

Maurice Blondel's *Histoire et Dogme* in the French Modernist Crisis

Jean-Jacques D'Aoust
Wells College, Aurora

The historiography of the modernist crisis within the Roman Catholic church has entered a new phase. In 1966, when I began research for my doctoral thesis at Yale, Roger Aubert, the famous historian of Louvain, could write in Concilium. "There has been a sudden and general revival of interest in the subject [the modernist movement] and a point which is of special importance to the historian is that documents long unavailable are now beginning to make their appearance."¹ Now that new documents are available, the historian needs to examine them carefully and will eventually re-assess and revise many previous conclusions based on insufficient information. Certain condemnations as well as certain exonerations will now seem unwarranted. For instance, many Catholic historians and biblical scholars will acknowledge today that Loisy was not as heretical as he might have appeared to some of their peers some sixty years ago. And again, Pope Pius X, although canonized as a saint, is now revealed in his involvement with a secret society aimed at spying and terrorizing those who did not follow the party-line of the integralism of the Sodalitium Pianum of Mgr. Benigni. When important documents of that secret society were discovered in Belgium in 1921, Maurice Blondel was informed immediately by his friend Fernand Mourret that his name had not yet been read in the papers under examination. In response to Mourret on March 16, 1921, Blondel wrote:

The documents you mentioned are historically very important. They reveal, for those who are knowledgeable, the scientific and moral insufficiency of occult modes of government and the painful intrusion of incompetent, sly politicians, of interloping agents, abnormal or subverted, in the most delicate spiritual decision-making process. I have had for a long time the impression that a plot had been devised to make the good Pius X see red, to cause an interior split within French Catholicism, to ruin our moral strength, to plan simultaneously the game of an authoritarian reaction and that of a German-style order . . . One must not forget that in spite of the

bluff of the young, generous for the most part, but without any solid intellectual foundation, our religious situation is deplorable and that since Leo XIII there has been, due to denunciations and reactions, a collapse of intelligent, laborious, and generous life among us.²

As I have been able to verify repeatedly, Blondel has suffered so much throughout his mature life from such suspicions and attempts at his condemnation that his three children who are still living in France react nervously whenever the traumatic experience of their father is mentioned.

Today, I intend to give a brief sketch of the literature on the French Modernist crisis, to follow it with a short biographical note on Maurice Blondel, along with a summary of the most important ideas which he developed in his treatise, Histoire et Dogme and to conclude with a few observations and recommendations for the research that still needs to be done.

The French Modernist crisis still has enigmatic aspects in the mind of every historian of Christianity. There is every likelihood that it will remain so for some years to come. The mass of literature which it provoked during the six years of its apogee from 1902 to 1908 was mostly controversial and partial. In defense of the modernists, several monographs and collections of documents were published, but as the modernists either submitted to the Roman condemnation or left the Church, their literature dwindled down. In defense of the official Roman Catholic position, every writer employed what might be called the "myth of modernism", the "crossroads of all Christian heresies," as it was defined by the encyclical Pascendi, for it provided him with an easy ploy to harass any tendency of which he disapproved. Nearly a generation went by before any kind of objective and impartial study was made.

The French Modernist crisis is a complex of innumerable tendencies to adapt the patterns of thought and action of the Catholics to the conditions of the modern world. As in all periods of social change, some persons

emphasize the value of antiquity, others point to the wealth of modernity, and few agree on the right balance between the two. The religious situation in France was tumultuous at the beginning of the twentieth century: the conflict between anti-clerical republicans and Catholic monarchists, the patronizing attitude of the bourgeoisie and its opposition to the social movements, the failure of the Christian democratic movement and the "affaire Dreyfus," the opposition to the papal policy of "ralliement," the rupture of diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See (1904), the separation of Church and State in France (1905), the condemnation of Modernism (1907), the condemnation of the Catholic social movement of Le Sillon (1910), the long domination of L'Action française until its condemnation in 1926, and so forth.

For the mass of nominal Roman Catholics in France, the Modernist crisis was a squabble in the sacristy. According to its latest historian, Emile Poulat, the French modernist movement was reserved to scholars who were indifferent to the great economic and political movements, strangers to the social and ideological influences which did not directly affect their own research. Without any popular support, this type of modernism could not succeed.

For English readers, one of the most objective accounts of the French Modernist crisis until this year, was written by Alec Vidler some thirty-six years ago. This was the essay which he wrote for the Norrisian Prize Essay at Cambridge in 1933. It was published in 1934 by the Cambridge University Press with the title, The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church: its Origin and Outcome. Since then, Vidler has come across so much new documentation that he thought for a while of giving us a new expanded revision of his earlier book. Instead of that, he opted for "an altogether new book with hardly any repetition of what [he] I had previously published." Consequently, both books are still to be read.

In his second volume, entitled, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (Cambridge U. Press, 1970) Vidler suggests two possible approaches to the study of the modernist period: "One is to start from the papal acts which defined and condemned modernism, especially the encyclical Pascendi." (p. 15) "The other way is, without presuppositions concerning orthodoxy or heresy, to look at the various persons or some of them who were involved in the movement that provoked the papacy to define and condemn the system which it called 'modernism', with a view of ascertaining what they conceived themselves to be doing, whether individually or collectively." (p. 15) Vidler chose to pursue the latter approach for the following reasons:

- 1) his interest was not a so-called theoretical modernism but persons who were presumed to have caused all the trouble,
- 2) modernism as defined by the pope was always regarded as a misrepresentation of what the so-called modernists themselves were actually doing.

Within the Roman Catholic communion, the most comprehensive account of the French Modernist crisis remains that of Jean Rivière, Le Modernisme dans l'Eglise: Etude d'histoire religieuse contemporaine (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1929). The Roman Catholic apologist Rivière did exactly what the Anglican Vidler refused to do. According to Rivière, "Modernism" has already been condemned, classified and indexed in the dictionary of heresies. To those who objected that the "Official Modernism" condemned by the syllabus Lamentabili and the encyclical Pascendi did not correspond exactly to the trends of renewal, reformation, and updating of Catholic thought and action, Rivière tried to prove how the official documents were factually accurate. Faithful to the neoscholastic methodology, Rivière prefaced his historical inquiries with the nominal and the real definitions of the "species Modernism." Rivière claimed objectivity by

remaining faithful to the official description of Modernism and finding historical evidences to justify that condemnation. If he showed any partiality, it was in favor of his former master, Pierre Batiffol.

More recently, two other monographs on the Modernist crisis have been published in English. The first, that of John Ratté, Three Modernists: Alfred Loisy, George Tyrrell, William L. Sullivan (Sheed & Ward, 1965), provides a useful summary of the issues involved for those unacquainted with the literature. Unfortunately, instead of new insights, it rehearses all the traditional condemnations of these three Modernists. The second study I want to mention is the English translation from the Italian of Michele Ranchetti, The Catholic Modernists. A Study of the Religious Movement, 1864-1907 (Oxford U. Press, 1969). Once again, Ranchetti adopts the dogmatic approach and proposes to illustrate how the so-called Modernism was twice condemned, "Pascendi, he writes, condemned it by examining its opinions, ideas, and doctrines individually, whereas the Second Vatican Council condemned it by pointing out, once again, the great conflict between charism and gnosis." Ranchetti does admit that "there is nothing particularly new" in what he is writing. "Most of the material has already been published." He has no revelations to communicate, he just wants to make sure that no one could or would ever imagine a connexion between the Modernists and the liberal Catholics during Vatican II. Unfortunately, Ranchetti's study is filled with inaccuracies and unfounded judgments. For instance, he identifies the editor responsible for the publication of the letters between Blondel and Valensin as Fr. Daniélou and calls it a "model critical edition". He identifies also the editor of the volume entitled Au Coeur de la Crise Moderniste as Rene Marle. In both instances, Henri de Lubac was the editor who refused to sign his name for fear of reprisals.

Shortly after the condemnation of "la nouvelle théologie" by the encyclical Humani Generis in 1950, Henri de Lubac began a long series of publications as Documents sur l'histoire du modernisme.³ A cursory glance and perusal of this huge and valuable documentation suffices to convince the reader of the major role that Blondel played in the French Modernist crisis. Unfortunately its tone is apologetic and its methodology is questionable. Great efforts are spent to show Blondel as one of the most clear-sighted and prudent thinkers who foresaw the peril, discovered the remedy, and with the publication of Histoire et Dogme, made a supreme effort to reconcile critical science with Catholic faith in harmony with an integral Tradition. Blondel is eulogized at the expense of many others, of course at the expense of the "modernists" such as Loisy, Hébert, Houtin, von Hügel, and Tyrrell, but also of the "traditionalists" such as Schwalm, Gayraud, Turinaz, Fontaine, Barbier, even of the Toulouse school of Batiffol and Rivière. With respect to methodology, it can be demonstrated that several letters brought forth as evidence have been cut up and distributed sometimes non-chronologically in places where they would best support the opinions of the compiler. The authors claim to reproduce all the letters of incontestable historical and doctrinal value, but readers using other criteria will judge that important letters have been omitted. Furthermore, sections of letters and words were dropped, and sometimes sections were rephrased. This is perhaps evidence of the diplomatic skill necessary to publish this extremely valuable documentation at a time when the least expression of sympathy for so-called modernistic ideas was immediately repressed. But it is certainly not "a model critical edition" as Ranchetti calls it. When impartial scholars are given easier access to this documentation, I am confident that my critical assessment will receive further confirmation. Nevertheless, I must say that I am grateful for the short-cuts that these

publications have provided me. If other scholars follow my recommendations, they too might find benefit in their careful use of them. With respect to these Documents sur l'histoire du modernisme, three observations need to be made: (1) at the present time, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to consult many of the original documents which de Lubac has published, (2) if we grant provisionally that the reproduction is "substantially" correct, there is still the problem of assembling together letters partially published in different books, or in different sections of the same book, (3) it is still possible to make use of this valuable documentation by overlooking its apologetic tone, by the use of internal and external cross-references, by collateral and complementary studies, and by verification with the original documents that are, or will eventually be accessible.

A more scientific history of Modernism was undertaken by Emile Poulat, a director at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and professor at the Sorbonne.⁴

In contrast to Rivière and most other Roman Catholic historians of the Modernist movement, Poulat adopted an empirical approach in preference to a dogmatic one. He described tendencies and texts through which men reveal themselves. He pursued his research in three stages: (1) a complete survey of the accessible archives, (2) a prolonged familiarity with the main persons involved in the Modernist crisis through a careful perusal of unpublished documents and comparison with the memoirs and biographies, (3) a review of the printed material concerning the doctrinal controversy. In his own presentation, Poulat reserved the first place to the published material as being more complete and explicit, and used the unpublished material to provide a concrete and more human context.

To begin with Pascendi's definition of Modernism, "the cross-roads of all Christian heresies," as Rivière and other dogmatic historians did,

appeared to Poulat an impossible task, it would mean the description and assessment of nineteen centuries of Christian divisions. He preferred to limit himself to a modern crisis within the so-called unity of Catholic thought before it became a crisis of Catholic unity. As time is limited, I shall end at this point my brief survey of the literature on Modernism. And now, for the uninformed, I wish to provide a few biographical items on Maurice Blondel.

Maurice Blondel was born at Dijon on November 2, 1861, as the youngest of four children, in an old bourgeois family of lawyers, physicians, and civil servants. He received his secondary education at the Lycée of Dijon from 1870 to 1879, majored in philosophy with Alexis Bertrand and Henri Joly as his tutors, and received his licentiate in 1880. From 1881 to 1884, he studied at the Ecole Normale Supérieure de Paris. Among his fellow students were Henri Berr, Frédéric Rauh, Victor Delbos, and Pierre Duhem, among his favorite professors, Emile Boutroux and Léon Ollé-Laprune. The director of the school was successively Louis Pasteur, Fustel de Coulanges, and Georges Perrot. The predominant philosophies were those of Ravaisson and Lachelier. The skepticism of Renan and the dilettantism of the young Barrès fascinated a great number of students. Strong in his Catholic faith, Blondel proposed to be as scientific as possible. He received his "agrégation" in philosophy in 1886. From 1885 to 1889, he taught successively at the Lycées of Chaumont, Montauban, and Aix-en-Provence. In 1889, he requested a leave of absence to prepare his doctorate. There was a brief substitution at the Collège Stanislas in Paris from December 1890 to April 1891. On June 7, 1893, he received his doctorate. He married Rose Royer on December 12, 1894, and had three children, Charles, Elizabeth, and André, who are still alive. In 1895, he was appointed professor of philosophy at Lille, and in 1896, at Aix-en-Provence. He became a widower in 1919. In 1927, he retired

because of increasing blindness, but continued to dictate and publish some of his major works until he died on June 4, 1949, at the age of 88.

How did Blondel come to write Histoire et Dogme in 1904? Was it simply his answer to the Modernist crisis as focussed by the biblical question? It would be too long at this time to examine in detail the circumstances of this important treatise. Let me say briefly that ever since Blondel wrote the Letter on Apologetics in 1896, in which he criticized harshly the pseudo-philosophy of the neoscholastic revival as the right method of approaching the religious problem, he was accused of being an innovator seeking to undermine traditional beliefs, and the father of philosophical modernism. It is not surprising if two doctoral dissertations, one written by Katherine Gilbert, entitled, Maurice Blondel's Philosophy of Action (U. of North Carolina Press, 1924) and the other by Leicester Lewis, The Philosophical Principles of French Modernism (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1925), both resulting from personal interviews with Blondel and others, besides research in published documents, --both these doctoral theses infer that the philosophy of modernism was essentially the philosophy of Blondel. In the opinion of a majority of Roman Catholics at the beginning of this century, Blondel was definitely a "modernist", in the opinion of most liberal Roman Catholics today, Blondel was very orthodox, a liberator of the "spirit" of Thomism, according to Father Henri Bouillard and Claude Tresmontant. Such disparate interpretations of the writings of Blondel invite the historian to make a more thorough and critical investigation. Let me now summarize the most important ideas which Blondel developed in his treatise, Histoire et dogme.

The publication of L'Evangile et L'Eglise in 1902 by Alfred Loisy caused a turmoil within French ecclesiastical circles. Rare were the priests acquainted with the modern critical methods applied to Scripture and Church history. Consequently, the debates over Loisy's "petit livre

rouge" became heated. Some radical progressives eventually rejected their Christian faith. Some conservative neoscholastics rejected the modern critical methods as leading to liberal Protestantism and apostasy. In this squabble in the sacristy, the ecclesiastical leaders took fright. Disciplinary measures were soon applied to safeguard the deposit of faith. Leo XIII was reluctant to curb the freedom of the scholars, while Pius X, a very holy man but not an intellectual, did not feel the same hesitation. Book after book was condemned by the Congregation of the Index, censures and excommunications deprived dozens of priests of all their privileges. As a precursor of the Modernist movement, Blondel was again an easy target for the reactionary forces. Fortunately, he enjoyed the protection of influential friends within ecclesiastical circles, both at the Roman Curia, and in France. Furthermore, he ~~dis~~associated himself publicly from every scholar who was censured or condemned. He circulated personal apologies for his orthodoxy among influential ecclesiastical leaders and observed faithfully all the measures of prudence recommended to him. He was even ready to make the "sacrifice of Abraham" and to commit an intellectual suicide if that were required to maintain his loyalty to the Church.

Pressed by his two ecclesiastical advisers, Wehrle and Mourret, Blondel undertook reluctantly to write "Histoire et Dogme." Blondel's treatise, "Histoire et dogme, Les lacunes philosophiques de l'exégèse moderne" was first published as three articles in La Quinzaine, on Jan. 16, Feb. 1 and 16, 1904. Three translations have recently been made, in Italian, German, and English. On the one hand, it was hard for him to criticize Loisy's biblical exegesis when he was not himself a biblical scholar, and when he agreed with him on the necessity of rejecting scholasticism in favor of modern critical methods. On the other hand, an outright criticism of Loisy could only encourage the neo-scholastic reactionaries, like Gayraud and company, to sabotage their common program

for the renewal of the Catholic intellectual life. The first article of Histoire et Dogme was a tempered criticism of the neoscholastic philosophy responsible for both extrinsicism and historicism. In the eyes of Mourret, this article appeared to be more anti-Gayraud and anti-traditionalist than anti-Loisy. Blondel was advised to disassociate himself more clearly from the modernists if he expected to escape condemnation. In the second article, Blondel repeated most of the objections raised previously in his correspondence with Loisy and von Hugel. Several of his criticisms had already been answered in the responses of Loisy and von Hugel. In particular, they all agreed on the futility of Christian apologetics based on history alone. From the correspondence and the articles examined in my research, it would appear that Loisy and von Hugel were even less inclined towards historicism than Batiffol and Lagrange, both of whom apologists usually picture as the opponents of historicism. A mixture of extrinsicism and historicism has indeed dominated the field of Roman Catholic apologetics until the eve of Vatican II.

In his last article on Histoire et Dogme, Blondel began with the two-sources theory, Scripture and Tradition, current in the Roman Catholic church between Trent and Vatican II. He soon rejected the unscientific notion of an esoteric transmission de ore in aurem of historical facts, received truths, accepted teachings, hallowed practices, and ancient customs. With the growing tendency towards written documents, he claimed, such a notion would lead to the "exhaustion of Tradition itself." In the light of his philosophy of action, Blondel preferred to speak of Tradition as encompassing the whole life of the Church, including the practice of all the faithful, the speculation of all the Christian scholars, and the exercise of the infallible magisterium assisted by the Holy Spirit. With such a comprehensive notion, he expected to overcome the extreme intellectualism and rationalism of both the neoscholastic theologians and the radical critical scholars. He succeeded in proving his loyalty to

the Church and his willingness to maintain an orthodox faith. He opened new horizons for Catholic scholars and inspired a whole generation of theologians to venture beyond the preliminary steps he had made.

The fundamental problem discussed in Histoire et Dogme concerns the scientific method for proceeding from history to dogma, and then reading history in the light of dogma. He labelled the two extreme attitudes to be rejected as extrinsicism and historicism. Extrinsicism subjects historical science to dogmatic presuppositions, while historicism reduces dogma to what can be ascertained by historical methods alone.

Blondel's notion of history is complex. In his own philosophy of action, he preferred to develop an integral phenomenology before tackling the problems of metaphysics. He expected the modern scientific historian to adopt the same method of immanence as he had done in philosophy. He conceived historical science as a strictly positive science which links together facts and events according to their natural determinism. Such a scientific synthesis, however, could only be an abstraction from real life, a phenomenal description preliminary to metaphysical and theological interpretations.

Besides this distinction between historical observations and historical interpretation, Blondel conceived a distinction between ordinary scientific history and Sacred History. He identified the latter with the whole life of the Church, including the practice of all the Christian faithful, the speculation of Christian scholars, and the infallible magisterium of the Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit. Thus, Sacred History was simply another name for Tradition. His distinction between the two kinds of history clearly raises problems for those who object to placing positive science on one side and supernatural life on the other.

Blondel began his treatise, Histoire et Dogme, with the intention of discovering a scientific method to explain the mutual relations between scientific history and dogmatic formulations, both conceived as intellectual abstractions from real life. He concluded by offering Tradition, also called Sacred History, that is, the whole life of the Church, as the bridge between history and dogma. In other words, the Church in the totality of its life was suggested to justify the historical foundations for dogmatic formulations and the dogmatic reading of history. His conclusion was much more clearly compatible with the position of an orthodox believer than with that of a scientist.

Blondel's notion of dogma is also complex. First of all, he distinguished between the primary object of faith, which is God revealing himself, and the secondary object, which is the human intellectual expression of that revelation. He distinguished between Christian faith (foi-confiance), which is absolute, and Christian beliefs (foi-croyance), which are relative. Because of his belief in the infallibility of the Church, he recognized the voice of God in the official teaching of the magisterium, and yet, he was aware that all human expressions are deficient and never adequate to their object, especially when that object is God revealing himself. Dogmatic formulations presented a dual value for Blondel: they enjoyed an absolute authority insofar as they point to divine revelation, but they were limited by their relative and inadequate modes of human expression.

Blondel's main objection against Loisy centered on Jesus' consciousness of his divinity. He agreed with Loisy that scientific history, by itself, is unable to prove Christian dogma. Consequently, biblical exegeses, conceived in a purely scientific fashion could never argue to the divinity of Jesus. If such belief forms the core of Christian tradition, Blondel wrote, it should be unscientific to exclude it from

Scripture. On the one hand, scientific history cannot by itself prove the divinity of Christ, on the other hand, scientific history should recognize this belief as central to Christianity. Blondel proposed a dilemma to the historian, either the a priori and unscientific denial of Christ's divinity, the rejection of the Christian supernatural, and the reduction of Christianity to the condition of natural religions; or the acceptance of Christ's divinity and the Christian supernatural, at least as a working hypothesis. According to Blondel, the interpretation of biblical texts and ecclesiastical history should then be in the light of the latter hypothesis. Although scientific history by itself can neither prove the supernatural, nor disprove it, it could at least use it as an hypothesis. On this hypothetical basis, Blondel believed that scientific history would prove to be not in contradiction with Christian dogma. While Loisy rejected any extra-historical principle for the determination of what is historical in Scripture, Blondel believed that, if the supernatural is incarnated in history, the scientific historian should be able to read it there. It would seem, then, that Blondel was presupposing faith. Both Loisy and Blondel were right in their rejection of historicism: history alone cannot prove the supernatural. While Loisy rejected any extra-historical principle for the determination of what is historical in Scripture, Blondel believed that, if the supernatural is incarnated in history, the scientific historian should be able to read it there. It would seem, then, that Blondel was presupposing faith. Both Loisy and Blondel were right in their rejection of historicism: history alone cannot prove the supernatural. While Loisy tried to develop an a-dogmatic methodology, Blondel tried to justify rationally his dogmatic reading of history. Their common problem still embarrasses many scholars.

It is important to remember that the study of Modernism has been handicapped by the partisanship of those involved. For some, the modernists have been heroes; for others, villains. The specter of Modernism still haunts the mind of "conservative" Catholics. Roma locuta est. Their concern with the modernists can only be to reiterate the earlier condemnations. The "liberal" Catholics, who might share the original intent of some modernists to renew the intellectual life within the Church, are very careful to indicate that their inspiration derives from men who have never been explicitly condemned by Rome.

Blondel in particular has been a center of controversy because "liberal" Catholics have wished to defend him against suspicion of compromising either with the modernists on the left or the reactionary scholastics on the right. While our own investigation no doubt also has its biases, it nevertheless analysed one body of material in greater detail than had previously been done. The picture of Blondel which emerges from these incidents is that of a man whose intellectual creativity and literary production seem to have been inhibited by the unhappily tense and polemical situation in which he lived and worked.

Until recent years, many of the problems raised within the Roman Catholic church by the French Modernist movement, far from having been solved by the radical disciplinary measures which abruptly ended the crisis, were simply shelved and removed from free and open discussion. In the liberalized atmosphere of Vatican II, contemporary Roman Catholic scholars, cautious in their efforts to avoid any affiliation with the condemned modernists, have nevertheless raised problems, if not identical, at least very similar to those of some seventy years ago. The nature and scope of revelation, the character and value of the Scriptures, the methods for biblical exegesis and hermeneutics, the origin and nature of the Church, the modes of expression for ecclesiastical authority and Christian tradition, the psychological, social, and cultural conditions for the

origin of Christian beliefs and practices, the history of dogmatic development, the contemporary need for demythologization, the increased understanding of man in contemporary society, and the need for the perpetual aggiornament of Christian doctrine and practice: all these problems occupied the mind of the French modernists and continue to be at the center of theological debates. Historians are invited to contribute their share by their rigorous application of a critical methodology.

Notes

- ¹Concilium, September 1966, p. 47.
- ²Poulat, E. Intégrisme et Catholicisms Intégral (Casterman, 1969), p. 40, note 49.
- ³Correspondance Blondel-Valensin, 3 vols. (Aubier, 1957-65); Au Coeur de la Crise moderniste; Le dossier inédit d'une controverse, présenté par R. Marlé (Aubier, 1960); Lettres philosophiques de Maurice Blondel (Aubier, 1961). We can add two other books edited by Claude Tresmontant, Correspondance philosophique Blondel-Laberthonnière (Seuil, 1961) and Le réalisme chrétien précédé de Essais de philosophie religieuse of Lucien Laberthonnière. Henri de Lubac is now preparing the publication of the Correspondance Blondel-Wehrlé, while his Jesuit confrère, André Blanchat, is responsible for the publication of the Correspondance Blondel-Bremond.
- ⁴See in particular, Les Semaines religieuses: Approche historique et bibliographique. Paris: Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 1958; Alfred Loisy: Sa vie, son oeuvre, par A. Houtin et F. Sartiaux; Manuscrit annoté et publié avec une bibliographie Alfred Loisy et un Index bio-bibliographique par E. Poulat. CNRS, 1960; Utopie ou anticipation? Le Journal d'un prêtre d'après-demain (1902-1903), de l'Abbé Calippe. Paris: Casterman, 1961; Histoire, dogme et critique

dans la crise moderniste. Paris: Casterman, 1962; "Néo-christianisme et Modernisme autour de Paul Desjardins," in Paul Desjardins et les Décades de Pontigny. Paris: PUF, 1964, pp. 77-103; "Une enquête anticléricale de pratique religieuse en Seine et Marne (1903) in Archives de Sociologie des Religions, 10 (1960), 109-131; "Travaux récents sur le modernisme," Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, 4 (1963), 1159-1167; "La crise moderniste," in L'Information historique, 27 (1965), 110-114; "Modernisme et Intégrisme: Du concept polémique à l'irénisme critique," in ASR, 27 (1969), 3-28; Intégrisme et Catholicisme Intégral. Paris: Casterman, 1969.