

STIMMEN DER ZEIT AND BENEDIKTINISCHE MONATS- SCHRIFT

THE DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF TWO RELIGIOUS ORDERS TO THE CULTURAL COMMUNICATION OF THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC

JOACHIM SCHMIEDL

THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS LABORATORY OF THE MODERN ERA

Seen from the vantage point of Church history, the period between the two World Wars (1914-18 and 1939-45) was one in which many exciting developments took place. Intellectual and spiritual ideas that had already been evolving in the final decade of the 19th century under the flag of *Lebensreform* (reform of life), and which had contributed to social change and modernization in Germany under the Kaiser, could be taken up again after the First World War. The political implication of the 'nervousness', defined by Volker Ullrich and others as a mark of the emergence of Germany as a great power, was an increase in military armament as a result of industrial progress and the rapid assimilation of belated colonialism, through which Germany believed it had been emancipated in the midst of the nations. The First World War, which some intellectual and middle-class circles interpreted as redemption from a torturous sleep, could not slow down the modernization of German culture. However, it complemented the necessary reorientations: Germany had to psychologically come to terms with the war, and, with the end of the monarchy, it had to define its political position in the new unstable democratic phase of government.

The period between the two World Wars, which in Germany can be divided into the time under the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, saw the development of models of religious thinking, belief and life that could only prove their value and find general acceptance within the Church as a whole after the Second Vatican Council and its accompanying developments. There was a new understanding of and openness to the meaning of 'Church'. Romano Guardini's classic statement about 'the Church that awakens in souls', testifies to its intimate relationship, to the mystery

of the Church as the mystical body of Christ (*corpus Christi mysticum*).¹ This Church became a reality in small groups, in particular among educated Catholic youth and in academic circles. The sense of belonging to a community within the Church became a religious experience through the celebration of the liturgy. The Liturgical Movement was one of the forces that exercised a profound influence on Catholic life in central Europe. Active participation in the liturgy changed the Catholic laity's self-awareness in relation to a largely clerical Church.

Some contemporaries, who watched these developments with keen interest, interpreted them as signs of a great cultural crisis and – without a doubt – this interpretation is justified. They saw that the 'objective' reality, manifested in the inaccessible institutions of the Church and the monarchy, was disintegrating. Oswald Spengler was not alone in fearing 'the Decline of the West'. The changes were noted, but the solutions were only present in an embryonic state. Let me quote two voices that were raised in 1924. Jesuit Father Max Pribilla (1884-1956) analyzed the contradictory phenomena of the 'roaring twenties' as follows: "It is a confusing, uprooted time in which we find ourselves. The most complete opposites exist side by side: craving for pleasure and the most bitter poverty; utter conscientiousness and incredible brutalization; the most warm-hearted love for others and crass selfishness; crystal-clear reasoning and hazy mysticism; blind belief in miracles and gross materialism. All the phenomena reveal profound dissatisfaction with the existing order, and helplessness as to what should replace it. There is a widespread twilight state between knowledge and faith, which many proclaim and rashly praise as the awakening of a religious spirit. Yet in essentials it reflects disappointment over lost ideals, and at best reveals a longing for something better to take their place. A cultural crisis is stealing through Europe, but there is no doubt that it has manifested itself most sharply in Germany."²

Benedictine Father Alois Mager (1883-1946) concentrated on the interplay between the individual and society: "The characteristic mark of our times is that subjectivism and individualism, which have forcefully broken through the limits set by Christianity, have hit their lowest point in every respect. Only a community that can unite these independent individuals can save the situation. It is the only thing that can save us and our culture from disaster. Indeed, it will create a culture in which all its members have to contribute their share. Our answer must be to create an all-embracing culture out of the spirit of faith and love. Then the future of our culture will also belong to the Church. And the spiritualized individual human beings who form the Church in the unity of love are called from within to work for a positive culture in a way that has never been done before. What St Augustine envisaged in his City of God becomes an empirical reality in the Catholic Church - a community founded on love."³

¹ Guardini, *The Church and the Catholic*.

² Pribilla, "Kulturwende und Katholizismus" in: *Stimmen der Zeit* (hereafter *SdZ*), 107 (1924), 259.

³ Mager, "Kulturschaffen und Christentum" in: *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* (hereafter *BMS*), 6 (1924), 238.

A PROFILE OF PERIODICALS PUBLISHED BY RELIGIOUS ORDERS

The very different approach of the two authors to the cultural crisis brings us to the subject of this contribution. Pribilla and Mager represent the two largest Catholic orders in Germany during the first half of the 20th century, the Jesuits and Benedictines. The Benedictines, who only formed a confederation of autonomous congregations in 1893, rapidly acquired a place for themselves in the German-speaking countries after their dissolution in the Kulturkampf. Above all, the Liturgical Movement and the pastoral care of elites, such as academics and the nobility, owe a great deal to them. The presence of the Jesuits in the German Reich, despite being the worst affected by the provisions of the Kulturkampf, was in fact never interrupted. They continued to work underground, or from neighbouring countries, conducting missions and advising other religious communities, and through publications in Germany's Catholic press. The official lifting of the ban in 1917 opened up a broad field of activity in academic circles.

Both the Benedictines and the Jesuits formed international communicative communities. The interaction between the Roman Generalate and the Provinces was typical for the Jesuits. Both orders had widely read publications. The Jesuits began publishing their periodical *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (Voices from Maria Laach), with programmatic articles in defence of the Syllabus and the First Vatican Council, in 1865. At first it appeared at irregular intervals, but from July 1871 *Stimmen* became a monthly. Its aim was to defend the ultramontane position with regard to the papacy. Since it was edited and published by the Jesuits, the periodical suffered the same fate as the Jesuits in the Kulturkampf. What was intended as a programme - combining the name with the place of publication - only lasted a few years. Starting in 1874 the editors worked from Schloss Robiano (in Tervuren near Brussels), and from 1880 their centre was in Blyenbeek, from 1885 in Exaten, from 1899 in Luxemburg, and finally, from 1909 in Valkenburg (the Netherlands). By keeping the name, they aimed to keep the founding impulse of the periodical alive. "The fruitful truths of reason, faith in Christ, and the moral teaching of the Church were their foundation, while service to the Church and its head were their motivation and source of life."⁴

A constant objective of the editors was to take note of "the prevailing changes in the currents of the life of the Spirit",⁵ and to comment on them from the standpoint of the Church. In the tension between Reform Catholicism and Integralism, between openness towards the times and criticism of the times, their aim was "to serve the times without obeying them. They wanted to speak from within the times for their times, in a timely and yet timeless way."⁶

During the First World War this programme also became their name. In order to allow the new start of the Benedictines on the Laach Lake sufficient scope, the Jesuits changed the name of their periodical to *Stimmen der Zeit* (Voices of the Times).

⁴ Redaktion, "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Stimmen der Zeit" in: *SdZ*, 88 (1915), 2.

⁵ Ibidem.

⁶ Ibidem.

By numbering the volumes continuously,⁷ they continued the fifty-year tradition of the publication, while the subtitle “Catholic Weekly for the life of the Spirit today” positioned them in the ranks of those who analyzed the times. The aspiration and intention of *Stimmen der Zeit* was to interpret, evaluate and live in this new era as a witness to the truth.⁸

The Benedictines had to stop the publication of the *St. Benedikts-Stimmen*, edited by the monks of the Abbey Emaus in Prague, after the First World War. It was continued as the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift zur Pflege religiösen und geistigen Lebens* (Benedictine Monthly for the Purpose of Cultivating Religious and Intellectual Life), the first number of which appeared in 1919. Published by the Archabbey of Beuron, it concentrated on religious life to distinguish itself from the Jesuit monthly. Its programme and the main emphasis of its content could be perceived in the first issue, which highlighted religious art in a special way. This was evident in the picture inserts, drawn mainly from the studio of Desiderius Lenz, a monk of Beuron Abbey, as well as in the poems, which were sometimes anonymous. The Benedictines had an ancient educational tradition; this too was referred to in many ways in the magazine, especially through essays on the history of Benedictine cloisters and schools. The longer history of the Benedictines was also reflected in the ‘big names’ in theology that they quoted. While grappling with contemporary philosophy and theology was central to the Jesuit publication, the Benedictines preferred to hark back to the Church Fathers and medieval writers. In this sense they were completely in line with the theological discussions of that time. Their articles on the liturgy were also programmatic. This demonstrates their most obvious difference with *Stimmen*, which merely acknowledged the existence of the Liturgical Movement, while not dealing with it in any way comparable to the Benedictine periodical. The first issue, which printed two articles on ‘Liturgy and Art’, and a historical survey of the celebration of the Eucharist, demonstrates this. The difference in content between the two periodicals was also evident in the book reviews, which were more comprehensive and varied than in the Jesuit publication.

The difference between the two periodicals can also be perceived in their readership. The *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* aimed at liturgically interested, academically educated people, mostly priests and friends of Benedictine monasteries. This periodical also served as an internal news magazine for the German-speaking congregations of the Benedictine order. The readership of *Stimmen der Zeit*, on the other hand, came mainly from the academically interested conservative German Catholics. During the 1920s, however, conflicts arose between this target group, advocated by the superiors of the Jesuit order, and the editor’s openness to modern intellectual challenges. The ‘sentire cum ecclesia’ was questioned. But due to the lack of suitable editors from the more conservative mainstream of the order, the magazine continued to discuss all subjects in a frank manner.⁹

⁷ Each year two volumes were published, each of which contained six monthly magazines. This has continued until the present.

⁸ Redaktion, “Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Stimmen der Zeit”, 3.

⁹ Schatz, “*Stimmen der Zeit* im Kirchenkonflikt” in: *SdZ*, 113 (2006) 3, 147–161.

THE AUTHORS

STIMMEN DER ZEIT

Each magazine in the semi-annual volume of editions, which comprised 500-600 pages (more than 1000 pages each year), was divided into three sections: longer articles on a subject, followed by a 'survey', which offered reports of events and interpretations of the times. A comprehensive series of book reviews came at the end of the magazine.

Stimmen was a mouthpiece of the Society of Jesus; this is evident from the choice of contributors. Between 1918 and 1933, 284 men and women contributed to *Stimmen der Zeit*. Of these, 15%, or 44, were not members of the Society of Jesus, while two were women (Oda Schneider and Edith Stein). With the exception of a Papal document in 1921, until 1928, the Jesuits contributed all the articles themselves. Only then were other individual authors included. Only eight of the non-Jesuit authors contributed more than one article, and none more than five.

Initially *Stimmen* offered the Jesuits a welcome opportunity to give their young academics a chance to practice their skills. In the period under consideration, 62 authors were engaged only in writing book reviews. Of these, 61 were Jesuits. A further 110 authors contributed only one article, of whom 21 were additional Jesuits writing book reviews. Between the World Wars the section dealing with book reviews, and hence the evaluation of new publications on philosophy, theology and the humanities, remained in the hands of the Jesuits. The non-Jesuit writers made their contributions in their highly specialised fields, that is, the history of music and art, films and psychotherapy, journalism, astronomy, medicine and the education of women. Naturally those Jesuits who were acknowledged specialists as a result of special studies in non-theological fields were also included.

Those writers who contributed articles more often deserve special mention. Between 1918 and 1933, thirty authors each contributed more than ten articles. Among them we find important members of the Society of Jesus, such as Erich Przywara, Max Pribilla, Constantin Noppel, Peter Lippert, Bernhard Duhr, Erich Wasmann, Joseph Grisar, Gustav Gundlach and Oswald von Nell-Breuning. They illustrate the internal intellectual Jesuit network of *Stimmen der Zeit*.

Erich Przywara (1889-1972) was a member of the editorial board from 1922 until the magazine was suppressed. He was an important comparative theologian whose main field of study lay in working out a new metaphysical system (*Analogia entis*). Przywara was one of the theological teachers of Hans Urs von Balthasar, who was a confrere at that time, and who was the first to publish an appreciation of Przywara's philosophy. He entered into discussion with Protestant theologians, such as Karl Barth and Paul Tillich. He also adapted the phenomenological philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Max Scheler. He was on a friendly footing with Husserl and his student, Edith Stein. He made Søren Kierkegaard and John Henry Newman known in Germany through debut articles in *Stimmen*. Przywara became widely known through his extensive lectures for the Catholic Association for Academics. Przywara, with 79 articles that mainly followed the philosophical and theological tendencies, was the most productive contributor to *Stimmen der Zeit* in the period under discussion.

Jakob Overmans (1874-1945), who contributed 78 articles, perused the cultural landscape. He covered an impressive range of subjects. He discussed Scandinavian writers such as August Strindberg and Henrik Ibsen, as well as the cultural scene in Hungary, France and India. Following a study tour of the US, he warned against the 'Americanization of the spirit'¹⁰ and deduced from it the demand for a connection to be set up between academic studies and the tendencies of the times. From 1939, Overmans wrote a regular 'cultural report' in which he surveyed international events and developments from a Catholic point of view. He was supported in his observations of the cultural landscape by Josef Kreitmaier (1874-1946), whose main interests lay in the fine arts, painting and music. From 1927-1936 he was the editor of the periodical.

In 1921, Pribilla (1884-1954) joined the editorial team of *Stimmen der Zeit*. He had been a field chaplain in the First World War. In his editorial work he deepened the ecumenical contacts he had made at that time. Many of his contributions dealt with Protestant theology and the possibility of reuniting the Confessions. He commented on the Ecumenical Movement with keen interest. He was a critical observer of the rise of National Socialism.

Constantin Noppel (1883-1945) introduced other points of view into the magazine. From 1922-1932 he was the regional director of Caritas in Munich before becoming the Rector of the Collegium Germanicum in Rome (1932-1935). Noppel promoted the emerging Caritas organisation through his articles. He was as concerned about welfare work and the movement for total abstinence as he was about socialism and the efforts to bring about just social laws. His obituaries kept alive the memory of Caritas pioneers, such as Lorenz Werthmann and Carl Sonnenschein.

Peter Lippert (1879-1936) covered a wide range of subjects. He was one of the Jesuit order's most important spiritual writers of the 20th century. His fields of interest covered religion and prayer, and he also appreciated the Indian philosopher Rabindranath Tagore and the Russian writer Dostoyevsky, Benedikt Momme Nissen, the author of the '*Rembrandtdeutscher*', and Johann Michael Sailer. He considered it most important to look outside the Catholic Church; so did his confrere, Heinrich Sierp (1873-1955), who wrote a review of the Stockholm Conference for practical Christianity (1925) and an article on the Hindu Sadhu Sundar Singh.

The name of the 'ant priest', Erich Wasmann (1859-1931), symbolizes Jesuit interest in the natural sciences. His regular contributions included a critical discussion of Ernst Haeckel's monism. In order to "overcome the materialism of the biological sciences"¹¹ he presented a "Christian approach to nature in the light of the results of modern research".¹² After his death, *Stimmen* published a series of five articles containing vignettes of his memories of his youth - a rare example of biographical appreciation.

Through the large number of contributors, *Stimmen der Zeit* managed to cover a broad spectrum of trends inside and outside the Church. Each author presented

¹⁰ Overmans, "Amerikanisierung des Geistes" in: *SdZ*, 118 (1930), 161-173.

¹¹ Wasmann, "Die Überwindung des Materialismus in den biologischen Wissenschaften" in: *SdZ*, 101 (1921), 305-314.

¹² Idem, "Die christliche Naturauffassung im Lichte der modernen Forschungsergebnisse" in: *SdZ*, 100 (1921), 125-138.

something from his particular subject or personal circumstances. Their perceptions helped *Stimmen* to become one of the best and most respected publications in the field of theology and the humanities during the Weimar period, and the focal point of the Catholic intelligentsia. Although it still had to compensate for inferiority complexes, the breadth of subjects covered nevertheless enabled *Stimmen* to offer a good example of what Catholic intellectuals were capable of, despite the fact that circulation had its peak of 8000 copies in 1935.

But it was exactly this attitude that provoked controversy within the Jesuit orders. Denounced by Cologne Cardinal Karl Joseph Schulte (1871-1941), North German Superior Bernhard Bley (1879-1962) noticed an increase in the periodicals' influence in Protestant circles. The *Stimmen* were no longer 'leader in Catholic Germany'. This observation was confirmed by South German Provincial Theobald Fritz (1878-1956), who identified a decrease of influence in conservative Church milieus.¹³ The themes and the authors show clearly that both superiors were well aware of the obstacles that Catholicism in general and members of religious communities and priests in particular, had to face in the period after the modernist controversy.

BENEDIKTINISCHE MONATSSCHRIFT

The *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* was about half the size of *Stimmen der Zeit*. Its annual output covered between 450-550 pages. The main articles were about ten pages in length. However, these were repeatedly printed in instalments that were continued over a number of issues. Communication between the autonomous Benedictine monasteries included information about deaths, the election of abbots and other events specific to the Benedictines.

About 81% of the contributors were Benedictines (193 of 238). Of the remaining 45 contributors mentioned by name, the Cistercians, Dominicans and Franciscans each had one representative. Between 1919 and 1933, 23 authors each contributed more than ten articles.¹⁴ Eight women (3,3%) had articles published in the *Monatsschrift*, of which only Edith Stein was not a Benedictine. With the exception of Hugo Lang, Stein is also the only writer who contributed to both periodicals. In *Stimmen* she presented an article on "the foundations of women's education",¹⁵ and in the *Monatsschrift* she continued the subject, dealing with "fashioning life according to the spirit of St Elizabeth",¹⁶ "problems in the education of women",¹⁷ and "incorporating woman into the Corpus Christi mysticum".¹⁸ The last article presented by Stein appeared only after she had been dismissed from her post as lecturer at the German Institute for Scientific Pedagogy in Munster by the Nazi regime.

Edith Stein (1891-1942) visited Beuron for the first time in 1927 on the recommendation of Przywara S.J. Przywara and the Beuron Benedictine, Daniel Feuling

¹³ Schatz, "Stimmen der Zeit im Kirchenkonflikt" in: *SdZ*, 113 (2006) 3, 148.

¹⁴ Since many of the short articles were published anonymously, the quota is inaccurate.

¹⁵ Stein, "Grundlagen der Frauenbildung" in: *SdZ*, 120 (1931), 414-424.

¹⁶ Idem, "Lebensgestaltung im Geist der hl. Elisabeth" in: *BMS*, 13 (1931), 366-377.

¹⁷ Idem, "Probleme der Frauenbildung" in: *BMS*, 14 (1932), 356-371, 436-444 and 15 (1933), 24-44, 110-122.

¹⁸ Idem, "Eingliederung der Frau in das Corpus Christi mysticum" in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 412-425.

(1882-1947),¹⁹ initiated the publication of the complete works of Cardinal John Henry Newman in German, and were able to win Stein's cooperation in translating his letters and diaries. Feuling, who as a Thomist philosopher had disseminated Edmund Husserl's phenomenology, was a professor of fundamental theology and Christian philosophy at the University of Salzburg from 1924-1933. In the 28 articles he wrote for the *Monatsschrift*, he repeatedly tackled subjects that mediated between Thomism and contemporary philosophy.

From 1927, Mager was also lecturing at the University of Salzburg, where the Benedictines had again opened a seminary in 1924. This Beuron monk, who had also studied psychology, was the specialist on mysticism in the period between the two World Wars, and "pioneer of a new understanding of mysticism".²⁰ Dietrich von Hildebrand, who had drawn Feuling's attention to Stein, was one of Mager's Munich contacts. His spiritual inspiration contributed to the start of the Benedictine 'Community Venio'. Mager, with 48 articles one of the most productive contributors to the *Monatsschrift* in the period under discussion, supported the efforts to found a Catholic University in Salzburg, and as a result was the main champion of the Salzburg University Weeks that started in 1931.

The only contributor as productive as Mager in the *Monatsschrift* was Anselm Manser (1876-1951),²¹ a Beuron monk who had been born in Appenzell. He was working at the Benedictine University College as lecturer in patrology and liturgy, and had written new liturgical texts for a number of dioceses and monasteries. He was the first head of the Beuron Palimpsest Institute. However, his main field of work was the library, through which he came into contact with many scholars, among them Max Scheler, Romano Guardini and Martin Heidegger.

The Archabbey of Beuron, which with 64 authors was the greatest contributor to the *Monatsschrift*, had stood for a certain form of Christian art since its inception. Desiderius Lenz (1832-1927) initiated an original art form in Beuron, which was based on that of the Nazarenes. His works, with which he supplied not just Beuron, but also Monte Cassino and the Prague Benedictine Convent, appeared regularly in the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* as illustrations. His collaborator, Willibrord Verkade (1868-1946),²² who also studied under Gauguin, contributed 29 articles. His main interest was the history of art, especially the influence of Egyptian art, and he also wrote the obituary for his teacher, Lenz.

A COMPARISON OF THEIR POSITIONS

In what follows, the contents and position of *Stimmen der Zeit* and the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* will be analysed and compared from various points of view. The chosen themes reflect the intellectual positions of both of these influential religious orders. It may be observed that the Benedictines concentrate more on the restora-

¹⁹ Schaber, "Feuling, Daniel".

²⁰ Schaber, "Mager, Alois", 1210.

²¹ Idem, "Manser, Anselm", 1228-1237.

²² Metzinger, "Verkade, Willibrord", 1259-1261.

tion of traditional Christian spirituality, whereas the Jesuits are more in favour of a modernized society and Church.

LITURGY

“A special characteristic of our times is the widespread and dominant attraction of people towards religion. [...] For this reason the Liturgical Movement, which has started more or less strongly almost everywhere in the world, is very welcome. It would be a grave mistake to see in it a cure-all for our profoundly sick times, or, for its sake to do without other no less effective, or perhaps even more effective means of improving the religious life. However, it would also be very wrong to ignore it, or to oppose it and attack it.”²³

With these words, Joseph Braun, (1857-1947), introduced his contribution to the Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands. The distinctions reveal a mid-position held by the Jesuits. In fact they did not belong to the main proponents of the Liturgical Movement. Their competition with the Benedictines left them in second place. Articles surveying the current position therefore stressed that there were other supporters of the Liturgical Movement than the Benedictines, for example, the diocesan clergy in Holland, the complementary catechetical work of the Jesuits in Hungary, and the contribution of a number of religious communities (Redemptorists, Jesuits) in the US to the inspiring of the liturgy with new spirit, through their teaching in schools and adult catechesis.

Nevertheless, even the Jesuits in Germany had their liturgical specialists. Joseph Kramp (1886-1940), who published a number of books on the liturgy at the beginning of the 1920s, mentioned a double goal: “Introduction to a deeper understanding of the liturgy and its spirituality”.²⁴ He recommended holding on to the example of the great founders, among whom he naturally included the founder of his own order, Ignatius. There was no thought of using the vernacular in the 1920s. What was more important was “to again give all the faithful access to and understanding of the prayers that were once created for the general participation of the faithful”.²⁵ According to Kramp, deeper theological understanding served to make people aware of the fact that they are children of God, as well as of the “idea of God’s kingdom or their communion in Christ”. “This spirit of the liturgy takes hold of people from the cradle to the grave.”²⁶ In this way the liturgy becomes a central remedy for stabilizing the Catholic milieu.

In the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* discussions on the liturgy were central, with at least one article devoted to it in almost every issue. The contributors were some of the most important representatives of the Liturgical Movement. Odo Casel and Athanasius Wintersig, Cunibert Mohlberg and Damasus Zaehringer sent in articles on liturgical questions.

The programme of the Liturgical Movement, as represented by the Benedictines, was clearly expressed in a miscellaneous essay published by Mager in the first

²³ Braun, “Die liturgische Bewegung in Holland” in: *SdZ*, 103 (1922), 125.

²⁴ Kramp, “Liturgische Bestrebungen der Gegenwart” in: *SdZ*, 99 (1920), 321.

²⁵ Idem, “Zur Liturgie der römischen Messe” in: *SdZ*, 101 (1921), 137.

²⁶ Idem, “Liturgie und religiöses Leben” in: *SdZ*, 106 (1924), 94.

volume of the *Monatsschrift*. “The liturgy, and teaching about the liturgy, has a pre-eminent place in building up and extending a religious and spiritually mature learning and culture.”²⁷ Liturgy as “cult” means “channelling what is holy to humankind” in a community form, hence it is essentially a cultural action. This point of view was developed in the *Monatsschrift*. The articles served to clarify the theology behind the Christian cult, and the development of the liturgy during the course of history, in the process of which patristic and medieval sources on the symbolism of individual parts of the Eucharistic celebration, or Church feasts, were repeatedly exploited. The authors’ main concern was to connect the liturgy with life. Thus the necessity of introducing the faithful to the liturgy was dealt with to the same extent as “liturgy and the spiritual life” or “Christian asceticism and the liturgy”. Church music had a central place, and the demand was made that Gregorian chant should be reanimated. This was apodictically expressed as: “There is no room in the Church for a *concert choir*, the Church only acknowledges the *cult choir*.”²⁸

In addition to the *Monatsschrift*, the Benedictines published a series of books called *Ecclesia orans*, and “Sources and research into the history of the liturgy”, as well as an “Annual for Liturgical Studies”.²⁹ Thus there was the possibility of giving more space to reports on liturgical courses in the *Monatsschrift*. Beginning in 1921, these were conducted in Maria Laach and other Benedictine monasteries with the twofold aim of promoting the apostolate of the liturgy and liturgical studies.³⁰ A great interest was taken in what was being done to promote the liturgy in other countries such as Holland, Hungary, Austria, Portugal and North America. In this way people became more aware of the international network of the liturgical avant-garde.

In comparison to the *Stimmen der Zeit*, the subject of the liturgy was clearly given far more space by the Benedictines. Theological considerations were given as equal a weight as the opening up of historical sources. Practical suggestions for the celebration of the liturgy, above all in abbeys, and in the way the Eucharist was celebrated, as well as information about the way in which the Liturgical Movement was taken up in other countries, could be found there. Thus through their publications, the Benedictines proved to be the main supporters of a liturgical renewal that was founded during the period between the two World Wars.

ECUMENISM

The opposite is true when we analyze both periodicals from the point of view of ecumenism. The liturgical interest of the Benedictines gave them a special orientation towards the Eastern Churches. In addition, Pius XI wanted the Benedictines to cultivate the common heritage with the Orthodox Church, above all against the background of the threatened loss of Christian ground in the Soviet Union. The founding in 1928 of the monastery of Chevetogne, which was supposed to practice both the Western and the Eastern liturgical rites, was also aimed in this direction. It would also

²⁷ Mager, “Liturgie und Kunde von der Liturgie” in: *BMS*, 1 (1919), 118.

²⁸ Beron, “Liturgie oder Konzert?” in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 138.

²⁹ Mohlberg, “Ein Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft” in: *BMS*, 3 (1921), 495-498.

³⁰ G’sell, “Der liturgische Kursus in Maria-Laach” in: *BMS*, (1921), 501.

be put into practice in the Bavarian monastery of Niederaltaich in the 1930s. Thus, the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* saw the Orthodox Church as one with which Catholics could enter into dialogue and share the wealth of symbols in their tradition. Reunions with the Eastern Church, and the Congresses that dealt with these, were noted and commented upon appreciatively.³¹ However, there was almost complete silence on the subject of the German Evangelical Church, with the exception of a critical comment on one of the papers presented by the Freiburg theologian, Engelbert Krebs, on Catholic and Protestant spirituality,³² and an obituary of the Swedish Bishop Nathan Söderblom.³³

Stimmen der Zeit presents quite a different picture. A great deal of space was given to ecumenical questions. Of course, the reports and biographies pointed to the possibility of conversion to the Catholic faith. Naturally, it protested publicly against the disturbance of the peace between the confessions by Protestant organisations or by inappropriate representations in public. However, the Jesuit authors had been working since the end of the First World War to provide an appropriate appraisal of the 16th century Reformation. Thus Hartmann Grisar criticized the lack of a uniform, Protestant interpretation of Luther, and especially a nationalistic view of the reformer as the saviour of all that was German.³⁴ Also, in connection with the 400th anniversary of the *Confessio Augustana* (the Augsburg Confession), Melancthon was characterized as a tragic figure.³⁵ German Protestantism was criticized for replacing religion with a cultural, or more concretely, a nationalistic objective.

Stimmen der Zeit was also on the alert to comment on the first, tentative attempts at intra-Protestant and Protestant-Orthodox ecumenism, which found expression in the large Church gatherings in Geneva (1920), Stockholm (1925) and Lausanne (1927). The Jesuits often noted a lack of clarity on ecclesiology. Nevertheless, the bringing together of the various Protestant Churches meant that an initial goal had been attained: "In principle we see here a break with Protestantism and a return to Catholic principles, even if for a time it seems that it will lead to a strengthening of a united Protestant front."³⁶ The Catholic commentators repeatedly insisted on the theological aspects of the gatherings, and refused to be satisfied with a unification based on natural ethics. Instead, they suggested that Catholic ethics and social teaching from the point of view of natural law was a feasible path for ecumenism. However, the gathering in Lausanne was precisely an opportunity to objectively take stock of the situation. It showed that the doctrinal differences between the hundred Churches represented at Lausanne were greater than expected. "Even the two fundamental principles of the so-called Reformers - the Bible alone and faith alone - no longer form a dominant highpoint of unity as they did a hundred years ago. They were

³¹ Lascar, "Ut omnes unum sint" in: *BMS*, 9 (1927), 441-462; Engberding, "6. Internationaler Unionskongreß zu Velehrad" in: *BMS*, 14 (1932), 351-355.

³² Feuling, "Die Protestanten und wir" in: *BMS*, 5 (1923), 198-200.

³³ Seiller, "Söderblom †" in: *BMS*, 13 (1931), 385-389.

³⁴ Grisar, "Luther im Spiegel seiner Jahrhundertfeier" in: *SdZ*, 96 (1919), 31-51.

³⁵ Böminghaus, "Die Augsburger Konfession. Nach vierhundert Jahren" in: *SdZ*, 120 (1931), 275-286.

³⁶ Sierp, "Unionsbestrebungen bei Protestanten" in: *SdZ*, 100 (1921), 184-195, 196.

replaced in the Lausanne proclamation by Jesus Christ and his redemptive message, the Gospel.”³⁷

WORLD RELIGIONS

The interpretation of the signs of the times from a position simultaneously Catholic and open became a far more urgent task with regard to what was going on outside the Christian churches. A sign of the period between the two World Wars was the fascination with the world outside Europe, and its religious phenomena. Through the comparative history of religions, represented in Germany by the Marburg theologians, Rudolf Otto and Friedrich Heiler, the West re-discovered the Eastern religions. Both of our periodicals discussed this animatedly.

After the First World War, *Stimmen* felt the need to study Buddhism. ‘Neobuddhistic’ trends in the West led to a more differentiated assessment, in which it was rejected as a religion, but accepted as a means to cope with life: “It is possible to learn a great deal from Buddhism about judging certain mysterious states of the soul, as well as about a number of general human forms of overcoming self and learning discipline. However, it is hardly possible to learn anything about genuine religious life, if one excludes Mahayama Buddhism, which rejects true Buddhism, nor can one learn anything about genuine, God-given mysticism.”³⁸

There was a lasting interest in India. The theology of the most important representatives of a form of Hinduism that was open to the West was discussed. The poet and philosopher, Rabindranath Tagore, was much admired, “a religious person of rare authenticity”,³⁹ whose concern was the return of human beings to God and union with him, combined with the fundamental attitude of faith and reverence. Lippert, who admired the Indian philosopher greatly, was wholly in line with the Church Fathers in acknowledging the grains of gold contained in non-Christian religions. “Although he has not discovered the fullness of Christian knowledge, I think we can say that he is not far from the kingdom of God, indeed that he has probably come closer to it than all those who, while they call themselves Christians, are far removed from the mystery of prayer and love, which had been revealed to this stranger.”⁴⁰

Another Indian, Sundar Singh, coming from a family with Sikh and Hindu roots, who converted to Christianity in 1903, and was baptized in the Presbyterian Church in 1905, was more controversial. He travelled all over India as a Christian mendicant monk (Sadhu). He was celebrated by Friedrich Heiler as a Christian apostle of India and a mystic, but Sierp wrote a critical article about him and his forty days of complete fast, which Singh barely survived. Although he showed understanding for Singh’s way of thinking, since it came from a different cultural context, he summed up his judgement as follows: “However, that does not excuse those who want to awaken a collapsing world to new life with the fantasies of a dreamer. Of what use are all our critical faculties when they come to a halt before the beautiful sayings of an oriental

³⁷ Reichmann, “Die Weltkonferenz von Lausanne vom 3. bis 21. August 1927” in: *SdZ*, 114 (1928), 429.

³⁸ von Dunin-Borkowski, “Buddhismus und Neubuddhismus” in: *SdZ*, 97 (1919), 206-216, 216.

³⁹ Lippert, “Rabindranath Tagore” in: *SdZ*, 101 (1921), 429.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*.

dreamer, and are blindly captured as soon as a superficial Indian journalist, such as Zahir, or a gullible woman missionary, tell fairy stories, and the prince of the fairy stories appears in our midst dressed in oriental garb?"⁴¹ After Heiler objected heatedly to this, Sierp hit back. Using Singh as an example, he criticized the theological method as such, and set out to expose the way in which an itinerant Indian monk had been used by a German professor: "Religion is not the product of hallucinations, but eternal wisdom. The refuge of truth cannot be a theology that is accessible to hallucinations, as is shown by the example described, but only to a Church that is confirmed by divine authority and heavenly support, and cannot go wrong."⁴²

The controversy spread. Mager took it up in the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift*. He considered Sundar Singh a "controversial personality",⁴³ who had been built up by the "Soederblom-Heiler camp" as an example of "Evangelical Catholicity". Mager criticized Heiler's mania for miracles, and accused him of actually having made Singh a Catholic by calling him a mystic. Mager summed his argument as follows: 'Heiler is the only one to blame for the Sadhu controversy, because when he described the life and teaching of the Sadhu, he tendentiously intended to use the "saint outside the Roman Church" to turn the world against this Church.'⁴⁴

A CONTEMPORARY DEBATE: JOSEPH WITTIG

In 1925 the Holy Office promulgated a decree condemning the five publications by the Breslau professor of religious history, Joseph Wittig (1879-1949). This Silesian theologian, who had also made a name for himself as the author of short stories and biographies, had published an essay in the periodical *Hochlana* with the title "the Redeemed". In the reviews, Wittig was accused of being too close to Lutheran teaching on justification. This article and further publications in the style of his 'autobiographical theology' (Siegfried Kleymann) led to his books being placed on the Index, and his excommunication in 1926. This step caused a storm in the Catholic Church at large. The two periodicals under review also discussed it.

Shortly before the Index decree became public, the Munich Benedictine, Hugo Lang (1892-1967), wrote a detailed appreciation of Wittig's works. With a mixture of fascination and distrust he praised the "freshness of his descriptions of nature", "the Pauline inclusion of the whole of creation in God's eternal plans of perfection", and the way he was rooted in his Silesian home country, which connected him with religious poets, such as Angelus Silesius and Jakob Boehme.⁴⁵ In the face of all the attacks directed against Wittig by, for example, the Chur professor, Anton

⁴¹ Sierp, "Sadhu Sundar Singh" in: *SdZ*, 107 (1924), 425.

⁴² Idem, "Religionswissenschaft oder Legendenerzählung?" in: *SdZ*, 108 (1925), 120. For a further answer by Sierp to Heiler, see Sierp, "Friedrich Heiler und der Sadhu" in: *SdZ*, 108 (1925), 270-282. The engagement of the Jesuits in interreligious dialogue was part of the internal Jesuitical controversy regarding the periodical's ecclesial standpoint. Father General Ledóchowski accused the redaction committee of "interconfessionalism"; see Schatz, "Stimmen der Zeit im Kirchenkonflikt", 154.

⁴³ Mager, "Sadhu Sundar Singh, der neuindische Mystiker" in: *BMS*, 8 (1926), 345.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, 356.

⁴⁵ Lang, "Joseph Wittig" in: *BMS*, 7 (1925), 261.

Gisler, who condemned Wittig as “Lutherus redivivus”, Lang defended the theological hermeneutic of the Silesian: “I think that neither Cyprian, nor Augustine, would be surprised or upset by his stories. I even harbour the suspicion that he owes far less to the late Scholastics, such as Capreolus, Báñez and Gonet, for the justification of his ‘Thomism’, than to the related ideas of the Fathers.”⁴⁶ By referring to an early period of Christianity, he was even related to the Benedictines. That was his real intention: “to allow the appearance, names, expressions, forces, experiences of the heroic centuries to again break forcefully and beneficially into the consciousness and experience of the people.” “The desire to educate the public - “I feel sorry for the people” - not academic ambition, motivated his light and buoyant pen to truly amazing productivity.”⁴⁷ Wittig, the popular author and unconventional theologian, could not be fitted into a pattern.

With that Hugo Lang had stuck out his neck rather far. When, shortly after the appearance of the article, Wittig’s works were put on the Index, the editors of the *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* felt it was necessary to take a stand on it. In their survey of the contents of the 1925 volume they indicated that the article had been written before Wittig’s works were placed on the Index, that it had been composed in line with Church teaching, and that the decision of the Church was accepted by all.

The Jesuits took a more critical stand to Wittig and distanced themselves from him. Ludwig Koesters pointed out that “he completely excluded the objective redemption”.⁴⁸ The way he refrained from using the traditional theological style, however, presupposed expert knowledge by which to distinguish what was right in what he said about faith, good will, weakness and fear, or the “certainty of all the baptized that they were saved”. His literary form also gave rise to misunderstandings, because not every word or every event he described reflected the opinion of the author. At the end of his discussion, however, Koesters was fully able to identify with “Wittig’s goal of tearing to shreds the unjustified fetters placed on the joy of redemption”.⁴⁹ He hoped that the “herald of the joys of redemption” would clear up the cause of the misunderstandings, because “only he can progress along Wittig’s paths to the pure source of joy in redemption, who is shown the way by theological knowledge or sure theological instruction.”⁵⁰

After Wittig’s works were placed on the Index, the Jesuits did not feel triumphant. Erich Przywara saw the decision of the Church as a “call to positive work”.⁵¹ It could not be understood as the victory of Molinism over Thomism, but “a defence against a false and dangerous formulation of the ultimate and indissoluble interplay between God’s omnipotent efficacy and the personal activity of the creature, which both Thomism and Molinism hold in common”.⁵² Nor was it concerned with rejecting the message of redemption over an emphasis on the law. Finally, Wittig’s sincerity and frankness in view of the faults and weaknesses of the Church had not

⁴⁶ Lang, “Joseph Wittig” in: *BMS*, 7 (1925), 270.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, 272.

⁴⁸ Kösters, “Erlösungsfreude” in: *SdZ*, 109 (1925), 116.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, 120.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, 122.

⁵¹ Przywara, “Zum Indexdekret gegen Joseph Wittig, Umschau” in: *SdZ*, 109 (1925), 474.

⁵² *Ibidem*, 474.

been forbidden. Przywara, who thought of Wittig “with the shy and loving concern of a brother, who knows that he is suffering and therefore treads gently and does not want to disturb”,⁵³ did not oppose the decision to put Wittig’s works on the Index, but through the way he commented on it, he made it clear that the Church had possibly wasted an opportunity to explain the message of redemption more clearly.

PASTORAL WORK IN ACADEMIC CIRCLES

The Weimar Republic was the golden age of pastoral work in academic circles in Germany. Jesuits and Benedictines were both engaged in it from various points of view. The contacts of the Jesuits were based above all on the ‘Union of Catholic Academic Associations for promoting a Catholic Weltanschauung’. In order to stop the “growing alienation of the Catholic intelligentsia from Church life”,⁵⁴ the Church had to concern itself with them, because “the fundamental tendency of our present culture, with which the educated classes are more closely related than the large masses of the people, is doubtlessly rationalism, that is, the aim of acquiring a new Weltanschauung and practical way of living through independent reasoning.”⁵⁵ A Christian *Weltanschauung* would stop the collapse of a culture⁵⁶ particularly in educated circles. Christian morality, social ethics, Christian principles for legislation, administration and the economy: “We have something to offer our Fatherland.”⁵⁷ The newly flourishing Union of Academics was called “part of the present-day intellectual life and struggle”⁵⁸ ten years after the First World War. The “vital questions of Catholic academics”⁵⁹ were noted and discussed.

The Benedictines reviewed the Congresses of the Union of Academics, especially when, as in 1923 through Abbot Ildefons Herwegen, the liturgy was on the agenda,⁶⁰ or the contribution of the Catholic Church to the unification of the West was being discussed.⁶¹ The Benedictines saw that their academic objectives, especially the formation of a Catholic elite, could only be realized through a Catholic University. This university, which had yet to be founded, would contribute to reducing the Catholic education deficit. Because Salzburg had had a Benedictine university prior to secularization, after 1924 they turned towards it. Since it had become obvious that as a result of state legislation they would not be able to found a new university in Austria in the near future, although a theology faculty had existed there since 1850, Mager was given responsibility for conducting ‘University College Weeks’. The

⁵³ *Ibidem*, 475.

⁵⁴ Quotation from unknown source, in: Sierp, “Der Verband katholischer Akademiker zur Pflege katholischer Weltanschauung” in: *SdZ*, 96 (1919), 261.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, 261.

⁵⁶ Spengler, *Untergang des Abendlandes*.

⁵⁷ Sierp, “Der Verband katholischer Akademiker zur Pflege katholischer Weltanschauung” in: *SdZ*, 96 (1919), 264.

⁵⁸ Böminghaus, “Katholischer Akademikerverband” in: *SdZ*, 117 (1929), 89-99.

⁵⁹ Krebs, “Lebensfragen der katholischen Akademikerin” in: *SdZ*, 117 (1929), 100-110.

⁶⁰ Mager, “Eindrücke von der Herbsttagung des Verbandes Katholischer Akademiker in Ulm (10.-16. August 1923)” in: *BMS*, 5 (1923), 398-402.

⁶¹ Schmutz, “Zur Akademikertagung in Konstanz (5.-9. August 1928)” in: *BMS*, 10 (1928), 383-394.

Monatsschrift followed these efforts from the first. In 1924 a Study House was erected at Stift St. Peter “for the Benedictine clerics from the houses in Austria and Bavaria”.⁶² The Benedictines committed themselves to enlarging the theology faculty by appointing new professors, and to strengthen the philosophy department so that it could create its own faculty.⁶³ Their intention was for Salzburg to become “a link between the German peoples separated politically, but not culturally”.⁶⁴ The first step in this direction - and the only one before the Second World War - was the Salzburg University College Weeks, which were conducted for the first time in 1931. In “an extremely difficult and decisive intellectual situation”⁶⁵ noted lecturers, such as Karl Adam, Karl Eschweiler and Dietrich von Hildebrand were to contribute to the “re-formation of a lasting *Weltanschauung* that could withstand the storms of the times, because it was based on the only safe and absolute foundation of the Catholic faith”.⁶⁶ These University College Weeks continued until 1937. They were forbidden after Austria was annexed to Nazi Germany.

ATTITUDE TO NATIONAL SOCIALISM

From early on, the Jesuit periodical took a stand toward Judaism that has been dubbed “double anti-Semitism” by researchers. Augustin Bea (1881-1968), who forty years later helped to bring about a new relationship between Christianity and the Jews at the Second Vatican Council, admitted that criticism of individual Jews was justified, but for the rest saw that in identifying the individual with the collective there was a danger of denying divine revelation: “We have no intention of denying the dangers that threaten Christendom and the German people from unscrupulous individuals of the Jewish faith, or of Jewish origin, or even of closing our eyes to them. [...] Nevertheless, we Christians, and above all we Catholics, have to protest against the attempt to place the pre-Christian people of Israel on the same level as low representatives of today’s Jews, and to discredit the pre-Messianic revealed religion with the help of a fantastic theory of race.”⁶⁷

We must not be deceived by this singular statement into thinking that the Jesuit authors indeed practiced anti-Semitism. For example, in the autumn of 1933 they expressed the hope that “with the promulgation and application of laws designed to limit Jews, every wrong move would be avoided”.⁶⁸ And in noting a study by Hans-Joachim Schoeps on the theology of Judaism, Przywara described the Old Testament practice of basing *Blut und Boden* on biology as one of the great sins of Israel, against which the Prophets, as the sharpest anti-Semites, had protested vehemently. He came to the conclusion that “vice versa, God’s judgement will fall on all unbelieving anti-

⁶² Kegel, “Um die Salzburger Universität” in: *BMS*, 6 (1924), 220.

⁶³ Mager, “Die Universitätsbestrebungen in Salzburg” in: *BMS*, 8 (1926), 318.

⁶⁴ Michels, “Zur Salzburger Herbsttagung des katholischen Akademikerverbandes” in: *BMS*, 12 (1930), 503.

⁶⁵ Zähringer, “Die Salzburger Hochschulwochen” in: *BMS*, 14 (1932), 140.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, 141.

⁶⁷ Bea, “Antisemitismus, Rassentheorie und Altes Testament” in: *SdZ*, 100 (1921), 182.

⁶⁸ Overmans, “Der gute Europäer und der ewige Jude. Umschau” in: *SdZ*, 125 (1933), 274.

Semites, because they themselves have fallen prey to the same blood and soil theory as the Semites, that is, the “biological foundation of the sacred”.⁶⁹

In the 1920s we repeatedly find references to the terminology of the conservative right. In 1924 Ernst Boeminghaus (1882-1942) objected to the concept ‘*völkisch*’ in the sense of sound nationalism for Catholics.⁷⁰ Hermann Muckermann (1877-1962) remained alone in his views. He conducted research into eugenics and even right after the First World War was demanding “racial hygiene”.⁷¹ However, in 1932 a “racial philosophy” was rejected on the basis of the Christian religion.⁷²

How did the editors of *Stimmen der Zeit* react to the National Socialists’ seizure of power? Even before the 30th of January 1933, Pribilla called for a “national concentration”. Germany was engaged in “self-laceration” and “fraternal strife”.⁷³ It needed a strong government in order to overcome its social and religious tensions. Indeed, Germany was at a crossroads. It could overcome its inner discord, but it could also persist “in its insane fragmentation of political parties”.⁷⁴ Communism was ready to take over the patrimony of the parties. However, the authors did not want to express themselves too politically. In a number of articles, Przywara analyzed the protagonists of the National Socialist ideology. The *Deutscher Aufbruch* (German Awakening) was connected with Ernst Guenther-Gruendel, Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn and Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, and the *Deutsche Front* (the German Front) with Carl Schmitt, Othmar Spann, Edgar Jung, Wilhelm Stapel,⁷⁵ Max Hildebert Boehm, Georg Weippert, Ernst Reventlow, Alfred Rosenberg, Walter Darre and Ernst Krieck. *Deutsches Schicksal* (Germany’s Fate) would be decided depending on whether the opposition trends of the “new German nationalism”⁷⁶ dominated. According to Joseph Schroeteler (1886-1955), “national political education” was essentially different from Catholic pedagogy, despite both sides aiming at holistic education.⁷⁷ *Stimmen der Zeit* found itself on the side of political Catholicism when, with Gustav Gundlach, it professed its adherence to parliamentary democracy: “The last decades of German history show clearly that German Catholicism can only make its way, and enrich the whole of Germany, if it is united in its determination on the basis of parliamentary government. For German Catholicism a positive approach to uniform, parliamentary formation and expression of the people’s political will through political parties is a question of life and death.”⁷⁸

⁶⁹ Przywara, “Theologie des Judentums. Umschau” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 342.

⁷⁰ Böminghaus, “Katholisch und völkisch?” in: *SdZ*, 107 (1924), 329-336.

⁷¹ Muckermann, “Die Erblchkeitsforschung und die Wiedergeburt von Familie und Volk” in: *SdZ*, 97 (1919), 115-132; Idem, “Eine neue Familienforschung” in: *SdZ*, 98 (1920), 15-28. Muckermann left the Jesuits in 1926.

⁷² Koch, “Rassenphilosophie und Religion” in: *SdZ*, 123 (1932), 217-224.

⁷³ Pribilla, “Nationale Konzentration” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 1-2.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, 12.

⁷⁵ In this survey Pribilla rejected Stapel’s attempt to work out a theology of nationalism as “an impossible undertaking”. See Pribilla, “Theologie des Nationalismus. Umschau” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 273-275.

⁷⁶ Przywara, “Deutsches Schicksal” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 221.

⁷⁷ Schröteler, “Nationalpolitische Erziehung” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 103-115.

⁷⁸ Gundlach, “Grundsätzliches über Partei und Parteien” in: *SdZ*, 124 (1933), 152-153.

Pribilla was able to draw a critical balance of the first six months of Hitler's government. In an article entitled "National Revolution" he expressed his surprise at "the course it had taken, the rapidity with which it had carried out its plans, and the extent to which it had spread".⁷⁹ He saw many possibilities for co-operation with the State, but drew attention to the government's need to prove itself in its observance of the foundations of law and freedom, particularly with regard to minorities. He remarked self-critically that weaknesses in their own (Catholic) ranks had made it easier for the Nazis to gain the ascendancy.

These few examples show that the *Stimmen der Zeit* followed the changes initiated by National Socialism in detail. It did so on the level of ideas, not that of actual daily politics.⁸⁰ With carefully considered judgement, the authors tried to find positive points of contact. Nevertheless, they cannot be called 'bridge builders'. The classification of the Nazi ideology in the history of ideas was too clear for this, and their dissociation from it too obvious, although it was at times clothed in pious phrases.

The *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* confronted National Socialism less directly, although the authors noted the final stages of a crisis of Christendom, "for which there are two possible outcomes: the downfall of the West, or a new Christian Europe: *Pax Christi in regno Christi*".⁸¹ The idea of the Reich was widespread at the beginning of the 1930s. Authors such as Alois Dempf, as well as the Benedictines Damasus Winzen and Alber Hammenstede, according to the judgement of their confrere, Hermann Keller, arrived at "the final unity between *Polis* and *Ecclesia* in the Holy Roman Empire, which had become a privilege of the German nation. Accordingly, as leaders, the Germans in the New Testament fill almost the same position as the Jews in the Old Testament."⁸² Keller criticized this view of the Middle Ages and admonished the Church to distance itself from the Holy Roman Empire, while insisting that God's will was to redeem the whole human race: "Therefore, from the point of view of theology, no *definite* people, no *definite* social class, has a preferential position vis-à-vis any other. There is an unbridgeable abyss between Church and State, between God's Kingdom and the world."⁸³ So, Keller concluded, Church and State belong to two different worlds, although Christians have to carry out their duties as citizens.

The Beuron Benedictine considered it quite possible for Christians to cooperate with the State. They were involved in carrying out their voluntary service (RAD - *Reichsarbeitsdienst* - Reich Labour Service), which had developed out of the Youth Movement, and which had been promoted by Franz von Papen's government. Hariolf Ettensperger considered it "a need of the times like the Hitler Movement".⁸⁴ One of the work camps promoted and financed by the different Churches, where people could do their 30-week voluntary service, was run by Beuron. With hindsight it gives one pause for thought to see the possible bridges to the National Socialist ideology,

⁷⁹ Pribilla, "Nationale Revolution" in: *SdZ*, 125 (1933), 156.

⁸⁰ See the studies printed in the years 1933-1935; Ederer, "Propaganda Wars. *Stimmen der Zeit* and the Nazis, 1933-1935".

⁸¹ Ettensperger, "Die katholische Aktion und wir Priester" in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 297.

⁸² Keller, "Zu uns komme dein Reich" in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 360.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, 363.

⁸⁴ Ettensperger "Der freiwillige Arbeitsdienst" in: *BMS*, 15 (1933).

despite their emphasis on being bound to a Christian *Weltanschauung*, for example, when ‘eugenics’ appears on the curriculum or ‘modern heroism’ is discussed.

The relationship of Christianity to Judaism was only touched upon indirectly by the *Monatsschrift* when it discussed Erik Peterson’s lectures at the Salzburg University. Israel’s importance lay in the past and the future. “In between, however, it lives in inner discord: obdurate and yet chosen, called to the spiritual Church and yet still carnal and without faith. Meanwhile the Jew remains a captive of the flesh and without deeper insight. That is why he is the necessary opponent of the spiritual Church.”⁸⁵ One was distancing oneself theologically while at the same time holding the doors open!

One article, however, closed with a critical look into the future. Stein ended her contribution on women with a plea for the education of the young. At that point she was already a victim of Hitler’s policies, but was able to write sceptically yet hopefully: “...on behalf of the Church’s work with our youth, and in particular with young women. This is perhaps the greatest task Germany has to carry out at present. Once it has been carried out, we can hope that a generation of mothers will grow up whose children will again have a home, and not have to be cared for like orphans. Then a sound and believing Christian people will again arise in Germany.”⁸⁶

CONCLUSION

The Jesuits and the Benedictines, as the two largest orders in Germany, exercised great influence on the spiritual life of Catholics. In their periodicals, *Stimmen der Zeit* and *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* they took up the religious and theological, as well as the intellectual and cultural trends and took a stand on them from different points of view. The subjects chosen, and the way they were dealt with, show that the ‘Catholic *Weltanschauung*’ during the Interbellum was not in any way uniform. The Jesuit approach, which impinged more strongly and directly on society, favoured modernization, and was open to the different realms of humanities and sciences, was complemented by a Benedictine point of view developed from contemplative practices. This becomes obvious in the way the periodicals handled liturgical and ecumenical subjects, which mirrored each other.

Since both orders were very widespread, it became possible for them both to draw on authors from many parts of the German-speaking world. It says a great deal about the reach of the Catholic Church in the period between the two World Wars that these two voluminous periodicals managed, almost completely, not to overlap their contributors, and hence were able to appeal to different readerships. It also says a great deal about the editors of the periodicals that they were able to mobilize a large number of contributors from their own order, and hence managed to recruit new members for their journalistic needs. The periodicals were the experimental field for the intellectual leaders of the orders.

⁸⁵ Keller, “Zum Problem des Judentums” in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 393-394.

⁸⁶ Stein, “Eingliederung der Frau in das Corpus Christi mysticum” in: *BMS*, 15 (1933), 425.

Both periodicals were open to women's education on the University level. The actual number of articles written by women, however, was very low. The scarcity of female authors reflects the level of development in Catholic female intellectual life during the two wars, with only a few decades of restricted, and a few years of unrestricted, possibilities of regular studies at a German university.

Both periodicals stand for the successful attempt of German Catholicism in the period between the two World Wars to overcome the much-invoked educational deficit that resulted from secularization. This can be observed in the range of subjects, although less so in the authors. Neither periodical managed to break out of the Catholic milieu and draw in contributors from differing intellectual backgrounds. Thus, the networks formed by the respective periodicals did cover an important part of German Catholicism, but on the other hand they did not succeed in forming an intellectual network outside of the traditional social milieus. Both the *Stimmen* and the *Monatschrift* covered a wide palette dealing not just with theological and philosophical subjects, but also with politics, the natural sciences, artistic, musical and literary aspects, in conjunction with international points of view and profound observations and criticism of the times. Both periodicals in their own way were part of the intellectual history and cultural communication of the Weimar Republic. They had a formative influence on the Catholic milieu, but did not manage to overcome the distances between the Catholic and the Protestant, and between Liberal and Socialist milieus. The cultural communication surmounted the milieu walls only in a thematic, but not in a personal manner.