

PROSPER GUÉRANGER O.S.B. (1805–1875) AND THE STRUGGLE FOR LITURGICAL UNITY

by PETER RAEDTS

ONE of the strongest weapons in the armoury of the Roman Catholic Church has always been its impressive sense of historical continuity. Apologists, such as Bishop Bossuet (1627–1704), liked to tease their Protestant adversaries with the question of where in the world their Church had been before Luther and Calvin.¹ The question shows how important the time between ancient Christianity and the Reformation had become in Catholic apologetics since the sixteenth century. Where the Protestants had to admit that a gap of more than a thousand years separated the early Christian communities from the churches of the Reformation, Catholics could proudly point to the fact that in their Church an unbroken line of succession linked the present hierarchy to Christ and the apostles. This continuity seemed the best proof that other churches were human constructs, whereas the Catholic Church continued the mission of Christ and his disciples. In this argument the Middle Ages were essential, but not a time to dwell upon. It was not until the nineteenth century that in the Catholic Church the Middle Ages began to mean far more than proof of the Church's unbroken continuity.

The sudden interest in the Middle Ages and in the medieval Church was certainly not an exclusively Catholic affair. On the contrary, it was outside the Catholic Church, in the circles of Romantic poets and of political enemies of the French Revolution, that the Middle Ages first appeared as an alternative to the cult of reason and the ideals of freedom and equality. For enthusiastic young Catholics, however, it was not so much the Revolution, as the way in which the ecclesiastical authorities handled the restoration of the Church after 1815, that made them think about a better future for their Church. To their deep disappointment the diplomats of the Roman Curia made no effort whatsoever to clean the slate but tried, where possible, to restore the situation as it had been before the Revolution: a close alliance between throne and altar and good relations with all the princes, not just the

¹ J. B. Russell, 'Interpretations of the origins of medieval heresy', *Mediaeval Studies*, 25 (1963), p. 28.

Catholic ones.² To maintain good relations the Roman authorities were prepared to make far-reaching concessions, as for example in the case of Poland. When in 1830 the Catholic Poles revolted against the Czar, their revolution was condemned twice by Pope Gregory XVI, for whom the principle of legitimacy was more important than the oppression of his Catholic children.³ This condemnation caused a stir in all of Catholic Europe: the cowardice of Gregory XVI stood in sharp contrast to his heroic medieval predecessors, such as Gregory VII and Innocent III, both men who had not been afraid of anybody and of whom all princes of Europe had stood in awe. So it was the half-hearted policy of the Roman Curia that made young Catholics dream of an alternative: the restoration of the medieval Church, of the days when all the nations of Europe looked upon the pope as their leader, of the days when spiritual and political guidance was found *ultra montes*.

In no country was the unimaginative restoration policy of the Roman Curia more bitterly regretted than in France. The concordat of 1801 in fact restored the authority of the state over the Church. The government controlled the appointment of bishops, as it had done before 1789, and the education of the clergy in the seminaries was closely supervised by the *Ministère des cultes*. The French Church became once more, in the words of a prominent jurist, that branch of the civil service that saw to it that all Frenchmen received sufficient spiritual nourishment.⁴ Probably the grip of the state over the Church was even more absolute than before 1789, because most of the ancient liberties and privileges that had once limited the power of the civil authorities remained abolished. Priests were treated like all other civil servants, which meant that they were completely subjected to the often arbitrary decisions of their civil and ecclesiastical superiors.⁵ To gain some legal protection many younger priests began to look over the

² A. van de Sande, *La Curie romaine au début de la restauration; le problème de la continuité dans la politique de restauration du Saint-Siège en Italie, 1814-1817* (The Hague, 1979), p. 190: 'La Curie romaine suivait une ligne de conduite traditionnelle et ne se laissait pas impressionner par la tendance nouvelle de l'ultramontanisme, prônée surtout par des autres non-ecclésiastiques, issus des cercles contra-révolutionnaires. . . . On donnait la préférence à une voie diplomatique plus traditionnelle: le rétablissement de l'Alliance entre le Trône et l'Autel.'

³ R. Gildea, *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1995), p. 118.

⁴ J. Le Goff and R. Rémond, eds, *Histoire de la France religieuse. 3: Du roi très chrétien à la laïcité républicaine* (Paris, 1991), p. 117.

⁵ N. Ravitch, *The Catholic Church and the French Nation 1589-1989* (London and New York, 1990), pp. 63-4; A. Gough, *Paris and Rome. The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign 1848-1853* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 12-13.

borders of their own diocese and of their country in the direction of Rome, in the hope that perhaps the pope might shield them from the worst vagaries and fancies of their immediate superiors and restore some liberty to the French Church.⁶ The growing resistance of the younger clergy to the established Church was brilliantly articulated by the charismatic convert Hugues-Félicité de Lamennais (1782-1854), who in the years between 1820 and 1830 became one of the most influential thinkers in the Catholic Church, first in France, and later on also in the rest of Europe.

Lamennais' concern was not so much with the position of the Church as with the freedom of man. In the ever-growing power of the modern state he saw the main threat to that freedom. He was convinced that the only authority that could resist the modern state effectively was a free and independent Church powerful enough to see to it that all citizens could follow their own consciences. That is why he advocated a strong, unified Church under the direct leadership of the pope, as it had allegedly been in the Middle Ages, before the rise of the national states after 1300. The modern Church had to fight for the same *libertas* she had enjoyed in the glorious years between 1000 and 1300, when the popes had been the leaders in the fight against tyranny and state oppression.⁷ Separation from the state was a necessary condition to re-establish that liberty. These ideas became very popular with the younger French clergy, so popular, in fact, that even the condemnation of Lamennais' ideas by Pope Gregory XVI in 1832 could not stop the rapid dissemination of the ideals of Ultramontanism all over Europe. Within a short span of thirty years Ultramontanism changed from a utopian dream of a few French hotheads into official Church policy. Few did more to spread the dream than Prosper Louis Guéranger.

* * *

Guéranger was born in 1805 in a small town to the west of Le Mans. In 1822 he went to the seminary of Le Mans, and was ordained a priest in 1827. During those years he became an ardent admirer of Lamennais' ideas about the renewal of the Church. Where Lamennais, however,

⁶ R. Gibson, *A Social History of French Catholicism 1789-1914* (London and New York, 1989), pp. 60-1.

⁷ H. J. Pottmeyer, *Unfehlbarkeit und Souveränität. Die päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit im System der ultramontanen Ekklesiologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz, 1975), p. 29; Ravitch, *Catholic Church*, pp. 72-3.

saw a strong Church as a guarantee of civil liberty, Guéranger was fascinated by the idea of a centralized Church unified under a strong Roman authority as such: politically he always belonged to the extreme right. In that sense Guéranger was not unique. From the beginning Lamennais had not only inspired a Catholic liberalism but also an ideal of papal theocracy linked with all the right-wing political forces opposed to the French Revolution.⁸ What Guéranger contributed to the development of Ultramontanism was not his passion for the pope, nor his reactionary political ideas, but his unique insight into the possibilities of the liturgy as a way of visualizing the unity of the Church and the authority of the pope everywhere in the Catholic world.

Liturgical unity was, in the nineteenth century, not a new idea in the Catholic Church. In 1570 Pope Pius V had prescribed the reformed Roman Missal for all Latin Christians. He had, however, exempted from that rule all dioceses and religious orders that had liturgies older than two hundred years. That exception meant, in fact, that most dioceses in France did not have to change to the Roman liturgy but were allowed to stick to their own traditions of which they were very proud, not in the least for political reasons. The existence of Gallican liturgies was, in their eyes, living proof that the French Church had always kept its distance from Rome, and was firmly resolved to keep it in the future as well. Therefore, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries most French dioceses had carefully reformed their liturgies and adapted them to the classical tastes of those days, which strengthened the conviction that the Gallican traditions were far superior to the Roman liturgy. The Revolution had brought no change in this respect; the French stuck to their own diverse rituals.

Guéranger was the first to complain about the liturgical diversity of the French Church. As early as 1830 he published four articles in the *Mémorial catholique*, an organ of Lamennais and his disciples, about the scandalous liturgical chaos in France.⁹ Guéranger's firm conviction that liturgical unity was essential to the success of the Church's renewal was strengthened in the years after 1830, when he was able to realize his second dream, the restoration of monastic life in France. In 1833 he bought the abandoned priory of Solesmes and, with a few friends, he

⁸ R. Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven, CT, and London, 1994), pp. 234–8.

⁹ A survey of these articles may be found in C. Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger (1805–1875): a Liturgical Theologian*, Studia Anselmiana, 89 (= Analecta liturgica, 9) (Rome, 1984), p. 31.

formed a monastic community there under the rule of St Benedict. In the new monastery the solemn celebration of the liturgy was to take precedence over everything else, just as, in Guéranger's imagination, it had been in the medieval monastery of Cluny.¹⁰ It was in Solesmes that Guéranger wrote his most successful and influential work, the *Institutions liturgiques*, the first part of which was published in 1840.¹¹

The *Institutions* are often described as a monument of that longing for the Middle Ages so characteristic of Guéranger's age.¹² That is not untrue, but the means and the end have to be distinguished very carefully. Guéranger wanted to be the champion of the Church of Rome and to restore all other churches to liturgical unity with the Roman See.¹³ One of the means to reach that end was a review of the history of the liturgy, with an emphasis on the Middle Ages, when the unity that Guéranger so much wanted for his own time had existed for a short period. The thrust of the book is more political than historical; Guéranger did not so much want to describe the past as to change the present.

* * *

The main reason to introduce the Roman liturgy throughout the Church was, according to Guéranger, that it was the only tradition free from all stains of heresy.¹⁴ Only in the Roman rite were all elements of the apostolic liturgy preserved; her *antiquité* stood in sharp contrast to the *nouveautés* introduced by heretics and schismatics in successive periods.¹⁵ To prove his claim Guéranger sums up a number of very ancient rituals in the Roman liturgy, such as the breaking of the bread, the mixing of water and wine, and the kiss of peace.¹⁶ He is absolutely certain that the Roman Canon is of apostolic origin. For, as he says, one cannot imagine that the apostles did not give exact rules for the celebration of the most fundamental of all Christian mysteries. As that is not imaginable, therefore it is impossible.¹⁷ With this kind of

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹¹ Originally the *Institutions* appeared in 3 vols, published in 1840, 1841, and 1851. I use the 2nd unaltered edn, published in 4 vols (Paris, 1878-85).

¹² So for example Gough, *Paris and Rome*, p. 122.

¹³ Guéranger, *Institutions*, 1, pp. lxix-lxx, lxxv.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 200: 'La liturgie romaine seule est vierge de toute erreur, comme l'Église qui la promulgue.'

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 399-400.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 30, 33, 36.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 34.

rhetorical trick several Roman traditions are traced back to apostolic times. Very cleverly he cites an ancient custom, preserved in the major basilicas in Rome, of the priest celebrating mass facing the congregation. That seemed to be much more like the habit of early Christians to gather around the altar than the later tradition of celebration where the priest had his back to the people, normal in all churches in Guéranger's own days. The conclusion must be that only Rome had preserved a link with the first, pure Christian community that had been lost in all other churches.

In this argument the medieval Church plays the same part as it did in the works of Bossuet and other Catholic apologists. The study of the liturgy of the Middle Ages is necessary to prove that there always has been a continuous development, that the Roman liturgy now is the logical conclusion to a long development reaching back to the first days of Christianity. This must be emphasised, because it qualifies the received wisdom that Guéranger belonged to a generation of romantics who wanted to restore the medieval Church. What Guéranger admired in the Roman liturgy was not its medieval but its apostolic character; it still breathed the spirit of the first Church gathered around St Peter in Rome. It had been the invaluable work of Pope Gregory the Great that the ancient Roman traditions, at the moment when they were threatened with extinction, had been collected and codified and been handed on to the barbarians who in the Middle Ages became the heirs to the Roman Church and Empire.¹⁸

The historic importance of the Middle Ages was that the whole of the Western Church between 500 and 1500 gradually introduced the apostolic Roman liturgy and thus began to form a visibly united society gathered around the Roman pontiff. At this point Guéranger is remarkably similar to other romantics: to him as to the others the Middle Ages were the time of order and unity, of a well-organized Christian society. He stressed two periods in particular, the Carolingian era and the age of Pope Gregory VII.

The first opportunity to unite all the western Church under Rome came with the alliance between the pope and the Franks in 751. After centuries of upheaval the Franks wanted to restore western Europe to political unity. For this they desperately needed the support of the papacy, because they themselves could not contribute much more than

¹⁸ Guéranger, *Institutions*, I, pp. 154-66.

military power to this project. Real cultural unity had to come from Rome. This step was taken when Pope Stephen II launched the proposal to make the Roman liturgy compulsory for all the Frankish king's subjects.¹⁹ Guéranger emphasises that the initiative for this reform came from the pope, who now saw the opportunity to implement a policy designed by his predecessors, to elevate the papacy to the central position it ought to have had in western civilization a long time before. What was achieved was much more than liturgical unity. Because the liturgy is 'le plus grand mobile de la civilisation d'un peuple', unity on this essential point meant, in fact, the creation of a new Western-Christian culture.²⁰ The popes stood at the origin of that culture, and the Roman Church was its heart.²¹

This is a colourful but not very accurate description of what actually happened between the popes and the Frankish kings. It is true that the Frankish kings, Charlemagne in particular, wanted liturgical unity; but the initiative was theirs and not the pope's. It is also true that there was a cultural revival; but its centre was in Aachen and not in Rome. Guéranger must have been so obsessed by what he wanted for his own time that he perhaps could not see that the Frankish kings used the papacy to achieve a political and religious unity on their conditions and under their leadership. If the Franks had a model, it was the imperial government at Constantinople, not the Roman court. To Guéranger the eighth century was the time when the powerful Gallican Church gave up its independence and bowed its head before 'la Mère et Maîtresse des Églises . . . d'assurer à jamais dans son propre sein la perpétuité d'une inviolable orthodoxie'. It was a sad contrast with the French Church of later days, when the clergy became set upon destroying the unity with Rome and its apostolic liturgy.²² Pope Gregory VII completed the work of his predecessors by adding the liberated areas of Spain to the Roman unity and forbidding the old Mozarabic liturgy. By 1100 the papal project was finished, all of western Europe was united in one Roman culture, the 'unité sociale catholique' was a fact.²³

Alas, not for long. Despite the ceaseless efforts of the popes, quite

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 235.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, p. 243.

²¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 237.

²² *Ibid.*, I, p. 233.

²³ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 268-70, 278.

soon the Roman liturgy became overgrown again with the weeds of local traditions. The main reason was that the piety of medieval man was fervent, but 'peu éclairé', especially in the later Middle Ages. That is why Guéranger warns his readers not to be too uncritical in their praises of the Middle Ages. It is now the fashion, he says, to speak lovingly of those 'siècles catholiques', but one should not forget that in those days people were also ignorant and superstitious, and invented all sorts of strange rites that overran the purity of the ancient Roman liturgy.²⁴

In the sixteenth century everyone agreed that a thorough reform of the liturgy was necessary. Many unfortunately turned their back on Rome and tried to reform the Church on their own. Guéranger's verdict on this reform is succinct: it resulted in nothing but an 'immense secte antiliturgique', and necessarily, therefore, heretical, because anyone who started opposing the liturgy ended by lapsing into heresy.²⁵ Fortunately, after the Council of Trent, the papacy took matters into its own hands and started the true reform: abolition of all medieval superstition, and restoration of the ancient Roman tradition. The result was the Roman Missal of 1570 which was to be the norm for all the Western Church. Unfortunately, what followed was a sad repetition of the later Middle Ages: local usage prevailed over the Roman liturgy once again, in France even more than in other countries. For his own time Guéranger saw it as his task to do what had been tried in the days of Charlemagne and of the Counter-Reformation; restoration of the Roman rite in all the Catholic Church.

Once again it must be noted that Guéranger's admiration for the Middle Ages was qualified. The liturgy that he so much admired originated not in the Middle Ages, but in apostolic times. Despite frantic efforts of the popes, medieval Christians were unable to understand the simplicity and purity of the Roman tradition. The only real merit of the medieval Church had been its quest for visible unity, and the subsequent efforts to spread the Roman liturgy all over the Church as a token of that unity. It had only been a very partial success, limited to the hundred years or so after the pontificate of Gregory VII, but that was the period and the unity to which Guéranger wanted the Catholic Church now to return.

* * *

²⁴ Guéranger, *Institutions*, I, pp. 320, 346-7.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 391, 396.

The question that remains is why Guéranger considered unity in the celebration of the liturgy so important. The answer to that question is given in the first lines of the *Institutions*. The liturgy is far more than praying together instead of alone, it is 'la prière considérée à l'état social'.²⁶ Where the same words and the same rituals are used, Christians are welded together into one community of mind and heart. Guéranger saw very well that inward unity can hardly exist without outward conformity in word and gesture. His argument was that the Church is not a community of spirits but of people. And as in man the body is the expression of the soul, so in the Church the liturgy embodies the truth of the Catholic faith in signs and gestures. The Christian dogma penetrates deepest not when uttered in words, but where it is celebrated liturgically, when abstract truths through ceremonials and rites become concrete realities.²⁷ That is why heresies, such as Calvinism and Anglicanism, were so successful with the people. The first thing they did was put an end to the ancient liturgy and create new rituals and formulae. When that had been done, the preaching of the new faith started; the word of the preacher followed the change of ritual.²⁸

The social character of the liturgy was not limited to its communal celebrations. Guéranger insisted that the private prayers of the clergy must follow the same rules as the Church's public prayers, because at every moment a priest should be aware that his prayers were not a private devotion but an 'acte de religion sociale'.²⁹ Guéranger rejected, therefore, the reform of the breviary, proposed by the sixteenth-century humanist Cardinal Quinoñez, because it made it too much a book for private meditation.³⁰ Such a distinction between private and public prayer was fundamentally wrong: even in their most personal prayers priests should be constantly soaking up the spirit and social unity of the Church.³¹

²⁶ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 1, 99.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 4-5: 'Et, comme l'Église est une société, non d'esprits, mais d'hommes, créatures composées d'âme et de corps, qui traduisent toute vérité sous des images et des signes, portant eux-mêmes dans leur corps une forme ineffable de leur âme; dans l'Église, disons-nous, ce céleste ensemble de *confession*, de *prière* et de *louange*, parlé dans un langage sacré, modulé sur un rythme surnaturel, se produit aussi par les signes extérieurs, rites et cérémonies, qui sont le corps de la liturgie.'

²⁸ *Ibid.*, I, p. 397.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 4.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 358-68.

³¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 379.

In the Middle Ages there had been a short period when all nations and races in Europe had been linked together in one common prayer and thus had been moulded into a 'nationalité unique en Occident',³² a revealing expression because it betrays that Guéranger thought of the Church as a sort of superstate destined to embrace all nations in the one Catholic faith. That thought as such was not original. Many Ultramontane Catholics were convinced that the only true fatherland of the Christian should be the Church and not a secular state.³³ Guéranger's original contribution is that he emphasises that this ideal of an all-embracing Church state should be expressed in concrete ritual unity, so that to all it becomes visible that the Church does not recognize races and nations, but that to her all mankind is one united family, joined together in one common liturgy and one common language, both inherited from Rome.³⁴

* * *

Guéranger's book was an immediate success. Although the first reactions were often very negative, with more than sixty bishops rejecting any proposal to introduce the Roman liturgy in their dioceses, the publication of the *Institutions* was a turning point in the relations of the French Church with Rome. In less than forty years the Roman liturgy was introduced in all French dioceses; the last diocese that gave up its own traditions was Orléans in 1875.³⁵ This is reason enough to ask why Guéranger's book was so immensely successful.

It cannot have been because of its scholarly qualities. Guéranger's quaint efforts to prove the apostolic origin of the Roman liturgy are uncritical to say the least. But perhaps that was an advantage, if social influence was what was really aimed at. In the *Institutions* Guéranger created a myth: the image that he gave of the Church's past was crystal clear, everyone could understand it, and, even more important, could use it as a weapon in the present. And the present was what Guéranger was really interested in. He was also very clever in attracting publicity for his ideas. He fully recognized the power of the modern media and used them to perfection. His great ally in the media circus was the notorious journalist Louis Veuillot, who in his weekly paper, *L'Univers*,

³² Guéranger, *Institutions* 1, pp. 347-8.

³³ Gough, *Paris and Rome*, pp. 92-3.

³⁴ Guéranger, *Institutions*, 1, p. 278.

³⁵ Johnson, *Guéranger*, p. 204. The only diocese that kept some, but not much, of its own ritual was Lyons.

supported Guéranger's struggle with all available means, not always in the best of tastes.

To Guéranger's credit it must be said that he was original and far ahead of his time in one respect. He was the first to appreciate the crucial role of ritual in religious communities. Almost instinctively, and long before anthropologists said so, he saw that religion as a cultural system is not so much held together by words and by organizations, but by shared rituals that 'establish powerful, pervasive and long-lasting moods and motivations in men'.³⁶ Guéranger's curious diagnosis of the success of the Reformation, that the reformers had to change the ritual before their word could be heard, shows his conviction. Here it is stated explicitly, but it is implicit everywhere in the book, that the Christian faith has no firm roots and cannot stand united without a common liturgical tradition. What Guéranger does in the *Institutions* is to show a way to form a coherent religious community and to keep it alive and strong. And that might, in the last analysis, well be the real explanation for the phenomenal success of his work.

The date of publication, 1840, is crucial. It was in that year that France, and all of continental Europe, stood on the verge of revolutionary social and economic changes. The onset of industrialization and the development of modern transport were the end of face-to-face communities, the world of villages and small towns, that since the beginning of history had been the normal form of social life for the vast majority of people. Even if people in the days before industrialization belonged to a larger organization, that organization had an impact only through its local representative, in the case of the Church, the rector of the parish. The faithful were loyal to priest and parish, not to the universal Church. That is why liturgical unity, even if desired, was an impossibility before the second half of the nineteenth century.

All that changed after 1850. In the industrialized world loyalties could no longer be based on family ties and/or personal acquaintance. People started moving and travelling on a scale as never before and if they wanted to find roots, it had to be in much larger communities where loyalties were impersonal and abstract, because there were far too many people in them to know everyone personally. In a happy phrase the anthropologist Benedict Anderson invented the term

³⁶ 'Religion as a cultural system', in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973), p. 90.

'imagined communities' to describe these new constructs. Very convincingly he shows that coherence and loyalty in these unnatural, constructed communities is only possible if their members, somehow, become aware that at the same moment they do the same things, which evoke the same feelings and the same thoughts. Such coherence must rest on a common language and a shared culture that usually forms its own organization in a unified and centralized political entity: the nation state.³⁷

I have argued elsewhere that the Catholic Church in the second half of the nineteenth century underwent revolutionary changes similar to other European communities and cultures, and that in that period the Church responded in the same way to the challenges of industrial society by organizing itself in the form of a nation state, or as it was called in neo-scholastic jargon, a *societas perfecta*.³⁸ Guéranger was the man who showed the Catholics how to achieve it. He saw clearly that the days of many traditions and local diversities were over and that the Church, like secular society, had to be changed into a centralized organization with one language and one common culture. He shaped the dream that Catholics could form one community of mind and heart, because from Manilla to Alaska and from Oslo to Cape Town they prayed in the same language and used exactly the same gestures and rituals. Thus he showed Catholics how they could form an imagined community, of which no longer the parish, not even the diocese, but the universal Roman Church was the horizon. In his *Institutions liturgiques* he created the historical myths on which such a community could be founded. His plea for a return to the happy days of the Middle Ages when the popes in collaboration with Charlemagne had created a 'nationalité unique en Occident' showed the Church a way not just to survive the age of nationalism but through liturgical change to come to a new period of growth and prosperity.

University of Nijmegen

³⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd edn (London and New York, 1991), pp. 6, 76-7.

³⁸ P. Raedts, 'De christelijke Middeleeuwen als mythe', *Tijdschrift voor Theologie*, 30 (1990), pp. 146-58.