situation: for many and various reasons, they had become “a stumbling block.”\textsuperscript{462} Yet the miracle had not lost its persuasive force—or at the very least “does not leave anyone indifferent.”\textsuperscript{463} Traditionally speaking, a miracle was an extraordinary, unexpected, inexplicable event that elicited astonishment at its moral or religious excellence so as to call attention to a teaching or a person.\textsuperscript{464} It also required someone who was disposed morally or religiously to perceive the truth of the event.

\textsuperscript{458} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 256-312.
\textsuperscript{459} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 313-68.
\textsuperscript{460} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 369-446.
\textsuperscript{461} Goguel, “Ouvrages récents sur Jésus,” 65.
\textsuperscript{462} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 228.
\textsuperscript{463} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 227-8.
\textsuperscript{464} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 242-4.
The personal religion of the believer demanded such signs. According to Thomas, the believer needed “a divine testimony that manifested the intervention by means of its divine force and truth.”\textsuperscript{465} The efficacy of prophecies and miracles had long been uncontested; moreover, as Vatican I declared, these signs were accessible to all.

The sign addresses itself to every religious man, and does not need these abstruse and very delicate investigations…It is enough, in any given case, if the divine imprint is clear from the outset, either because the event it marks is beyond the compass of any natural agency:…or that the suddenness of what is done, its greatness, and the striking disproportion of the means employed powerfully incline the spirit to acknowledge a superhuman intervention.\textsuperscript{466}

There were criteria that showed whether a miracle was morally or spiritually worthy of being used by God and that showed connections to a body of teachings or a person. Such indices escaped geometric precision, but came by way “of insinuation, high probability, and concrete and moral certitude.”\textsuperscript{467} No two miracles were alike. “The appeal to Providence will ordinarily be enough to ratify as certain an interpretation that is already strongly suggested by the importance of the thing done and by its religious quality.”\textsuperscript{468} Most miracles did not require posterior reflection.

Miracles were the acts of a transcendent, personal God who was sovereignly free.

The framework of nature is flexible enough to accommodate the intervention of a higher liberty…The powers of action whose inertia or weakness puts a limit on the forces of nature, whether set in motion automatically or able to exercise choice, remain subject to the Creator, who can increase or supplement their effect.\textsuperscript{469}

\textsuperscript{465} Thomas, \textit{De Potentia}, 6, a 5, in Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 226.

\textsuperscript{466} “le signe s’adresse à toute homme religieux, et n’a pas besoin, pour valoir, de ces recherches abstruses et très délicates…Il suffit que, dans un cas concret, le sceau divine apparaîsse d’emblée, soit qu’il s’inscrive dans une champ où nulle force naturelle ne saurait atteindre:…soit que la soudaineté du fait, sa grandeur, la disproportion éclatante des moyens employés inclinent puissamment l’esprit à admettre une intervention surhumaine.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 227; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 5.)

\textsuperscript{467} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 227.

\textsuperscript{468} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 227; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 5.

\textsuperscript{469} “Le cadre de la Nature est donc assez souple pour que l’intervention y soit possible…Les puissances d’action, automatiquement mises en branle ou capables de choix, dont l’inertie ou la faiblesse oppose une limite aux forces
A miracle came from the hands of the God of Jesus Christ, who by adoption, gave his creatures a share in his divine life. The miracle was possible because of the gratuitous act of a sovereign God who created and conserved the world in love. Contrary to the expectation of rationalist exegetes, the most unlikely gospel miracles had the most frequent multiple attestations, which reinforced their credibility.

The miracles gave witness to the divinity of Christ by showing his sovereignty in all domains. “Humanity, as it presented itself to the conquering assault of the Son of Man, was utterly spoiled, hardened in evil of every kind, physical, moral and religious…Jesus routed the enemy everywhere, and particularly in the case of physical obsession, or possession.” The miracles, however, were not mere demonstrations of raw power. “The miracles are the consequences, and as we might say, the overflow in the material order of the Master’s spiritual work: they are the naturelles, restent soumis au Créateur, qui peut en majorer l’efficacité ou la suppléer.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 239, Jesus Christ, 3, 16.)

---

470 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 240.

471 “[L]e signe extraordinaire qu’est le miracle devient antérieurement probable, comme est extraordinaire et inattendu, l’amour dont il doit témoigner. Ce qui dans l’ordre habituel de Providence pouvait sembler un double emploi, ou un expédient masquant une insuffisance, devient normal dans l’ordre supérieur, gratuit, surnaturel, où nous introduit l’incompréhensible bonté du Créateur.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 240; Jesus Christ, 2, 17.)

472 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 318.

473 Thomas, De Potentia, VI, 5, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 226.

474 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 354.

475 “Tel qu’il se présentait à l’élan conquérant du Fils de l’homme, le milieu humain était profondément gâté, enveillli dans les maux de toutes sortes, physiques, moraux et religieux…Jésus a fait reculer l’adversaire sur tous les terrains, en particulier sur celui de l’obsession physique, de la possession.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 352-3; Jesus Christ, 3, 141.)
Kingdom of God in action.” Indeed, the Church has always understood that the miracles revealed truths about Christ and the Kingdom. “All the activity of the Master—his teaching, controversies, the missions that he gives—suppose the reality of miraculous signs and often make no sense without them.” The miracles performed by God on his behalf, and those miracles by which the Master rewarded the faith of those who believed in him” showed that they were intimately tied to Christ’s mission. His inability to perform many miracles in his hometown of Nazareth underlined the importance of the dispositions of his audience. The faith that Jesus demanded was part and parcel of personal religion; such faith was not blind confidence in a wonder-worker. It was “a meritorious religious disposition that often concerned his person and mission.” The reality of miracles could not be discerned outside of the proper vision provided by faith.

Most importantly, the miracles were indications of the personal religion of Jesus. “In this amazing work Jesus shows at once simplicity and nobility; his manner is far removed from conceit, or from any trace of ostentation or hypocrisy! Nothing but a few words, an ‘I will,’ a gesture, a symbolic touch on the opened eyes or loosened tongue.” Jesus’ manner of performing the miracles, so simple and so majestic, showed that he was at ease in his Father’s house and was

---

476 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 365; Jesus Christ, 3, 152.
477 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 366.
478 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 319.
479 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 330.
480 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 334.
481 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 362.
482 “Dans cette œuvre extraordinaire, la manière de Jésus est d’autre part très simple, très grande; si éloignée de toute complaisance, de tout ce qui sentirait l’ostentation ou le charlatanisme! Quelques mots, un vouloir, un geste, le toucher symbolique des yeux qui s’ouvrent, des langues qui se délient. Et toujours l’assurance d’un fils qui se meut dans la maison de son père, et se sait obéi dès qu’il manifeste un désir.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 354; Jesus Christ, 3, 141.)
confident that his wishes would be answered. Such facts rendered alternative explanations for the miracles improbable, if not childish.

Christ’s prophecies and manner of prophecy sustained the credibility of the mystery of his person; at the very least, they avoided rendering him as a bizarre, mentally unbalanced figure. This could be seen first of all in the prophecies he made about himself that were the most difficult to decipher: the enigmatic, ignored, and all-important prophecies of the Suffering Servant from Isaiah and Christ’s triple prediction of his death and resurrection.

[In them] we find an organic and living sequence, which yet is unexpected and defies all forecasting—just such a train of events as we should expect from a plain reading of history. There is a much higher probability that issues from these scattered references, so different in their white-hot intensity from all conventional oratory! We are far from the uncertain advocate of reform, from the Messiah-without-knowing-it that we have sometimes been offered. Jesus manifestly anticipated from the start, and he alone, the fact of his tragic death, and measured the effect of this catastrophe on his mission. He alone understood the texts that all of Israel knew and that the rabbis knew by heart.483

These prophecies, then, were a conjunction of the unexpected and the obvious. Jesus could read the hearts of men.484

A simple examination of the texts from Isaiah 52 and 53 were adequate confirmations that Jesus’ triple prediction was authentic. From a psychological point of view, Jesus’ struggle to break through the disciples’ carnal vision of his coming passion was enough to validate the authenticity of the gospel accounts without recourse to textual–critical preoccupations.485 There were hints before

483 “[N]ous trouvons une suite organique et vivante, bien qu’inattendue et défiant toute prévision, une trame enfin comme celle que l’histoire nous découvre, quand elle est interrogée naïvement. Et quelle vraisemblance supérieure ressort de ces notations dispersées, fièvres étrangères à toute rhétorique d’école! Nous sommes loin du fauteur incertain de reforme, loin du Messie–sans-le–savoir qu’on nous présente parfois. Manifestement Jésus, et lui seul, envisage dès l’origine le fait de sa mort tragique, et mesure le contre-coup de cette fin sur sa mission. Lui seul a compris les textes que tout Israël connait et que les rabbis savent par cœur.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 263; Jesus Christ, 3, 40.)

484 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 258.

485 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 265.
Peter’s confession: yet after it, Jesus was willing to be open with his disciples. The confluence of prophecies and events related to his death was so ubiquitous and embedded so naturally in the framework of the history related by the gospels that no real objections could be credible. “Their rejection is based, therefore, more or less explicitly, on considerations which satisfy neither criticisms of the texts nor history.” Again, Grandmaison’s wager depended on a faithful examination of what Scripture reported.

Jesus’ predictions about the coming of the Kingdom and about the fulfillment of all things were the great bone of contention for critics such as those in the eschatological school. Grandmaison focused first on the inception and the nature of the Kingdom as Jesus had envisioned it:

Its beginnings would be humble, not attracting the attention of the profane; indeed it would be difficult, when it was established, to trace its origin…. Above all, the Kingdom is spiritual:….It is composed of men and not of disembodied souls; hence it is visible and subject to the precarious conditions that the mustering of people dictates; yet it is, nevertheless, the Kingdom of heaven, and makes no appeal to the proud display of triumphant force, or to the childish miracles which formed the substance of the Jews’ deluded hopes.

What other prophet could claim “anticipations of such breadth”? No heart could fail to understand his utterances. The Father’s Envoy conquered not by the sword, but by his word. He would yield “a empire of the spirit, adding to itself to the end men of good will, but under attack,

486 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 265-6.

487 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 271.

488 “On aura peine, après coup, à discerner ses origines…. Surtout le Royaume est spirituel:….Composé d’hommes et non d’âmes désincarnées, donc visible et soumis aux conditions précaires qu’implique le recrutement humain, le Royaume des cieux ne fait pas, pour autant, appel à l’éclat impérieux de la force triomphante, ou aux prodiges simplificateurs dont se berçait l’illusion juive.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 272; Jesus Christ, 3, 50-1.)

489 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 280.

490 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 273.
hard pressed, sometimes worsted and reduced to extremities.”\(^{491}\) Although there would be tares among the wheat and wolves among the sheep, Jesus would leave his Holy Spirit, who would render witness to him, and the Eucharist.\(^{492}\) Christ’s followers could have confidence because the Kingdom was a divine work.

Grandmaison spent much time refuting the claim of the eschatological school that Jesus was obsessed with the apocalyptic vision of the fulfillment of the Kingdom.\(^{493}\) The last set of prophecies of special apologetic importance and difficulty were those concerning the devastation of the Jewish world, Christ’s coming, and the fulfillment of all things.\(^{494}\) But not all prophecies uttered by Jesus were apocalyptic. Moreover, although Christ’s prophecies seemed at times to be contradictory, they were in fact complementary. The Kingdom of God arrived in Christ, but its fulfillment was yet to come.\(^{495}\) For the Jews, the ruin of Jerusalem entailed the end of the world. Yet the apocalyptic predictions that Jesus delivered were to be fulfilled in two main stages,\(^{496}\) with the fall of Jerusalem and the fulfillment of all things (Mt. 24:36; Mk 13:32).\(^{497}\) Christ prophesied the Cross that he had to suffer and anticipated his Resurrection.\(^{498}\) He would come in power twice, in the glorification after his death, and at the Parousia.

\(^{491}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 275; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 55.

\(^{492}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 276-7.

\(^{493}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 294.


\(^{496}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 303.

\(^{497}\) Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 305-12.

\(^{498}\) Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” *DAFC*, 1396; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 81, 613.
The first coming of Jesus, and the destruction of Jerusalem could be predicted with some accuracy, but not, of course, the second coming. In examining the texts, Grandmaison was not sure about the expectations of the apostolic generations about the gap between the first and second coming. Nonetheless, such moderate uncertainty did not allow the eschatologists to take liberties in their conclusions. Grandmaison appealed to the psychological argument about Christ’s consciousness. The truth about these prophecies was based on probabilities that had to do not only with the expectations themselves, established by the texts, but also with the Master’s consciousness of his mission:

The Lord’s inner life as we discover it [in the Gospel] is the very antithesis of the feverish expectation attributed to Jesus by his opponents. Could there be anything so removed from the gloomy fanaticism of a visionary preoccupied with the approach of a world upheaval than his untrammeled spirit, his mastery of self, his gracious and discerning goodness? Could there be anything more childish than to circumscribe the limitless horizon of the Son of Man with a wall of fire? And then, the work that he had predicted, planned, and actually begun—what place could it hold in a world already in its last agony, with only a few years left to it?

Jesus’ intention in his apocalyptic predictions was rather to reassure his disciples in the face of the coming catastrophes and to provoke them to a choice for a truly human life. Why legislate moral reform in a revolution without a future? Such an attitude would indeed have been irremediably contradictory.

There were passages from the gospel according to John that also gave the correct interpretation: “They reveal to us further the true meaning of the Son of Man’s mission and the


500 “La vie intime que celles-ci nous révèlent est au pôle opposé de l’attente fiévreuse prêtée à Jésus par ses adversaires. Est-il rien de plus opposé que cette limpidité d’âme, cette maîtrise de soi, cette condescendante et clairvoyante bonté, à l’ardeur sombre d’un visionnaire hanté par l’approche d’un cataclysme universel? Est-il rien de puéril comme de borner à ce mur de flammes l’horizon sans limites de Fils de l’homme? Et puis, quelle apparence de faire tenir l’œuvre prédite, ébauchée, commencée, dans les quelques années que pouvait se promettre agonisant?” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 308; *Jésus Christ*, 2, 91-2.)
sovereign dignity of his person. And in this connection we should speak of a triple event.”  

The first was the Resurrection and the Ascension; the second, the ruin of Jerusalem, and the preaching of the gospel to all nations; the third, the coming in glory of the Son of Man at the Last Judgment. John’s (realized) eschatology—focusing on the individual’s choice—dovetailed with the synoptics’ consequent eschatology. Grandmaison’s understanding of John’s eschatology ruled out an immanent, subconscious encounter with God. The Father called each person through Christ to choose eternal life. “This election is not the result of an impulsive, blind, unconditioned instinct; the Father’s call is answered in each ransomed soul by an unfettered decision.”  

Admittedly, given the many divine confirmations, rejection was inexcusable. Still, the Son’s stern words in John were meant for repentance. The fact that the whole Church adopted John’s gospel showed that the early Church thought that the apocalyptic prophecies of the synoptics were still in force. But the first generation had judged itself by its very acceptance or rejection of Christ in the flesh.

Of all the works of Christ, the Resurrection was the most important. Lebreton wrote the following about Grandmaison’s convictions concerning it:

The miracle of Christ’s Resurrection is the keystone of this entire investigation. With it, everything holds together; without it, everything falls apart. The solidness of its historical reality redounds upon Jesus’ entire earthly life and makes it more credible, and, reciprocally, a career that already revealed itself as more than human finds in this miracle such a perfect fulfillment that this very harmony confirms the testimony rendered by previous facts. With a very Pauline sense of this capital importance, P. de Grandmaison wanted to devote an entire chapter to the Resurrection of Christ.  

501 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 311.

502 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 311; Jesus Christ, 3, 94-5.

503 “Le miracle de la Résurrection du Christ est la clé de voûte de toute cette démonstration. Par elle, tout se tient; sans elle, tout croule. La fermeté de sa réalité historique rejaillit sur toute de la vie terrestre de Jésus et la rend plus croyable, et, réciproquement une carrière qui déjà se révélait plus qu’humaine trouve en ce miracle un si parfait achèvement que cette harmonie même confirme les arguments de fait. Avec le sentiment très paulinien de cette importance capitale, le P. de Grandmaison a voulu réserver un chapitre entier à la Résurrection du Christ.” (Lebreton, “Le Jésus Christ,” 144.)
Although Jesus and the writers of the New Testament often attributed this work to the Father, there are times when Jesus attributed the power to rise from the dead to himself (Jn. 2: 19; 10:18). As the greatest miracle and surest vindication of Christ’s claim to divinity, the Resurrection reflected back upon his entire earthly life. Just as the Son bore witness to the Father, so the Father gave witness to the Son, especially at the Resurrection. Comparisons made to the resuscitations of other gods showed all the more the distinctiveness of the Resurrection.

The reports about the Resurrection and the consequent apparitions from Acts 1:3 and Acts 10: 40-41 showed that the event was both factual and mysterious:

The life now manifested by the Savior was not the common life as had lived it in the days of his flesh. New and glorious, it transcended and upset our present knowledge by many of its properties. It was, in this sense, as theologians tell us, full of mystery, and the object of faith, but not of sight. Nonetheless, between these two aspects of reality there is a distinction only, and no opposition. The fact, as established by the evidence of history, does not by itself explain this superhuman life; nor does the mystery eclipse the value of the testimony to the actual fact. Apart from the new and marvelous qualities of the risen Christ recorded by the witnesses, his personal identity with Jesus of Nazareth is a matter of knowledge. The supposed incompatibility of the mysterious modes of being and the certitude of the Paschal message: ‘Jesus is risen!’ is only a particular application of the overwhelming objection: ‘It cannot be.’

Hence, Grandmaison refused to accede to the antinomy that had been postulated of the Resurrection during the quest for the historical Jesus and the modernist period: that belief in the Resurrection was either an act of faith or the perception of a fact. Just as Paul could not separate the

---


505 “La vie que le Seigneur manifesta alors ne fut pas en effet la vie commune, telle qu’il l’avait menée pendant les jours de la chair. Nouvelle, glorieuse, elle déborde et déconcerte, par plusieurs de ses manières d’être, notre connaissance actuelle. En ce sens, elle est, nous avertissent les théologiens, pleine de mystère, et objet de foi, non de vue. Ces deux aspects de la réalité, qu’il faut distinguer, ne s’opposent pas pour autant. Ni le fait, tel que les témoignages d’histoire, ne s’opposent, n’expliquent intégralement cette vie surhumaine; ni le mystère de cette vie n’offusque la valeur des témoignages concernant le fait lui-même. Indépendamment des qualités merveilleuses et nouvelles, constatées par les témoins chez le ressuscité, l’identité personnelle de celui-ci avec Jésus de Nazareth est objet de connaissance. L’incompatibilité prétendue des modalités mystérieuses avec la certitude du message pascal: ‘Christ est ressuscité!’ n’est que la reprise, propos d’un détail, de la négation massive: ‘Cela ne peut être.’” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 370; Jesus Christ, 3, 156-7.)
apologetic from the dogmatic dimensions of faith, one could not separate the mystery of Christ’s life and Resurrection from one another. Referring to Paul’s vision of Christ on the way to Damascus, Grandmaison wrote:

Concerning the very nature of the appearance, the terms used by Paul here and elsewhere all imply an element of immediacy and enlightenment, interpreting an external phenomenon with certitude. It is a ‘seeing,’ a ‘revelation,’ and from this intuition comes an unshakeable certainty regarding the personal identity of Him who appears.506

Glorified in body, the crucified Christ was not merely resuscitated, nor was he a phantom—he manifested the fullness of life.507

Although one could not state with precision all the details of Paul’s encounter with Christ, there was certainly enough testimony to establish its external, historical occurrence.508 Noting the sobriety of the Pauline and gospel texts, Grandmaison observed: “A disproportion erupts between the importance of the fact of the Resurrection—such as emerges from evidence of the entire primitive Christian teaching—and the relative brevity, lacunae, and clashes of the written tradition.”509 Given this relative lack of information, one cannot help but note the peaceful, uncontested possession of belief in the Resurrection by the disciples of Jesus’ time.510

---


507 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 380.

508 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 424-5.

509 “Une disproportion éclate entre l’importance du fait de la résurrection, telle qu’elle ressort l’évidence de tout l’enseignement chrétien primitif, et la brièveté relative, les lacunes, les heurts de la tradition écrite.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 398.)

510 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 400.
The different accounts of the Resurrection appearances differed much more from one another than was the case with the crucifixion. Why might have that been so?

The appearances all began with astonishment, fright, even doubt on the part of the witnesses: it was Jesus whom they saw, heard, and might touch, but not the Jesus that they knew! Recognizing him demanded an effort, an abstraction from their customary, everyday life: and this was responsible for the uncertainty, fluctuations, and alternations of feeling that have left their mark on the records of the times and places of the appearances, which were nearly always abrupt, upsetting expectations or desires.511

Although it was a delicate matter for the historian to give a sketch of the documents given their character, dishonest witnesses would have given a smoother account. If one stepped back, though, one noticed: “A very notable primary trait, even though negative, is the absence of any indication of the time and of any description of the capital fact.”512 The second fact was the empty tomb, which was discovered by women disciples, who included Mary Magdalene. The women could not interpret the facts: the intervention of the angels and of Christ convinced them. But no plausible interpretation called these traditions into question.513

Only a personal gesture of the Master could overcome their uncertainty, disquiet, fright of the supernatural, misunderstanding, and even defiance in a concrete, lasting way. “Thus was formed in spirits slow to believe…an unshakeable conviction that changes and reverses their previous state of soul, giving them a new heart.”514 Such encounters immediately transformed these people into fearless, convinced witnesses to the Easter faith. “This indissoluble union between the reality of the

511 “Les apparitions ont toutes commencé par l’étonnement, l’effroi, le doute même, de ceux qui les subissaient: c’est Jésus qu’on voyait, qu’on entendait. Qu’on pouvait toucher; ce n’était pas le Jésus d’autrefois! Il fallait, pour le reconnaître, un effort, une abstraction des habitudes de la vie ordinaire: de là des incertitudes, des fluctuations, des oscillations sentimentales qui ont y laissé trace en ce qui touche le temps et la localisation des apparitions, presque toujours soudaines, déroutant les attentes et les désirs.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 400-1; Jesus Christ, 3, 190.)

512 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 402-3.

513 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 404.

514 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 405.
fact of the resurrection and the fact of the Paschal faith that founded the Church and transformed the world, confirms the truth of apostolic testimony in the most solid way.” Grandmaison added:

In fact, far from being able to create its object, in a desperate impulse of enthusiasm, and far from ‘founding the religion of Christ with the pieces of broken hopes,’ it was the faith of the apostles that needed to be renewed, remade, recreated. For this neither the women’s story sufficed, nor the tomb found empty; still less will a display of metaphors be enough to explain this overwhelming change.

The Resurrection was the unique motive for the credibility of the Christian faith, the “assent to the divine mystery, not yet expanded, which hid itself in the person of the Savior.” This kerygma was given to the Church, and not invented by Christ’s disciples in response to a felt psychological need. The Resurrection was simply too overwhelming to have been fabricated.

Grandmaison was not put off by the uncertainties concerning Jesus’ appearances to his disciples both in Jerusalem and Galilee. “The order and exact time of the appearances elude us in part on account of the nature of the accounts. One ought not to make difficulties about recognizing that analysis and the distinction of the sources, of which there has been much abuse, are not without foundation in the texts.” The Johannine and synoptic accounts complemented one another.

while recognizing that in the texts we have the echo of diverse reminiscences that are put together rather than harmoniously blended, in company with the evangelists, we refuse to choose between them. One finds cases in history where although the facts are solidly attested one has to give up the attempt to fix with certitude their exact sequence and their

---

515 “Cette union indissoluble entre la réalité du fait de la résurrection et la foi pascale qui a fondé l’Église et transformé le monde, confirme de la façon la plus solide la vérité du témoignage apostolique.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 407.)

516 “Loin enfin de pouvoir créer son objet, dans un élan désespéré, et ‘fonder la religion du Christ avec les morceaux de ses espérances brisées,’ c’est la foi apostolique elle-même qui avait besoin d’être renouvelée, refaite, recrée. La parole des femmes n’y suffit pas, non plus que le tombeau trouve vide; encore moins un jeu de métaphores suffira-t-il à expliquer ce prodigieux changement.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 427; Jesus Christ, 3, 218.)


518 “L’ordre et le temps exact des apparitions nous échappent en partie, de par la nature des récits. On ne doit pas faire difficulté de reconnaître que l’analyse et la distinction des sources, dont on a tant abusé, ne sont pas sans fondements dans les textes.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 420.)
agreement with other texts; to treat them on that account as if they had not happened may be convenient, but it is a procedure hardly worthy of a historian.\textsuperscript{519} Good historical judgment showed that the different accounts had the ring of truth and needed to be respected as such. Indeed, Grandmaison delighted in the seeming discrepancies in parallel accounts of the same event, especially those concerning the Resurrection: the somewhat disparate details of the accounts actually confirmed that the events were indeed real.\textsuperscript{520} The accounts of this unique, overwhelming event would have been less credible if all the loose ends were neatly tied together.

What were the appearances like? One could say at the very least that it was the body of Christ that prompted the reaction of the disciples; Loisy too agreed with this.\textsuperscript{521} The Church knew from her contact with Christ before the Resurrection that it was the same Christ who appeared to them after the Resurrection.\textsuperscript{522}

Two other signs that confirmed the truth of the Resurrection were Christ’s prophecies concerning the sign of Jonah and the sign of the temple being rebuilt in three days. These signs also set up the expectation for the emergence of the Church after the Resurrection. The former had as much to do with the conversion of the pagans (the “Ninevites”) into Christians as with the death

\textsuperscript{519} “tout en reconnaissant dans les textes l’écho de souvenirs divers, plutôt rapprochés qu’harmonieusement fondus, nous refusons, avec les évangélistes, d’opter entre eux. Le cas se présente souvent en histoire de faits solidement attestés, mais dont il faut renoncer à fixer avec certitude la suite exacte et la cohérence avec d’autres: traiter les premiers comme non avenus est un procédé commode mais peu digne d’un historien.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 420; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 3, 211.)

\textsuperscript{520} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 405.


\textsuperscript{522} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 380.
and Resurrection of Christ. The latter sign, in effect, “a reply like that of Jonah is even more exclusively prophetic” of the first glorification of the Son of man. Even more:

The great tragic duel between these two spirits, the Judaizing and the Christian, was resumed and symbolized in the two Temples. For the worship celebrated exclusively in the magnificent structure (‘a few stones and what a building!’), where, for every good Israelite, resided the glory of the LORD, God was going to substitute a religion that was ampler in spirit and in truth. But this immense reality was, as a visible reality, yet hidden in Jesus.

The Resurrection would not only be the sign of the great change, but the measure of its reality, and indeed, its development.

The faith that the Resurrection engendered had indeed conquered the world and still continued to make itself felt in countries that were being de-Christianized. Such a conviction conveyed a warning about measuring the truth of dogma by merely human proportions.

we may rightly recall in this connection the Gospel counsel that tells us to judge the tree by its fruits, and note the contrast between these exalted opinions and the objections lodged by our opponents against the marvelous works of Christ. These negations are not well founded in history, nor can they be defended even on philosophical grounds; they are the residue of rigid determinist conceptions now superseded, or of those ‘so-called theories’ of radical evolutionism stigmatized by Henri Poincaré in his Dernières Pensées, ‘which reduce themselves to crude comparisons, such as those between societies and organisms.’

523 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 435-41.

524 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 443.

525 “Le grand duel tragique des deux esprits, le judaïsant et le chrétien, se résume et se symbolise dans deux Temples. Au culte célébré exclusivement dans le magnifique édifice (‘quelques pierres et quelle bâtisse!’), où résidait, pour tout bon Israelite, la gloire de Yahvé, Dieu va substituer une religion plus large, en esprit et en vérité. Mais cette immense réalité se cache présentement, pour ce qui est visible, en Jésus.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 443; Jesus Christ, 3, 235.)

526 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 445.

527 “C’est là ce que nul penseur ne tiendra pour négligeable et, moins qu’autre, celui qui prétend juger d’une doctrine, au moins partiellement, par ses aptitudes à contenter l’intelligence et à guider noblement l’action. Sans accorder à cette façon de voir une valeur décisive, et surtout exclusive, nous avons le droit de rappeler, à ce propos, la maxime évangélique qui conseille de juger l’arbre par ses fruits; et de marquer le contraste qui existe entre ces hautes vues et les fins de non-recevoir opposées par nos adversaires aux œuvres merveilleuses de Christ. Mal fondées en histoire, ces négations ne sont pas, en philosophie même, défendables: elles sont le reliquat de conceptions déterministes rigides, actuellement dépassées, ou de ces ‘soi-disant théories’ de l’évolutionnisme radical, stigmatisées par Henri Poincaré dans ses Dernières Pensées, ‘qui se réduisent à des comparaisons grossières comme celles des sociétés avec les organismes.’” (Henri Poincaré, La Morale et la science, vol, 8, Dernières Pensées [Paris, 1913], 241, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 446; Jesus Christ, 3, 238.)
Here Grandmaison repeated the point that he had made in his articles on doctrines, that the truth of a doctrine cannot be measured by its utility, even as a guide for upright living, and that one cannot erect the human intellect as the measure of divine truth. This passage also made clear that the scholars who rejected the miraculous in Jesus’ did so first as bad *historians*. Their conclusions were unjustifiable on historical grounds. Their constant and consistent failures warranted his criticism of the philosophical errors that brought them to this pass.

**D. *Jesus Continué Dans L’Église* (I):**

**The Church as the Personal Religion Founded by Jesus Christ**

As seen in the last chapter, for Grandmaison, as for many of the modernists, the question of Christ frequently took the form of the question of the Church. Christology and ecclesiology were closely connected. Was the founding of the Church the act of a merely human agent? Was it the result of an individual or of a community? If Jesus saw himself as the divine and human inaugurator of the Kingdom,528 was he successful in his endeavor? What was the relationship of Christ and the Church today? The Church rose and fell with the divinity of Christ.529

*Jésus Christ* tried to lead its reader to trust in Christ. Grandmaison hoped that the reader would then take the next step to trust in the Catholic Church, from which the believer received the doctrine of the Incarnation. The immediate aim in the sixth and final book, entitled *La Religion du Jésus Christ*,530 was to show not only that the Catholic Church was the personal creation of Christ, but also the authorized witness to the personal religion embodied in Jesus. The Church as founded

---


529 Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ*, 2, 211.

by Christ was witness to his divinity. Grandmaison also continued to make the argument for the Church as the consummate personal religion of the Spirit. In other words, while continuing to argue for the credibility of Christ from the witness of the Church, Grandmaison’s Christology argued directly for the credibility of the Church from the attractiveness of her constitution.\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535, 639.}

The two main sections of book six were \textit{L’Établissement de la Religion de Jésus Christ}\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535-624.} and \textit{Les Témoins du Jésus Christ dans l’histoire}.\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 625-60.} In speaking of the witness of the Church—la Religion du Jésus—book six elaborated how the witness of the Holy Spirit was present and active in the lives of Christians. Grandmaison changed somewhat his way of speaking of the Church that had predominated in the \textit{DAFC} article.\footnote{Huby, “Le ‘Jésus Christ’,” 145.} A more vigorous defense of the Church was all the more necessary in light of the virulent attack that Paul Couchoud\footnote{See Ch. 1, 120.} made on Christianity. So Grandmaison interpolated into the \textit{L’Établissement de la Religion de Jésus Christ} a section entitled \textit{Le Mystère chrétien et les mystères païens}.\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535-60.} It presented a critical survey of the comparative study of mystery religions. This section was followed by a section entitled \textit{Les origines de la religion de Jésus Christ},\footnote{Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 561-624.} which formed the core of book six.

Grandmaison’s defense of the Church was more comprehensive and integrated in the Christological works than in earlier articles on Catholicism because of the confluence of the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[\footnotenum{531}] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535, 639.
\item[\footnotenum{532}] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535-624.
\item[\footnotenum{533}] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 625-60.
\item[\footnotenum{534}] Huby, “Le ‘Jésus Christ’,” 145.
\item[\footnotenum{535}] See Ch. 1, 120.
\item[\footnotenum{536}] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 535-60.
\item[\footnotenum{537}] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 561-624.
\end{footnotes}
Pneumatological and the Christological approaches. Echoing the structure of the Nicene Creed, he wrote of the Church in the *DAFC* article under the section entitled *Le Témoignage du Saint Esprit*. The title emphasized that the Holy Spirit bore personal witness to Christ through the Church. The section moved on from a brief description of Christ’s promise of the sending of the Holy Spirit—explicitly made in John and implicitly in Luke—to a consideration of the gifts that the Holy Spirit poured out upon the Church as concrete instances of this witness. That miracle of miracles was, after all, for the sake of the regeneration of believers (I Cor. 15: 16).

What mattered first of all was Christ’s intention as expressed in passages such as Mt. 16:13-21, 18:15-19, and 28: 28ff., upon which Grandmaison commented in this passage from an earlier article:

Christ affirms with perfect clarity the necessity and the value of his personal mediation;—the fact of the general delegation of his powers to the apostles, who are charged with teaching doctrine, ‘making disciples’ of all the nations, all the while respecting the unity of the Master’s teachings;—the existence of an effective sign of invitation into the Kingdom by the consecration of the faithful to the triune God;—the divine guarantee of an indefectible presence for the work and for the workers.

One sees that each word aims at, foresees, and engages the future. In its determined and specific structure, in its *forme* (in the scholastic sense of the word), the Church is thus defined and brought back, as to its origin, to a conscious thought and a distinct intention on the part of Jesus.

---


539 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 574.

540 For a discussion of the authenticity, historicity, and significance of these passages, see Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1917), 84-5.

541 “Le Christ affirme, avec une netteté parfaite, la nécessité et la valeur de sa médiation personnelle;—le fait de la délégation générale de ses pouvoirs aux apôtres, chargés d’endoctriner, de ‘rendre disciples’ tous les peuples, touchant l’intégralité des enseignements du Maître;—l’existence d’un signe efficace d’initiation au Royaume, par la consécration du fidèle au Dieu trine et un;—la garantie divine d’une permanence indéfectible pour l’oeuvre et les ouvriers. Chaque mot, on le voit porte coup, prévoit et engage l’avenir. Dans son élément spécifique et déterminant, dans sa *forme* (au sens scolastique du mot) l’Église est ainsi définie et reportée, comme à son origine, à une pensée consciente et à une volonté distincte de Jésus.” (Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” [1917], 86.)
Jesus’ intention to announce the Kingdom was connected with his intention to found the Church. The latter did not arrogate to itself its authority to represent him or the Kingdom. The Church’s existence and mission was Christ’s forethought, expressed more than once during his lifetime. “Jesus effectively prepared, definitely foresaw and certainly wanted the Church.”  

Moreover, the Church’s mediation referred back to the absolute necessity of the continuous mediation of Christ. Although Grandmaison does not directly comment on the fact that only one gospel uses the word church, he does, in his discussion of the gospel according to John, acknowledge that the word is not used at all. This fact does not prevent him from claiming that the gospel of John is the most ecclesial of all the gospels.  

The intimate connection of Jesus and his Church was made strongly in *Jésus Christ*. Grandmaison magnified the personal religion of the Church with a proportionately larger section in Book Six of the two-volume work. The title *L’Établissement de la Religion de Jésus Christ* emphasized the fact that the Church echoed and participated in the personal religion of Jesus. The Church was truly the divinely inspired witness to Jesus Christ. The second section, *Les Témoins de Jésus Christ*, held up the witness of exemplary believers as evidence for the divinity of Christ. Grandmaison also continued to show how the Church resolved seeming antinomies that the modernists posited. For example, he continued to draw the connection between the Spirit of interior liberty and the ecclesial hierarchy, which was an essential part of her social nature.  

---

543 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 613; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 434; see also pp. 440-1 below.  
Le Mystère chrétien et les mystères païens

Responding to Loisy’s *Le Mystère chrétien et les mystères païens*, Grandmaison attempted to underline the uniqueness of Christianity. He asked whether there was a difference between the Christian religion as a mystery and the non-Christian mystery religions. (Goguel himself lauded this exercise in comparative religion for its astute analysis of the differences between the two.) The meaning of mystery was stable enough so as to make the comparison a valid one. He first made the distinction between an analogy and a borrowing.

In every age, the emotions of the religious soul, eager for purification, light, and certitude, or confessing its wretchedness, seeking intercessors before the too exalted majesty of God in his too impartial justice, point naturally in the same direction. No less universal is the yearning for a Master so near to us that we can plant our steps in his, and, at the same time, so holy that in following him we are sure of attaining salvation. These thoughts, though sometimes debased almost beyond recognition, are found in all kinds of surroundings and at all periods, more clearly defined wherever religious speculation is more deeply stirred.

The fact that the Christian mystery had satisfied these immense hopes was evidence in itself for the truth of Christianity. Yet the problem of borrowings was still open. For, as this passage and others

---

545 Grandmaison gave a talk at the Semaine d’ethnologie religieuse in response to Alfred Loisy’s *Le mystère Chrétien et les mystères païens* (Paris: Nourry, 1919): Léonce de Grandmaison, “Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien,” *Semaine d’ethnologie religieuse: Compte rendu analytique de la 3e session tenue à Tilburg, 6–14 septembre, 1922* (Enghien: Maison Saint-Augustin, 1923), 456-70. An abridged version of the talk also appeared in print; Léonce de Grandmaison, “Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien,” *Études* 175 (1922), 515-32. The section in his Christological work was less a critical assessment of the work of Loisy and other ethnologists than a presentation of a history of these religions vis-à-vis Christianity.


548 “Les analogies générales en soulèvent une autre. Les sentiments éternels de l’âme religieuse, avide de purification, de lumière et de certitude, ou criant sa misère, cherchant des intercesseurs auprès de la majesté de Dieu trop haute, et de sa justice trop exacte, s’orientent naturellement dans le même sens. L’aspiration n’est pas moins universelle vers un Maître assez proche pour que nous puissions mettre nos pas dans ses pas, et ensemble assez saint pour qu’en le suivant nous arrivions sûrement en salut. Dégradés parfois jusqu’à devenir presque illisibles, ces traits se retrouvent dans tous les milieux, à toutes les époques, d’autant plus que nets que la préoccupation religieuse est davantage éveillée.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 535; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 350.)

549 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 552.
pointed out, the longings for personal religion were universal. Vestiges of the truth were everywhere. Had Christianity merely been the latest version of its pagan predecessors?

What the mysteries held in common was

the jealously kept secret with regard to what was revealed in the initiation; and the dramatic and realistic nature of the rites by which the original myth was acted, mimed, represented, reproduced. The initiates, associated with these experiences by supposedly effective means, and instructed in the doctrines they symbolized, were in some manner attached to the deities whose clients they became in this world and the next.\(^{550}\)

In the end, though, mysteries that began at the initiative of strictly religious men were degraded and evaporated due to curious and sensual people who were eager for strong emotional experiences.\(^{551}\)

Although the mysteries created a new language embodying their noblest ideas and sentiments, they also spread practices having to do with divination, demonism, and magic. The mystery meals had only superficial resemblances to the Eucharist.\(^{552}\)

What were the consequences for belief in Christianity?\(^{553}\) According to some of the Fathers, the members of mysteries were less apt than the God-fearing among the Jews to become Christian, but more apt than the general populace to show interest in religion. So the mysteries were a kind of \textit{preparatio evangelica}. On the other hand, the mysteries were the most formidable enemies of Christianity simply because they did not require the exclusive commitment that Christianity did vis-

\(^{550}\) “le secret jalousement gardé sur ce qui était révèle dans l’initiation; c’est encore le caractère dramatique et réaliste des rites par lesquels l’aventure divine originelle était jouée, mimée, représentée, reproduite. Associés par des moyens réputés efficaces à ces expériences, instruits des doctrines qu’elles symbolisaient, les initiés étaient en quelques sorte apparentés aux divinités dont ils devenaient les clients en ce monde et dans l’autre.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 538; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 352.)

\(^{551}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 553-4.

\(^{552}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 552.

\(^{553}\) Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 554.
à-vis civic religion. Nor were the pagan mysteries as demanding with respect to moral purity.\textsuperscript{554} “The cathartic practices neither demand nor imply any sense of having committed a fault, of personal culpability, or of personal responsibility.”\textsuperscript{555} This kind of behavior put the scholar on notice that the Christian mystery was of a different order even if the ambience it held in common with other mysteries invited comparisons.

Early evangelizers such as Paul could use the mysteries as ready-to-hand platforms from which to make comparisons. But this was more a matter of expediency.\textsuperscript{556} He and the rest of the New Testament did not use them in the technical sense described above, but in the sense of “the object of Christian revelation taken as a whole,” in the sense of the hidden workings of divine Providence in the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{557} Such a secret was not to be kept from others; instead, God wanted to disclose it and Christians themselves were to make it known. So the partial resemblances between the Christian sense of mystery and that of the pagan mysteries might be more misleading than helpful in the study of religion. Grandmaison did acknowledge a genuine religious imperative in the mystery religions, the hope of being received favorably by a god after death:

This hope found satisfaction also in the religion of Jesus; but here it was far surpassed by the conception of eternal life, and sanctified by the insistence on a life of purity, a rebirth even in the present world; above all, it was given a foundation...Jesus is the guarantor and mediator for it all: to live this life was to live by him and in him.\textsuperscript{558}

\textsuperscript{554} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 556.


\textsuperscript{556} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 558.

\textsuperscript{557} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 558-61.

\textsuperscript{558} “À cette espérance aussi, la religion de Jésus donne satisfaction, mais en la débordant par la conception de la vie éternelle, en la sanctifiant par l’exigence d’une vie pure et, des ici-bas, ressuscitée, en la fondant surtout...De tout ceci, Jésus est le médiateur et le garant: vivre cette vie, c’est vivre de lui et en lui.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 601; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 420.)
Only Christ and his Church could fulfill the deepest desire for a truly personal religion; but faith in him carried the demand of living a pure life.

_The Religion of Jesus Christ from its Origins till the Apostolic Age_

About the origins of Christianity among the Gentiles, Grandmaison wrote:

The small number of certain facts which illuminate the origin of the religion of Jesus are ‘a light shining in a dark place.’…we have a very imperfect knowledge of the spiritual world that God then called into being…darkness, lifting a little here and there, covers the quarter of a century that passed between the death of Jesus and the radiant vision that is evoked by a reading of the letters to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans—a vision which if still incomplete is firm enough in its main outlines.559

During the very short period between the death of Christ and the time of Paul’s conversion, Christianity had been established in its liturgy, catechesis, and moral life.560 The first stage of origins had long since passed in which a strong personality could exercise itself with infinite plasticity upon an imperfectly founded religion.

Grandmaison singled out two essential traits of the testimony from the first generation onward.561 First, the disciples of Jesus loved him with the love due to God. Second: “All these heroes of the divine friendship had the profound sense of orthodoxy as the guardian of Christ, and the sense of the Church, condition of orthodoxy.”562 The Church did not construct or even fabricate its own

---

559 “Une lampe, luisant dans un lieu obscur,’ c’est le petit nombres de faits certains qui éclaire l’origine de la religion de Jésus…nous connaissons très imparfaitement la genèse du monde spirituel que Dieu appelle alors à l’existence…l’ombre, ici ou là plus claire, pèse sur le quart de siècle écoulé entre la mort de Jésus et l’apparition étincelante, incomplète encore, mais assurée dans ses grandes lignes, qu’évoque la lecture des épîtres aux Thessaloniciens, aux Corinthisiens, aux Galates et aux Romains.” (Grandmaison, _Jésus Christ_, 2, 561-2; _Jesus Christ_, 3, 377-8.)

560 Grandmaison, _Jésus Christ_, 2, 562-3, 609.


fundamental ideas about the identity and mission of Jesus, nor was the Church constituted merely by the will of its members.  

It was the Resurrection—Christ’s vindication by his Father—that evoked and commanded the belief of the disciples and founded the Christian community. For the Jews, Kyrios referred to the Messiah considered as king, whereas for the Christians, “it was the very Son of Man glorified by God, established in his reign and ‘seated at the right hand of the [divine] Power.’” The Messiah was judge, prophet, and revealer. The cult of the adoration of Jesus began in Jerusalem. “It would be necessary later on to make certain qualifications against an overly radical reaction that refused to recognize providential transitions or pushed a more just view of the things to excess and error.” The disciples, for example, could have spoken with some reserve about the Master in public, all the while adoring him as God. Grandmaison reviewed this and other signs that would have confirmed the belief of the disciples as members of a new religion. Not the least of these was Pentecost, the forgiveness of sins, and the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

As expected, the idea of a bloody redemption would not have been so easy to explain. Given that the doctrine was so apparent in the Scriptures, it was beyond doubt that there was need for

563 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 427.
564 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 564.
565 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 565.
566 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 566.
567 “Il faudrait plutôt faire des réserves sur une réaction trop radicale, qui refuserait de reconnaître les transitions providentielles, ou pousserait une vue plus juste des choses jusqu’à l’excès et à l’erreur.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 566.)
568 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 566-7.
569 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 568.
reconciliation between God and man and for the remission of sins, for the blood of the Lamb.\textsuperscript{570} There was need neither for discussion nor for apology about the superabundance of Christ’s merits. Admittedly, the reason why may be difficult to ascertain. Remembrance of the Lord’s Supper would have helped.\textsuperscript{571} But again, it was the Resurrection that overcame the doubtful and made sense of the many signs that went before.

The Spirit played a large role in the Church’s faith.\textsuperscript{572} His active testimony to Christ was evident in the belief, prayer, worship and life of the early Church.\textsuperscript{573} His personal intervention was essential:

It was perhaps the most persuasive, for it normally reached beyond the generally narrow circle of recognized official witnesses to the new Christians, at the same time strengthening all of the others in their faith. These divine outpourings gave to the disciples’ interpretation of the facts of the life of Jesus a striking confirmation. Outside of this perspective, the boldness of the apostles, their unshakable confidence, their perseverance in building up and leveling, uprooting and planting, are inexplicable.\textsuperscript{574}

From the day of Pentecost, Peter explained the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” and the charismata as signs of the Messianic times. It was hard to overestimate the importance of the spiritual gifts—ordinary and extraordinary—in establishing the religion of Jesus.\textsuperscript{575} The Holy Spirit was at work in the life of the early Church in many other ways, such as in healings, exorcisms, apostolic office, and

\textsuperscript{570} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 570-1.

\textsuperscript{571} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 569.

\textsuperscript{572} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 571-8.


\textsuperscript{574} “Il a été peut-être le plus persuasif; car, au delà du cercle, restreint en somme, des témoins appointés et privilégiés, il atteignait ordinairement les nouveaux chrétiens, affermissant du coup tous les autres dans leur foi. L’interprétation donnée par les disciples des faits de la vie de Jésus recevait, de ces effusions divines, une éclatante confirmation. Hors de cette perspective, l’audace des apôtres, leur confiance inébranlée, leur persévérance à construire et à mettre à terre, à arracher et à planter, n’expliquent pas.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 571; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 387-8.)

\textsuperscript{575} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 574.
in Stephen’s case, extraordinary spiritual fortitude. Yet Paul did not fall prey to the error of those who acclaimed the wonder-working super-apostles: he distinguished exterior signs and interior gifts (internal virtues) of the Spirit, and gave pride of place to charity, fraternal delight, as the greatest virtue of all.

The influence of the Holy Spirit accomplished the first acts of this religion, such that the cult of the early Church—its worship and prayer in commemoration of Jesus—was organized quickly. It was under the inspiration of the Spirit that the Church rendered Jesus the worship due also to the Father.

Revealed and authorized by the Spirit, Christ is the mediator without whom one cannot come to the Father; he is the Lord who saves by reconciling to the only God through the infinite dignity of his intercession. The formulas that will later explain these delicate shades of meaning and which will distinguish personal terms within the unity of the divine nature did not yet exist; but the concrete realities of faith, love, and piety were there.

The beliefs that would later be expressed in dogmatic formulas were already at work in the Church. The hierarchical and personal dimensions—authority and interior liberty—were stable and in harmony. Such conditions promoted the development of doctrine, which was part of the Church’s authoritative witness to Christ and enjoyed a beauty similar to Christ’s own. Governed by the Spirit, this development was perfect, unified, and balanced.

---

579 “Révélé et autorisé par l’Esprit, le Christ est le médiateur indispensable pour aller au Père; il est le Seigneur qui sauve, en réconciliant, par la dignité infinie de son intercession, au seul Dieu. Les formules qui plus tard exprimeront ces nuances délicates et distingueront des termes personnels dans l’unité de nature divine, n’existent pas encore; mais les réalités concrètes de foi, d’amour, de piété sont présentes. Les attitudes intérieures et extérieures s’ébauchent déjà, ou s’affirment, que ces formules seront explicites en leur temps.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 578; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 394.)
The beauty of the new religion was especially shown, more so than in Catholic dogmas, by the deeds of the saints of the first generation. The gifts of personal sanctification inspired heroic deeds that spoke louder than words.

A thinker once wrote: ‘Nothing is beautiful at the beginning. True beauty arrives after things work themselves out.’ [Charles Maurras, *Anthinea* {Paris, 1912}, 218] This is a statement pregnant with human truth; but here there is more than man. The origin of the religion of Jesus, in its design and its reality, in its shoot, first flowers, and fruit is beautiful in a divine sense.581

Grandmaison applauded people such as Stephen, Barnabas, Peter, John, and the humble ones described in Acts 4: 32, 34-35 who were “of one heart and one mind” as “the most persuasive witnesses, in a carnal world, of the primacy of the spirit, of detachment for the sake of love and of the disinterested service of one’s brothers.” These heroic activities were already in place, sustaining virtues that would never be superseded.

Like Christ, Paul’s apostolic ministry and theology reconciled opposites. Contrary to the mistaken claims of comparativists such as Loisy,582 Paul’s sensibility was fundamentally Biblical rather than Hellenic. Living in Tarsus, a Hellenistic center, would have familiarized him with contemporary pagan movements; hence, it was not unreasonable that there was some Hellenization of his thought. But he also wanted to make himself at home for the sake of his mission (I Cor. 19: 19-22). This desire only demonstrated the liberty of the Gospel.583 Ever the intransigent monotheist, Paul borrowed references from mystery religions, Gnosticism, and syncretism only to exploit


582 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 579n2.

583 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 586; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 403.
allusions that were comprehensible to his Gentile audiences. Christ had won victory over the powers and principalities of this present age. “It is this mystery with its implications—salvation from henceforth available to all, and the new life lived in the image of the risen Christ—that God reveals to his friends. In days of old, it was hidden in the divine abysses, which only the Spirit of God could penetrate and completely fathom.”

One could see another example of how the Spirit superintended the development of doctrine in the manner in which terms foreign to the Old Testament were incorporated into the faith.

The problems that St. Paul faced between about 50 and 70 A.D. in nurturing the churches that he founded lay “in the idolatrous atmosphere and the libertinage of pagan morals, on one hand, and, on the other, in Judaizing deformations and demands.” The former was found in popular religion, while the second was an infantile form of Judaism, accompanied by strange mixtures of indiscrete ascesis and speculations about the spiritual world. Such obstacles suggested parallels to the intellectual opposition confronting the faith of Grandmaison’s contemporaries. Religion was “essentially a personal religion, spirit to spirit, with the infinite God,” “a complete way to God, which assured means of gaining his favor, offering him due worship, and serving him as he should be served.” True religion was co-terminous with Christianity, the religion of Jesus as it appeared early on. Secondly, it was the means of salvation. But an abyss lay between Christians and the errant savants of Grandmaison’s day.

---

584 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 588.

585 “C’est ce mystère, avec ses corollaires du salut ouvert désormais à tout et de la nouvelle menée à l’image du Christ ressuscité, que Dieu révèle à ses amis. Dans les temps anciens, il était enfoui aux profondeurs divines que, seul, l’Esprit de Dieu peut pénétrer et scruter entièrement.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 589; *Jésus Christ*, 3, 407.)


588 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 593.
behind the petty controversial questions, Christianity and all religion is at stake here. In front of the fountain of the apostolic faith, liberal philosophers had erected, respectfully but firmly, a barrier of debatable arguments; the comparativists concealed it behind a profusion of tinsel wrappings, torn from cults and theosophies of every kind.589

The charge here was that much of contemporary learning—whether philosophical or ethnological—had lost sight of the faith that nurtured it. But to those who chose to drink of its waters, the Church sustained the individual personal religion of its believers.

The intransigent monotheism of the first disciples formed an unbridgeable abyss between Christianity and the pagan cults. The impure fables of the “horrible polytheism” of Paul’s time prompted Grandmaison to remark: “Man worshipped his own image, or at most his own ideal—but how could he seriously, unreservedly, unhesitatingly invoke what even at its best is merely a mosaic of attributes borrowed from our miserable human condition and sublimated by our desires?”590 Yet, according to Paul, the God of the Christians who totally transcended his creation was not a favorer of persons.591 Just as no theologian would want to hold every member of a pagan cult guilty of religious error, so Paul did not contest that there were pagans of good faith. Once again, Grandmaison recognized the universal desire for God implanted in the human race.

The need for a positive religion, and the feeling that certain obligations were entailed by the gracious intervention of the Deity, survived among the pagan masses, like the problems that still confront those whom some initial error prevents from discovering its true solution. In such a case, our suggestions, though mistaken, are sometimes not far from the truth; and this was true of the religious conception then in favor of an immortal life in which everyone

589 “au-delà des chétives polémiques d’école, il y a ici de tout christianisme et de toute la religion. Autour de la fontaine apostolique, les philosophes libéraux avaient édifié une respectueuse mais épaisse barrière de discussions contentieuses; les comparatistes l’ont masquée derrière une foire d’oripeaux arrachés à toutes les cultures et à toutes les théosophies.” (Grandmaison, Jesus Christ, 2, 593; Jesus Christ, 3, 410-1.)

590 “C’est alors son image ou, tout au plus, son idéal que l’homme adore; et comment invoquer sérieusement sans réserve et arrière-pensée, ce qui n’est, à le prendre au mieux, qu’un mosaïque d’attributs empruntés à notre misère et sublimées par nos désirs?” (Grandmaison, Jesus Christ, 2, 594; Jesus Christ, 3, 412.)

591 Grandmaison, Jesus Christ, 2, 594-5.
should receive according to his works. The Christian regeneration and development, which were comparatively easy for the ‘God-fearers’ who counted for so much in the primitive churches, were thus able to appeal to many others through their religious sense, which though misguided was still alive.\textsuperscript{592}

These elementary truths of positive religion—of the graciousness of God upon which followed the duties of a believer, immortal life—were still found among the fertile fields where evangelizers such as Paul went. These vestiges of Christianity were especially compatible with the Catholic notion of the interrelationship of grace and nature.

The heart of the kerygma was Christ crucified.\textsuperscript{593} Why was such emphasis placed on this most disconcerting aspect of the faith?

\begin{quote}
the cross, aided by the works of power and the outpouring of the charismata, that was to establish the first believers in an atmosphere of pure faith, where the things of the spirit and of God would assume their true proportions. Then would this weakness and this humiliation prove themselves ‘the power of God and the wisdom of God,’ and the crucified Jesus as the only Savior.\textsuperscript{594}
\end{quote}

The teaching about the Cross of Christ was so different from the wisdom that the first believers encountered in other religions. They were able to take the news of Christ’s crucifixion because of the outpourings of the Spirit, who established this “just and penetrating sense of spiritual realities,” this air of pure faith.\textsuperscript{595} The oldest Christian writing, Paul’s first letter to the Thessalonians, already

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{592} “Le besoin d’une religion positive, le sentiment d’une religion positive, le sentiment des devoirs conséquents à une intervention gracieuse de la divinité, survivaient dans les masses païennes, comme les problèmes restent posés devant ceux qu’une erreur liminaire empêchée de découvrir la solution véritable. Ces errants ne laissent pas d’en proposer qui, parfois, s’en rapprochent, et c’était le cas pour la conception religieuse, alors en faveur, d’une vie immortelle où chacun recevrait selon les œuvres. Le redressement et l’épanouissement chrétiens, relativement aînés aux hommes ‘craignant Dieu,’ qui comptèrent si grandement dans les premières Églises, pouvaient donc s’appuyer, chez beaucoup d’autres, sur un esprit religieux fourvoyé, mais vivant.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 596; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 414.)

\footnotetext{593} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 597.

\footnotetext{594} “soutenue par les œuvres de puissance et l’effusion charismatique, [la croix de Jésus] établira les premiers croyants dans une atmosphère de foi pure, où les choses spirituelles et divines prendront leurs proportions véritables. Ces faiblesses, ces humiliations se démontreront alors ‘force de Dieu et de sagesse de Dieu.’ Jésus crucifié apparaîtra le Sauveur unique.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 597; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 415-6.)

\footnotetext{595} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 596.
\end{footnotes}
acknowledged the worship rendered Jesus vis-à-vis the Father, and the eschatological dimension of the apostolic preaching. “The great line of separation between God and man, those two terms that every religion seeks to unite, is drawn below Jesus, who remains on the divine side.” “Jesus became for his disciple the atmosphere, the ambience, the spiritual milieu where he breathes, lives, and moves.” Echoes of liturgical formulas and greetings that conveyed the blessing of the Spirit as well as of the Father and the Son helped the awareness of the mystery of Jesus to grow in terms of the development of Trinitarian dogma.

Christ fulfilled the believer’s desire for all that could be wished for in a personal religion—but only if Christ’s transcendence was respected.

The Christian sense of reality, which made the believer akin to his Lord, still preserved the distance between them, either by recalling Christ’s absolute and universal primacy or by associating him so closely with God that the unity was not broken and man was not deluded by a mad dream of equality with his Creator. God was kept in his proper place and so was the believer. Paul’s rich impressions of the fullness of Christ managed “to bring to light the religion of Jesus as a new creation in the enlarged but unbroken framework of the religion of one God, creator and Father.” The Church was able to safeguard the personhood of Christ and of the believer while bringing them together in the most
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596 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 597-8.
597 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 598; Jesus Christ, 3, 417.
598 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” D.AFC, 1517.
599 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 600.
600 “Tout en assimilant le croyant à son Seigneur, le réalisme chrétien maintient pourtant les distances, soit en rappelant l’absolue et universelle primauté de Christ, soit en l’associant si étroitement à Dieu que l’unité ne soit pas brisée, et l’homme fourvoyé dans un rêve fou d’égalité avec son Créateur.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 601; Jesus Christ, 3, 420-1.)
601 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 606-7.
602 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 607; Jesus Christ, 3, 427.
intimate ways. The Church and Christ were not to be identified with one another. On the one hand, the Son of God gathered the Church by his grace; the Church did not invent him. On the other hand, the Church was indeed empowered by his ongoing personal, transcendent, and immanent presence and activity in the Church to be his witness to the ends of the earth.

An organic unity with Christ and among its members suffused her social life. In a sense, there was no “morality” for the early Christians—simply the imitation of the Christ. The basis of that imitation was this sense of Christ’s assuming our human nature “spontaneously and through love.” The communion of saints was of course the human witness par excellence to the divinity of Christ, for Christianity’s greatness lay in the charity exercised by its members. Such activity was not the fruit of a devotion to an abstract spirit. The certainties that Christians held they lived “in a personal, immediate, substantial union with the eucharistic Christ.” Hence, this religion was far from being a haphazard movement.

Those who banded together, to seek together the solution of the great problems of life, the pattern of duties, the motive of right action and the means of pleasing God, formed by that very fact a spiritual commonwealth which St. Paul, as we have just seen, compared to a body. Far from being a simple association of free believers aiming in the same direction—something like the Orphic lodges—the Christian community was from the first a church.

Moreover, the Church that Paul entered and the Church at the end of the apostolic age. “Paul outlined the characteristics of the new religion—its transcendence and love for mankind, its

---

603 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 609.


605 Grandmaison, “Religion personnelle,” *Études* 135 (1913), 616–20. Here Grandmaison contrasted the spirit of mere human philanthropy with the love of Christ and the fraternal love that motivated the works of mercy.

606 “Ceux qui s’associaient pour y chercher de concert le mot des grands problèmes, le modèle des devoirs, la force de bien agir, les moyens de plaire à Dieu, formaient, par le fait même, une collectivité spirituelle que saint Paul comparait plus haut à un corps. Loin d’être un simple groupement de libres croyants orientés dans le même sens—une peu comme les loges orphiques—la communauté chrétienne était dès lors une Église.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 607; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 427.)
profundity and charm—in harmony with the first apostles, Barnabas, James, and the ‘brethren of the Lord,’ but in terms suggested by his native genius and of his personal inspiration.” 607 Here again the liberty of the Spirit and the authority of the tradition complemented one another.

The three images that Paul most preferred using in describing the Church vis-à-vis Christ showed how authority and the Spirit were reconciled, and gave precious insights into “the intimate nature of the Church, its structure, its efficacious principles of action and its sovereign dignity.” 608 These images so familiar to the early Christians were echoes of the human voice of Jesus. 609

The first Pauline image was that of the Church as temple, of which Christ was the cornerstone (Eph. 2: 9-22).

Paul, great mystic as he was, was a man of authority, a champion of the visible Church. He showed the greatest firmness in regulating the employment of the charismata with which many of the faithful were endowed. He forestalled their abuse not by mere measures of prudence but by an appeal to principle. With the same conviction with which he sings the praise of union with Christ, he claims the indispensable mediation of the ecclesiastical body. More than that: for him they are not two realities set side by side or even coordinated but a single reality whose unity and very existence demand the close correlation and subordination of equal parts. A whole range of striking metaphors makes this abundantly clear: Jesus is the cornerstone and keystone of the sacred building that is rising, ‘a holy temple in the Lord,’ in which each faithful soul, a miniature reproduction and integral part of the whole, occupies the place assigned it by the Holy Spirit. 610

607 “en accord avec leurs premiers apôtres, Barnabé, Jacques et ‘les frères du Seigneur,’ mais dans les termes de son génie originel et de son inspiration personnelle, Paul dégageait ainsi les caractères de la religion nouvelle: sa transcendance et sa philanthropie, sa profondeur et son charme.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 610; Jesus Christ, 3, 430.)


610 “Le mystique éminent qu’est Paul est un homme d’autorité, champion de l’Église visible. Il règle de très haut l’usage des charismata déparés à beaucoup de fidèles. Il prévient les abus, non par de simples dispositions prudentielles, mais en rappelant les principes. Du même accent dont il célébre l’union au Christ, il revendique l’indispensable médiation du corps ecclésiastique. Mieux: ce ne sont pas pour lui deux réalités juxtaposées, ou même coordonnées, mais une seule, dont subordination de parties inégales. Tout un jeu de comparaisons admirables le montre à l’évidence: Jésus est la pierre d’angle, la clé de voûte de l’édifice religieux qui s’élève, ‘temple saint dans le Seigneur,’ où chaque fidèle, image en miniature et part intégrant du temple total, occupe la place à lui assignée par le Saint Esprit.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 608; Jesus Christ, 3, 428-9.)
As co-founders of this Temple, the apostles and prophets were intrinsic parts of this organic harmony. Moreover, the union of Christ with the Church and with each believer respected the transcendence of the divine Persons as well as the individuality of all members of the Body of Christ. A hierarchy with ordinary powers was launched alongside the outpouring of the charismatic gifts.

The second Pauline image, that of the Church as Body, of which Christ was the Head, underlined even more forcefully that hierarchical authority made possible the intrinsic and liberating unity of Christ and the Church, and of Christ with the individual believer. “The head should play its role, which is not that of the hand or the foot. An intimate solidarity of sympathy, interests, and life reigns in this whole. Each works for all the others, and in turn, receives something from each of them. If one suffers or prospers, all share in his suffering or advantage.” A mutual, self-donating love reigned within the hierarchy of Christ vis-à-vis the Church and of the clergy vis-à-vis the faithful.

The third image of the Church’s relation to Christ —“even more touching”—was that of the Bride to the Bridegroom (Eph. 5:22-32). This image applied to each church, but above all to the Church as a whole (2 Cor. 11:2; 1 Cor. 12: 4-30; Eph. 4: 4-16). The image of the New Jerusalem made of stones, albeit living, was balanced by another intimate, personal image of mutual friendship between God and man that had been in force since the beginning. The Church was the New Eve: “saved by him, submitted to him, not servilely, but through tenderness, loved until death, nourished

611 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 609; “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 224.

612 “La tête doit jouer son rôle, qui n’est pas celui de la main ou du pied. Dans cet ensemble régne une étroite solidarité de sympathie et d’intérêts, et de vie. Chacun travaille pour tous les autres et son tour, reçoit de chacun d’eux quelque chose. Si l’un souffre ou prospère, tous participent à sa peine ou à son bien.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 609; ) See also Grandmaison, “Autorité et l’Esprit,” (1918), 224.

613 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 609.
and cherished as flesh of his flesh, bone of his bone, completely one with him! She is purified and sanctified to be finally the glory of her Spouse, without spot or wrinkle, holy and immaculate. How great a mystery!”

“Marriage, the closest union among human beings, only provided the most distant analogy of the union of Christ with his Church.” Still, it described the religion of Jesus in the most comprehensive personal terms possible, even while respecting the divinity of its founder.

The high theologies of Paul and his companions did not cause a one-sided development that downplayed the human nature of Christ, against the history and catechesis that the synoptic gospels conveyed. “It is truly remarkable that the image of Jesus’ activity remained so pure, so modest, so little affected by the backlash from the sacramental institutions and the developed beliefs that were undoubtedly common in the churches where this picture was drawn.” The words of Christ testified irreproachably to his humanity against the false spiritualizing, docetic tendencies that were beginning to threaten the faith. The synoptics preserved “a particular accent, an implicit and often mysterious character, that indelibly marked their authenticity.” When the questions posed, for example, about Christ’s return sometimes received incorrect answers, the substantial historicity of the synoptics served as correctives. These same gospels suggested “the essential role of the Church with a notable discretion.” Jesus and the Spirit would give Peter, then the apostolic college, the

---

614 “sauvée par lui, soumise à lui, non servilement, mais par tendresse, aimée de lui jusqu’à la mort, nourrie et chérie, os de ses os, chair de sa chair, une seule chose avec lui! Elle est purifiée et sanctifiée pour être enfin la gloire de son Époux, sans tare et sans tache, sainte et immaculée. Quel grand mystère!” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 609; Jesus Christ, 3, 429-30.)

615 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 609; Jesus Christ, 3, 430.

616 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 611.

617 “Il est extrêmement remarquable que l’image de l’activité de Jésus y soit restée si pure, si modeste, si peu marquée par le choc en retour des institutions sacramentelles et des croyances développées, indubitablement communes dès les Églises quand cette image fut tracée.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 610; Jesus Christ, 3, 430.)

618 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 611.
special assistance they needed in the superhuman task of untying the compact Judaic knot of the duties that Jesus delegated to select disciples: “the right to bind and loose, to pasture and to govern, to teach in the name of God, [these powers] having been made permanent by their delegation to chosen disciples...Thus armed, the religion of Jesus seemed to be able to confront the perils that it expected.”

But another phase of the Church’s development had begun.

There arose a new task to be surmounted. While the synoptics emphasized the gospel of Christ’s fleshly existence, the Pauline writings proclaimed magnificently the gospel of the spirit that placed the Master in the perspective of eternity. The faithful knew of both, more juxtaposed than justified in their proximity.

A certain uneasiness might arise when reflections suggested by adversaries succeeded affirmations of faith. The study of the first doctrinal deviations shows us that an exclusive attachment to one of the two elements discernible in the Savior did indeed tend to give in turn a predominant place to inadequate or definitely erroneous conceptions. The antithesis about which there has lately been much ado, between the Christ of history and a supposed Christ of faith, was already present here and there in some less elaborate forms. In the language of the day, Christ was ‘divided.’

The spiritual gospel, presuming the historical facts established by the other gospels, showed the interconnection of the life and doctrine of Jesus. As such, the gospel of John represented another stage of the development of doctrine. One encountered two kinds of texts there: one that established the history of Christ, and another that spoke of his pre-existence in glory. Both found

---

619 “droit de lier et de délier, de paire et de gouverner, d’enseigner au nom de Dieu, éternisées par leur délégation aux disciples élus...Aussi armée, la religion de Jésus semblait pouvoir affronter les périls qui l’attendaient.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 611.)

620 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 611-2.

621 “un malaise pouvait naître, quand les réflexions suggérées par des objectants succédaient aux affirmations à la foi. L’études de premières déviations doctrinales nous montrée qu’en effet l’attachement exclusif à l’un des deux éléments présents dans le Saveur tendit à faire prévaloir successivement des vue incomplètes, ou positivement erronées. Sous les formes moins élaborées, l’antithèse autour de laquelle on a mené tant de bruit naguère, entre le Christ de l’histoire et un prétendu Christ de la foi, se faisait, dès lors, ça et là. Pour user des termes du temps, on ‘divisait’ le Christ.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 612; Jesus Christ, 3, 432-3.)
their unity in the same person. John authority’s reinforced what every believer should acknowledge, that in his earthly life Jesus was “fully conscious of his human and superhuman dignity.” As man he received everything from the Father, was dependent on, and subject to him; as divine Son, Jesus was equal and one with him. Although this understanding would be fleshed out more precisely with other doctrines, the truth would not be a new one. John did not separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith.

Moreover, one found in John of what Grandmaison called years before “the Catholic concept of the visible Church, the general economy of salvation”:

In this book in which the Church is not named, the Church is everywhere. And I mean the Church universal, Catholic in right and in power, but exclusive of every particular opinion in matters of faith, jealous of its unity, and by that very fact reduced in practice to the chosen flock of those who accept its doctrine and jurisdiction in their entirety. This constantly implied conception is clearly suggested by the episodes that allow greater scope for it. The entire history of Jesus, temporal and eternal, is conceived by John in terms of the vocation, adherence to the Master, and formation by him, of the privileged band that forms the germ, the determining element or, if we may use a scholastic expression, the form of the great Church.

Christ’s intention to found the Church was expressed magnificently in the high-priestly prayer of John 17, so much so that Grandmaison agreed with a commentator who said that the evangelist’s deep intention was to depict “the story of the foundation of the Church: the formation of a chosen group to which Christ revealed himself and bestowed the gift of life.” Paradoxically, the fourth


623 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1238.

624 “Dans ce livre où l’Église n’est pas nommée, elle est partout. Et je dis bien l’Église universelle, catholique en droit et en puissance, mais exclusive de toute opinion particulière en matière de foi, jalouse de son unité, et par cela même réduite en fait au troupeau choisi de ceux qui acceptaient intégralement sa doctrine et ses autorités. Constamment supposée, cette notion est clairement suggérée par les épisodes qui permettaient de lui faire une place plus large. Toute l’histoire, éternelle ou temporelle, de Jésus, est ramenée par Jean à l’histoire de la vocation, de l’adhésion au Maître, et la formation par celui-ci du groupe privilégié qui est le germe, l’élément déterminant et, pourrait-on dire en style scolastique, la forme de la grande Église.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 613-4; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 434.)

gospel—the spiritual Gospel\textsuperscript{626}—was “the most institutional and sacramental of the four.”\textsuperscript{627} Like Paul, John refused to oppose the charismatic and the institutional dimensions of the Church. The centrality of this community of disciples showed that John, like Paul, was not only a mystic of the highest order, but also a man of tradition and authority—in short, a man of the Church.

What a sermon on unity! What a lesson given to all kinds of sectarians, supporters of individualism or founders of private conventicles! But also, what a miraculous fusion of the two main elements of religion: the conserving and the inspiring, the dogmatic and the personal, the interior call of the Spirit, without which all is formalism, and the visible communion in the one truth, apart from which a body must dissolve and perish.\textsuperscript{628}

In short, the gospel of John embodied the proper coincidence of opposites, of apparent antinomies—the dogmatic and the personal, the spiritual and the visibly communal—that modernism had sundered.

But the religion of Jesus was not a matter of mechanical checks and balances. It was a living, organic unity. Such was confirmed especially by John, “Gospel of the Spirit and of direct testimony.”\textsuperscript{629} The living unity that the Church enjoyed was a reflection of the very person of Jesus: ecclesial unity was analogous to the hypostatic union.\textsuperscript{630} The duality without dualism of the hypostatic union\textsuperscript{631}—with the proper qualifications—was reflected in the dual nature of the Church,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[626] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 614; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 3, 435.
\item[628] “Quelle prédication d’unité! Quelle leçon donnée aux sectaires de tout genre, fauteurs d’individualisme ou fondateurs de petites chapelles! Mais aussi, quelle fusion miraculeuse des deux éléments religieux: le conservateur et l’inspirateur, le dogmatique et le personnel, l’appel intérieure de l’Esprit sans lequel tout est formalisme, et la communion visible dans mérite, hors de laquelle un corps se dissout et périt.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 615; \textit{Jesus Christ}, 2, 435.)
\item[631] Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 213.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
which had both a human and a divine dimension. On the one hand, it was “the institution that most resembles humanity.” Drawing an analogy to St. Ignatius of Antioch’s valuation of the bishop as Christ himself, Grandmaison, like Möhler, thought that “the great, universal Church was the continued incarnation of the Son of God.” This duality in unity was not only moral, but also ontological: “the Savior is continued according to what he really is.” The unity of the Church was not merely notional or idealist, but real. The Church was full of witness to the Witness, Jesus Christ.

One of the most formidable witnesses to the religion established by Jesus was the Apocalypse, which expressed well the originality of Christianity. The treatment of the book was an addition to the DAF article. The letters to the seven churches represented the Church in its catholicity. More important was the role of the Master, the faith of the Churches in Asia revealed in his titles, and the slowness with which the Church was sundered from Judaism. Many of the expressions and much of the style were clearly consonant with the Old Testament, such as the title of the Son of man, and other elements were more familiar to Gentile Christians, such as the death and resurrection of Jesus, and eternal damnation. In the first chapter preface to the seven letters, “A whole series of titles of veneration relates to the infallibility of the divine witness who is speaking: He is the holy and the true, the ‘faithful and true witness’; he is the very Amen (an
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632 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 598.
633 Grandmaison and Rousselot, “Religion catholique,” 1000.
634 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 634. See also Grandmaison and Rousselot, “La religion catholique,” 952.
637 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 617.
638 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 617-9.
untranslatable word) in person, that is, the most solemn affirmation of the true, standing for truth itself, vouching for it after the fashion of a seal.”639 This “Amen” in person meant that Christ was the complete revelation of God. As for Paul, so for John, Jesus was Creator and Lord of the new dispensation—the Alpha and the Omega.640

Although his earthly life had been real and its main historical contours ascertainable, Jesus was not merely a figure of the past: he was still alive. “His presence among his own and in his own is one of the principal dogmas of Christianity, and one of those whose efficaciousness is most clearly apparent.”641 Even if none can take his place or command the love that he did, Jesus was present till the consummation of all things through intermediaries and images such as the sacraments and the hierarchy. The poor, the pure, children, and the saints reinforced his authority and echoed his own personal religion. Jesus was present as himself and able to be experienced, whether in ordinary or extraordinary prayer. The visible communion of the Church was an “authentic echo of the Master”:

the religion of remembrance is a cult whose worshippers are few and far between. But Jesus is not absent: his friendship triumphantly counters the fiercest passions, the strongest attractions, love and hate, in the hearts of millions of human hearts, and those not the least ardent or the least pure: to the contrary, the friends of Christ form an elite distinguished by the rarest virtues…. The apostles worked in an atmosphere of respect, or better, of unified worship, of submission to legitimate authority—inincarnate nonetheless in men who are sometimes all too human—in the visible communion maintained at the cost of heavy sacrifices. In them ‘the Spirit and the Spouse,’ meaning the interior Master and inspired authority, finds docile pupils, because in both of these they recognize the authentic echo of the one sole Master whom they discern and obey.642

639 “Toute une série de titres augustes se rapporte à l’inafiableté du témoin divin qui parle: Il est ‘le saint et le véritable,’ le ‘témoin fidèle et véritable’; il est, d’un mot intranslisible, l’Amen en personne, c’est-à-dire l’affirmation la plus solennelle du vrai, valant pour la vérité même, faisant foi à la manière d’un sceau.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 620; Jesus Christ, 3, 441.)

640 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 621.

641 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 622; Jesus Christ, 3, 443.

642 “la religion du souvenir est un culte qui a peu de fidèles, encore, intermittents. Jésus, lui, n’est pas un absent: son amitié balance victorieusement les plus dures passions, les plus fortes attirances, amour et haine, dans des millions de cœurs des hommes. Ces cœurs ne sont pas les moins chauds, les moins purs: au contraire, les amis du Christ forme d’une élite distinguée par les plus rares vertus…. C’est dans le respect, ou, mieux, dans le culte d’unité, dans la soumission aux
The image of the Bride and Spirit at the conclusion of Revelation is a sign of visible communion (Rev. 21: 2-9; 22:17) that evoked the loving, living presence of Christ. For Grandmaison, such an image also referred to the religion of Jesus as the cult of unity, the submission of the faithful to their rightful authorities. This submission of the Bride—in the context of the eschatological expectation for Jesus, the Master, her Bridegroom—showed the abiding presence within her of the Holy Spirit, the interior Master. Such a vision of the Church as witness included a mutually loving, visible, and sacrificial communion.

This testimony rendered through the Spirit was among the most reliable witnesses to the mission of Christ through the ages. Though the Spirit diversified, it also harmonized that diversity into a unity. True witness—a Biblical statement of the ideal of Christianity—was not “a malleable, amorphous ideal in which our race projected its dream of better things, without any continuity other than itself.” The religion that Jesus founded was not merely an immanent, abstract movement, but one whose ideal was a living person, Jesus Christ. It was not created in the image of man.

There is family likeness among the disciples of Jesus, from one people to another, and from one century to another: the same expressions of praise and of love rise spontaneously from their lips; the same compelling influences configure them to a type that is all the more recognizable the more it allows the particularities of race and culture to subsist.

---


645 “Les disciples se reconnaissent entre eux, de peuple à peuple, et de siècle en siècle: les mêmes actions de louange et de l'amour naissent spontanément sur leurs lèvres; de mêmes attraits impérieux les configurent à un type d'autant plus reconnaissable qu'il laisse subsister les particularités de race et de culture.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 623; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 444-5.)
These disciples who faced the same struggles and marched toward the same Kingdom recognized and loved God and one another. Some saints figured more prominently in this visible communion than others.\textsuperscript{646} But having this spiritual elite did not amount to an elitist religion.\textsuperscript{647} The excellence of some was for the sake of all. The free and unique witness of each person was consonant with service of the Church as a whole.\textsuperscript{648}

Grandmaison infrequently mentioned Mary in his Christological works. Outside the Christological works, though, he did write of Mary as an important type of the Church and its single most outstanding witness.\textsuperscript{649} As Our Lady, Seat of Wisdom, she was the place where Son and Spirit met in an incomparable way.\textsuperscript{650} Therefore, her relationship to the Trinity was a reflection of the personal religion of Jesus—Wisdom itself—the embodiment of the personal religion that Christ founded and the paragon of the individual believers’ faith.

St. Peter was an important instance of the personal dimension of ecclesial witness. He was the one to whom the Father revealed the mystery of his Son.\textsuperscript{651} Moreover, “Jesus will communicate his powers of teaching and of forgiveness; he invests [the apostles] with his authority, and makes others into another self…The unity of this immense edifice thus constituted will thereby be assured by its foundation: visible at times and immortal as the edifice itself. This role is handed on to Peter.”\textsuperscript{652} Being a central witness of the Resurrection,\textsuperscript{653} Peter was the eminent representative of the

\begin{enumerate}
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 608.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 275-6.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 609.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Dernières retraites}, 147-8, 183-5.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Conférences}, 45.
\item Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 337.
\end{enumerate}
Church’s essential supernatural role in governing, instructing, and sanctifying the faithful.\textsuperscript{654} The paradox that the Church’s strength was manifested in Peter’s case in spite of his frailty bolstered Grandmaison’s case for the Church as the personal religion founded by Jesus. The fact of the Petrine office confirmed that Christ was able to lead his people in spite of the weakness of their leaders.

Grandmaison did not rule out non-believers as witnesses. He was ever mindful of those who sought gropingly for God\textsuperscript{655} and for Christ.\textsuperscript{656} As noted in the previous chapter, his articles on mysticism frequently acknowledged that the boundaries of the Church lie outside the visible Church: he not only acknowledged the traditional doctrine that held out the hope of salvation for those who do not explicitly profess Christ, but also opined that it was quite likely that the mystical experience of some non-Christians was authentic. Such an opinion, however, did not efface the uniqueness of Christ:

Thus, from the beginning of his academic career, P. de Grandmaison was eager—something that he would never stop doing—to recognize in the efforts of pagan humanity who seek God the response to a divine call that is obscurely sensed, even if the memory of this divine revelation has also been nearly wiped out. He never believed that, in order to perceive the transcendent message of the Son of God, true witness to the Father, it was necessary to shut one’s eyes to the confused ways throughout all times and places which remind us of the religious aspirations of man and of the infinite mercy of God, who was never left without testimony.\textsuperscript{657}

\textsuperscript{652} “[Jésus] communiquera ses pouvoirs d’enseignement et de pardon; il les investit de son autorité, il en fait d’autres lui-même…L’unité de l’immense édifice spirituel ainsi constitué sera assurée par celle de son fondement: visible à la fois et immortel comme l’édifice même. Ce rôle est dévolu à Pierre.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 278-9; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 3, 57-8.)

\textsuperscript{653} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 378.

\textsuperscript{654} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 611.

\textsuperscript{655} Grandmaison even applied the phrase to Newman; Grandmaison, “Développement,” \textit{Revue pratique d’apologétique} 6 (1908), 33.

\textsuperscript{656} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 354; 2, 554.

\textsuperscript{657} “Ainsi, dès le début de sa carrière scientifique, le P. de Grandmaison a ce souci, qu’il ne perdra jamais, de reconnaître dans les efforts de l’humanité païenne qui cherche Dieu la réponse à un appel divin obscurément senti, en même temps
Rather the witness of Christ to the Father confirmed the existence of a personal, transcendent God whose providence precluded hope of salvation for no one.

**E. Jesus Continué Dans l’Église (2): The Witnesses of Jesus in History**

Chapter two of book six, entitled Témoins de Jésus Christ dans l’histoire, examined the personal religion of exemplary believers as confirmations of the divinity of Christ in continuity with the Church’s corporate witness. The chapter was divided into three sections—L’Antiquité, Le Moyen Age, and Les Temps Moderne. Although there was no lack of traditional doctrinal concepts and judgments in Grandmaison’s treatment of the saints, their personal religion was seen largely from a biblical perspective. Such a point of view accorded with the overall approach of his Christology.

The religion of the Spirit required unity in diversity. This unity was Christocentric. “The traits attributed to the Word will be traced on the common faith of the church and not vice versa.” Obedience and discernment were required for full participation in the life of the Church.

---


662 For example, Grandmaison spoke of each member of Christ as divinized; Grandmaison, *Vie interieure*, 44.


or even communal experience did not trump all aspects of ecclesial life any more than Christ came
to do his own will. The Jesuit attitude of “sentire cum ecclesia”—thinking and feeling with the Church—
was also important.665

On the other hand, the fundamental unity of the Church as the religion of the Spirit made
room for considerable legitimate diversity in the witness to Christ. As chapter three made clear,
Catholicism for Grandmaison was the true religion of the Spirit where each believer found his or her
place. He celebrated, for example, the various kinds of perspectives and devotion that characterized
sacred writers and saints alike. Their evangelical witness consisted in large part in “orthopraxis”
correct practice of religion) or “areteicpraxis” (exemplary practice of religion).666

The witness of the saints also confirmed the truth of the noblest teachings of the gospel.667
Scripture itself incorporated the individual sensibility of the writers and was the better for it. The
subjectivity of the saints supported the veracity of the gospels. Grandmaison found a template for
this diversity in unity in the complementarity of the Johannine, Pauline, and synoptic traditions,668 all
of which he drew upon amply. The particularity of the writers’ pieties emerged in echoing the
objective claims that Christ had made. The source of St. Paul’s own personal religion was reflected
in his doctrine of the death and Resurrection of Christ, Paul’s résumé of the gospel: “But
throughout one senses that [Christ] was the active principle of the personal life: ‘I no longer live, it is
Christ who lives in me.’ (Gal. 2:20)…When in the history of humanity has such a thing ever

665 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 655-6.


667 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 1, 399.

668 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 420.
The personality of the evangelist John too shone through his gospel. The personality of these sacred writers did not obscure the light of Christ, but in fact magnified it.

The Catholic faith extended beyond the sacred writers. The first remarkable written witness was St. Ignatius of Antioch.

‘His personal value as a Christian and as a writer,’ says Harnack, ‘brings him nearer than any of the others to the great apostles Paul and John, though he is still far behind them. At the same time, he represents the growing Catholic Church so well that many Protestants have for more than two centuries refused to admit his letters as authentic documents of the time of Trajan.’

What impressed Grandmaison was “the personal, penetrating, and passionate tone” that distinguished Ignatius’ letters from all others. Moreover, “An irreproachable witness, this ardent friend of Christ was at the same time the oldest theologian, after Paul and John, of the Catholic Church… the bishop incarnates his particular Church as the great Church universal is the continued incarnation of the Son of God.” Saint Augustine was such a tender lover of the Catholic communion of saints, that even “Protestant theologians are the first to give to Monica’s son the title, meant here in the full literal sense of the word, as doctor of the Church… The Church, the bishop says again, is Christ visible, permanent motive of believing in the divine mission of the Christ who is

669 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1492.
670 Grandmaison, “Jésus Christ,” DAFC, 1356; Jésus Christ, 2, 47-8.
671 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 614n2.
672 “Sa valeur personnelle comme chrétien et comme écrivain, écrit M. A. von Harnack, le rapproche plus qu’il en reste encore loin. En même temps, il représente si bien l’Église catholique naissante que c’est précisément pour ce motif que beaucoup de protestants, pendant plus de deux siècles, se sont refusés à reconnaître dans ses lettres, des documents authentiques du temps du Trajan.” (Adolph von Harnack, Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1926), 28-9, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 631; Jesus Christ, 3, 447.)
673 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 634.
now invisible.” Augustine was also commended for interpreting the dictum that there is no salvation outside the Church as requiring the condition that leaving the Church was the result of deliberate choice and bad faith.

The last two ancients to receive homage, briefly, were St. Patrick and St. Benedict. Of the latter Grandmaison wrote:

Not a mere freedom from constraint, a counterfeit thing, but that interior freedom, the agreed subordination of brothers, in which each action is given its proper place and each desire its own value. The quasi-sacramental expression of the Benedictine life is the word PAX, which in effect means Jesus, for ‘he is our peace: *ipse enim est pacis nostra*.”

These words of praise disclose an important insight into how Grandmaison saw the proper exercise of authority and the interior freedom needed to go along with it. Evangelical peace was achieved by detachment and aimed at the fraternal harmony of superior and subordinate.

Grandmaison did not hide his preference for the Middle Ages, which gave the Church “the most tender friends of Jesus, perhaps, that history mentions.” Two figures dominated the age’s spiritual elite, who were distinguished for their Christocentric piety and devotion: St. Bernard of Clairvaux and St. Francis of Assisi. Called the most catholic saints in the Catholic Church, Bernard and Francis, like Christ, succeeded in uniting opposites. With respect to their piety,

---

674 “[l]es théologiens protestants sont les premiers à donner au fils de Monique le titre, entendu ici au sens littéral et plein du mot, de docteur de l’Église…L’Église…dit encore l’évêque, c’est le Christ visible, motif permanent de croire à la mission divine du Christ présentement invisible.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 639.)


676 “Non un laisser-aller qui n’est que la contrefaçon, mais la liberté intérieure, la subordination acceptée des frères, qui met à sa place chaque action, et chaque désir à son rang. Le mot quasi sacramental de la vie Bénédictine est PAX, autant dire Jésus, car aussi bien ‘c’est lui qui est notre paix: *ipse enim est pacis nostra*.”’ (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 642; Jesus Christ, 3, 459.)


the most notable feature of their love for Jesus is the place occupied by the application of the redemption to the individual…The accent was placed as a result on the contemplation of the mysteries of the earthly life of our Lord. To render him present by recollection; to make them present by the reading the Gospel, liturgical commemoration, meditation on the figures and the symbols of the Old Testament, the reconstruction of episodes where the imagination seeks less historical exactitude or local color than a framework to limit its restlessness: all that is assuredly as old as Christianity.679

In his *Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles*, Bernard wrote of “the great and sweet wound of love: grande et suave vulnus amoris’: one sees that the Holy Spirit had distressed his heart with this wound for Jesus of Nazareth.”680 Grandmaison’s love of charity and of mysticism shone here. He quoted historian Achille Luchaire, who extolled the quintessence of Catholicism in Bernard; like Paul and John, Bernard a mystic and man of the Church, a contemplative of the highest order and a man of action.

Contrast is not incoherence. A secret logic in Saint Bernard brings together all things and the contradictions are only apparent, a logic founded from the start on faith, an absolute faith that does not allow any concessions, and secondly on Bernard’s conception of the superior interests of the Church. It was the supreme criterion, the principle to which he subordinated all his deeds, to which he pitilessly sacrificed his own inclinations, his dearest affections, and the particular interests of his friends…to the point of the cohesion of his thought and conduct…all was as nothing in his eyes compared with the general good of the Church681

Bernard manifested the Catholic ability to reconcile apparent contraries, which in this case was that between the individual and the good of the Church.

---

679 “Dans leur amour pour Jesus, le trait plus notable est, en toute cas, la partie faite a l’application individuelle de la rédemption…L’accent est mis, en conséquence, sur la contemplation des mystères de la vie terrestre du Seigneur. S’y rendre présent par le recueillement; se les rendre présents par la lecture de l’Évangile, les commémorations de la saint liturgie, la méditation des figures et symboles du Vieux Testament, la restitution de scènes où l’imagination cherche moins l’exactitude historique ou la couleur locale qu’un cadre pour limiter son inquiétude: tout cela est assurément aussi ancien que le christianisme.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 643; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 460.)


As Providence would have it, St. Francis of Assisi—“an incomparable hero of the Spirit”—was somewhat of a counterpoint to Bernard: he was neither priest nor theologian nor achiever of great apostolic works. Contemplation of the life of Jesus and loving, persevering, humble, and concrete imitation of him made Francis almost “another Jesus.” “Francis never separated the Son from the Father. At the culminating point of his career on Mount Alverna, it was still Jesus, and Jesus crucified, who introduced him into ‘the King’s secret,’ and the great divine joy.”

But it is very noteworthy that Francis does not set out in search of his Master by his own road, with no guide but his love, apart from the sacraments, teachings, and traditions of the Church. In this connection, the Lutheran theologian Heiler says well that ‘Francis was the model Catholic saint. All the traits of ideal Catholic sanctity are visible on his face. All the richness of Catholic piety lives in his great and generous soul; the powerful religious antimonies that Catholic Christianity embraces are manifested in his interior and exterior life….’ For he knew that ‘no man can have God for a Father who does not have the Church for his mother.’ Again and again, therefore, he protests his full and perfect submission to authority; he imposes this submission on his disciples; he exalts the need for the authorized, consecrated mediation of the Catholic priest in terms into which a truly heroic note is imported by his allusion to the frightful abuses of the time.

Like Bernard, Francis reconciled seeming antinomies in his person—so great was his originality, his being sui generis. Well aware of the imperfection of the clergy, Francis’ heroism found no intransigent

---

682Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 645.

683“Jamais François ne sépare le Fils du Père: au point culminant de sa carrière, sur le mont Alverne, c’est encore Jésus, et Jésus crucifié, qui l’introduit dans le ‘secret du roi’ et la grande joie divine.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 646.)

684Freidrich Heiler, Der Katholizismus, seine Idee und seine Erscheinung (Munich, Reinhardt, 1923), 133, 134, in Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 646-7.

685“Mais ce Maître, cela est bien notable, François ne va pas le chercher par sa route à lui, guidé par son seul amour, hors des sacrements, doctrines et traditions ecleésiastiques. Là-dessus, le théologien évangélique F. Heiler dit justement que François ‘est le modèle du saint catholique. Tous les traits d’idéale sainteté catholique sont visibles sur sa face. Toute la richesse de la piété catholique vit dans son âme large et grande; les puissantes antimonies religieuses que la chrétienté catholique embrasse sont manifestées dans sa vie intérieure et extérieure….’ C’est qu’il savait que ‘nul n’aura Dieu pour Père s’il n’a l’Église pour mère.’ À mainte reprise il proteste donc sa soumission pleine et parfaite à l’autorité; il impose cette soumission à ses disciples; il exalte la nécessité de l’intermédiaire autorisé, consacré, du prêtre catholique, en des termes où l’allusion aux terribles abus du temps met une note vraiment héroïque.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 646-7; Jesus Christ, 3, 464-5.)
conflict between interior liberty of the Spirit and the exterior authority also of the Spirit; such heroism was embodied in his Rules for the Order.

Thomas à Kempis’ Imitation of Christ received last mention in the medieval section. It was no wonder that Ignatius Loyola considered it the “partridge” of spiritual books. The two classics of modern times—St. Ignatius’ Spiritual Exercises and St. Francis de Sales’ Introduction to the Devout Life—offered the same doctrine of the Imitation. The former put forth “doctrine that is set in dramatic form and reduced to precise lessons,” while the latter, “doctrine that is broken up and make more assimilable, without damaging its innate force.” Notice the emphasis on doctrine: Grandmaison infrequently used the word spirituality.

The saints who received the lion’s share of the modern section were Saint Teresa of Avila and Saint John of the Cross. Their works formed the “flowering of the most beautiful spiritual springtime that Western Christianity ever enjoyed.” Echoing his praise of Pascal and Newman, “who spoke well of Jesus,” Grandmaison wrote of Teresa:

no one has spoken as she has of the love of the Lord, with a more sensitive realism, a livelier spontaneity, a more exquisite purity. One is made aware in her writings of the proper and incommunicable quality of the love of Jesus. It is real love for a real person, without anything Platonic about it, but a strong and substantial love that engenders heroism; a love that is not conjured by our imagination, but proven by works.

686 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 648.
687 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 649.
688 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 649-55.
689 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 650. Goguel himself had praised this chapter on the witnesses to Christ for its mastery of literature on mysticism. He doubted, though, that mystical witness could shed much light on the history of Jesus; Goguel, “Ouvrages récents sur Jésus,” 66.
690 “personne n’a parlé comme elle de l’amour de Seigneur: avec un réalisme plus sensée, une spontanéité plus vive, une pureté plus ravissante. Dans ses écrits, mieux qu’ailleurs, on prend conscience de la qualité propre et incommunicable de l’amour de Jésus. Amour réel pour une personne réelle, sans rien de platonique, mais amour fort, et substantiel, et père d’héroïsme: non forgé dans notre imagination, mais attesté par des œuvres.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 650; Jesus Christ, 3, 468-9.)
Teresa’s mediation of the contemplative and the active represented a very important moment in the history of Western spirituality. Her sensibility was also safe for the beginner, for it never departed from the humanity of Christ. So accessible and so full of psychological penetration, Teresa’s way left no room for the imperfect, the ephemeral, or the sensual. Being a master of religious psychology, she spoke well of the love of Christ and of the soul’s journey to him.

When through practical generosity of heart and sound sense, through mortification and competent direction, making use of an adaptable ascetical training that deals ruthlessly with illusions, we have left this stage behind, then, she tells us, we may speak of mysticism and spiritual love without danger or impropriety! Then at length we may begin, with purified lips, to stammer out the divine canticle.

Unlike the mysticism of the modernists, Teresa’s mysticism was grounded in a sound asceticism. Sometimes she was so wounded by a ray of divine love, she desired to leave all created things to be united to her Love. “Teresa discovered rather, with astonishment and a sort of sacred horror, the immense capacity of the human being, the abysses that our limited spirit harbors when it has heard and followed the Gospel teaching and abandoned sensible ‘consolations’ for the savor of the divine, the created for the eternal, and the Nothing for the All.” This last vision symbolized her entire life’s work:

Once when I was in choir praying the Divine Office with everyone, my soul suddenly recollected itself and seemed to me to be utterly like a clear mirror, without reverse, sides, or height, to prevent it from being clear; and in its center Christ our Lord showed himself to

---


692 Par la générosité pratique et le bon sens, par la mortification et le contrôle autorisé, moyennant une ascèse souple et impitoyable aux illusions, dépassez ce stade, et vous pourrez, dit la sainte, sans danger, sans danger et sans indécence, nous parler mystique et amour spirituel! Alors avec des lèvres purifiées, vous pourrez balbutier le divin poème…” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 651-2; *Jesus Christ*, 3, with quotation from Teresa de Avila, *Vie par elle-même*, XX, 24, ed. Silvano, 148.)

693 “Thérèse découvre ailleurs avec étonnement et une sorte d’horreur sacrée, l’immense capacité de l’être humain, les abîmes que recèle notre esprit borné quand il a écouté et suivi la leçon évangélique, abandonné les ‘contentements’ sensibles pour les ‘goûts’ divins, le crée pour l’éternel, et le Rien pour le Tout.” (Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 652.)
me, as if I was seeing him in an ordinary way. And I saw him clearly in all the parts of my soul, as in a mirror.694

This state was for her the height of mystical experience—the clear sight of God. This clarity reflects Grandmaison’s own fascination with the limpidity of Christ’s soul.

The most profound of all mystics was Teresa’s disciple, John of the Cross. The one detail that Grandmaison focused on was his personal devotion to Jesus; the *Oraison de alma enamorada* gave the solution to the abyss dug up by God, “and that he alone could fill…the fundamental problem of all religious life.”695 Properly enjoyed, mystical experience could give a Christian precious knowledge of God.

Grandmaison singled out two very different witnesses of the personal religion founded by Jesus: Blaise Pascal and St. Margaret Mary Alacoque, visionary of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The one was an intellectual—“to the extreme limits of orthodoxy, and sometimes beyond that”—, the other, only hinted at, a person of simple faith.696 “The philosopher and religious man who was Pascal always owed his immense influence to his personal devotion to Jesus.”697 Grandmaison then quoted *Pensées* ns. 527, 547, and 548 (cited throughout his works), and then n. 553, the most precious pages in French for him on the mystery of Christ. St. Margaret Mary Alacoque—unnamed—complemented the example of Pascal.

694 “Une fois que j’étais aux Heures avec tout le monde, mon âme entra soudain en recueillement et me parut être tout entier comme un clair miroir, sans revers ni cotés, ni haut, ni bas qui l’empêchât d’être clair; et en son centre se représenta à moi le Christ Notre Seigneur, comme je le vois d’ordinaire. Et dans toutes les parties de mon âme, je le voyais clairement, comme dans un miroir.” (Teresa of Avila, *Vie par elle-même*, XI, 643, in Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 654.)


697 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 2, 656; *Jesus Christ*, 3, 476.
At the same time, a humble nun of the Visitation, illiterate and ‘completely plunged into her nothingness,’—walking in the way that was opened to her, but singularly illumined by God—saw the work of Christ epitomized in his love and honored in the eloquent symbol of his heart; a powerful devotion, which has been confirmed by the piety of the multitudes, the approval of the saints, and the authority of the Church.\textsuperscript{698}

Both announced the abyss of sin that opened up between God and sinner as well as the divine love that sought to bridge this abyss. Such a worldview avoided the reduction of the personal, transcendent, and immanent God of Christianity to an abstract idea\textsuperscript{699}—to Pascal’s God of the philosophers. By their very different vocations, these two saints demonstrated another truth: that the \textit{Catholic} held out the possibility of the union of the affective and the intellectual that modernists so yearned for, but which in so many ways eluded them.\textsuperscript{700}

The Spirit had not ceased raising up witnesses to Christ. Charles de Péguy presented a moving vision of Christian eschatology.\textsuperscript{701} “The purest, the most deserving, have spoken well of Jesus; but how is one to choose between the holy Cure d’Ars and Lacordaire; between Ozanam and Contardo Ferrini; between John Henry Newman and Charles de Foucauld?” Thérèse of Lisieux was mentioned, as were martyrs from China and the Orient. “All confess that Jesus has revealed to them the Father, and see in him their Savior. Far from preventing, dividing, or leading away from the supreme homage due to God alone, the personal worship of Jesus serves that homage and

\textsuperscript{698} “Vers le même temps, une humble Visitandine sans lettres et ‘tout abîmée en son néant,’ marchant dans une voie ouverte avant elle, mais singulièrement illuminée pour elle par Dieu, résumait l’œuvre du Christ dans son amour, honoré sous le parlant symbole de son cœur. La piété des foules, le suffrage des saints, l’autorité de l’Église ont confirmé, en le recevant, une dévotion si touchante.” (Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 657; \textit{Jésus Christ}, 3, 478.) There are two reasons why the devotion to the Sacred Heart was very important to a Jesuit and a Frenchman of Grandmaison’s time. First, the devotion to the Sacred Heart had been entrusted to the Jesuits. Second, France had made an act of reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus by building the basilica of Sacré Coeur on Montmartre in Paris in 1873.

\textsuperscript{699} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 1, 352.


\textsuperscript{701} Grandmaison, \textit{Jésus Christ}, 2, 644.
incarnates it. Where this worship is eclipsed, the very notion of God is weakened and obscured.”

On a poignant note, Grandmaison reminded his readers of the need for unity in the religion of Jesus. “In the conflict of opinions and the dust of critical dissections, the very basis of Christianity tends to be shaken, or is obscured in such a way that the believer is left with empty heart and hands: ‘They have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they have put him!’ [Jn. 20: 13].”

Further Christian disunity was the fruit of the abuse of critical thought in liberal Protestantism and modernism.

The conclusion to Jésus Christ took stock of the general effect that aridity of rationalist criticism had on basic Christian belief. Grandmaison’s aim had been to lay to rest the objections to the gospels accumulated over the last centuries by making the case for the historical credibility of the gospels. He summed up his case for the personal religion of Jesus in all three senses in the following way:

All the labors of specialists have worth for us in so far as they give us access to the source: once one has reached it, let him kneel down and quench his thirst. He will find there an interior strength, a purity (let us mean by this word the absence of all personal ambition, of all human designs) without parallel in the history of religion. There he will learn, or learn anew—marveling, it may be at having understood so little!—prayers that place God in his place and man in his. A holy and also a sane morality, in part implicit, sincere, without guile or affectation, where a true proportion between the counsel to heroism and necessary duty is so rightly observed that inevitable abuses are held in check or at least denounced for avoidance. Spiritual worship, confessing that ‘God alone is good,’ and that he is the Father of all; that ‘no one knows him except the Son,’ and that no one is unaware of

702 “Tous confessent que Jésus leur a révèle le Père, et voient en lui leur Sauveur. Loin que son culte personnel empêche, divise ou fourvoie l’hommage souverain du à Dieu seul, il y sert et il incarne. Où ce culte subit une éclipse, la notion même de la divinité s’affaiblit et s’obscurcit.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 644.)

703 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 660.

704 “Dans les conflits d’opinions et la poussière des dissections critiques, le fonds même du christianisme tend à se volatiliser, ou s’obnubile de telle sorte que le croyant demeure le coeur et les mains vides: ‘Ils ont pris mon Seigneur, et je ne sais où ils l’ont mis!’ [Jn. 20: 13].” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 660.)

705 Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 661-3.
him; that he alone is to be feared, and the first who must be loved. Altogether, justice is done to the whole human person, who is treated neither as pure spirit nor as animal of pleasure and glory, but as a rational and social being. He is a creature who is adopted by God, graciously expected and unconstrained; a sinner—let this be noted against the illusions of the times—redeemed, but needing remission; a pilgrim on the way in an obscure and divided world, toward the Kingdom of heaven. Jesus is the author, the Master, and the all of this magnificent religion, where many of the greatest and noblest of good people have found their peace. He appears in his history in his own time, inserting himself in a venerable and immemorial tradition, which he fulfilled without abolishing: the psalms, the prophets of Israel are full of an immense hope that he realized in the most spiritual sense. His acts, his words, his message—so personal and direct—remain, as luminous as they are, full of mystery and a holy darkness; and this is certainly the highest of his attributes, the most divine.706

Grandmaison began and ended his historical study by meditating on the mystery of Jesus, a mystery that persisted through the direct examination of the plain facts. The Church, the religion that Jesus founded, reflected purely his own personal religion; that Church also fulfilled the natural desire of the human person for supernatural fulfillment. This was possible because, as Grandmaison so often repeated, God remained in his place, and man in his.

F. Conclusion

Grandmaison’s case for the divinity of Christ embraced both historical-critical scholarship and the dogmatic tradition of the Church. It also took the same form as his Pneumatological scholarship:

706 “Tous les travaux des spécialistes ne valent que pour nous donner accès à la source: arrive près d’elle, que celui a soif s’agenouille, et qu’il boive. Il trouvera là une force intérieure, une pureté (entendons sous ce mot l’absence de toute ambition personnelle, de toute politique humaine) sans parallèle dans l’histoire religieuse. Il y apprendra, ou y réapprendra, s’émerveillant d’aventure de les avoir si peu comprises! des prières qui mettent Dieu à sa place, et l’homme à la sienne. Une morale sainte, et saine aussi, en partie implicite, sincère, sans pose et sans fard; entre l’héroïsme suggéré et le devoir nécessaire, les proportions y sont si justement gardées, que les abus, partout à l’oeuvre, sont tenus en échec, ou du moins dénoncés, partant, évitables. Un culte spirituel, confessant que ‘Dieu seul est bon,’ et qu’il est le Père de tous; que ‘nul ne le connaît, hormis le Fils,’ et que nul ne l’ignore; qu’il est seul à craindre, et le premier qu’on doive aimer. Ensemble, justice est faite à l’homme tout entier, traité non en pur esprit ou en animal de plaisir et de gloire, mais en être sensible et social. Il est une créature adoptée, gracieusement prévenue et non contrainte; un pécheur—qu’on note ce trait à l’endroit des chimères de tous les temps!—racheté, mais ayant besoin de rémission; un pèlerin en marche, dans un monde obscur et divisé, vers le Royaume des cieux. De cette religion magnifique, où beaucoup des plus grands et les meilleurs parmi les bons ont trouvé leur paix, Jésus est l’auteur, le Maître, et le tout. Historiquement, il apparaît à son heure, s’insérant dans une tradition auguste, immémoriale, qu’il s’achève sans s’abîmer: les psaumes, les prophètes d’Israel sont pleins d’une immense espérance qu’il a réalisée au sens le plus spirituel. Ses gestes, ses paroles, son message—si personnels, si directs—restent, pour lumineux qu’ils soient, pleins de mystère et d’une ombre sacrée. Et c’est là sans doute le plus hauts de ses attributs, le plus divin.” (Grandmaison, Jésus Christ, 2, 661-2; Jesus Christ, 3, 483-4.)
argument for the Church. As seen in the previous chapter, Grandmaison used the notion of personal religion to respond to the contemporary search for a religious subjectivity that was worthy of the human person. By speaking of the personal religion of Jesus, Grandmaison contested the modernist overvaluing of the subjective dimension of religion at the expense of its objectivity: Christ was the measure of religion rather than vice versa. The primary referent for the personal religion of Jesus was his relationship with the Father. Personal religion was the linchpin that connected Grandmaison’s Christology with his understanding of normative Christian discipleship within the Church. The personal religion of the believer and of the Church were not mere human constructs (whether by evolution or by choice), but founded by Christ’s relationship with his Father. Christ’s personal religion was the continuous condition of the individual’s experience of God: “the Kingdom of God is Jesus known, savored, and possessed.”  Christ’s personal religion was in effect the source and template of the Church and of the individual believer’s piety. It was conclusive proof of his divinity.

Grandmaison’s exegetical approach did not rely upon the authority of the Church, but upon as straightforward a reading as possible of the Scriptures, in particular the gospels, as human documents. His case rested on the basic facts that could be ascertained therein. Jesus’ personal religion, founded in his relation to the Father, was not the irrational reality that much of the quest for the historical Jesus portrayed. To the contrary, the remarkable and unique coincidence of opposites in the person of Christ and in his human consciousness was a confirmation of the doctrine of the hypostatic union. The balance, clarity, and integrity of Christ’s personality was summed for Grandmaison by the word limpidity.

707 Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, 1, 388.
This coincidence of opposites also made a more than plausible case for the claim that Jesus transmitted the truth about his divinity to his disciples: the fact of such revelation was both confirmation of the truth he conveyed and a confirmation of the Church’s divine mission. Founded personally by Christ, and empowered by the Holy Spirit, who spoke through the prophets, the Church was in turn the faithful witness to the divinity of Christ. The Church conveyed the truth and the life that she had from Christ to her followers after his Resurrection and throughout the ages. This truth was transformative of those who accepted it. Christ transmitted eternal life to those who received him (John 1: 12). The witness of the divine Persons to Jesus was mirrored in the Church as a whole and in the individual lives of the disciples. As the Bride of Christ, the Church preserved the mystery of Christ in an ineffable way.

Through his use of the three senses of personal religion, Grandmaison drew together the various dimensions of Christian doctrine, discipleship, and worship that modernism had sundered. Through the notion of personal religion as witness, he attempted to integrate Trinitarian theology, Christology, Pneumatology, ecclesiology, and anthropology. The Son gave testimony to the Father by his life and teaching. The Son bore witness to himself by his message, miracles, and comportment. The Father bore witness to the Son by raising him from the dead. The Spirit continued to bear witness to the Son, in the Church herself. The example of the saints embodied a compelling direct witness to Christian doctrine, and in particular, to the divinity of Christ.

The notion of personal religion integrated all levels of theology beyond the various areas of dogmatic theology. It embraced the relationship between fundamental theology and dogmatic theology (e.g., the human sciences and biblical exegesis) and between theology and spirituality. Personal religion was also a formal element of Grandmaison’s theology, in as much as piety figured

---

explicitly into his methods of intellectual inquiry and exposition, as he sought above all to speak well of Jesus.

In short, personal religion was Grandmaison’s material and formal equivalent of the analogy of faith. This analogy obtained in the unity of the individual and Christ, of the individual member and the Church, and of Christ and the Church, all of which in turn reflected the unity of the two natures of Christ, which finally referred back to the communion of the Persons of the Trinity. The mystery of Jesus introduced his reader to the mystery of God in an utterly unique way.
CONCLUSION

The aim of this dissertation has been to show that, in response to the challenges posed by modernism, Grandmaison used personal religion as the integrating principle of his Christology. The movement addressed many issues regarding Christ, the origins of Christianity, and the nature of faith. Although Grandmaison vigorously opposed many of the methods and conclusions of his liberal Protestant and modernist contemporaries, he also shared many of their aspirations. Like James and Sabatier, he wanted to re-vitalize the practice of Christianity. Like Loisy, he saw the need to establish once again the facts of the biblical record. He recognized, as did Sabatier, Renan, and Adolf von Harnack that this revival would come about, in part, by the study of Christianity’s origins. Like Laberthonnière and Tyrrell, he recognized that religion was not mere cognitional gnosis or reducible to mystical experience of any kind. Like Sabatier and Laberthonnière, he also sought to characterize Christianity as a religion of love, of true communion between God and man.¹

But modernist thought harmed the cause of Christ by opening up apparent antimonies of all kinds between the divine transcendence and the divine immanence; the interior liberty of the individual believer and the authority of the Church; speculative thought and critical scholarship; reason and faith; the supernatural and the natural; asceticism and mysticism; the collective and the individual; and thought and affect. Worst of all, modernism destroyed the traditional sense of the mystery of Christ, an important part of which was his personal relationship with the Father—upon which all else in Christianity depended. Believers were left with a Christ who was neither the fully divine Son of God nor knew himself to be so. The so-called Jesus of history was sundered from the Christ of faith. The Church was no longer the intention of Christ’s mission. The faith of the individual believer was shattered.

¹ Sabatier, Religion de l’autorité, 440-1.
For Grandmaison, the study of the origins of Christianity had to recover and respect the mystery of the Incarnation. The idea of personal religion referred to three things: the relationship of Christ to the Father, the Catholic Church—the personal religion that Christ had founded—and the personal religion of the individual believer. The notion of personal religion allowed him to coordinate his response to the various challenges posed by modernism. Personal religion was in effect a modern restatement of the analogy of faith. It afforded a way to speak of the unity of faith in organic terms, so as to appeal to contemporary sensibility shaped by sentimental religion.

A. Evaluation

One might ask how well Grandmaison’s use of the integrating principle of his apologetic Christology achieved what he set out to accomplish. How well did Grandmaison’s use of personal religion answer the concerns and challenges posed by modernism as he saw them? How well did his approach avoid the pitfalls that he saw in modernism? Did it help to demonstrate in a convincing way that Jesus Christ was Son of God, knew himself to be such, and revealed himself as such? Did it resolve the antinomies opened up by much of modernism? Did Grandmaison’s defense of the objectivity of faith inspire confidence in the Church’s identity and mission as the religion of the Spirit? Was his achievement a durable one?

First, I will make a few remarks about his overall achievements as an apologist. One can readily concede with Lebreton that Grandmaison’s synthesis was more implicit than explicit. Although his theological interests were comprehensive, there were limitations to his work taken as a whole. The occasional nature of his writings and the pressing practical demands of his editorial career did not allow him the opportunity to form an explicit synthesis. His philosophical analysis of modernism did not go beyond an application of Pascendi’s composite construction of the modernist
mindset, as valid as that might be. Although he was acquainted well with its failures, he was unable to provide new speculative solutions.

Nonetheless, Grandmaison’s DAFC article and Jésus Christ were remarkable in many ways that preserve their status as apologetic and exegetical classics. This praise may be surprising to some. Grandmaison’s achievement has usually been considered to be mainly in the area of spirituality. His accolades on that count are well-deserved. But the compliment often paid to his Jésus Christ—that it is good for spiritual reading—can be taken in a somewhat backhanded way. An inference that one might draw is that the work was thin or deficient in its exegetical and dogmatic content.

Yet one cannot dismiss Grandmaison’s biblical scholarship as being relevant only for devotional purposes. Ever since his death, he has been consistently mentioned today with Lagrange and Prat as one of the leading French Catholic exegetes of his time. This was all the more remarkable given the fact that Grandmaison did not have the technical training that Lagrange and other leading contemporary exegetes had. Grandmaison’s work is gradually receiving a second look from exegetes and theologians. Its use is not merely historical; Grandmaison’s integration of theology, apologetics, and spirituality is of unique and permanent value.

Grandmaison made appropriate use of the historical-critical method without being hedged in by it. As limited as his philosophical training might have been, he was also astute in his diagnosis of the religious problems of his contemporaries as well as their dogmatic errors. The modernist crisis fundamentally had to do with the question of God, in terms of the divine transcendence and the divine immanence. Modernism’s worldview attenuated belief in a transcendent, immanent, and personal God. Its account of Christianity presented a fragmented image of Christ, muted or denied his excellence, and severed the intimate connection between Christ and the Church. Much of the

2 Laplanche, Crise, 347.
modernist sensibility, succumbing to sentimental religion, had reduced religious sensibility to an extreme religious individualism, a sense of vague collectivity. Having denied the traditional dogmas about Christ, modernism reduced religion to inconsequential hero-worship. The individual believer was left adrift in his religion so as to find his way in contemporary society without the assistance of Christ and Church. Spiritual shipwreck often followed.

As a masterful scholar of religions, psychologist of religion, and exegete, Grandmaison was able to counter the negative effects of both the quest for the historical Jesus and of popular reconstructions such as Renan’s. First of all, his literary acumen enabled him to recognize the tremendous influence that works such as Renan’s *Vie de Christ* and Couchoud’s *Mystère de Jesus* could have on the faithful. His erudition answered amply the faith-devastating objections and reconstructions of the quest for the historical Jesus, while being able to rescue the truth it recovered.

More positively, the integrating idea of personal religion did help Grandmaison to recover the image of Christ from the dissolution set in motion by modernist critical scholarship and the religious philosophy underpinning it. As is true of any apologists’ work, such an approach was particular. His sense of personal religion drew on traditional and modern Christian sensibilities. Such particularities gave his Christology range, depth, and loftiness. Grandmaison was able to deal directly and credibly with many of the burning issues of the day: the interpretation of religious experience, a critically informed faith, and Catholicism’s outreach to contemporary society. He had a truly catholic vision of the world, one that was open to what was best in the world. His Christology, rooted deeply in the Catholic Church’s tradition, allowed him to reconcile many antinomies that liberal Protestantism and modernism had opened up. *Jésus Christ* was a fresh, convincing portrait of Christ also because his biblically-based Christology took into account all the main traditions of the New Testament. The work also possessed a rare imaginative and meditative power that drew on both his
literary talents and spiritual formation. Grandmaison’s wager was successful in part because he was able to convey the excellence of Christ’s person, whose uniqueness was characterized by balance, reserve, and above all, purity. The result gave his readers the clear and confident possession of the richness of the mystery of Christ. Such a vision was possible because his starting point—like St. Paul’s—was in fact Christ.

Lest it be forgotten, the modernist—as well as modernity’s—quest for knowledge and freedom—was also a spiritual movement. The academic commitments of the modernists were not merely rationalist: The modernists undertook such scholarship motivated by a quest for a renewed spirituality. Yet their search for knowledge was often misguided in that it lost sight of the objectivity of the Christian faith. A strength of Grandmaison’s Christology was that it was able to present, understand, and appreciate the Incarnation anew while preserving the mystery of it.

Given the spiritual aspect of the modernist crisis, it is altogether relevant to note that what Grandmaison lacked in speculative depth, he often made up for with wide experience as a spiritual director, formator of religious, and founder of an institute of consecrated life. In fact, his keen insight into the spiritual life along with his substantial theological acumen gave him a vantage point that few—if any—of the more formidable speculative thinkers of his time had. These successes enriched his thought and made him all the more credible as a bridge from the larger Catholic world to the intelligentsia. Grandmaison’s personal religion showed a way in which heart and mind could be one. It was what Bourget called an experiential apologetics. As a master practitioner of the discernment of spirits, Grandmaison could claim that he was able to do what Sabatier wanted to accomplish, to discern whether religious experience was truly from God.³

³ Colin, Audace, 346.
Grandmaison did not synthesize a developed speculative theology of the Holy Spirit. Nonetheless, his insight into the personal religion of Christ was supported by a robust theology of the Holy Spirit. The two major Christological works—as well as his other apologetic works and spiritual writings—demonstrated a novel, direct concentration on the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in the life of Christ, the Church, and the believer.

Grandmaison’s apologetic Christology made a good case for Catholicism as the religion of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Applying Möhler’s understanding of Christianity as a coincidence of opposites, Grandmaison managed to reconcile whatever contraries could be incorporated into his theology. The transcendence and immanence of God was respected.

The personal religion that is the Church was appreciated for its power of both social integration and authentic interiority. The hierarchy was portrayed as being at the service of the truth and of the sacramental life of the Church. Obedience was understood rightly, in accord with the teachings of St. Ignatius, as a matter of freedom in the deepest sense of the word. The interiority of faith, assisted by the exterior aspects of the Church, also carried a certain authority. Grandmaison showed great respect for the role of the witness of the individual believer in confirming the truth of the gospel.

With regard to anthropology, personal religion distinguished the supernatural and natural orders without separating them. There was ample account of the possibility of human self-transcendence, both in action and in prayer. Grandmaison’s positive view of all things human was also balanced by a compassionate sense of human frailty. His account of personal religion and of human history took better account perhaps of a problem that the modernists might have tended to slight—but a problem that never failed to exercise their mentors Pascal and Newman: in the face of the divine love, there was the reality of human evil.
Grandmaison’s sense of personal religion conveyed a carefully balanced approach to Christian spirituality. On the one hand, his warnings against the flight to false mysticism were offset by a reverence for true mystics of all kinds. On the other hand, personal religion was able to appropriate the ascetical dimension of Christianity without succumbing to the moralism that was so repellent to him.

Grandmaison was on the apologetic and pastoral frontline of French Catholicism, and, at times, the lone orthodox Catholic voice that recognized an otherwise ignored important issue and confronted it. Yet, even in the midst of defending the uniqueness of Christ and of the Catholic Church, Grandmaison also served the ecumenical cause. He was also a pioneer of interfaith dialogue in that he entertained the possibility of authentic supernatural religious experience and salvation in a hidden way by those outside the visible Church. These are some of the ways in which Grandmaison’s use of personal religion in his Christology is a valid and durable achievement.

B. Theological and Pastoral Consequences

Grandmaison’s intellectual achievements and pastoral engagement invite one to consider some of the implications of his Christology for theology today. Projecting these consequences will also highlight the strengths and weakness of the apologetic approach of his Christology in both its dogmatic content and method.

From a general apologetic perspective, Grandmaison showed to a relativistic age how helpful it is to engage a wide range of apologetic strategies and themes. Many non-believers can still respect the undeniable aspiration for the truth and for communion. His Christological works, after all, focused on countering the attacks mounted by the new fields of historical-critical exegesis, comparative study of religions, and religious psychology. A Christian need not be afraid of the truth in any of its forms. Pointing out and resolving apparent antimonies is a good starting point for
apologetic strategy. For example, it is worth raising the question of the relationship of authority and reason. Believers and non-believers alike need to be reminded that they do have authorities, whether or not they are conscious of them.

The notion of personal religion reminds us that theology must always return to Christ. The analogy—the unity—of faith depends upon the answer to the question “Who do people—who do you—say that I am?” The analogy of the divine and the human that the Incarnation realized and made possible has relevance to all areas of theology, including Pneumatology, ecclesiology, anthropology, and spirituality. Personal religion reminds us that in speaking of the Church, Christ is the one who is the touchstone of all ecclesial reality; it is his task to lead his disciples to the Father. Here personal religion has its source; here the Church and the Christian must return for renewal in the intellectual, pastoral, social, and spiritual tasks ahead.

An important issue in ecclesiology today is the relationship of Christ and the visible Catholic Church. The question of the Church is being posed throughout the world as it was in Grandmaison’s day, even if a little more intensely and radically: what is the need of organized religion at all, so long as one has spirituality? Such a radical question demands that theologians pay attention to the excellence of the Church. Recognizing a whole gamut of legitimate aspirations that true religion had to fulfill, Grandmaison strove especially to show that the collective and individual dimensions of religion were necessary to one another. As the religion of the Spirit, Catholicism sets the standard for the personal religion of the believer. For example, Christianity is founded in part on communally shared truth. As the permanent Incarnation of Christ, the Church is as much a communion of love, of fraternal charity, as it is a communion of truth. A philosophy as well as a theology of witness can have wide appeal.
The notion of personal religion could be applied to ecumenical dialogue. Sticking points today among Christians have to do with issues of ecclesiology more than of Christology; such topics include the holiness of the Church, the nature of the sacraments, and the role of the papacy. However, such questions do take their central reference from the person of Jesus Christ. The personal religion of Christ should always be the touchstone of the form that personal religion takes for the Christian today. The objectivity of dogma is essential to secure and nourish the optimal subjectivity of individual personal religion.

At a time in the Roman Catholic Church, and in western Christianity in general, when it is lamented that there is little talk of the Holy Spirit in theology, Grandmaison’s Christology is an example of how to think of the Spirit as the One who follows Christ’s lead and guides the Church’s consciousness and her life of witness in the world. The outline of Grandmaison’s personal religion is still today novel, direct, and fresh for its concentration on the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer, in mystical prayer, and in the life of the intellectual.

Grandmaison’s Christology also reminds the theologian of an essential obligation: there is a moral responsibility on the part of both the scholar and the speculative theologian to have an eye toward the apologetic implications of thought and scholarship for the life of the whole Church and for the world. Apologetics is as much an act of charity as it is of clarity.

Grandmaison’s Christology also has an important thing to say to us about the form of theology—that just as the best dogmatics is a good apologetic, so a good apologetics can give rise to the best dogmatics. Speculative theology is enriched by the apologetic imperative. As he saw from the beginning of his career as theologian, speculative theology and critical scholarship cannot do without one another. His Christology shows that it is possible—and necessary—to use the historical critical method and spiritual discernment together. The Catholic scholar must make the case for faith
from faith, albeit without being fideist. Religious experience such as mysticism cannot substitute for
dogmatic teaching or critical scholarship. Nonetheless, contemplation has a role in theology. A
consideration of the beauty of Christ, of God, and of creation have a place in critical scholarship as
well as in speculative thought.

All speculative theology is undertaken by someone who is situated in history. A theologian
must always be aware of his or her presuppositions, especially in the realm of the philosophy of
religion. A historian too has presuppositions. The Catholic theologian can proceed with his work,
confident that the truth can be known in part by having an attitude of loyalty to the magisterium.
Conversely, the discovery of the truth in whatever form it takes will confirm him in the reliability of
this magisterium. This ecclesial obedience, freed from fear and cramped observance, can satisfy the
quintessentially modern concern with freedom and conscience.

Grandmaison’s mastery of spiritual direction brings us back to Christology. There is much
discussion among Christians and non-Christians alike today about the nature of religious experience.
The self-understanding of Christians as to the relationship of a Christian to the person of Christ is
an especially important issue as they strive to promote harmony among members of all religions.
The fruitful involvement of Christians in such a dialogue requires certitude of the uniqueness of
Christ: Such a position inform one’s standards as to what experience is truly of God. A Christian can
do no other than to refer such experience back to the person of Jesus Christ, true God and the true
man. Ultimately, the highest critical faculty of the human person is not the critique that reason
provides, but the discernment within faith. There is no substitute for spiritual discernment; without
it, critical philosophy and scholarship fail to arrive at the truth. Whereas the letter kills, the Spirit
gives life (2 Cor. 3:6).
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