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Historians and theologians commonly overlook how the Benedictine revival of the nineteenth century arose not only in Europe but also in the United States. Monks from Bavaria and Switzerland looked to America as a providential setting for restoring the Benedictine Order to its original glory through missionary activity. As missionaries, their vision manifested a reinterpretation of the Benedictine tradition and its principle of stability. Embodying this vision was the life and thought of Martin Marty (1834–1896), a Swiss-Benedictine monk who became the first abbot of St. Meinrad Abbey in Indiana and later a missionary and bishop in Dakota Territory. Despite his famous interaction with Sitting Bull (ca. 1831–1890), few historians have explored how Marty influenced the development of Benedictine missionary activity in the United States.

The present dissertation reconstructs and analyzes Marty’s life and thought through a distinctly theological lens. This study poses a theological question with ecclesiological and missiological consequences: how does Marty the Benedictine monk become Marty the itinerant missionary? It argues that Marty’s vision for Benedictine evangelization in America transforms the Rule’s principle of stabilitas in congregatione, “stability in community,” into an original missionary paradigm of ora et labora, “prayer and work.” The study demonstrates the development of this vision through three stages of Marty’s monastic vocation. During his monastic formation (1834–1860), Marty combines old and new elements of Einsiedeln’s Swiss-Benedictine tradition to create a vision of the monastery as a spiritual family educating and unifying Catholics. As the administrator and prior of St. Meinrad in Indiana (1860–1870), Marty applies this “familial imagination” to the community’s monastic life, school, and missionary work. He further advances the Benedictine principle of stability (stabilitas) as an agent of lasting evangelization through the education and unity of the local ecclesial community (congregatio). Finally, through his reform agenda as abbot (1870–1880), Marty transforms his vision of stability in the community into a missionary model of prayer and work designed to educate the indigenous faithful and to unify monastic and ecclesial families.
Enim filii Beate Virgine Maria Einsidelnsis,
religiosis et laicis,
in Helvetia et America,
heri et hodie ipse et in saecula.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Paul G. Monson, B.A., M.A.

“O Lord, open my lips, and my mouth shall declare Your praise” (Psalm 51:15). For centuries Benedictine monks and nuns have begun their day with this line, following the instructions of St. Benedict (RB 9.1). So too must I begin by imploring God to “open my lips” to praise not only my Creator but also the colleagues, friends, and family who made this dissertation possible.

My gratitude naturally begins with my co-directors, Patrick W. Carey and Ulrich L. Lehner. This project would not have been possible without these “Doktorväter” and their insights into American Catholicism, Benedictine monasticism, and modern European Catholicism. They are the reason that I chose Marquette University for my doctoral studies, and their steadfast encouragement and friendship are invaluable gifts that have molded my scholarship. The other members of my board also deserve special recognition. Susan K. Wood, SCL, has guided my theological thinking, and Fr. Steven M. Avella has offered the perspective of a seasoned historian of U.S. Catholicism. My work would have been significantly impoverished without their generous time and support.

Over the years, Marquette has provided fertile soil for the flourishing of my doctoral studies and professional development. I have benefited from the wisdom of Mickey L. Mattox, Michel R. Barnes, Markus Wriedt (Goethe Universität), Mark F. Johnson, Fr. Robert M. Doran, S.J., Deirdre A. Dempsey, Fr. William S. Kurz, S.J., Sharon P. Pace, M. Therese Lysaught (Loyola University Chicago), D. Stephen Long, and Fr. Joseph G. Mueller, S.J. Within Marquette’s Special Collections & University
Archives, Mark Thiel has assisted me in locating Marty’s missionary letters. Numerous friendships at Marquette have further enriched my thinking and nourished my soul. Special mention must be given to Nathan and Lisa Lunsford, Eric and Ellen Vanden Eykel, Jeremy and Rachel Blackwood, Peter and Ariel Budnik, Christopher and Laura Samuel, Kellen Plaxco, Brian Sigmon, David Horstkoetter, Anne Carpenter, Claudia Satchell, Gregorio Montejo, and Sean Cahill. In particular, I must thank Tony Bonta (Barry University). Prior to my matriculation, Tony hosted me at Marquette and gave me insightful advice that later helped me navigate the daunting labyrinth of graduate studies. Had he not been there at the beginning, I doubt that I would have reached the end.

I am further indebted to a host of colleagues beyond Marquette University. Fr. Joel Rippinger, O.S.B., has mentored this dissertation from its infancy. His earlier scholarship has provided a roadmap for my own, and his generous encouragement for pursuing this dissertation has manifested both Benedictine humility and Christian wisdom. The monks of St. Meinrad Archabbey also deserve credit, as their witness of the Swiss-Benedictine tradition in America was the inspiration behind this study. Fr. Anthony Vinson, O.S.B., Fr. Godfrey Mullen, O.S.B., and Fr. Harry Hagen, O.S.B., introduced me to Benedictine liturgy and hospitality. Likewise, my research would have been impossible without the assistance of Fr. Cyprian Davis, O.S.B., the archabbey’s venerated archivist and scholar. The monks of Kloster Einsiedeln in Switzerland also ensured the success of my work. During my two weeks of archival research over Easter of 2012, the community hosted my stay and allowed me to join the monks in the choir stalls and at table. Fr. Justinus Pagnamenta, O.S.B., guided me through the abbey’s library and archives. Fr. Cyrill Bürgi, O.S.B., and Fr. Jean-Sébastien Charrière, O.S.B.,
extended the hospitality of the *Rule* to me. Deserving special mention is Abbot Martin Werlen (now emeritus), who shared countless personal insights into Einsiedeln’s history and mission. I also must thank two Benedictines who generously located and copied archival documents for my work: Br. Bernard Montgomery, O.S.B., archivist of Conception Abbey, and Fr. Andrew Campbell, archivist of St. Vincent Archabbey.

Likewise, grants from the American Benedictine Academy, the Cushwa Center for the Study of American Catholicism (University of Notre Dame), and the American Catholic Historical Association aided my travels for archival research. I must also express my deepest gratitude to Manuel Menrath of the University of Lucerne (Switzerland). Manuel hosted me in Switzerland and has been a generous colleague in our mutual work on Marty. The integrity of this dissertation would have suffered without his friendship.

Finally, I would be remiss not to mention the mentorship of many colleagues at my alma mater, the University of St. Thomas (St. Paul, Minnesota): John Boyle, Don Briel, Robert Kennedy, Fr. Michael Keating, Michael Naughton, Mary Reichardt, John Martens, Christopher Thompson, Bill Stevenson, and Mary Kay O’Rourke. These scholars inspired me to embrace the academic life and pursue graduate studies. Most importantly, they taught me that good scholarship begins with an ecclesial vocation.

A word of penultimate but nonetheless profound thanks goes to my extended family. For three decades, my parents, Gregory and Janette Monson, have been the bedrock of my intellectual and spiritual development. They have shown me love and passed along their faith, and my theological scholarship stems from both of these gifts. I am also indebted to the love and support of my siblings: Priscilla (and husband Robert), Elliott, Dominic, Jacob (and wife Katie), Aaron, Jordan, Emily, and Grace Marie. Finally,
my success is indebted to the support of my in-laws, Joe and Karen Vaske, and Doug and Kathrine Miller, who, on more than one occasion, provided me halcyon moments of sanity amid the stormy seas of scholarship. *Per familia mea, scio quid sit amor.*

Nevertheless, my greatest gratitude is reserved for God’s greatest gifts in my life: my wife, Stephanie, and my daughter, Sophia Catherine. Their joy has inspired my vocation; their patience has endured its many trials; their love has sustained every syllable of this work. “All good things” and “innumerable riches” have come to me through their love (Wis 7:11).

21 January 2014
The Feast of St. Meinrad
Hermit & Martyr
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................................. i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .................................................................................. v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ............................................................................ xi
INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................... 1
  Background on Marty .................................................................................... 3
  Scholarship on Marty ................................................................................... 7
  Thesis ........................................................................................................... 13
  Method, Structure, and Terms .................................................................... 14
CHAPTER 1: NOVA ET VETERA .................................................................... 19
  I. Schwyz: 1834–1846 .............................................................................. 21
     Swiss-Catholic Localism ........................................................................ 23
     A New Swiss State ............................................................................... 25
  II. Fribourg: 1846–1847 ......................................................................... 29
  III. A Student in Einsiedeln: 1847–1854 ................................................. 33
     Einsiedeln Abbey: A Millennial Tradition ........................................... 34
     Historical Origins ............................................................................... 35
     New Life, New Problems ................................................................. 38
     Marty’s Monastic Education: The New Stiftschule ......................... 42
     Historical & Social Context ............................................................. 43
     Twilight of the Old School: 1847–1848 ............................................. 45
     The Dawn of the New School: 1848–1849 ....................................... 46
     The Lyceum: 1849–1854 .................................................................... 48
From School to Monastery .......................................................... 52

The Missionary Annals ............................................................ 53

Historical Context ................................................................. 54

The Project & Its Significance ................................................. 57

The Marian Sodality ............................................................... 60

The 1852 Address .................................................................. 62

Historical Context ................................................................. 63

The Program & Its Significance .............................................. 64

The Death of a Sister ............................................................. 68

Marty’s Account ................................................................. 69

Significance .......................................................................... 71

The Zeitgeist Confession ....................................................... 73

IV. Marty as a Monk in Einsiedeln: 1854–1860 ............................. 75

Monastic Profession ............................................................... 76

Marty the Professor ............................................................... 79

The 1857 Essay: Monastic Education ...................................... 81

The Text ............................................................................... 83

Significance .......................................................................... 93

The 1858 Essay: Ecclesial Unity .............................................. 94

The Text ............................................................................... 95

Significance .......................................................................... 104

The Pastoral Marty ............................................................... 106

The 1859 Sermon ................................................................ 107
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2: STABILITAS ET CONGREGATIO</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Historical Background</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholicism in America</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Benedictine Revival</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface Wimmer</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Meinrad</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Marty As Administrator And Prior</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1861 Résumé</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Text</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ordenshaus”</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastic Contribution: The Cantarium Project</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Text</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Schule”</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Contribution: The Translation Project</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Project’s Framework</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Seelsorge”</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Missions</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worship .................................................................181
Pastoral Contribution: Lay Associations .......................183
Sodalities ......................................................................183
Oblates.......................................................................186

III. Stability And The 1868 Wimmer-Marty Controversy ....190

Background ....................................................................193
The 1868 Exchange ......................................................199
Significance ..................................................................211

Historical Aftermath ....................................................215

Conclusion ....................................................................221

CHAPTER 3: ORA ET LABORA .....................................223

I. The Abbatial Controversies ........................................227

The Breviary Controversy ..............................................231

Historical and Liturgical Context .................................232

A Tale of Two Breviaries ..............................................233

The Kulturkampf ............................................................234

Translating the Council ................................................237

Hope in a New World ...................................................239

Marty’s Rationale for the Reform ..................................240

Initial Reactions to the Reform & Marty’s Response .........243

Correspondence with Einsiedeln ....................................244

Correspondence with Conrad ........................................250

Beuron & the Campaign against Marty .........................256
Marty’s Defense against the Campaign.................................263
Defense for Einsiedeln .................................................264
Defense for Conrad......................................................271
Rome’s Reversal & Marty’s Reaction.................................277
Significance .....................................................................280

The Conversi Controversy ..................................................282
Historical Background......................................................283
The Reform & its Rationale ..............................................284
Reactions & Defense .......................................................286

Einsiedeln ........................................................................286
Beuron ............................................................................287

Significance .....................................................................290

II. Marty’s Scholarship......................................................292

Biography of Purcell.......................................................293

St. Benedict and His Orders ............................................296

Structure ........................................................................298

Sources ..........................................................................298

Method ............................................................................301

Argument ........................................................................302

Significance .....................................................................305

III. A New Missionary Model ...........................................307

Historical Background....................................................310

Grant’s Peace Policy........................................................311
The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions .................................................. 312
Marty’s Mission .................................................................................. 313
The Missionary Model Emerges: 1876–1877 .................................. 316
Reports to the Bureau ....................................................................... 319
Correspondence with Swiss Benedictines ........................................ 323
Significance ...................................................................................... 328
The Sitting Bull Encounter: 1877 .................................................... 330
Inspirations ....................................................................................... 331
The Encounter .................................................................................. 333
The Rise of the Boarding School: 1878–1879 ............................... 342
The Proposal and its Realization ....................................................... 342
The Convergence of Themes .............................................................. 349
Epilogue: The Monk Becomes Bishop .............................................. 350
Conclusion .......................................................................................... 355
CONCLUSION ....................................................................................... 358
BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................. 362
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCIM: Bureau of Catholic Indian Mission Records and Conception Abbey Indian Mission Records, Special Collections and University Archives, Raynor Memorial Library, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

CAA: Conception Abbey Archives, Conception Abbey, Conception, Missouri

KAE: Klosterarchiv Einsiedeln, Kloster Einsiedeln, Canton Schwyz, Switzerland

MUA: Special Collections and University Archives, Raynor Memorial Library, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

RB: *Regula Sancti Benedicti* (Rule of St. Benedict)

SMAA: St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives, St. Meinrad Archabbey, St. Meinrad, Indiana

SVAA: St. Vincent Archabbey Archives, St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pennsylvania

UNDA: University of Notre Dame Archives, Notre Dame, Indiana
INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1877, an extraordinary cultural encounter took place on the high plains of Canada. After transversing vast prairies and endless herds of buffalo, a unknown Benedictine monk finally came upon the camp of a renowned Lakota chieftain. The monk was a native of an Alpine valley in Switzerland; the chieftain was a native of the rugged prairies of Dakota Territory. The monk was the abbot of a monastery more than a thousand miles away in the woodlands of southern Indiana; the chieftain was a wanted fugitive accused of killing a famous American war hero in an equally infamous battle in southern Montana. The monk was a gaunt, malnourished priest who had sacrificed the comforts of the cloister to become a self-appointed missionary; the chieftain was a brawny, indomitable shaman who had refused to surrender the sacred lands of his people to become a reluctant warrior. The monk promised a life of peace and civilization on the American reservations; the chieftain promised death to any American who had the audacity to approach him. The monk’s name was Martin Marty (1834–1896); the chieftain’s name was Thátȟáŋka Íyotake, better known as Sitting Bull (ca. 1831–1890).

Over time scholars have attempted to make sense of this fascinating encounter through one of three historical lenses. The first group of historians to document this meeting were Catholic apologists and Benedictine monks.¹ Reminded of the gospel command to “teach all the nations” (Matt 28:19), this group views Marty as an apostle of Christian salvation, a herald of modern civilization, and an heir of the same monastic

¹ The best example of this group is an issue of the Indian Sentinel, a publication of the Benedictine missionaries of South Dakota, devoted to the legacy of Marty. See The Indian Sentinel 2, no. 1 (January 1920).
tradition that had converted the barbarous tribes of Europe. This lens paints a narrative of a fearless, selfless Marty approaching an insolent, sinister Sitting Bull, stubbornly posing an obstacle to the progress and peace of his own people. It is a lens of hagiography and triumphalism. After the cultural changes of the 1960s and 70s, a second group of historians of Native American culture have shifted their assessment in the opposite direction. Cognizant of the ineffable atrocities suffered by North America’s indigenous peoples, this group views Marty as an emissary of Euro-American oppression, Christian intolerance, and brutal “cultural genocide.”

This lens constructs a narrative of an insensitive, bigoted Marty approaching a tenacious, indefatigable Sitting Bull, heroically preserving his threatened culture against all odds. It is a lens of scorn and skepticism. From the stark dichotomy of these two lenses has emerged a third group of secular cultural historians. These historians seek to understand the encounter as the convergence and clash of two divergent worldviews. Few in number, this group suspends judgment and limits itself to an objective reconstruction of the cultural background of each man. Nevertheless, this group confronts an unavoidable obstacle: the historical record preserves Marty’s life better than it does Sitting Bull’s. Moreover, in approaching Marty as a Swiss immigrant and missionary, this lens omits critical pieces of Marty’s monastic identity.

---

2 Although he does not refer to Marty explicitly, the most vocal member of this group is George E. Tinker, *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993). With respect to the actual encounter, this approach manifests itself in Joseph Manzione, “*I Am Looking to the North for My Life:*” Sitting Bull, 1876–1881 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1991), 48-50 (see chapter 3 below).

The present dissertation takes its inspiration from this third historical lens while offering an original contribution through a distinctly theological lens. In assessing this encounter, this study poses a theological question with ecclesiological and missiological consequences: how did Marty the Benedictine monk become Marty the itinerant missionary? Secular historians overlook Marty’s transition from a monastic life to a missionary life or presume that his encounter with Sitting Bull was no more novel than that of other missionaries. This presupposition fails to differentiate the Benedictine tradition of community and stability from the traditions of other religious orders. To overlook Marty’s distinct identity as a Benedictine monk is to misunderstand his original contribution as a Benedictine missionary. Consequently, the following study answers this theological question by reconstructing Marty’s monastic worldview. This historical reconstruction recovers and analyzes Marty’s Benedictine vision for what theologians commonly refer to as “evangelization,” i.e., the spreading of the Christian gospel through words, personal witness, and ecclesial institutions.

BACKGROUND ON MARTY

The reconstruction of Marty’s monastic identity begins with the sixth-century *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, attributed to St. Benedict of Nursia (d. 547). This *Rule* maintains that the enclosed monastery is a “workshop” of good works through *stabilitas in congregatione* – “stability in the community” (RB 4,78). Although a nascent idea of

---

stability existed among the eremitical communities of the Egyptian desert and the early coenobitical monasteries of Cassian in Gaul, Benedict placed new emphasis on the idea by making stability foundational for monastic life. After the Carolingian propagation of the Rule in the ninth century, the promise of stability came to dominate the character of Benedictine monasticism and its development in the West.⁵

Nevertheless, the story of Benedictine stability and its development remains incomplete and fragmented. When pondering the Benedictine tradition, historians focus on the great medieval congregation of Cluny or the remarkable scholarship of the Maurists in the seventeenth century. Theologians focus on how the medieval Benedictine tradition informed the Church’s liturgical and mystical traditions, and questions about the relationship between monasticism and ecclesiology are often left to studies of medieval theology.⁶ Consequently, scholars often neglect the great revival of Benedictine monasticism after the Reformation and its almost miraculous resurrection after the French Revolution.⁷ Moreover, historians and theologians commonly overlook how the Benedictine renaissance of the nineteenth century arose not only in Europe but also in the United States. Amid the Romantic idealism of early nineteenth-century German Catholicism, a handful of European monks attempted to reclaim the Benedictine heritage of heroic monk-missionaries like St. Boniface (d. 754). Their vision focused on America

---

⁵ For a systematic study of the semantics of “stabilitas” in the Rule, see Rüdiger Gollnick, Die Bedeutung des stabilitas-Begriffes für die pädagogische Konzeption der Regula Benedicti (Regulare Benedicti Studia 14; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1993).


as a providential setting for restoring the Benedictine Order to its original glory through missionary activity. These monks ventured to the shores of the United States, convinced that their tribulations would lay the foundation for a new chapter in Benedictine history. As missionaries, their vision manifested a reinterpretation of the Benedictine tradition and the *Rule’s* principle of stability.

Embodying this new vision were two German-speaking monks who together mark the origins of the Benedictine story in America. The first figure is the Bavarian missionary Boniface Wimmer (1809–1887). Arriving in the United States in 1846, Wimmer established St Vincent Abbey in western Pennsylvania, becoming America’s first abbot. His Cluniac vision created the American-Cassinese (Bavarian) Congregation with St. Vincent as its motherhouse. Around the same time, monks from the Swiss abbey of Maria Einsiedeln established a small priory in southern Indiana. In 1860, Marty arrived from Einsiedeln to save the community. By 1870 he had become the first abbot of St. Meinrad Abbey. Together with its sister abbey in Missouri, St. Meinrad became the center of the Swiss-American Congregation. These Bavarian and Swiss communities developed alongside other emerging institutional structures in the Midwest and possessed a distinct advantage not afforded their coreligionists in Boston and New York. As some of the first “stable” institutions in the Midwest, these pioneering monasteries were able to create distinct loci of Catholic life and culture that dominated rural America and its expansion. Consequently, it is difficult to overestimate the influence Wimmer and Marty had on American Catholic history. Their communities sponsored the establishment of Benedictine nunneries, created priories and abbeys from coast to coast, and built schools, seminaries and colleges that exist to this day. Together Wimmer and Marty mark the
origins of the Benedictine attempt to integrate an active missionary apostolate with a stable community life amid the challenges of American culture.

Although a substantial amount of scholarship exists on Wimmer, few scholars have explored Marty’s distinctly Swiss adaptation of Benedictine monasticism in the United States. Marty’s story remains understudied and practically forgotten. This lacuna in scholarship is significant for three reasons. First, whereas Wimmer’s communities remained independent from their original Bavarian abbey of Metten, Marty’s community remained intimately connected with its home abbey of Einsiedeln. Consequently, the Swiss-American Benedictines enjoyed a greater transatlantic exchange of ideas and monastic values. It was Marty’s leadership that fostered this unique dimension of the Swiss-American Benedictine story, allowing many ancient traditions of Einsiedeln to take root in American soil. The Swiss heritage and its focus on the local Catholic community departed from Wimmer’s more aggressive congregational vision, leading to two different interpretations of stability in American Benedictine monasticism. Second, Wimmer and Marty differed in their visions of monastic scholarship and education. Whereas Wimmer was educated as a diocesan priest before entering the monastery, Marty experienced a true monastic education in Einsiedeln and attempted to transmit this experience to America. Consequently, Wimmer and Marty came to approach the mission of Benedictine education differently. Third, the vision of evangelization differed in the two traditions. Once he established St. Vincent, Wimmer directed this monastery as a Bavarian patriarch, sending forth other monks to act as missionaries throughout the United States. Although he led an itinerant life, Wimmer’s missionary activity remained more or less administrative. Marty, on the other hand, became a missionary in its most
literal sense, both as a monk and as a bishop. After securing the future of St. Meinard Abbey, the new abbot traveled to Dakota Territory with the hopes of establishing a new monastery on the American prairie. Once he arrived, he stayed. His work on the northern plains and his encounter with Sitting Bull attracted the attention of Catholics across the United States. He became a spiritual advisor to Katharine Drexel (1858-1955), who later credited Marty as the inspiration for her religious order dedicated to addressing the plight of Native American and Black Catholics. Eventually Rome named Marty vicar apostolic of the territory and later appointed him as the first bishop of Sioux Falls, South Dakota. During this transition from monastic life to apostolic work, Marty’s Benedictine identity continued to guide his pastoral vision for the Dakotas, both as a missionary and as a bishop. This monastic dimension of Marty’s apostolate remains unexplored.

**Scholarship on Marty**

Almost all general histories of U.S. Catholicism are silent with respect to Marty and the role of Benedictine monasticism. Most secondary literature on Marty is limited to monastic studies that blend scholarship with hagiography, complicating the historiography of Marty’s life and works.

The earliest biographical sources for Marty include three sympathetic and interconnected accounts, all written by Benedictine monks. The first published biography is by Albert Kuhn (1839–1929), a student from Marty’s teaching days in Einsiedeln who later became one of the monastery’s most reputable scholars. In 1897, shortly after Marty’s death, Kuhn published his brief necrology in the Swiss-Catholic periodical, *Alte

---

Two other Benedictine biographies followed Kuhn’s outline in the early twentieth century: a serial biography by Luke Gruwe (1849–1940), published in Paradiesesfrüchte (a St. Meinrad Abbey publication) between 1914 and 1916; and a book-length essay by Ildefons Betschart (1903–1959), published in 1934 through Benziger. These two biographies form a joint narrative. Written from an American perspective, Gruwe’s extensive overview of Marty’s life (published in fifteen installments) has the distinct advantage of being written by someone who knew Marty as his own abbot at St. Meinrad Abbey. Written from a Swiss perspective, Betschart’s work consolidates Gruwe’s biography and marks the first complete monograph on Marty. Betschart occasionally includes other Swiss sources unavailable to Gruwe, including Marty’s letters in Einsiedeln’s Klosterarchiv and the anecdotes of Swiss family members and friends. Most importantly, Betschart is the first to cite many of his sources, providing future historians with an invaluable guide for identifying archival material. For the most part, however, Betschart simply follows the narrative and details of Gruwe, and both

---

11 On Betschart, see Henggeler, *Professbuch*, 634.
12 Betschart further claims that many of Marty’s original letters as bishop in Sioux Falls were burned (*Apostel*, 5–6). Later biographers occasionally refer to this claim to explain various lacunae in Marty’s biography. However, it is not clear what exactly was destroyed and why. One must consider that most of Marty’s contemporaries had colleagues burn personal correspondences after their deaths (for instance, John Ireland). Moreover, it is still common practice to burn a pope’s private letters after his death. The question has recently surfaced in the life of Mother Teresa of Calcutta: her diary was supposed to be burned, yet one of her followers kept the diary, leading to its publication. These comparisons are worth keeping in mind when the scholar is tempted to suspect something sinister about the burning of Marty’s letters in Sioux Falls. Moreover, Thomas O’Gorman, Marty’s friend and successor, seems to have been the one who chose to burn Marty’s private letters. There is, however, the suspicion among some that Marty’s vicar general, Otto Zardetti, had skeletons to hide and asked O’Gorman to burn the letters. This has yet to be substantiated.
accounts of Marty’s life are saturated with hagiography.\textsuperscript{13} Nevertheless, because Gruwe and Betschart provide the oldest written and oral accounts of Marty, their works deserve close attention and analysis.

Gruwe and Betschart laid the foundation for the principal source for Marty’s life and thought: the work of Albert Kleber (1881–1958). As a monk of St. Meinrad Abbey, Kleber wrote a centennial history for the monastery in 1954.\textsuperscript{14} As he compiled his history, Kleber also collected sources on Marty for a future biography to commemorate the centenary of his arrival in America in 1960. To this end, Kleber drafted a forward and nine chapters, yet his death in 1958 prevented its completion. Although some of the sources and quotations in Kleber’s draft appear in his published \textit{History of St. Meinrad Archabbey}, many details for Marty’s life are found only in this unpublished document. In 1992, Alcuin Leibold, a monk of St. Meinrad, transcribed Kleber’s handwritten draft into a legible, type-written document for the St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives.\textsuperscript{15} Although Kleber’s unfinished biography did not include footnotes, it reflects the work of a skilled historian familiar with every known document by or on Marty. In fact, many of Marty’s writings in the St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives are from Kleber’s diligent search for archival documents in the United States, Switzerland, and Germany. Kleber’s \textit{History} and unpublished draft mark the first step to reconstruct Marty’s life through critical archival research.

Kleber’s \textit{History} remained the most extensive account of Marty’s life in English until Robert Karolewitz (1922–2011) popularized Marty’s life with his 1980 monograph,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{Paradiesesfrüchte}, although published in Indiana, was sent to Einsiedeln and is still available in the Stiftsbibliotek.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Albert Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad Archabbey}, 1854-1954 (St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail, 1954).
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Albert Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” compiled by Alcuin Leibold, vol. 1, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 6, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.
\end{itemize}
Bishop Martin Marty: “The Black Robe Lean Chief.” As a South Dakotan columnist and freelance historian, Karolevitz developed a personal interest in Marty’s biography. Although Karolevitz’s journalistic style offers a lucid and engaging portrayal of Marty’s life, his book is not a work of critical scholarship. One glaring oversight plagues Karolevitz’s work: he fails to include a single footnote, even for block quotations. Upon closer examination, the book relies heavily on a private translation of Betschart’s 1934 biography, Claudia Duratschek’s histories of Catholicism in South Dakota, and, I am convinced, Kleber’s unpublished manuscript. Many of Karolevitz’s quotations of German material match Kleber’s translations, and Karolevitz shows no knowledge of Marty’s original German documents. Many biographical details are almost verbatim from Kleber’s account. Its only original contribution to Marty’s life and thought is a handful of local newspaper accounts detailing his life as a bishop. Consequently, this study avoids using Karolevitz’s work for reconstructing Marty’s monastic life and thought.

The most academic presentation of Marty to date can be found in the work of Joel Rippinger, a Benedictine monk of Marmion Abbey in Aurora, Illinois. Rippinger is widely recognized as the foremost historian of American Benedictine monasticism. His *The Benedictine Order in the United States: An Interpretative History* remains the only

---


17 In 1979, M. Stanislaus Van Well, a Benedictine sister of Sacred Heart Convent in Yankton, South Dakota, produced a translation of Betschart’s biography for her community and others interested South Dakota Catholic history: “Bishop Martin Marty, O.S.B., 1834–1896.” Copies of this private translation exist in Mount Marty College (in Yankton) and Conception Abbey in Missouri.

18 M. Claudia Duratschek (1894–1988) was member of Sacred Heart Convent in Yankton, South Dakota, the community of Swiss-Benedictine sisters Marty helped establish in 1880. Although Duratschek never wrote a study exclusively devoted to Marty, her 1943 study of South Dakota Indian missions contains valuable quotations from Marty’s letters in the BCIM records. See Duratschek, *Crusading along Sioux Trails* (St. Meinrad, Ind., 1947). Duratschek had access to the BCIM records when they were still in Washington, D.C., before they were moved to Marquette University.
comprehensive history of the order’s development in America.\textsuperscript{19} Likewise, his two-part biography of Marty in the \textit{American Benedictine Review} in 1982 and its revision for a new history of St. Meinrad in 2004 are the only biographies of Marty that meet the requirements of critical scholarship.\textsuperscript{20} In all three publications Rippinger employs the earlier works of Betschart and Kleber alongside archival documents. Rippinger is the first scholar to make use of Kleber’s collection of materials on Marty in the St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives.\textsuperscript{21} However, Rippinger’s citations demonstrate a limited command of German sources, and his archival notes follow collections that have since been rearranged. I have met with Fr. Rippinger personally and he has encouraged my work, especially in its potential to offer a lay scholar’s new perspective. He is further delighted by my archival findings, including archival documents he was unaware of or unable to locate. Moreover, Rippinger insists that scholars need to reexamine Marty within his nineteenth-century intellectual and theological context, something he believes is missing from his own work.

Rippinger’s groundbreaking work has inspired two academic dissertations on Marty’s life and though. The present dissertation takes its inspiration from Rippinger’s works while nuancing and expanding it in light of new archival findings, a closer analysis


\textsuperscript{21} Surprisingly, I have no clear evidence that Rippinger used Kleber’s unpublished biography in SMAA. This explains why he relies on Karolevitz for some details that he could not find in Kleber’s published materials.
of original German sources, and a more complete historical and theological context. At the same time, Rippinger has connected me with Manual Menrath, a Swiss historian who is also currently writing a dissertation on Marty from socio-cultural, post-colonial perspective. Menrath and I have met in person, hosted one another during archival research abroad, and collaborated throughout our research and writing. Our respective dissertations are complementary in that I focus on Marty’s theological and monastic vision while Menrath focuses on Marty’s immigrant history and work among the Lakota. My discovery of Menrath’s work is partially responsible for my decision to limit the present dissertation to Marty’s monastic vocation and the theological vision behind his life as a missionary. Manuel’s work effectively takes up where this dissertation ends, and his focus on Marty’s Lakota missions complements my study of Marty’s Swiss-Benedictine background. My dissertation reexamines Marty’s years as a Swiss-Benedictine monk from an American perspective; Menrath’s dissertation reexamines Marty’s years as an American missionary and bishop from a Swiss perspective. Consequently, both dissertations analyze Marty’s story in new ways that transcend the work of Betschart, Kleber, Karolevitz, and Rippinger. Together our dissertations mark the first full survey of Marty’s social and intellectual history. My dissertation ensures that this reconstruction considers the theological vision behind the development of his biography.

22 Menrath’s primary inspiration is Schelbert’s work on Marty in relation to Sitting Bull (“Conflicting Identities,” cited above, note 3).
Reconstructing Marty’s monastic worldview, this dissertation focuses on three subquestions: (1) How did Marty’s Swiss formation influence his vision of Benedictine evangelization? (2) How did this formation develop in America during his leadership of St. Meinrad? And, (3) how did this development inform Marty’s application of his vision to his missionary activity in Dakota Territory? Focusing on the Benedictine character of Marty’s vision, the study limits its scope to Marty’s monastic years in order to answer the dissertation’s overarch question as presented above: how did Marty the monk become Marty the missionary?

Reconstructing Marty’s monastic worldview, this dissertation argues that Marty’s vision for Benedictine evangelization in America transforms the Rule’s principle of *stabilitas in congregatione*, “stability in community,” into an original missionary paradigm of *ora et labora*, “prayer and work.” During his monastic formation (1834–1860), Marty combines old and new elements of Einsiedeln’s Swiss-Benedictine tradition to create a vision of the monastery as a spiritual family educating and unifying Catholics. As the administrator and prior of St. Meinrad in Indiana (1860–1870), Marty applies this “familial imagination” to the community’s monastic life, school, and missionary work. He further advances the Benedictine principle of stability (*stabilitas*) as an agent of lasting evangelization through the education and unity of the local ecclesial community (*congregatio*). Finally, through his reform agenda as abbot (1870–1880), Marty transforms his vision of stability in the community into a missionary model of prayer and work designed to educate the indigenous faithful and to unify the monastic and ecclesial
families. Overall, Marty’s life and thought demonstrate the development of a vision of Benedictine evangelization rooted in monastic education and ecclesial unification.

**METHOD, STRUCTURE, AND TERMS**

The present dissertation proceeds as a study in historical theology. It retrieves and refocuses historical data with a theological lens, shedding new light on a historical problem. In particular, the dissertation takes a biographical approach. Through the life of Marty, it analyzes the problematic of mission and communion within American Benedictine history and U.S. Catholicism. Likewise, the study critically analyzes previous biographies. It determines the historical validity of an event or source and analyzes its significance through archival research and careful attention to chronological development, discerning true biography from mere hagiography. In a similar vein, the dissertation recovers and analyzes many of Marty’s works that have been ignored or misunderstood by previous scholars, including Kleber and Rippinger. These include unpublished sermons, two neglected essays, several missionary reports in German, a lay guide for Gregorian chant, an unexamined translation project of American Catholic historians, and a forgotten published history of the Benedictine Order. A dearth of copies or the inability to read the German *Frakturschrift* (typeface) or *Kurrentschrift* (handwriting) has prevented scholars from exploring these works. The dissertation further situates these writings within their proper historical context through Marty’s correspondence with his contemporaries.

Furthermore, the study’s biographical focus provides a framework for structuring the dissertation. The structure reflects the study’s three subquestions by focusing on the
corresponding stages of Marty’s monastic life: (1) his youth and monastic formation in Einsiedeln (1834–1860); (2) his leadership of St. Meinrad as administrator and prior (1860–1870); and (3) his leadership of St. Meinrad as abbot alongside his nascent efforts to expand its mission (1870–1880). The three chapters of the dissertation correspond to these three stages of Marty’s life, focusing on the development of his reflections on monastic stability and community in America.

Chapter one outlines the convergence of old and new worldviews during Marty’s youth and monastic formation (1834–1860). By recovering sources that prior scholarship has either neglected or misinterpreted, it argues that this convergence prompted Marty to envision the Benedictine monastery as a spiritual family fostering education and unity among the Catholic faithful. Outlining four stages of his intellectual and spiritual development, the chapter demonstrates how Marty’s years in Switzerland reflect a search for a communal life that transcends the natural and perishable. In Einsiedeln he discovers a supernatural family life that endures the test of time. This realization becomes the foundation for his vision of the Benedictines as effective and providential agents of education and unification throughout Christian history. The chapter further shows how this vision manifests itself in Marty’s two essays and his use of St. Meinrad as an exemplar of Benedictine conversion.

Chapter two develops Peter Yock’s work on the monastic life and vision of St. Meinrad Abbey during its infancy (1860–1870). It moves beyond Yock’s insight into the monks’ “sacramental imagination” to demonstrate how Marty applies a Swiss-Benedictine “familial imagination” to the American mission. Through this vision, Marty guides the Swiss monks’ threefold Benedictine mission to America: the establishment of
a monastery, the education of youth and seminarians, and the care of souls through missionary work. Marty uses his Swiss-Benedictine experience to transform each of these elements and unite American Catholics with the universal Church. The chapter further demonstrates how Marty not only adapts but also challenges American culture by reconstructing his 1868 debate with Wimmer over the Rule’s principle of stability. Overall, the chapter reveals how Marty approaches Benedictine stability as an agent of lasting conversion through the education and unification of the local ecclesial community.

Chapter three engages the work of M.D. Meeuws to show how previous scholars have overlooked the originality of Marty’s rhetoric of “ora et labora” in his transition from abbot to missionary (1870–1880). It argues that Marty’s embrace of the idea of “ora et labora” marks not only an original contribution to his own monastic tradition but also the culmination of his vision for Benedictine evangelization in America. The chapter demonstrates how Marty’s missionary paradigm, embodied in this concise phrase, flowed from his controversial reforms of the monastery’s breviary (prayer) and conversi (work). Moreover, it recovers his neglected history of the Benedictines, Der heilige Benedikt und seine Orden, to reveal the importance of Marty’s sense of history as biography for his transition from a monastic reformer to an itinerant missionary. The chapter also analyzes Marty’s encounter with Sitting Bull to show how Marty returns to Benedictine stability as the foundation for his missionary paradigm of prayer and work. Overall, the chapter shows how Marty’s pursuit of “stabilitas in congregatione” for the monastery develops into a missionary model of “ora et labora” that establishes the Benedictines, including himself, as agents of ecclesial evangelization through education and unification.
Finally, the term “evangelization” requires clarification. Marty and his contemporaries never use the language of “evangelization,” and thus one could object to the term as anachronistic and ahistorical. Rather, nineteenth-century Catholics spoke of “missions” and avoided the language of “evangelization” because of its association with Protestant “evangelism.” Scholars have argued that the Catholic idea of “missions” originated with the Jesuits and expanded through early modern European colonialism. After Vatican II’s return to a more “kerygmatic” or gospel-centered model of mission, Catholic terminology moved away from the “territorial” or geographical language of “mission” and embraced the “situational” or cultural idea of “evangelization.” Marty and his confreres do indeed speak of St. Meinrad as a “colony” and the Dakota missions as “nurseries” of Benedictine expansion, ostensibly reflecting geographical language.

This historical distinction, however, confronts limitations when presented with the life and thought of Marty. Although his vision reflects the idea of geographical expansion and transplantation, it also transcends the early modern Catholic language of a “mission” to a foreign, non-Christian culture. Marty’s life stands at the threshold of a new Catholic reflection on the multidimensional nature of spreading the Christian gospel. Marty’s model of Benedictine missionary activity encompassed more than the erection of a church, the teaching of doctrines, and the performance of sacraments. Rather, Marty’s sense of mission began with internal reform and a return to St. Benedict’s founding vision. Benedictine missionary activity stemmed not from colonial, political expansion but rather a desire to preserve the Catholic faith and the Benedictine tradition in the

---

modern world. Consequently, Einsiedeln’s mission to America did not serve non-
Christians but rather German-Catholic immigrants. Moreover, Marty’s leadership and 
reforms were centered on a more active participation of the faithful rather than passive 
reception. In the Dakota missions Marty extended this idea to indigenous faithful. Even 
in these missions, Marty’s priority for Benedictine missionary activity was to serve the 
Sioux who were already baptized and to create a Catholic culture through education and 
work. Rather than imposing the faith, Marty sought to create a stable community that 
would serve as an invitation for other non-Christian Sioux. His distinctly Benedictine 
approach to these missions focused more on fostering community than meeting a quota of 
baptisms. Consequently, this study follows the lead of other American Catholic scholars, 
including Benedictines, who have adopted the broader terminology of “evangelization” 
for a more comprehensive understanding of Catholic development and expansion in the 
United States.24

CHAPTER 1: NOVA ET VETERA

“Oportet ergo eum esse doctum lege divina, ut sciat et sit unde proferat nova et vetera...” RB 64.9

Marty, like any monk, was a man of his time. He viewed the world through the political and cultural controversies of his day. Nineteenth-century Switzerland sat at the European crossroads of religious tensions between Protestants and Catholics and political polarities between Enlightenment liberals and Romantic conservatives. As a native of Schwyz, Marty viewed this modern tension through the lens of Swiss-Catholic conservatism. Nevertheless, Marty was also a Benedictine monk, steeped in the millennial-old tradition of Einsiedeln. Marty’s life and thought thus embodied two converging worlds: Swiss-Catholic modernity and monastic antiquity, the new and the old.

This convergence of new and old worldviews escapes most biographies of Marty. The biographies of Gruwe, Betschart, and Kleber presume a monastic audience already familiar with Einsiedeln’s history and its Swiss-Catholic cultural milieu. This assumption presents a significant obstacle for an Anglo-American understanding of Marty’s monastic life and thought. Although Rippinger’s work attempts to overcome this obstacle, a significant lacuna in scholarship prevents his success. Aside from Kleber’s unpublished manuscript, no other work analyzes two essays that Marty penned as a teacher in Einsiedeln: (1) a biographical treatise, “How One Learned and Taught a Thousand Years Ago” (1857), and (2) an exhortation for student unity, “On Associations and Studying Youth” (1858). The first reconstructs the familial character of monastic education, and the second promotes the Marian sodality as a solution for student and ecclesial unity.
Rippinger and other scholars confuse these essays as “dissertations” while further failing to read and analyze their contents. Even Kleber, who is the only scholar to have read the German texts, gives only a cursory overview that lacks depth and insight. Consequently, previous scholarship has completely overlooked two essential works. These works manifest not only Marty’s integration of ancient Swiss-Benedictine monastic values and modern Swiss-Catholic concerns but also his blueprint for American Benedictine evangelization later in life. Filling this lacuna and reconstructing Marty’s monastic formation, the present chapter argues that Marty combines old and new elements of Swiss Catholicism and Einsiedeln’s Swiss-Benedictine tradition to create a vision of the monastery as a spiritual family educating and unifying the Catholic faithful. It further demonstrates how Marty’s Swiss experience reflects a search for a communal life that transcends the natural and perishable. In Einsiedeln he discovers a Benedictine family that offers supernatural life and permanency. This realization becomes the foundation for his vision of the Benedictines as effective and providential agents of education and unification in Christian history.

To support this thesis, the chapter traces the development of Marty’s idea of Catholic family life in four chronological stages. The first stage (1834–1843) focuses on his upbringing in his hometown of Schwyz and its Swiss-Catholic milieu of traditional localism and political tension. Turning to his adolescent years, the second stage (1843–1847) discerns the impact of the Jesuits on Marty’s early education in Fribourg. The Jesuits expose Marty to an ultramontane worldview that transcends Swiss localism through an emphasis on foreign missions and the Marian sodality. The third stage (1847–1854) marks a crucial transition point in Marty’s life through Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule.
(collegiate school). In this stage, Marty begins to embrace a providential vision of history through a distinctly Benedictine lens. Marty’s experience of Einsiedeln’s time-honored monastic tradition prompts him to envision the Benedictines as effective agents of conversion in the modern world because of their supernatural and lasting family life. During the fourth stage (1854–1860), Marty, as a monk, professor, and preacher, integrates his idea of Benedictine conversion with a vision for Catholic education and unification. This integration comes to light in the two overlooked essays, noted above, that Marty penned for the school just prior to his departure for America. A close examination of both works demonstrates how Marty’s vision blends Benedictine history (the old) with a modern Swiss-Catholic yearning for religious education and unity (the new). This vision finds further expression in his homiletics, in which he presents St. Meinrad as an exemplar of Benedictine conversion who shows a new generation of students their roots in an ancient Benedictine tradition.

I. SCHWYZ: 1834–1846

Joseph Melchior Alois Marty was born and baptized on the same day, January 13, 1834, in the city Schwyz, the capital of the Swiss “canton” (province) of the same name. Referring to simply as Alois, he was the first of eleven children born to James Alois Marty

---

1 It remains questionable whether Marty was baptized on the same day of his birth. The parish records state January 13, 1834, as the date of his baptism, and Kleber maintains that this was also his birth date. He bases the opinion on (1) the local custom to baptize on the same day of birth and (2) Marty’s baptismal certificate necessary for his monastic profession (which states the 13th as both his day of birth and baptism). See Kleber “Bishop Martin Marty,” 10. Betschart, however, claims that Marty’s birthdate was the 12th. See Betschart, Apostel, 9.
Alois (1806–1870) and Elizabeth (Reichlin) Marty (1810–1888). From the beginning his family life was steeped in the piety of Swiss Catholicism. Marty’s father was both a shoemaker and the parish sexton, and the young Alois could be found faithfully every morning assisting his father with the morning masses (beginning at 5 am) in the ornate baroque St. Martin’s Church in the center of the city, the same church of his baptism.

In addition to a life rooted in liturgy and prayer, Marty’s family imparted two qualities that later led to his monastic vocation: a zealous devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and an appreciation for education, which was not compulsory in Catholic cantons like Schwyz. An incident in his childhood testifies to the first quality. Only a year old, the young Alois ingested sulfuric acid from his father’s workshop. Immediately the family implored the intercession of Mary while resolving to make an annual pilgrimage to the nearby Marian shrine at Sonnenberg. The incident almost suffocated the child and left permanent scars on his face, yet miraculously the acid had no effect on Alois’s mouth and

---


3 Unlike Alois, all three brothers received their seminary training not in Einsiedeln but in Mainz under Bishop Wilhelm Kettler (1811-1877), a vocal proponent of religious freedom for Catholics in Germany. The first, John Baptist (1840-1901), became a professor for the Catholic gymnasium in Schwyz and later the chaplain to the Swiss Guards in Rome. The second, Anton (1847-1914), was the greatest intellectual of the family. Through his studies in Mainz, the melancholy Anton developed a close friendship with Franz Brentano (1838-1917) and later left the priesthood to join Brentano among the Old Catholics. Through Brentano he became a distinguished professor in philology and philosophy in Prague. The final brother, Martin (1850-1916, and not to be confused with Alois’s professed name), eventually became the pastor of St. Martin’s in Schwyz. On Kettler, see Paul Misner, Social Catholicism in Europe from the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War (New York: Crossroad, 1991); and Jonathan Sperber, Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984). See also Betschart, Apostel, 17-22. Alois’s relationship with these brothers cannot be reconstructed through archival evidence and thus remains a mystery.

4 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 25. In the same church Alois was confirmed at the age of three by the Bishop of Chur in 1837. According to Kleber, Alois was confirmed with his sisters since the last episcopal visit had been in 1821 and Schwyz did not know when the next would be (10).
voice (and thus never hindered his musical talent). In gratitude, the family made its annual pilgrimage throughout Alois’s life, leaving a plaque commemorating the event.\(^5\) As for a love for learning, the young Alois attended the Latin school up the hill, known as the Klösterli (“little cloister”).\(^6\) For a decade the Jesuits had staffed the primary school, in which Alois received four years of preparatory Latin and advanced quickly. In 1843 at age nine (three years before the normal age) he received his first communion.\(^7\) Excelling in Latin, Alois enrolled early in the Jesuit’s gymnasium (or “college”) in Schwyz in the fall of 1843 at the Klösterli site. The following year the gymnasium moved to a new site in the city, and there Alois remained with the Jesuits for the next two years.

The family’s efforts to educate Marty soon confronted a new political reality that directly impacted the youth’s life and initiated his transition from the family of his birth to the family of the cloister. By the 1840s, Schwyz stood at the center of Swiss-Catholic conservatism on the eve of a civil war. The escalating conflict stemmed from two converging cultures in Marty’s native Switzerland: a Swiss-Catholic tradition of localism, and a liberal movement to form a modern Swiss state.

**Swiss-Catholic Localism**

Marty’s Swiss experience began with a culture of localism indicative of Swiss-Catholicism, a quality known as *Kantonligeist* (“spirit of the canton”).\(^8\) This Swiss-Catholic worldview began with the history of a thirteenth-century alliance between the cantons of Uri, Unterwalden, and Schwyz to escape Habsburg rule. Other cantons formed

---

similar alliances, and by 1353 an organized confederacy emerged. With the confederacy arose two legends around 1470: the “Oath of the Rütli” between the three original cantons of 1291; and the fictional story of Wilhem Tell, an heroic marksman who assassinated an imperial reeve and became a symbol of Swiss liberty. These narratives served as battle cries for rural Swiss peasantry in various uprisings against the political elite and gave rise to a Swiss patriotic movement throughout the eighteenth century, one uniting Enlightenment ideals of social and political progress with a sense of Swiss exceptionalism in European history. This patriotism was tested in 1798, when the confederacy became a “sister republic” of France, named the Helvetic Republic. From its beginnings the new state lacked internal unity. Only French troops could ensure its continued existence, as rebellions in rural regions became more commonplace. The radical, centralizing forces governing the republic remained in conflict with more moderate liberals and conservatives who valued the sovereignty of local cantons and a more “direct” model of democracy via the Landesgemeinde, the popular cantonal assemblies. Marty’s conservative canton of Schwyz stood at the center of this conflict. Its citizens would commonly refer to the canton as “our fatherland” versus the republic as “the common fatherland.” After 1798 internal unrest throughout Switzerland ensued until Napoleon’s “Act of Mediation” in 1803, dissolving the Helvetic Republic and restoring the confederation.

---

10 Ibid., 29.
11 Ibid., 41.
12 Ibid., 80.
13 Ibid., 117.
14 Ibid., 112.
Even with the abolition of the republic, internal fractions within the confederation persisted. The old divisions became all the more acute: Protestant versus Catholic cantons, French-speaking versus German-speaking cantons, industrial city-cantons (like Berne, Basel and Zurich) versus rural, agrarian cantons (like Lucerne and Schwyz). Several cantons were some of the “most highly industrialized areas of the world,” and consequently wealthier cantons were economically outpacing more mountainous, rural cantons.\(^{15}\) After France’s July Revolution of 1830 sparked a movement for constitutional reform in Switzerland, the conservative Catholic cantons resisted any reforms on the federal level. In the ensuing culture war, liberal, Protestant cantons promoted the idea of a national *Volksvereine* in stark contrast to the conservative, Catholic idea of *Gemeinschaft*, in which community was rooted in the family, the village, and the canton.\(^{16}\)

**A New Swiss State**

Between 1830 and 1847, the tension between Protestant and Catholic cantons swelled to the point of war. Three distinct groups formed the political landscape of the 1830s and 40s: the elite, property-holding liberals; the egalitarian, utilitarian radicals; and the religious, traditional conservatives.\(^{17}\) Within this latter group, moreover, were two more subgroups: the Protestant “ultras” who embraced national popular sovereignty and “modern methods,” and the Catholic “federalists” who insisted on cantonal sovereignty


and a political role for the Church.\textsuperscript{18} By the 1840s the liberal and more radical cantons were economically, politically, and militarily superior to the conservative cantons, sparking a full civil war in 1847.\textsuperscript{19}

The watershed moment sparking the war of 1847 can be traced to the question of monasticism within a liberal Swiss nation. In 1841, the northern canton of Aargau, equally divided between Protestants and Catholics, enacted legislation that suppressed all eight monasteries in its territory (four male, four female) and confiscated their property.\textsuperscript{20} Although the Confederate Diet later ruled that the move violated the federal constitution, only the four female monasteries were restored (since, it was presumed, they could be useful in education). In retaliation, the council of Lucerne, the center of Catholic opposition within Switzerland, invited the Jesuits to assume pastoral and professorial duties in its canton. The move infuriated Swiss liberals and radicals, both united in their intense hatred of the Jesuits. The Lucerne man behind this act of protest, the charismatic Josef Leu (1800–1845), was later murdered in bed during the radical uprisings known as the \textit{Freischarenzüge} of 1844 and 1845.\textsuperscript{21} On December 11, 1845, the Catholic cantons of Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Lucerne, Valais and Fribourg joined forces as the so-called \textit{Sonderbund} (“special union”). Originally the alliance was formed as a secret political coalition to reconfigure cantonal boundaries in favor of Catholics. When the Confederate Diet learned of its existence a year later, Swiss liberals and radicals demanded that it be dissolved. In July of 1847, the Diet

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{19} Zimmer, \textit{A Contested Nation}, 122.
\textsuperscript{21} For more on Leu, see M. Syfrig, \textit{Joseph L. von Ebersol (1800-1845) und seine Bewegung} (Hochdorf: 1995).
\end{flushright}
ordered the *Sonderbund* to disband. In August, reforms for the federal constitution were introduced. In September, the Diet formally expelled the Jesuits from Switzerland (a law that lasted until 1973). Fighting erupted in November, with federal troops outnumbering the *Sonderbund* two to one. By November 29, the 25-day “gentlemen’s war” came to end with 74 causalities.²²

In his description of the Sonderbund War and its effects on Swiss Catholicism, one historian concludes that Swiss Catholics “ceased to want anything to do with liberal ideas. They retired into their communities and erected walls against the general society of their country.”²³ Swiss Catholics did indeed embrace an enclosed culture as a “state within a state” or, in the language of one Swiss historian, a “Sondergesellschaft” or “special society,” echoing the self-description of the Catholic cantons in the ill-fated union.²⁴ Nevertheless, Catholics within this subculture explicitly referred to themselves as “katholisch-konservativ,” a political label that referred not only to self-enclosure but also to the protection of the Church’s freedom from state interference. Conservative Swiss Catholics understood themselves as the voice of true liberty and the preservers of true democracy at the cantonal level. Whereas liberals sought a “new social order” that would trump cantonal diversity, Catholics sought to conserve the political and cultural independence of Catholic cantons.²⁵ In this sense, Swiss Catholics did anything but “retire” into a cultural bastion. On the contrary, their worldview was one of zealous activity, manifested in political parties, Catholic newspapers, and Catholic patriotic unions (such as the *Piusverein* and the Swiss Student Union, established in 1857 and

1858, respectively).\textsuperscript{26} Rather than merely acquiesce, Swiss Catholics promoted their own flavor of patriotism that centered on Catholic identity and transcended the confederation. The Swiss Catholic was expected to be “always and above all else Catholic, whether he be present at Mass or defending Catholic values in his political community or being actively charitable toward the missions.”\textsuperscript{27}

Alongside this interest in activity and external missions was also a rising Swiss-Catholic neo-ultramontanism that employed Enlightenment philosophies of liberty, law, and history to argue for the restoration of a Christian society. Swiss Catholics joined many of their coreligionists in a nineteenth-century ultramontane movement that looked to the papacy for moral, spiritual, and political support and the works of Joseph de Maistre (1753–1821) and Joseph Görres (1776–1848) for inspiration.\textsuperscript{28} Consequently, Swiss Catholics of the mid-to-late-nineteenth century demonstrated a “peculiar mixture of cantonal particularism and Catholic universalism.”\textsuperscript{29} This new Swiss-Catholic “universalism” and its embrace of foreign missions and ultramontanism came to life in Marty’s Jesuit education.

\textsuperscript{26} Altermatt, \textit{Konfession}, 165.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 58.
\textsuperscript{29} Zimmer, \textit{A Contested Nation}, 153.
Recognizing his linguistic and musical talents, the Jesuits invited the young Alois to their premier Swiss gymnasium, St. Michael’s College in Fribourg. Marty’s biographers have commonly interpreted this invitation as a recognition of his potential for joining the Society of Jesus, convinced that Marty would have become a Jesuit had it not been for Switzerland’s political upheaval. Albeit plausible, these biographers leave his Jesuit education to this observation and overlook its intellectual and spiritual impact. A closer examination of this second stage of his youth (1843–1847) reveals how the Jesuit’s school in Fribourg exposed Marty to an elite cosmopolitan ultramontanism that challenged the Swiss-Catholic localism of Schwyz and fostered Catholic unity through the Marian sodality. Although his education at Fribourg lasted only a year, Marty took this Jesuit experience with him to Einsiedeln.

In the fall of 1846, the young Alois left his hometown for his fourth year of gymnasium in Fribourg. Although Alois’s family initially protested the move, it later yielded to this life-changing opportunity. In exchange for subsidizing his tuition and board, the Jesuits employed the youth’s talents as an organist and vocalist. Alongside these duties, the young Alois experienced a regimented schedule similar to what he would later experience in Einsiedeln. Rising at 5am, students had set times for prayer and eating, with a special emphasis on musical instruction alongside a classical Jesuit

32 Ibid.
curriculum. According to samples of the school’s curriculum, Alois’s fourth year was devoted to grammar. He likely studied Canisius’s catechism, read Cicero in Latin and Plato in Greek, and perfected his French grammar through the poetry of Fénélon and J.B. Rousseau. Alois had the famous Jesuit catechist Joseph Deharbe (1800–1871) as an instructor in Fribourg, potentially influencing Marty’s emphasis on catechesis later as an abbot and a missionary. The Jesuits of Fribourg also emphasized the grandeur of liturgical aesthetics. The school boasted a regionally-renowned choir and orchestra for its liturgies, and for high feasts the students chanted vespers with solemn processions. In many ways, Alois’s experience was a fortuitous primer for his later move to Einsiedeln.

33 Kathleen Ashe, *The Jesuit Academy (Pensionnat) of Saint Michel in Fribourg, 1827-1847* (Fribourg: University Press, 1971), 86. The Fribourg school also hosted a variety of distinguished Jesuits, many of whom influenced the development of nineteenth-century Catholicism in Europe and America. Although his tenure at Fribourg preceded Marty by some four years, Joseph Kleutgen (1811–1883) taught aesthetics and natural law at the school between 1837 and 1843. From Fribourg he was summoned to Rome, where he promoted neo-Scholastic thought at Vatican I (1869–70) and aided Pope Leo XIII in the drafting of *Aeterni Patris* (1879). Although Kleutgen never taught Marty in Fribourg, Marty read Kleutgen’s *Ars dicendi* (1847) as a sixth-year student in Einsiedeln and later used the same book as an instructor in rhetoric (see *Jahresbericht über die Schulanstalt des Benediktiner-Siftes Maria Einsiedeln* [Einsiedeln, 1849], 8).

Another Jesuit whom Alois may have encountered was Bernardin F. Wiget (1821–1883). Like Deharbe, Wiget fled Fribourg in 1847 with the suppression of St. Michael’s, later joining the Maryland Province of Jesuits in the United States. In his study of freedom and U.S. Catholicism, John McGreevy points to the pivotal role Wiget later assumed in forging the American Catholic parochial school system as an entity opposed to the common school system (Catholicism and American Freedom: A History [New York: W.W. Norton, 2003], 7-11, 19-20, 42). For Wiget, the creation of sodality for boys in 1856 (swelling to an enrollment of 1,800) prompted the creation of Boston’s first parochial school in 1858. Wiget’s story exemplifies the Fribourg Jesuit connection between education and the sodality movement. Although it is unlikely that Alois had Wiget as an instructor, they had two things in common: they both hailed from the city of Schwyz, and both would leave Switzerland for apostolic work in America centered on education and sodalities. For Wiget’s life, see “Fr. Bernardin F. Wiget,” *Woodstock Letters* 12 (1883): 189-93.


35 Betschart, *Der Apostel*, 11. Deharbe was best known for the popularity of his catechism, *Katholischer Katechismus oder Lehrbegriff* (Regensburg, 1847). The catechism gained currency in almost all German-speaking dioceses of nineteenth-century Europe and enjoyed popularity among German-American Catholics. Almost nothing is written on Deharbe’s life, despite the popularity of his catechism. We only know that Deharbe left Switzerland in 1847 with expulsion of the Jesuits. See J. E. Koehler, “Deharbe, Joseph,” *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 4:612-13. Whether or not he taught in Fribourg is a matter of speculation (Betschart does not cite a source). If Marty did know him at this time, it would have been just before the publication of his famous catechism in 1847.

Aside from a more advanced curriculum, Fribourg opened up a new cosmopolitan world to Marty that, paradoxically, formed a bastion of Catholic conservatism on the eve of the Sonderbund War.\textsuperscript{37} After the fall of Napoleon, Fribourg invited the Jesuits to return and reclaim the school they had staffed since the sixteenth century. In 1827 the Jesuits created a boarding “academy” alongside its established “college” (gymnasium). The academy gradually attracted an international populace from as far away as the Americas.\textsuperscript{38} Many of the academy’s pupils numbered among Catholic Europe’s elite, and more than a few were French political refugees with strong royalist sympathies. The student body promoted loyalty to king and pope, reinforced through the school’s ultramontane Jesuit faculty.\textsuperscript{39} In this environment, the young Alois imbibed French ultramontanism while mingling with future princes, diplomats, priests, and bishops.

In addition to its international atmosphere, Fribourg further exposed Marty to the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a hallmark of Jesuit education. The Marian sodality enjoyed a rich legacy in Fribourg. St. Peter Canisius (1521–1597) had introduced the sodality to Jesuit education in Fribourg in 1581, and since then its members included the social elite of the city.\textsuperscript{40} The Marian sodality fostered the spiritual life of upper level students (and later parishioners) through a regiment of weekly confession and communion, daily mass and rosary, communal prayer and meditation, acts of charity in hospitals and among the poor, and spiritual instruction by a director. After the restoration of the society, the Jesuits marked March 25th with an annual candlelit procession of

\textsuperscript{38} Ashe, The Jesuit Academy, 20-26, 128-29.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 130, 144.
\textsuperscript{40} See the description for the Fribourg model in ibid., 97. The sodality originated in the society’s college in Rome in 1563 and was given papal approval in 1584.
sodality members, including students, magistrates, military personnel, and clergy, along with a renewal of consecration to the Virgin that “left a deep impression on all hearts.”

Within St. Michael’s, the sodality occupied a prominent role in the boarding academy to ensure piety and virtue. The sodality “set the tone of the academy,” and the priests in charge were regarded as “saints.” Marty witnessed this display of Marian pageantry and piety. Later as a student in Einsiedeln, Marty introduced the Marian sodality among his students at the Benedictine school, an idea that he clearly imported from his Jesuit experience.

Marty’s exposure to Jesuit education, however, was short lived. Alois had barely begun his second year in Fribourg before the Jesuits were expelled from Switzerland. On November 14, 1847, federal troops captured Fribourg during the Sonderbund War. Although the majority of federal troops followed their general’s orders to respect private property in Fribourg, the soldiers made an exception for the Jesuits. Upon discovering wine in the building, the troops vandalized, looted, and defiled it with drunken orgies. Insult added to injury when the new constitution of 1848 officially expelled the Jesuits from the confederacy, and the society was forced to close their schools, including those in Fribourg and Schwyz. Despite his departure from Fribourg, Marty applied his Jesuit experience to a new religious family no less fervent in its Marian piety.

41 History of the Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin Mary: A Memorial of the Tercentenary Jubilee, 1584-1884 (Boston: Noonan, 1885), 54, 212.
42 Ashe, The Jesuit Academy, 126-7. The Jesuits created three sodalities so that all the students could be included: for the upper college level, the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin (originally founded by Canisius); for the lower college, the Sodality of the Holy Angels (for students Marty’s age); and the Sodality of St. Aloysius (for the youngest pupils). See Ashe, The Jesuit Academy, 97.
43 Ibid., 38-9. See also Joachim Remak, A Very Civil War: The Swiss Sonderbund War of 1847 (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1993), 114, 170-1. Prior to the invasion, students were either sent abroad or home, and much of the Jesuit community fled to Savoy. Marty had to wait out the war in the Zurich area before he could return to Schwyz at the end of November.
III. A STUDENT IN EINSIEDELN: 1847–1854

With the Jesuits gone, Marty’s parents searched for a new school for their son. The Catholic Sonderbund had faded into the shadows of history, and new constitutional reforms were forging a more liberal Swiss confederacy. The new gymnasium the Jesuits had recently built in Schwyz now stood empty, and it remained so until 1858. With the Jesuits expelled, Swiss Catholic families like the Martys looked to the only other religious order with the institutional means to educate their sons: the Benedictines. In conservative cantons the Benedictines continued to dominate rural Catholic culture. Since Trent, most Swiss priests were trained in monasteries and not Jesuit schools or diocesan seminaries, creating a “localized Catholic culture centered on the monasteries.”

For the Martys, the nearest Benedictine school in the canton of Schwyz was Einsiedeln. Although its modest Stiftschule hardly qualified as a classic “college” for secondary education, it was one of the few options available within Switzerland’s new political milieu. Consequently Alois’s father entrusted his son to the monks of Maria Einsiedeln in December of 1847. Alois thus transitioned from a Jesuit to a Benedictine education, and this transition had life-changing consequences.

Although Marty’s biographers acknowledge the importance of Marty’s transition to Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule, most accounts content themselves with generalities. Even Kleber’s unpublished biography overlooks the intellectual and cultural transformation of the school at the time of Marty’s matriculation. Consequently, scholars’ understanding of

---

45 Schwyz still did not have any state-sponsored schools at this time.
46 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 28. Because the school semester had already started on October 18, Alois began his studies late, arriving in Einsiedeln on December 21.
Marty’s Benedictine education during this third stage (1847–1854) remains incomplete. Retrieving curricular yearbooks, this section demonstrates how Marty experiences mid-century reforms in Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule that combined old and new elements, blending the abbey’s venerable monastic tradition with a modernized pedagogy and German Catholic Idealism. Moreover, by reexamining five extracurricular developments during this stage, the section further shows how this transformation impacts Marty both intellectually and personally. Intellectually Marty begins to embrace a providential vision of history through a distinctly Benedictine lens, one that envisions the Benedictines as effective agents of conversion in the modern world by virtue of their supernatural and lasting family life. This recognition of the Benedictine family as an eternal, everlasting antidote to the temporality of the world further sparks a personal conversion that inspires Marty to enter the monastery.

In order to trace these intellectual and personal developments, this section first outlines the history of Einsiedeln’s monastery and school and then proceeds to analyze Marty’s curriculum. Finally, it reconstructs and analyzes five extracurricular developments: the translation of missionary annals, the establishment of a Marian sodality in Einsiedeln, a panegyric for Einsiedeln’s departing missionaries, the death of Marty’s sister, and Marty’s confession in Einsiedeln’s student newspaper.

**Einsiedeln Abbey: A Millennial Tradition**

Some twenty-five miles south of Zurich, in an Alpine valley in the canton of Schwyz, is the small village of Einsiedeln, a name corresponding to “settlement” or “hermitage.” Perched above the small dwelling is the sandstone facade of a baroque
abbey and its two noble towers. A cascade of stairs descends from its portal to meet two arched porticos that mimic the colonnade of St. Peter’s in Rome. Behind the abbey’s grand yet altogether simple facade, one is greeted by an ornate, late-baroque interior, replete with flying cherubs, soaring frescos, and dazzling colors that impress upon the mind the descent of the heavens. Upon entry, the eye immediately meets a small free-standing chapel under an octagonal cupola, a church within a church. Within this humble Gnadenkapelle or “chapel of graces” stands a fifteenth-century Schwarzmadonna, known among pilgrims as Our Lady of Einsiedeln. The statue marks the original spot of the Meinradzelle or “cell of St. Meinrad,” the spot where the monastery’s founder was martyred. Ever since 1547, with the exception of three years during the abbey’s suppression, the monastic community has processed after vespers from the rococo choir at one end of the nave to the humble Gnadenkepelle at the other end. There the Madonna’s monks have sung a polyphonic Salve regina in her honor. This combination of aesthetics, tradition, and ceremonial piety permeated Marty’s life in Einsiedeln. Consequently, one cannot understand Marty’s monastic education and the formation of his vision without first grasping the complicated history of Einsiedeln and how this history molded Marty’s monastic education.

**Historical Origins**

Einsiedeln’s history begins with the story of a hallowed martyr. His tenth-century vita is a potpourri of legend, hagiography, and fact. According to his vita, Meinrad (“Meginrat”) was born near Württemberg, entered the Abbey of Reichenau as a scholar, and later pursued the eremitical life near the Etzel, next to Lake Zurich. At some point in
the early ninth century (ca. 835), Meinrad abandoned this early hermitage because of its many visitors. He escaped into a high valley a few miles to the south, built a small chapel, and remained in this new hermitage until the date of his martyrdom, recorded as January 21, 861. It was on this day that his \textit{vita} speaks of two bandits who attempted to rob Meinrad of his supposed “treasures.” Discovering none, the two clubbed the hermit to death.\textsuperscript{47}

Two monks followed this martyred hermit into the forest to mark Einsiedeln’s progression from a forgotten hermitage to a cenobitical abbey. The first was Benno (d. 940), a canon of Strasbourg who first visited the “Meinradzelle” in 906. As a political favor, Benno was allowed to return to the high valley as a bishop-hermit in 927 and act as a spiritual father for other hermits in the area. Benno’s relative, Eberhard of Strasbourg (d. 958), arrived on September 16, 934. The date marks the monastery’s founding, as it was Eberhard who gathered together the hermits of the surrounding “Finsterwald” to form a monastic community, perhaps emulating the monastic reforms of Cluny to the west.\textsuperscript{48}

As the monastery’s first abbot, Eberhard rebuilt Meinrad’s hermitage as a chapel and dedicated it to the Blessed Virgin and St. Maurice (the patron saint of the Holy Roman emperors). The dedication of the chapel is recorded as occurring on the Feast of the Holy Cross, September 14, 948. After 1318 a legend emerged that Christ himself, in the presence of his mother and accompanied by a host of saints and angels, dedicated the chapel (a legend bearing a resemblance to Meinrad’s vision of Christ in his \textit{vita}).

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{47} For the \textit{vita}’s text and commentary, see Odo Lang and Markus Bamert, ed., \textit{Sankt Meginrat: Festschrift zur zwölfen Zentenarfeier seiner Geburt} (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 2000).
\item \textsuperscript{48} Georg Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln: The Monastery and Church of Our Lady of Hermits: From the Carolingian Period to the Present} (München: Schnell & Steiner, 1988), 8-10.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
story explains the chapel’s transfer of patronage from the Holy Cross to the Virgin and coincides with the introduction of a Marian statue around 1190.\textsuperscript{49} In the wake of fourteenth-century plagues, surrounding communities (including Zurich) initiated annual pilgrimages to the chapel in gratitude for the Virgin’s protection, culminating with “Engelweihe” (the “dedication of the angels”) on September 14.\textsuperscript{50} If the feast fell on a Sunday, a two-week “Great Dedication” festival would converge on Einsiedeln, as barefoot pilgrims journeyed from as far away as the Rhineland. After the chapel burned in 1465, the present Madonna statue from Ulm was introduced in time for the “Great Dedication” of 1466.\textsuperscript{51} Over the years the endless soot of candles changed the statue’s original fair complexion to its famous blackness. The black Madonna made Einsiedeln and its \textit{Gnadenkapelle} a center of Marian piety in Switzerland and greater Europe.

Einsiedeln’s \textit{Gnadenkapelle} further symbolizes the monastery’s remarkable ability to weather Europe’s tumultuous history. Initially the community prospered under Eberhard, and his successors attracted men like St. Wolfgang (d. 994), a student of Reichenau who later became a missionary to Hungary and the bishop of Ratisbonne.\textsuperscript{52} Otto I (d. 982) and other emperors bequeathed a host of temporal domains to the abbey, and Einsiedeln aided the founding of other male monasteries (Petershausen, Muri, Schaffhausen, and Hirsau) and a female cloister (Fahr).\textsuperscript{53} Nevertheless, a period decline set in during the fourteenth century. Struggles with its “protectors” depleted its material and spiritual resources. Likewise, the abbey began to admit only noble sons in the

\textsuperscript{49} Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln}, 18-19.
\textsuperscript{50} Landolt, Justus. \textit{Ursprung und erste Gestaltung des Stiftes Maria-Einsiedeln: Nebst einem Anhange über die Engelweihe und die Wallfahrt} (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1845).
\textsuperscript{51} Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln}, 19.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 11, 15. The abbot of Einsiedeln is also the “abbot” of Fahr.
thirteenth century, leading to a drastic reduction in the number of monks. By 1480 only three monks were left, and the monastery’s last monk (other than the abbot) fell in battle at the side of Zwingli in 1531. Through the labor of the monastery’s “second founder,” Joachim Eichhorn (1518-1569, abbot 1544 until death), the abbey paid its debts, returned to a simpler and stricter observance of the Rule, and improved its pastoral care of the region’s faithful. Eichhorn emulated the reform movement within Catholicism that preceded Trent, celebrating mass daily, enforcing a stricter monastic enclosure, and participating in the council itself. During his tenure the monastery’s famous Salve Regina tradition took root in 1547. Despite a devastating fire in 1577, the abbey grew under strong abbatial leadership in the seventeenth century. It participated in the monastic and teaching reforms of the new Swiss Benedictine Congregation (1602), sent its monks to Rome and Lyon for studies, provided professors for the Benedictine university in Salzburg (including Augustine Redding, 1625–1692), established a printing press (1664), staffed a school for boys in Bellinzona (1675), ministered to local parishes, and even hosted negotiations during the Thirty Years War. By 1664 the community numbered 58 monks, and by 1676 a new choir accommodated the larger community.

New Life, New Problems

With the dawn of the eighteenth century, the monastery emerged not only as one of Europe’s greatest Marian sites but also one of the continent’s premier Benedictine abbeys. In 1702, the chapter approved plans for a new monastery “for the sake of good

---

54 Ibid., 23.
55 Ibid., 24.
57 Ibid., 29-30.
58 Ibid., 33-34.
Caspar Moosbrugger (1656–1723), a trained architect within the community, designed a symmetrical Baroque abbey in the style of the famous Escorial in Madrid, with four courtyards and the abbey church at the center of a cruciform pattern. The new monastery was built between 1704 and 1718, and the facade and its twin bell towers were completed in 1726. After 1719 the abbey church was rebuilt according to an ingenious, three-stage axis that progressively narrows from the Gnadenkapelle to the upper choir. In order to accommodate the throngs of pilgrims to the Gnadenkapelle, an octagonal dome was constructed around the chapel, decorated with frescos recalling the legend of Engelweihe. East of this octagon rose a square vault for the pulpit with a fresco of the Last Supper overhead, followed by a lemon-shaped dome depicting the Nativity. These three, longitudinally connected “rooms” were finished in 1734. Beginning in 1746, the community turned its attention to the old lower choir from 1665. To the east of the new church structure and separated by an iron grill, the lower choir was redecorated in the rococo style with symbols of the Evangelists and the Passion, rising to meet the high altar and its retablo of the Assumption of Mary. Finally an upper choir was built behind the retablo and separated from the lower choir and the rest of the church (yet still visible through openings on each side of the retablo). In this manner the community could pray the office in a separate space still audible to visitors in the church and celebrate solemn liturgies in the lower (original) choir that could be separated behind a grill yet still be visible to those beyond it. Overall, the new design attempted to accommodate the monastery’s double role as a center of monastic prayer and Catholic pilgrimage.

59 Ibid., 36.
60 Ibid., 64.
61 Ibid., 56-80.
By 1792, new threats to Einsiedeln’s tradition emerged. During the French Revolution, the monastery became a sanctuary for over a thousand French Catholic exiles, including Maurist refugees.\textsuperscript{62} As French troops advanced into Swiss cantons, the new French governor explicitly threatened the “useless lackeys of Einsiedeln Abbey.”\textsuperscript{63} Instead of making preparations, the majority of the community ignored the ominous advances of the French.\textsuperscript{64} The Swiss resistance forces, however, proved ineffective, and on May 3, 1798, French troops captured Einsiedeln. A few days prior, the monks had escaped to Einsiedeln’s house of St. Gerold in the Vorarlburg region of Austria, taking with them the relics of St. Meinrad and several baroque vestments. However, the monks did not take the Black Madonna of the \textit{Gnadenkapelle} with them but rather entrusted the original statue to locals and placed a replica in the chapel. When the French entered the monastery, the general permitted a full-scale pillaging of its property for two weeks. The abbey’s library, archives, medieval artifacts, and countless relics were removed. Instead of destroying the monastery and its new church, it was decided to liquidate the property slowly, much like Cluny. Yet in retribution for its “unrepublican” character before the invasion, the French did the unthinkable: they razed the \textit{Gnadenkapelle} to the ground and carried off the Black Madonna replica.\textsuperscript{65} This act of vengeance shocked Catholics throughout Switzerland and infuriated the villagers. Even after the French realized how they had been deceived with a replica, they continued to look for the original statue for

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 84.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 85.
\item \textsuperscript{64} One of Einsiedeln’s members, Marianus Herzog (d. 1828), the abbey’s archivist and librarian, did not follow this trend and rather became a “general in monk’s cassock” as he led troops against the French. See Lehner, \textit{Enlightened Monks}, 77.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln}, 86.
\end{itemize}
the next five years. A small altar was erected on the spot of the original chapel, yet it no longer attracted the devotion of pilgrims.

If Einsiedeln’s history seemed to cease with the destruction of the *Gnadenkapelle*, the rebuilding of the venerated chapel marked the abbey’s remarkable nineteenth-century restoration. In the summer of 1799, only a year after the French suppression of the abbey, several monks were allowed to return to Einsiedeln after Austrian forces had forced the French westward. The return was short lived, and when the French returned they were even more merciless toward the village residents. It was not until 1801 when the new Helvetic Republic’s first “premier” (a Catholic from Schwyz) invited the monks to return. On September 29, 1801, monks returned to Einsiedeln, and in January of 1802 the abbot himself returned from exile. The village welcomed the monks with jubilation, and Napoleon’s Act of Mediation of 1803 officially restored the monastery’s possessions and allowed the abbey to accept novices and reopen its school. Yet it was the return of the Black Madonna that symbolized the complete restoration of monastic life in Einsiedeln on September 29, 1803, exactly two years after the first monks had returned. Exactly three years later (September 29, 1806), the community received its first new novices, bringing the number of monks to 66 (from a pre-revolution total of 93). Although the monks could now rebuild the monastery, the famous Black Madonna remained without a permanent home until September 14, 1817 (Engelweihe), the year the *Gnadenkapelle* was finally rebuilt.
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66 Ibid., 86. Such an invitation was not extended to all Benedictine monasteries. For instance, St. Gall was never restored.

67 Ibid., 87.

68 The delay stemmed from heavy taxation from Schwyz in return for the monastery’s security, as well as political uncertainty until the fall of Napoleon. The new chapel used any materials from the ruined chapel that could be located and reclaimed, yet it also introduced a distinctly new aesthetic into the abbey church. Although it retained the black marble exterior, large gated archways now allowed more pilgrims to
As a student four decades later, Marty learned Einsiedeln’s history and came to interpret his Swiss-Benedictine roots through the prism of the restored Gnadenkapelle. For Marty, the chapel stood as a testament of Benedictine resilience and stability in a world of violent conflict and change. The Marian cult around the chapel further informed his vision of the need for Catholic unity in the face of adversity. Most importantly, however, Einsiedeln’s history became Marty’s framework for reforming his order. Reform became synonymous with a return to the roots of the Swiss-Benedictine tradition he both venerated and criticized. He viewed the approaching millennial celebration (1861) as God’s providential invitation to return to the legacy of St. Meinrad and his Carolingian followers. This providential vision of monastic history came to life in the monastery’s Stiftschule.

**Marty’s Monastic Education: The New Stiftschule**

Marty entered Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule during a year of institutional reform. Prior to 1848, Einsiedeln had followed a pedagogical model designed for the school’s original intention: the formation of novices. Despite gradually opening its doors to non-monastic students since the eighteenth century, the school had only grown from 30 to 60 students by the 1840s. Marty’s years in Einsiedeln saw the implementation of a new model designed to attract and serve more students. The abbey hoped that this new Stiftschule would continue the monastic character of the older model while simultaneously creating a modern academy.

pray with an unobstructed view of the Madonna. Likewise, the statues decorating the balustrade of the chapel were now in a Neoclassical style.
Historical & Social Context

The reform of the Stiftschule stemmed from political and social concerns. After Einsiedeln’s restoration, the Swiss government declared its “hope” that the abbey and other monasteries would be “subservient to the public” and do so by “dedicating themselves to the education of the youth.” Einsiedeln quickly realized that its usefulness was the key to its political security. Consequently, Abbot Beat Küttel (1733–1808) appointed a seven-monk commission to draw up a plan for a new, modern school. The abbot expressed his wishes that the new school “could ensure at best the monastery’s existence.” Additionally, the new monastic school was to focus more on the “practical” rather than the “theoretical.”

Leading Küttel’s commission was Cölestin Müller (1772–1846), a zealous visionary who became abbot in 1825. Despite his elevation, the intended modernization of the school stagnated because of external and internal politics. Müller did leave a lasting mark on the school in 1836 by designating it a “Lehr- und Erziehungsanstalt” (an establishment for teaching and upbringing) with a “prefect” for the curriculum and a “preceptor” for moral formation. The new prefect of the school was Gall Morel (1803–1872), who the same year drew up a formal plan for modernizing the school. His blueprint transformed the school and earned him a national reputation for pedagogy. Morel envisioned a school that would be a true gymnasium, with more time dedicated to study and less time to monastic choir. To this end, he orchestrated the publication of an annual school report (“Jahresbericht”) beginning in 1840, an invaluable record for

---

70 Ibid., 39.
71 Ibid., 29.
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understanding Marty’s education. With the death of Müller in 1846, and the election of Heinrich Schmid (1801-1874) as abbot, Morel began to implement his reforms, with a full structural reorganization in the fall of 1848.\textsuperscript{73}

Morel’s plan attempted to combine the strengths of the older model with the practicality of newer methods. This program of integrating old and new elements stemmed, ironically, from the example of the Jesuits in Fribourg. Prior to the French Revolution, Einsiedeln’s monks had criticized the Swiss-Jesuit model, claiming that it was blind to practicality and thus failing to educate future Catholic patriots and statesmen.\textsuperscript{74} Nevertheless, Einsiedeln’s new model of 1848 owed both its structure and its success to the Jesuits. Not only did it imitate the Jesuit model of a “gymnasium” with an adjoining “lyceum,” but it also materialized because the Jesuit suppression had led to an influx of students, including Marty, who suddenly turned to the Benedictines for education. The school added over a hundred students within only a few years, quadrupling the enrollment of the 1840s to some 200 students in 1855.\textsuperscript{75}

The Jesuits also provided a ready reminder of how politically delicate the state of Catholic education was in Switzerland. In 1835, the liberal government of Fribourg passed a law that limited the Jesuits to “higher studies” (i.e., the classics of the tax-lucrative boarding academy) and assumed control of the society’s “college” in the city center in order to create a more modern school.\textsuperscript{76} The move came after the Jesuits refused to modernize their curriculum at the college to include mathematics, physics, and a

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 40, 47, 62, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{74} A more direct example of this new way of thinking operative in the abbey school is a open letter written by Johannes Schreiber, a monk of Einsiedeln, to some literary friends in Lucerne in 1779. Entitled “On the Improvement of the Schools,” the publication was an open affront on Jesuit education, accusing it of impoverishing Swiss-Catholic education and not preparing students for the “practical life.” See Banz, \textit{Kurze Geschichte}, 29.
\textsuperscript{75} Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln}, 89.
\textsuperscript{76} Ashe, \textit{The Jesuit Academy}, 32-33, 52-53.
greater use of vernacular languages. The conflict was well known in Switzerland and prompted Joseph Kleutgen (1811–1883) to publish his influential Über die alten und neuen Schulen in 1846.\textsuperscript{77} Kleutgen insisted that Catholic education must return to older models of education steeped in philosophy and theology if the moral integrity of modern society were to be secured. Catholic schools should not be “militaristic” but rather “fatherly,” fostering a communal, familial spirit.\textsuperscript{78} Although it is impossible to discern whether Einsiedeln’s new model imbibed Kleutgen’s theory or the Swiss-Catholic ethos of localism, the new school continued to emphasize a monastic “family spirit” and idealize medieval pedagogy. Nevertheless, Kleutgen wrote before the dissolution of the Fribourg school, and the visionaries of Einsiedeln likely took note that modernization was inevitable if their school were to thrive in the new confederacy. Consequently, Einsiedeln’s reformers adopted a via media. The new school expanded to include philosophy and theology, yet at the same time it also offered new courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and vernacular languages. This blending of conservative theory and modern pragmatism informed Marty’s intellectual and spiritual development in Einsiedeln.

\textit{Twilight of the Old School: 1847–1848}

Marty’s first year at Einsiedeln (1847–1848), and fifth in gymnasium, witnessed the last days of the old monastic model. Students prayed with the monks regularly in choir (including early morning matins) and, along with every monk, submitted a list of

\textsuperscript{77} Joseph Kleutgen (“J.W. Karl”), \textit{Über die alten und neuen Schulen} (Mainz: Kirchlheim, Schott and Thielmann, 1846). Kleugten begins with the example of the Fribourg school, quoting its Jesuit rector at length (26-28).

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 28, 134.
Lenten penances to the abbot. Each class had one professor for all subjects, and the curriculum mirrored the medieval trivium: two years in grammar, syntax, and rhetoric, respectively. Marty’s first year corresponded to the first year of rhetoric, and records indicate that he focused on Ciceronian orations and Virgil’s *Aeneid*. His year also required the study of religion (catechesis), world history (up to the High Middle Ages), mathematics, and Greek. Marty also took up the electives of French, penmanship, and music (organ, piano, and violin).\(^\text{79}\) Despite his late enrollment, he excelled in history (his “favorite subject,” according to Kleber) and did well in Latin and French.\(^\text{80}\) Biographers emphasize that Marty further embraced the familial character of this old model, producing what they term a Benedictine “true family spirit” (“echte familiäre Geist”).

This relationship between the school and the monastery formed, in the words of Betschart, one “Meinradsfamilie.”\(^\text{81}\) The vision of forming a collegial “family” became the foundation of the new model with its expanded curriculum. The idea also proved to be foundational for Marty’s vision of Catholic education both in Switzerland and America.

**The Dawn of the New School: 1848–1849**

During Marty’s second year in Einsiedeln (1848–1849), Morel’s new model instituted significant curricular changes. The school added a “lyceum” for philosophical and theological studies, with the explicit intention of forming an “united humanistic

---

\(^{79}\) *Jahresbericht über die Lehr- und Eziehungs Anstalt und die Leistungen der Zöglinge des Benediktiner Stiftes Maria Einsiedeln* (Einsiedeln: Kuriger, 1848), 5-6. 12-16.

\(^{80}\) Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 32.

\(^{81}\) It is interesting to note that this “report” changed publishers over the years and was distributed throughout Switzerland. To the best of my knowledge, the only complete collection of these reports exists in Einsiedeln. Subsequent references to volumes of this report are from collection “CH2530” and “X63-105” in the Stiftsbibliotek.
school. “Although the school’s historians are silent about its inspiration, the inspiration for a “lyceum” seems to have stemmed from both the Jesuit model and a German Romantic fascination with classical Greek education. Unlike the gymnasium, the lyceum had separate instructors for each discipline, and thus the abbey also began sending monks abroad for better training in the new disciplines. The school added electives in Italian and English in 1850, a development that proved serendipitous for Marty’s future. The tripartite structure of the gymnasium remained, new methods and texts were introduced. For example, during Marty’s second year in rhetorical studies, the school suddenly turned to Kleutgen’s *Ars dicendi* as a more advanced resource. The school also expanded its library and musical archive. The school’s musical instruction greatly improved as monks organized more student concerts, oratories, and operas. A choir and an orchestra, both including monks and pupils, were created in 1853 and 1858, respectively. Even earlier in 1850, the “Gregorian Choir” was given new life as baroque polyphony fell into disfavor, and students like Marty were now given the opportunity to study the theory of Gregorian chant and practice it in choir with the monastic community. Thus, even as the hours of instruction were increased and reconfigured according to student needs rather than according to monastic hours, the students were still encouraged to pray with the monks in the interest of preserving elements of the older model. His class standing in his second year of rhetoric (1848-1849) significantly improved across the

---

82 Banz, *Kurze Geschichte*, 93.
83 Ibid., 65-66, 124-25. See also Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 32.
disciplines, and the new attention to monastic chant and its theory indubitably sowed the seeds of Marty’s monastic vocation.

Alongside this closer attention to monastic prayer and music, the new school also attempted to retain the older ideal of a common “family.” This trajectory is evident in Morel’s inaugural “program” (academic essay) for the school’s Jahresbericht in 1851. One monastic historian describes the new school as designed to foster an even greater “familial upbringing” (Familienerziehung) focused on creating a genuine Catholic culture. The curricular changes complimented an “inner reorganization” with improved living arrangements, nutrition, and spiritual formation for students, all intent on fostering a Benedictine “Familiengeist” through communal life. Marty thrived in this new environment, and it molded his later idealism about how the monastery creates a “double family” in Catholic culture.

The Lyceum: 1849–1854

In the fall of 1849, Marty entered the lyceum in its nascent form. The second year in philosophy had just appeared as Marty entered the first year. Theological studies did not emerge until the following year in 1850, when the lyceum was divided into two “sections,” one in philosophy (two years or “courses”) and one in theology (eventually two years with three courses). These developments were advantageous for Marty, since beforehand only novices and monastic clerics received philosophical and theological

---

85 Jahresbericht (1849), 8-9, 11-12.
87 Banz, Kurze Geschichte, 77-80, 128-29, 152.
88 Ibid., 86-89.
instruction in a private school within the monastery.\footnote{Ibid., 86.} Over time the lyceum’s curriculum included courses in the philosophy of religion, patrology, aesthetics, natural history, anthropology, physics, and chemistry (as “natural philosophy”). Because of low enrollment, the faculty often merged courses in both philosophy and theology and constantly revised the curriculum to meet pressing needs. Despite the lyceum’s nebulous form during its first decade, a close examination of its evolving curriculum reveals a wealth of knowledge about Marty’s philosophical and theological education.

At first glance, the records for Marty’s education show the great breadth of his intellectual formation. His two years in philosophy (1849–1851) included classes in world history, philology (Greek and Latin classics), and, most importantly, aesthetics. The introduction of aesthetics with the new lyceum was the hallmark of Morel, and it was Morel who taught Marty in art history, rhetorical and linguistic aesthetics, and art criticism.\footnote{\textit{Jahresbericht} (1850), 12; and \textit{Jahresbericht} (1851), 24. Morel used Franz Ficker for aesthetics: \textit{Aesthetik: oder die Lehre vom Schönen und von der Kunst in ihrem ganzen Umfange} (Vienna, Heubner, 1840).} Marty excelled in aesthetics, and later as abbot in Indiana he would teach the subject at St. Meinrad’s seminary and relate to a Swiss confrere how he was probably the first instructor of aesthetics in America.\footnote{Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 144.} Marty also scored high in English and French (although he never learned Italian).

The records for his study in the theological section, however, are perplexing. Whereas most students took only two or three years of theology, Marty enrolled in four years (1851–1855).\footnote{There were three “courses,” but only two were taught at any given time.} Marty’s patient wait for admission into the monastery may have been the reason for this extra year. In 1850 he had already applied for admission as a
novice, only to be told that he needed more time for dis
cernment and intellectual
formation.\textsuperscript{93} As a remedy, Marty enrolled in the lyceum’s theological section and took
the same theological classes as admitted novices.\textsuperscript{94} The lyceum’s new theological
curriculum exposed Marty to classes in Hebrew, biblical archeology, exegesis,
hermeneutics, dogmatics, moral theology, Church history, and, in the final year, pastoral
theology and canon law. Noteworthy is the lyceum’s emphasis on patristics and the early
Church during Marty’s tenure. The very structure of his education intimates a faculty
program to immerse the students in the origins of Christian thought and idealize the
Christian past as a template for the Church’s present mission. Such an idealization of the
ancient and medieval Church reappears in Marty’s works.

In addition to intellectual rigor, the content of the lyceum’s curriculum poses two
significant observations about the development of Marty’s Catholic worldview. The first
intriguing observation, completely overlooked by biographers, is that the early lyceum
embraced the thought of the Catholic Tübingen School.\textsuperscript{95} The influence of this school of
Catholic Romanticism is evident in the records for Marty’s first-year philosophy class,
“Theory of Religion and Revelation,” which used John Sebastian von Drey (1777–1853)

\textsuperscript{93} Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 43.

\textsuperscript{94} The lyceum’s theological curriculum had replaced an older, separate theological formation within the
cloister for novices. Consequently, Marty shared the same education as the novice Chrysostom Foffa
(1830-1899), who later joined Marty’s missionary work in the Dakotas.

\textsuperscript{95} On the Tübingen School and German Catholic theology in relation to German Romanticism, see
Bernard Reardon, \textit{Religion in the Age of Romanticism: Studies in Early Nineteenth Century Thought} (New
York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 88-145. See also Thomas O’Meara, \textit{Romantic Idealism and
Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians} (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1982),
and Louis K. Dupre, \textit{Quest of the Absolute: Birth and Decline of European Romanticism} (Notre Dame,
Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013). The early faculty’s receptivity to the thought of the Tübingen
School may be attributed to the practice of sending monks to a seminary in Brixen (South Tyrol) and the
influence of its bishop, Bernhard Galura (1764-1856), as well as the legacy of Stapf and Fessler, both of
whom taught in Brixen (see below). Ubler, according to the Einsiedeln’s \textit{Professbuch}, was sent there along
with other monks (534). However, this theory requires further study.

A closer examination of the school records further reveals the mark of German Catholic Idealism on the lyceum’s curriculum.\footnote{On German Catholic Idealism, see Aidan Nichols, *Conversation of Faith and Reason: Modern Catholic Thought from Hermes to Benedict XVI* (Chicago: Hillenbrand, 2011), 42-59.} During both philosophy years, and during his final two years of theology (1853–1855), Marty had Georg Ulber (1840–1892) as an instructor. One historian describes Ulber as promoting a “Zeitphilosophie,” using an eclectic mix of thinkers in his class that included Schelling, Deutinger, Bader, and the controversial Anton Günther (1783–1863).\footnote{Banz, *Kurze Geschichte*, 89.} In 1852 Ulber composed an essay for the students in the *Jahresbericht* on “True and False Unity in Philosophy.” Although it is difficult to categorize Ulber as a strict disciple of Günther, the essay bears striking

---

\footnote{Jahresbericht (1850), 12. On Staudenmaier, see Reusch, Heinrich, “Staudenmaier, Franz Anton” in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 35 (1893), 510-512.}
similarities to the latter’sIdealism, especially in its firm conviction in the natural human desire for unity and its attempt to outline a Catholic system avoiding the pitfalls of Hegelian pantheism and Protestant rationalism.\textsuperscript{103} Ulber later partnered with Karl Johann Greith (1807–1882), bishop of St. Gall and critic of scholasticism, to compose a philosophical handbook.\textsuperscript{104} It is further intriguing that the project was abandoned in 1857, the same year of Günther’s formal condemnation by Pope Pius IX.\textsuperscript{105} To what degree Marty imbued Ulber’s Güntherian theory is uncertain. Nevertheless, as demonstrated below, Marty later used similar language about the search for human unity in his 1858 essay on student associations.

\textbf{From School to Monastery}

Up to this point, the present section has examined Marty’s curriculum in the \textit{Stiftschule}’s gymnasium and lyceum. Changes in curriculum shaped Marty’s zeal for education and monastic idealism later in life. His years in the school also coincided with another unusual trend: between 1840 and 1940, some 300 students of the \textit{Stiftschule} chose to enter the monastery, an average of three per year.\textsuperscript{106} Marty was among these students. The rest of the present section presents five extracurricular developments that influenced Marty’s decision to enter the monastery.

Marty’s extracurricular progression from school to monastery is best grasped chronologically. Marty begins with (1) a translation project that piques his interest in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{103} Georg Ulber, “Programm über die wahre und falsche Einheit der Philosophie,” in \textit{Jahresbericht über die Erziehungsanstalt des Benedictiner-Stiftes Maria Einsiedeln} (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1852), 3-25.
\item \textsuperscript{105} On Günther’s condemnation, see Nichols, \textit{The Conversation of Faith and Reason}, 90-95.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Holzherr, \textit{Einsiedeln}, 89.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Catholic missions and the American missionary narrative. Shortly thereafter, (2) Marty introduces the Marian sodality into Einsiedeln’s *Stiftschule*. He and his peers adapt this Jesuit sodality to their Benedictine education as they search for a community that has the spiritual potential to convert and preserve souls amid the dangers of the modern world. At about the same time that the sodality takes form, (3) Marty presents a panegyric for Einsiedeln’s departing missionaries that applies an emerging historical vision to argue that the time has come for the Benedictines to transcend individual missionary efforts and provide a lasting model of evangelization. This optimistic vision confronts a personal moment of crisis in Marty’s experience of the death of his sister (4). This event leads him to a decision to enter the monastery, and (5) his confession as editor of a student newspaper reveals his desire to find a spiritual, everlasting life through the cloister. Together these developments mark the birth of Marty’s vision of the Benedictines as providential agents of conversion in the modern world through a spiritual, everlasting family life.

*The Missionary Annals*

The first extracurricular activity is one that provided Marty a stipend to subsidize his education: the translation of missionary annals from French into German. Previous biographers note this project in passing and fail to provide any historical context or analysis.\(^{107}\) However, a closer examination of the history behind the annals and the

---

\(^{107}\) Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 35. See also Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Monk - I,” (1982), 224. Rippinger follows Betschart in claiming that Marty introduced the “foreign missions” to the *Stiftschule* through the translation project (*Apostel*, 17). Albeit fascinating, I could not find any archival evidence to support this claim. It is more likely that the students at Einsiedeln gained interest in the foreign missions from their Swiss-Catholic milieu rather than from Marty personally.
stories that Marty translated reveals how the project formed his interest in foreign missions and influenced the development of his vision of history.

_Historical Context_

Along with ultramontane universalism, nineteenth-century Swiss Catholicism experienced a rising interest in Christian “Weltmission” or “world mission.”108 This trend joined forces with an ultramontane attempt to separate ardent Catholics, the “Strengkirchlichen,” from lukewarm liberal Catholics. Lay financiers joined forces to create missionary societies. The most famous and influential of these was the Society for the Propagation of the Faith (Oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi) founded by Marie-Pauline Jaricot in 1822 and based in Lyon, France. The Lyon society focused on evangelizing the “pagans” through prayer and alms societies.109 Members formed a “supraregional” organization that transcended languages and nationalities. In addition to alms, members were to pray daily an Our Father, a Hail Mary and then “St. Francis Xavier, pray for us!” The society also sponsored memorials, mission sermons, and mission festivals to honor a patron or martyr. The patronage of St. Francis Xavier was

---


109 Ibid., 96-100. According to Weichlin, these early societies, led by the Lyon society, manifested five “dialectics” or paradoxes: (1) a narrative of decline after the revolution, even though the Church’s internal life prospered; (2) a “universalization of mission and concentration on Rome;” (3) a strong bond between charismatic revivalism (Erweckungsbewegungen) and the Church hierarchy; (4) lay initiative and organization with Roman, clerical leadership; and (5) a “universalization of mission and homogenization of mission societies” that included all classes, genders and ages. It was in this final paradox that the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was particularly successful as it “constructed a universal, ecclesial community as an ideal as well as a social practice.”
remarkably popular, and in 1840 a German sister society of Lyon formed in Aachen, naming itself the “Franziskus-Xaverius Verein.”

The impact on this foreign missions movement is already evident in Marty’s education in Schwyz. In his second year of studies at the Jesuit gymnasium in Schwyz, Alois began collecting various notes and quotations in a little notebook he called “Quodlibet” - “whom it pleases” - a book he would later bring with him to America. On the first numbered page, Marty penned a six-page reflections on the “vita” of St. Francis Xavier. One entry speaks about how the famous missionary Jesuit ministered to the “Indians” of Mozambique. This reference to Xavier and “Indians” reflects the missionary fervor of Marty’s Swiss-Catholic milieu. The memory of St. Francis Xavier even dominated Marty’s hometown. One finds an old fresco of Xavier in the town square directly across from St. Martin’s, with the inscription (in Latin): “St. Francis Xavier, S.J., Indian Apostle, Patron of the Holy Missions and our Homeland.” Marty would have been familiar with this fresco, and it seems more than coincidence that his Swiss contemporaries would later designate him as the “Indianerapostel.”

---

110 Another German-speaking society similar to the Lyon model preceded this one and was even more successful: the famous Leopoldinen-Stiftung in Austria. Formed in 1829, the society was inspired by the stories of Stephen Badin (d. 1853) as propagated by the bishop of Cincinnati. It assumed an explicit mission to convert the “pagan Indians.” As outlined below, Marty would also rely on the aid of this society during his work near the Ohio River (where Badin once labored).

111 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 25. The title reflects a type of text used in classical education. A philosophical or theological idea would be posed to the class for disputation, followed by the teacher’s insights on the subject.

112 Marty’s “Quodlibet” is preserved in the Einsiedeln’s Stiftsbibliotek (collection “EM”). The copy was transferred from Yankton, South Dakota, to Einsiedeln by Betschart. I have consulted and copied this little work.

113 In speaking of the lands of the unbaptized, the Jesuits commonly used the term “Indies” or “Indians,” even if not referring directly to the subcontinent. See Peter R. D’Agostino, “Orthodoxy or Decorum? Missionary Discourse, Religious Representations, and Historical Knowledge,” *Church History* 72, no. 4 (2003): 706-7.

114 See, for instance, the title of Betschart’s book: *Der Apostel der Siouxindianer*. Marty was also likely familiar with an enormous side altar in his parish church that contained a mesmerizing statue of St. Francis Xavier, as well as an eighteenth-century painting near the entrance depicting Xavier with an Indian in headdress kneeling at his side. See Hans Steinegger, *Pfarrkirche St. Martin - Schwyz* (Schwyz: Tiner,
In addition to piety and supernatural patronage, the missionary societies also published missionary letters and biographies in “annals.” The Lyon society’s *Annales de la propagation de la foi* were the most popular and were translated into English (in London) and German (in Strasbourg, Cologne, Munich, and Einsiedeln). King Ludwig I of Bavaria (1786–1868), convinced that the Lyon society did not adequately attend to the interests of the German Catholic diaspora, established his own “Missionsverein” in 1838. Unlike the Lyon and Aachen models that sought to convert “pagans,” Ludwig’s focused on preserving Catholicism among German emigrants to North America. By 1844, Ludwig severed all ties between his society and Lyon, citing the negligence of the French for German Catholic interests. This Bavarian society began to publish its own annals the same year. Consequently, German-speaking Catholics confronted two competing publications known as the *Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens*. German-speaking Swiss Catholics followed the Lyon version, owing to the fact that the Benziger family, based in Einsiedeln and recognized as the largest German-Catholic publishing house in Switzerland (and later in the United States), continued to publish a German translation of the Lyon *Annales*. To continue this project, Benziger offered Marty an “honorarium” in exchange for employing his French skills for the publisher’s annual translation.

---


116 There is surprisingly little scholarship on the Benziger family publishers. For a brief overview of the history of the family, see Rachel Coffey, “Negotiating Tradition and Technology: Benziger Brothers' Trade Catalogues of Church Goods, 1879-1937” (Diss., University of Delaware, 2001).

117 This claim stems from Kleber (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 35). Karolevitz repeats this idea, obviously using Kleber’s language (*Bishop Martin Marty*, 16). It is likely that Marty’s reputation for tutoring French-
The Project & Its Significance

Marty’s translation of the Lyon _Annales_ shaped his vision of history and budding interest in foreign missions through the biography of the famous Belgian Jesuit missionary Pierre-Jean de Smet (1801–1873). An examination of the Benziger translations between 1849 and 1855 (reflecting translation work done between 1848 and 1854, while Marty was a student) confirm this claim. Seven letters by De Smet appear during this period and offer the best key into reconstructing the development of Marty’s historical consciousness.

The development of Marty’s appreciation for De Smet likely stems from four letters written to the Lyon society in June of 1849 and published in its _Annales_ in 1850. In the letters, De Smet describes his work among various Indian tribes in the Niobrara River basin. He paints the American interior landscape as a “wasteland” (Wüste) devoid of water and vegetation and plagued with mosquitoes and rattlesnakes. These so-called “Bad Lands” bear “the sad reality of human suffering and poverty” as they await speaking students in German attracted the attention of Nicholas Benziger, son of the owner, who had sons in the abbey school.

Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 41. Rippinger, noting how Marty was later heralded as De Smet’s successor on the Dakotan prairie, asserts that the famed Jesuit visited Einsiedeln while Marty was a student and directly inspired him to take up missionary work in America (The Benedictine Order in the United States, 17; “Martin Marty: Founder” [2004], 72). De Smet did indeed visit Europe to elicit financial support for his missions in 1853-54 and 1856-57, yet he only visited Belgium and France (George Bishop, _Black Robe and Tomahawk: The Life and Travels of Fr. Pierre-Jean De Smet, SJ., 1801-1873_ [Leominster: Gracewing, 2003], 182-98; Robert C. Carriker, _Father Peter John De Smet: Jesuit in the West_ [Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995], 141-45). The source that Rippinger cites is a letter Marty penned in 1876 from Dakota Territory, yet the letter only mentions that the Sioux expressed how they had not seen a missionary since De Smet; Marty says nothing about De Smet in Einsiedeln (The Benedictine Order in the United States, 259n17).

Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1850, 1852), 93(18): 299-241, 282; 105(20): 221, 338. The translations also contain accounts by Georges-Antoine Belcourt (1803-1874), a Jesuit missionary who labored in the Red River Valley (where Marty also later worked), and letters by various provincial councils in the United States, including several penned by Cincinnati Bishop John Baptist Purcell (1800-1883). See _Annalen_ (1849, 1853, 1855), 87(17): 257; 111(21): 289; 123(24): 344. The years 1854 and 1855 also contain letters by the two missionary monks from Einsiedeln.
missionaries who can aid the “unfortunate souls” with the “banner of the cross.”

In the third letter, dated June 4, 1849, De Smet describes these souls or “Wilden” (“savages”) in fascinating detail. He tells the story of how he averted the raiding of a caravan of fur traders by his mere presence. As he rode to the scene, the Indians (Poncas) exclaimed, “The blackrobe is coming! The blackrobe is coming!” Hundreds greeted, offered him a calumet, and invited him to spend the night. In this midst of a thousand gathered at his feet, De Smet claims that these Indians listened for the first time about Christ with “curiosity and attention.” The next day he claims to have baptized “a great number.”

But it is how he closes the letter that is most memorable. He tells his reader how this barren wilderness “awaits a noble and loving hand to bring forth fruit,” and he trusts God’s providence to realize this dream: “Would the Lord of grace and assistance deny the apostolic man who gives up the advantages of civilized life, living in the middle of every type of deprivation, to proclaim the saving and consolatory truths of the Gospel to the savages (Wilden)?” This confidence grounds itself in an intriguing historical narrative. He compares Europe, plagued with “godlessness,” with the “unlucky inhabitant of the desert who raises his hands to heaven” seeking “to know the true faith.” Thus, he believes, “God’s Providence” is quietly preparing “another hemisphere” for Christianity: “Who knows, whether the divine Master does not place his sanctuary there, and new worshipers elect themselves, whose simple hearts feel and proclaim only gratitude.”

---

120 Pierre Jean de Smet to Society, 1 and 2 June 1849, in Annalen (1850), 93(18): 230-34.
121 De Smet to Lyon Society, 4 June 1849, in Annalen (1850), 93(18): 238-39.
122 Ibid., 240: “Es ist dies also noch ein brach liegendes Feld, das aber nur auf eine grossmütighe und liebeifrige Hand wartet, um Früchte zu bringen, die des himmlisches Thaues würdig seyn werden. Könnte wohl der Herr seine Gnade und seine Hülfe dem apostolischen Manne versagen, der alle Vortheile des ziviliseren Lebens verlässt, um mitten unter jeder Art von Entbehrungen, dem armen Wilden die heilsamen und so trostvollen Wahrheiten des Evangeliums zu verkünden?”
123 Ibid., 240-41.
The Jesuit missionary repeats this sentiment in the last of the four letters, dated June 5, 1849, only this time it is in reference to the Sioux to the north. The Sioux he describes as bizarre “barbarians” who prize human scalps as war trophies and who seem utterly “lost.” Yet even amid this “darkness of paganism,” the Sioux welcome him as an “emissary of the Great Spirit” and listen to his preaching with fascination. He rhetorically asks, “Should a mission among these [Sioux] be without hope in success?” His experience of the Sioux only strengthens his faith in God’s providence to provide for these “unfortunate Indians.”  

These glowing accounts are worthy of consideration not merely because Alois Marty likely read and translated them but, more importantly, because Marty later lived them and intentionally placed himself within this narrative. The narrative appears alongside the letters in an anonymous report on the “State of the Church in the United States,” written by a member of the Lyon society and published in the Annals in three parts (part one in 1850, and parts two and three in 1851). The report seeks to update the society on the progress of the American church since the days of the missionaries, whom the author consistently refers to as the “blackrobes.” The author’s language mirrors that of De Smet, romanticizing the receptivity of native tribes to the Christian message. The report focuses almost exclusively on Euro-American immigrant developments east of the Mississippi, yet the third and last installment concludes by drawing the reader’s attention to the predicament of Indians on the American frontier. The author insists that these people should be joined to Whites through “the cross, which

teaches mutual love.” The reports then proceeds to outline a genealogy of “blackrobes” who have undertaken this task, ending with De Smet as the last of this fading missionary force. It too beseeches God to provide future “apostolic men” to follow in De Smet’s footsteps. Marty likely read and knew this narrative, and later as an abbot he undertook a project to promote this narrative of American Catholicism among German Catholics in Europe.

Overall, the Annales exposed Marty not only to the persona of De Smet but also provided him with a narrative of U.S. Catholic history and its contemporary needs. Together De Smet’s letters and the anonymous narrative informed Marty’s historical consciousness of the world around him. Both gave him a thirst for the conversion of souls. The next extracurricular activity shows how this thirst combined with a sense for the need of a spiritual community.

The Marian Sodality

In 1850, only a couple of years after Marty entered the school, a group of boarding students formed a small group dedicated to spiritual discipline and Marian devotion. Marty spearheaded this group and borrowed the idea from his experience in Fribourg. The prefect of the school, Kaspar Willi (1823–1879), also desired to create just such a sodality for the school. With the bourgeoning size of the school, it had become more and more difficult for students to connect with the monastic community outside of choir. The sodality was a remedy for this problem, advancing student spiritual life through community. Thus Einsiedeln’s “Marian Sodality” was formally created on

---

127 Betschart, Apostel, 16.
November 11, 1852, the feast of St. Martin, and Alois Marty was elected as its first "president." It seems more than coincidence that Marty later chose “Martin” for his profession name upon entering the monastery.

The sodality was voluntary and consisted of two monthly meetings with various sermons and prayer intentions. Members were expected to attend mass daily, pray certain morning and evening devotions (including the “Salve Regina”), pray for sick members, and adhere to “brotherly love and unity.” The sodality also placed special emphasis on liturgical observance. The most important feast day was that of the Immaculate Conception (two years prior to its dogmatic declaration), along with the feast days of St. Meinrad (January 21), St. Benedict (March 21), and Our Lady of Einsiedeln (July 16). Thus the sodality was adapted for a Benedictine school, such that the sodality claimed two patrons for its protection: the Virgin and St. Meinrad. By the next year (1853), the sodality counted 140 members.

Aside from its piety, the sodality’s original manual sheds further light on its worldview. The sodalitists sought to be a sign of conversion in the world through supernatural graces. The sodality is described as a remedy to the previous century’s “false enlightenment” and is part of a “new and glorious revival” in the Church. It is to increase not only knowledge but also “religiosity and virtue” while encouraging students to give something back to parents and fatherland. The sodalitists, “in the middle of a

129 Die Marianische Sodalität, 16, 18-19. See also Banz, Kurze Geschichte, 81.
130 Die Marianische Sodalität, 9, 13-14.
131 Betschart attributes the work to Willi, even though no author is listed in its published form (Apostel, 16). It is quite possible the Marty had a hand in its language. He enjoyed a close friendship with Willi, who later became the first bishop of Chur.
132 The language of “false enlightenment” reflects conservative, often Jesuit rhetoric against “freethinkers,” common in the nineteenth century.
tumultuous and dangerous world \textit{[Weltleben]},” recognize “the necessity of a steadfast sign and greater protection” in society, linking the idea of stability with spiritual community.\footnote{Die Marianische Sodalität, 5, 9, 14.} Moreover, each member enjoys five distinct spiritual “advantages:” he becomes a “child of Mary,” he undergoes a “cultivation of the heart” \textit{(Herzensbildung)} of the “eternal and everlasting,” participates in the good works of other members, receives the Eucharist more frequently, and thirsts with a “zeal for souls” \textit{(Seeleneifer)}.\footnote{Ibid., 37-41.} Overall, the language of the manual reflects a search for a supernatural community that can effectively convert not only its members but also the greater world. A month after forming this sodality, Marty combines this language of a “steadfast” community and “zeal” for conversion with Benedictine history and the order’s mission in the modern world.

\textbf{The 1852 Address}

On the evening of December 19, 1852, several students of the \textit{Stiftschule} orchestrated a “farewell program” for the two monks departing Einsiedeln for a mission in America.\footnote{There is some confusion about whether the program was on the 19th or 20th. Kleber uses both dates (“Bishop Martin Marty, 35, 77). Kleber’s confusion probably stems from the originals in Einsiedeln: “Programm,” Folder 3, RG II, Series A (A.RG.II.03) KAE. Some handwritten copies of the “Programm” have the date of the 19th while others have the 20th. The transcribed copy in the St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives provides a narrative (not found in the Einsiedeln collection) that clarifies the “Programm” as taking place after Sunday solemn vespers and before the “final meal” with the two missionaries (see “Abschied,” 2:71, Box 1, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Collection, SMAA). Dec. 19th, 1852, was a Sunday, and thus the most likely date.} Marty’s address highlights his first known application of Benedictine idealism to the missionary narrative of America that he gleaned from the \textit{Annales}. Previous historians have omitted the program’s context and content, and a reconstruction of both demonstrates Marty’s nascent ideas about Benedictine evangelization.
**Historical Context**

As Marty was studying in the lyceum and awaiting admission into the monastery, a series of events unfolded that later determined his future. In May of 1852, the cantonal government of Ticino suppressed Einsiedeln’s school in Bellinzona, which the abbey had supported since 1675. Abbot Schmid suddenly had a handful of monks at his disposal. In July, Joseph Kundek (1810–1857), vicar general for the Diocese of Vincennes in Indiana, visited Einsiedeln on behalf of his bishop. Kundek’s timing was advantageous. Schmid was now more receptive to the idea of a political refuge in light of Switzerland’s unpredictable political climate. With unusual haste, he presented the idea to Pope Pius IX in October, and, with papal approval, submitted it to the monastic chapter for a vote. The chapter consented and chose Beda O’Connor (1826–1875) and Ulrich Christen (1814–1871) for the task of surveying the American diocese for suitable location for a mission. O’Connor was an Irish Catholic from London who had been Marty’s English teacher, and Christen seems to have been chosen for his pastoral skills. Six years later, Marty joined both men and eventually became their superior.

According to some records, the program for these two monks was a production of a student “academy.” Since the 1840s, and with a renewed interest in classical Greece,

---

136 The following events are taken from Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 73-74. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad Archabbey*, 30-31.
138 Kleber presumes this (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 35) while Betschart says nothing about an academy and only designates Marty as “Redner der Studenten” (*Apostel*, 28). Kleber’s presumption seems to come from the transcribed copy of the narrative in SMAA (see above), which mentions an “academy;” the originals in KAE say nothing about an academy. According Romuald Banz’s history of the school’s academies, Marty was not president of the school’s academy at the time, and this same academy never produced a program for the departing monks (Romuald Banz, “Die ‘Akademien’ am Einsiedler-Gymnasium: Ein Stück Schulgeschichte,” in *Jahresbericht der Stiftschule Maria-Einsiedeln* [Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1916], 91, 95-96). Rather, the names of presenters for the 1852 address correspond perfectly with
the *Stiftschule* facilitated various extracurricular “academies.” Each academy was a voluntary group with elected student leadership, designed to improve students’ skills in literature and oratory while also allowing them to select the material. \(^{139}\) Each year the academy hosted sessions open to the entire school (“öffentlichen Sitzungen”) in which the members presented arguments on a specific topic through a series of dialogues, monologues, poems, and theatrical scenes. \(^ {140}\) The 1852 program for the departing monks was a special “Sitzung” that followed this structure.

*The Program & Its Significance*

The records of the student program bear more than the mark of Marty’s leadership and creativity; they also reveal a vision of history that he embraced as a student and later championed as a missionary. As the group’s leader, Marty introduces the program’s argument like any “academy” session. He begins with the premise that one can only appreciate the historical significance of Einsiedeln’s mission to America if one realizes that the force behind history is not one of industry or military might but rather one of “inner thought, a spiritual power externally inconspicuous.” From this premise Marty presents the program’s overarching argument: “We assert, namely, that this undertaking is a return of the Benedictine Order to its original, world-historical purpose, as expressed

---

\(^{139}\) For a comprehensive history of the “academy” in Einsiedeln, see Banz, “Die ‘Akademien,” 1-117.

\(^{140}\) Banz, *Kurze Geschichte*, 110-11.
most clearly in its earliest days." He then proceeds to outline six student speeches on the topic, including a poem by Ignaz von Ah and an address on missionaries from Monte Cassino by Johan (later Fintan) Mundwiler (1835–1898), who later joined Marty in America and became his successor at St. Meinrad. Among these speeches is Marty’s own: “The Sixth and the Nineteenth Century and its Benedictines: An Historical Analogy.”

Marty’s speech outlines a restorationist sense of history that became the impetus of his monastic vocation. His opening line consists of a premise that he adhered to throughout his life: the “fundamental law” of both nature and humanity, both collectively and individually, is that “all life is circular - a continuous series of various repetitive events that generate one another.” The Hegelian character of this assertion mirrors the thought of Ulber, Marty’s philosophy instructor. The premise grounds his following narrative. No other century resembles the predicaments of the present as does St. Benedict’s sixth century, when the “pagan-Roman” world gave way to the “German-Christian” world. Mediterranean Christianity lost its lifeblood (“Lebenskraft”) after the vines of heresies had gradually choked it. Christianity “needed different, more fertile soil,” and it found this soil through the migration of Germanic tribes. Admittedly the conversion of these heathen tribes was a “violent work” that required more than individuals, since “the education and development of an entire people requires more time than the short term of a human’s life - they need an enduring, uninterrupted and effective

---

141 Martin Marty, “Abschied,” transcribed copy in 2:71, Box 1, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Collection, SMAA. “Wir betrachten nämlich diese Thatsache als eine Rückkehr des Benediktinerordens zu seiner ursprünglichen weltgeschichtlichen Bestimmung, wie sie in der ersten Zeit sich am klarsten ausgesprochen hat.”

force over the course of many generations.”\textsuperscript{143} Thus from the “innermost essence of Christendom” emerged monasticism, in the tradition of the martyrs. The monks taught the “barbarians” to “bow before the cross.” This process began in 543 when Benedict sent two of his monks to the Frankish lands (the topic of Mundwiler’s speech), and in a couple of centuries “countless” abbeys dotted the landscape of Germania: “These obedient, chaste, industrious cooperatives drew the scattered, wondering barbarians to themselves, held them together through good deeds, edified and moved them through example, and thus became the spiritual and moral epicenter of their lands.”\textsuperscript{144} These “monk-colonies” marked the edge of Christianity as they “refined” the family and “grounded” the state. As demonstrated in chapter three, Marty later employed a similar narrative and language for the Indian missions of the Dakotan prairie.

However, in 1852, Marty does not yet concern himself with the Indians of America per say. The narrative is more concerned about the designs of divine providence for German monks and their “similar circumstances” in the nineteenth century. Repeating the history of Mediterranean Christianity, heresies have now made “deep roots” in Germany: “Europe has gradually become the land of the past, the gaze of people and the blessings of Christendom direct themselves more and more toward the far West, and with this world history wanders across the ocean to finish its circuit around the globe that began in the East.”\textsuperscript{145} Great masses are once again on the move, realizing that “America

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid. “…denn die Erziehung und Heranbildung eines ganzen Volkes erfordert mehr zeit als die kurze Frist eines Menschenlebens, sie bedarf einer durch mehrere Generationen fortdauernden und ununterbrochenen wirksamen Kraft…”

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 2:81. “Diese gehorsamen, keuschen, arbeitsamen Genossenschaften zogen die vereinzelten staunenden Barbaren an sich, hielten sie durch ihre Beispiel und wurden dadurch die geistlichen und sittlichen Mittelpunkte ihrer Länder.”

\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 2:81. “Europa ist allmählich das Land der Vergangenheit geworden; die Blicke der Völker, die Segnungen des Christenthums richten sich immer mehr nach dem aussersten Westen und mit diesen
is the land of the future.” Moreover, this new migration, like that of Germanic tribes in the sixth, is focused on material and temporal gain while aloof to spiritual and eternal goals. Indeed, America has not yet had a “history” because the activity of Americans “is oriented toward themselves and the present” such that nothing is “permanent and lasting” (dauerhaft und haltbar). In focusing on the fleeting present, Americans reflect the “essence of barbarism,” and must be guided in a “common quest” toward higher realities through the “acceptance and practice” of the Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{146} Marty points to the “Annals,” which speak of the “tremendous efforts” of certain individuals toward this goal. Nevertheless, the same annals also speak of the “experience of daily sufferings” of so many “God-inspired men” who see their labors whither and decay once they leave, a clear allusion to De Smet. Marty gives two reasons for this problem: missionary labors remain “fruitless” because they are scattered, and “heresies” from England “poison” the land and prevent the seeds of Catholicism from taking root. This point allows him to conclude with his ultimate point: America demands Benedictine evangelization just as Europe needed monks in the sixth, for “now is the time for that force, which once saved Europe under similar circumstances, to intervene in the history of America and, in the manner indicated, guide her to the better and the best.”\textsuperscript{147} He concludes with the example of St. Wolfgang as a son of Einsiedeln who provides a ready model for two missionaries departing for the New World.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 2:82.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid. “Es ist darum an der Zeit, dass jene Macht, welche schon einmal unter ähnlichen Umständen Europa gerettet hat, auch jetzt wieder eingreife in die Geschichte Amerikas und selbe in angedeuteter Weise zum Bessern und Besten lenke.”
\end{flushleft}
The language of Marty’s panegyric bears a striking similarity to that of De Smet’s accounts and the anonymous narrative in the *Annales*. Marty explicitly points to the annals as a testament of a great struggle on American shores for souls, and how the heroes of the present see their labors go to waste in the face of American “barbarism.” However, Marty does not just repeat the annals’ narrative. Rather, he combines other elements and offers a commentary. He affirms De Smet’s argument that Christian Europe is dying, that America offers new potential for Christianity, and that the hands of divine providence are guiding Christianity toward this new future. Nevertheless, Marty insists that only the Benedictines present a solution to De Smet’s worries that ignorance will prevail in the New World and the converted will simply relapse. The labors of individual missionaries, like De Smet, are not successful because they are not “permanent and lasting” with a “common quest” rooted in Benedictine community. Only the Benedictines can provide a stable community in a land of darkness, just as they did in the sixth century. For Marty, the Benedictines offer two things not found in the *Annales*: evangelization through community, and conversion that endures the test of time. Marty’s personal yearning for both elements comes to light in a personal life event that prompted him to apply this call for conversion to himself and enter Einsiedeln’s monastery.

**The Death of a Sister**

In September of 1853, Marty experienced the death of his oldest sister, Elizabeth.\(^{148}\) She was his closest sibling in terms of age and affection. Her death marked a turning point in Marty’s life, and more than one biographer has opined that it was the

\(^{148}\) Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 44.
threshold to his monastic profession.\textsuperscript{149} The event prompted Marty to write a detailed, personal account of his anguish, likely composed a year later during Marty’s novitiate (1854-1855).\textsuperscript{150} The account is one of the longest personal writings of Marty that has survived and offers a rare window into his internal thinking. Its content and significance need reexamination, as neither Kleber nor Betschart recognize the account’s overt theological undertones, especially with respect to the work of divine providence in history.

\textbf{Marty’s Account}

Marty recalls how for weeks after Elizabeth’s death he departed to a lonely mountainside to read a book on world history.\textsuperscript{151} He confesses how “inexpressible” his sorrow was: “All human society, life itself, was loathsome to me.”\textsuperscript{152} Watching the sun set over the mountains, he contemplated his “own destiny” and “how long I should still have to live and what terrible things would still have to come upon me till I, too, should be at the goal.”\textsuperscript{153} He prayed the rosary for his sister, lamenting how he did not treasure her love while she was alive. This thought “gnawed” at his “heart” as he retreated more and more from friends and family. This continued until one day he attempted to scale the peak of a nearby mountain. Noticing several omens along the way, he failed to reach the peak.

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid. See also Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 25.
\textsuperscript{150} Betschart suspects that Marty’s superiors requested that he write the account (\textit{Apostel}, 25). He cites the original as in KAE, yet my search of the archives yielded no document. Consequently, I rely on Betschart’s limited reproduction of the German (\textit{Apostel}, 24-27) and use Kleber’s translation of much of the original in his unpublished biography (Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 45-51). Karolevitz also quotes the account at length, apparently using Kleber’s manuscript (Karolevitz, \textit{Bishop Martin Marty}, 19-23).
\textsuperscript{151} Marty refers to the book simply as “Hammers Lehrbuch der Weltschichte.” No copies of this work could be found.
\textsuperscript{152} Quoted in Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 45. Betschart provides the German: “Wie mir damals zumute war, ist unsäglich. Alle menschliche Gesellschaft, das Leben selber war mir verleidet.”
\textsuperscript{153} Quoted in Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 25: “…eigenes Schicksal…Dann rechnete ich aus, wie viel Schreckliches über mich kommen müsse, bis auch ich am Ziele sei…”
summit and suddenly found himself struggling to climb down. He came to a split in the path, and credits divine providence that he chose the wrong path not once but twice. Confused where he was, he cautiously descended in fear, clinging to trees and grass, as he repeated the “Memorare.” He finally reached a dry creek bed and proceeded to make a hasty, confident descent. It was at this point that he blacked out as he fell nearly 70 feet off a cliff. He awoke to severe pain and confusion, reassuring himself, “Impossible; a thing like that cannot happen to you.” He gradually realized that the creek was now overflowing with water from a brief storm, and it was the water that had forced him to gain consciousness. Making his way to creek’s edge, he rested for the remainder of the night, contemplating his imminent death and attempting to pray the Memorare and a rosary as he struggled with consciousness. At one point he recalls seeing the mountains of Unterwalden in the distance, the home of the Swiss Catholic patron “Brother Klaus” (Nicholas von Flüe), and considered making a vow to the patron in exchange for his rescue. However, before he could do so, he drifted back into unconsciousness.

After resting for a while, his “confidence in God gained the upper hand.” Now he was able to move. His decision to take one route rather than another he again attributes to divine providence, since the other way would have led to deep valley where it would have been impossible to find him. Gradually the clouds lifted. With the moonlight he made his way toward the lake and discovered a barn and house. Although he continued to fall to the ground, they transported Marty back to the city of Schwyz where, in the meantime, his family had promised the Virgin yet again to make an annual pilgrimage to Sonnenberg, just as they did when Marty had ingested acid as a
child. At home Marty received last rites before he drifted into unconsciousness for “three days.”

**Significance**

Although this autobiographical story has been reproduced in several biographies, it has been presented as nothing more than an intriguing glimpse into Marty’s thinking; its theological symbolism has been overlooked. The story is the admission of a spiritual conversion, written for either the novice master or greater monastic community. This admission, moreover strikes at the heart of the Benedictine *Rule*: a call for conversion through Christ-like humility. Marty begins by lamenting his ingratitude for his sister’s life. Her death prompts a spiritual crisis for the young Marty: what is the point of his life? God uses his retreat into the wilderness as an opportunity to lead him toward unexpected sufferings. At the same, Marty confesses that his arrogant self-confidence and pride blinds him to the dangers around him. As the dangers become more and more obvious, he turns to prayer. It is then that his literal “fall” ushers forth a new life. The dry creek flows with water and awakes him from his unconsciousness, perhaps an allusion to baptism. In the cloak of night, he continues to walk in the biblical “valley of darkness” (Ps. 23:4) or Marian “vale of tears” (*Salve Regina*), yet God’s hand guides him home. Even his vow to Brother Klaus suggests a deeper symbolism: the hermit’s death date coincides with the traditional death date and feast day of St. Benedict. It is possible that here Marty designates his novitiate as part of this conversion, yet rather than embracing a national patron he has followed a Benedictine path. He continues in pain, and his recollection of constant stumbling and blood flowing from his forehead echo the passion of Christ. All

---

the while, it is Mary’s intercession that protects him from further dangers, the “moon” leading him safely home. Yet the clearest theological symbolism is in the “three days” of his unconsciousness, a clear allusion to the death and resurrection of Christ.

This autobiographical account, in light of its theological undertones, suggests more than a story. In writing for monastic superiors, Marty connects the death of this natural sister to his personal conversion to enter a supernatural fraternity. For Marty, to join the monastery is to continue this conversion through communal life, a classic Benedictine theme. Here he applies his vision of Benedictine conversion in his panegyric directly to himself. The Benedictines are indeed the agents of conversion in history, and this story of conversion begins with his own life. The autobiographical account indicates a resilient confidence in the role of divine providence guiding him to the monastery.

Whatever its theological value, the events of Marty’s story prompted him finally to disclose to his parents his intention to enter the monastery.155 Up to this point, his parents had presumed that he only intended to become a priest, and they had neither knowledge of his petition to enter in 1850 nor his rejection. Marty now confessed to his mother how “the impulse of my heart… [is] to become a Benedictine.” After confirming that his desire to enter the monastery preceded the accident, thus verifying that it was not the direct impetus, his parents gave their consent.156 Marty’s explicit rationale for this “impulse” is preserve in a confession in a student newspaper that he edited, the last of his significant extracurricular developments.

---

156 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 52. The accident also shortened Marty’s finger, potentially preventing his ordination. Through a home remedy of soaking the finger in warm animal’s blood, the finger was remarkably restored.
The Zeitgeist Confession

On December 16, 1851, the first issue of a new student weekly appeared, named *Der Zeitgeist: Ein Unterhaltungsblatt* (“The Spirit of the Time: A Conversation Page”). The previous year, Morel had encouraged Marty and Ignaz von Ah to found a student paper. A satirical cartoon occupied the first page of each issue that poked fun at student life in the school, often with allusions to the school’s curriculum. Poems, dramas, and essays filled its pages, all handwritten by student authors without any signatures. Instead of circulating copies, the contributors of the *Zeitgeist* created one copy that was read out loud at student meals for entertainment on recreation days. According to Kleber, Marty was the primary hand behind the paper’s production and remained its editor from its inception until he entered the monastery in May of 1854.

Although Marty’s work with *Zeitgeist* preceded other extracurricular developments (such as the 1852 panegyric and the Marian Sodality), its significance for the development of Marty’s monastic worldview emerges only toward the end, just before he entered the monastery. As editor, Marty composed a farewell address in the *Zeitgeist* for May 14, 1854, five days before he entered the monastery. The address contains Marty’s only explicit confession of why he chose to enter the monastery.

---

157 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 38-39. Kleber cites November 16, 1851, as its first issue, yet the originals clearly state December (see the only existing copy of all issues, bound together, in Einsiedeln’s Stiftsbibliothek, EM 1008). See also Betschart, *Apostel*, 14.


159 Kleber maintains that Marty penned most of the newspaper’s handwritten pages, yet this claim is impossible to verify because there are no signatures in the original copies. See “Bishop Martin Marty,” 39. The next editor failed to keep the newspaper going, such that the last issued appeared in March of 1855.

160 „Abschied Worte der Redaction,” *Die Zeitgeist: Ein Unterhaltungsblatt* no. 23 (14 May 1854). No page numbers. The cover of the issue has a cartoon of an older man, dressed for a long Alpine hike, bidding smaller, younger students farewell. A monk to the left stands in the open doorway to the cloister, and the students shed tears as they wave goodbye. The previous issue (no. 22, dated 4 May 1854) contains a cartoon of monks casting ballots with five frightened candidates off to the side, anxiously awaiting the results. The scene references the monastic chapter’s upcoming decision to admit Marty (May 6).
With the title, “Notice for the Coming Generation,” Marty explains that he has chosen a supernatural, spiritual life that transcends his former natural life. He consistently repeats the theme of exchanging the “temporal for the eternal” (“das Zeitliche mit dem Ewigen zu vertauschen”). The “spirit of the time” had not predicted his entrance into the monastery, but the “future will teach us, that the present must yet contain what is unclear and unresolved.” After once again apologizing for any offense, he assures everyone that he will still participate with them “in spirit” via prayer. He then concludes with an admonition: “For all of you will and must come a moment when you exchange the temporal for the eternal - whether forced or freely. Do not let this moment take you by surprise…” They should “prepare” themselves for this “struggle,” since “happy are those who with joyful and loving hearts, if not in external act then in inner sense, can exchange the temporal for the eternal, the perishable for the everlasting, the natural for the supernatural and divine.” In light of the experience of his sister’s death, this final line epitomizes Marty’s idea of conversion to the monastic life. Marty sees himself as transitioning from a natural, temporal family to a supernatural, ecclesial family. Marty further develops this vision of transition between old and new, natural and supernatural, temporal and eternal in the fourth stage of his Swiss years as monk, preacher, and professor.

---

161 “Wohl diejenigen, welcher freudigen und liebenden Herzens, wenn nicht in äusserer That, doch, der innern Gesinnung nach das Zeitliche mit dem Ewigen, das Vergängliche mit dem Unvergänglichen, das Irdische mit dem Überirdischen und Göttlichen vertauschen kann.”
IV. MARTY AS A MONK IN EINSIEDELN: 1854–1860

The fourth and final stage of his Swiss development (1854–1860) demonstrates how Marty applies his twofold vision of Benedictine history and familial transition to his threefold vocation of monk, professor, and preacher in Einsiedeln. In the classroom and in the pulpit, Marty integrates language of the “everlasting” and the “eternal” with his idea of Benedictine conversion in history. After first outlining his formal entrance into the monastery and the priesthood, this section analyzes two pedagogical essays in conjunction with a key sermon on St. Meinrad. The first essay, “How One Learned and Taught a Thousand Years Ago” (1857), reconstructs the life of a medieval monk as a template for the familial bond between professor and student. The second essay, “On Association and Studying Youth” (1858), introduces the Marian sodality as a familial solution for instilling ecclesial unity among students. A close examination of both works, overlooked by previous scholars, demonstrates Marty’s use of Benedictine monasticism as a template for the intellectual and spiritual conversion of culture. The first essay outlines monastic education as the means to initiate the conversion of both the student and society. The second essay celebrates the Marian sodality as that which can sustain conversion through ecclesial unity. A sermon for students, delivered the following year (1859), combines these themes in the figure of St. Meinrad as an exemplar of Benedictine conversion for students to follow. Overall, Marty’s thought during this fourth stage converges on the general thesis of this chapter: Marty’s years in Switzerland exemplify a combination of old and new elements of Swiss Catholicism and Einsiedeln’s Swiss-
Benedictine tradition to create a vision of the monastery as a spiritual family educating and unifying the Catholic faithful.

Monastic Profession

On May 19, 1854, five days after he bid farewell to his peers in the pages of the *Zeitgeist*, Marty was admitted as a novice and clothed with Einsiedeln’s Benedictine habit. His admission came with the unreserved recommendation of Ildefons Hürlimann (1826–1894), the prefect (or spiritual formation superior) of the school.¹⁶² On the same day he assumed the habit, Marty moved into the novitiate wing of the monastery, separate from both the students and the monks.¹⁶³ There he experienced a schedule that was even more rigorous than that of the school. He rose at four in the morning, followed by choir, private prayer, three common meals, menial tasks, study, and classes, concluding at 8:30 in the evening after compline. Marty was particularly noted for his “zeal” for chanting and his enthusiasm for taking up undesired tasks, later writing as a missionary on the prairie, “Already in the days of the novitiate….divine grace impelled me to do what nobody else wanted to do; and I have since then constantly been guided by this rule.”¹⁶⁴ This novitiate fell under the direction of the novice master, Claude Perrot (1803–1881), who had a great impact on Marty’s spiritual formation. Perrot was a favorite confessor among his confreres, and like Marty, exhibited a love for the missionary annals.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ Quoted in Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 56.
¹⁶⁵ Henggeler, *Professbuch*, 509. At the time that he was Marty’s novice master, Perrot was writing a book on perpetual adoration (*Die Schule der ewigen Anbetung im Kloster- und Weltstande* [Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1860]), and it is likely more than mere coincidence that Marty later promoted Eucharistic adoration in the St. Meinrad community and as a missionary and bishop in the Dakotas.
Alongside his spiritual formation, Marty also completed his fourth and final year of theology in the lyceum. The year was devoted to biblical exegesis and archaeology, patrology, canon law, and pastoral theology. In this same class were two future lifelong friends: Benno Kühne (1833–1916) and Frowin Conrad (1833–1923), with whom Marty later confided his vision for monasticism in America and to whom he explained the rationale for Benedictines assuming apostolic, missionary work.

With Perrot’s recommendation, Marty took solemn vows on May 20, 1855, almost exactly a year after his entrance into the novitiate. Adding to the Rule’s vows of obedience, conversion of morals, and stability (RB 58.17), Einsiedeln also included poverty and chastity (reflecting the “evangelical counsels” of the mendicants and other orders). The liturgy for this profession coincided with Einsiedeln’s solemn proclamation of Pope Pius IX’s Ineffabilis Deus (December 8, 1854), the recent papal bull defining Mary’s Immaculate Conception as universal dogma. Hürlimann delivered the sermon, comparing the Virgin’s triumph over sin with new monks’ triumph over sin.

---

166 It is also worth noting that Marty’s exegesis class focused on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. This observation is curious given Marty’s trans-ethnic vision of evangelization and ecclesial unity later as a missionary, one insistent upon the premise that in Christ there is “neither Jew nor Greek” (Gal. 3:28). See Jahresbericht über die Erziehungsanstalt des Benedictiner-Stiftes Maria Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln: Benziger 1855), 45.

167 According to Kleber, there were no simple vows at the time (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 56). Marty professed with Isidor Hobi (1830-1895), who left for St. Meinrad three years before Marty and later served as the rector of the seminary under Marty’s leadership.

168 Although later generations read the solemn, liturgical rite of initiation as encompassing three distinct “vows,” the text of the Rule speaks only of a single “promise” with three dimensions. After the novice “promises perseverance in his stability” (RB 58.9), and after a year of preparation, the new monk “comes before the whole community in the oratory and promises stability [stabilitate sua], fidelity to monastic life [conversatione morum suorum], and obedience [oboedientia]” (RB 58.17). The third dimension of this promise is the least surprising. The beginning of the RB outlines obedience in great detail. The second aspect of “conversatione morum” is the most controversial. A variety of opinions exist on how to translate this elusive concept, commonly rewritten as “conversio morum” until the scholarship of Cuthbert Butler proved that the original was “conversatione.” A more recent philological study suggests “manner of life” as the best translation. See Fry, RB 1980, 459.
through their profession.\textsuperscript{169} Bells were rung and cannons were fired in celebration, and after solemn compline the monks led an outdoor candlelit procession. On September 14, 1856 (Engelweihe), Marty was ordained a priest in the abbot’s chapel.\textsuperscript{170}

More noteworthy than the celebration was the name that Alois Marty assumed with his solemn vows. He chose the name Martin, which his biographers attribute to St. Martin of Tours (316–397), the patron saint of both the canton of Schwyz and the church in which Marty was baptized and spent his childhood.\textsuperscript{171} This connection is certain. What they neglect is the monastic history associated with St. Martin. In Gregory the Great’s \textit{Vita}, Benedict founds Monte Cassino by replacing a pagan altar on the hill with one dedicated to St. Martin. Nineteenth-century monastic historians also revered Martin as the first monk of Gaul and thus Western Europe (and also one of the first monk-bishops, an intriguing coincidence given Marty’s future).\textsuperscript{172} With Marty’s thorough knowledge of medieval monastic histories, including Sulpicius Severus’s \textit{Life of St. Martin}, it is unlikely that he would have been aloof to this double symbolism. It thus seems that Marty’s selection of the name Martin signaled a transition or bridge between his natural family roots and the new spiritual or supernatural family of the monastery. His further work as “Pater Martin,”\textsuperscript{173} in both the classroom and the pulpit, confirms this speculation.

\textsuperscript{169} Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 21. Betschart does not explain why the monks chose to delay the formal proclamation in Einsiedeln. Delaying the event until the following May may have been intended to accommodate outdoor festivities.

\textsuperscript{170} Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 59. Marty received minor orders on June 2, 1855, and was ordained to the diaconate on May 17, 1856. Because of his age, he required a dispensation for his ordination to the priesthood.

\textsuperscript{171} See Kleber,” Bishop Martin Marty,” 56; Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 30; and Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Founder” (2004), 57.


\textsuperscript{173} Einsiedeln seems to have followed the Austrian-Benedictine custom of bestowing the title “Pater” on monks who had made solemn vows, even if they were not ordained to the priesthood (which was Marty’s case between May 1855 and September 1856). “Frater” was reserved for novices.
Marty the Professor

Immediately upon taking the Benedictine habit, Marty became an educator. Already during his novitiate and final year of theology in the lyceum, “Frater Marty” was placed in charge of the first-year class of the gymnasium (1855–1856). Records indicate that he taught 22 students in six subjects, including religion (catechism), Latin (via memorization of Lhomond’s *Epitome historiae sacrae*), German, mathematics, history (especially Swiss history), and natural history. Immediately after his ordination, the abbot assigned him to the fifth-year class in rhetoric (1856–1857). The following year witnessed Marty promotion to the sixth year (second in rhetoric), and he remained in this position for two years (1857–1859). This transition from fifth to sixth meant that for one year Marty had the same students, including two noteworthy pupils. The first was Louis Benziger (1840–1896), who later emigrated to the United States, assumed leadership of his family’s publishing house in America, and invited Marty to publish most of his printed works as abbot and later as bishop. Marty’s friendship with this Benziger brother proved to be instrumental in his scholarship and evangelizing efforts. The second pupil was Jacob (later Albert) Kuhn (1839–1929), one of Marty’s earliest biographers. Kuhn provides later biographers with one of the only first-hand accounts of Marty’s demeanor in the classroom: “Above all things he wanted to be an educator…and he

---

175 *Jahresbericht* (1856), 11.
177 Henggeier, *Professbuch*, 626. Kuhn later became a professor at the *Stiftschule* and wrote extensively on the history and aesthetics of Einsiedeln.
always looked out into the life and future of his pupils,” such that his “free and living” style “expanded the vision of the pupil...beyond pedantic questioning.”

As a professor, Marty penned two essays that manifest this concern for the “life and future” of Einsiedeln’s students. They reflect his combination of old and new ideas and experiences just prior to his departure for America. Together they provide a ready window not only in Marty’s pedagogy but also his monastic worldview. Despite their importance, previous scholars have either misinterpreted their content or given them only a cursory glance. Consequently, each essay deserves a more detailed exposition and thorough analysis in order to grasp Marty’s Swiss-Benedictine worldview and its later adaptation to the American scene.

The first essay was for the school year 1856–1857: “Wie man vor tausend Jahren lehrte und lernte” (“How One Taught and Learned a Thousands Years Ago”). As he transitioned with the same group of students to the sixth year (1857–1858), Marty penned his second Jahresbericht essay: “Das Vereinswesen und die studirende Jugend” (“On Associations and Studying Youth”). Whereas “How one Taught” constitutes an historical argument, “On Associations” reflects a philosophical argument. Both apply the Swiss-Benedictine tradition to Catholic intellectual and spiritual life in the modern world.

---

178 Albert Kuhn, “Bischof Martinus Marty, ein Indianer-Apostel,” Alte und Neue Welt (1896): 285. I borrow Kleber’s translation of this well-quoted account (“Bishop Martin Marty, 61). With respect to curriculum, Marty taught the same six subjects in both the fifth- and sixth-year classes. The class read Sallust and Tacitus, Cicero’s Orationes, Horace’s poetry, Virgil’s Aeneid, and Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey, and the records suggest that Marty emphasized the memorization of these texts more than his colleagues did. These classical texts were paired with medieval history, especially in the fifth year. It is thus not surprising that Marty celebrates the glories of ancient Greece and the medieval tradition in the two essays that he composed for the school’s Jahresbericht during this time: Jahresbericht (1857), 23; Jahresbericht (1858), 24 (see below).

179 Jahresbericht (1857), 3-18. The Jahresbericht does not provide the name of any authors for its “Programm” until the 1870s. Rather, names are penciled in under the title in the Einsiedeln Stiftbibliothek copies. This is true for both of Marty’s essays. Other sources collaborate Marty’s authorship, so there is little reason to question these additions to the Einsiedeln copies.

180 Jahresbericht (1858), 3-18.
Moreover, ideas in both essays resurface during Marty’s work in America. Together the essays form Marty’s lenses for evangelization in America: monastic education and ecclesial unity. This joint vision consumed Marty’s life and thought in the New World.

**The 1857 Essay: Monastic Education**

Marty’s first *Jahresbericht* essay attempts to reconstruct the ninth-century monastic education of Walafrid Strabo (ca. 808–849). Strabo was a monk and abbot in Reichenau, tutored Charles the Bald in Aachen, and later penned several noteworthy works in poetry, hagiography, horticulture, and monastic liturgy. Yet Marty turns to the life of this rather obscure medieval for a simpler reason: Strabo was a contemporary of St. Meinrad in Reichenau, and thus Marty approaches Strabo as a figure who can bridge the monastic education of Meinrad with that of nineteenth-century students in Einsiedeln.

Before examining the content of the 1857 essay, a word is necessary with respect to its origins and nature. In 1851 Morel added the first faculty essay (“Programm”) to the *Stiftschule’s* annual *Jahresbricht*. For the 1856–57 academic year, Morel invited Marty to produce an essay for the *Jahresbericht*. The omission of this background has caused serious confusion among scholars. Rippinger mistakes the essay as Marty’s

---


183 Kleber is the exception (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 67); Betschart alludes to the practice in passing but does not clarify the nature of the publication (*Apostel*, 33).
“dissertation” in the *Stiftschule*, and Karolevitz erroneously describes it as treatise on medieval Benedictine pedagogy that was later published elsewhere. The essay was indeed published beyond the *Jahresbericht* in *Der Katholik*, a widely-distributed German Catholic periodical, based in Mainz, that promoted Görres’s ultramontanism alongside Germany’s Neo-Thomistic revival. The reason behind *Der Katholik*’s interest in the essay is unknown, yet it is certain that its republication ensured that Marty’s humble essay was read throughout Catholic Germany. The impact that this essay had beyond Einsiedeln is evinced in the ripples of confusion that the *Der Katholik* edition initiated. By omitting Marty’s introduction, the republication erroneously claimed that it was Strabo’s personal account of his education. This misrepresentation prompted at least one German scholar to presume that Marty had discovered Stabo’s lost “diary.” The chain of confusion even made its way to America, well after Marty was a bishop in

---

185 Karolevitz, *Bishop Martin Marty*, 32. Karolevitz seems to get his information about *Der Katholik* from Kleber’s manuscript, but he misses the point. Rather, he describes the second essay (1858, see below) as Marty’s “dissertation” (32). This may be the source of Rippinger’s confusion.
187 All biographers are silent on this point. Marty’s essay may have come to the attention of editors through his brother, John Baptist Marty, who was probably in the seminary in Mainz at the time (see Betschart, *Apostel*, 18).
188 “Wie man vor tausend Jahren lehrte und lernte,” *Der Katholik: Zeitschrift für katholische Wissenschaft und kirchliche Leben* 1, no. 16 (Neue Folge, 1857): 314-334. At 314: “…welcher uns der berühmte Walafried Strabo selbst von seiner Studienzeit erstattet.” *Der Katholik* gives no credit to Marty. This probably stems from the fact that the *Jahresbericht* copy does not provide an author’s name (see note 179 above).
189 Kleber notes this problem (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 68). So too does Roumald Banz (*Kurze Geschichte*, 12). Neither Kleber nor Banz provides examples, however. An example of this problem is found in Lorenz Kellner, *Skizzen und Bilder aus der Erziehungsgeschichte* (Essen: Bädker, 1862), 1:133-147. Kellner seems to reproduce the text from *Der Katholik* (thus unaware of any introduction) and introduces the text as Strabo’s “diary” that has been “recently discovered and published” and is worthy of reproducing because of its “lively and fresh” prose (132, my translation).
Dakota Territory, when an historian in Wisconsin came across this “autobiography” of Strabo and translated it as Strabo’s own words.\footnote{James Davie Butler, of Madison, Wisconsin, mentions Kellner’s publication of this “diary” in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 39 (1882): 405-406. He identifies it as Strabo’s “autobiography” that was discovered in a “rubbish heap of MSS at Swiss [abbey of] Einsiedeln” (405), noting that it was published in the “annual report” of the abbey (as if it was a research publication rather than a school report). The following year Butler translated and reproduced the text as a pamphlet: *The School-life of Walafried Strabo* (Madison, WI: 1883; copy in the Wisconsin State Historical Society). One would presume that Bulter simply translated Kellner’s German copy. However, Bulter quotes and translates Marty’s second-person introduction, intimating that Butler actually located a *Jahresbericht* copy for his translation. Despite his access to this introduction (unlike Kellner, who seems to have relied on the *Der Katholik* copy), Bulter misleads his reader by claiming to translate Strabo’s personal narrative, an “autobiography of a school-boy” (19).}

In the end, one can point to Marty’s stylistic prose in the essay as the ultimate source of confusion for this particular essay: while his introduction makes it clear that he employs a variety of “reputable” sources on Strabo, the rest of the text is a reconstruction of Strabo’s life in the first person. This prompts one to question Marty’s rationale, and for an answer one must turn to the text itself. The text is divided into four sections: a conservative narrative of monastic history, a qualification of scholarship, a first-person narrative, and a concluding reflection on the nature of monastic pedagogy.

*The Text*

In the first section, Marty outlines the main argument of the essay: Catholic education is the direct beneficiary of ancient Greek and Roman learning, and the life of Strabo exhibits how Benedictine monasticism ensured this transition and preserved classical learning for Western civilization. The premise for this argument is the essay’s opening line: “The church of Jesus Christ is the educator of humanity.”\footnote{Marty, “Wie man vor tausend Jahren,” 3.} Even though every age has its specific “tasks,” each age can accomplish these only through the Church’s hallowed tradition, and the eduction of youth is no exception. This argument is
directed at the educational reforms of Swiss liberals: “True progress is in no way found in the change of methods, but rather through lawful and natural training in the true, just, and established tradition, refined through the experience of centuries.” The church possesses this true tradition because it is the “possessor of the sphere of art and science, which Greece and Rome passed on to her.” This language is imbued with German Romanticism and its obsession with ancient Greek culture, and it is clear why the essay’s German Catholic audience would not hesitate to agree. This argument drives the essay toward its goal, and the figure of Strabo serves only as a means to reach this goal.

In order to introduce Strabo, however, Marty expands his introductory narrative. He predictably turns to the Carolingian era. As the empire decayed, the “last Roman,” Boethius, passed on the classical tradition to Cassiodorus, who in turn passed it along to the “sons of Benedict.” One of these sons (Pope Leo III) crowned Charlemagne, who became the new “Roman emperor” destined to promote the “purposes” (Absichten) of the church in spreading “her faith and life to the salvation of all peoples.” Recognizing that the sons of Benedict possessed the “seed of Christian curriculum,” Charlemagne desired to plant “roots” that would give life to new “blossoms” and “fruit” in the “fresh, uncultivated soil” of Germany. Consequently, Carolingian Germany witnessed the founding of great monastic schools in Fulda, Mainz, St. Gall, and Reichenau (the school of Strabo).

However, before turning to Strabo, Marty concludes his introductory narrative by painting a portrait of these monastic schools, a portrait strikingly similar to Einsiedeln.

---

192 Ibid., 3. “Und der wahre Frotschritt besteht keineswegs im Wechsel der Methoden, sodern in der gestz- und naturgemäen Fortbildung der wahren, richtigen, durch die Erahrung von Jahrhunderten bewährten Ueberlieferung.”
193 Ibid., 4.
He claims that these schools housed the sons of nobles and peasants, and “the teachers and fathers of these youth were the Benedictines.” Cognizant of their heritage, they implemented ancient Greek and Roman trivium and quadrivium, yet “the highest goal of the curriculum, as of education, was God, in whom the wellbeing of the Church and in her the wellbeing of humanity, as well as the individual rests.” For these monastic educators, “knowledge was only a means, not the end; the formation of the heart, the development of character counted as more important.” This line is a clear allusion to Morel’s reformation of the school as an institution of intellectual and spiritual formation.

As monastic institutions, these schools followed a schedule based on the liturgical calendar of the Church. Students participated in solemnities that “awoke love and joy in their youthful hearts,” and each daily lesson with these great monastic educators developed a sense for the “truly great and noble.” With paganism and heresy gone, Christianity now assumed the task to “erect a living whole from all acquisitions and achievements.” However, the monks were well aware that not all “stones” have the same purpose. Rather, they taught subjects in accordance with a student’s “aptitude, position, and vocation,” beginning with what was “necessary” (language many of Marty’s predecessors had used to defend the Stiftschule in a world focused on utility). With Swiss liberals also in mind, Marty continues by claiming that the monks’ use of this traditional curriculum ensured a “lively conversation” through dialectic pedagogy and instilled “independence in thought and life.” With the stage set, Marty concludes his introductory narrative with another premise: “Whoever saw one of these schools encountered the essence of all of them.” Consequently, Reichenau, the abbey of St. Meinrad, participated in this tradition. Thus, to appreciate this tradition more fully, the essay

---

194 Ibid., 5.
introduces one of Riechenau’s “most significant personalities,” Walafrid Strabo. As a contemporary of Meinrad, Strabo taught in Reichenau as Meinrad taught students on Lake Zurich and later laid the foundation for a “great edifice that exists to this day.” Strabo is thus the key to understanding St. Meinrad as both a monastic educator and the founder of Einsiedeln.

At this point, Marty transitions from his introductory narrative to a caveat on historical sources. He makes it clear that the purpose of the essay is to reconstruct Strabo’s life from a variety of sources, since no clear narrative of his education has survived. Rather, it must be pieced together “bit by bit” through various writings. The essay attempts “to introduce [Strabo] here in plain speak” for the benefit of “our loyal pupils.” Nevertheless, Marty insists that this reconstruction is done in a scholarly, scientific manner: “The expert will soon see, that all that is said, also individually, is not arbitrary composition, but rather based on original reports; and the less well versed can rest assured, that in all liberty of form, the content is thoroughly based on the standard of historic truth.” To support this claim, Marty proceeds to name his sources. For Strabo’s primary works, he identifies three collections: (1) the *Canisii antiquae lectiones*; (2) the *Bibliotheca maxima Sanctorum Patrum*, one of the first critical collections of patristic sources; and (3) Jean Mabillon’s famous collection of Benedictine *vitae*, the *Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.* (completed between 1668 and 1701). For additional medieval primary
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196 Ibid., 5. “Der Kundige sieht bald, daß alles Erzählte auch im Einzelnen nicht willkürliche Dichtung ist, sondern auf urkundlichen Berichten beruht; den in solchen Studien weniger Bewanderten aber dürfen wir mit der Versicherung beruhigen, daß, bei aller Freiheit in der Form, der Inhalt doch durchaus auf geschichtliche Wahrheit Anspruch macht.”
197 This was the posthumous collection of works by Henricus Canisius (1562–1610), a canonist of Iglostadt and nephew of St. Peter Canisius.
198 The collection was first published by Magurerin de la Bigne (1546–1595) in 1579, and, through the efforts of other scholars, expanded to 27 volumes by 1694.
material, Marty names the works of Bede, Alcuin, and Rhabanus Maurus, as well as various “Scriptores” (writings) in the collections of the Maurist Benedictine Martin Bouquet (1685–1754) and the German historian Georg Heinrich Pertz (1795–1876). The latter citation refers to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, a state-sponsored collection of German primary sources, edited by Pertz between 1826 and 1874, that attempted to continue the Maurist tradition of collecting and preserving monastic manuscripts. Finally, for secondary material, Marty points to a history of the Diocese of Constance by Trudpert Neugart (1742–1825), a Benedictine historian of St. Blasien, and a history of Reichenau by “Prior Egon” in the *Anecdota* of Berhard Pez (1683–1735). Pez, a monk of Melk Abbey in Austria, was instrumental in introducing Maurist scholarship to German Benedictines and defending his order against the Jesuits. These details are important because Marty provides only names and presumes that his audience recognizes the scholarship. Consequently, scholars have completely ignored their significance for Marty. Betschart and Kleber refer only to Marty’s efforts to “synthesize” the works of Bede, Alcuin, and Rhabanus in the essay, a point repeated by Karolevitz and Rippinger. In the end, they all miss the point: Marty’s disclosure of sources places his essay in continuity with the Maurist tradition of Benedictine scholarship, and the list identifies this heritage for his students. The essay is thus not merely a reconstruction of a ninth-century life but also of a Benedictine tradition. Later, as a prior and abbot in

---

199 Marty likely refers to Bouquet’s *Rerum gallicarum et francicarum scriptores*.  
201 The full title is *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, published as six volumes between 1721 and 1729.  
Indiana, Marty attempted to reclaim and institute this tradition of scholarship in his own monastery in America.

After introducing his narrative and qualifying his sources, Marty finally begins his reconstruction of Strabo’s life. He opens with one of Strabo’s most famous poetic works, the Visio Wettini.205 He quotes a section on the history of Reichenau that lists its abbots. The list ends with abbot “Hatto” (Haito, 763–836) coming back from Constantinople as a representative of Charlemagne. This selection of the Visio is significant for two reasons: Strabo’s Visio is the poetic rendition of an original account by Haito, and the return of Haito from Constantinople symbolizes the journey of the Greek tradition to the Benedictines of Charlemagne’s realm. It is at this point that the text switches from poetic meter to prose: “Under this abbot [Hatto], I came to Reichenau as a poor orphan [Waisenknabe].”206 For the next eight pages, “Strabo” tells his experience of the school year by year. This transition to the first person is abrupt, takes the reader by surprise, and leaves the scholar puzzled. To explain this transition, one must approach this first-person narrative as a three-stage story of intellectual and spiritual conversion.

In the first stage, Strabo begins by noting how he entered Reichenau’s school in 815 as a nine-year-old, “completely naive,” under the leadership of Grimald, the headmaster. He immediately began with Latin grammar. By comparing Latin to German, he learned that some things are not translatable and came to grasp “how one could both read and understand what is read.”207 Exercises in translation used biblical history, and Strabo tells how despite his acumen for his work, his immaturity surfaced. Nevertheless,
an event unfolded that ripened his moral and spiritual formation. In his second year, Strabo relates how he witnessed the completion of the abbey church and its dedication, attended by lords, knights, bishops. For the ceremony, a thousand monks and students formed one choir “as I had never seen nor heard before, and at the high mass the whole people answered the prayers of the bishop.”

This display of communal prayer and participation gave the young Strabo pause: “For the first time in my life, something unnamable stirred within my heart, an endless plaintiveness came over me, God’s greatness and goodness filled my soul, and I determined that I would dedicate myself to his service completely and undividedly.” This realization assumed even greater clarity when the same abbot who had been seated among the honorary guests at the dedication later took interest in the school’s examinations and “now as good father” seated himself among the students.

From this first stage in the first-person narrative follows a second outlining Strabo’s further conversion and maturity. As the narrative continues, Strabo recalls how his Latin studies focused on the psalms, and in this way he learned the entire psalter. Now he could join the community in choir even though he did not have the habit. He also learned various liturgical hymns and antiphons through repetition, and Strabo identifies repetition as the way he “overcame the feeling of disquietude [Bangigkeit]” and gained confidence.

With Grimald’s departure for Aachen, Wettin became his instructor as he passed to rhetoric in 820. He began to read Cassidor, Cicero, Quintilian, and at the same time he started to learn history through the Martyrologium, Bede’s chronicles, Eusebius.

\[\text{Ibid., 8}\]
\[\text{Ibid., 9}.\]
of Caesarea, Sallust, and Virgil’s *Aenied*. Next he turned to dialectic and logic and practiced these with his peers in the form of disputations and readings of poetry and history. Recently returning from Aachen, Tattí, Grimald’s brother, introduced Carolingian ideas in rhetoric, history, and music. With these curricular advancements came an event with “special significance.” It was the last time that Abbot Haito gave the exams, as he had decided to live the rest of his years in a “quite cell dedicated solely to the service of God and the salvation of his soul.” After the exam, he told the students, “Only in the service of God will you all be able to employ your talents and knowledge for your own happiness and the well being of others. Neither power and reputation, nor wealth and pleasure will be able to give your hearts peace.” This exhortation, Strabo relates to the reader, prompted further conversion. Although he “did not yet understand what [Haito] meant by this,” the next day he witnessed Haito surrender his abbatial throne, give his staff and mitre to the younger Erlebald, and take his place among the rest of the brothers. In this act of humility, Strabo tells how “light flooded my soul, and I recognized the inanity of the earthly as never before, and I felt in me the potential for a similar abnegation and the same sacrifice.” Whenever his peers would speak of the architectural splendors of their homeland, Strabo now only looked out on the lake and would “think about God, about the God of my heart, and the farewell words of the aged abbot would resound again in my soul.”

---

210 Ibid., 10.
211 Ibid., 11.
213 Ibid., 11-12. “…da wurde es Licht in meiner Seele und ich erkannte die Nichtigkeit alles Irdischen, wie noch nie, und ich fühlte in mir die Kraft zu ähnlicher Entsagung und zu gleichem Opfer. Und wenn ich nachher oftmals am späten Abend in unserm Garten saß bei meinen Mitzöglingen, und wenn sie bei ihren
On the heels of this appreciation of humility comes a third stage of conversion in the narrative. Strabo expresses how he had gradually developed a “passionate love” not only for the “art of poetry” but also “knowledge.” To his studies he added Alcuin’s treatises on arithmetic and geography and began to study nature via ancient authors and Bede. He and his peers delighted in horticulture, yet at the same time Strabo noticed how Tatton could instill “divine peace” and humility alongside student enthusiasm. Another new subject was music, and Strabo excelled in the singing of psalms. Noticing his great aptitude, Tatton encouraged Strabo to take up Greek. The youth found himself reading Homer’s works from handwritten copies that Haito had brought back from Constantinople. Yet as he came to finish his studies, another event ushered forth further spiritual conversion. Wettin, whom Strabo “honored and loved…like a father,” fell ill. Wettin had visions of heaven, hell, and purgatory before his death, and shared these with Haito, Erlebald, and Tatton. Because of Strabo’s great care for Wettin as a loyal son, Erlebald shared these visions and had Strabo write them down (the *Visio Wettini*, with which Marty began the narrative). Here the narrative quotes a first-person poem that Strabo composed in his sorrow, expressing how Strabo saw himself as “an orphan.” The year 825 dawned, and the impact of Wettin’s death persisted such that “I felt that I myself had died with him.” Strabo confesses how he had long ago felt that he “was called to serve God in Reichenaun,” yet now his resolve had “matured” (*gereift*) with Wettin’s

---

*Burgen und Schlössern sprachen, und von den herrlichen Palästen der Fürsten und Herzöge…achte an Gott, an den Gott meines Herzens, und die Abschiedsworte des greisen Abtes ertönten wieder in meiner Seele.”

214 Ibid., 12.
215 Ibid., 13
216 Ibid., 14
217 Ibid., 15.
passing. Consequently, he asked Abbot Erlebald for admission. Before he could enter, however, he was told that he must first finish his studies.

After this final stage of conversion, the first-person narrative gives way to Marty’s reflection on the nature of monastic pedagogy. He insists that further reconstruction of Strabo’s students years is unnecessary as it does not serve the purpose of the “next goal.” At first, this secondary goal is unclear. Marty notes that Strabo did indeed enter the Reichenau community and study theology. He then reproduces ten hexameter stanzas of a triumphant hymn Strabo composed for the visit of Charles the Bald to Reichenau in 829. Marty continues Strabo’s biography as he is sent to Fulda to study with Rhabanus Maurus and later to Aachen to serve the imperial court. This rather awkward assortment of poems and history initially leads the reader to think that Marty intends to demonstrate Strabo’s legacy for the Carolingian era. Instead, Marty shifts to the death of Tattilo and Strabo’s return to Reichenau as headmaster of the school. Here Strabo penned several important treatises, histories, and scriptural commentaries. One of these works, dedicated to Grimald as “wisest father,” implores Grimald to “cut out what is bad, and make better what is good.” It is with these lines that Marty comes to the point of his conclusion: Strabo’s “good-natured character remained constant” throughout his life, as these final works manifest his enduring “humility and modesty.” In essence, the essay uses Strabo as a symbolic figure to unveil the nature of monastic pedagogy. Monastic education is a tradition grounded in a familial relationship between a paternal teacher and a childlike pupil. It is for this reason that so much of the first-person

---

218 Ibid., 16.
219 Ibid., 16-17.
220 Ibid., 17.
221 Ibid., 18.
narrative focuses on the role of Haito, Grimald, Wettin, and Tatto. The tradition of classical learning is thus communicated through this familial relationship, yet knowledge is not the ultimate goal of a true monastic education. Rather, it is conversion through this family life, one that is both intellectual and spiritual.

**Significance**

Marty’s familiarity with Swiss-Benedictine history sheds light on why he assumes a first-person perspective for his essay: Strabo’s story of his education is actually Marty’s story. The narrative reflects the very curriculum Marty experienced as a student and later executed as an instructor. At the same time, the narrative mirrors Marty’s own spiritual journey toward his monastic profession. Just like Strabo, Marty’s journey began with an appreciation of the familial character of the Benedictine school (stage one), gradually matured as he came to identify the superiority of the spiritual over the physical (stage two), and culminated with the death of a loved one that prompted him to act on a prior decision (stage three). This is why Marty interrupts the first-person narrative where he does, because his first and primary goal of the essay is to show students how not only his education but also their education in Einsiedeln is in the same tradition as Stabo’s and, most importantly, St. Meinrad’s monastic education. This primary goal is the foundation for the second (or “next”) goal, which is to invite his student readers (1) to participate in this tradition of monastic education through the humility and obedience of a father-son relationship in education, and (2) to open themselves to intellectual and spiritual conversion through their monastic education, rooted in a common family life. This invitation is essential for understanding Marty’s essay the following year.
The 1858 Essay: Ecclesial Unity

In many ways, Marty’s second essay for the following year (1857–1858) is an extension of his invitation for student conversion in the first essay. “On Associations and the Studying Youth” is more philosophical and theological, beginning not with the historical “how” but rather an existential “why.”

Like the first essay, the historical background of the second shrouds its ultimate purpose. Marty penned the essay not as an objective study but rather as an orchestrated answer to problems with the Swiss Student Association (Schweizerischer Studentenverein) in Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule. The Swiss Student Association had its roots in conservative Swiss-Catholic patriotic movements and was designed to foster and preserve Catholic identity in antebellum Switzerland. Founded in Schwyz in 1841, the association had sponsored a chapter in the Stiftschule since 1848. The group had morphed into an elitist group “ostentatiously manifesting a superiority complex” that disregarded teachers’ authority. Faculty further questioned the moral integrity of its student periodical (the Waldroslein), precipitating an urgent need to address the problem.

---

222 As discussed above (note 185), Karolevitz mistakes the essay for Marty’s “dissertation” (Bishop Martin Marty, 32). Karolevitz also provides some background about the Swiss Student Association, ostensibly borrowed from Kleber’s manuscript. Rippinger, however, does not mention the essay at all. In her private translation of Betschart’s Apostel, Van Well also omits Marty’s 1858 essay entirely and provides her reader with only a footnote that she has not translated Betschart’s section on “student associations” because it “would have relatively little interest for the reader today” (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 24). On Van Well’s translation, see above, introduction, 10n17. It is likely that Rippinger used Van Well’s translation, causing him to overlook the 1858 essay.


224 Betschart, Apostel, 34; Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 68.
Given Marty’s history with the Marian sodality, the abbot asked him to compose an essay on the matter to be presented as official school policy.\textsuperscript{225}

The essay follows a structure similar to the first: after some introductory remarks, the main argument progresses in three stages, followed by two points for his audience to consider. Earlier scholars have more or less missed the true intention behind the work. Although it addresses internal school problems, it also constitutes a larger argument for ecclesial unity. This second work forms an implicit manifesto for the Marian sodality as an entity that can unite Catholics and sustain student (and Christian) conversion in the world.

\textit{The Text}

As Marty introduces his second essay, any reader of the first recognizes the same Benedictine emphasis on communal life. Like the first, its prose is saturated with Romantic idealism. A restorationist reading of history emerges once again, yet instead of medieval \textit{vitae} and chronicles, it relies more on Romantic rhetoric for a distinctly theological argument. Its opening line is a Romantic salvo: “Whatever one may say to the contrary, our age is an age of rebirth.”\textsuperscript{226} For proof, Marty turns to the popularity and activity of so many associations. These associations mirror a phenomenon witnessed throughout Christian history: after the “destruction of the old structure,” one must build “a new order of things…upon unshaken foundations.” In the good that they accomplish, these associations draw from the lifeblood of Christianity, since “the \textit{Vereinswesen} is one of the most beautiful gifts of Christendom.” The theatrical, political, and industrial

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{225}Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 69.
\item \textsuperscript{226}Marty, “Das Vereinswesen,” 3. “Was man auch dagegen sagen mag, unsere Zeit ist eine Zeit der Wiedergeburt.”
\end{itemize}
associations of paganism lacked what Paul, the “Völkerapostel,” terms “fidelity” (quoting Romans 1:31) and, in Marty’s estimation, “spiritual and charitable goals.” The Christian gospel introduced the Trinitarian principle into the world, such that all the faithful are one just as the Father and Son are one. The Acts of the Apostles further confirms the communal life of early Christianity as they were “one heart and one soul” (Acts 4:32).227

As a final testament to this early Christian ideal, Marty invokes the authority of a letter “from the first Christian century.” Its author writes, “What the soul is to the body, so are Christians to the world. The soul is expanded through its members, just as Christians are spread through all the lands of world.”228 In a similar manner, just as the soul dwells in the flesh, but is not from the flesh, so “Christians are in the world, but not of the world.” Likewise, the flesh hates the soul, but the soul “loves the flesh, its enemy…and the Christians, love their enemies.” Christians also “but hold the world together,” much like the soul does the flesh. This unnamed text draws from Christ’s prayer to the Father in John (17:16-17; see also 15:19) and combines its theology with Paul’s dichotomy of the spirit versus the flesh (Gal. 5:17). Although Marty never names this ancient Christian source, his quotation matches the second-century Epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus as translated in an essay by Johann Möhler on early Christian theology.229 His selection of this text is far from random. Rather, Marty intentionally blends Tübingen scholarship with Johannine and Pauline themes, and it seems more than a coincidence that his last years of theological studies focused on these sources. Together they form the cornerstone

228 Ibid., 4: “Was die Seele im Leibe, das sind die Christen in der Welt. Die Seele ist durch alle Glieder verbreitet, so die Christen durch alle Länder der Welt. Die Seele zwar wohnt im Leibe, aber ist nicht vom Leib; ebenso wohnen die Christen in der Welt, aber sie sind nicht von der Welt.”
for his theological argument: from its inception, the Christian association has been an agent of rebirth in the world because it is one of spiritual conversion and ecclesial unity. With this theological argument established, Marty applies it to history. As in his 1852 panegyric, Marty weds his restorationist vision of history to the Benedictine tradition. The “animating spirit” (*belebende Geist*) of Christian associations emerges in Egyptian and Syrian monasticism before spreading to Italy and Gaul. Then comes St. Benedict, whom Marty portrays as a second Moses sent by God as the “great lawgiver,” bestowing upon “all of these associations their composition and invigorating spirit.”

The new associations, reborn through the Benedictine tradition, and introduced throughout Europe, come to form “what we call civilization, which is none other than the temporal form of Christendom.” They began with Charlemagne, and later Cluny and Citeaux rose to complete the “conversion” (*Neugestaltung*) of the Middle Ages. These associations furthered “religion and morality, cultivated art and science, led upbringing and education, introduced farming and industry, built villages and cities.” With the second millennium, a “new period” of associations (i.e., monasteries) gathered together people from every level of society to form a “great whole” (*großen Ganzen*) as a “spiritual confraternity, an ecclesial Order” by way of “following the evangelical call” and the “solemn taking of vows.” Along with these, “new ecclesial orders” (likely referring to the Mendicants) renewed the “Volksmissionen” and “knowledge of the soul.” They brought millions of unbelievers to the faith, doing “more in 600 years for freedom

---


231 Ibid., 4. “ Diese Vereine waren es, welche alle Länder der Europa’s der Reihe nach in jenen lichten Kreis einführen, den wir die Civilisation nennen und der nichts Anderes als die zeitliche Form des Christenthums ist.”

232 Ibid., 5.
than all philosophy, economics, revolutionaries, and government together.” After the Reformation, new and old associations took upon themselves the “religious and moral rebirth of all classes of society” and shared the “blessings of Christian-European culture” in newly discovered lands. However, other associations also formed at this time, often opposed to the truth (likely referring to Jansenism and the *philosophes*). With the French Revolution, all of these Christian associations that cared for the spiritual needs of humanity disappeared. However, liberal forces were not able to “suffocate” their life completely, and soon “rose all over the old associations again with renewed power.” For Marty, this is the glory of the nineteenth century, as one witnesses in “all classes of society, men of the church and men of the state, men of science and art, join hands to assume the work of true progress once again - what their predecessors eschewed - to assemble a new structure from the ruins of the old and the stones of modernity, in which the twentieth century of Christian history confidently makes its entrance.” What individuals could once accomplish can now only come to fulfillment through the *Vereinswesen*, the association.

Marty’s language for this triumphal narrative is key because it develops the Benedictine idealism of his student years. Here Marty moves his Benedictine narrative into a larger ecclesial narrative. He celebrates the work of non-Benedictine orders (Mendicants, Jesuits, etc.) as part of a cycle of restoration in history. These “associations,” stemming in part from the Benedictine tradition, are agents of rebirth in

---

233 Ibid., 5. “Zwei kirchliche vereine haben binnen sechshundert Jahren mehr für die Freiheit gethan, als alle Philosophen, alle Oekonomisten, alle Freiheitsmänner und alle Regierungen miteinander.” Marty takes this line from an unnamed “publicist” (whom I could not locate).

Christian history, forming a greater “whole” as the supra-association of the Church. Nevertheless, Benedictine monasticism remains the ancient “foundation” for this rebirth of the Church, providing the template for new religious orders - the “new stones” of modernity. Christian civilization begins with the Benedictines, but “true progress” converges not on various associations but rather on ecclesial unity. The Benedictines are the foundational agents of rebirth in society, yet they are the not the summation of rebirth. In the end, associations “may never wish to replace or supercede the family, state, or church.” The Benedictines begin with the life of the family, they complement the state (e.g., Carolingian civilization), and they serve the greater Church through missions. This is the premise driving the argument of the essay, and it is clearly directed at the Swiss Student Association.

Having established his argument and its historical premises, Marty presents two paths for his reader. First, there is the example of an unnamed student association, originating in the sixteenth century, which has remained under the “special protection of the Queen of Heaven” and has thus yielded much good in the world and enjoys papal approval. This is an obvious allusion to the Marian sodality that Marty established in Einsiedeln as a student six years previously. The other path is found in student “fraternities” (Landsmannschaften), which lack “any higher purpose” and are little more than “bestiality.” These latter associations, first common in Germany and now present in Switzerland, entertain only political goals. Consequently, the faculty have decided it is

---

235 Ibid., 6: “Vereine dürfen nie weder Familie, noch Staat, noch Kirche ganz ersetzen oder überflüssig machen wollen.”
236 Ibid., 6. “Neben ihm bestanden auf den meisten Universitäten die schon im Mittelalter vorhandenen und wiederholt aufgelösten Landsmannschaften, gesellige Vereine ohne allen höhern Zweck, welch endlich, um mit Wolfgang Menzel zu reden, bis zur ‘Bestialität’ entarteten.” Marty draws this characterization of “bestiality” from literature critic Wolfgang Menzel (1798–1873) in his Die Geschichte der letzten vierzig Jahre (Stuttgart, 1857).
time to “say a word” on the matter. The rest of the essay expands this dichotomy of associations by presenting three questions: (1) whether associations among youth are desirable at all, (2) if they are, what form should they take, and (3) what are the conditions for them to prosper.\footnote{Ibid., 7.}

Marty’s answers to these questions form an extensive commentary based on his answer to the first question. Marty begins by maintaining that all education progresses in three stages: the family, the school, and society. The Church assists and permeates each of these respective stages. It is the second (the school) that is the linchpin of Catholic education. A good school forms not only the intellect but also the will, and thus it is a “work of authority, but it is also a work of freedom.”\footnote{Ibid., 7.} The youth must “freely choose, want, and love the true, the good, and the beautiful,” but he can only do so through obedience to authority. It is “absolutely necessary” that the Church, which “alone is the educator of humanity,” instruct youth in this combination of authority and freedom while he is still in “small circles” before he ventures into a greater society.\footnote{Ibid., 8.} Associations provide just such a forum within the school, thus answering the first question. However, Marty makes a qualification. Even seminaries, which already form a “family circle,” could also benefit from an association in so far as it draws together scientific knowledge with rhetoric and music. Once again, Marty alludes to the tradition of the “academies” in the school while setting up his case for a “Marian” academy.

For the second and third questions, Marty expands on his authority-freedom paradigm and blends together a concoction of ultramontane liberalism and Romantic rhetoric while adding Swiss-Catholic localism. To answer the second question, Marty

\footnote{Ibid., 7.}
begins with another premise: “The root of every association is its purpose.”\(^{240}\) From this observation, Marty categorizes all student associations into two forms: (1) the “social and scientific”, which are “transitory” (vorübergehend), and (2) the “religious-moral and political,” which are “enduring” (bleibend). Marty insists that the second group can avoid “corruption” only by maintaining goals that are “certain,” paraphrasing Görres that nothing is more “pernicious” for youth than the “brooding over generalities.”

Associations that are not bound to the Church speak only of “virtue” as a generalized goal and neglect that this noble goal can only be reached through one’s ultimate goal, which is the honor of God.\(^{241}\) Many present-day youth, steeped in such associations, have grown “world-weary” because they have known neither “consistency” nor the Fatherland’s “local conditions.”\(^{242}\) In other words, their associations have attempted to supercede the family, the state, and, most importantly, the Church. This is the problem plaguing student political associations, which are “in no manner, in no age, and in no educational level acceptable for studying youth.”\(^{243}\) In focusing only on the self and political goals, they are not “free and independent” because they deny “truth, love, justice, and wise freedom.”\(^{244}\) They place “faith in the possibility of a philosophically conceived state” rather than begin with the “experience” of history. Their goal is a “type

\(^{240}\) Ibid., 9. “Die Wurzel jedes Vereins ist sein Zweck.”
\(^{241}\) Ibid., 10. As an example, Marty points to the history of the so-called “Tugendbund” of early German Romantics (11). Along with this historical reference, he quotes Schiller’s poem, “Erwartung und Erfüllung.” Its text reads, “In den Ozean schifft mit tausend Masten der Jüngling / Still, auf gerettem Boot treibe in den Hafen der Mann.” Marty replaces the original “Greis” with “Mann.”
\(^{242}\) Ibid., 11: “Die widerliche Schaar der Weltmüden, der Euorpanmüden rekrutirt sich stark aus solchen früh überreizten und abgenutzten Jünglingen. Wir müssen aber die und anvertraute Jugend zur Festigkeit, zur Stetigkeit erziehen, zur Lust und Liebe an fester Thätigkeit in unsern heimischen Verhältnissen, auf dem Boden unseres Vaterlandes.”
\(^{243}\) Ibid., 12.
\(^{244}\) Ibid., 12.
of idolatrousness” centered around “castles in the sky” (Luftschlösser). There political associations espouse a “particular spirit” (Sondergeist) rather than a “communal spirit” (Gemeingeist) - language that surfaces again during Marty’s debate with Beuronese monks. Consequently, Marty answers both remaining questions. For the second, he maintains that student associations must advance moral and spiritual goals. For the third, he presents two principles necessary for any “lasting good” among students: “Every scientific association must be led by instructors and educators, and every religious-moral association, moreover, must actually be established on a religious, ecclesial foundation.”

The rest of the essay consists of a commentary on how these two principles must be joined together in student formation. It once again assumes a similar combination of ultramontanism and Romanticism and adds Marian devotion. For Marty, knowledge comes only through the Socratic method and respect of the authority of teachers who are versed in truth and experience. Students simultaneously need a religious-moral education, otherwise they succumb to, in the words of Christian Garve (1742–1798), “sensuality,” “hedonism,” and a “disposition of unbound freedom.” It is the latter that Marty characterizes as the “fundamental evil” (Grundübel) of the present. The arrogance of student insubordination threatens the social order. Alluding to Schiller,

---

245 Ibid., 13.
247 Ibid., 14.
Marty laments, “We have no more men, because we no longer have children!” This is because society no longer follows the “spirit of God” and fails to heed de Maistre’s warning that society unravels into “brutalization” if it does not “return to the old foundations...if knowledge is not subordinated to religion.” For society to recognize this reality is to realize that “the present state of humanity is a product of sin,” and that without the supernatural means of the Church, “no true, no lasting moral character” is possible. Marty then threads these various sources together as banner for the Virgin. The recently defined dogma of the Immaculate Conception represents the antithesis of human corruption. It stands a reminder that man cannot reverse his corruption by “only human means” but rather needs the Church’s “supernatural means, which are required for this moral rebirth” of the world. She is a “life of community of the higher world,” and students must love her as a mother with “childlike dependence.” They must do this with “one heart” and as “brothers,” not with “verbose triads” but rather with “love and action.” Many of his readers, both as colleagues and as students, would have recognized the language of the manual of the Marian Sodality couched in these words.

In the conclusion of his essay, Marty intertwines his ultramontane and Romantic appeals to Swiss localism and Marian devotion into an invitation for student conversion and evangelization. The Church is, in the words of Joseph Othmar Rauscher (1797–

---

250 Ibid., 15. Marty quotes the original poem in a footnote but does not provide its source: “Es war nicht immer wie jetzt, ich kann das Geschlecht nicht begreifen; Nur das Alter ist jung, ach! und die Jugend ist alt.” The quotation is from Schiller’s “Jetzige Generation.” See Gedichte von Friedrich von Schiller (Stuttgart: Cotta’schen, 1873), 359.
253 Ibid. 17. Marty borrows the idea of the Church as “Lebensgemeinschaft” from a sermon by Joseph Cardinal Rachscher of Vienna.
254 On Marian piety and ultramontanism in Germany and Europe, see Norbert Busch, Katholische Frömmigkeit und Moderne: Die Sozial- und Mentalitätsgeschichte des Herz-Jesu-Kultes in Deutschland
1875), at a “turning point in the history of peoples” that demands “coaction” from its members through the “sermon of example,” such that “every member is an epicenter, from which radiates in larger or smaller circles the invitation to serve God.”

Marty concludes that all student associations are united in this mission and “stand on ecclesial ground” through “motherly guidance.” Only then will Swiss Catholics be “one in inner faith and active love,” preserve Switzerland’s “place and liberty” in Europe, and proclaim Schiller’s oath of the Rütli, “We wish to trust the almighty God, and not fear the power of man.” Like ancient Greece, Switzerland will find “its place of honor in world history” as “one people that holds fast to the faith and institutions of its fathers.”

Significance

Once again, Marty invites his students to participate in an enduring tradition. For Marty, this tradition is indeed Swiss, but it is first and foremost Catholic. It begins with the local experience, but it culminates in a universal mission; it begins with the monastic community and finds sustenance in filial devotion to Mary, the maternal model of the Church. This tradition’s final goal is the “rebirth” of the humanity through the Church. Like the first essay, it begins with Marty’s paradigm of Benedictine monasticism as an agent of intellectual and spiritual conversion in history. Whereas the first essay upholds monastic education as that which facilitates both intellectual and spiritual conversion, this


“Wir wollen trauen auf den höchsten Gott / Und uns nicht fürchten vor der Macht der Menschen.” The line comes from Schiller’s drama, Wilhem Tell (1804).
second essay implicitly upholds the Marian Sodality as doing the same on a greater ecclesial level. For Marty, monastic education grounds and initiates this twofold conversion while the true Christian association (i.e., the Marian sodality) sustains this conversion both in the school and later in society. Monastic education introduces the Church’s tradition of learning and spiritual fulfillment; the sodality bridges the student’s transition from the school to society and sustains this conversion in the Church while assisting its greater unification. In many ways, the second essay presumes the first and completes it. Together both essays demonstrate how Marty’s emerging vision blends Swiss-Benedictine history and its pedagogical legacy (the old) with a modern Swiss-Catholic yearning for religious education and unity (the new). This twofold ideal of conversion through monastic education and ecclesial unification later reappears in his work in America.

Nevertheless, Marty’s call for ecclesial unity had an immediate effect in the school. The essay prompted a vociferous rebuttal by a spokesman for the Swiss Student Association in the *Schwyzer Zeitung*.\(^{258}\) In turn, the *Stiftschule* prohibited its students from joining the organization.\(^{259}\) At the same time, with abbatial approval, Marty reorganized the school’s “academy,” which had waned in previous years.\(^{260}\) He joined the academy with the Marian Sodality that he had established as a student, creating a new “Marian Academy” that countered the Swiss Student Association’s influence. Reflecting the program of his essay, the new academy blended intellectual and rhetorical development with moral and spiritual formation. Marty led the Marian Academy as the faculty “director” for the next two years (1858–1860), organizing it according to the

\(^{258}\) Betschart, *Apostel*, 34.
\(^{259}\) Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 70.
statues of the Marian Sodality’s manual.\textsuperscript{261} For the next century the Marian Academy remained the primary student association in the school and became Marty’s pedagogical legacy in Einsiedeln. During his final year the abbot promoted him to professor of moral theology in the lyceum (1859–1860). Alongside these new duties he became one of the abbey’s premier homilists. Many ideas in his earlier writings, including the essays, reappear in his sermons. This is particularly true for a sermon he delivered for students in 1859, the year after his second essay.

The Pastoral Marty

No sooner had Marty assumed a double vocation as monk and teacher than he ascended the steps of the abbey’s ornate baroque pulpit as a respected preacher. Marty excelled at pastoral work and later described it as “in my element.”\textsuperscript{262} According to Albert Kuhn, the young Marty never imported his penchant for theatrical drama into the pulpit. Instead, he employed a “conversational tone, the tone of a friendly talk” that “penetrated deeper into the hearts” of his listeners.\textsuperscript{263} However Marty may have delivered his sermons, they warrant closer analysis since they uncover his pastoral vision and outline themes he advocated as foundational for monasticism and later advanced in America. Although Kleber and Betschart mention the preservation of a collection of sermons (1856–1859), they have been almost entirely ignored in scholarship.\textsuperscript{264} A survey

\textsuperscript{261} Banz, “Die ‘Academien,’” 13-15, 94.
\textsuperscript{262} Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 62.
\textsuperscript{264} Both Betschart and Kleber note the existence of the bound, 362-page collection of Marty’s handwritten sermons in the Stiftsbibliotek (EM 6): Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 64; Betschart, Apostel, 33. Kleber claims there are 59 sermons, while Betschart claims 42; Kleber is correct. The collection is not chronologically arranged. Kleber does translate and reproduce one of these sermons in his manuscript (the
of these sermons discovers dichotomies reminiscent of Marty’s language in the *Zeitgeist*, i.e., between the natural and supernatural, the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal, and the perishable and the everlasting.\textsuperscript{265} For the purpose of the present chapter, I have selected and translated one of these sermons that, in my opinion, demonstrates how Marty uses these common dichotomies to advance his monastic worldview. The sermon, delivered on the feast of St. Meinrad (January 21) in 1859, further situates Marty as both preacher and educator, as the sermon is marked as delivered to the students of the *Stiftschule*.\textsuperscript{266} The sermon demonstrates how Marty merges Pauline themes with the life of St. Meinrad to present Einsiedeln’s founding martyr as an exemplar of Benedictine conversion in the modern world.

**The 1859 Sermon**

Marty opens his sermon in his usual manner: he introduces a line from scripture, and the rest of the sermon serves as an exegetical commentary on this simple line. For this particular sermon he selects the second part of 2 Cor. 4:18: “For the things which are seen are temporal: but the things which are not seen, are eternal.”\textsuperscript{267} With this line he immediately turns to the figure of St. Meinrad and acknowledges that, in two years, Einsiedeln will celebrate the millennial jubilee of his martyrdom (861–1861), when his “blood soaked” the ground where the *Gnadenkapelle* now stands.\textsuperscript{268} The event, he continues, simultaneously commemorates his passage to heaven, “of which the Apostle

\textsuperscript{265} For instance, see Marty’s sermon for his “name day,” the feast of St. Martin, 11 Nov. 1858 (pp. 53-56).

\textsuperscript{266} “Sermons,” 199-206. A later hand has penned in the margin, “bei den Studenten.”

\textsuperscript{267} For almost all of his scriptural references, Marty quotes the Latin of the Vulgate: “quae enim videntur temporalia sunt quae autem non videntur aeterna sunt.”

\textsuperscript{268} “Sermons,” 199.
[Paul] says, ‘eye has not seen…the things which God has prepared for those who love him’ [1 Cor 2:9].’ Thus, after laboring in the “valley of tears” for some sixty years, Meinrad is blessed not only for a thousand years but rather from “eternity to eternity” in the “celestial house of his Father.” Marty then directly addresses the students before him: “This is also our goal.” Quoting Heb. 13:14, he reminds them that Paul’s claim that “here we have no lasting city, but we seek the city which is to come” also applies to them. He continues: “we have often knelt in the place where St. Meinrad knelt and prayed: ‘to thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve, to thee do we send up our sighs, mournings, and weepings in this valley of tears.’”

This introduction, referencing both Scripture and the Salve Regina, blends together Christian martyrdom, Einsiedeln’s monastic heritage, Pauline theology, and Marian devotion. They all point to an eternal home and remind the students that the present world is not a true home but a “valley of tears.” They further serve as what Marty terms the “foundational principles” (Grundsätze) of a student’s “vocational choice” (Berufswahl) as manifested in a “proven exemplar and paradigm.”

For Marty, they are in essence Paul’s principles in the line selected for exegesis (2 Cor 4:18), which reveals two truths: “the visible is spiritual,” and “the invisible is eternal.”

The rest of the sermon is divided according to these two ideas as applied to Marty’s example of an “exemplar:” St. Meinrad.

For the first truth, the “visible is spiritual,” Marty outlines the life of St. Meinrad. He begins by recalling the story of the forty-day temptation of Christ in the Synoptic

---

269 Again, Marty quotes the Latin of the Marian hymn, which would have been familiar to the monks and the students.


Gospels, focusing on Satan’s offer of the kingdoms of the world.\textsuperscript{272} Marty proceeds to connect the biblical story with the life of St. Meinrad: “Without doubt, the Tempter also spoke to St. Meinrad in a similar manner, or else it must then not be true, what St. Paul says, ‘Without battle there is no victory [2 Tim. 2:5].’”\textsuperscript{273} Occasionally quoting the Latin of St. Meinrad’s tenth-century \textit{vita}, Marty retells the story of how Meinrad surrendered his inheritance and rejected a career as an imperial advisor for the life of a monk.\textsuperscript{274} He expands the \textit{vita}’s narrative with details about Meinrad’s peers and teachers at Reichenau, gleaned from other sources (many of which Marty uses for his 1857 essay above) and various local hymns for Meinrad’s feast day. Through his studies at the monastery, Meinrad came to realize how the “visible” veiled “spiritual” truths that alone could bring fulfillment in life. Marty emphasizes how Meinrad ventured beyond what nature gave him to embrace an education in eternal realities. Thus Meinrad understood the “reverse side” (\textit{Kehrseite}) of the visible world around him, and it is this “foundation” (\textit{Grundlage}) upon which “we may confidently construct our life.”\textsuperscript{275}

For the second truth, the “invisible is eternal,” Marty expands this “foundation” of Meinrad as one not only of knowledge but also love. Meinrad grasped that God’s love is eternal and that all labors and sufferings done through this love have “eternal worth.” According to Marty, Meinrad applied this insight to Benedict’s \textit{Rule}: “we must haste to do now what will profit us forever.”\textsuperscript{276} This line “was the thinking of St. Meinrad that led

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{272} “Sermons,” 200. See Mt. 4:1-11, Mk. 1:1-12, Lk. 4:1-13.
  \item \textsuperscript{273} “Sermons,” 200. “Auf ähnliche Weise hat der Versucher zweifelsohne auch zu dem hl. Meinrad gesprochen, oder es musste dann nicht wahr sein, was der hl. Paulus sagt: non coronatur nisi legitime certaverit.”
  \item \textsuperscript{274} For the \textit{vita} see “Vita S. Meginrati,” in vol. 15, part 1 of \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica}, \textit{Scriptores}, ed. O. Holder-Egger (Hannover, 1888), 444-448.
  \item \textsuperscript{275} “Sermons,” 203: “…eine Kehrseite…die aus eine positive Grundlage gibt, auf der wir unser Leben zuversichtlich aufbauen dürfen…”
  \item \textsuperscript{276} “Sermons,” 204, quoting the Latin from RB, Prol., 44.
\end{itemize}
him to the cloister and into the dark forest.” It was the “invisible and eternal” that drove him, and as he now enjoys eternal life, his labors have also become “lasting” (dauernde) and “eternal” (ewige). Marty turns again to his students and tells them that they are Meinrad’s peers in the monastery and are invited to embrace the same love, since “only love of the eternal and celestial gives us the power to reject the earthly and to win the eternal, to offer the visible in order to achieve the invisible, to regard temporal sufferings and adversities as little with a view toward eternal joy and blessedness.”

Like Meinrad, the students should be filled with the same love and cast from their hearts “every appetite for the visible, the temporal, and the perishable.” It was this love that even prompted Meinrad to leave his confreres to become a hermit and unwittingly lay the foundations for a future monastery in the wilderness. Thus the students should not hesitate to turn to this love for an answer to the “question of calling” (Berufsfrage). They must “build” their “future upon this foundation” and thus “decide” that only the eternal “counts.”

**Significance**

This sermon, in both its content and structure, is more than a pious reflection on Einsiedeln’s martyred founder; it is a template for Marty’s monastic idealism. It demonstrates how Marty views monasticism through the lens of Meinrad’s life. The entire sermon constitutes an invitation to imitate St. Meinrad through self-denial,
Benedictine education, a Pauline desire of the “spirit” over the “flesh” or world, and devotion to the Virgin. In the sermon, all four ideas converge in one way or another on the figure of St. Meinrad. In essence, St. Meinrad is Marty’s “paradigm” for the monastic life because the monk of Reichenau sacrificed natural gifts for a supernatural life and thus established, through divine providence, a monastery that bridges the visible, temporal, and perishable world with an invisible, eternal, and lasting reality. The sermon invites the students to place themselves within the tradition of St. Meinrad, to leave behind their natural family for a supernatural family. Marty understands his monastic vocation as doing precisely this, as embracing what is lasting and permanent, realized through the monastery. As monk, educator, and preacher, Marty invites the student to follow in the footsteps of St. Meinrad and yield lasting fruit in the world around them.

Furthermore, the sermon repeats themes in Marty’s earlier essays. The first two ideas (monasticism and education) appear in the first essay; the remaining two ideas (spiritual primacy and Marian piety) guide the second essay. Like the essays, the sermon is directed toward a pragmatic goal to foster the intellectual and spiritual conversion of the student and, by extension, society. The sermon also follows the logic of the two essays. A student’s conversion begins with the monastic tradition of Einsiedeln, and his initiation takes place both in the classroom and in the Gnadenkapelle. However, it is the recognition of higher realities and eternal goals, learned through this tradition, that sustains the student on his path of conversion, and this happens through solidarity with peers (associations) and a common devotion to Mary. By presenting St. Meinrad as a concrete exemplar, Marty insists that his monastic idealism is more than speculation; it is embodied through a tradition and heroic individuals who perpetuate this tradition. This is
why his Marian Sodality, (and later, the Marian Academy) sought patronage not only in the Virgin but also in St. Meinrad. Marty is interested in tangible realities that can connect Catholics to the eternal and everlasting, to the Church itself. For Marty, Einsiedeln’s Benedictine tradition supports such realities through monastic education and ecclesial unification, embodied in the life of St. Meinrad. This is the monastic tradition that Marty brings with him to America.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has demonstrated how Marty integrates the modern exigencies of his Swiss-Catholic milieu with his Benedictine formation in Einsiedeln’s millennial tradition. Like many of his contemporaries, Marty’s thought reflects a search for a Catholic community that can spread the Christian gospel at a critical moment in history. His experience of the Benedictine tradition in Einsiedeln convinced him that evangelization is realized through a spiritual community that transcends the temporal and provides permanency in a rapidly changing world. He comes to recognize the Benedictine family as a solution, for the very reason that it is a supernatural family that bridges the transition between the temporal and the eternal. Yet even here his thought does not remain trapped in abstractions. His essays reveal a twofold solution based on his Swiss-Benedictine experience in Einsiedeln. For Marty, Benedictine evangelization begins with monastic education and ends in ecclesial unity. This twofold ideal forms the lenses of Marty’s vision for monastic evangelization. Moreover, as his 1859 sermon attests, Marty turns to
St. Meinrad as the embodiment of this vision. Upon his assignment to the American mission, Marty envisions himself as bringing Einsiedeln’s tradition of St. Meinrad into the wilderness once again, a tradition he interprets through his nineteenth-century Swiss-Benedictine experience.
CHAPTER 2: STABILITAS ET CONGREGATIO

“Officina vero ubi haec omnia diligenter operemur claustra sunt monasterii et stabilitas in congregatione.” RB 4.78

On the eve of Einsiedeln’s millennial celebration of St. Meinrad’s martyrdom, Marty arrived in the United States to save a fledgling community in the Indiana woodlands. During his first decade in Indiana (1860–1870), his leadership charted a path that engaged a new American culture through Einsiedeln’s old Swiss-Benedictine tradition. Most historical scholarship on this first decade (Betschart, Kleber, Rippinger) focuses on Marty’s biography and hesitates to reconstruct his philosophy of evangelization. The only scholarly work that approaches Marty’s life from a theological angle is that of Peter Yock.¹ In his recent dissertation on the pioneer monks of St. Meinrad, Yock identifies five facets of the community’s nineteenth-century missionary activity: parish administration, the Volksmission, parish sodalities (Vereine), worship aesthetics, and a seminary. He employs Andrew Greeley’s popular idea of a Catholic “sacramental imagination” to describe the monks’ vision, maintaining that they evangelized the region through “socialization and ritual” intent on perceiving God as “active in the world.”² Yock further notes that Marty was instrumental in articulating and realizing this Swiss-Benedictine vision, especially as it separated itself from the missionary activity of other Benedictines in America.³

---


Yock’s study marks an important step in understanding Marty, yet its cursory insight into Marty’s role needs nuance and expansion. Yock neglects Marty’s vision of the monastery as a *stable family* of educators and missionaries. A closer analysis of Marty’s early writings in America (1860–1870) reveals that he rarely refers to St. Meinrad as a “community” or “congregation” but rather insists on describing the mission house and its monks as a “family.” The present chapter develops Yock’s work by analyzing Marty’s early vision of the Benedictine “family,” a concept he imports from his experience in Einsiedeln and adapts to American culture. It argues that Marty envisions the American Benedictine monastery not merely as a locus of “sacramental imagination” but, more importantly, as a locus of what this chapter terms “familial imagination.” The chapter demonstrates how Marty’s early philosophy of evangelization advances the familial character of Benedictine monasticism as an antidote to American instability and fragmentation. This familial character provides a vision that unites the Swiss monks’ threefold Benedictine mission to America: the establishment of a monastery, the education of youth and seminarians, and the care of souls through missionary work.

Marty uses his Swiss-Benedictine experience to transform each of these elements through a contribution designed to unite American Catholics with the universal Church. Overall, the chapter shows how Marty introduces and adapts Benedictine monasticism to American culture while further challenging it through a vision that interprets the *Rule’s* vow of stability (*stabilitas*) as an agent of lasting conversion through the education and unity of the local ecclesial community (*congregatio*).

To support this thesis, the chapter traces the development of Marty’s life and thought from his arrival in America (1860) to the elevation of St. Meinrad as an abbey.
(1870) with Marty as its first abbot. Unlike the four chronological stages of the previous chapter, the present chapter outlines three thematic sections. The first section (1) provides a history of the St. Meinrad mission in the context of antebellum American Catholicism and the transatlantic Benedictine revival. The following section (2) focuses on how Marty as administrator and prior introduces the Benedictine revival to American culture. This section shows how Marty unifies the threefold mission of St. Meinrad: founding a monastery (Ordenshaus), building a school (Schule), and doing missionary work (Seelsorge). For each task, Marty introduces a Swiss-Benedictine idea and transforms it to make the monastery an agent of Catholic unity through the participation of lay Catholics in the spiritual life of the greater Church. The final section (3) recovers Marty’s neglected defense of his Swiss-American vision. It reexamines a pivotal controversy between Marty and his Bavarian counterpart, Boniface Wimmer, on adapting the Rule’s principle of stability for evangelization. This controversy refines Marty’s theology of the monastery as an evangelizing family and provides a preamble to his reform agenda as abbot of St Meinrad in the following chapter.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history of the “mission house” of St. Meinrad is a story of translation, adaptation, and transformation. The monks who preceded Marty’s leadership attempted to translate their baroque Swiss-Benedictine tradition to the bucolic woodlands of southern Indiana. The poverty and pastoral demands of the region proved that any
translation of this heritage required adaptation. Through a unifying vision, Marty assisted
his confreres in adapting to the missionary exigencies of America without sacrificing
their Benedictine heritage. This vision blended two social phenomena: (1) antebellum
American Catholicism in its intellectual, political, and cultural diversity, and (2) the
transatlantic Benedictine revival in its desire to return to the original vision of St.
Benedict. Marty’s leadership of St. Meinrad combined these two worlds through the
Swiss-Catholic tradition of Einsiedeln and applied it to a rural pocket of Indiana.
Consequently, any study of Marty’s vision necessitates an examination of these two
movements within the context of St. Meinrad’s infancy.

**Catholicism in America**

In coming to the United States, Marty joined a burgeoning flock of Catholics. By
the time of his arrival, Catholics constituted the largest single denomination in the
country. From 1850 to 1860, the Catholic population of the United States had doubled
and swelled to over three million. This drastic increase stemmed from a surge of Irish
and German immigrants after Ireland’s potato famine of 1845 and central Europe’s
political upheavals in 1848. The nascent American church struggled to accommodate the
influx of coreligionists, relying heavily on foreign-born bishops, priests, and women
religious. Consequently, this antebellum American Catholicism witnessed the rise of a
vibrant immigrant culture. However, as Patrick Carey has observed, parallel to this
development was the emergence of a distinctly American Catholic Romanticism that was

---

a more intellectual culture. Represented by Anglo-Protestant converts like Orestes Brownson (1803–1876) and Isaac Hecker (1819–1888), American Catholic Romanticism promoted Catholic communion, tradition, and authority in the name of converting the republic to the Catholic fold and saving American society from anarchy and decay.

Brownson embodied this worldview when he penned, “Infidelity, Protestantism, heathenism may institute a democracy, but only Catholicity may sustain it.” As a Swiss missionary monk with an intellectual formation in German Romantic Idealism, Marty belonged to both the immigrant and the Romantic strains of antebellum American Catholicism. As evinced below, the St. Meinrad mission embraced both German Catholic immigrants and an idealistic narrative for converting America.

Within this national milieu, St. Meinrad found itself in a young state on the fringes of the Western frontier. Unlike the older urban centers of the East Coast, where Catholics formed their own structures within an established Protestant society, Catholics created pioneer social, political, and economic institutions alongside Protestants in the rural landscape of Indiana. For example, Edward Sorin’s Notre Dame College in the northern tier of the state and St. Theodore Guerin’s Sisters of Providence near Terre Haute rose from the landscape during the state’s infancy.

Catholicism in the St. Meinrad region also fell within the shadow of historical Bardstown, Kentucky, one of the first five

---

7 Orestes Brownson, Essays and Reviews: Chiefly on Theology, Politics, and Socialism (New York: Sadlier, 1852). v-vi.
8 Carey, Catholics in America, 33.
dioceses in the country (1808), and its French missionary culture. The first priest
ordained in the United States, Stephen Badin (1768–1853), was a missionary hero of the
region and had died only a year before the Swiss monks arrived. His friend and fellow
French émigré, Benedict Joseph Flaget (1786–1850), became the first bishop of
Bardstown (later moved to Louisville). Flaget in turn attracted another French Sulpician,
Simon Bruté (1779–1839), to America, who later became the first bishop of Vincennes.10
When Bruté returned to France in 1835, he recruited a young deacon at the Sulpician
seminary for his diocese. His name was Jacques-Maurice de St. Palais (1811-1877), a
man who returned with Bruté to America and in 1848 succeeded him as the fourth bishop
of Vincennes.11 By the time De St. Palais welcomed the monks from Einsiedeln, the
region enjoyed economic prosperity along the Ohio River Valley, a natural highway
connecting trade and settlers with the Mississippi River.

Because of its proximity to the Ohio River Valley, St. Meinrad took root near the
Mason-Dixie line and thus stood at the political and social crossroads of a fragile republic
on the eve of war.12 The nearest cities were Cincinnati and Louisville on opposite sides of
the river, each reflecting a different face of American Catholic reaction to the question of
the day: slavery. In Cincinnati was the outspoken, even trenchant abolitionist bishop John

10 On frontier Catholicism along the Ohio River, see James Hennesy, American Catholics: A History of
See also Anne M. Butler, Michael E. Engh, Thomas W. Spalding, ed., The Frontiers and Catholic
Identities (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999); J. Herman Schauinger, Stephen T. Badin: Priest in the Wilderness
(Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956); Martin J. Spalding, Sketches of the Life, Times, and Character of Rt. Rev.
Benedict Joseph Flaget, First Bishop of Louisville (Louisville, Ky.: Webb and Levering, 1852); J. Herman
Schauinger, Cathedrals in the Wilderness (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1952); Mary Salesia Godecker, Simon Bruté
de Rémur, First Bishop of Vincennes (St. Meinrad, 1931); Theodore Maynard, The Reed and the Rock:
Portrait of Simon Bruté (New York: Longmans, 1942). On Badin and Bruté, see Blanc
hard, History of the
Catholic Church in Indiana, 1:142-48, 482-535.
11 Francis A. Kennedy, The Archdiocese of Indianapolis: 1834–2009 (Strasbourg: Éditions du Signe,
12 See Emma Lou Thornbrough, Indiana in the Civil War Era, 1850–1880, vol. 3 of The History of
Baptist Purcell (1800–1883). Purcell used his diocesan newspaper, the Catholic Telegraph, as a mouthpiece for his minority opinion among Catholics: “He who tries to perpetuate slavery disrespects the doctrine and example of Christ.” It was the first Catholic newspaper in America to call for full emancipation, earning it and Purcell the praise of Dupanloup and Montalembert and the scorn of southern bishops and northern “Copperhead” Catholics like James McMaster (1820–1886). Purcell also incurred the derision of his episcopal cohort on the opposite bank in Louisville, Martin John Spalding (1810–1872). Although Kentucky remained in the Union, Spalding was a proud slaveowner, thought emancipation would only destroy American society, and believed Purcell was a warmonger. At one point Spalding sent a report to Rome on the matter, in which he placed Purcell in the same camp as Garibaldi and “nearly every other wicked charlatan of our times.” The report was published in L’Osservatore Romano and attributed to “A Kentucky Catholic.” Even though St. Meinrad was in Spencer County, the birthplace of Lincoln, the monks gravitated toward Spalding’s opinion of the war as unnecessary bloodshed and an “intrusion” to peace and stability. However, most monks viewed slavery as an abomination, yet they did not trust the abolitionist agenda and a Republican government responsible for drafts, inflation, and heavy taxes.

One of the reasons that Marty and his confreres distanced themselves from the war and emancipation is that most antebellum Catholics, and especially German
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13 John Purcell, Catholic Telegraph, October 11, 1838, quoted in Faith and Action: A History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, 1821-1996 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2002), 143. Coediting the Catholic Telegraph were Purcell’s auxiliary bishop, Sylvester Rosecrans (brother of the Union General William Rosecrans) and Purcell’s brother, Edward Purcell.
17 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 169-70.
immigrant Catholics, associated abolitionism with “nativism,” an anti-immigrant movement. Louisville had hosted the infamous “Bloody Monday” riots of 1855, during which the Know-Nothings, a group of anti-immigrant populists, attempted to prevent German immigrants from voting. At same time, St. Meinrad stood within the so-called German “triangle” of Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Milwaukee and its heavy concentration of German immigrants. Three waves of German immigrants converged on this area. The first came between 1815 and 1845, made up of middle-class conservatives looking for economic opportunity. The second wave crested in 1854. This group, like the first, came from the western and southern regions of German-speaking Europe, yet many came for more political reasons and were polarized between the liberal “48ers” and the more agrarian and religious “Grays.” St. Meinrad’s pioneer monks belonged to this latter pole. The third and largest group came after the Civil War, seeking inflated promises of fertile land and fleeing Bismarck’s Kulturkampf. The rallying cry of these German Catholics was “language saves faith.” This idea united German Catholic immigrants, who applied it to education and worship. The idea also forged the “Central-Verein” in 1855 as a unified national voice for German-American social causes.
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19 Carey, Catholics in America, 30.
21 Joseph M. White, Worthy of the Gospel of Christ: A History of the Catholic Diocese of Fort Wayne (Fort Wayne, Ind.: Diocese of Ft. Wayne-South Bend, 2007), 50. White claims that John Martin Henni (see below) coined the phrase when he was pastor of Cincinnati’s German Catholic parish. White cites Colman Barry, The Catholic Church and German Americans (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1953), 10. Barry notes that the missionary Francis Weninger attributed the saying to Henni.
22 Barry, The Catholic Church and German Americans, 10.
Along with a search for unity in a foreign land, German Catholics also imported European Catholic revivalism in the form of the *Volksmission*. The parish mission attempted to evoke what Jay Dolan terms “evangelical piety” through passionate preaching that could “seal” conversions through recourse to confession and communion.\(^{24}\) The famous Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier Weninger (1805–1888), who supposedly preached a mission in every existing state of the Union, preached his first American *Volksmission* in Indiana in 1848.\(^{25}\) Hecker’s Paulists further expanded the parish mission to target Protestant conversions in hopes of converting America. In many ways Catholic revivalism presented a meeting point between German immigrants and Anglo-American Romantics. It harnessed the mutual goal to evangelize America, and it was a goal that dovetailed with Marty’s experience of a concurrent monastic revival.

### The Benedictine Revival

*Succisa virescit:* “Cut down, it will live again.” This motto on the crest of Monte Cassino epitomizes the unexpected revival of Benedictine monasticism in the nineteenth century. In the wake of France’s “Terror” and Napoleon’s *Reichsdisputationshauptschluss* of 1803, even St. Benedict’s hallowed Monte Cassino succumbed to French vandalism and suppression. As the dust of Waterloo settled, the days of Cluny seemed to be a lost memory; less than thirty Benedictine houses survived on the continent, once home to more than 1,500 communities.\(^{26}\) Einsiedeln was among these few, and its

---


Gnadenkapelle, razed by the French and rebuilt, symbolized a Benedictine resurrection. By the end of the century, history’s verdict on Western monasticism shifted course and the Benedictine Order could boast of more than 500 monasteries in Europe and the Americas.\(^27\) Marty played a key role in this revival. The century’s restoration was both papal and congregational, and while Marty embraced Rome with enthusiasm, he questioned his contemporaries’ penchant for congregational monasticism.

At the heart of the monastic revival in post-revolutionary Europe was the papacy. Nineteenth-century Benedictines affectionally referred to the pope as the “abbot of abbots.”\(^28\) Just when the papacy seemed to wither as Pius VI (1717–1799) died in the grip of French troops, a Benedictine monk became his successor. Barnaba Niccolò Maria Luigi Chiaramonti (1742–1823) proved to be a formidable foe for Napoleon, even in exile at Fontainebleau. When Pope Pius VII returned to Rome as a hero in 1814, he quickly did two things: he lifted the 1773 suppression of the Jesuits and restored the Benedictine monasteries of the Papal States, including those of St. Paul outside the Walls and Subiaco. These two monasteries bore reform-minded monks intent on restoring the glories of the Benedictine Order on the continent. Together they sprouted three branches of Europe’s Benedictine revival. From St. Paul’s emerged the French Congregation of Solesmes (albeit symbolically) and the Beuronese Congregation of Hohenzollern Prussia. From Subiaco rose Pietro Francesco Casaretto (1810-1878) and his reform of the Cassinese Congregation in Italy. Pius VII also stipulated the restoration of monasteries in his concordats with Catholic states.\(^29\) This move produced fruit in Ludwig I’s Bavaria.


\(^{29}\) Ibid., 328.
after 1830, especially in the story of its American extension. All four restoration
movements grew alongside Marty’s work in America, and he was well acquainted with
their competing models of Benedictine life and mission. However, the French,
Beuronese, and Bavarian models influenced his thought the most.

Prosper Guéranger (1805–1875) led the charge of the revival with his pen and
personality, both of which influenced Marty’s ideas on the papacy, scholarship, and
monastic liturgy. Guéranger was a diocesan priest enamored with the legacy of the
French Maurists. He was steeped in French ultramontanism and befriended de Maistre,
Lammenais, Lacordaire, Chateaubriand, and Montalembert. The latter helped him
acquire the abandoned ruins of Solesmes Priory with the vision of restoring the
Benedictine tradition in France and uniting the Catholic faithful through the Roman
liturgy. In 1833 he formed a small religious community on the priory grounds and
looked to Rome for approval and protection. In 1837 Gregory XVI approved the
restoration of the Benedictine Order in France and created the French Congregation with
Guéranger as its abbot. Without any novitiate, Guéranger made his solemn profession
that same year in the sacristy of St. Paul’s outside the Walls in Rome (the basilica having
been destroyed in a fire a year prior). The event symbolized his twofold vision to
rebuild a ruined church and place his work at the service of the papacy, writing the pope,
“for us the Alps do not exist. We are Romans, and we are ready to fight for the Roman
doctrine in all matters.”
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30 Ibid., 332.
33 Prosper Guéranger to Gregory XVI, 18 Jan. 1832, translated in *In a Great and Noble Tradition: The Autobiography of Dom Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875), Founder of the Solesmes Congregation of*
Returning to France as abbot, he immediately attempted to support Solesmes through scholarship in history and literature, resurrecting the Maurist tradition.\(^{34}\) His obsession with the medieval Church was in fact a search for continuity with the apostolic age, prompting the publication of his *Institutions liturgiques* in 1840.\(^{35}\) The work upheld the Roman liturgy as the most certain exemplar of the apostolic liturgy and became the manifesto of his movement to “restore” the Roman rite in France by instilling unity through liturgical uniformity.\(^{36}\) Moreover, as one scholar is keen to note, Solesmes’s promotion of Gregorian chant was more than a ploy of traditionalism. Aside from its symbolic unification with Rome, Guéranger saw the use of a common plainchant as an opportunity to encourage the faithful to participate in worship, fostering a communal spirit that would return to the practice of ancient Christians and reawaken interest in the liturgy.\(^{37}\) Marty admired Guéranger’s vision, visited Solesmes in 1869 on his way to the Vatican Council, and even corresponded with him later as an abbot.\(^{38}\) As prior and abbot, Marty adopted the vision of Guéranger’s *Institutions* and its emphasis on ecclesial unity through liturgy.

Guéranger’s liturgical vision extended well beyond Solesmes and inspired the unparalleled success of the Beuronese Congregation. This second, German branch of the Benedictine revival was arguably the greatest and most extensive. It began, like
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\(^{34}\) Rees, “Benedictine Revival,” 333-34.

\(^{35}\) Peter Raedts, “Prosper Guéranger O.S.B. (1805–1875) and the Struggle for Liturgical Unity,” in *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Studies in Church History 35; Woodbridge, England: Boydell, 1999), 337-38.


Guéranger, with diocesan priests enchanted with the Benedictine tradition. Maurus (Rudolf) Wolter (1825–1890) and his brother Placid (Ernst) (1828–1908) grew up in Bonn. There they were steeped in the thought of Günther and his idealization of Benedictine monasticism. By 1853 Simplicio Pappalettere (1815–1883), the new abbot of St. Paul’s Outside the Walls, began implementing a Güntherian-Benedictine vision. He attracted the Wolter brothers to Rome where they made their profession by 1857. In Rome the brothers made contacts with G.B. De Rossi (1822–1894), discoverer of the Roman catacombs and friend of Guéranger, and the widowed Princess Catherine von Hohenzollern (1817–1893). When the brothers sought to leave St. Paul’s after Papalettere was transferred to Monte Cassino and replaced by an unfavorable abbot, the princess secured for them the defunct Augustinian priory of Beuron in her family’s territory near the Danube in 1863. Her access to the pope ensured the swift elevation of the priory to an abbey five years later with Maurus as its first abbot.

The Wolter brothers looked to Solesmes for inspiration and direction and shared Guéranger’s love for liturgy and fascination with the ancient Church. Placid spent several years at Solesmes, and Guéranger aided Maurus in drafting the constitutions for the Beuronese Congregation. However, Daniel Rees identifies three ways that Beuron differed from Solesmes: (1) Beuron enjoyed less hostility than Solesmes in France; (2) unlike Solesmes, Beuron embraced pastoral work in the form of preaching, retreats, and publishing devotional works; and (3) Beuron excelled at expansion and centralization.
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creating a network of abbeys outside of Germany in the face of Bismarck’s Kulturkampf. No other community exerted the same degree of influence on the century’s revival as did Beuron, and it later asserted a prominent role in the papal establishment of a centralized Benedictine Confederation in 1893. However, the spirit of Beuron remained intimately linked to that of Solesmes, and it too eschewed any direct sponsorship of parishes or schools in favor of a more contemplative and liturgical form of monasticism.

Marty looked to Beuron for inspiration later in his leadership of St. Meinrad. He admired its reform spirit and even replaced St. Meinrad’s Swiss-Benedictine habit with the Beuronese. Nevertheless, Marty was never completely satisfied with its model and believed that the Beuronese lacked the ultramontane zeal of Guéranger. Moreover, he thought Beuron overemphasized the contemplative spirit at the expense of an active apostolate in parochial work and education. For this more active strain of the revival Marty looked to its Bavarian branch and its American maverick, Boniface Wimmer.

Boniface Wimmer

Well before the Wolter brothers arrived in Rome, Bavarian monks had made their way to America through the labors of a zealous monk nicknamed the “Project Maker.” Like Guéranger and the Wolter brothers, Boniface (Sebastian) Wimmer was educated not
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44 Klieber, History of St. Meinrad, 239.
as a monk, but rather as a diocesan priest.\textsuperscript{45} Likewise, his inspiration to join the Benedictines was more intellectual than experiential, coming through his study of history in Munich under Ignaz von Döllinger (1799–1890).\textsuperscript{46} In 1832 he decided to become a Benedictine monk at the nearby Abbey of St. Michael’s in Metten, which Ludwig I had restored only two years prior. As American pleas for German-speaking priests made their way to Bavaria, Wimmer saw an opportunity for Metten to find its place in the annals of church history. In the face of resistance to his idea, Wimmer crafted an argument and anonymously published it in a Bavarian Catholic newspaper in 1845. The article became a sort of manifesto for American Benedictine monasticism, and although Marty never referred to it explicitly, he shared its vision and language.

Wimmer’s article warrants a close reading as it contains two ideas Marty had in common with Wimmer: the potential of Benedictine stability for effective missionary work, and the need for the monastery to educate future priests for the missionary field. In the article, and with an idyllic eye, Wimmer maintains that the Benedictines, unlike Jesuits or Redemptorists, possess the singular ability to be both missionaries and long-term cultivators. In his words, Benedictines are “men of stability; they are not wandering monks.”\textsuperscript{47} For proof, he points to the Benedictine conversion of Europe, a conversion that was “not transient but lasting and permanent.” Alluding to the legacy of his namesake, St. Boniface (d. 754), Wimmer romantically appeals to an age of missionary monks “when the Benedictine Order attained its fullest development and effectiveness by its wonderful

\textsuperscript{45} Rees, “Benedictine Revival,” 329, 332, 335.
adaptability and stability.” This historical premise serves the pragmatic goal of the article: the critical need for Benedictine priests in America. At the center of his argument is the claim that diocesan priests are inept missionaries since they lack a “religious community.” Only the permanent foundation of an abbey can inspire vocations to the priesthood. The monastery’s liturgies would reveal the “dignity” of the priesthood; the material and spiritual “advantages of community life” would shine forth; and a school and seminary would nurture future monk-priests who “might preach the word of God…to those who live at a great distance from the monastery.” In other words, the conditions of pioneer America demand monk-priests rather than secular priests. Moored to a community and its benefits, monks can endure the hardships of rural life, communicate the splendors of the faith to impoverished settlers, and, most importantly, administer the sacraments to the far-flung German Catholic diaspora.

However one might judge the idealism of Wimmer’s essay, one cannot fault his life with starry-eyed torpidity. The persistent monk finally received permission to journey to America with nineteen companions in 1846. With the help of Peter Lemke (1796–1882), a German missionary priest, Wimmer settled in the new Diocese of Pittsburgh in western Pennsylvania. The bishop, Michael O’Connor (1810–1872), quickly entrusted the parish of Mount St. Vincent to Wimmer’s monks. Adding a priory and school to the parish, Wimmer founded American’s first Benedictine monastery in October of 1846. From its inception the monastery had only formal ties with Metten, and by 1852 Rome
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48 Ibid., 494. Wimmer’s profession name, “Boniface,” was actually given to him; he did not select it. See Oetgen, An American Abbot, 23.
49 Wimmer, “Concerning the Missions,” 496.
50 Coincidentally, O’Connor’s younger brother, James O’Connor (1823-1891) also played a pivotal role with the Swiss-American Benedictines. He became vicar apostolic of Nebraska and later the first bishop of Omaha. In his missionary work in the Dakotas, Marty worked extensively with James O’Connor (since the Dakotas were in his vicariate), and the latter was instrumental in Marty’s appointment as vicar apostolic of Dakota Territory.
made St. Vincent’s completely independent of Metten and placed it and its three
dependent priory-parishes under O’Connor’s supervision. Thus Wimmer’s branch of
the revival in America assumed a distinctly parochial character with only cultural ties to
Bavaria.

With an American motherhouse established, Wimmer immediately looked to the
proliferation of Benedictine monasteries in America. This vision required abbatial status,
and Wimmer was further intent on liberating St. Vincent’s new seminary from the grip of
O’Connor. In 1855 Wimmer convinced Rome to elevate St. Vincent to an abbey, making
him America’s first Benedictine abbot. In the same stroke Rome created a new
“American-Cassinese” Congregation (since the Cassinese Congregation was still intact
while the Bavarian Congregation remained suppressed). Although linked to the Italians,
the new congregation was to follow the old Bavarian Congregation’s constitutions. St.
Vincent had now swelled to 188 monks, allowing the new abbot to realize his vision of
westward expansion with the motto “Forward, always forward.” No sooner had he
received his crosier than he sent monks to Minnesota, a land he described as the “extreme
boundary of European civilization.” There in 1856 a new priory was founded that
would become St. John’s Abbey, at one point the largest Benedictine monastery in the
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51 Jerome Oetgen, "The American-Cassinese Congregation: Origins and Early Development (1855-
52 One could argue that Wimmer was not in fact the first “abbot” in the present United States. In 1814,
Abbot Augustin de Lestrange (1754-1827), an exile of La Trappe, fled under Napoleon to New York and
purchased the land of the present-day St. Patrick’s Cathedral. He returned to France the following year.
Rees, “Benedictine Revival,” 325-6. See also Lawrence F. Flick, “The French Refugee Trappists in the
(Philadelphia: D.J. Gallagher, 1886).
53 Oetgen, "The American-Cassinese Congregation, Part I,” 243. The Bavarian Congregation was re-
established three years later in 1858.
54 Wimmer to Utto Lang, 8 November 1858, quoted in Oetgen, An American Abbot, 185.
55 Wimmer to Ludwig-Missionsverein, 1856, quoted in Rippinger, The Benedictine Order in the
United States, 35. Minnesota was chosen as the first extension outside of Pennsylvania since the local
bishop was the first to agree to the terms set by Wimmer. Oetgen, "The American-Cassinese Congregation,
Part I.” 245.
world. A year later Wimmer sent monks to Kansas to establish another community, later known as St. Benedict’s Abbey. The ceaseless demand for priests eventually forced Wimmer to look beyond German Catholics, leading to the establishment of monastic communities for Czech and Irish immigrants and freed slaves in the South.56 For the next three decades, Wimmer expanded the American-Cassinese Congregation by forming a centralized network of monasteries stretching from Newark to Minnesota with St. Vincent as their motherhouse. Like Guéranger and Beuron, Wimmer’s congregational model of monasticism looked to the seventeenth-century model of the French Maurists, in which monks would be able to remain mobile through a network of abbeys and thus “adapt” to the vicissitudes of a new missionary age.57 By the time of his death in 1887, Rome had graced Wimmer with the title “archabbot” in recognition of a legacy that continued to amaze his coreligionists in America and Europe.58

Behind Wimmer’s impressive congregation was a pragmatic and apostolic vision, one that departed from the French and Beuronese models. Wimmer’s principal objective was to train monk-priests as educators and missionaries to serve beyond the confines of the monastery. For this reason, Wimmer embraced a pragmatic style of monastic studies, once commenting that “two or three practical preachers can do more than twenty professors with their pedantic knowledge.”59 Likewise, the hallmark of Wimmer’s vision

---

56 Oegten, *An American Abbot*, 325, 332, 346-7, 350. This included St. Procopius near Chicago (Bohemian) and St. Malachy in Iowa (Irish), and the Isle of Hope near Savannah (African-American).


59 Wimmer to Lang, 8 November 1858, quoted in Oetgen, *An American Abbot*, 178.
was what Yock terms the “priory-parish” model, with most monks residing at parishes in small groups rather than returning to the motherhouse for compline.\footnote{Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 107.} This apostolic model eventually caused rifts within Wimmer’s own community. Upon returning from the missions shortly after Wimmer’s death, his protégé, Oswald Moosmüller (1832–1901), discovered that almost three quarters of St. Vincent’s monks were spread beyond the walls of the cloister in parishes and mission work, and a meager ten monks regularly attended the chanting of the hours. In a journal article he retorted, “No religious order…was founded for the purpose of parish administration….\[I\]f they make this their principal object, they are failing in the fulfillment of their vocation.”\footnote{Moosmüller, \textit{Die Legende} 1 (1893): 385, quoted in Jerome Oetgen, “Oswald Mssmüller: Monk and Missionary,” \textit{American Benedictine Review} 27, no. 1 (March 1976): 28. In 1892 Moosmüller gained permission to found a priory named New Cluny in southern Illinois. The community did not survive his death in 1901, in part because the local clergy dismissed the priory as a community of “useless” monks.} The nature of the monastic vocation in relation to evangelization became a question that consumed Wimmer’s American Benedictine empire, and the answer to this question became something of a wedge between the Bavarian and Swiss branches of the revival in America.

Marty had a profound respect for Wimmer, who influenced him from early on. Marty had first met the pioneer monk as a student in Einsiedeln, when Wimmer passed through in 1855 on this way to Rome.\footnote{Yock claims that Marty met Wimmer while in Einsiedeln (“The Role of St. Meinrad,” 104). This claim is confirmed in one of Marty’s letters, in which he recalls how Claudius Perrot introduced Wimmer to Einsiedeln’s novices (including Marty). Marty to Ildefons Hürlimann, 16 December 1887 (M125), 8:1041, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.} Marty likely read Wimmer’s reports from America in the missionary annals, and he and many of his Swiss confreres passed through St. Vincent on their way to Indiana. Marty admired Wimmer as a “genuine American” for his self-reliance, although he also feared that Wimmer exhibited an
American vice in his mounting debt. Differences between the two Benedictine leaders emerged over time, stemming from two important historical factors. Unlike St. Vincent, St. Meinrad did not begin by taking over a parish and tried to avoid the “priory-parish” model. Likewise, St. Vincent developed independently of a European motherhouse, whereas St. Meinrad was a direct offshoot of Einsiedeln and depended on the Swiss abbey for its governance and welfare. As outlined below, these key differences manifested themselves in the leaders’ divergent visions for Benedictine monasticism in America.

St. Meinrad

The rapid success of Wimmer’s monks in Pennsylvania inspired many American prelates to look to the handful of remaining Benedictine houses in Europe for missionary priests, including Einsiedeln. On a July evening in 1848, Einsiedeln hosted a Swiss-born bishop who had emigrated to America and now led a pioneer diocese in its hinterland. After solemn vespers, Marty was among the students entertaining the guest, singing Marian hymns from a collection recently published by a monk of Einsiedeln. The bishop was apparently so impressed that he asked a student for his copy so that he could examine it. The student was Marty; the prelate was Bishop John Martin Henni (1805–1881) of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Four decades later, as a bishop of Dakota Territory, Marty would recall this chance encounter in his own German biography of Henni, written
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63 Marty to Henry Schmid, 16-23 Oc. 1860, 13:1434, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
64 Anselm Schubiger, *Marienrosen, eine Sammlung mehrstimmiger Lieder ohne Begleitung zur Verehrung der seligsten Jungfrau in Kirche und Hausa* (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1845). The work was quite popular in Switzerland and went through numerous editions. Besides an historical introduction praising the Benedictines for preserving many Marian antiphons and hymns, the book also includes new hymns in German by Guido Görres (son of the famous ultramontanist Joseph Görres) and the rector of Einsiedeln’s school, Gall Morel.
in Milwaukee at the very desk of his deceased compatriot and episcopal confrere. In the biography, Marty even admits that “at that time, he [the student] had not yet thought of emigration to America.”65 Even if Henni’s visit in 1848 did not immediately inspire Marty to seek missionary work in America, he later saw the mark of divine providence guiding a series of labors and events that would ultimately lead to his vocation as a monk-missionary. Despite several formal invitations, Henni was never successful in convincing the abbot of Einsiedeln to send monks to Wisconsin, yet his visit seems to have marked the beginning of the community’s consideration of an American mission.66

Henni was not alone in petitioning Einsiedeln. The Swiss abbey’s initial reluctance eventually gave way to the persuasive personality of Joseph Kundek (1810–1857). Kundek was born in the Austrian Empire and had come to Indiana through the Leopoldinen-Stiftung in 1838. Ever since his arrival, Kundek had been looking for other German-speaking priests to help him in the Diocese of Vincennes. He set his sights on a religious order, yet his requests to the Redemptorists and other orders were unsuccessful. Gradually he became convinced that he could find “good and everlasting priests” among the Benedictines.67 In 1851, Bishop de Saint Palais appointed Kundek vicar general of the diocese and sent him to Switzerland. It took him a year before he made his way to Einsiedeln, and compared to Henni, Kundek’s timing proved to be perfect. He arrived just after the closing of the Bellizona school in 1852, heightening fears of suppression and freeing a handful of monks for new work. Abbot Schmid wrote Kundek a month after

66 Two letters are preserved in Einsiedeln, one before his departure for Switzerland and one after he had visited Einsiedeln: Henni to Gall Morel, 28 April 1847, and 18 Oct. 1848, both in Folder 01, Series RGI, Collection A-Einsiedeln, KAE.
his departure that Einsiedeln would accept the offer. With the chapter’s approval, the
abbot selected Fathers Bede O’Connor and Ulrich Christen, who departed the day after
Marty’s student panegyric on December 20, 1852. After visiting Wimmer on their way to
Indiana, they arrived in Vincennes on February 17, 1853. De St. Palais received them
with a warm welcome, and the two monks began to survey the vast diocese for a suitable
location for a mission.68

In their attempt to establish a mission in the American hinterland, the monks’
initial optimism gave way to a harsh reality. Yock summarizes the mission’s problems as
a “lack of vision, unsuitable leadership, a large debt, and being overextended.”69 An
unfavorable climate and delay in communication with Einsiedeln compounded these
problems, yet the foundation’s debt and dysfunction ultimately stemmed from the
impudence of its leaders, beginning with Christen. Without the consultation of
Einsiedeln’s abbot or O’Connor, he purchased a tract of land only a few months after his
arrival. Located in the southern portion of the diocese, the cost was more than $12,000,
only a thousand of which he did not procure through credit. Christen took offense to
Abbot Schmid’s gentle chastisement for this rash purchase, and in turn the abbot sent two
more missionaries to survey the state of the mission and implement statues for communal
life. He sent two teachers from the school, Eugene Schwerzmann (d. 1854) and Jerome
Bachmann (1810–1895), both arriving in October 1853.70 The following February the
abbot appointed Bachmann as prior, and the four monks moved into a new house on the
property. On March 21, 1854, the Feast of St. Benedict, the mission celebrated its

68 Ibid., 41-42.
70 They came with four lay companions to aid them. Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 56. On Bachmann, see Henggeler, Professbuch, 518. The birthdate for Schwerzmann is unknown because he does not appear in Einsiedeln’s Professbuch (since he was actually a monk of Engelberg Abbey).
founding date with a procession of over a thousand Catholics from the region and with the bishop and Kundek in attendance.\footnote{Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 58–60.} In accordance with the abbot’s instructions, the monks named the mission after St. Meinrad.

The festivities of the mission’s founding soon gave way to internal and external conflict. Bachmann insisted that the monks had come to “plow” while the bishop demanded that they “preach.”\footnote{Yock,”The Role of St. Meinrad,” 91-93.} A concordat between the monks and the bishop presented obstacles, in part because Abbot Schmid sought exemptions and parochial privileges that were unrealistic in a frontier diocese. In the end the monks adapted to what O’Connor welcomed as America’s bishop-centered “system,” free of state interference.\footnote{O’Connor to Schmid, 20 September 1854, quoted in Yock,”The Role of St. Meinrad,” 93.} The monks served parish missions spread throughout the surrounding area, with O’Connor in Cannelton, Christen in Ferdinand, and Schwerzmann tending to the small boarding school and mill. Protests began to make their way to Einsiedeln about Bachmann’s reluctance to help with these pastoral duties. The abbot recalled him to Einsiedeln for a detailed report of the mission in 1854 (which he delivered at same chapter that admitted Marty to the novitiate). Bachmann returned to St. Meinrad with a new superior, Athanasius Tschopp (1803–1882), a former dean of Einsiedeln, and another confrere, Chrysostom Foffa (1830–1899).\footnote{Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 92-95. On the “sieben Schwaben” who volunteered to come to St. Meinrad after reading about the mission in German newspapers, see Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 86-87. See also Henggeler, \textit{Professbuch}, 507-07 (for Tschopp) and 546 (for Foffa).}

Tschopp’s arrival signaled a new era of leadership and temporary stability. However, crop failure and disease precipitated crisis after crisis and led to a series of temporary superiors. Before the arrival of Tschopp, Schwarzmann died of malaria in
August of 1854, which forced the closure of the school.\textsuperscript{75} Less than a year later, Tschopp contracted typhoid fever. Despite his illness, he was convinced that St. Meinrad should neither separate from Einsiedeln nor liquidate its property, but his own illness and inability to adapt to the humid climate forced him to return to Switzerland in 1856. Foffa then became superior and succeeded in building a simple framed church for the monastery, but he quickly found himself inept for the position and asked to be relieved. The abbot then appointed Christen in October of 1858, a move that proved to be imprudent. As superior he instituted the praying of the divine office in common, yet at the same time he spent the community’s limited funds on a coat of arms, bells, and a brewery.\textsuperscript{76} Then, on March 21, 1859, Christen organized the formal profession of vows of several novices. This profession infuriated Einsiedeln, as the vows were de facto invalid because they were done without the permission of the abbot.\textsuperscript{77}

In the meantime, Isidor Hobi (1830–1909) arrived from Einsiedeln in 1857. Hobi had been ordained with Marty the previous year.\textsuperscript{78} Recognizing the perilous state of the mission, Hobi privately recommended to the abbot that St. Meinrad separate from Einsiedeln and further offered to assume legal responsibility for the mission’s debt. Abbot Schmid was pleased with this idea, but it met opposition from O’Connor, Foffa, and most importantly, the bishop. In 1860 De St. Palais proceeded to organize a conference with the monks and drafted a memorandum specifying that St. Meinrad should not separate and that the debt was manageable. The abbot found the whole process and its opinion unacceptable. In May Hobi explained the affair to the abbot and

\textsuperscript{75} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 89.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 120, 124-5, 134.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 125.
\textsuperscript{78} On Hobi, see Henggeler, \textit{Professbuch}, 552.
recommended that the abbot appoint a superior with Einsiedeln’s full authority. Hobi even went so far as to recommend a “confrere who in every regard possess the qualities and who from every standpoint is that which the position calls for….And that confrere is Father Martin.”79 In August the abbot informed Christen that Martin Marty and Fintan Mundwiler would visit St. Meinrad soon and relay his instructions for the mission’s future. In a similar manner, Abbot Schmid wrote to the bishop that he was sending Marty, who “by reason of his deep religious sentiments, his broadness of vision, his talents and firmness of character merit full confidence.”80 Marty was to be the abbot’s representative and the administrator of the mission behind the scenes, while Hobi would remain the prior in name.81 Schmid intended that this arrangement be short-lived. Marty was to return to Einsiedeln and become novice master while Mundwiler would stay.82 History would prove otherwise.

II. MARTY AS ADMINISTRATOR AND PRIOR

In 1864, after four years in the United States, Marty turned to Goethe for his description of American culture in a letter to Morel, his former colleague and mentor:

“Life and motion is here, but not order or discipline.”83 The line captured a nation not

79 Hobi to Abbot, 30 May 1860, quoted in Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 93. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 123-28.
80 Schmid to de St. Palais, 24 August 1860, 3:321-22, Box 1, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. I have used Kleber’s translation (“Bishop Martin Marty,” 96).
81 Kleber History of St. Meinrad, 150-51.
82 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 130.
83 Marty to Gall Morel, 26 October 1864 (M25), 8:951, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA; “Leben und Weben ist hier, aber nicht Ordnung noch Zucht.” The line is from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Venetianische Epigramme, no. 4 (Leipzig, 1790).
only enamored with incessant economic progress but also torn apart by war. Marty’s concern lay with the effect this worldview had on the spiritual life, especially among his fellow Catholics: “*Quo cito fit, cito perit* [what is soon made, is soon destroyed] is the motto of the American, just as much in the ecclesial as in the secular realm.”  

Absent from the American mosaic was stability and permanence, and thus Marty admitted that it was a “consolation” to him that the “*cito* is not found” at the St. Meinrad mission. At the same time, Marty believed that the difficulty lay in the “right relationship” between American life and motion on the one hand and order and discipline on the other.  

He thought that European Benedictines could learn something from American assiduousness. In an earlier letter to his abbot, Marty had confessed, “I realize ever better that we Benedictines should and can help ourselves not by begging but rather through work and the blessings of God obtained through prayer.”  

In the New World Benedictines could no longer rely on the patronage of kings and the revenue of pre-revolutionary estates. For Marty, this American reality was an opportunity to return to Benedict’s founding spirit, in which the *opus Dei* of prayer served the work of the field. Nevertheless, the “field” to be sown was one of souls, more important than the uncultivated Indiana woodlands. With some financial order restored at St. Meinrad, Marty concluded his 1864 letter to Morel with a line many of his biographers quote: “We can now live our vocation, and we are on the right path for us and others to become what we should be - religious and, at that,
Benedictine educators and missionaries.” The line reflects what Yock terms the “two-sided coin” of St. Meinrad’s vision, a vision stated in Einsiedeln’s petition to Rome for the establishment of the mission in America. For Marty, education and missionary work were not additions to the monastic vocation; rather, they were constitutive of it and flowed from a monastic family life organized through the Rule. As educators and missionaries, Einsiedeln’s American monks manifested what he had called as a student their “original historical destiny.”

The 1861 Résumé

Although the program of education and missionary work came from Einsiedeln, it assumed a new life and form in America. This development can be seen in his missionary reports for the annals of European missionary societies and his first report of 1861 in particular. In his first letters to Abbot Schmid, Marty noted his preparation of a general report for the societies of Lyon, Munich, and Vienna, intended to secure further funds for the impecunious community. Dated January 1, 1861, Marty’s “Résumé” appeared in the French, German, and English annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Lyon and the Annalen of the Ludwig-Missionsverein in Munich. Previous scholars have
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89 Marty to Henry Schmid, 30 Oct. 1860, Pioneer Letters 3:1022, Box 3, Archival Historical Series, SMAA; German in 8:911, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Marty mentions three societies but does not name them. Besides the Lyon and Bavarian societies, he probably sent a report to the Austrian Leopoldinen-Stiftung; however, his report appears neither in the Stiftung’s archives (as copied for the Notre Dame University Archives) nor its Bericht.

90 From the Lyon society: Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, issue 135 (London, 1 Nov. 1861): 351-57; Annales de la propagation de la foi 33 (Lyon, 1861): 449-58; Annalen der Verbreitung des
misidentified this report,\textsuperscript{91} and no one has observed how Marty produced two versions: a French-English version (used only by Lyon) and a German version (used by Munich).\textsuperscript{92} The versions are almost identical, yet a diligent comparison uncovers different emphases that Marty discloses only to certain audiences. Taken together, these different emphases reveal how Marty transfers his ideas and experiences from Einsiedeln to America and further illumine his original vision for evangelizing the surrounding rural population through prayer, education, and missionary work.

\textit{The Text}

The first page of the 1861 report declares the significance of Marty’s timing. Addressing his confreres in Einsiedeln, Marty laments how the monks in Indiana cannot be present to celebrate the millennial jubilee of St. Meinrad’s death on January 21. He attempts to outline historical continuity and spiritual solidarity with the mission’s Swiss-Benedictine roots in Einsiedeln, its “cradle.”\textsuperscript{93} The “family feast” of this jubilee thus comes at an opportune time, reminding the missionaries how they have come to “sow the seeds of the Gospel” and communicate the “powerful sap” of Einsiedeln, the “great tree” in Europe. In the German version, Marty blends this fructiferous language with the sanguinary imagery of martyrdom: the “blood of St. Meinrad” that was so fruitful in the

\textit{Footnotes}

\textsuperscript{91} Betschart and Kleber present it as a routine letter; Rippinger cites it as a “Résumé” but gives no details (probably borrowing the title of the copy in SMAA). See Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 44; Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 110; Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Monk - I,” (1982): 236.

\textsuperscript{92} Transcriptions of these versions are side-by-side in SMAA: 13:1442-52, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. I have confirmed that Lyon (per Strassburg) and Munich use the same German version. It is unclear what the original language was of the French-English version; only the German original could be located: M4, Folder 7, Series A.RG-II, KAE; another German transcription of this original is in 8:913-18, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

\textsuperscript{93} Marty, “Résumé,” \textit{Annals of the Propagation of the Faith}, 351. All English quotations are taken from this publication unless the German version is designated, in which case the translation is my own.
“old world” promises a “fresh life seed” (*Lebenskeim*) in the “new” world. Marty describes the St. Meinrad mission as ideally situated in an “oasis” (*Insel*) of German culture and language in the midst of “Protestant” America, and he further claims that the area’s “spiritual welfare and material prosperity” stem in no small part from his “little monastic colony.” Besides the salvation of souls, the colony has a further goal (*doppelte Zweck*) in “uniting” the region in faith.

The rest of Marty’s report unveils how the community attempts to accomplish its twofold purpose. Despite the monks’ itinerant condition, necessitated by pastoral demands, Marty insists that the mission must have an eye to future permanence. Thus the monks have founded “establishments and institutions by means of which the good already accomplished might be sustained, extended, and perpetuated.” In the German, Marty emphasizes how these institutions provide a “firm foundation” (*feste Grundlage*) and “stability” (*Bestand*). Such establishments look to the intellectual and spiritual welfare of Catholics through education and worship. For education, the community has created “regular schools in every locality,” which are promising but taxing. The need for worship is even more urgent, since the immigrant enjoys the “recollections of his native land” at the “foot of the altar.” Thus the community has not only built churches but also created “confraternities [Vereine] of men and women, boys and girls” that “have excited in all hearts a holy emulation.” Churches have “sprung up as if by enchantment” through the zeal of these societies. For his German audience, Marty highlights how these
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94 Marty, “Bericht,” *Annenen der Verbreitung des Glaubens* (Munich), 165. All German quotations come from this publication.
95 Marty, “Résumé,” 354.
97 Marty, “Résumé,” 354.
societies encourage the “lively participation in church life” of all classes and ages, such that even the poorest exhibit a “competitive” spirit to create churches that match the splendor of any European parish.\textsuperscript{99} Both versions speak of how this zeal among the Catholic faithful has made a “lively impression” on the surrounding Protestant population, which comes “from a great distance” to observe the processions and festivities that these confraternities facilitate.\textsuperscript{100} Several conversions have resulted from this curiosity, and Marty hopes that “numerous conversions” will follow with greater effort.

After outlining the community’s commitment to education and spiritual solidarity, Marty finishes his report by focusing on their work for ecclesial unity in the region. Physical churches are only a means to a “greater aim,” which is “the construction of that spiritual temple, of which the souls of the faithful are the living stones.”\textsuperscript{101} This is an acute challenge in a region that is host to a multitude of German dialects and customs that often betray a “Parteigeist” opposed to unity. The community’s remedy has been “Missions.” Marty provides no details in his French-English report, yet he expands on this remedy for his German audience. By “Missions” he means “Volksmission,” the preached parish missions eminently part of German Catholic revivalism. In the German version, Marty notes that the monks came to this remedy by considering the common experience of these Catholic immigrants when they were in Europe.\textsuperscript{102} This work of Catholic unification, like that of education and worship, also depends on a “central house of missionaries” that is “indispensable for the future spiritual progress” of this “new

\textsuperscript{99} Marty, “Bericht,” 170.
\textsuperscript{100} Marty, “Résumé,” 355.
\textsuperscript{101} Marty, “Résumé,” 355; The language of “spiritual temple” and “living stones” appears only in the French-English version; the allusion is to 1 Peter 2:5.
\textsuperscript{102} Marty, “Bericht,” 171.
colony of Christians” as it will “continue to spread” and evangelize the region.\(^\text{103}\) In the German Marty adds that such a monastery of missionaries must provide “stability and permanence” (\textit{Bestand und Dauer}) if the monks’ labors are not to go to waste.\(^\text{104}\) This vision is already taking root as “people are making pilgrimages to our church” and the diocesan clergy “adopt this as the place of their annual retreat.”\(^\text{105}\) Marty closes by expressing his hope that the St. Meinrad mission will become an “image” (\textit{Nachbild}) of Einsiedeln, creating an identical missionary orbit (\textit{Missionskreis}) as that which grew from the “poor cell” of St. Meinrad in the Dark Forest. To this Marty adds the intercessory significance of Mary, and in the German he notes that an image of the “Immaculate Virgin” graces the monks’ altar in America. The German version also implores Marty’s confreres to pray in solidarity with the mission and its “Vereine” in securing not only the first part of its mission - pastoral duties - but also the second part - permanence.\(^\text{106}\)

\section*{Significance}

A careful eye to Marty’s language throughout the 1861 “Résumé” finds a map for his transatlantic vision for the next decade. The report contains Marty’s blueprint for monastic evangelization in America while reflecting the imprint of Marty’s work in Einsiedeln. He envisions the Benedictine monastery as an agent of conversion in America, and thus his vision adopts the same “lenses” of his two essays in Einsiedeln: monastic education and ecclesial unity. In this vein Marty adapts to the two currents of antebellum American Catholicism: his focuses on immigrant piety and concerns while

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{103}{Marty, “Résumé,” 356.}
  \item \footnote{104}{Marty, “Bericht,” 172.}
  \item \footnote{105}{Marty, “Résumé,” 357.}
  \item \footnote{106}{Marty, “Bericht,” 174-5.}
\end{itemize}
simultaneously sharing the intellectual, Romantic idealism of Anglo-American converts (Brownson and Hecker) and their optimistic call for unity and tradition in converting American Protestantism. But this adaptation comes with a distinctly Benedictine caveat. The German version of the report also emphasizes the need for the monastery’s stability and permanence if the community is to be an effective agent of evangelization in the local region. As seen later in his debate with Wimmer, Marty’s insistence on monastic stability in relation to the local church forces him to distinguish his translation of the Swiss-Benedictine tradition to America from that of Wimmer’s American-Cassinese Benedictines.

However, the “Résumé” is more than a map of a transatlantic importation of ideas. It is also a blueprint of the mechanics propelling Marty’s vision. Its presentation is neither clear nor systematic, but three tasks dominate his vision: the formation of a “central” monastic house, the education of the population through schools, and the spiritual care of the population through missionary work (churches, sodalities, processions, and parish missions). The first ensures the “stability and permanence” of the latter two. Marty repeats and clarifies this threefold description of St. Meinrad’s mission in another missionary society report for Munich two years later: the “principle points” of the mission in America is the founding of a monastery (Ordenshaus), the building of a school (Schule), and the care of souls (Seelsorge). He employs the same description three years later in 1866, describing St. Meinrad to his abbot as a “prayer-school-mission

---

107 Hobi [Marty] to Gregor von Scherr (Ludwig-Missionsverein), 27 December 1863, 13:1469, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. "In dem wir diesen Bericht an den letztjährigen ausschliessen, wollen wir abermals die Begründung eines Ordenshauses, Seelsorge und Schule als die drei Hauptpunkte unserer Bestrebungen hervorheben." In a later letter to Abbot Schmid, Marty reveals that he wrote this letter and put it in Hobi’s name. Marty to Schmid, 1 February 1864 (M20), 8:944, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
By the time Marty arrived at St. Meinrad, all three of these goals existed in a nascent form. The monks had built a humble framed monastery and had prayed the divine office in it since 1858. They were preachers and pastors in the surrounding countryside, and they had opened a school twice with minimal success. Nevertheless, as Christen had confessed to the abbot earlier, “none of the confreres was able to say what the goal of St. Meinrad was.” The community lacked a coherent and unifying framework to move forward with these tasks.

Both Yock and Rippinger observe that Marty’s leadership brought these tasks together in a unified vision by anchoring missionary work and education in common prayer. They nonetheless neglect both how Marty transforms each element through contributions designed to unite Catholics and how each contribution reflects his formation and thought in Einsiedeln. From Einsiedeln’s liturgical aesthetics and his monastic vocation, Marty focuses on the monastic liturgy as the key to Catholic unity. From Einsiedeln’s school and his essay on Strabo, Marty looks to monastic scholarship as a way to transcend historical and cultural differences for the sake of Catholic unity. From Einsiedeln’s pilgrimage culture and his essay on student associations, Marty revisits the effectiveness of Marian devotion and confraternities for Catholic unity. With these additions to St. Meinrad’s threefold task, Marty seeks to unite the faithful surrounding the monastery to the Church, a greater ecclesial communion transcending local boundaries through the prayer, scholarship, and the missionary work of his monks. The rest of this section outlines Marty’s leadership of each task (monastery, school, and missionary

---

108 Marty to Schmid, 23 April 1866, 8:964, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “…unsere benedktinerishe Gebet-Schul-und Missionsstätte…”
work), identifies his particular transformative contribution, and analyzes the significance of this contribution for Catholic unification in relation to its origin.

“Ordenshaus”

Marty’s first task, to establish a permanent monastic house of prayer, was no simple feat. When Marty was still in Einsiedeln, Hobi had complained to him that both the mission’s monks and the secular priests living at the mission neglected the daily obligation of praying the breviary.\(^\text{111}\) He attributed this vice to a scattered missionary field that overwhelmed everyone at the mission. Marty saw the approaching millennial jubilee of St. Meinrad’s death as an opportunity to “return” the mission to the abbot’s original plan.\(^\text{112}\) He saw humility and stable leadership as the keys to the mission’s success, built upon the “cornerstone” of the Benedictine vows of obedience, conversion of morals, and stability, which together could form “one heart, one soul.”\(^\text{113}\) His principle goal was to create a true monastery from the mission house. According to Yock, the heart of Marty’s vision was what his contemporaries called the “reform” view of Benedictine monasticism. In contrast to Wimmer’s “parish-priory” model, Marty championed a return to traditional monasticism in which the monk’s primary task was to live in the monastery and do missionary work *excurrendo*, i.e., extending from the cloister.\(^\text{114}\)

Marty embraced a reform vision from early on, yet Yock overlooks how his *excurrendo* Benedictine vision developed only gradually during the 1860s. Initially


\(^{112}\) Marty to Schmid, 16-23 October 1860, 13:1441, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

\(^{113}\) Marty to Schmid, 13 November 1861 (M9), 8:928, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Dieser Grundstein kann wohl kein anderer sein als die hl. Gelübde…Alle Ein Herz und Eine Seele…”

\(^{114}\) Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 108.
Marty did little to restructure the activist vision of the mission. For instance, in his 1862 missionary report, Marty celebrated how he and his confreres observed the *Rule* and prayed daily “in the middle of the American forest…where only a few years prior only the call of the wild and the hunting cry of the Indian was heard.”\(^\text{115}\) However this description focused not so much on the centrality of monastic prayers as it did on the evangelical potential of this arrangement. A monk in the American hinterland “ignites an eternal light in the vast wilderness, that should both exalt God and enlighten man.”\(^\text{116}\) The monks do so through the “double blessing” of education and missionary work which “counterbalance” American “superficiality and one-sidedness.”\(^\text{117}\) The tone echoed that of Marty’s 1861 “Résumé,” emphasizing an active apostolate and progressive optimism for expansion.

The following year Marty applied this optimism to St. Meinrad’s mission in Terre Haute, over 100 miles away. The monks had accepted the bishop’s invitation to staff a parish in Terre Haute only a month after Marty’s arrival in November 1860.\(^\text{118}\) Marty had endorsed this undertaking. He persuaded his abbot that Terre Haute offered more potential for a successful school since the Sisters of Providence staffed a school for girls and parents wanted to send their boys to a school in the same city. Moreover, a successful boys’ school could feed monastic vocations. Likewise, the city lay on major

\(^{115}\) Hobi (Marty) to Joseph Othmar Rauscher (Leopoldinen-Stiftung), 24 April 1862, 13:1455, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Ein eigenthümliches Gefühl ergreift den Benediktiner, wenn er mit seinen Mitbruedern hier im amerikanischen Walde, wo auf hunderte und hunderte Meilen kein ähnliches Institut besteht, und wo vor wenigen Jahren noch nur die Stimme des Gewildes und der Jagdruf des Indianers ertönte, Tag für Tag seinen Chor hält und nach Vorschrift der Regel mit Mund und Herz das Lob Gottes singt.”

\(^{116}\) Ibid. “…dort in der unermesslichen Wildniss ein ewiges Licht anzündeten, das zugleich Gott verherrlichen und die Menschen erleuchten sollte.”

\(^{117}\) Ibid., 1456-57. “…der amerikanischen Oberflächlichkeit und Einseitigkeit wenigstens bei denjenigen, die für den geistlichen Stand sich vorbereiten, ein heilsames höchst notwendiges Gegengewicht zu balten.”

\(^{118}\) Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 133.
transportation routes, including a railroad, and the future of St. Meinrad’s activity and effectiveness depended on easy accessibility. Despite Schmid’s hesitation, Marty opened a school in Terre Haute in 1863. He remained there for almost a year as he, O’Connor, and Mundwiler offered classes at the new St. Benedict’s College and constructed an adjoining parish for German Catholics. Marty thought that this undertaking presented a “better promise at hand” than St. Meinrad, and he described his own extended absence from St. Meinrad as a “test” case for its monastic integrity.

Two developments altered Marty’s enthusiasm for the activist vision that he inherited at St. Meinrad. The first was the failure of the Terre Haute mission. The construction was barely completed before the college closed its doors in 1865. The next fall Marty severed all ties between St. Meinrad and Terre Haute, despite O’Connor’s protest. The distance was too taxing for the community and enrollment in St. Benedict’s College was minimal. Beyond his work in Terre Haute, Marty and his confreres had kept an itinerant schedule with parish missions and other pastoral duties. That same year St. Meinrad had constructed no less than ten churches in the area, including Marty’s own construction projects at Terre Haute and Fulda. These labors had fatigued Marty.

---

121 Marty to Schmid, 17 September 1863 (M19), 8:943, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “…heirzu kann ich aber in T.H. weit mehr leisten und ist dort bessere Aussicht vorhanden als in St. M. Endlich mag auch diese zeitweilige Abwesenheit als eine Art Probe dienen, ob ich mich in meinem Vertrauen auf die Haltbarkeit der gegenwärtigen Ordnung der Dinge in St. M. nicht getäuscht habe.”
123 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 139.
124 Marty to Schmid, 17 September 1863 (M19), 8:942; Marty to Schmid, 22 April 1864 (M21), 8:946-47, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
125 Marty to Morel, 5 August 1865 (M29), 8:955; Marty to Schmid, 15 January 1866 (M33), 8:959, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
to the extent that he collapsed with an unknown illness in July. Death seemed imminent. The local Catholic population banded together to offer devotions and prayers for Marty, and within a week he recovered to the astonishment of all. As he had done when confronted with death as a youth in Schwyz, Marty attributed his miraculous recovery to the Virgin’s intercession and celebrated his first mass after the illness on July 16, the Feast of Our Lady of Einsiedeln.

These two events, the failure of Terre Haute and Marty’s illness from fatigue, lay behind a shift in mood and vision in his letters after 1864. As a monk Marty had always cherished the recitation of the office as a celestial moment of peace in the midst of America’s war. Immediately after his recovery he began to reorganize community life and to emphasize the monastic nature of St. Meinrad’s mission. His letter to Morel, penned months after his illness and quoted above, evinced this shift in Marty’s qualification that he and his confreres were Benedictine educators and missionaries by virtue of their monastic vocation. The same letter further displayed Marty’s wariness of the American obsession with progress and expansion (“cito”) destabilizing society.

After Schmid appointed him as the permanent, official prior in April 1865, Marty focused ever more on consolidating the community’s missionary activity and improving its monastic observance through communal prayer. In October Marty reported that he

---

126 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 168.
127 Marty to Morel, 24 June 1864 (M22), 8:948, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
128 Marty to Morel, 16 October 1864 (M24), 8:950, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. See above, chapter 2, note 84.
129 From the moment of his arrival, Marty informed the senior members of the community that Schmid had appointed him as the actual administrator and superior of the mission. Hobi remained the public, legal superior while Marty directed the mission behind the scenes. The logic of this arrangement was that Marty could leave at any moment without compromising the community’s leadership. See Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 150-1, 170-1. By 1864 Hobi and the rest of the community petitioned Schmid to appoint a permanent superior.
was staying put in St. Meinrad and focusing on “interior ministry” by facilitating retreats for students and spiritual exercises for the monastic community.\footnote{Marty to Morel, 19 October 1865 (M30), 8:956, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.} A couple of months later he told a confrere in Einsiedeln how he wanted to train young monks more in the “cenobitical life” before sending them into the missionary field. He also confessed how he now viewed the monastic liturgy and discipline of St. Meinrad as a “source of true comfort.”\footnote{Marty to Rupert Ledergerber (“Dekan”), 26 December 1865 (M32), 8:958, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.} His report to Einsiedeln in 1866 also revealed plans for a new permanent stone monastery that could bring permanence to the community’s monastic life.\footnote{Marty to Schmid, 15 January 1866 (M33), 8:960, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. For an architect Marty hired Ludwig Riedinger, who had designed St. Mary’s in Evansville, Indiana, the same year.} To mark the feast of St. Meinrad in January 1867, Marty further implement a daily conventual mass for the monastery in the spirit of imitating the same practice in Einsiedeln.\footnote{Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 171.} Many of his reorganization efforts looked back to Einsiedeln for a model to follow, and even the architectural plans he continued to submit to his abbot copied Einsiedeln’s layout of a grand entrance to the abbey church facing the town below the hill.\footnote{Marty to Schmid, 6 June 1866 (M37), 8:964, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. The monastery was built between 1869 and 1874, yet the abbey church was never realized. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 171.}

Marty’s shift in emphasis also fills his missionary report to Munich and Vienna in 1867, published in the Leopoldinen-Stiftung’s \textit{Berichte}.\footnote{Marty produced two slightly different letters to each society on 31 December 1867. The Ludwig-Missionsverein produced a small synopsis of the letter: \textit{Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens} 36 (Munich: 1868): 213. The Austrian Leopoldinen-Stiftung reproduced Marty’s entire report in its annual publication: “Bericht des Benedictiner-Ordens-Priesters und Priors Fr. Martin zu St. Meinrad…” \textit{Berichte der Leopoldinen-Stiftung in Kaiserthume Österreich} 38 (Vienna, 1868): 22-32. The transcription of the Munich version is in “P. Martin to L.M.V.” 13:1498-1502, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. All subsequent citation will refer to the publication in the \textit{Berichte}.} Unlike the scattered goals of
his 1861 “Résumé,” this 1867 report makes clear what St. Meinrad’s priority is: “We consider the direct service of the Lord in his sanctuary to be our primary task, by which we wish to draw down the dew of heavenly grace upon the vast harvest field of missionaries.”\textsuperscript{136} Quoting Schiller, Marty specifies that St. Meinrad’s efforts are to be “small” with eye toward the “greater whole” of converting America to Catholicism.\textsuperscript{137} Thus, Marty concludes, “We hold the liturgical service as the first and most blessed duty of the Benedictine missionary, because neither the planter nor the zealot provides the growth, but only God.” He views St. Meinrad as “a place of prayer [\textit{Gebetsstätte}], from which the heart beat the Church’s life, as it comes from the tabernacle, is to be transmitted to the remotest members of the mystical body.” Through the monastery “the various hours of day and night the Office and liturgy of the Holy Church is celebrated in full form and greatest possible perfection, with external accuracy and inner piety.”\textsuperscript{138} In this perspective, Marty envisions the monastic “Ordenshaus” (monastery) as primarily a “Gotteshaus” (house of worship).


In light of these later reports, Marty develops his vision by focusing on the monastic liturgy. For Marty, monastic prayer is to feed and guide St. Meinrad’s educational and missionary efforts. Both flow from the monastic choir, otherwise they are not properly Benedictine. Even though this vision existed in seminal form in his first missionary report, the “Résumé” of 1861, it is not until later in the 1860s that Marty prioritized the monastic liturgy as St. Meinrad’s principle contribution to the Church and the evangelization of America. This development is particularly evident in Marty’s application of this principle through a lay manual for Gregorian chant.

**Monastic Contribution: The Cantarium Project**

In his 1861 “Résumé,” Marty complained of the “Parteigeist” poisoning Catholic unity in St. Meinrad’s mission district. Although most of the settlers were German Catholics, they came from different regions with different dialects. Consequently, Marty and his confreres needed a remedy to unify local Catholics as one body. At the same time, Marty’s theological ultramontanism maintained an eye toward unity between American Catholics and the universal, Roman Church. In addition, Marty had made it clear that he encouraged his monks to “look back to the past, and in this spirit we wish to build for the future.”\(^{139}\) This spirit inspired Marty to apply his later vision of the monastery or *Ordenshaus* and create a “tabernacle” or “house of prayer” that could evangelize American Catholics. Looking to the past, Marty attempted to make a contribution through which the prayer of the monastery could bridge the cultural divides of Catholics in the region and unite all American Catholics with the ancient tradition of

\(^{139}\) Marty to Schmid, 27 January 1866 (M35), 8:963, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
the universal Church. This contribution was a publishing project designed to instruct the lay faithful in Gregorian chant. He succeeded in producing one volume of his multi-volume project, appearing as *Cantarium Romanum* in 1869 on the eve of the Vatican Council. It was a Gregorian chant hymnal for a variety of mass settings with a bilingual introduction (English and German). The volume adopted Gregorian plainchant for modern musical notation so that the laity could sing along with the priest or choir. He actively promoted this work in other dioceses during his travels, and he even used it for a liturgy with American bishops on board a ship bound for the council in Rome. The success of this project, however, was limited, and Marty seems to have abandoned his plans for subsequent volumes because of a lack of public interest in the first volume.

While most of Marty’s biographers note the appearance of *Cantarium*, the majority neglect its content. Kleber is the exception, but even he gives it a cursory glance and omits keys sources that inspired the project. A more diligent analysis of its content, especially Marty’s preface, uncovers the project’s origins and its significance.

---

140 Monks of St. Meinrad, *Cantarium Romanum: Pars Prima, Ordinarium Missae* (Cincinnati and New York: Benziger, 1869). It appears that the other “parts” of this title were never published. A rare copy of this work can be found in Box 3, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers – Addendum, Abbatial File Series, SMAA.

141 Marty to Schmid, 23 September 1869 (M53), 8:992; Marty to Schmid, 24 October 1869 (M54), 8:993, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. The bishops on board included Purcell, Henni, and De St. Palais, among others.


143 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 150. Kleber claims to have seen a second volume that included a four-part harmony with accompaniment. Marty intimates the production of such a volume in the preface to the first volume (viii), but a copy of this volume cannot be found in SMAA. Kleber acknowledges the role of Baltimore II, but overlooks the other two sources.
Marty’s preface for *Cantarium* intimates several sources. The first inspiration is clearly the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866), evident from his opening quotation. Marty quotes and translates a decree of the council that states it is “very desirable that Gregorian chant be taught and practiced in the parochial schools,” so that “in course of time, the greater portion of the people learn to sing…with the minsters and the choir, as it was the custom in the primitive church.”¹⁴⁴ Regardless of whether Marty had a direct hand in the wording of the decree, he certainly played some role in its formulation. He attended the council as the theological advisor to Bishop De St. Palais, along with O’Connor.¹⁴⁵ Marty was among 120 theologians and 45 bishops who attended the council from October 7 to October 20, 1866. Convened after the Civil War as symbol of American Catholic unity, the council continued the American Catholic tradition of episcopal collegiality and addressed Roman concerns about inconsistencies in American ecclesiastical norms and discipline. It also indirectly affirmed Pope Pius IX’s controversial “Syllabus of Errors” (1864) while simultaneously adopting a more positive tone that could allay the fears of American Protestants.¹⁴⁶ Marty was assigned to the congregations on *De fide orthodoxa* and *De culto divino*, the latter of which produced the

¹⁴⁴ Martin Marty, preface to *Cantarium Romanum*, vi. The quotation is from *Concilii plenarii Baltimoresis II* (Baltimore: J. Murphy, 1866), 197 (no. 380, *De culto divino* 3): “Insuper valde exoptandum esse censemus, ut rudimenta cantus Gregoriani in scholis parochialibus exponantur et exerceantur, sicque numero eorum, qui psalmos bene cantare valent, magis magisque increascente, paulatim major saltem pars populi, secundum primitivae ecclesiae adhuc in variis locis vigentem usum, Vesperas et alia similia cum ministris et choro decantare addiscat.” Ellipses are my own. The decree goes on to quote Ephesians 5:19, “…speaking to one other in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs…”

¹⁴⁵ Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 171-2. Marty met with Wimmer at the council. Marty also received two offers of land for future communities. One of these was made by Bernadine Wiget. See Marty to Schmid, 17 October 1866 (M39) Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Marty is listed as a participant in *Concilii plenarii Baltimorenseis II*, lviii.

decree he quotes in the forward of _Cantarium_. Even though this decree is not mentioned in the bishops’ pastoral letter for the council, Marty embraced it as a pastoral imperative that the Benedictines could readily facilitate. His _Cantarium_ was a direct answer to the decree and its encouragement of lay participation in the liturgy.

Marty’s Benedictine agenda emerges in another statement in his preface, leading to a second source. Marty describes the text as an attempt to “introduce” Catholics “to the patrons of plain chant” (i.e., the Benedictines) by way of “Roman choral melodies in their unalloyed purity.” This line points to the influence of Prosper Guéranger and his French Benedictine recovery of Gregorian chant. As stated above, Guéranger promoted plainchant as means for the faithful to connect with the universal church and its apostolic roots through the liturgy. This explains Marty’s use of “Romanum” in his title, as these chants are not purely for the monk in choir but in fact for the _Roman_ liturgy of the universal church. This further demonstrates Marty’s sympathy for Guéranger’s ultramontanism and his naïve presupposition that the purest or most “unalloyed” tradition of the Church was de facto the Roman one. This sympathy even led Marty to visit Solesmes on his way to the council, right after using his _Cantarium_ en route.

However, an even closer examination of Marty’s preface pinpoints a third source and reveals how Marty departs from the Solesmes model in favor of his Swiss-Benedictine roots. After heralding the antiquity of _Cantarium_’s Roman liturgical melodies, he traces their genealogy back to the Benedictines of St. Gall near Einsiedeln.

---

147 Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 148. See also Marty’s handwritten notes on the council in Folder “Notes to II Plenary Council, Balt.,” Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA.
149 Marty, preface to _Cantarium_, vi.
150 Marty to Schmid, 24 October 1869 (M54), 8:993, SMAA.
The trope is a familiar one that occurs earlier in Marty’s teaching days in Einsiedeln: monks from Rome, at the bequest of Charlemagne, come to evangelize the Franks and bring with them the ancient, apostolic liturgy. These ancient Roman chants eventually make their way to Germany and Switzerland, but Marty emphasizes that this is by way of the “Irish monk, St. Gallus.” Marty’s emphasis suggests that he wants to highlight how these chants stem from a tradition that unites his English-speaking Catholic readers (i.e., Irish Catholics) with his German-speaking Catholic readers. Like Guéranger, Marty wants the Benedictines to illuminate the unity of the Catholic tradition through the patrimony of Gregorian (and thus “Roman”) chant. In an explicit attempt to connect this Benedictine tradition with the nineteenth century, Marty then proceeds to supply a page-length quotation of “Ekkehard,” an obscure, thirteenth-century monk of St. Gall. The quotation speaks of the merits of ecclesiastical music for the soul, but what is more interesting is its likely source: Canisius’s Antiquae lectiones. Marty references this work in his essay on Strabo, suggesting that Marty draws from the scholarship of his Einsiedeln years.

Nevertheless, an even closer examination of the German version of the preface leads one deeper into the well of Marty’s Swiss-Benedictine youth. In the German, he footnotes a work that he omits for his English readers (on the opposite-facing page). Marty cites and lauds the work Die Sängerschule St. Gallens vom achten bis zwölften Jahrhundert by Anselm Schubiger. Schubiger was Marty’s choirmaster as a student

---

151 Marty, Cantarium, viii. Emphasis original.
152 Ibid. Marty quotes the Vita b. Notkeri by Ekkehard V (d. ca. 1220).
154 Anselm Schubiger, Die Sängerschule St. Gallens vom achten bis zwölften Jahrhundert: Ein Beitrag zur Gesangsgeschichte des Mittelalters, mit vielen Facsimiles und Beispielen (Einsiedeln: Benziger Brothers, 1858).
and monk and also the author of the Marienrosen that Marty sang before Henni in 1848.\textsuperscript{155} Although Schubiger’s work is a history rather than a hymnal, its appended “Exempla” bear a remarkable similarity to Marty’s Cantarium. Schubiger also reproduces St. Gall’s chants and adapts the notation for modern readers.\textsuperscript{156} The works are not identical, and Marty’s notation and selection of chants appear to be his own.\textsuperscript{157} Nevertheless, the appearance of Schubiger behind the facade of the Cantarium confirms Marty’s use of his education in Gregorian chant in Einsiedeln.

\textbf{Significance}

The significance of Marty’s three sources lies in their ends. In invoking the authority of Baltimore II, Marty presents the Benedictine tradition as a legitimate and ready servant of the American church. The other two sources point to Marty’s past, yet this connection has completely escaped his biographers. Cantarium exemplifies Marty’s continuation of an earlier push for Catholic unity that he advocated during his Einsiedeln years, especially in his essay on student associations. At the same time, the imprint of Guéranger reveals how this agenda developed to join the liturgical ultramontanism of European confreres. Finally, Marty’s incorporation of his Swiss-Benedictine roots

\textsuperscript{155} Marty also used Schubiger’s works for musical classes at St. Meinrad, including his Marienrosen. See Marty to Schmid, 3 June 1862 (M14), 8:936, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

\textsuperscript{156} Schubiger, Die Sängerschule St. Gallens, “Exempla,” 3-60.

\textsuperscript{157} For instance, Schubiger also quotes a similar passage of Ekkehard (p. 58), but the German translation differs from that of Marty. Marty uses the exact same translation as Karl Greith’s preface in Cantarium Sancti Galli: Römischer Choralgesang der St. Gallischen Stiftskirche (St. Gall, 1845), ix-x. Greith’s intention to reproduce mass parts and vespers chants looks remarkably similar to Marty’s Cantarium. However, Greith’s notation and selections are not a perfect match when compared with Marty’s. Nevertheless, Kleber notes from a student’s diary that Marty used Greith’s “Choral-Messe,” based on melodies from St. Gall, for student choirs at St. Meinrad (History of St. Meinrad, 144), and thus Greith is a likely source. See also Karl Greith, Choral-Messe: Harmonis. u. für gem. Chor mit Begl. d. Orgel für Stadt- u. Land-Chöre bearb. (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1859). Ultimately Marty’s primary source for his chants remains unclear.
demonstrates how he set his contribution apart from Guéranger’s project, in so far that Marty’s intention with *Cantarium* was to educate and evangelize the faithful. The more contemplative Guéranger limited Solesmes’s activity to liturgical research and publication that could support institutional efforts for Catholic unity; at the same time, he shunned education and missionary work. In contrast, Einsiedeln’s heritage embraced education and pastoral work for pilgrims. Marty’s *Cantarium* used liturgical scholarship for pastoral goals, thus moving beyond Guéranger toward the goals of the Swiss tradition. *Cantarium* was to make Gregorian chant accessible to the laity and educate them in its tradition. Marty’s *Ordenshaus*, unlike Guéranger’s monastery, was never to remain an enclosed monastery. Marty endorsed Guéranger’s emphasis on the liturgical observance of monks, yet Marty had a different end in mind. He wished to improve the monastery so as to make it a better agent of Benedictine education and missionary work. To teach Gregorian chant, the monk must first chant in the choir. Consequently, *Cantarium* was a monastic contribution designed to unite more than just different American ethnicities through chant; it also marked an attempt to bridge different cultures of the Benedictine revival, binding Wimmer’s emphasis on education and missionary work with Guéranger’s emphasis on chant and scholarship. This bridging of cultures comes to light all the more in Marty’s leadership of education reform at St. Meinrad.

“Schule”

Marty’s second task, the creation of a school, was the most complicated of the three. The building of a school was part of the mission’s objective from its inception. Its model, naturally, was Einsiedeln’s *Stiftschule* and its double function as a secondary
school (gymnasium or “college”) and a seminary (theology and philosophy). The mélange of American students who came to St. Meinrad forced the monks to rethink their Swiss tradition and its curriculum. The students entered at varying levels, and some did not even know their alphabet. Language was a further source of cacophony, as most students mixed English and German. And there was the matter of tuition. Most students could not pay, and those who could exhibited little interest in a religious vocation. The success of the school depended on creating a model that could both communicate Einsiedeln’s classical tradition and adapt to American exigencies. Marty was the key to this model and the school’s later success.

Upon his arrival, Marty inherited a school with a history of failure. The monks opened their first school in April 1854, and their first pupils were two sons of prominent Protestant merchants in the area. Schwerzmann was their only teacher, and his unexpected death in August forced the school to close. When Foffa became prior in 1857 he decided to reopen the school with six students. However, Foffa’s actions were without abbatial sanction, and his school was poorly organized. Students came and went, and Foffa’s successor, Christen, closed the school in the fall of 1858. A third attempt came with Marty, who reopened the school in the spring of 1861, mere months after his arrival. Marty made the school a priority. He recruited students, obtained books from Einsiedeln, and constructed a larger school building. Despite the onset of war, the school reached capacity in 1863 with 30 students and turned away interested pupils. After the war Marty built an even larger school to accommodate an influx of diocesan

---

159 Mundwiler to Dean of Einsiedeln, 22 April 1862, 13:1454, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
161 Ibid., 235-36.
seminarians in 1866.\textsuperscript{162} At the same time he also secured Benedictine sisters from Covington, Kentucky, to staff a school for girls in nearby Ferdinand.\textsuperscript{163} By the end of the decade St. Meinrad’s school and its seminary hosted over 40 students, prompting Marty to build a larger monastic complex with a sandstone school by 1874.\textsuperscript{164}

Along with institutional advancement, Marty improved the school’s curriculum. In his first letters to Einsiedeln Marty begged his confreres for books. The monks, he claimed, “thirst in this American wilderness for a word or sound from the learned world.”\textsuperscript{165} His wishes were granted, and Yock notes that in using the same textbooks as Einsiedeln, “the monks were directly transplanting the ideas from the Old World to the New.”\textsuperscript{166} The American school also had a similar structure, with a gymnasium devoted to a general liberal arts education in grammar, syntax, and rhetoric (alongside mathematics, sciences, languages and history) and a lyceum reserved for advance philosophical and theological studies (including church history, hermeneutics, exegesis, canon law, and liturgy).\textsuperscript{167} As in Einsiedeln, lay students attended the former and mostly seminarians attended the latter. Even the academic calendar coincided with the great feast days of Einsiedeln: classes began on September 14 (Engelweihe) and concluded on July 11 (a

\textsuperscript{162} Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 179-80.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 199; Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 221; Marty to Schmid, 15 January 1868 (M44), 8:976, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA (the transcription does not have a date, but the original does: M44, Folder 7, A.RG-II Series, KAE).
\textsuperscript{164} Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 240; Marty to Schmid, 18 January 1869 (M48), 8:983, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
\textsuperscript{165} Marty to Morel, 24 June 1864 (M22), 8:948, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA (English transcription 4:1160-61, Pioneer Letters Box 4, Archival Historical Series, SMAA): “So dürstet unsereins in der amerikanischen Wildniß nach einem Worte oder Klange aus der gebildeten Welt.” See also M7, M14, M32, and a list of “school books” for St. Meinrad in 13:1575-78, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
\textsuperscript{166} Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 235-36.
\textsuperscript{167} Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 244-45. Yock notes that, surprisingly, there were no formal religion classes in the gymnasium.
feast of St. Benedict). Joseph White further identifies St. Meinrad’s school as similar to most American Catholic colleges in its classical curriculum with one exemption: the option for “commercial classes” for the sons of local businessmen. It seems that the monks of St. Meinrad were pioneers in American Catholic business education. In 1863 Marty introduced business classes to subsidize the classical curriculum. These classes were so popular that they were later moved to another town in the region for want of space. This development reflects Marty’s ability to adapt to American pragmatism and, learning from Einsiedeln’s own history, ensure the social utility of his monastery while preserving its tradition.

Nevertheless, Yock and White overlook one of Marty’s original contributions to American Catholic education, directly imported from his education in Einsiedeln. In addition to philosophy, history, physics and natural history, Marty introduced St. Meinrad’s school to the world of aesthetics. In an early letter to Morel, Marty expressed his dismay at how Americans knew nothing about the philosophy of aesthetics. He could not find any books in America on the subject (in English or Latin). Consequentially, he turned to Morel’s notebooks and produced a handwritten summary in

---

168 Marty to Gregor von Scherr (Ludwig-Missionsverein), 7 November 1862, 13:1458, Box 3, and Marty to Schmid, 24 September 1862 (M15), 8:938, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.


170 Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 237. The move to Jasper, Indiana, was controversial within the community. The school later moved to the Swiss-American foundation in Aurora, Illinois, and is the precursor of its present-day Marmion Academy (238).

171 Marty to Morel, 26 October 1864 (M25), 8:951, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

172 Marty to Morel, 3 June 1862 (M14), 8:936, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
Latin for use in his classroom.\textsuperscript{173} Marty reported that the students were enamored with the subject and posited that he was “the first and only professor of aesthetics on the western continent” and that, by extension, Morel was the “father of American aesthetics.”\textsuperscript{174} Marty further applied his love of aesthetics to his instruction in music and drama at St. Meinrad, including the introduction of Einsiedeln’s four-part \textit{Salve Regina}.\textsuperscript{175}

Aside from subject matter, Marty’s most noteworthy influence on the school’s development was the framing of its goals. Like his vision for the monastery, his vision for the school shifted during the course of the decade. Yock rightly identifies Marty’s closure of the school at Terre Haute as the beginning of a distinctly Swiss-American educational model. He describes it as a “turning point for Marty and monks” that forced them to focus on “one district with one school” that “definitively” set their vision apart from that of Wimmer’s monks and their scattered priory-based schools.\textsuperscript{176} The insight is correct, yet it neglects an \textit{internal} development in the school regarding the purpose of its seminary.

\textsuperscript{173} Ibid. A copy of Marty’s “epitome” of Morel is under “Aesthetica” in Box 3, Martin Marty, Abbot and Bishop: Official and Personal Papers-Addendum, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. Kleber presumes that this copy is from Marty’s student notes rather than Morel’s notes (Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 143). Marty’s letter to Morel clearly states that he used a copy of Morel’s unpublished notes on aesthetics that Mundwiler had at the time. A copy of these notes is listed in Henggeler, \textit{Professbuch}, 506. Marty also likely consulted Morel’s \textit{Werth und Bedeutung der Aesthetik. Anrede, gehalten bei Eröffnung der höhern Schulen im Kloster Einsiedeln von P. Gall Morel, Subprior und Professor der Aesthetik} (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1848).

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid. “….und ich mußte mich sehr irren oder ich bin der erste und einzige Aesthetikprofessor auf dem westlichen Continent, denn in allen engl. od. lateinischer Compendien d. Philosophie sowie in allen Studienplänen der amerik. Kollegium ist nichts von Aesthetik zu finden, und somit wären also Ew. Hochwürden der Vater der amer. Aesthetik.” See also Betschart, \textit{Apostel}, 35.

\textsuperscript{175} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 144.

\textsuperscript{176} Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 168.
The principal reason why Marty reopened the school in 1861 was that the diocesan seminary had closed the previous year.¹⁷⁷ From the beginning Marty described the school’s “formation of new missionaries” as his monks’ “most distinct vocation” and the “most important thing that we can do for the church of this land.”¹⁷⁸ To create “good priests in the greatest possible number” was the “principal point from which everything depends.”¹⁷⁹ He repeated this sentiment in a letter to the Ludwig-Missionsverein the following year, describing the “formation of native clergy” as “one of the main purposes of the foundation of our mission house.”¹⁸⁰ The conversion of America to Catholicism lay behind this goal, and Marty believed that with a “sufficient number of good priests, so will we overcome the greatest hurdle in expansion of the Catholic Church in this land.”¹⁸¹ These early sentiments mirrored Wimmer’s mission for the Benedictines in America.

However, by the mid 1860s, a different, clearer objective emerged, inspired by other concurrent events. In 1866 Bishop de St. Palais decided to send all of his seminarians to St. Meinrad. Marty built a larger school to accommodate the influx of students, and the next year the St. Meinrad school witnessed its first ordination of secular

---
¹⁷⁸ Marty to Schmid, 13 November 1861 (M9), 8:927, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “…ist ja die Heranbildung neuer Missionäre unser eigenster Beruf, für den wir befähigt sind und das Wichtigste, was wir für die Kirche dieses Landes thun können.”
¹⁷⁹ Hobi (Marty) to Joseph Othmar Rauscher (Leopoldinen-Stiftung), 24 April 1862, 13:1456, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Gute Priester in möglichst grosser Anzahl und möglichst bald heranzuberufen, das ist der Hauptpunkt, von dem Alles abhängt.”
¹⁸⁰ Marty to Gregor von Scherr (Ludwig-Missionsverein), 7 November 1862, 13:1458, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “…daß wir fortan zur Heranbildung eines einheimischen Klerus das unsrige beitragen können und somit einen der Hauptzwecke der Gründung unseres Missionshauses erreicht haben.” The letter was never published in the society’s Annalen.
¹⁸¹ Ibid., 13:1459. “Man kann daher kaum ein verdienstlicheres und für den Aufschwung in diesem Lande ersprieslicheres Werk tun, als wenn man solchen Berufenen zur Erreichung ihres Lebenszieles verhilft; denn sobald wir eine hinreichende Anzahl guter Priester haben, so wird dem Größten Hindernis der Ausbreitung der Katholischen Kirchen in diesem Lande abgeholfen sein.”
This development coincided with Marty’s focus on consolidating the monks’ mission activity and improving the communal life of not only the monastery but also the school and its greater ecclesial mission.

As with Marty’s new vision for the monastery, his clearer objective for the school emerges in the same 1867 missionary report to Munich and Vienna. At first glance, Marty repeats the goals of the past: the conversion of America requires a sufficient number of priests, and this goal is “no longer a question of possibility but rather one of time.”

A closer reading of the text discovers, however, that Marty’s mechanics for evangelization have changed. First there is a new emphasis on Catholic unity. Marty employs the words of John 10:16: “there will be one shepherd and one flock.” He blends this with the providential, restorationist vision of history that he articulated as a student. Asian immigrants meet westward migration in America, and just as the sun rises again in the east to complete its “Kreislauf” in the west, so it is with “the sun of the gospel: the path of converting the great peoples of east Asia lies in America, for if this land becomes Catholic, then too has the Middle Kingdom’s hour come…”

Yet it is at this point, noted above, that Marty emphasizes prayer as the “priority” of the monastery, its “small” role in the “greater whole” of evangelization. He proceeds to apply this clarity of priorities to the school. The seminarians are now required to join the monks for choir and

---

182 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 179-180. In 1868 Bishop De St. Palais protested an increase in tuition and threatened to withdraw his students. Marty refused to budge on the cost. When the bishop realized that other seminaries charged the same if not more, he acquiesced. This event was undoubtedly behind a period of frosty relations between the bishop and Marty during the process to make St. Meinrad an independent abbey. See Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 241.

183 Marty, “Bericht,” 26. “…daß es keine Frage der Möglichkeit mehr, sondern nur noch eine Frage der Zeit ist…”

184 Ibid., 25. “Wie die Sonne fortschreitet von Osten nach Westen, um wieder in Osten an ihrem Ausgangspunkte den Kreislauf zu vollenden, so die Sonne des Evangeliums; der Weg zur Bekehrung der großen Völker des östlichen Asiens führt über Amerika; ist dieses ein katholisches Land geworden, dann ist auch für das Reich der Mitte und dessen Tributländer die Stunde gekommen.”
“accustom themselves early to the foundation on which the missionaries held fast and which converted Europe: ‘Operi Dei nihil praeponatur!’ [‘Let nothing take precedence over the work of God,’ RB 43.3].”

In the same breath Marty extols St. Meinrad as the only place in Indiana where communal choir is held, the ultimate “work of God.” Then Marty makes a remarkable statement for a report to a missionary society: he readily admits that St. Meinrad has “retreated in solitude” in recent years to realize, paradoxically, the greater goal of American evangelization. It has surrendered many pastoral assignments because his monks consider it “more important and more pressing to educate priests and missionaries and form them with the greatest possible care.”

Instead of creating monk-missionaries, Marty makes it clear that St. Meinrad’s vision is about monks educating secular missionaries to go out into the world. With this new vision, he concludes his report with appeal for more funds to expand his seminary to 200 students and erect a new building for seminarians within the monastery that can ensure “one heart” between the monks and their missionary pupils.

With this new emphasis on the monastic education of secular missionaries, Marty looked to educate not only future missionaries within St. Meinrad’s school but also beyond its walls and even American shores. To this end he contributed a personal project that employed the Benedictine tradition of scholarship for American evangelization, one that blended European and American strains of the Benedictine revival.

---

185 Ibid., 27-28. “…halten auch unsere vierzig Seminaristen mit und gewöhnen sich damit schon frühe an den Grundsatz, an welchem die Missionäre festhielten, die Europa bekehrt haben, an das, ‘Operi Dei nihil praeponatur!’”
186 Ibid., 28. “…so nothwendig aber es auch war und ist, daß wir der Seelsorge und den Volksmissionen uns widmen, so halten wir es doch für noch wichtiger und dringender, Priester und Missionäre zu erziehen und mit möglichster Sorgfalt heranzubilden. Um dieses thun zu können, haben wir uns in die Einsamkeit zurückgezogen und manche Stellen aufgegeben oder ausgeschlagen, die nicht bloß eine reiche Missions-Ernte, sondern auch gute pecuniäre Hülfsquellen zu werden versprachen.”
187 Ibid., 30. “…so müssen wir in nächster Zukunft entsprechendere Gebäulichkeiten herstellen, d. h. uns ein Herz fassen und mit dem eigentlichen Klosterbau den Anfang machen.”
Scholarly Contribution: The Translation Project

In addition to his pedagogical and administrative skills, Marty introduced the monastery’s school to the tradition of monastic scholarship. In the midst of a national war, Marty set his educational sites on an international audience. He had discovered nascent American Catholic publishing efforts to record and defend the role of Catholicism in American history, and within a year of his arrival, Marty began to share this literature with fellow German Catholics in Europe. At first glance, the timing suggests that Marty was ostensibly aloof to the war around him. However, the war was the impetus behind his project, as Marty believed that the war occasioned a rare moment rife with European interest in America and its internal conflict. He thought it opportune to translate curiosity into knowledge. He also shared the sentiment of American Catholic Romantics like Hecker, who believed that the war would yield a great conversion of the nation to the Catholic fold, an idea Marty paired with the words of John 11:4: “This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God.” Whatever his opinion of the war, the project marked Marty’s first work of scholarship in America.

Before the war’s end, Marty’s project produced one physical product in 1864: *Die katholische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, dargestellt von einheimischen Schriftstellern.* The book credits no specific editor, the subtitle attributes the German translation simply to the “Benedictines at St. Meinrad in the state in Indiana,” and a sycophantic foreword dedicates the work to King Ludwig I of Bavaria. The work

---

was not widely distributed, and only a dozen copies of the work can be found in American and European libraries today. Marty’s biographers attribute this rare work to him, and letters in Einsiedeln confirm this claim. Only Betschart and Kleber appear to have paged through a copy, and Kleber is the only biographer who provides any details about its content. However, even Kleber misses Marty’s explicit intentions for the project and its parallel with his academic work in Einsiedeln. A diligent analysis of the volume and its role in Marty’s greater project yields two key insights that reframe the significance of Marty’s first scholarly work in America: the work’s primary goal was not merely to enlighten German Catholics but rather to inspire German Catholic youth to embrace missionary work in America; and, consequently, the work reflected the objective of Marty’s earlier essays as a professor in Einsiedeln that invited youth to participate in a greater enterprise through the use of a biographical method.

The Project’s Framework

Marty’s true intentions behind the project emerge in his surviving correspondence with others on the matter. Before even broaching the topic with his abbot, Marty contacted Joseph Ferdinand Müller (1803–1864), Ludwig I’s court chaplain. Marty asked to dedicate the project to Ludwig I, a move that he thought would raise its profile and pique German interest in it. Explaining his project to Müller, Marty lamented how

---


191 Marty to Joseph Ferdinand Müller, 2 December 1862, 13:1460-62, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. The SMAA transcription states that the letter was to the Ludwig-Missionsverein via Müller; this, however, is incorrect. Müller was secretary of the society from 1847 to 1855, after which he remained a special royal agent for North American interest without any formal ties to the society. Therefore the letter was not a standard missionary report to the society asking for money but rather a personal letter simply asking for permission. See Roemer, *The Ludwig-Missionsverein*, 35-37.
European sympathy for the American missions had waned despite the work of the Ludwig-Missionsverein, and he attributed this trend to the reality that its annals offered “no overview, no whole, no history, allow no living insight into the condition, undertakings, progress of the American church (hopes, needs, joys).”\(^\text{192}\) He believed that this was the underlying reason for the apathy of many German Catholics and a dearth of missionary vocations “among the studying youth of Germany.” As a remedy, Marty introduced his project as a translation of American Catholic literature written by “living, excellent men” who could inspire German Catholic youth through their fluid and vivid prose. A translation was preferable to a new history because these authors reproduced original sources that could introduce German students to the accounts of American “eyewitnesses” and thus instill a “better and animated image of the American Church.”\(^\text{193}\) Marty even compared his project to the medieval chronicles as one with a perennial value for future historians.

Marty repeated these ideas in letters to his abbot and confreres in Einsiedeln. After receiving Müller’s enthusiastic support, Marty formally asked his abbot for permission to go ahead with the project.\(^\text{194}\) He provided more details to his former teacher.

\(^{192}\) Marty to Joseph Ferdinand Müller, 2 December 1862, 13:1461, SMAA. “Allerdings geben die Annalen manchmal Andeutungen über diesen Lebens- und Berufskreis aber wenn diese auch in alle Hände kämen, so gehen sie doch nur Vereinzeltes, Unzusammenhängendes, kein Überblick, kein Ganzes, keine Geschichte, gewähren keine lebendige Einsicht in die Zustände, Unternehmungen, Fortschritt der am. Kirche (Hoffnungen, Bedürfnisse, Freude).”


\(^{194}\) Marty to Schmid, 12 June 1863 (M18), 8:942, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
and colleague, Karl Brandes (1810–1867).\(^{195}\) Brandes was an intellectual light at Einsiedeln who published beyond Switzerland and conversed with the Tübingen Catholics.\(^{196}\) Looking to his former mentor for guidance, Marty shared with Brandes how he had already selected some 30 works for the project, had planned four volumes, and had the help of another German priest who was living with the community.\(^{197}\) He further expressed his amazement “that America has its own church history and literature, although I had heard nothing about it in Europe.”\(^{198}\)

Beyond his intentions, Marty’s correspondence with Müller and Brandes revealed a joint list that outlined the full scope of his four-volume project.\(^{199}\) Marty listed eleven works in his letter to Müller, and in his letter to Brandes he sketched a publishing plan for these works. He reserved the first volume for a general history, selecting a popular collection of speeches entitled *The Catholic History of North America* by the controversial Irish politician Thomas d’Arcy McGee (1825–1868).\(^{200}\) For a second


\(^{196}\) For example, see his history of the Benedictine Order: “Der Benediktiner-Orden nach seiner welthistorischen Bedeutung,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 33 (1851): 3-40.

\(^{197}\) Marty to Brandes, 10 June 1863, 13:1463-64, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. An English translation is in 4:1124-24, Pioneer Letters Box 4, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The only helper that Marty names is “Adelrich” in Marty to Schmid, 22 April 1864 (M21), 8:947, SMAA. Betschart further claims that one of Marty’s students, Joseph Alerding 1845-1924), also helped, although this may be from a confusion of names (*Apostel*, 48). Alderding later went on to become the fourth bishop of Ft. Wayne-South Bend, Indiana.

\(^{198}\) Marty to Brandes, 10 June 1863, 13:1463, SMAA. Marty repeated this same sentiment in a letter to Jared Sparks when asking to reproduce his “Life of Father Marquette.” Sparks was an Unitarian minister before becoming a popular American historian. See Marty to Jared Sparks, 1862, 13:1463, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA; English translation is in 3:1083, Pioneer Letters Box 3, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.

\(^{199}\) Marty specifies plans for a fourth volume in his June 1863 letter to Schmid (M21), even though he only speaks of three in his letter to Brandes.

\(^{200}\) Thomas D’Arcy McGee, *The Catholic History of North America: Five Discourse*, *to which are added two discourses on the relations of Ireland and America* (Boston: Donahoe, 1855). McGee was a journalist and a staunch advocate of Irish nationalism. After immigrating a second time, he moved from New York to Boston and eventually to Canada in 1857 before his election to its parliament and his assassination in 1868. The book gathered five lectures he gave across the U.S. around 1854 that connected

John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States* (New York: Kennedy, 1854). According to Cadden (Historiography, 25-6), Shea intended to show how the only tribes that remained were those evangelized by Catholic missionaries. Moreover, Shea sought to pose a “pertinent question: what was the Catholic Church in the United States doing to preserve the faith among the Catholic Indian tribes which had survived the white man’s conquest of the West?” (26).


Martin J. Spalding, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky* (Louisville: Webb, 1844); *Sketches of the Life, Times, and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, First Bishop of Louisville* (Louisville: Webb and Levering, 1852). The first work preserves many original sources that Spalding collected with the aid of Badin. See Cadden, *Historiography*, 66-67. This first work also raised Spalding’s national profile, along with his *D’Aubigné Reviewed*. His biographer notes that the second work on Flaget was a “decided improvement” over his other sketches and “perhaps the most scholarly biography written by an American Catholic before the Civil War.” It sold 1,500 copies in the first 6 months and inspired Spalding’s *Miscellanea* (1854). See Thomas Spalding, *Martin John Spalding: American Churchman* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1973), 96, 105.
Jesuit missionary whose legacy he later assumed in Dakota Territory. To De Smet’s accounts Marty added two more missionary stories: one on John Cheverus (1768–1836), the first bishop of Boston, by the French Sulpician André-Jean-Marie Hamon (1795–1874); and another, more famous account of the life of the Jesuit explorer Jacques Marquette (1637–1675) by the prominent Unitarian historian Jared Sparks (1789–1866). Marty also listed “various lives” from the United States Catholic Magazine, but he did not name them.

The full scope of this Brandes-Müller list did not become a published reality, but the list is worth reproducing for a variety of reasons. First, the list betrays not only Marty’s principal source but also his interpretation of this source. Here again his correspondence for the project is essential for understanding its published form. Marty’s familiarity with the authors of his list ultimately stems from his correspondence with John Gilmary Shea, the foremost American Catholic historian of the nineteenth century. Marty’s fascination with Anglo-American accounts of U.S. history led him to Shea as a Catholic pioneer. In a letter to Shea, Marty asked to translate one of his works for his project, and at the same time he asked Shea to direct him to “a short account of American literature and historical and Catholic literature.”

---

204. These are The Indian Missions in the United States of America under the Care of the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus (Philadelphia: King and Baird, 1841), Oregon Missions and Travels over the Rocky Mountains, in 1845-46 (New York: Dunigan, 1847), and Voyage au Grand-Désert, en 1851 (Brussels: Vandereydt, 1853).


206. At least one scholar describes this Catholic periodical as more “erudite” than its contemporaries, and for this reason it lasted only from 1843 to 1847. See Cadden, Historiography, 16.

207. Marty to John Gilmary Shea, no date, 13:1464, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. A second copy is in 4:1084-85, Pioneer Letters Box 4, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The original does not survive but only the transcription, which records Marty asking Shea for his
copy of a three-part essay that he had published in the *Metropolitan*. As outlined below, Marty reproduced this essay in German. The essay’s content is telling, because it lists many of the sources that Marty outlines in his letter to Müller.\(^{208}\) Marty used this essay as the guide for his project, but he did not follow it slavishly. His list for Müller adds some works and omits others.\(^{209}\) Consequently, Marty filtered Shea’s work as much as he translated it, and thus the Müller-Brandes list reveals not only Marty’s source in Shea but also his lens for interpretation.

What is Marty’s lens of interpretation? To begin with, the list shows how Marty viewed his new American home through the prism of Einsiedeln. Marty’s interest in a wide range of the other American Catholic authors demonstrates that he maintained a love for literature that Einsiedeln had inculcated in him as a youth. As in Einsiedeln, Marty viewed his new American world through the lens of history, and he looked to American Catholic literature to locate St. Meinrad’s place in both local and national narratives. His choice of sources in the list is thus telling. Aside from McGee’s history, the works that he chooses are more or less missionary accounts. Ever since his days translating annals, the missionary was Marty’s hero. Although this focus on missionary biographies arises primarily from Marty’s objective to pique the interest of European youth in missionary work, it also reflects Marty’s vision of divine providence in history that he embraced in Einsiedeln. His idea of exceptional, providential men shaping history inspired his study of monastic education (Walafrid Strabo) and his homily for his “Life of Marquette.” It is unclear whether Marty thought Shea (rather than Sparks) was the author of this work, or whether this is a transcription error. 


\(^{209}\) For instance, Shea mentions the works of Campbell, Spalding, and De Smet, but he does not point to Sparks’s work or the biography of Cheverus. Marty also adds De Smet’s *Voyage au Grand-Désert, en 1851*, a work he probably knew from his days in Einsiedeln.
students to imitate the humility and poverty of St. Meinrad. As he did in his 1858 essay, Marty targets German youth through inspirational biographies. This idea of providential men in history resurfaces later in Marty’s history of the Benedictine Order and his missionary undertakings.

Content

The content of the sole physical volume that Marty produced follows his earlier intentions and realizes his biographical mode of interpretation. The volume’s emphasis is on missionary history, and it combines his plans for the first two volumes into one, 518-page volume. Marty divides the work into three main sections with a forward. The foreword is Marty’s only original contribution to the book, and the rest of the sections are translations of McGee, Shea, and various papal decrees and historical letters.

Marty uses his foreword to repeat the ideas and intentions that he expressed to Müller and Brandes and to introduce his sources. He points to the war as an opportunity for German interest in America, and proceeds to give detailed statistics on the number of German immigrants in America state-by-state. He quotes John Hughes, Archbishop of New York, on how his recent travels to Europe (representing the Union) revealed how little Europeans know about America. Marty uses this authority as a justification for his work, and again he argues that the translation of American authors is the best method for giving German readers an authentic account. He then presents each of his three sections. The first, noted above, is Shea’s “Overview of Catholic Literature in the United
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210 Marty, foreword to Die katholische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten, xi-xiii.
States,” published as a three-part series in the *Metropolitan* (the successor of the *U.S. Catholic Magazine*) in 1854. Marty claims that Shea “improved and expanded” the original publication for this translation. The second contains the only work that Marty names in his letters to Müller and Brandes: McGee’s *The Catholic History of North America*. Marty identifies McGee an “excellent historian” (a naïve assertion) known to attract large audiences even in the midst of winter. The third section Marty identifies as an invaluable “American Martyrology.” This work he also attributes to Shea, whom he calls “the father of American ecclesiastical historiography,” and claims that the work first appeared in Shea’s *History of the Catholic Missions*. Marty reserves most of his commentary for this particular work, telling his European readers how the first three centuries of North American Catholicism was a “period of martyrs” no less heroic and bloodstained than the “tribunals and amphitheaters” of the Old World. He does not mention the logic for his appendix of historical documents, but he does state that he hopes to follow this volume with one on the seven ecclesiastical provinces of America in a similar manner, that is, by American historians themselves. He closes his foreword with a qualification that the work is not designed to serve a “narrow specialty” but rather enlighten the “educated” and, “most especially the German studying youth” and thus


213 Marty, forward to *Die katholische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten*, xv.


“awaken the call to mission activity in the new world” through “great examples” of “courage and sacrifice in this glorious and immense field.”

**Significance**

Marty’s foreword is both the key to understanding the content of the book and also an obstacle. Kleber, the only biographer who refers to this foreword, fails to apply a critical eye to Marty’s work and thus misrepresents its content. His most glaring omission is the true nature of the book’s “American Martyrology.” A comparison of Marty’s translation against Shea’s *History of the Catholic Missions* proves that they are completely different texts, contrary to Marty’s description. Unlike the historical narrative of Shea’s *History*, this martyrology is a series of individual biographies that Shea compiled in preparation for his book but in fact never published. Marty’s letter to Shea sheds some light on how Marty acquired this unpublished text, since he asks Shea for any “unedited papers” that he could also translate. Shea must have sent Marty his unpublished notes for his *History*, and he likely intended to publish them eventually as the first “American Martyrology.” This 634-page, handwritten manuscript survives as a bound collection of quotations and biographies in the University of Notre Dame Archives. The manuscript bears the exact same name as Marty’s translation, assembles the same quotations from Protestant historians (e.g., Bancroft and Sparks), and organizes
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216 Ibid., xvi. “Mit dieser Arbeit wollen wir weniger der engern Fachgelehrsamkeit dienen, als vielmehr allen Gebildeten und besonders der deutschen, studirenden Jugend eine angenehme und bildende Lektüre bieten. Alle unsere Mühe wäre uns besonders dann reichlich gelohnt, wenn es uns gelingen sollte, den in den Herzen so mancher deutschen Jünglinge schlummernden Beruf zur Missionsthätigkeit in der neuen Welt, zu wecken und durch die großen Beispiele, die wir ihnen hier vorführen, ihren Muth und ihre Opferwilligkeit auf dieses so herrliche und unermeßliche Feld für hingebende Thätigkeit hinzulenken.”


218 Marty to John Gilmary Shea, no date, 13:1465, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
some twenty-five biographies of the earliest Catholic martyrs in America, including
longer accounts for the French Jesuits Isaac Jogues (1604–1646) and René Goupil (1608–
1642).\textsuperscript{219} It also contains the same appendix of papal decrees and historical documents as
Marty’s translation. These include Columbus’s supposed will, Alexander VI’s bull on the
discovery of the Americas, Paul III’s letter on the human dignity of indigenous peoples in
America, Alonso de Ojeda’s proclamation, excerpts on the Jesuits by Canadian
historians, and John Carroll’s letter to George Washington and the president’s reply.\textsuperscript{220}
Kleber also mistakes this appendix as Marty’s own rather than from Shea’s unpublished
manuscript.\textsuperscript{221} In the end, Marty produced the only published copy of Shea’s
martyrology, albeit in German. Another martyrology for American Catholics did not
appear until F.G. Holweck’s in the \textit{Catholic Historical Review} in the early twentieth
century.\textsuperscript{222} This work became something of a rallying point for popular petitions that
sought the canonization of North America’s early missionaries, leading to the formal
canonization of the North America Martyrs in 1930.\textsuperscript{223} One can only wonder what earlier
impact Shea’s manuscript would have been if Marty had published it in English.

Aside from overlooking Marty’s sources and their historical context, Kleber also
fails to ask larger questions about the work’s significance. He does cite a favorable
review of the book in a German Catholic periodical, as well as Peter Guilday’s private
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comment to a latter abbot of St. Meinrad that “the idea involved is about the best thing that has been done in its line.” Both suggest that the book garnered some attention on both sides of the Atlantic. However, a better question is why Marty chose Shea’s martyrology over his published History of the Catholic Missions or the other biographies listed in his letters to Müller and Brandes. In light of Marty’s biographical method, especially his 1857 essay on Strabo, the reason for the choice is obvious. Shea’s martyrology offers individual stories that read like medieval chronicles. As noted, Marty compared his project to these chronicles in his letter to Müller, and Marty further argued that this biographical style was missing from the annals of missionary societies. For Marty, only individual biographies could inspire youth to follow the missionaries’ footsteps, since youth needed to identify with a person rather than an impersonal movement. This is exactly how Marty approached the studierende Jugend, the “studying youth” of Einsiedeln through his writings as a professor.

Nevertheless, one could ask a further question beyond Marty’s intention: how did his sources, including Shea’s martyrology, influence him? Marty was likely unaware of these missionaries and their stories before the project. De Smet was probably an exception, but these stories of De Smet’s predecessors put the entire missionary history of America in perspective for Marty. The project and its martyrology was likely one of Marty’s prime inspirations for his latter missionary efforts. For instance, if Marty was not already aware of the appendix’s papal decree on the human dignity and protection of indigenous peoples, it undoubtedly stood in the background of Marty’s later criticism of the U.S. government’s Indian policy. More importantly, Marty said little about how the
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224 Peter Guilday to Athanasius Schmitt, 3 August 1925, quoted in Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 176. Kleber cites a review in Literarischer Handweiser (History of St. Meinrad, 176n50).
Benedictines’ missionary calling included the Indians prior to the 1860s, and his 1852 panegyric as a student remained completely silent on the “Indians” of the New World. Up to this point Marty’s focus, as well as that of his confreres, was on German Catholics in America. Even though his translation project was ultimately unsuccessful, it marks a shift in his vision as Marty began to look beyond Euro-American settlers to the souls of the American frontier.

“Seelsorge”

Up to this point, this chapter has demonstrated how Marty reorganized St. Meinrad’s monastery and school by applying his monastic experience at Einsiedeln to the American mission. To do so, the section has recognized and expanded Yock’s thesis that Marty distanced his vision from that of Wimmer by way of an *excurrendo* model, in which monks ministered to the surrounding countryside from the same monastery rather than individual, scattered priory-parishes.\(^{225}\) Naturally, the same holds true for Marty’s third task: missionary work. Yock outlines three dimensions of this work: parish missions (*Volksmission*), worship (especially processions), and lay associations (sodalities).\(^{226}\) Integral to all three was lay participation, what Yock describes as an “essential ingredient” that ensured that the faithful had a “common objective, one in which they could all have a part and take pride.”\(^{227}\) Nevertheless, Yock is unable to recognize Marty’s particular contribution to this vision of missionary work and thus overlooks the transatlantic character behind Marty’s vision. Rather than repeat Yock’s study, this section identifies what Marty inherited and what he contributed. It shows how Marty


\(^{226}\) Ibid., 171.

\(^{227}\) Ibid., 212, 110.
inherited parish missions and liturgical celebrations while he also instituted his own vision for lay associations through sodalities and oblates.

**Parish Missions**

Marty’s predecessors at the mission set a precedence of importation and adaptation. A notable example is the monks’ organization of a “Triduum” series in 1855 to mark the papal proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The “Triduum” was a three-day parish retreat model drawn from Einsiedeln, including preaching, rosaries, litanies, and Eucharistic adoration.\(^{228}\) Despite its apparent success, the monks quickly turned to the German-Catholic *Volksmission* or parish mission model that was more common in antebellum America. As noted above, Marty stated in his 1861 “Résumé” that monks had turned to this model as a means of uniting disparate ethnic groups into a stable parish.\(^{229}\) The founding and administration of parishes in the region went hand-in-hand with the occasional parish mission and its ability to revive religious enthusiasm and unite parishioners. This plan preceded Marty, as the monks were already facilitating parish missions and inviting renowned revivalists like Francis Xavier Weninger as early as 1858.\(^{230}\) The monks followed Weninger’s eight-day template for missions, with general and particular sermons designed to direct listeners to confession, communion, and devotional societies.\(^{231}\) Between 1858 and 1868 the monks conducted some 41 missions in the area. O’Connor and Foffa were in high demand, and Marty was

\[^{228}\text{Ibid., 171. The only other Triduum recorded was given by O’Connor in Terre Haute in 1872. See Marty to Schmid, 3 December 1872 (M70), 8:1005, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.}\]

\[^{229}\text{Marty, “Résumé,” 355. See, chapter 2, 144.}\]

\[^{230}\text{Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 176, 178.}\]

\[^{231}\text{Ibid., 180-81. On Weninger’s role in Catholic revivalism, see Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism*, 21, 146.}\]
also respected as an effective mission preacher. Yet even as he recognized their inherent value, Marty began to question whether these missions were stretching the community, writing in an early report to Munich that “our family is much too small” for such work. After 1868 and Marty’s consolidation of St. Meinrad’s missionary work, missions given by the monks decreased to a mere five by the century’s end. However, the devotions that the missions had promoted continued, especially the Forty Hours Eucharistic devotion.

**Worship**

Marty’s predecessors also brought Einsiedeln’s liturgical tradition to St. Meinrad and fostered a symbolic connection between monks and laity in worship. The monastery’s church, built by Foffa and Christen between 1857 and 1859, serves as a prime example. It followed the floor plan of Einsieden’s *Stiftskirche*, with a double altar separating the monks’ choir from the rest of the sanctuary and side altars devoted to St. Meinrad and St. Benedict in each transept. Like Einsiedeln, the architecture and aesthetics of the mission church indicated a distinction between monks and laity while simultaneously fostering a connection through worship. The monks accommodated lay attendance by moving liturgies to the larger sanctuary for Sundays and special feasts (much like Einsiedeln), and for Forty Hours devotions the monks led the laity with the
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232 Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 177-78, 263-66. For Marty’s accounts of missions see: Marty to Schmid, 13 November 1861 (M9), 8:928; Marty to Schmid, 17 September 1863 (M19), 8:942; Marty to Schmid, 22 April 1864 (M21), 8:947; Marty to Morel, 19 October 1865 (M30), 8:956, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 140.
233 Marty to Gregor von Scherr (Ludwig-Missionsverein), 7 November 1862, 13:1459, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
235 Ibid., 181-84.
236 Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 118-19; Marty to Morel, 24 June 1864 (M22), 8:948, SMAA.
monastic office instead of rosaries and other diocesan prayers. In Yock’s words, “Unity through worship was the goal of the monks…the monks believed that good worship made good Catholics.”237 The monastery thus became the liturgical center of the region.

When he arrived, Marty heartily endorsed this tradition of lay participation and expanded it. One of his first actions as adminstrator was the establishment of the town of St. Meinrad with its own parish, marking the jubilee of 1861. The monks did not want the monastery’s church to function as a parish, yet at the same time they wanted Catholics to settle near the monastery and participate in its liturgies as in Einsiedeln. Marty even expanded the sanctuary for the laity in 1864.238 His greatest joy of lay participation came with the Corpus Christi processions that the mission had held since 1858. Marty expressed the evangelization potential of such an event in his Résumé of 1861, and he orchestrated a grand procession later that year to mark both Corpus Christi and the Einsiedeln’s jubilee year. The Wahrheitsfreund covered the event with fascination, recording the participation of all ages and sexes. Men built altars, women wove wreaths, children joined the procession, and soldiers fired cannons in celebration.239 So that all the faithful of the region could attend, the monks held processions at various parishes throughout the octave. Yet it is Marty’s comments about a similar Corpus Christi procession toward the end of the decade, in 1869, that best demonstrate how much he valued lay participation and devotion: “Our celebration here is more to my taste than those in Einsiedeln. It is more a thing of the people than of the monastery.” Marty added to this that in America all participated with joy in such processions and, unlike in Einsiedeln, there were no disrespectful bystanders or “soldiers who point at the girls with

238 Ibid., 156; Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 119.
their guns.”240 He concluded his letter with a detailed list of all the lay associations
(Vereine) that participated. This list, however, demonstrates more than just lay
participation at the mission; it also reveals Marty’s pastoral contribution to St. Meinrad’s
missionary work through lay associations.

**Pastoral Contribution: Lay Associations**

Aside from the ideas that Marty inherited for missionary work, he also introduced
one of his own. Marty established and developed two types of lay associations tied to the
monastery: sodalities and oblates. As with his other contributions in monastic liturgy and
scholarship, this contribution imported traditions and ideas from Marty’s experience of
Einsiedeln and sought Catholic unity as its primary objective. A more detailed study of
Marty’s role in the formation of sodalities and Marian devotion at St. Meinrad moves
beyond Yock’s work and better appreciates how Marty applied and transformed his
Swiss-Benedictine experience for his vision for America.

**Sodalities**

In order to make sense of Marty’s contribution through sodalities, one must return
to Marty’s list of lay associations for the 1869 Corpus Christi procession. Yock relies
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240 Marty to Morel, 27 May 1869 (M136), 8:1047, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln
Archives Series, SMAA. “Unsere Feier hier ist mehr nach meinem Geschmäcke als die in E. Es ist mehr
Volkssache als bloß Klostersache. In der ganzen Gemeinde ist keine Seele, die nicht mithält und sich
mitfreut und glücklich ist, in irgend einer Weise mitzuwirken, es sind keine Koffer und Eckenstein, auch
keine Milizien, die auf die Mädels zielen mit ihren Gewehren.” A different English translation can be found
in 4:1297-99, Box 4, Pioneer Letters, Historical Archival Series, SMAA. Neither the German transcription
nor the original (M136, Folder 7, A.RG-II, KAE) has a date, but from the context Marty was obviously
writing on Corpus Christi, which was on May 27, 1869. Likewise, Marty states that O’Connor was at St.
Benedict’s Priory in Kansas for the dedication of its new church. This happened in the spring of 1869. See
Peter Beckman, *Kansas Monks: A History of St. Benedict's Abbey* (Atchison, Kas.: Abbey Student Press,
1957), 88.
almost exclusively on this list for his description of St. Meinrad’s lay associations. He misreads the letter’s list and overlooks its greater context, stemming from his reliance on an imprecise English translation rather than the German original. The German text outlines five groups, four of which are clearly “Verine” or sodalities: boys and youth of the St. Benedict’s Sodality, girls and “virgins” of the St. Gertrude the Great Sodality, the students in cassocks “just like at home,” men of the St. Meinrad Sodality and, finally, women of the St. Anne Sodality. At first glance, the list reflects Marty’s milieu and suggests nothing original. The pastoral of the bishops for the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore encouraged the proliferation of pious societies among Catholics, and German Catholics were renowned for their love of Vereine in parish life. Yock notes this popularity and points to the establishment of lay associations in parishes prior to Marty’s arrival, especially through the work of Kundek and Christen.

Marty’s list, however, differs from other Catholic associations and bears his mark in two ways: the sodalities are not associated with a parish but rather the monastery, and most assume the name of Benedictine saints. A closer look at the historical context of sodalities at St. Meinrad further leads one to the reason why the students are included in the list: they form their own “Marian” sodality “just like at home,” that is, just like the
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242 Yock’s list on p. 215 is identical (including its omission of ellipses) to one in 4:1298, Pioneer Letters, Box 4, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The German transcription is cited above (Marty to Morel, 27 May 1869 [M136], 8:1047, SMAA) and the original is in M136, A.RG-2, KAE.
243 Marty to Morel, 27 May 1869 (M136), 8:1047, SMAA. “Voran gingen ex more Kreuz und Fahne des hl. Altarssakramentes, denn die Knaben und der St. Benediktus-Jünglingsverein mit ihren Auszeichnungen, hinter ihnen die Mädchen und Jungfrauen-Verein d. hl. Gertrudis magnae mit ihrem Vereinsfahnen und Jungfernkränzen. Hernach T. Benedikts-Fahnen und die Studenten in Talar Chorrock tout comme chez nous - die Feldmusik derselben….hinter dem Somum [?] die Männer und endlich die Frauen resp. der St. Meinrads - und St. Anna Verein.” Yock adds “Young Ladies Sodality” to his list and separates it from the “St. Gertrude Society.” The German suggests that the two are the same.
students of Einsiedeln. This is the key to Marty’s two-fold contribution to sodalities at St. Meinrad: he applies sodality life to the school, and he gives sodality life a distinctly Swiss-Benedictine character. This contribution echoes his work as student president of the Marian Sodality in Einsiedeln and manifests the ideas of his 1858 essay.

Marty’s contribution is at first elusive because of a dearth of sources, and this is undoubtedly why Yock overlooks the student sodality. Marty speaks little of sodalities in his letters, yet he unmistakably refers to a student “sodality” in the school, and the first time that he mentions it he names it the “Marian sodality” with its own monk “director” (Präses). According to Marty, this sodality also held school theatrical and musical performances and intellectual debates or “declamations.” This description matches Marty’s “Marian Academy” in Einsiedeln with its combination of pious and intellectual objectives, as does its oversight by a “director” (which Marty was in Einsiedeln) from the monastic community. Other letters point to the feasts of St. Benedict, St. Meinrad, and Our Lady of Einseideln as days for the induction of new members, and Kleber further confirms that this sodality had both the Virgin and St. Meinrad as its celestial patrons. This combination of feasts and patronage mirrors perfectly Marty’s Marian Sodality manual from Einsiedeln. Moreover, Marty appears to have founded this sodality at the same time that he reopened the school in January of 1861, thus using the sodality not
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246 Marty to Schmid, 17 September 1863 (M19), 8:842: “…und P. Meinrad [Meinrad McCarthy, d. 1914] als Präses der marianischen Sodalität;” Marty to Schmid, 22 April 1864 (M21), 8:946: “…Nachmittag 2 Uhr hatten die Studenten eine Sodalitätsversammlung, wobei zwölf neue Mitglieder aufgenommen wurden…” Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.


248 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 145. See also Marty to Schmid, 22 April 1864 (M21), 8:946, SMAA; Mundwiler to “Herr Doktor,” 2 April 1879 (F25), 9:1073, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

249 Die Marianische Sodalität für die studierenden Jünglinge der Schulanstalt des Stiftes Maria Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1852), 15.
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only as a means to institutionalize his ideas and successes in Einseideln, but also to mark
Einsiedeln’s millennial jubilee.\(^{250}\) Overall, Marty’s establishment of the Marian sodality
signals a transformation of Einsiedeln’s model to Indiana and his intention to form a
sodality life at St. Meinrad that was more academic and Benedictine in character.\(^ {251}\)

**Oblates**

Marty’s contribution to lay spiritual life also extended to the formation of St.
Meinrad’s lay oblates. Benedictine oblates are lay persons who follow the *Rule* outside of
the monastery and without any formal vows. Unlike a typical devotional sodality, oblates
imitate the monastic life by praying the office daily and receiving spiritual guidance from
a monk. As one scholar has recently noted, the historical development of lay oblates as
they exist today is complicated and understudied, and “not a single thread” connects the
present with the ancient past.\(^ {252}\) Despite this lacuna, it is certain that interest in lay oblates

\(^{250}\) I admit that this latter point is debatable. Kleber claims that archival records state that the sodality
was founded on July 21, 1861, and that this is a mistake since the students would have been on vacation.
He opines that the foundation date was actually June 21, 1861, since it would have been the feast of St.
Aloysius (commonly the patron of boys) and the handwriting for “July” is difficult to decipher. However, it
makes little sense that Marty would have founded a sodality at the end of a school year and in the middle
of June. Rather, I am convinced that “July” (Juli) is actually “Jan.” (Jän). In my research I have repeatedly
encounter this problem, in which Marty’s handwriting for “Juli” looks very similar to the vowels and
punctuation of “Jän.” Furthermore, January 21, 1861, was the millennial feast of St. Meinrad and coincided

\(^ {251}\) Many of these sodalities also had their own libraries for what Marty called “useful and most
necessary reading.” See Marty to Gregor von Scherr (Ludwig-Missionsverein), 7 November 1862, 13:1458,
Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Two other associations that Marty
promoted were the “Society for the Propagation of the Faith” (Marty, “Bericht” [1869], 30) and the
Apostleship of Prayer (Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 141-2; Marty to “Spiritual Mother,” 14 October
1867 [M43], 8:973, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA).

\(^ {252}\) Roberta Werner, *Reaching for God: The Benedictine Oblate Way of Life* (Collegeville, Minn.:
Liturgical Press, 2013), 79; Werner is one of the few scholars to give any documented history of the oblates
in America. However, she focuses only on the American-Cassinese and most of her account details St.
Benedict’s in St. Joseph, Minnesota. Her only source for the nineteenth century is an unpublished, online
manual (“Oblate Formation Book,” 2002) which in turn bases its history on two sources: Alcuin Deutsch,
*Manual for Oblates of St. Benedict* (Collegeville, Minn.: St. John’s Press, 1937) and Leander Schnerr,
arose in the nineteenth century among Marty and his contemporaries. Rome first granted permission for secular oblates toward the end the century, and only in 1894 did the archabbot of St. Vincent Abbey formally secure a papal decree to introduce “secular oblates” to monasteries in the United States. Nevertheless Wimmer expressed interest in a “third order” of lay Benedictines as early as 1865, and the first publication of his foundation in Minnesota, St. John’s Abbey, was a pamphlet that encouraged students and parishioners to join a similar organization. It is possible that Marty adopted the idea from his American-Cassinese confreres, and Edward Schoughnessy’s history of the oblates at St. Meinrad documents how Marty actually wrote Wimmer for advice in founding his own oblate institute.

Like the sodality, the idea of oblates was not original to Marty. However, his particular implementation of the idea escapes both Yock and Schoughnessy. Yock mistakes Marty’s founding of the Marian Sodality in 1861 for a “St. Benedict Sodality” that eventually became the “Oblates of St. Benedict” in 1879. The sources he cites do

Saint-Martin de Ligugé, 1927). Deroux is more thorough but has nothing on the oblates in the nineteenth century.

253 Schnerr, Manual of the Secular Oblates, 6. The Italian Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance (Subiaco Congregation) was the first to receive permission in 1891. See pp. 47 and 54 for the relevant decrees.


255 Marty to Wimmer, 28 February 1879, SVAA, translated in Edward Shaughnessy, The Benedictine Oblates of St. Meinrad Archabbey: A Brief History, 1879–1999 (St. Meinrad, Ind.: Abbey Press, 2000), 94. “So I request that Your Grace assist me with counsel and deed in this matter, with which you are familiar through many years of experience.”

256 Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 191. Yock cites Marty’s April 1864 letter to Schmid (M21, cited above). The German, which I have quoted above, speaks only of a “sodality gathering” on the feast of St. Benedict; it never calls this the “Sodality of St. Benedict.” The sodality in this letter seems to be the “Marian Sodality” designated in a letter from a few months earlier (M19). It should also be noted that the Marian Academy in Einsiedeln gathered on St. Benedict’s feast day because it provided free time to host special events. Finally, Yock also cites another letter to support his point: Marty to Ildefons Hürlimann, 2 January 1886 (M117), 8:1056-57, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
not support this conclusion. Kleber and Shaughnessy rightly limit the founding of oblates at St. Meinrad to March 21, 1879, which was the twenty-five-year jubilee of St. Meinrad’s founding.\textsuperscript{257} For the occasion, Marty announced the formal establishment of, in his words, a “Third Order” that required monthly instruction. After a year, the members would be “ceremoniously incorporated” into the Order with a liturgy “in the cloister itself.”\textsuperscript{258} The success of this project is unclear, since Marty became vicar apostolic of Dakota Territory later that year, and his successor, Fintan Mundwiler, did not embrace the idea.\textsuperscript{259} Nevertheless, all three scholars neglect what Marty explicitly designated as the manual for his movement in 1879: “The booklet of Reverend Father Claudius, \textit{Third Order of St. Benedict of Perpetual Adoration}, Einsiedeln, 1862, will serve as the basis for the instruction as well as for the entire undertaking.”\textsuperscript{260} The “Claudius” of this line is Claudius Perrot, Marty’s former novice master in Einsiedeln. Chapter one has already shown how influential Claudius was on Marty’s spirituality, and the idea of a lay “third order” may have come in no small part from this Swiss confrere.

\textsuperscript{257} Schaufhnessy, \textit{The Benedictine Oblates of St. Meinrad}, 24. See also Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 233.

\textsuperscript{258} Marty to Frowin Conrad, 27 March 1879, Conception Abbey Archives (CAA), translated in Edward Shaughnessy, \textit{The Benedictine Oblates of St. Meinrad}, 100. Mundwiler confirms this event: Mundwiler to “Herr Doktor,” 2 April 1879 (F25), 9:1073, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. It is interesting that Mundwiler refers to it as “The Third Order of St. Benedict of Perpetual Adoration.”

\textsuperscript{259} Schaufhnessy, 24-25. The nomenclature of a “Third Order” also became problematic because it could be confused with the Franciscan “third order” which was not lay but religious.

\textsuperscript{260} Marty to Frowin Conrad, 27 March 1879, Conception Abbey Archives (CAA), translated in Edward Shaughnessy, \textit{The Benedictine Oblates of St. Meinrad}, 100. In Henggeler’s \textit{Professbuch}, this exact title does not exist under the works of Claudius Perrot. The closest title listed is \textit{Geistlicher Bund zur Theilnahme an der ewigen Anbetung des allerheiligsten Altars-Sakraments: Errichtet im lobwürdigem Frauenkloster M. Einsiedeln in der Au.}(Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1862). Marty is likely referring to an abridged version of this work. See Henggeler, \textit{Professbuch}, 509.
Another Swiss source for the idea was probably his former mentor, Karl Brandes. In his commentary, Brandes speaks of an “early” Benedictine tradition of lay persons, sometimes called “oblates,” who belonged to the “monastic family” and made limited vows. He endorses this model and calls for its recovery as a “third branch of the Order” composed of lay people who could live the Rule’s “evangelical ideal” and “cooperate” with the mission of the monastery in the world. Marty’s establishment of a “Third Order,” albeit brief, echoes these ideas of his Swiss mentor. Moreover, it resonates with Marty’s earlier essay on student associations. In the essay, Marty described each member as “an epicenter, from which radiates in larger or smaller circles the invitation to serve God.” Members of his lay “third order” were to do the same with their “epicenter” as the monastery.

---

261 See above, chapter 2, 171n195.
262 Karl Brandes, Erklärung der Regel des heiligen Vaters Benedikt (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1857). This was volume three (numerically, not chronologically) for his three-part series, Leben und Regel des heiligen Vaters Benedikt: Patriarchen der Mönche des Abendlandes. The other two volumes are Regel des heiligen Vaters Benedikt: Deutsch nach der Originalausgabe von Monte Cassino (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1856) and Leben des heiligen Vaters Benedikt (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1858).
263 Karl Brandes, Erklärung des Regels der heiligen Vaters Benedikts, 573-75. “Außerdem gab es von frühe an auch Solche, die zur klösterlichen Familie gehörten, und doch dem Kloster nicht durch dieselbe Form der Gelübde, wie die Mönche selbst verbunden waren, und die entweder einfache Gelübde oder bloßes Handgelübde ablegten. Sie heißen Dargebrachte, Uebergebene, Oblaten u. s. w….Aus den gleichen Gründen können, neben der eigentlichen Ordensmiliz unserer Manns-und Frauenklöster, auch Personen aller Stände in der Welt als ein dritter Zweig des Ordens, in nähere Beziehung zu der heiligen Regel treten. Personen, die in der Welt leben müssen und in derselben ihre Berufs- und Standespflichten zu erfüllen haben, aber wegen innerer Geistesverwandtschaft sich getrieben fühlen der starken geistigen Verbindung des Ordens irgendwie anzugehören und seine Kämpfe mit ihm zu kämpfen, nehmen, um ihre ernstere Gesinnung in Mitte weltlicher Frivolität leichter zu bewahren, mit einer äußern Tracht, die sich von der gewöhnlichen standesmäßigen Kleidung nur durch größern Ernst in Schnitt und Farbe unterscheidet, vom Geiste der heiligen Regel in ihr Leben mit auf, was sich mit demselben vereinigen läßt. Sie halten sich so nahe als es in ihren Verhältnissen möglich ist, an das evangelische Ideal, welches die Regel verwirklichen soll. So nehmen auch sie wie am Leben so auch an allen Früchten des Ordens Theil; und so heiligen sich durch die Regel mitten in der Welt, Männer, Frauen, Jünglinge, Jungfrauen, die nicht in's Kloster kommen können, denen aber das Kloster sozusagen entgegenkommt.”
The present section has outlined Marty’s vision and implementation of St. Meinrad’s monastery-school-missionary work model. Venturing beyond his biographers, the section has also identified Marty’s monastic, scholarly, and pastoral contributions to this model. Moreover, it has shown how each contribution stems from his prior experience and work in Einsiedeln. The section has further demonstrated how Marty forged his own American vision of Benedictine evangelization through an integration of elements from American Catholicism, Benedictine revivalism, and Swiss-Benedictine monasticism. Marty adopted ideas from all three traditions, adapted these ideas to address the exigencies of his monks and the lay faithful, and challenged the culture of his new home through this blending of traditions. Overall, the primary objectives of his leadership, both as administrator and prior, was to stabilize the mission, ensure its permanence, and preserve its Benedictine character. To accomplish the latter, Marty gradually emphasized the role of the monastery and its communal prayer life in relation to the school and missionary work. As the following section shows, this emphasis challenged not only American Catholics but also other American Benedictine monks.

III. Stability and the 1868 Wimmer-Marty Controversy

Marty’s desire to return to his abbot’s threefold mission of a house of prayer, a school, and missionary work required a framework that he borrowed from his experience in Einsiedeln. At the heart of Marty’s Benedictine vision for America was his interpretation of “stabilitas” in Benedict’s Rule. Marty’s earliest concerns about the “cito
fit, cito perit” character of American life shared Wimmer’s idealization of Benedictine stability as an antidote to American superficiality and instability. The question of how to apply the Rule’s vow of stability to American culture became a pressing question, and after the Civil War it became a point of controversy between the two American Benedictine leaders. However, the full scope of their conflicting interpretations of “stabilitas” has escaped the notice of their biographers. The problem stems from an archival complication: the debate on Benedictine stability between Marty and Wimmer comes down to four letters, all penned in 1868, that have been preserved in different locations, misfiled, or neglected altogether; they have never been placed in dialogue with one another. Consequently, some scholars have focused on one collection and other scholars on another, leaving any reconstruction of the debate and its chronology incomplete. Moreover, Wimmer’s letters have eclipsed Marty’s side of the debate as

265 The four letters, in chronological order, are the following: (1) Marty to Wimmer, 3 September 1868; (2) Wimmer to Marty, 19 September 1868; (3) Marty to Wimmer, 4 November 1868; (4) Wimmer to Marty, 22 November 1868. The first letter’s original copy is in Folder VAB1 FM13 (Marty), SVAA; a handwritten copy by Kleber (retaining the Kurrentschrift) is in Pages 3-4, Folder “Latrobe,” Box 3, Kleber: Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA. The second’s original copy is A.RGII.7.48, KAE (Marty forwarded the original to Einsiedeln); a transcription in German is in 8:985-86, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA; an incomplete English translation is in 4:1280-82, Pioneer Letters, Box 4, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The third’s original exists in a photocopy form in Folder VAB1 FM14 (Marty) 1870-1887, SVAA (misfiled); a handwritten copy by Kleber (retaining the Kurrentschrift) is on Pages 7-10, Folder “Latrobe,” Box 3, Kleber: Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA. The fourth letter is the best known. Its original, as well as a German transcription, is in Folder VAB1, FM13, SVAA. An English translation of the letter appears in Oetgen, Boniface Wimmer: Letters, 323-26. I am grateful to Fr. Andrew Campbell, Archivist of St. Vincent Archabbey, for his generous aid in obtaining copies from his collection.

scholars have focused almost exclusively on the issue of the common novitiate and house of studies. Marty’s interpretation of stability in the Rule, as well as his emphasis on the familial character of Benedictine monastery, have received at best a cursory glance.

This lacuna in American Benedictine scholarship is significant because the exchange between Wimmer and Marty determined the formation of a separate Swiss-American Congregation, resulting in two independent Benedictine branches in America. In other words, the debate altered the course of American Benedictine history and its development. If Marty had agreed with Wimmer, or if Wimmer had been able to persuade Marty, St. Meinrad would have joined the American-Cassinese Congregation and assumed Wimmer’s vision for American evangelization. Consequently, the debate is essential for understanding how Marty differentiated his Swiss-Benedictine model (Ordenshaus, Schule, Seelsorge) from Wimmer’s Bavarian model. A reconstruction of the debate demonstrates how the point of contention was not organization but vision. A retrieval of Marty’s letters in the debate reveals how he combined a theological

---

267 Kleber’s work is the exception. He quotes a list of reasons that the St. Meinrad monks gave to their abbot why they did not like the Bavarian statutes and their interpretation of stability. See History of St. Meinrad, 209. Nevertheless, Kleber has nothing to say about Marty’s role behind this opinion in his History. Both Oetgen and Rippinger cite Kleber when discussing the formation of a separate Swiss-American Congregation, but both neglect the issue of stability. Oetgen’s latest study of the American-Cassinese speaks only of a preference of traditions: “American-Cassinese Congregation: I,” 251.

Rippinger’s works speak only on the issues of Wimmer’s centralization and common novitiate: “The Swiss-American Congregation,” 93-4; The Benedictine Order in the United States, 197, 200; “Martin Marty: Founder” (2004), 64-65. Other Swiss-Benedictine studies also reduce the issue to the common novitiate: Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 46; Betschart, Apostel, 54-55. Even Basilius Doppelfeld’s, work, comparing Wimmer and Marty from a European perspective, omits the debate between Wimmer and Marty entirely and mentions the role of stability only in passing: Mönchtum und Kirchlicher Heilsdienst: Entstehung und Entwicklung des nordamerikanischen Benediktinerums im 19 Jahrhundert (Münsterschwarzach: Vier-Türme-Verlag, 1974), 124, 254. Finally, one would presume that the dissertation of R.M. Endress on the role of stability for the monks of St. Meinrad would include its history and Marty’s role; rather, it’s sociological method neglects the historical background of Swiss-American stability altogether: “The Enduring Vision: Stability and Change in an American Benedictine Monastery” (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1974).
interpretation of Benedictine stability with his Swiss vision of the monastery as an autonomous family. Disagreement over a common novitiate, a centralized house of studies, or even the original meaning of *stabilitas* in the *Rule* was secondary for Marty. As he saw it, if Benedictines were not a family under a familiar “abbas,” then they were no different from other religious orders in America. Wimmer vehemently disagreed. For Marty, Benedictines were primarily an independent, localized family bound by stability of place; for Wimmer, Benedictines were primarily a religious congregation of missionaries united through the stability of their monastic vocation.

**Background**

In a twist of historical irony, St. Meinrad’s elevation as an independent abbey owes its existence to Wimmer rather than Marty. Wimmer first approached Marty about the prospect of seeking independence for his community when the two leaders met at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866). Marty casually mentioned the conversation to his abbot in a letter and did nothing more.\(^\text{268}\) Wimmer persisted, informing Marty a year later that his community of St. Louis by the Lake (later St. John’s) in Minnesota had just become an abbey. Wimmer rejoiced how this proved that “nothing stands in the way for the multiplication of abbeys,” even though, in the same paragraph, he admitted that the monks in Minnesota were spread thin and could not live together in community. With this news Wimmer encouraged Marty to “begin thinking of making St. Meinrad an abbey” and not let his “humility” prevent him from petitioning Rome.\(^\text{269}\) Wimmer

\(^{268}\) Marty to Schmid, 18 January 1867 (M39), 8:968, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

\(^{269}\) Wimmer to Marty, 18 November 1867 (M43), 8:974, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Es freut uns aufrichtig, von allen Seiten zu vernehmen, daß Ihr Priorat
expressed his belief that monks should “imitate the church which makes new dioceses as soon as possible” and maintained that an “abbot can do more than a prior.” It would only be a “disadvantage to the Order” if Marty’s humility got in the way. A recent general chapter meeting at St. Vincent’s concurred with this opinion, and thus Wimmer wished to invite the monks of St. Meinrad to become a “third abbey” and join the same congregation and labor in “fraternal charity” toward the same goals for the Order in America.  

Marty’s cordial reply confessed a mutual desire to work for the same goal and agreed that the joining of “little branch” of St. Meinrad to the “trunk” of the Order in America would be “an incalculable gain.” However, Marty feared that the size of the community in Indiana prohibited such a development, and he doubted that the abbot of Einsiedeln would permanently release all six Swiss monks for the American mission. He forwarded Wimmer’s letter to Einsiedeln without comment.

The reluctance and skepticism of Marty’s initial reaction to Wimmer’s proposal reflected his earlier letters to Einsiedeln. Early on Marty had told his abbot that the Rule’s vows and its principle of humility were the “foundation” that St. Meinrad needed in order to overcome its initial problems: “…the good Lord compels us to hold that way which St.

sich zu schöner Blüthe entfaltet habe und die Zahl Ihrer Mitbrüder so sehr gewachsen ist, daß Sie auf eine Beförderung desselben zu einer Abtei denken müssen, und wohl nur durch Ihre Demuth davon abgehalten wurden…”

Ibid., 8:975. “So weit meine Erfahrung geht, zeigt es sich aber, daß wir die Praxis der Kirche hierin nachahmen sollen, die möglichst viele Bisthümer errichtet…d.h. nicht bis zum Nachtheile des Ordens gehen zu lassen, sondern, wie ich auch thun mußte, selbst auf die Gefahr hin, des Ehrgeizes beschuldigt zu werden, die Abtei zu erhalten; und so dachte auch das H. Kapitel. Wir hoffen zwar, in nicht sehr ferner Zeit eine dritten Abtei herstellen zu können; allein Sie haben mehr Elemente zu einer solchen schon jetzt….und wollen wir verbunden sein durch das Band aufrichtiger warmer und thätigen Bruderliebe.”

271 Marty to Schmid, 15 January 1868 (M44), 8:976, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “…so wachten wir immerhin diese nunmehr angebahnte und fortan unzertrennliche Verbindung unseres Zweigleins mit dem großen Stamme unseres hl. Ordens in Amerika also einen höchst werthvollen und in seinen Folgen unberechenbaren Gewinn.”
Augustine indicates, ‘to construct a large building rising high, first consider the foundation of humility.’”  

In another letter, a year prior to his debate with Wimmer, Marty had further claimed that a successful monastery must be “grounded in poverty and humility.” At the heart of Marty’s skepticism was his own agenda to return to the “original” vision of Benedict, and thus he stated that the monks of St. Meinrad “look back to the past, and in this spirit we wish to build for the future.” Likewise, he did not share Wimmer’s admiration for the rapid proliferation of dioceses in America, as demonstrated in his letter to Gall, cited above, in which he expressed his wariness of Catholics embracing the American mantra of “soon” (“cito”) at the expense of stability and genuine progress. Marty had even regretted that he was appointed prior of his community in 1865 and insisted that he could “work for God alone” if his leadership remained in the shadows and Hobi remained the public superior. Wimmer’s description of his Minnesota abbey and its scattered communal life probably caught Marty’s attention more than anything else and gave him pause. However, Marty did ask Wimmer for copies of his congregation’s Bavarian statutes for consideration, suggesting that Marty had at least some interest in eventually seeking abbatial status for St. Meinrad.

273 Marty to Schmid, 16 November 1861 (M9), 8:928, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. For his quotation of Augustine, Marty uses the Latin: “magnam fabricam vis construere celestitudinis, de fundamento prius cogita humilitatis.” The line is from Augustine’s “Sermon 69” (Migne, Patrologia Latina 38, 441).

274 Marty to Schmid, 27 January 1866 (M35), 8:963, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. He uses the same line of Augustine as M9 (above).

275 Ibid. “In diesem Sinne schauen wir hier Alle auf die Vergangenheit zurück und in diesem Geiste möchten wir bauen für die Zukunft.”

276 Marty to Morel, 26 October 1864 (M25), 9:951, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

277 Marty to Schmid, 21 January 1862 (M11), 8:931; Marty to Schmid, 15 January 1865 (M33), 8:960, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
Abbot Schmid’s reply surprised Marty. The following April the abbot warned Marty that Wimmer was tempting him with “abbatial lice.” Nevertheless, several events in Europe prompted Schmid to take Wimmer’s suggestion seriously. First was the precarious state of Europe in the wake of the Austrian-Prussian War of 1866. This prompted Schmid to ask Marty to consider seeking abbatial status in the case that Einseidein might need a place of refuge. A second consideration was the upcoming Vatican Council and rumors that reforms would be introduced that might allow bishops to have a greater hand in the affairs of monasteries in their sees; abbatial status, and thus canonical independence, might prevent the ill effects of such a development. In July Schmid expanded on this idea by presenting Marty with three questions for the St. Meinrad community to consider: (1) whether an independent abbey was desirable; (2) whether St. Meinrad wished to join Wimmer’s congregation; and (3) how should such an elevation, if desirable, be realized. He also suggested that Marty come to Europe and join him for the council in Rome, permitting them to discuss the matter further in person and with the relevant Roman authorities.

Marty took his abbot’s recommendation to heart and summoned the senior members of the community together to discuss the questions. Within a month Marty presented the abbot with the “unanimous” decision of the community. With respect to the first question, the community maintained that its dependence on Einsiedeln had been “neither burdensome nor harmful.” However, it concluded that an abbey’s privilege to

---

278 Schmid to Marty, 1 April 1868, quoted in Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 155. I could not locate the original in SMAA.
279 Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 37, 43.
280 See Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 156. He refers to Schmid’s letter as dated 23 July 1868. Again, I could not find the original in SMAA.
281 Marty to Schmid, 25 August 1868 (M47), 8:980, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Kleber translates the answers of this letter in “Bishop Martin Marty,” 156-57, and History of St. Meinrad, 208-10. My subsequent translations modify Kleber’s after consulting the German.
have solemn vows and elect its own superiors was “more desirable than a priory because it is more in keeping with the ancient tradition and is a better basis for future expansion.”

For the second question, the community expressed hesitation with Wimmer’s offer. With a “unanimous ‘no’” the monks made known their “greatest concern with respect to the Bavarian statutes and their prescription of a common novitiate and house of studies.” The statutes made it clear that the reason for this centralized monastic formation was so monks could be easily transferred from one monastery to another. What alarmed St. Meinrad the most was how the “vow of stability should already become modified to that effect at profession.” The community thought it would be better to join the Swiss Congregation in Europe or, following the example of Wimmer, create a separate Swiss-American congregation in the United States. Moreover, Bishop De St. Palais preferred that St. Meinrad remain separate from Wimmer’s monks. Finally, in answer to the third question they recommended that Abbot Schmid apply to the Holy See on their behalf. They saw no reason to seek the same territorial exemption from Vincennes as Wimmer had from Pittsburgh, since they had “nothing to fear” with their bishop. As a final note, Marty personally confessed that he had “no homesickness” and that “my work here is closer to my heart and I do not wish to go

---

282 Marty to Schmid, 25 August 1868, 8:980, SMAA. “Eine Abtei scheint wünschenswerther als ein Priorat, weil der alten Tradition mehr entsprechend und ein besserer Anhaltspunkt für künftige Ausbreitung.”

283 Ibid. “Ferner haben wir die größten Bedenken gegen die bayerischen Statuten, die gemeinsames Noviziat und Studiert vorschreiben und zwar ex fine ut translatio Religiosorum ab uni ad Altertum Monasterium commode fieri possit, weswegen denn auch das Gelübde der Stabilität schon bei d. Profess dahin modifizirt werden soll.”

284 8:981. “Bei unserem hochst. Bischofe haben wir Nichts zu fürchten.” Marty also noted how the Jesuits were able to fend off the bishops’ move for greater episcopal oversight of religious orders at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore. Marty later regretted his naïveté with respect to his own bishop.
anywhere else, even to visit.”

In the meantime, Wimmer was waging his own battles over stability and a common novitiate within his own congregation. Already in 1852 he had defended his adaptation of monastic stability for a missionary apostolate against his own Bavarian Benedictines: “Stability is an important virtue but it should not be allowed to deteriorate into inactivity.” This idea guided Wimmer’s American-Cassinese Congregation from its inception. When the general chapter at St. Vincent granted independent canonical status to its Minnesota and Kansas priories in 1858, it reserved the right to elect the priors itself (and not the community, which would have been the norm). At the same time it stipulated that monks in the priories could not transfer their vow of stability to the new priories but instead must maintain it with St. Vincent Abbey. This move was to ensure that the monks’ primary superior was Wimmer as president of the congregation and not the appointed prior. This arrangement secured flexibility in assigning monks to the different priories, and it was the basis of American-Cassinese Congregation’s modification of the vow of stability in its statutes, against which the Swiss monks so vehemently protested.

---


287 Jerome Oetgen, “American-Cassinese Congregation: Origins and Early Development (1855-1905), II,” American Benedictine Review 56, no. 4 (2005): 419. Unlike Wimmer’s priories in Minnesota and Kansas, which had been granted independence, St. Meinrad was a dependent priory until its elevation to the rank of abbey in 1870. Normally the vow of stability was transferred to an independent priory but not an dependent priory like St. Meinrad.
By the time of Wimmer’s correspondence with Marty in 1868, Wimmer’s own monks had challenged this model of stability. Augustine Wirth (1828–1901), prior of the Kansas community, had petitioned Rome for a separate novitiate in 1861 against Wimmer’s explicit wishes. Wimmer protested that Wirth did not have enough competent professors for such an endeavor and prevented Rome’s blessing. He censured the Kansas priory, ordered its novices to repeat their formation at St. Vincent, and finally forced Wirth’s resignation in May of 1868. Marty’s letter, informing Wimmer that the Swiss monks also disagreed with the idea of a common novitiate, arrived only a few months later, compounding Wimmer’s resolve to defend his model of Benedictine monasticism.

The 1868 Exchange

A few days after penning his detailed letter to Schmid, on September 3, 1868, Marty informed Wimmer of the community’s decision. There is no record of letters between the two in the meantime, suggesting that Marty surprised Wimmer with his objections. The letter ignited a private yet spirited exchange between the two Benedictine superiors over the nature of stability in the Rule. This letter and the three that followed present the best window into the leaders’ competing visions.

Marty begins his letter by stating that it is indeed “very desirable” to join the American-Cassinese Congregation. However, he outlines four reasons why his community has decided not to join: “modification of the vow of stability, the common novitiate and studies, and the transferability of members generally,” as well as the peculiar Bavarian requirement for beards, which, Marty adds, would cause “endless

---

288 On the “Keck affair,” a reform movement that accused Wimmer of lax discipline, see Oetgen, American Abbot, 266-81. For the Cluniac idealism of this movement, see Barry, Worship and Work, 79-81.
289 Oegten, “American-Cassinese Congregation, II,” 441; Beckman, Kansas Monks, 71-83.
troubles” with the bishop in Vincennes. Wimmer closes with heartfelt gratitude for Wimmer’s advice and assistance, and humbly asks for further advice as to how to proceed with Rome.

Wimmer had originally stated that he was open to Marty’s monks forming their own congregation, and his reply two weeks later on September 19, 1868, maintains this disposition. In his letter he generously details the process that he undertook for the independence of St. Vincent. He goes so far as to describe how to address the pope, what titles to use, and the style of Latin to follow. However, Wimmer was never one to surrender his designs easily. He emphasizes that the process would be “easier” if St. Meinrad simply joined the American-Cassinese. As to the Swiss monks’ objections, Wimmer insists that they are based on a surmountable “misunderstanding.” He sees the issue of modifying the vow of stability as a minor one, arguing that it is only for the sake of an “important undertaking,” such as the founding of an abbey, college, or mission. The modification also facilitates the easy transfer of insubordinate monks, and never can it trump the wishes of a superior. As to the other objections, Wimmer refuses to budge on the idea of a common novitiate, which is “an imperative” that Rome also requires for “obvious” reasons. However, the common house of studies is not “strictly stipulated,” but clearly it is “an advantage because more professors are available, there is more

---

290 Marty to Wimmer, 3 September 1868, SMAA. “Auch der Anschluß an die Congregatio americana cassinensis wurde sehr wünschbar gefunden, aber starke Bedenken erhoben gegen die Modifikation des Stabilitätsbelübdes (Statuta Cap. 2 sect. 1.) gegen gemeinsames Noviziat und Studiat (Stat. Cap. 2 sect. 2.3) sowie gegen Versetzbarkeit der Mitglieder überhaupt, wie sie von den Statuten befürwortet wird. Statuten anzunehmen aber mit dem Einverständnisd, daß man sie nicht beobachten will, würde auch nicht angehen? - Und um selbständig zu sein, müß ich noch beifügen, daß auch die Annahme das Bartes uns beim Ordinarius in Vincennes endlose Schwierigkeiten verursachen würde.”

291 Wimmer to Marty, 19 September 1868, 8:985, SMAA.

292 Ibid. “einbedeutenes Unternehmen.”
encouragement to study, and the courses are more complete.” The distress over beards
Wimmer brushes aside as something that by no means should warrant a “schism.” He
clarifies that he only adopted the custom at the recommendation of an American bishop,
and he is ready to reconsider the issue for the American-Cassinese. Wimmer concludes
with the assurance that he has little to gain, whereas St. Meinrad would gain “prominence
and strength.” Consequently, he strongly advises that the St. Meinrad community
reconsider his recommendation. If St. Meinrad acts quickly, its new abbot could represent
the community at the upcoming Vatican Council. Besides, there are rumors that the
council might form a federation of national Benedictine congregations “so that the great
tree can show forth its strength.” Wimmer cannot hide his enthusiasm for this prospect,
and he suggests to Marty that the American-Cassinese Album Benedictinum, a newly
completed catalogue of Benedictine houses around the world, might prove to be
“providential” for this international undertaking. Wimmer even offers to travel to St.
Meinrad to help convince Marty’s brethren in person.

It took more than a month for Marty to respond on November 4, 1868. Kleber, the
only historian to mention Marty’s reply, characterizes it as an “utterance to the ideas that

---

293 Ibid., 8:896. “Das Commune-Novitiat ist aber imperativ, und darauf wird in Rom vorzüglich
bestanden.Die Gründe dafür liegen auf der Hand. Der Ort desselben kann aber wechseln. Das Commune-
Studiat ist nicht so strenge gefordert, jedoch auch wieder eine Wohlthat, weil Professoren erspart werden,
mehr Ehrgeitz zum lernen da ist und der Unterricht kompleter wird.”
294 Ibid. “Ich gewinne nichts wenn Sie Sich an uns anschließen….Der Orden aber und auch Ihr Kloster
gewinnt dadurch an Bedeutung und Kraft.”
295 Ibid. “Bei diesem Konzil ist jetzt schon, wie ich von Rom höre, der Antrag, daß alle Benediktiner -
Zweige, Cisterziensi [sic] Kamaldulenser, etc., mit dem alten Stamme sich vereinigen, so daß der große
Baum sich nochmal in seiner ganzen Kraft zeigen könnte und wahrscheinlich in mehreren nationalen
Congregationen unter einem General-Abt konzentriert würde. Unser Album dürfte in dieser Hinsicht eine
providentielle Erscheinung werden.” On St. Vincent’s Album Benedictinum, see Oetegen, An American
Abbott, 362, 366. Wimmer had organized the Album with a future Benedictine federation in view. The work
saw two editions (1869 and 1881).
he thought basic to a Benedictine Abbey,” a merited observation.\footnote{Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty” 159. Although Kleber provides a full translation in his manuscript, I have produced my own that alters Kleber’s for a more literal representation of the German. Likewise, Kleber does not note the stresses of the original document (see note 297 below).} Because all other scholars have completely overlooked this letter, close attention to Marty’s language warrants extensive quotation.

Marty’s letter remains cordial yet assumes an uncharacteristic tone of pertinacity.\footnote{Ibid.} In a rare move, Marty underlines select points of his letter for Wimmer’s attention.\footnote{Marty to Wimmer, 4 November 1868, SVAA. The original document has underlined text. It is possible that Wimmer underlined the text and not Marty, but both the lack of any notes in the margins and the selection of lines lead me to conclude that Marty underlined certain portions after he composed the letter.} He readily admits that joining the American-Cassinese would be the “easiest and shortest route to our desired goal,” yet in the same breadth Marty insists that “we could never resolve ourselves to accept a common novitiate or house of studies.”\footnote{Ibid. “Der Anschluß an Ihre Congregation erschiene auch uns als der leichteste und kürzeste Weg zum er wünschten Ziele, aber zu gemeinsamen Noviziat oder Studiat könnten wir uns nie entschließen.” I have retained Marty’s original emphasis with italics.} To do so would surrender “an essential peculiarity of our holy Order” and in fact facilitate the formation of “frustrated Jesuits, Franciscans, or Dominicans who still wear the old habit but would cease to be Benedictines.”\footnote{Ibid. “Wir sehen darin ein Aufgeben der wesentlichen Eigenthümlichkeit unseres hl. Orders. Durch ein gemeinsames Seminar würden wohl gefehlte [frustrated] Jesuiten, Franziskaner oder Dominikaner bilden, die den alten Ordenshabit immer noch tragen - aber aufhören würden, Benediktiner zu sein.”} Citing 1 Corinthians, he admits that there should be other types of religious orders in the Church, but “old Benedictines do not come from new patterns.”\footnote{Ibid. “Unus quidem sic alius [1 Cor 7:7] vero sic - in eodem spiritu [1 Cor. 12:9]: es muß allerlei Leute geben; aber alte Benediktiner kommen nicht aus neuen Schablonen.”} New orders constitute “one single family” through a province, in which “constant change is either the explicit rule or the dominant principle” because any member can move from house to house. Marty argues that “exactly the opposite is the case for we Benedictines. Our vows mean stabilitas not ordinis or provinciae but rather
loci.” This underlined point marks the heart of Marty’s argument: Benedictines promise to remain permanently in a specific place, and this charism of “stability of place” is their distinct contribution to religious life in the Church. Nevertheless, his point also betrays his own interpretation of the Rule. “Stabilitas” appears four times in St. Benedict’s Rule, yet the text never states “stabilitas loci” but only “stabilitas sua” (RB 58.17) or “stabilitas in congregatione” (RB 4.78). Nevertheless, Marty believes that St. Benedict intimated “stability of place” through his application of the principle to the monastic “congregatio” or community. Unlike Wimmer, Marty insists that this “congregatio” is not synonymous with a modern religious congregation. Rather, Marty views the Benedictine community as an autonomous monastic family bound by the principle of stability, and for the family to mature and flourish, the monks vow stability of place.

In order to defend this idea of stabilitas loci, Marty devotes the rest of his letter to an argument for the familial and patriarchal nature of a Benedictine monastery. He begins and ends with the abbot. He designates the abbot as the “Hausvater” of the monastery for life. According to Marty, the abbot “operates and rules, prays and works” with the senior members of the community “as time and local conditions allow,” and his only measure is the precept of the Rule that “in all things God may be glorified” (RB 57.9, 1 Peter 4:11). The abbot raises the community according to the Rule and the “manner and

301 Ibid. “Gerade das gegentheil ist die uns Benediktiner der Fall. Unsere Gelübde heißt nicht ordinis oder provinciae, sondern loci.”
302 “Stability” appears in two other places in the Rule: in the context of priests who seek to enter the community (RB 60.9) and guests who desire the same (RB 61.5). In both cases, a promise of stability is contingent upon their admission into the community.
custom of the family, in accordance with the condition and desideratum of the place.” But the abbot is not the only family member who learns through local conditions. Younger monks must also learn to value the personality and aptitude of an older confrere. He can do so only in accord with “local conditions and conventions, and [through] the thousandfold personal and real relationships that make a community a family and a monastery a home.”

304 Fraternal solidarity that can surmount the “shortcomings” of the family comes only through “living, praying, working, enduring together.”

305 Borrowing an analogy from St. John Chrysostom, Marty’s monk is like a child who eschews the regal splendor of a queen (the world) for its humbly clad mother, the “little monastery” that “rebores him to new life” and first opened his eyes “to the daylight of the supernatural world.”

306 For this reason the common novitiate is simply unacceptable. The novice returns a “stranger in his family and feels strange.” Such a feeling compromises fraternal harmony and peace. The novice now critiques his monastery based on his novitiate in another, and the elders in turn become displeased. Individual monks may find common ground, but “sameness in attitudes and interests” eludes the “whole.”

307 To this Marty

\[\text{beinahe ohne andern Schranke als die Verantwortung, auf welche die Regel ihn so oft hinweist und das Prinzip U.I.O.G.D.}\]

304 Ibid. “Er ist es auch der sich den Nachwuchs erzieht und bildet nicht bloß noch den allgemeinen Grundsätzen der Aszete und hl. Regel, sondern auch noch Sitte und Brauch der Familien, noch Lage und Bedürfnis des Ortes. Die Jungen müssen sich lernen und schicken in die Charaktere und Fähigkeiten der älteren Brüder in die Vermögens umstände, in die örtliche Lage und Gebräuchlichkeiten in die tausenderlei persönlichen und sachlichen Verhältnisse, die den Konvent zur Familie und das Kloster zur Heimat machen.”

305 Ibid. “...Zusammen-leben-beten-arbeiten-entbehren-sich freuen von Jugend auf erzeugt kindliche Gesinnung gegen den gemeinsamen Vater, brüderliche unter einander, Anhänglichkeit an das Haus trotz seiner Mängel und Opferwilligkeit für dasselbe...”

306 Ibid. “...das schöne Wort des hl. Chrysostomus, daß das Kind, wenn ihre eine Königin in voller Ornat und seine Mutter im schlichten Gewande verführt wird, der Mutter zuläuft und die Königin stehen läßt, möchte ich auch anwenden auf den Benediktiner, der das stille Klösterlein, wo er zuerst zum rechten Bewusstsein gekommen, zu neuen Leben wiedergeboren worden ist und das Tageslicht der übernatürlichen Welt erblickt hat, der ganzen Welt vorzieht.”

adds that “the stability of superiors is no longer desirable and intermittent change more advisable.” If novices can come and go, so should superiors, and “the two principles stand or fall together.” Marty seems to attack Wimmer’s logic of leadership, arguing that if he insists on a common novitiate then he must relinquish his life-term role as abbot (something Wimmer insisted on in the formation of his own congregation). Marty is certain that Wimmer would never surrender the life term of his abbatial office, and so continues: the Benedictines “consist of kindred and befriended families from various peoples,” and each family “should develop, grow, and work independently.” These families “should support one another and cling together” and establish “common understanding for the preservation of tradition in law and custom,” but congregational ties and visitations should only be “stimulative and corrective, and nothing more.” Each abbot is an “autonomous Hausvater” who is “free and independent” in the governance and the “formation of his children.” As he begins, so Marty ends with the role of abbot: “An abbot who loses one or another of these paternal rights is indeed still a superior, guardian, custodian or however one might call him, but he is no longer an abbot, no longer a father.” He concludes by apologizing for his resolve to “oppose new

---


310 Ibid. “Jeder Hausvater ist autonom und so lange er den Prinzipien der Ehre und des Wohles der Familien nicht zuwiderhandelt ist er frei und unabhängig in Verwaltung seines Vermögens und von Allen in der Erziehung seiner Kinder. - Ein Abt, der das Eine oder das Andern von diesen väterlichen Rechten verliert, ist wohl nach Superior, Guardian, Kustos oder wie man ihn titulieren will, aber er ist kein Abbas, kein Vater mehr.”
experiments, even if Rome condones them, and to hold absolutely fast the old Rule and tradition.” Nevertheless, he is convinced that “the order will thrive not in a hybrid form but only in its original strength and essence.”\(^{311}\) Marty admits that it is easier to communicate his ideas in person rather than on paper, and expresses the hope that he and Wimmer can continue their discussion of the matter at the council in Rome.

Wimmer responded with equal vigor two weeks later on November 22, 1868. Because Oetgen reproduces translated excerpts of the letter in his biographies of Wimmer, scholars tend to focus on this particular letter and neglect the other three, including Marty’s November 4 letter.\(^{312}\) Consequently, scholars have completely overlooked what is missing from Wimmer’s letter: Wimmer refuses to address Marty’s argument about the familial nature of Benedictine monasticism in any great detail. Moreover, a closer inspection of the German text unveils the precise vocabulary and complexity of the debate: Wimmer retains Marty’s Latin terms while introducing his own and invoking the authority of the famous Benedictine scholar, Augustin Calmet (1672–1757).

If one recalls how Wimmer had paired Benedictine “stability” with an equal virtue of “adaptability” in his 1845 “manifesto” for Benedictine missions to America,\(^{313}\) one witnesses the same trajectory of thought in his response to Marty. Wimmer opens his letter with an assessment of Marty’s worldview that falls somewhere between a fraternal joke and a gentle insult. He calls Marty a “true Switzer” who yearns to return to the

\(^{311}\) Ibid. “Ew. Gnaden werden mich entschuldigen wenn ich neue[n] Experimenten gegenüber, obschon sie von Rom gutgeheißen werden, an der alten Regel und Tradition absolut festhalte, aber der Orden wird nie gediehen als Zwittersgestalt, sondern nur in seiner ursprünglichen Kraft und Wesenheit.”

\(^{312}\) For citations, see chapter 2, note 265 above.

\(^{313}\) Boniface Wimmer, “Concerning the Missions,” Augsburger Postzeitung 8 Nov. 1845, translated and reprinted in Oetgen, Mission to America, 494.
“side” of his “papa in Einsiedeln,” in a land where his compatriots do not dare venture beyond the Alpine valley for fear that they might “die in a foreign land from homesickness if they cannot promptly return home!”\textsuperscript{314} He concurs that “the Order of St. Benedict is patriarchal and monarchical” and leaves Marty’s discussion of the Benedictine “family” to that. He also grants that “\textit{stabilitas} is a fundamental condition of the Rule.” He then counters his Swiss confere with his own interpretation of stability in the Rule: “But that this \textit{stabilitas} is only \textit{loci} or so limited as you wish to make it, I deny; it is also \textit{stabilitas status}.”\textsuperscript{315} The principle of \textit{stabilitas} “does not mean that one must remain lifelong in the monastery in which one makes one’s profession.” Rather, the principle ensures that monks do not move to another monastery at their own will without abbatial consent. For Wimmer, history proves that monks have adapted stability to missionary ventures: “How else could the Order have expanded, how could the Benedictines have converted England, Germany, Hungary, Sweden, etc.? What would've been of our St. Boniface, St. Otto, and the others? What would you and I be?” Stability was St. Benedict’s antidote to the vices of the “gyrovagues and sarabites of his time” (RB 1.6-11), and his model of stability was “\textit{stabilitas loci} as well as \textit{status}” so as to prevent

\textsuperscript{314} Wimmer to Marty, 22 November 1868, German transcription in VAB1, TM.14, SVAA: “Es wundert mich nur, dass Sie nicht während des Schreibens das Heimweh bekommen und versucht worden sind, mit Sack und Pack aufzubrechen und zu Ihrem Papa nach Einsiedeln zurückzukehren, um alle Tage Ihres Lebens dort an seiner oder seines Nachfolgers Seite in gemütlichem Zusammenleben zuzubringen, wie manche Ihrer Landsleute (wenigstens in den guten alten Zeiten) die nie aus dem Thale, worin sie geboren, hinauskamen oder wenn sie es verlassen mussten, vor Heimweh in der Fremde starben, wenn sie nicht zeitig wieder zurückkehren konnten!” As cited above, a translation of the letter appears in \textit{Boniface Wimmer: Letters}, 323-26. Since this published translation does not retain the original Latin terms, I have altered Oetgen’s translation for a more literal version.

\textsuperscript{315} Wimmer to Marty, 22 November 1868. SVAA. "Den Orden S. Benedicti ist patriarchalisch oder monarchisch - concedo. Eine Grundbedingung seiner Regel ist Stabilitas, etiam hoc concedo. Dass aber diese Stabilitas nur loci oder so beschränkt sei, wie Sie sie machen wollen, nego; sie ist auch stabilitas status."
his monks from abandoning their vocation and returning to the world.\textsuperscript{316} If Marty questions this interpretation, Wimmer explicitly refers him to Calmet’s thoughts on the vow of stability in his eighteenth-century commentary on the \textit{Rule}, what Oegten identifies as the “standard” commentary for nineteenth-century Benedictines.\textsuperscript{317} Wimmer expresses his fear that Marty’s “one-sided” interpretation of stability will arrest St. Meinrad’s development and “stifle the hopes that the young American church places in us,” which is the “special task to supply America with a sufficient number of good priests.”\textsuperscript{318} The Benedictine mission flows from this objective.

With his own interpretation of stability established, Wimmer devotes the rest of his letter to a historical argument for the common novitiate. He assures Marty that it does not violate \textit{stabilitas loci} any more than a monk does as a parish pastor or college professor. In fact, St. Benedict’s \textit{vita} suggests that he had a common monastic “seminary” (\textit{Ordensseminar}) in both Monte Cassino and Subiaco for his missionaries to Gaul and Sicily.\textsuperscript{319} Benedict permitted his monasteries to enjoy the customs of their

\textsuperscript{316} Ibid. “Die erstere meint auch nicht dass man lebenslänglich im Kloster bleiben müsse, wo man Profess gemacht, sondern dass man nicht pro libito in ein anderes Kloster etc. übertreten kann, ausser wenn, ’Necessitas” (u. sicher auch charitas Dei vel Dei honor) Abbatis jussio et voluntas id permissat. Wie müsste sich denn sonst der Orden verbreiten, wie hätten die Benediktiner England, Deutschland, Ungarn, Schweden, etc. bekehren können, was wäre da unser S. Bonifaz, Willibrord, Otto, und andere? was wären Sie und ich? Gegen die Gyrovages u. Sabaraiten seiner Zeit hat S. Benedict die Stabilität eingeführt, sowohl die stab. loci als auch status, damit nicht die profissi wieder den Habit auszögen und in die Welt zurückkehrten. (vid. Calmet Com. Litt. in S. Reg. cap. 58).”


\textsuperscript{318} Wimmer to Mary, 22 November 1868, SVAA: “Wenn Sie es mit dieser Stab. loci so einseitig nehmen, was hat dann Amerika von St. Meinrad zu erwarten? Dass es bleibe was es jetzt ist oder vielleicht noch einige Patres mehr kriegt - und damit punctum. Bewahre Gott dass wir uns mit dem so interpretierten votum stabilitatis einen Hemschuh [sic] angelegen, der alle künftige Entwicklung unmöglich machte u. alle Hoffnungen, welche die junge Kirche von Amerika auf uns setzt, vereteilte u. für immer die Aussichten zerstörte, dass die Lücke ausgefüllt werde, die hier beseht, nämlich der Mangel an einem Orden, der es sich zur besonderen Aufgabe machte, Amerika mit guten Priestern in genügender Zahl zu versehen.”

\textsuperscript{319} Ibid. “Wenn Sie es mit dieser Stab. loci so einseitig nehmen, was hat dann Amerika von St. Meinrad zu erwarten? Dass es bleibe was es jetzt ist oder vielleicht noch einige Patres mehr kriegt - und damit punctum. Bewahre Gott dass wir uns mit dem so interpretierten votum stabilitatis einen Hemschuh
“locality,” such as dress, drink, and even the organization of the divine office. At the same time, he strived for “uniformity” through his Rule. Thus, a common novitiate can exist alongside local customs and “domestic peace.” If Marty thinks that a local novitiate prevents “murmuring,” Wimmer can attest “from experience” that this is not the case and, in fact, a common novitiate actually quells grumbling because monks learn to appreciate what is both uniform and diverse.\[320\]

Moreover, Marty’s characterization of the American-Cassinese norms as “new experiments,” according to Wimmer, is blind to the historical record. St. Benedict of Aniane (c.750–821) laid the groundwork for the rise of Cluny and its congregation. The congregations of Clairvaux, Citeaux, and Bursfeld followed, and from the ruins of the Reformation rose the Bavarian, Swabian, Austrian, and Marty’s own Swiss congregations: “These were not experiments but rather outcomes of the times and circumstances,” and they were “not excrescences but rather natural, vigorous, fresh branches that sprouted from the original trunk.” The Church itself has done the same in history according the “exigencies of the age.”\[321\] This is why Rome itself has demanded a common novitiate for religious orders in recent years. The quality of novitiate formation

---


suffers otherwise, especially where there are only a handful of novices. The truth of this claim lies in the example of Tegernsee, where the abbot declined to use the common novitiate and his monks consequently became “free-thinkers and enemies of the Church.” The great Benedictine university of Salzburg and the order’s innumerable gymnasia of past centuries would have been impossible without a common novitiate and congregation. An abbot is like a king: if he is a good man with great foresight, he can accomplish many things. But there are few examples of such abbots in history, and a congregation is a surer path. Once again, Wimmer invokes the authority of Calmet’s preface to his commentary on the Rule, who, he claims, lauded the moderate centralization of the Bursfeld Congregation and demurred the hyper-centralization of the Cassinese Congregation. He introduces this example to assure Marty that the abbot should remain in charge of his own house and that in his congregational model “charity should rule, not coercion.” The organization of a congregation should be flexible and adapt to the “time and circumstances.” Nevertheless, Wimmer concludes by voicing his ardent resolution that Benedictines cannot compete with other modern religious orders “if our efforts are only scattered and we do not march in rank and file like they do.” In his estimation, a “congregation cannot exist without a common novitiate and house of studies.” Unity must come before autonomy.

---

322 Ibid. “Der letzte Abt von Tegernsee schickte seine vier Novizen nicht ins Commun-Noviziat. Sie wurden lauter Freigeister u. Feinde der Kirche.” Wimmer refers to Abbot Georg Rottenkolber (1750–1810), the last abbot of Tegernsee Abbey (ADB 29 [1889], 392). Before its suppression in 1803, Tegernsee was considered one the oldest and most important Benedictine monasteries in Bavaria. Wimmer’s inability to name specific “free-thinkers” suggests that his point is one of bias rather than historical fact. On Tegernsee and the Enlightenment, see Lehner, Enlightened Monks, 32, 183.

323 Wimmer to Marty, 22 November 1868, SVAA. “Calmet lobt die Bursfeldische Kongregation u. ihre Sprossen-bayrische, österreichische, schwäbische, schweizerische ausserdentlich. Praef. 34 während er mit der cassinenser nicht zufrieden ist.”

324 Ibid. “Die Liebe muss regieren, nicht der Zwang. Vollkommen ist übrigens auf Erden nichts u. alles hat 2 Seiten, besonders wenn Zeit u. Umstände sich ändern; da kann die beste Einrichtung lästig oder auch
Significance

The reconstruction of this forgotten debate over monastic stability sheds light on how Marty and Wimmer interpreted the same Rule from different perspectives and with different premises. Moreover, the four letters demonstrate how the two Benedictine leaders were more or less talking past one another. Wimmer presumed that a monk could not be a missionary if he resorted to a strict, literal interpretation of his vow as stabilitas loci. Marty presumed that a monk could not be a truly Benedictine missionary apart from the familial character of the monastery, and this required stabilitas loci. Wimmer refused to entertain Marty’s extensive argument on this familial character of Benedictine monasticism, passing it off as Swiss provincialism. Marty refused to address Wimmer’s case for maintaining the quality of monastic formation through a common novitiate, as well as his historical justification for adapting stability to a congregational model.

Wimmer feared that the Swiss Benedictines would repeat the mistakes of the order’s past, becoming isolated and fading into the shadows of the Church until they became useless and their suppression inconsequential. Marty feared that the American-Cassinese Benedictines would repeat the mistakes of the present, imitating other religious orders, forgetting their roots, and ultimately shirking the ancient principles of the Rule.

These competing interpretations of the Rule also point to divergent interpretations of historical events surrounding both men. Wimmer and Marty likely based their arguments on concurrent developments in Benedictine monasticism. Wimmer likely equated Marty’s rejection of the common novitiate with the obstinacy of Prior Wirth in nachtheilig werden. Gewiss ist aber, dass wir den anderen Orden gegenüber nichts Bedeutendes leisten können, wenn wir nur vereinzelt u. nicht auch wie sie, in Reih u. Glied aufmarschieren. Ohne Com-Noviziat u. Studiat kann aber eine Kongregation nicht existieren."
Kansas in the 1860s. Marty likely equated the trajectory of Wimmer’s congregation with the recent formation of Casaretto’s Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance in 1867. Later known as the Subiaco Congregation, Casaretto organized this offshoot of the Italian Cassinese with radical and controversial idea: the congregation had a “Abbot General,” similar to the Jesuits, and each monastery did not have an abbot but rather a prior who answered directly to this Abbot General.\footnote{See Rees, “Benedictine Revival,” 339-42; Pietro Casaretto e gli inizi della Congregazione sublacense (1810-1880) (Subsidia monastica 3; Montserrat: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Monserrat, 1972). After Casaretto’s death in 1880, the congregation went back to its original form of stability with independent abbots.} Such a comparison with Wimmer’s enterprise would have been unfair but not implausible, especially in light of Wimmer’s direct hand in the operation of his monasteries. Marty also retained fresh memories of the “change of superiors and instability of all things” that characterized the early days of the St. Meinrad mission before his arrival.\footnote{Marty to Schmid, 21 January 1862 (M11), 8:931, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.}

Moreover, the four letters further highlight how differences of opinions between the two leaders stemmed from different literary sources. This is intimated in Wimmer’s reference to Calmet not once but twice in his final letter of November 22. A close reading of Calmet’s commentary further reveals how selectively Wimmer read Calmet. His first reference is to Calmet’s commentary on chapter 58 of the Rule, which specifies the promises or “vows” of profession. Calmet does indeed state that Benedictines are not required to “remain always locked in their monastery” but can for “legitimate reasons” leave it, including “to preach the Gospel” and to create “new establishments.” Yet in the very next line Calmet also states that modern congregations, imitating the Mendicants,
“have also promoted the fickleness and instability of superiors and individuals.”

Calmet makes a similar point on the next page, stating that the vow does not mean that monks can never leave the monastery, and presumes a “stability of heart and mind.” At the same time, the “simplest and most literal sense is stability of place, which the ancients understood and practiced well.” Calmet makes it clear that he prefers *stabilitas loci* because “nothing is more contrary to the spirit of St. Benedict than the instability and movements of many religious living in the present. It is impossible to fix one's heart and mind, unless one stops one’s body in a certain place.”

A further contradiction of Wimmer’s point arises in his second reference to Calmet, this time citing section 34 for the commentary’s preface. Calmet does indeed uphold the Bursfeld Congregation as a post-Reformation congregation that follows the spirit of St. Benedict better than the Cassinese Congregation. However Wimmer appears to miss the point. Calmet criticizes the Cassinese precisely because they move superiors around at will. He explicitly condemns vows that are made to a congregation rather than a particular monastery, as this breeds “inconstancy and instability of religious, so contrary

---

327 Calmet, *Commentaire littéral*, 2:314. “Les Religieux de saint Benoît ne se sont jamais tellement crûs obligez de demeurer toujours enfermez dans leur Monastere, qu'ils ne pâssent pour des raison légitimes en sortir quelquefois; par exemple, pour annoncer l'Evangile aux Peuples, pour faire de nouveaux Etablissemens, pour des affaires importantes, et toujours par obéissance. Mais il faut convenir, qu'anciennement les Religieux sortoient beaucoup moins qu'ils ne sont aujourd'hui; ils étoient à peu-près comme les Chartreux. L'exemple des Religieux Mendians, qui sont presque toujours en campagne, a beaucoup contribué à autoriser les fréquentes sorties des Religieux, d'autre part les Monasteres réunis en Congrégations ont aussi favorisé l'inconstance et l'instabilité des Superieurs et des particuliers…”

328 Ibid., 2:315. “Or ce terme ne signifie pas seulement l'obligation de demeurer dans un Monastere sans en sortir, à moins qu'il n'y ait nécessité, et qu'on n'en ait obtenu la permission de son Superieur; il renferme aussi la stabilité du coeur et de l'esprit, dans une ferme résolution de ne se départir jamais de l'état qu'on a embrasse, ni de la profession qu'on a vouée. C'est ainsi que les Commentateurs l'expliquent communément. Cependant le sens le plus simple et le plus littéral est celui, qui l'entend d'une stabilité de lieu; les Anciens l'ont entendu et pratiquée ainsi.”

329 Ibid. “Rien n'est plus contraire à l'esprit de saint Benoît, que l'inconstance et les mouvemens où vivent à présent plusieurs Religieux. Il est impossible de fixer son coeur et son esprit, à moins qu'on n'arrête son corps en un certain lieu…”
to the Rule and the solitary life.” This point is fascinating considering that it was the modification of the vow in the American-Cassinese Congregation that so alarmed Marty. Calmet’s contradiction of Wimmer’s thought finds a final salvo in another section that Wimmer does not refer to but that Marty easily could have used for his argument. In his commentary on “stabilitas in congregacione” (RB 4.78) earlier in the Rule, Calmet echoes Marty’s objections. Congregatio does not refer to the modern Benedictine congregation that is “a society of several monasteries and under the same head and depending on the general chapter.” Such an interpretation is “posterior to the time of St. Benedict.” Instead, the author of the Rule “refers here to the community, the monastery, the family gathered in the same house, and under one head.”

Was Marty using Calmet? It is possible but unlikely, especially because Calmet’s commentary does not appear in the list of books that his confreres in Einsiedeln sent to him after his arrival. The more probable source of Marty’s interpretation of the Rule is one of the confreres who sent him books: his former teacher and mentor, Karl Brandes. This chapter has already shown how Marty turned to Brandes for his translation project and echoed vestiges of his commentary on the Rule with respect to St. Meinrad’s oblate.

---

330 Ibid., 1:61-62. “Enfin on donne entrée à l'inconstance & à l'instabilité des Religieux, si contraire à l'esprit de la Règle, & à l'état des Solitaires, en ne les liant par leur profession à aucun Monastère particulier, mais seulement à la Congrégation dont ils font membres; ce qui les autorise à demander souvent sans aucune raison solide, de changer du demeure, & par conséquent de Supérieur; ce qui cause une dissipation & un dérangement plus fâcheux & plus opposé à la perfection religieuse, qu'on ne sçauroit croire.”

331 Ibid., 1:209. “Congregatio en cet endroit ne signifie pas une Congrégation, dans le sens que ce terme se prend aujourd'hui, pour une société de plusieurs Monasteres, unis sous le même Chef, et dépendans du même Chapitre Général. L'établissement de ces Congrégations est de beaucoup posterior au tems de saint Benoît. Il désigne ici la Communauté, le Monastere, la Famille réunie dans une même Maison, et sous un même Chef.”

332 “Schulbücher,” 13:1575-78, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. See also Marty to Morel, 3 June 1862 (M14), 8:935, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

333 See Marty to “Dekan,” 26 December 1865 (M32), 8:958, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. On Brandes, see 171n195 above.
movement. The shadow of Brandes’s commentary reappears in Marty’s ideas on stability
and mission, and unlike Calmet’s work, it appears in the list of texts from Einsiedeln.

Brandes’s commentary describes the *Rule* not only as a “book” but also as an “action”
that has transformed world history. Its last page celebrates how the *Rule* has remedied
the instability of “wandering tribes,” who have been “stabilized and cultured through the
stability of the sons and daughters of holy Benedict.” This stability has created a
“blooming field” around the monastery that has replaced the “wilderness,” and this
arrangement has secured the settlers’ “temporal prosperity” and “constant guidance
toward eternal salvation.” In his letters to Wimmer, Marty’s theological vision of
monastic stability reflects these ideas of his mentor. At the same time, the debate with
Wimmer reveals how Marty also adds his own emphasis on the familial character of the
monastery in relation to stability. The following chapter shows how Marty’s vision
blends this stability and family to secure the material and spiritual health of Catholics to
form a “double family” through work and prayer.

**Historical Aftermath**

There is no clear record that Marty and Wimmer discussed the issue further.

Marty, however, intimates that the debate lingered but remained unresolved. In his
January 1869 letter to Schmid, Marty summarized the contents of his November 4 answer

---

334 “Schulbücher,” 13:1575, 1577, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
335 Brandes, *Erklärung des Regel des heiligen Vaters Benedikt*, vol. 3 of *Leben und Regel des heiligen
Vaters Benedikt, Patriarchen der Mönche des Abendlandes* (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1857), 669.
336 Brandes, *Erklärung*, 670: “Der unstäte Sinn jener stets wanderen Völkerstämme wird durch die
Beständigkeit der Söhne und Töchter des heiligen Benedickt, welche diese selbst ihrer Regel verdanken,
angezogen und gefestigt. Die Wüstenei rings um das Kloster, wird durch die Arbeit, die die Regel
vorschreibt, zur blühenden Flur, auf der auch andere Hütten bauen, in denen die durch das Kloster
erzogene, sittlich und geistig erstarkte Bevölkerung zeitlichen Wohlstand findet und stete Hinweisung auf
das ewig Heil.”
to Wimmer, reiterating his opinion that the transferability of superiors and the common novitiate “contradicts the spirit and history of our Order” and only produces “frustrated” Benedictines who imitate Jesuits and Franciscans. At the same time he forwarded Wimmer’s September 19 letter, yet he also claimed, surprisingly, that Wimmer had not responded to his November 4 letter. Marty further begged not to go to Rome, stating “I have seen enough councils.” Later the following month Marty wrote Schmid again. This time he stated that Wimmer “has finally written again, but has not responded at all to my arguments and not once acknowledged the reception of my letter.” Rather, Wimmer sent him the confidential protocols of an unpublicized conference of European abbots in Salzburg in June 1868. The conference was an ad hoc session to prepare for the upcoming council. Many of the abbots present expressed the desire to unite all Benedictine monasteries into a centralized religious order, and the meeting set the groundwork for a Benedictine confederation later in the century. Marty’s tone made it clear that Wimmer’s endorsement of this meeting did not amuse him. More intriguing is that Marty neither mentioned Wimmer’s November 22 letter nor ever forwarded it to Einsiedeln. This lends itself to a hypothesis that Marty may have never received

337 Marty to Schmid, 18 January 1869 (M48), 8:982, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “In meiner Antwort an Abt Bonifaz, die jedoch ohne Erwiederung geblieben ist, bewies ich ihm, daß gemeinsames Noviziat ebensosehr also Wechsel des Abtes dem Geiste und der Geschichte unseres Ordens widerspreche und daß wir auf dem von den bayerischen Statuten vorgezeichneten Wege gefehlte Jesuiten oder Franziskaner, aber nie Benediktiner erziehen können.”


339 Marty to Schmid, 8 February 1869 (M49), 8:982, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Abt Bonifaz hat endlich wieder geschrieben, aber auf meine Argumente gar nicht geantwortet, ja nicht einmal den Empfang meines Briefes bescheinigt, sondern nur das Protokoll der im Juni 68 stattgehabten Salzburger-Konferenz und das Begleitschreiben des Hochwst. Abtes von Metten mitgetheilt.”

340 Wimmer to Marty, 19 January 1869, transcription in SVAA.

Wimmer’s November 22 reply. Only a copy of the letter exists in St. Vincent, and the original is missing. If this is the case, one wonders what Marty’s response would have been. Nevertheless, even if Marty never received Wimmer’s final letter, the correspondence testifies to two entrenched interpretations of the Benedictine tradition that both leaders viewed as incompatible.

Marty’s resolve, regardless of Wimmer’s contrary opinion, prompted him to proceed with his abbot’s plans to make St. Meinrad independent. In May he made it clear to his abbot that St. Meinrad did not want “separation or independence from our motherhouse,” but only the canonical establishment of a monastery that could receive the solemn profession of novices. Nevertheless, Marty drafted a formal request for abbatial status in Latin and submitted it to Abbot Schmid for the chapter’s approval in Einsiedeln. By the time autumn set in Marty was on a boat bound for Europe, much to his chagrin. Bishop De St. Palais had refused to approve Einsiedeln’s plan for St. Meinrad’s independence and left for Rome without signing the necessary documents. In a move of duplicity, De St. Palais complained about Marty’s leadership in Rome while at the same time he submitted Marty’s name to Propaganda Fide as a candidate for the vacant see of Detroit. Marty described this move as a “promoveatur ut amoveatur”

342 This contradicts Oetgen’s notes in Boniface Wimmer: Letters, 326. Oetgen claims that the original is in SMAA; I could not find any such letter in St. Meinrad.
343 Marty to Schmid, 6 May 1869 (M50), 8:988, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Eine Abtei will Niemand von uns haben, wenn eine kanonische Errichtung des Klosters auf einem einfacheren Wege erzielt werden kann und so lange der liebe Gott Ev. Gnaden das Leben fristet, wollen wir keinen andern Abt haben.”
344 Marty to Schmid, 30 May 1869, 3:264-5, Box 1, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
345 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 210-11; “Bishop Martin Marty, 163; Marty to Schmid, 24 October 1869 (M54), 8:992-93, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. See also Joachim Köhn, Beobachter des Vatikanum I: Die römischen Tagebücher des P. Georg Ulber, OSB (Quellen und Studien zur neueren Theologiegeschichte 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 2000), 116-17.
(“promoted to be removed”) on the bishop’s part. Illness delayed Marty in Einsiedeln, and he was anxious to get to Rome not only because of the bishop’s unsubstantiated claims but also because he no longer trusted Wimmer. Marty confided in his abbot, who was in Rome for the council, that he was deeply concerned about the “reform of the Order.” He anticipated a “not insignificant future for the Benedictine Order in America.” Wimmer was the only American representative in Rome, and Marty did not “trust the matter in his hands.” He eventually made his way to Rome in March of 1870 to celebrate the feast of St. Benedict in Monte Cassino and to have his feet washed by Pope Pius IX on Holy Thursday.

The rest of Marty’s dealings in Rome remain unknown. It is unclear whether he ever met Wimmer in Rome, let alone discussed their correspondence. Marty quickly returned to the United States in June and awaited Rome’s decision. By August the Franco-German War exploded on the landscape of northern Europe, forcing French troops to abandon Rome and leading to the Piedmontese entrance into the Eternal City on September 20. Despite this political turmoil the Vatican bureaucratic apparatus remained in motion. On September 30, only ten days after the surrender of Rome, Pius IX formally erected St. Meinrad as an independent abbey of the Swiss Congregation with the right to elect its own abbot. Marty was duly elected the first abbot unanimously (minus his own vote) on January 23, 1871. Apparently the Roman apparatus slipped gears in the midst of confusion and panic. Just as St. Meinrad was electing its own abbot, Einsiedeln received

---

346 Marty to Schmid, December 1869 (M55), 8:993, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
a letter contradicting the original papal declaration, stating the pope had taken the liberty to appoint Marty as St. Meinrad’s first abbot. Yet before Marty learned of this serendipitous confirmation of his confreres’ decision, he invited Wimmer to assist at his abbatial confirmation ceremony in the spirit of a “true brothers’ feast.” Wimmer accepted the invitation with the caveat that their monasteries must never “live in isolation” but rather “band together…to offer a more powerful resistance to the forces of evil.” He attended the ceremony in St. Meinrad on May 21, 1871.

As Marty was securing St. Meinrad’s independence, Wimmer led the charge for Benedictine unity. Although he had not attended the ad hoc meeting of abbots in Salzburg in 1868, it nonetheless inspired him to work towards its goal of a federation, something he had already strived for with his *Album*. He had departed for the Vatican Council in October 1869, and he stayed in Europe for considerably longer than Marty, arriving back in Pennsylvania until just before Christmas of 1870. Wimmer attended most of the sessions of the council and remained an ardent infallibilist throughout its proceedings. He brought copies of his *Album* with him and distributed them to fellow abbots and curial officials. This not only raised Wimmer’s profile in Europe but also led to a surprising development. In his *Album* Wimmer had called for an international gathering of abbots at Monte Cassino in 1880 to mark the 1,400th anniversary of St. Benedict’s birth. In Salzburg in 1876, a meeting of German-speaking abbots seconded Wimmer’s proposal. The gesture prompted Wimmer to send a letter to all Benedictine

---

349 On these events, see Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 211-17.
350 Marty to Wimmer, 7 February 1871, handwritten copy in Page 11, Folder “Latrobe,” Box 3, Kleber: Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA. “…es könnte ein rechtes Brüderfest werden…”
353 Ibid., 307.
abbots that repeated his call for a jubilee meeting. This second invitation received the enthusiastic support of the abbot of Monte Cassino and even papal endorsement. This worldwide gathering of abbots took place in May of 1880 and was the first of its kind.

Wimmer chaired the business meeting, which discussed Beuron’s idea of an abbot-general. Wimmer actually objected to this plan, stating, “Unity, but not centralization.” He did support the abbots’ overall agreement that a federation was desirable, and to this Wimmer added the idea of a common house of studies in Rome. 354 Wimmer lived to see this idea realized months before his death, when Pope Leo XIII restored the suppressed Collegio di Sant’Anselmo in Rome in 1887. Nevertheless, he did not live to see the formation of the Benedictine Confederation in 1893, although he would have heartily endorsed its establishment.

Absent from the fourteenth centenary celebration in Monte Cassino was Marty. Pius IX had appointed Marty as Vicar Apostolic of Dakota Territory the previous August. Wimmer had left for Europe after Marty’s episcopal consecration in February of 1880, but Marty stayed behind to conduct ordinations to the deaconate in his own Monte Cassino Chapel. 355 Mundwiler, Marty’s prior and successor, also did not attend the international gathering of abbots in Rome. Both did, however, attend a common American celebration of St. Benedict’s birth at St. Vincent’s in April of 1881. The two strains of American Benedictine monasticism retained a fraternal bond while going their separate ways. The next chapter shows how Marty himself went a separate way during his tenure as abbot, as he attempted to apply his monastic vision to the American “wilderness.”

354 On this 1880 meeting and Wimmer’s role, see Oetgen, An American Abbot (1997), 362-65; the quotation is from p. 365.
355 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 320-322.
CONCLUSION

The chapter has demonstrated how Marty’s early leadership of St. Meinrad focused on reestablishing Einsiedeln’s mission and sustaining it through monastic observance, education, and missionary work. For each task, Marty transformed ideas from his Swiss-Benedictine formation into monastic, scholarly, and pastoral contributions designed to unite Catholics through the monastery. These contributions converged on a line from the Rule: *stabilitas in congregacione*, “stability in the community.” This idea became the heart of Marty’s vision of Benedictine stability as an agent of lasting conversion through the education and unification of the local ecclesial community.

Nevertheless, this chapter has also outlined how challenges and exigencies prompted Marty to refine this vision of stability and community. For St. Meinrad to retain its Benedictine vocation in evangelization, Marty came to believe that the prayer of the monastic community needed to stabilize its school and missionary work and thereby overcome Catholic fragmentation. As this vision matured, Marty further transformed St. Meinrad’s monastery-school-missionary work model through monastic, scholarly, and pastoral contributions designed to unite local Catholics with the universal Church. These contributions mirrored the ideas of his mentors as well as his own essays and sermons as a monk in Einsiedeln. Behind these contributions was Marty’s restorationist sense of divine providence’s role in history, especially through the labors of special individuals. As the following chapter shows, Marty never abandoned this biographical lens for discerning his place in America.
By reconstructing Marty’s debate with Wimmer and recovering his emphasis on *stabilitas loci*, this chapter has further demonstrated how Marty interpreted the Benedictine tradition and imagined the monastic “community” primarily as a “family.” This “familial imagination” guided Marty’s extension of “community” to the lay faithful beyond the cloister, with the monastery as a “tabernacle” for the “mystical body.” His work for monastic stability at St. Meinrad looked toward a twofold community: the monastic community, and the ecclesial community. For Marty, evangelization of the ecclesial community began with the *stabilitas loci* of the monastic community. The following chapter shows how Marty applied this vision to his leadership in the next decade, both as an abbot and as a missionary. This becomes especially evident in his ideal of an ecclesial “double family” in Dakota Territory.
CHAPTER 3: ORA ET LABORA

“...ut in omnibus glorificetur Deus.” RB 57.9

If “stabilitas in congregatione,” a maxim from the Rule (RB 4.78), articulates the maturity of Marty’s “familial” vision of Benedictine evangelization during his first decade in the United States (1860–1870), then “ora et labora,” another Benedictine maxim entirely absent from the Rule, expresses the transition of this vision from the monastery to the prairie during his second decade (1870–1880). Anyone familiar with the Benedictine tradition has encountered this phrase of “prayer and work” as a common adage that the sons and daughters of St. Benedict use to describe their mission and identity in the modern world. Very few, however, are familiar with the phrase’s provenance. Terrence Kardong, one of the foremost Benedictine scholars of the United States, has recently reminded Anglophone scholars that the Benedictines did not adopt this phrase as a widespread unofficial “motto” until the end of the nineteenth century.¹

For evidence he directs his reader to the landmark study of M.D. Meeuws, who cogently maintains that Maurus Wolter was the first Benedictine to apply the exact phrase “ora et labora” to monasticism in his 1880 work Praecipua ordinis monastici elementa.² From this influential work the popularity of “ora et labora” spread. This thesis is quite plausible given Wolter’s extensive promotion of his book to mark the fourteenth centenary of St. Benedict’s birth (480–1880).³ Meeuws further concludes that Benedikt Sauter (1835–

---

³ Wolter wrote the work during his exile in Belgium (after the 1875 suppression of Beuron) and published two versions (one shorter and one longer). The shorter version he gave to the pope, cardinals, and
1908), Wolter’s confrere and cofounder of Beuron, was later the first monk to promote
the phrase as capturing the distinct character of the Benedictine monasticism in 1899. To
date no one has disputed Meeuws’s thesis.

Although Meeuws’s study is extensive and compelling, it possesses two
fundamental flaws. Its purview omits the American Benedictines altogether, and its
chronology unravels when confronted with Marty’s words, penned in 1876: “The
education of several generations is unthinkable without stability, and the family life of a
true Benedictine house of worship….Ora et labora is still today the only formula for
healing the children of Adam and neither the one nor the other can be taught in words
alone.” This line, written four years before Wolter’s work and almost a quarter of a
century before Sauter’s application, presents an indisputable refutation of Meeuws’s
thesis. However, when one searches for Marty’s inspiration, his use of the phrase
intimates originality. The concept appears as a “principle” of the Rule in the fifth volume
of Montalembert’s monumental The Monks of the West, a work Marty knew well. However,
this particular volume did not appear until 1877, and although Montalembert
refers to the interplay of “work and prayer” in earlier volumes, he does so only in passing
and never uses the Latin adage. Marty’s Swiss-Benedictine background may also have
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5 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 20 November 1876, file “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop
Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. For the German, see below, 324n273.
6 Charles Forbes René de Montalembert, The Monks of the West from St. Benedict to St. Bernard,
trans. F.A. Gasquet (London: Nimmo, 1896), 5:196. Montalembert’s first volumes appeared in 1860, but the final
fifth and sixth volumes did not appear until after his death in 1870. Rippinger claims that Marty used
Montalembert’s work for his instructional “conferences” with the monastic community (“Martin Marty: Monk - I” [1982]: 236). He cites Marty’s “personal chronicle” for this valuable information. It appears that
this chronicle has since been misplaced, as I could not find it in my own research in SMAA.
Montalembert typically cites various medieval vitae for the monastic description of “work and prayer.” It is
played a role, as one German-Catholic contemporary uses the phrase for the Benedictines while citing the work of Karl Brandes, Marty’s mentor, including Brandes’s translation of Montalembert’s work. However, Brandes himself never employs the language, leaving his exact influence on Marty indiscernible. If one looks to the American context, the phrase is absent in the writings of Wimmer and other American Benedictine contemporaries. Nevertheless, it is possible that American culture inspired its application, as one recalls from his earlier remark to Morel in 1862 that “we Benedictines should and can help ourselves not by begging but rather through work and the blessings of God obtained through prayer.” In the end, Marty appears to a pioneer, if not the first among his contemporaries, to use “ora et labora” to capture the ethos of Benedictine monasticism.

However, Marty’s peculiar use of “ora et labora” does more than nuance Meeuw’s thesis. Its originality sheds light on its greater significance for Marty’s life and thought. The present chapter argues that Marty’s embrace of the idea of “ora et labora” marks not only an original contribution to his own monastic tradition but also the possible that Marty absorbed this characterization of the monastic life during his own study of various vitae for his essay on Strabo.

8 Godfried Edmund Friess, *Studien über das Wirken der Benediktiner in Oesterreich für Kultur, Wissenschaft und Kunst* (Waidhofen an der Ybbs, Austria: Halsuska, 1868), 1:8. “Damit aber der Wahlpruch des Ordens St. Benedikts: ‘Ora et Labora’ zur Wahrheit wurde, war über alle Stunden des Tages wie der Nacht so disponirt, dass Gebet mit Handarbeit, Lösung mit Ruhe im weisen Gleichmass abwechselten.” Friess cites page 5 of Brandes’s essay, “Der Benediktiner-Ordens nach seiner welthistorischen Bedeutung” (*Tübinger theologische Quartalschrift* 33, no. 1 [1851]: 3–40). However, the phrase does not appear anywhere, in either Latin or German, on the page cited or elsewhere in the essay. On an earlier page (6n2) Friess also cites volume 2 of Brandes’s translation of Montalembert’s *The Monks of the West*, which Brandes produced in the same years that the original French was published. See *Die Mönche des Abendlandes vom H. Benedikt bis zum H. Bernard*, 2 vols. (Regensburg: Manz, 1860).

9 The phrase appears nowhere, in either Latin, English, or German, in Oetgen’s collection of Wimmer’s letters (Boniface Wimmer: Letters). After contacting Oetgen personally, I discovered that in Oetgen’s years of research on Wimmer he was surprised that he never came across the phrase “prayer and work,” in any language, in Wimmer’s writings. Oetegen’s collection contains 778 of some 1,200 letters by Wimmer. Thus, it is possible that the phrase may exist in other letters, although this is highly unlikely.

10 Marty to Gall Morel, 3 May 1862 (M12), 8:934, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives, SMAA.
culmination of his vision for Benedictine evangelization in America. The chapter demonstrates how this concise phrase flowed from two pivotal controversies during Marty’s abbatial tenure and became his missionary paradigm for the Benedictines in America. It shows how Marty’s pursuit of “stabilitas in congregatio” for the monastery develops into an educational model of “ora et labora” in the local church that unifies monks with the indigenous faithful. Moreover, it reveals the importance of Marty’s biographical approach to history in his personal embodiment of this vision, prompting him to transition from a monastic reformer to an itinerant missionary. Overall, the chapter shows how Marty employs “prayer and work” as a framework to establish the Benedictines, including himself, as agents of ecclesial evangelization through education and unification.

To support this thesis, the chapter traces the development of Marty’s vision from “stabilitas in congregatio” to “ora et labora” during his abbatial tenure and second decade in the United States (1870–1880). Like the previous chapter, it uses Marty’s three dimensions of monastery, school, and missionary work to chart the development of his thought. Once again, Marty’s idea of monastic reform informs his sense of monastic scholarship, which in turn drives his pursuit of missionary work. The chapter thus traces this development in three stages. The first section identifies two key controversies that challenged and refined Marty’s vision for the Benedictine monastery in America. By reconstructing these two international debates, this section highlights how each controversy respectively provided the blueprint for Marty’s idea of “prayer and work” later in the decade. The second section recovers Marty’s neglected scholarship during this period, especially in its attempt to educate both his monastic confreres and the laity on
the Benedictine tradition and its place in the Church through a biographical approach to history. In particular, this second section focuses both on Marty’s idea of God using “providential men” to renew the Church and his application of this idea to the history and future of his religious order. From this historical worldview emerges a third and final section, in which Marty looks to the American West and the prairie of the Northern Plains for an opportunity to put his missionary paradigm of prayer and work into practice. By analyzing this final stage of his monastic vocation, just before he became vicar apostolic in 1879, the chapter ventures beyond the assumptions of prior scholarship. Rather than presume that Marty’s Benedictine background inspired his turn to missionary work, this final chapter shows how Marty the Benedictine monk and abbot became Marty the itinerant missionary and bishop.

I. The Abbatial Controversies

Marty’s leadership as abbot was more aggressive than this leadership as administrator and prior. His first decade at St. Meinrad exhibited a greater penchant for emulating Einsiedeln and the model of monasticism he had experienced in Switzerland. While these roots never left him, he nevertheless adopted a more pragmatic and activist outlook for monastic life as an abbot. His experience of the Vatican Council opened him to ideas of Benedictine centralization and reinforced his sense of a divine mission for the Benedictines in America. During this second decade, Marty also gradually lost confidence in Europe’s ability to weather the storm of nineteenth-century liberalism and
anti-clericalism. He absorbed American optimism and its sense of exceptionalism in history, and both informed his belief that a vital opportunity for the continent’s conversion to the Catholic fold lay in the hands of St. Benedict’s sons. What first flickered when he had arrived now became a fire that consumed him.

However, Marty’s years as abbot were also contradictory. He escapes characterization as either a liberal or a conservative. While he imbibed American pragmatism, he simultaneously eschewed American fragmentation, materialism, and its disregard for history. He did not share his contemporaries’ confidence in the inevitable progress of modernity; rather, his confidence lay in a divine mission to evangelize America by returning to the roots of his own monastic tradition. His method for reform was one of returning to the first centuries of the Benedictines. Although this reform agenda originally confined itself to St. Meinrad, it gradually ventured beyond its enclosure. As abbot, Marty realized this agenda in three ways, often in tension with one another: (1) a stricter, simpler life in the monastery conforming to a literal reading of the Rule, (2) a mission to effect Catholic unity through the monastery, and (3) an expansion of the evangelical call of the Benedictines to spread out and convert the world.

With respect to simplicity, Marty applied the idea to both the community and himself. Meals were meager, fast days were strict, and wine and tobacco were forbidden.\footnote{Kl\,eber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 238.} At the same time Marty was intent upon “reducing the external splendor” of his abbatial office, simplifying his role during solemn masses and electing not to wear his pectoral cross beyond the monastery.\footnote{Ibid., 241.} He viewed the Rule’s precept of humility as an essential directive guiding monastic life and liturgical observance.
Marty’s love for Benedictine humility did not, however, prevent him from flexing his authority. He returned from Rome with a renewed zeal for Catholic unity and immediately began with his own monastery. Imitating the basilicas of Rome, Marty placed his abbatial chair in the apse of the monastic church facing a repositioned altar with its back to the people. In doing so, Marty attempted to institute a reform in which the priest (and the abbot) faced the people during the eucharistic liturgy. However, the community found the arrangement to be awkward, and it was quickly abandoned. It was nonetheless a gesture of his ardent desire to unite monks and laity through worship, a wish he would not surrender.

Finally, Marty’s interest in Benedictine expansion looked not to Wimmer’s congregation but rather his own. Although he wanted to emulate Wimmer’s expansion, he wanted to retain the Swiss tradition of localism as an agent of his particular reform at the diocesan level. Opportunity presented itself as early as 1871, when Frowin Conrad, Marty’s former classmate and friend from his days in Einsiedeln, informed him that Engelberg, Conrad’s home abbey, was looking for a possible refuge in the face of Switzerland’s *Kulturkampf*. Meanwhile John Joseph Hogan (1829–1913), the new bishop of St. Joseph, Missouri, wrote Marty inviting the Benedictines to establish a community in his diocese. Marty viewed this as providential. By 1873 Conrad and a confrere had arrived from Engelberg and quickly established “New Engelberg,” later
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13 Ibid., 240-41.
14 Marty likely got this idea from Guéranger’s *Institutions liturgiques*, which argues that the priest facing the people was closer to the true Roman (and thus apostolic) tradition. See Raedts, “Prosper Guéranger,” 338.
Conrad remained Marty’s trusted friend and confidant, and the two set out to reform and renew the Benedictines through their Swiss-American model. The success of Conception further led Marty to expand further into Arkansas in 1877. He accepted an offer from a railroad and the local bishop without St. Meinrad’s approval. Known as “St. Benedict” and later as New Subiaco, the struggling community was the mirror opposite of Conception. Rather than a work of collaboration, it emerged as a testament of Marty’s imprudent self-determination, a source of endless controversy at St. Meinrad, and a cross for Fintan Mundwiler, Marty’s successor.  

The foundation in Arkansas was not the only point of controversy surrounding Marty’s reform agenda. The frustration of his confreres in St. Meinrad soon reached Einsiedeln, which in turn used the visit of Caspar Seiler (d. 1902), a secular priest from Switzerland, to investigate the matter. Seiler presented an extensive report to Einsiedeln on Marty’s leadership. While lauding some of Marty’s achievements, Seiler also criticized Marty as occasionally autocratic, overzealous, and imprudent in his expansion agenda. In his summary, he described Marty as more of “a prophet” or “founder of a religious Order” than “an abbot of an existing Benedictine abbey.” This reaction to Marty’s agenda echoes two larger controversies that consumed his abbatial tenure at St. Meinrad: the introduction of the Roman breviary to replace the monastic breviary, and the integration of the lay brothers with the rest of the monastic community. Both flowed from his reform agenda and set the stage for his missionary vision of “ora et labora” later
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18 Kleber translates and reproduces the report in *History of St. Meinrad*, 234-238.
19 Quoted in ibid., 238.
in Dakota Territory, one extending the unity of the monastic “family” to the greater “family” of the local church.

The Breviary Controversy

For the Easter Octave of 1874, Marty implemented a liturgical innovation that earned him the chastisement of his Swiss confreres in Einsiedeln, the scorn of the Wolter brothers in Beuron, and the rebuke of the Vatican Congregation of Rites. Rather than continue with the *Breviarium Monasticum*, Marty replaced the choir books of his monks with the *Breviarium Romanum*. The former was the common psalter of the Benedictine Order, an interpretation of Benedict’s ordering in the *Rule* that was standardized in the seventeenth century. The latter was the common psalter of secular (i.e., diocesan) priests of the Roman rite, promulgated in the sixteenth century with the reforms of Trent. Both Kleber and Rippinger point out how Marty was ahead of his time, anticipating later attempts to conform the monastic breviary to the Roman breviary in the twentieth century.\(^20\) Both historians note Marty’s attempt to return to the original spirit of St. Benedict, to accommodate the ultramontane spirit of his day, and to make the monastery the liturgical center of the local church. These insights, however, need nuancing with respect to the development of Marty’s thought. The controversy was neither, in Kleber’s words, one of many “mistakes” nor merely an instance of Marty’s foresight.\(^21\) In presenting only a fragmented account of the controversy, these and other scholars have neglected three key elements: (1) Marty’s case for the Roman breviary is based on a restorationist reading of history; (2) Marty’s earlier vision of Benedictine *stabilitas loci*


\(^{21}\) Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 259.
guides his argument and its defense; and (3) at the heart of his reform is an attempt to return the order to its missionary roots. Through these three overlooked elements, the controversy stands at the crossroads of Marty’s transition from a Benedictine monk to a church missionary. The debate shows how his historical worldview championed a return to antiquity for the sake of renewal, and it further marks the first step in his application of Benedictine *stabilitas in congregatio*ne to his own model of Benedictine evangelization as “prayer and work.”

Examining the role of these three elements, this section presents the first complete chronological reconstruction of Marty’s breviary controversy while highlighting its significance in the development of his model of Benedictine evangelization. This section follows seven stages in its reconstruction of the controversy: (1) the debate’s historical and liturgical context, (2) Marty’s rationale for the reform, (3) initial reactions to the reform and Marty’s response, (4) the Beuronese campaign against the reform, (5) Marty’s defense of his reform in light of Beuron’s campaign, (6) Rome’s reversal of Marty’s reform, and (7) the controversy’s contribution to Marty’s transition from abbot to missionary.

**Historical and Liturgical Context**

In order to grasp the novelty of Marty’s reform and the reactions it elicited, one must first understand its liturgical and historical context. The controversy stems from four factors: (1) the liturgical development of separate offices in the Roman Rite, (2) Europe’s *Kulturkampf* during the 1870s, (3) Marty’s interpretation of the spirit of ultramontanism dominating the Catholic world after Vatican I (1869–1870), and (4) his
embrace and promotion of American exceptionalism. These four elements created a chain reaction that ignited a transatlantic imbroglio in the Benedictine world. While Beuron and the Swiss Benedictines saw the *Kulturkampf* as a threat to their existence, Marty saw it as an opportunity for a new, American chapter in the history of Benedictine evangelization, beginning with the reform of the order’s breviary. Both sides celebrated the ultramontane victory of the council, yet for Marty this victory was one of ecclesial unity rather than papal authority.

* A Tale of Two Breviaries

The first factor is perhaps the most puzzling. The common praying of the psalms in the West gradually developed into two main “offices.” The Roman office followed the practice of the ancient Roman church and ordered the liturgy of the hours of cathedral chapters; Gregory I (d. 604) revised it and Gregory VII (d. 1085) extended its observance to the entire Latin Church. The monastic office of the West followed the guidelines of Benedict’s *Rule* (chapters 8-20) after the Carolingian reforms of Benedict of Aniane (d. 821) made the *Rule* the standard of Western monasticism. Despite growing uniformity, Benedictine monasteries continued to interpret the *Rule* according to their own local traditions, and thus the offices of individual monasteries varied in their development of graduals, antiphons, and local feast days.22 As they developed side-by-side, the Roman and monastic offices adopted different liturgical calendars and chose different psalms for specific hours (e.g., matins, vespers, etc.). Gradually the use of portable “breviaries”

---

emerged to accommodate the itinerant apostolate of mendicants and to allow secular priests to pray the office privately. After the Council of Trent (1545–1563), Rome standardized the two offices in the form of breviaries. The *Breviarium Romanum* was promulgated by Pius V (1504–1572) in 1568. Published later by Paul V in 1612, the *Breviarium Monasticum* standardized the liturgical office for the entire Benedictine Order. Einsiedeln naturally observed the latter with its own variation of graduals, hymns, and special feast days. Secular priests observed the former and were required to pray it in private. Consequently, by the nineteenth century a monastery that trained diocesan seminarians had to accommodate two breviaries under the same roof.

*The Kulturkampf*

In his attempt to remedy the double breviary situation, Marty could not have chosen a worse time to irritate his confreres in Europe. The political climate of central Europe had grown alarmingly anti-Catholic. In the background of the controversy loomed the infamous *Kulturkampf* (“culture struggle”) in Prussia and the newly formed German Empire (1871), a conflict that eventually spilled into Switzerland. This context, at least for the breviary controversy, escapes Kleber and Rippinger entirely, and Yock mentions it only in passing. The *Kulturkampf* is nonetheless essential for understanding the European reaction to Marty’s alleged “Americanism.”

---

24 The *Breviarium Romanum* was later revised in 1911 by Pius X (who also revised the *Breviarium Monasticum*). See Pierre Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, trans. Atwell M. Y. Baylay (London: Longmans, 1912).
26 Yock, “The Role of St. Meinrad,” 43-44.
The *Kulturkampf* was the product of Vatican I’s declaration of papal infallibility (*Pastor aeternus*, July 18, 1870) and the liberal pragmatism of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898). Catholics in Prussia had anticipated an anti-Catholic reaction to the council’s decree by forming the Catholic Center Party in the summer of 1870. At the same time, the Franco-German War erupted on the European stage, forcing French troops to abandon Rome and precipitating the fall of the Papal States to the Risorgimento forces and the indefinite suspension of the council. The German Empire was declared, an imperial Reichstag was formed, and the “internationalist” and “Rome-serving” Center Party was seen as a threat to Bismarck’s nationalist agenda. A tide of anti-Catholic legislation in Prussia ensued, championed by the National Liberal Party. In 1872, the state assumed all supervision of schools and expelled the Jesuits. Prussia created a new Royal Tribunal of Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1873 that imposed oaths of allegiance for clergy and seminaries. Catholic resistance only provoked Bismarck further. During the year that Marty introduced the Roman breviary, the *Kulturkampf* reached its apogee. The year 1874 witnessed the state control of bishopric appointments, the introduction of civil marriage laws, limitations on the Catholic press, and the imprisonment of nearly half of Prussia’s bishops and priests. Pius IX reacted with an encyclical denouncing the laws as invalid, and the liberals countered with a law on May 31, 1875, banning all remaining religious orders, including the Benedictines. Monasteries could no longer accept novices and were to be dissolved within six months unless they had a teaching ministry, in which

---

case they could remain for four years. Among these suppressed monasteries was Beuron, situated in Hohenzollern (Prussian) territory. The monks of Beuron fled to their daughter house in Maredsous, Belgium, in 1875 and did not return to Beuron until 1887.

The *Kulturkampf*’s liberal anti-Catholic agenda gradually rippled beyond Prussia. The other kingdoms of the new empire followed Bismarck’s example, albeit not uniformly or with the same tenacity. In Bavaria, for example, Minister Johann von Lutz (1826–1890) pursued a more “covert” course of state control and secularization. Adding insult to injury, Bavaria further witnessed Ignaz von Döllinger’s public dissent from the dogma of papal infallibility and the rise of the Old Catholics, who endorsed the *Kulturkampf*. Beyond Bismarck’s empire the effects of the German *Kulturkampf* were felt in Switzerland more than anywhere else. Liberal cantons like Solothurn and Aargau reignited the fears of the 1850s by expelling bishops and suppressing monasteries in the early 1870s. Although the more conservative cantons refrained from such measures, these events caused significant anxiety among the Swiss Benedictines. Engelberg’s foundation in Missouri was a product of these fears, and Einsiedeln looked once again to St. Meinrad as potential refuge in the event of suppression.

---


Translating the Council

Marty was well aware of the Kulturkampf as it unfolded in Europe and anticipated it after witnessing the Vatican Council first hand. Before leaving Rome in the spring of 1870, Marty had taken it upon himself to publish a German translation of the council’s first decree on faith and reason, the dogmatic constitution Dei filius (April 24, 1870). Only a couple of days after its promulgation, Marty handed his manuscript to Kaspar Willi, his former professor from Einsiedeln’s Stiftschule and now the bishop of Chur, who in turn provided a forward for the translation. Marty then returned to Switzerland and gave the manuscript to Benziger for immediate publication in June, before the controversial promulgation of Pastor aeternus on papal infallibility (July 18, 1870). The content of this modest work has been practically ignored in scholarship on Marty, yet it is essential for understanding the breviary controversy. Marty’s translation offers a window into his approach both toward the ultramontanism of day and the crisis of Catholicism’s Kulturkampf. Both inspired his decision to embrace the Roman breviary.

In a brief afterword after his translated text of Dei filius, Marty presents his own interpretation of the council and its meaning for Catholic unity. He shares the ultramontane spirit of his day and celebrates how the voice of the pope combines “reason and history” to express an “eternal truth” that every faithful Catholic can readily recognize. However, he simultaneously speaks of infallibility in terms of the church’s

34 Kleber is the only biographer who analyzes this modest work. See Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 170-73.
35 Martin Marty, “Nachworte,” in Die ersten Beschlüsse der vatikanischen Kirchenversammlung, 42. “…weder Priester noch Laien, der nicht in der vorliegenden Entscheidung des Nachfolgers der Apostel die klare, ruhige, mit Vernunft und Geschichte im Einklang stehende Sprache der ewigen Wahrheit freudig erkennt und ehrfurchtstvoll anerkennt.”
collective teaching office of the assembled bishops, with the pope as the “first of these
divine messengers.” Together the pope and the bishops “give witness to the eternal truth
in the view of our age.” Even though this more collegial approach is written before
Pastor aeternus, it already reveals Marty’s particular lens toward the ultramontanism of
his day. The council is fundamentally about Catholic unity rather than papal authority,
and Dei filius is a call for Catholics to return to this infallible source of unity.

This emphasis on unity explains why Marty explicitly addresses his afterword to
his fellow Swiss Catholics, a point scholars have completely ignored. Even though the
work was also published for German-American Catholics in the United States, it is clear
that Marty intended the translation primarily as a stern warning for a Swiss, German-
speaking audience. He predicts that the Swiss republic will fall like ancient Rome despite
its high culture “if, rejecting its Catholic traditions, [it] sinks back into unbelief and
paganism.” In particular he attacks the Swiss press as “less honorable” than that of its
“transatlantic sister-republic,” since the American press at least does not deny
Catholicism a voice. Yet his chastisement of his Swiss coreligionists serves a greater
purpose: he reminds Swiss Catholics that “we have received [the truth] not for ourselves,
but also for others. Those who are in danger of loosing this precious good should find
protection and help from us.” It is in the spirit of the Catholic duty towards “others” that

---

36 Ibid., 43. “Auf diese Thatsachen gestützt hat Pius IX., der gegenwärtige Nachfolger Petri, des ersten
dieser Gottesboten, die Glieder des einen von Christus eingesetzten und darum unfehlbaren Lehramtes aus
allen Nationen zu Rom versammelt, damit sie mit ihm der ewigen Wahrheit Zeugniß geben im Angesichte
unserer Zeit.”
37 Ibid. “Das Schweizervolk insbesondere, sollte es auch die alte römische Republik…noch
übertreffen, wird ebensowenig als jene dem sittlichen und gesellschaftlichen Ruin entgehen können, wenn
es seinen katholischen Traditionen untreu in Unglauben und Heidenthum zurücksinkt.”
38 Ibid., 46. “Zugleich wollen wir uns aber auch der Pflichten erinnern, welche dieser Besitz uns
auferlegt, denn die Wahrheit ist Gottes Gabe und wir haben sie nicht bloß für uns selbst empfangen,
sondern auch für Andere. Diejenigen, welche in Gefahr sind dieses kostbare Gut zu verlieren, sollen bei uns
Schutz finden; denjenigen die es suchen, sollen wir zu Hilfe kommen.”
he has undertaken the task of this translation. The teachings of the council, in other words, are a call for evangelization, and to hear this call, one must be in union with Rome. Consequently, Marty’s intention behind the work comes down to a call for ecclesial evangelization through ecclesial unity, inspired by the teachings of the recent ecumenical council.

Hope in a New World

As the tide of the *Kulturkampf* surged, Marty combined the call for ultramontane unity and evangelization with a spirit of American exceptionalism. He continued to voice a lack of confidence in the future of European Catholicism while presenting America as the hope for “others” in an age of darkness. He offered the monks of Maria Stein in Solothurn asylum in St. Meinrad, and invited the monks of Engelberg to Missouri after learning of their fears of suppression. 39 Yet it is his reports to Europe that bear the greatest mark of this attitude of American exceptionalism. In a published letter to the Ludwig-Missionsverein, Marty compares St. Meinrad with the biblical story of Joseph and his brothers in Egypt, “sent ahead” to create a “place of refuge” in the “only land of ecclesiastical freedom.” 40 On the eve of Marty’s introduction of the Roman breviary, he describes St. Meinrad to the same Bavarian missionary society as an “offshoot of the old faith” planted in America. Like the Benedictines of the eighth and ninth centuries, the

---

39 Marty to Schmid, 18 January 1872 (M68), 8:1004, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

monks of Indiana offer the exiled “Catholic, priest and monk” a “new homeland.” In a similar letter to the Leopoldinen-Stiftung in Vienna, Marty invites Benedictines caught in the “storm in Europe” to plant a “seed of the old tree in the new ground of freedom” in America. At the very time he composed this last letter, another “storm” was brewing in Beuron over Marty’s implementation of the Roman breviary.

Marty’s Rationale for the Reform

Marty’s introduction of the Roman breviary in 1874 was not without forethought. According to Kleber, Marty had already entertained the idea in 1869. Kleber further outlines Marty’s logic for the move as threefold: the Roman breviary was less cluttered with feast days; the secular seminarians of the monastic school could learn the same psalter they were required to pray; and secular priests at the abbey (often sent there for disciplinary reasons) could partake in the prayer of the monastic community.

However, Kleber neglects another practical reason behind Marty’s reasoning. The new abbot now had the opportunity to move his monks into a recently completed portion of the new sandstone monastery in the fall of 1874. Marty anticipated this transition of the community into a new private chapel separated from the old double church that

---


42 Marty to Joseph Othmar Rauscher of Vienna, 18 October 1874, 13:1510, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Allein da der Sturm in Europa immer dohender wird, so möchte nun so eher der Augenblick gekommen sein noch einige Saamenkoerner vom alten Baume auf neuen Boden der Freiheit zu verpflanzen und von dem alten Erbe des Ordens wenn möglich noch einige Ueberreste demselben zu erhalten.”

43 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 249.

44 Ibid., 223-25.
served the monks, the seminarians, the lay students, guests, and the faithful from the
surrounding area. This new space for the recitation of the hours presented a problem for
Marty. Were the seminarians, students, and visiting priests to observe the Roman
breviary in the old chapel and the monks continue to pray the monastic breviary in the
new? It made little sense to have the students and secular priests follow the monastic
breviary without the guidance of the monks. Moreover, this separation was to be
temporary. Once work on the abbey church was completed (which it never was),\(^45\) Marty
hoped that the community would again pray in a space that could also accommodate the
seminarians, students, and guests and replace the old chapel altogether. How would the
two groups then pray together? Moreover, is not the very essence of a monastic seminary
the education of future priests in the art and rubrics of liturgical prayer? The adoption of
the Roman breviary by the monks presented itself as a ready solution to these questions.

Kleber also misses the liturgical source of Marty’s idea and its development,
manifested in his *Cantarium Romanum*. As discussed in the previous chapter, this humble
work was an explicit response to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore’s decree on
the laity and Gregorian chant (1866). The work blended the American demand for
liturgical unity and the French liturgical ultramontanism of Guéranger. *Cantarium
Romanum* was a direct precursor to Marty’s decision to adopt the Roman brevIary for the
sake of liturgical education and unity, yet the brevIary controversy marked a definitive
departure from the French Benedictine model that inspired the reform. After publishing
*Cantarium Romanum*, Marty’s 1869 visit to Solesmes on the way to the council likely
reinforced his desire to increase lay participation through Guéranger’s retrieval of

\(^{45}\) Economic depression was one reason, among others. See White, “The Making of an American
Seminary,” 91.
Gregorian chant and promotion of the Roman missal in France.\textsuperscript{46} It was during this visit that Marty also shared his thoughts on the Roman breviary with Guéranger.\textsuperscript{47} Guéranger, an ultramontane champion of liturgical uniformity in France through the Roman missal, surprisingly advised against the Roman breviary. Solesmes had in fact began with the Roman breviary from its infancy, yet when Guéranger was able to acquire a sufficient number of monastic breviaries in 1846, the community embraced the standard \textit{Breviarium Monasticum}. Marty was likely aware of and inspired by this chapter of the abbey’s history.\textsuperscript{48} As with his own abandonment of the Roman breviary, Guéranger’s reaction to Marty’s idea stemmed from a conviction that the Benedictines were first and foremost monks, and thus while they served the Church and facilitated unity with Rome, their first duty was to their own liturgical tradition. Marty met a similar opinion when he proposed the idea to the dean of Einsiedeln, Idelfons Hürlimann (1826–1894).\textsuperscript{49}

Marty was always one to respect the opinion of his mentors, and he appears to have abandoned the idea of the Roman breviary upon returning from the council. In 1873 he asked Hürlimann that Einsiedeln bear the cost of new monastic breviaries for St. Meinard.\textsuperscript{50} However, less than five months later, Marty procured Roman breviaries

\textsuperscript{46} Austin Gough, “The Roman Liturgy, Gregorian Plain-chant and the Gallican Church,” \textit{The Journal of Religious History} 11, no. 4 (Dec. 1981): 536-57. Gough does point out that, although Guéranger was a staunch advocate of the Roman missal in France, he thought some local, Gallican liturgies should be tolerated.

\textsuperscript{47} Marty to Frowin Conrad, 18 July 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, Frowin Conrad Collection, CAA: ' in Solesmes habe ich mit Dom Guéranger selbst darüber gesprochen…”


\textsuperscript{49} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 249. Hürlimann was Marty’s mentor as prefect of school during his teaching years. Hürlimann confesses that Marty asked his opinion in his “Vorbemerkung,” 13:1562, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. On Hürlimann, see Henggeler, \textit{Professbuch}, 537-38.

\textsuperscript{50} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 249.
instead. This reversal marked a definitive departure not only from Einsiedeln’s precedent but also that of Solesmes. Marty was no longer convinced that the monastic breviary was true to St. Benedict and the *Rule*. In fact, he believed that the Roman breviary was more faithful to the spirit of the *Rule*, facilitated full unity between monks and the rest of the church, and allowed the Benedictines to serve the Church more fully.

With these premises, Marty took Guéranger’s liturgical ultramontanism to its logical conclusion: if liturgical uniformity was desirable for the unity of the Church, why should not monks follow the same path of uniformity in their own daily office?

From these practical considerations and their liturgical inspiration, Marty implemented his reform. He did not, however, anticipate that the reform would attract attention beyond Indiana. He soon discovered that he was mistaken.

**Initial Reactions to the Reform & Marty’s Response**

The transition to the Roman breviary caused some ripples within St. Meinrad, but Marty did not expect them to continue. By selecting Holy Week for the introduction of the reform, when the monks were required to follow the Roman breviary anyway, Marty sought to make the transition as subtle as possible. He saw no reason to promote his reform beyond St. Meinrad, even within the Swiss-American Congregation. In fact he sent his monastic breviaries to his Swiss confreres in Missouri to put to good use. Nevertheless, this gesture of goodwill was what eventually drew the attention of both

---

51 Ibid. See Marty to Hürlimann, 16 February 1874, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA.
52 It is unclear whether Marty consulted the monastic chapter before his reform. Rippinger suggests that he did (*The Benedictine Order in the United States*, 51). Kleber, on the other hand, intimates otherwise and points to division within the community on the issue. See *History of St. Meinrad*, 249-50; “Bishop Martin Marty,” 214. Mundwilder was against the idea, while Hobi and the seminarians endorsed it.
Einsiedeln and Beuron in Europe. As criticism of the change mounted, Marty found himself on the defensive. These rebukes nevertheless forced Marty to articulate his greater vision not only for St. Meinrad but for monastic evangelization in the United States. The ensuing debate spurred Marty to expand his vision and strengthen his conviction that he was following God’s will for the Benedictines in America. The demur of his confreres further convinced Marty that the Benedictines had grown insular and had become reluctant to pursue evangelization efforts. Indeed, without the controversy surrounding his reform, it is unlikely that Marty would have written so forcefully and clearly about his designs for Benedictine evangelization in America.

The first wave of reaction to Marty’s efforts came from two fronts: his former mentors in Einsiedeln, and Frowin Conrad of the Swiss foundation in Missouri. Marty’s responses to these reactions form the bulk of Kleber’s discussion of the controversy, and the quotations that he selects have in turn been reproduced by other scholars.54 These quotations, while insightful, have often been presented in a random arrangement without an eye to chronology or context. However, if the two strains of initial reaction are juxtaposed, variances in language and emphases come to light.

**Correspondence with Einsiedeln**

Einsiedeln’s dismay at Marty’s reform stemmed in no small part from his reluctance to give Einsiedeln any advanced warning about his decision. He did not inform Abbot Schmid directly, but rather informed Hürlimann, “in all confidence,” that Benedictine breviaries were no longer necessary since he had ordered Roman breviaries instead. The news was abrupt, the decision seemed impulsive, and Marty’s explanation

---

54 Rippinger, for example, follows Kleber. See “Martin Marty: Monk - I” (1982): 234-36.
intimated that Einsiedeln had chosen a “particularistic” direction rather than the path of Catholic unity: “When today all dioceses in the Catholic world abandon their liturgy, why should the [religious] orders hold a particularistic position?” In other words, monasteries should follow the lead of dioceses, who had left local liturgical arrangements behind in favor of the Roman missal. The days of cathedral chapters forming communities of prayer within each diocese had disappeared with the French Revolution. Marty argued that “in the present, when the public recitation of the office is no longer possible for the secular priest, the [religious] orders alone can continue the public recitation of the office and form the prayer nucleus of the diocese.” The argument was one from unity, since “all good elements must join together.” For Marty, it was the task of the Benedictines to effect this in each diocese, and abandoning the order’s “particularistic” breviary was a means to this end.

Hürlimann quickly expressed his dismay at Marty’s decision. He informed the American abbot that he had actually hoped that the Church would adopt the Benedictine breviary to replace the Roman one. He further invoked the authority of a 1616 decree from the Congregation of Rites, inserted into the cover of the Breviarium Monasticum, that stipulated how the monk was obliged to follow this specific breviary. In his reply, Marty countered with two points. The decree in question applied only to monks as “individuals” and not to a community that elected to follow the Roman breviary, and the


57 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 249; “Bishop Martin Marty,” 216.
monastic breviary was moreover a “privilege” that the Benedictines could “relinquish” at any point.\(^{58}\)

On the same day that he replied to Hürlimann, Marty penned a letter to another confrere in Einsiedeln, Benno Kühne (1833–1916), who was rector of the *Stiftschule*. Kühne had been ordained with Marty in 1856, and the two were close friends who had been students and teachers at the *Stiftschule* together.\(^ {59}\) Unlike the more business-like letter to Hürlimann, this letter presented a more personal and thorough rationale for the breviary decision.

Marty’s letter to Kühne converges on two main points. First, a renewal of the church’s spiritual life comes only through unity with Rome. Second, the pressing task of the Benedictines is to become centers of this renewal at the local, diocesan level. The first point flows from the premise that the old habits of European monasticism hinder the realization of the renewal rather than aid it. He insists that “in Europe all pretenses must first fully become a *tabula rasa* [a blank slate] before the genuinely good elements can free themselves from the old customs and prejudices and can pursue the path of salvation laid forth at the last session of the Vatican Council.”\(^ {60}\) Even a friend like Kühne must have blinked at this provocative line and its indirect verdict on the “customs” of

\(^{58}\) Marty to Ildefons Hürlimann, 19 April 1874, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. “Die Bestimmung der Congr. Rit. von 24 Jan. 1616 bezieht sich auf die Mönche als Individuen bindet aber die Kommunität nicht, denn es von Anfang an freigestellt werden, wenn alle Mitglieder damit einverstanden seien, das römische Brevier zu adoptiren. Überdies ist die Rezitation des monastischen Breviers ein Privilegium, auf das der Orden oder das Kloster verzichten kann.”

\(^{59}\) On Kühne, see Henggeler, *Professbuch*, 548-49.

Einsiedeln. Nor would Benno have shared Marty’s assessment of the order in the following lines: the Benedictines, Marty continues, have, “more than any other order,” sought a “particularistic direction and thereby fully or partially severed themselves from the sole life source of all ecclesial-social forms.”61 However, Kühne would have had some sympathy for Marty’s ultramontane reading of history in the following lines. He appeals to the witness of history: the French Benedictines became “Jansenists,” the Italians “Italianissimi,” the Germans “Josephinists,” and the Swiss “have also not become ultramontane.” From these descriptions, Marty maintains that in “a century of newspapers, telegraphs, and railroads, one can no longer seclude oneself particularistically.” Kühne would have likely read this line as an alarming endorsement of modernity, and he would have disagreed with Marty’s application of his broad, sweeping narrative for an ultramontane agenda: “The demand of the present is to unite oneself perfectly to the whole ecclesial-life [kirchlichen Gesamtleben], to surrender all special ideas and special interests. So long as the Benedictines have identified themselves with Rome, they have achieved their mission; and if we are to fulfill our purpose, we must again become fully one with the divine and – in the Holy Spirit – only infallible center.”62 With this final line, Marty points to Döllinger and Dupanloup as prime examples of this

---

61 Marty to Benno Kühne, 19 April 1874, SMAA. “Mehr als irgend ein anderer Orden haben die Benediktiner seit Jahrhunderten eine partikularistische Richtung verfolgt und damit von der einzigen Lebensquelle aller kirchlich-sozialen Gestaltungen sich ganz oder theilweise abgeschnitten.”

62 Ibid. “Die französischen Benediktiner haben als Jansenisten geendet, die italienischen als Italianissimi, die deutschen waren und sind großenteils noch Josephiner und wir in der Schweiz sind auch nicht ultramontan gewesen. Im Jahrhundert der Zeitungen, Telegraphe und Eisenbahnen kann man nirgends mehr sich partikularistisch abschließen - dem kirchlichen Gesammtleben sich vollkommen anschließen alle Sonderideen und Sonderinteressen aufgeben, ist die Forderung der Gegenwart. So lange die Benediktiner sich mit Rom identifizierten, da haben sie auch ihre Aufgabe gelöst und sollen wir unsere Bestimmung erfüllen, so müssen wir wieder völlig Eins werden mit dem göttlichen, im hl. Geiste allein unfehlbaren Zentrum.” Again, I have revised Kleber’s commonly quoted translation upon consulting the original, handwritten manuscripts. Oddly enough, Dulles makes a similar point with respect to the need for a centralized Church in the modern world. See Avery Cardinal Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” America 183 (July 15-22, 2000): 6-11.
“particularistic” attitude. For a Swiss Benedictine like Kühne, the importance of ultramontanism would not have been in question. What he would have questioned was Marty’s use of the word “particularistic.”

The rest of Marty’s letter focuses on his second main point, employing this ultramontane argument for a program of Benedictine evangelization at the local level. Immediately one recognizes a premise from Marty’s debate with Wimmer on the essence of Benedictine stability in the context of evangelization. Marty maintains that the Benedictines are “not cosmopolitans, but rather, by virtue of their stability, their task is of a local nature.” Any separation between the monks and the “diocesan life and its clergy” would only produce “antagonism instead of community life.” Rather, Marty repeats his argument from the letter to Hürlimann, noting that there are no cathedral chapters in America. The Benedictines must therefore fill this void: “To my way of thinking there ought rather to be a Benedictine monastery in each diocese” that serve as “centers of prayer and fountainheads of supernatural spiritual life.” These centers would facilitate the education of the secular clergy, provide it with “recreation, renewal, counsel and help both for itself and, through missions, for its parishes,” and offer a place of retirement in illness and old age. Marty even claims that this model is a “partial” reality in Switzerland. He tells Kühne that the time is at hand to “prepare and organize ourselves for such a purpose, following the cues of Providence.” After all, the Roman breviary is clearly “through and through a spiritual, true, and divine work,” whereas the monastic

---

63 Marty to Benno Kühne, 19 April 1874, SMAA. “Die Benediktiner sind überdies keine Kosmopoliten, sondern ihre Aufgabe ist vermöge der Stabilität lokaler Natur…”

64 Ibid., “Wie ich mir's denke, sollte vielmehr in jeder Diözese ein Benediktinerkloster stehen, namentlich hier in A. wo es keine sonstigen Collegiat- und Cathedral Kapitel gibt, als Gebetscentrum und damit auch als Quellpunkt des übernatürlichen geistigen Lebens - der Weltklerus sötte bei den Benediktiner seine Erziehung finden, während seinen Arbeitsjahren bei denselben Erholung, Erneuerung, Rath und Hilfe für sich und durch Missionen für s. Gemeinde finden, und in diese seine Jugendheimath sollte er in seinen alten oder kranken Tagen sich zurückziehen können.”
breviary “has become an amalgamation of the Roman and is a human work, a patchwork without thought and coherence.” Marty insists that this fact is obvious. It is this closing line that likely alarmed Kühne and others in Einsiedeln the most, especially in its bestowal of divine status on one breviary over the other.

However, Marty’s response may have offended Einsiedeln most because of something completely ignored by other historians: the dating of both letters. The choice of April 19, 1874, may have been intentional for Marty. The date marked a national vote in Switzerland that overwhelmingly favored the radical liberal move to revise the confederation’s constitution. The Catholic conservatives feared the revision as a triumph of centralization and secularization that would erode cantonal governance and surrender education to the state. Marty was well aware of this latest chapter of Switzerland’s Kulturkampf, and his dating in the letter to Kühne directly confirms this knowledge. Kleber and others fail to note that Marty concludes his letter with a peculiar dating in the margins: “on the 19th of A, the day of the Swiss-Confederation revision vote.” This note, unusual for Marty, suggests that he intentionally chose the date for the defense of his position against the “particularism” of his Swiss confreres. Further

---


67 Zimmer, A Contested Nation, 167-70. The success of the revision also resulted in a direct form of democracy (the referendum) that, ironically, allowed Catholic conservatives to join with other groups to overturn the radical-liberal reforms later in the century (e.g., the secularization of schools). See Urs Altermatt, Katholizismus und Moderne: Zur Sozial- und Mentalitätsgeschichte der Schweizer Katholiken im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Zürich: Benziger, 1989), 143-46.

evidence can be found in Marty’s pejorative application of the term “particularism,”
which was an embattled word that ultramontanes used against Gallican governments (like
Bavaria and its toleration of the schismatic Old Catholics) and German and Swiss liberals
categorized as an obstruction to state unification and centralization.\(^69\) Marty clearly uses
the term in the sense of the former, but it is plausible that his confreres, while agreeing to
ultramontane principles, could not help but associate the term with the latter as an attack
on their resistance to the radical-liberal agenda of centralization. By signaling this
infamous date for Swiss Catholics, Marty implied that Swiss Catholicism’s only hope
was in solidarity with papacy as its protector. His confreres likely viewed Marty’s
argument as an American, progressive ultramontanism that did not have to rely on the
state for its protection and existence. Regardless of whether Hürlimann and Kühne took
offense to accusation of “particularism,” German monks in Beuron to the north, in the
midst of battling Bismarck’s *Kulturkampf*, certainly did.

**Correspondence with Conrad**

Only a few days after writing Hürlimann and Kühne, Marty began another strain
of correspondence with Frowin Conrad. As noted above, Conrad was the prior of the
Swiss-Benedictine foundation in Missouri and a classmate and friend from Marty’s days
in Einsiedeln’s *Stiftschule*.\(^70\) Conrad had heard of the breviary change earlier in a letter
from Mundwiler, and the Missouri priory had also received St. Meinrad’s old monastic

\(^{69}\) See Volker Sellin, “Nationalbewusstsein und Partikularismus in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert,” in
*Kultur und Gedächtnis*, ed. Jan Assmann and Tonio Hölscher (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988), 241-64. For a
contemporary example of its use, see “Gedanken über das persönliche Verhalten des katholischen Klerus
den politischen Zeitfragen,” *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland* 63 (1869):
581-96.

\(^{70}\) See above, chapter 2, 77.
breviaries. Conrad appears to have been troubled by the decision, and thus Marty found himself defending the decision on yet another front. It was this second front with Conrad, however, that would make the breviary question an international controversy beyond the Swiss-Benedictine Congregation. Although Conrad’s foundation was a daughter house of Engelberg, the young prior was enamored with the liturgical aesthetics and monastic discipline of the Wolter brothers in Beuron and by extension, Guéranger’s legacy in Solesmes. Marty approached Conrad as a close friend and confidant, and thus the correspondence with Conrad bears a more personal, direct explanation, and this explanation, unlike the one with Einsiedeln, assumes a different line of argumentation. Whereas Marty’s initial correspondence with Einseideln focuses on ultramontanism, his correspondence with Conrad emphasizes a return to the original spirit of St. Benedict in the New World. Marty presumed that he would find in Conrad an ear sympathetic to the American monastic experience and its opportunities. Instead, Marty underestimated Conrad’s personal ties with Beuron. Conrad shared this personal correspondence with the Wolter brothers of Beuron, who later used the correspondence to attack what they perceived as a radical American movement blind to tradition.

Marty’s first letter to Conrad on the issue, dated April 24, 1874, is immediately surprising upon examination: unlike most of his letters, Marty writes Conrad in English, and thus this first letter proffers a window into Marty’s vision in another tongue. But

---

71 Fintain Mundwiler to Frowin Conrad, 8 January 1874, File “Correspondence St. Meinrad, Abbot Fintan Mundwiler 1874-1897,” Drawer 2, File Cabinet 515, CAA. See also Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 214.
73 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 24 April 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. In this first letter (24 April 1874), Marty acknowledges that Conrad wrote him on April 14, 1874. This letter does not survive in SMAA. In choosing English, Marty appears to have wanted to help improve the English skills of his Swiss confere.
the letter is also remarkable for other reasons. Marty once again stresses the “great advantage” that the Roman breviary is in comparison to the monastic breviary. He encourages Conrad to adopt not only the Roman breviary but also the missal and ceremonials. The monastic breviary, he insists, “is mere sham” in its appeal to follow faithfully St. Benedict and his Rule. For this daring claim, Marty presents three reasons. First, there is the aftermath of French Revolution, before which “there is not one monastery like the other and not one, which was not deserted at the time of the Revolution.” In other words, Marty appears to attribute the collapse of Benedictine monasticism during the Revolution to its own fragmentation. After the Revolution, the monks who restored monastic observance “kept of the old rules or dropped, what they pleased,” perpetuated by each successive abbot. This leads to Marty’s second point: the adoption of the Roman breviary will prevent Conrad’s successors (as well as his own) from doing “anything arbitrary” as “subsequent change [would be] an act of disobedience and lawlessness.” For a ready example of such arbitrariness, Marty points to the piecemeal traditions of Beuron and Solesmes, each a “new institution” that follows a different liturgy according to the wishes of its respective abbot. He even accuses Guéranger of keeping “of the old Benedictine regulations, what coincided with his taste and views.” From this bold attack on the heart of the European revival, Marty ends with his third point emphasizing a return to the original Benedictine spirit: “I would simply ask this one question: If St. Benedict was living and writing his Rule today, would he prescribe a breviary and ritual different from the Roman?” For this rhetorical question, he provides an obvious answer: “No, certainly, and he would not be allowed to do so. Who then is more faithful to his spirit, the fili obedientiae or the spiritus singularitatis?”

74 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 24 April 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin
someone who both sought Guéranger’s counsel on the matter five years earlier and, moreover, who was simultaneously planning to introduce the Beuronese habit for his monks (without their consent) at the very moment he penned these words, this dichotomy of “obedience” versus “singularity” seems uncharitable and even hypocritical. Nevertheless, the line signals Marty’s self-conscious break from the European model of monasticism in a way his correspondence with Einsiedeln does not. His audacious claim that Americans were “obedient sons” while European monks were men of “singularity” following a “sham” of a breviary was likely an opinion Marty did not dare share with his European confreres. His trust that Conrad would keep these comments on the American side of the Atlantic proved to be misplaced.

As Conrad received Marty’s letter, he also received one from Placidus Wolter denouncing Marty’s idea. Wolter appears to have already known of Marty’s plans, or had at least heard of them, from an unknown source. Conrad appears to have hoped to act as an arbitrator between Marty and Wolter. In an attempt to shed light on Marty’s rationale for his decision, Conrad forwarded his letter, unbeknownst to Marty, on June 3, 1874, to Wolter in Beuron. In the meantime, Conrad in turn forward Wolter’s letter to Marty. In his letter, Wolter had accused Marty of not being a “true son” of St. Benedict with his repulsive “innovations,” which, moreover, abandoned twelve chapters of the Rule (RB 9-

---

75 Placidus Wolter refers to the controversy in an April 17, 1874, letter to Conrad, translated in Malone, “Documents,” 316. Placidus’s language in this letter suggests that he is informing Conrad about Marty, rather than vice versa. Consequently, Wolter’s likely source was Einsiedeln, intimating that the Swiss abbey and Beuron shared close ties at the time.

76 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 253; “Bishop Martin Marty,” 220. See Conrad to Placidus Wolter, 3 June 1874, handwritten copy in Pages 7-8, Folder “Archives-Varia,” Box 4, Kleber: Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA.
and rejected “a form of prayer which our Holy Father [Benedict] used and sanctified.” The accusation compelled Marty to formulate a response.

Dated July 18, 1874, Marty’s letter responds to Wolter’s forwarded letter with a vociferous, ultramontane defense. “All the objections that have been made,” Marty maintains, “do not touch the issue at all.” In its “parts and proportions,” the Roman breviary is a “homogenous and harmonic whole.” This breviary, moreover, was created from the “foundation” of Benedict’s Rule by a “holy Benedictine,” Pope Gregory VII (d. 1085). There is little historical veracity to this claim, yet it is only tangential to Marty’s greater point. As in his defense to Hürlimann, Marty again describes the current monastic breviary as a “patchwork” (Flickwerk) that lacks the “inner, organic coherence” that the Rule proscribes. Consequently, Placidus Wolter’s claim that St. Meinrad has tossed aside twelve chapters of the Rule could be equally leveled against the monastic breviary. Only the Cistercians follow the literal organization of the Rule, and Marty dismisses them

77 Wolter to Conrad, 17 April 1874, in Malone, “Documents,” 316. Malone translates the letter as “how in the world can a true son of St. Benedict deliberately set aside the twelfth chapter of the Holy Rule, and on his own initiative abandon a form of prayer which our Holy Father used and sanctified?” This translation must mistake “twelfth chapter” for “twelve chapters” for two reasons: the twelfth chapter plays a minor role in Benedict’s ordering of the psalms, and Marty’s original letter, responding to Wolter’s charge (see below), speaks of “twelve chapters.”

78 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 18 July 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. Kleber quotes a small portion of this letter. See Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 219. Kleber, however, dates the letter July 14, 1874; the CAA original states July 18. Marty also acknowledges the reception of a letter from Beuron on the matter, but he says little more. It is not clear if the letter was addressed to him or another confrere at St. Meinrad.

79 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 18 July 1874, CAA. “Aber alle Einwürfe, die gemacht werden berühren die Sache selbst gar nicht. Das römische Brevier ist ein einheitliches, in allen seinen Theilen und Verhältnissen harmonisches Ganze, geschaffen auf der Grundlage der Benediktinerregel v. dem h. Benedictiner Gregor VII.”

80 It appears that Marty creates this argument from a claim in Guéranger’s Institutions liturgiques, a claim that Pierre Batiffol refutes in his history of the Roman breviary: Pierre Batiffol, History of the Roman Breviary, trans. Atwell Baylay (London: Longmans, 1912), 126-30. Marty also presumes that Gregory VII was once a “monk” of Cluny, a claim that has since been disproven by modern research. See H.E.J. Cowdrey, Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 29. See also Uta-Renate Blumenthal, Gregor VII. Papst zwischen Canossa und Kirchenreform (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2001).

81 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 18 July 1874, CAA. “Das jetzige Benediktinerbrevier ist ein unförmliches Flickwerk ohne innere, organischen Zusammenhang, das der hl. Regel weit weniger entspricht.”
as more of an “artificially received ruin of the past than an animated and effective
member of the present.” Benedict’s organization, Marty continues, was an attempt to
stabilize the Roman liturgy. If Rome’s liturgical norms had reflected the integrity in the
sixth century that they now enjoy in nineteenth, “would Benedict have introduced
something of his own?” He further questions the ultramontanism of Conrad and his
Beuronese mentors: “You tell me, ‘a hundred times Rome.’ Now where is there more
reverence toward the [Holy] Father: in improving that which can not be improved
because of its condition, or presenting him, as an honor, that which is defective as if it
were better?” Marty concludes by pointing out that the Beuronese and others have yet to
present any “intrinsic arguments” against the Roman breviary, and instead their
“extrinsic” arguments are a product of a “misunderstanding.”

A few weeks after Marty penned this latest defense, an open letter or “memorial”
from Beuron began to circulate Benedictine abbeys in Europe that accused Marty of his
own misunderstanding of the Benedictine tradition. Marty’s April 24 letter, forwarded by
Conrad, had reached Beuron and precipitated this vociferous denunciation of St.
Meinrad’s reform. The combination of Marty’s April 24 letter and Beuron’s memorial
elevated the controversy from a minor fraternal disagreement to an international
imbroglio.

---

82 Ibid. “Die Anklage, daß wir die hl. Regel in 12 Kapitale gegenstandslos machen gilt ebensogut von
dem jetzigen Benediktinerbrevier und nur die Cisterzienser die fast gar keine Heiligen und Feste feiern
haben noch den modus orandi der Väter dafür sind sie aber auch mehr eine wirkliche oder künstlich
erhaltene Ruin der Vergangenheit, als in lebendiges und wirksames Glied der Gegenwart.”
83 Ibid. “Wäre Rom so gestanden in Liturgie und Disziplin zur Zeit des hl. Benedikt, wie es Heute steht
und spricht, würde St. Benedikt was Eigenes eingeführt haben? - Sie sagen mit mir: "hundertmal Rom."
Wo ist nun mehr Pietät gegen den Vater, wenn man verbessert, was er nicht besser machen konnte der
Verhältnisse wegen, oder wenn man ihm zu Ehren das Mangelhafte dem Bessern vorzieht. Fragen Sie doch
die Beuroner, welche Vorzüge das alte, wie das jetzige Brev. monast. - vor dem Romanum habe? -
Argumenta intrinsica sind gegen uns noch von Niemanden vorgebracht und die extrinisca beruhen auf
Mißverständniss.”
Beuron & the Campaign against Marty

Beuron’s “memorial” and the public campaign against Marty’s decision came from the desk not of Placidus Wolter but rather his brother, Maurus. As abbot of Beuron, Maurus Wolter sent an open letter on the subject to some twenty abbots throughout central Europe, France, and England.\(^8^4\) Kleber and Rippinger present only a cursory glance at Wolter’s argument and dismiss his characterization of Marty’s idea as “traditionless Americanism” as little more than the a desultory diatribe. Rather than make sense of Wolter’s argument and approach it on its own terms, it becomes a regrettable “manifesto” of an entrenched European conservative.\(^8^5\) However, a closer and more charitable analysis reveals how Wolter’s argument attempts to turn Marty’s explanation on its head: the abbot of Beuron accuses Marty of departing from a Roman tradition, thus calling into question the authenticity and veracity of Marty’s ultramontane argument for the Roman breviary. Wolter constructs the counter argument from three main points: Marty strays from tradition, eschews the normativity of the Rule, and threatens the liberty of Benedictine monasticism as rooted in the papacy. From these points Wolter creates an ultramontane argument from authority, one centering on monastic unity rather than ecclesial, diocesan unity.

The core of Wolter’s argument from papal authority emerges in the first paragraphs of his circular letter. The question of a “Roman liturgy” versus a “particular


liturgy” misses the point. Rather, the issue at hand is the “Roman monastic office.” The papacy “did not discover, and more or less tolerated with benevolence” this office, but rather “prescribed it and made it an exclusive obligation” because it “arose under their eyes and in connection with their decrees.” It is not a question of whether European monks eschew a “Roman spirit and Roman tradition” in favor of their own “exceptional” liturgy; rather, it is a question of “whether or not we should continue as Roman monks, to fulfill our prayer obligation in the form ordained and safeguarded by ecclesiastical authority.”86 These lines demonstrate how Wolter’s counterargument is more than just a blind assent to traditionalism. Rather, Wolter insists that European monks, in following a breviary blessed by popes throughout the centuries, are in fact more loyal to Rome than St. Meinrad. In other words, the monastic breviary is as much “Roman” as the secular Roman breviary. Monks who follow the monastic breviary follow the decrees of Rome, and thus are “Roman monks.” In stark contrast, the monks of St. Meinrad, in abandoning the monastic breviary, are not “Roman monks” because they have rejected the wishes and teachings of the papacy. Wolter’s three points, as well as his denunciation of Marty’s “traditionless Americanism,” flow from this ultramontane argument.

86 Maurus Wolter, “Mémoire,” 13:1563, SMAA: “Es handelt sich ja ganz und gar nicht um eine der römischen entgegenstehenden Partikularliturgie, sondern um das römische Mönchsoffizium, das die Päpste nicht etwa vorgefunden und mit mehr oder minder Wohlwollen geduldet, sondern daß sie, wie es unter ihrem Augen und im Anschluß an ihre Anordnung entstand, vorgeschrieben und zur ausschließlichen Pflicht gemacht haben. Nicht darum handelt es sich, ob wir eine römischen Geiste und römischer Überlieferung ferner stehende und daher nur relativ berechtigte Sonderstellung in der kirchlichen Liturgie aufgeben wollen, sondern darum, ob wir als römische Mönche fortfahren sollen, unsere Gebetspflicht in der von der kirchlichen Auktorität selbst bestimmten und gewährleisteten Form zu leisten, oder nicht.” Emphasis added. An English translation of this letter (different from my own, and with significant lacunae) is in 2:340-44, Bishop Martin Marty Series, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. It is worth noting that Wolter’s “Mémoire” explicitly attacks the accusation of a “particular” liturgy. Since Marty does not use this language in his letters to Conrad (who in turn forwarded them to Beuron), it appears that Wolter learned of this accusation through other sources. Only in Marty’s letters to Hürlimann and Kühne does one find the charge of a “particular liturgy,” thus suggesting that it was one of Marty’s Swiss confreres in Einsiedeln that informed Beuron of the experiment at St. Meinrad.
From his counterargument of papal authority, Wolter turns to the monastic
tradition and contrasts it with Marty’s reckless disregard for history and divine authority.
He notes how Rome has celebrated and blessed the “particular liturgies” of the
Cistercians, Trappists, Carthusians, Premonstratensians, and the Dominicans, and he
further points to the work of Guéranger in securing new papal recognition of these and
other monastic traditions. They, like the Benedictine *Breviarium Monasticum*, are “living
witnesses of antiquity,” which in turn guide the “future” through their “traditional,
unchanging character.” They form a “concert of divine praise” whose various voices do
not “destroy, but rather expand and fulfill” a united harmony. This chorus he contrasts
to those (such as Marty) who are willing to “risk such a tradition” on “mere practical
grounds and a misconstrued sense of the heritage of the Fathers entrusted to him.” The
Benedictine breviary is an “equitable part” of the expansion of the Roman breviary,
“emanating from Rome.” Indeed, its “rights” are superior to other offices in that it is
Benedictine monks’ “most appropriate service” and “preemptory obligation of honor” to
pray this special office, their “distinction, the certificate of their profession and even
nobility, their marching orders.” This breviary was bequeathed to the order by
“ecclesiastical legislation,” and thus they are obliged to follow this prescribed office not
merely for the sake of “self-preservation” but rather in accord with the express wishes of
“the Holy Spirit,” who “has desired” this office throughout history and “does so up to the

---

ohnehin nur zu leicht entschwindet, als zugleich, eben in ihrem traditionellen, unveränderlichen Charakter,
der gleichdenkenden Zukunft, willkommene Nebenklänge im Concentus des Gotteslobes, die dessen
unisono nicht stören, sondern schwellen und erfüllen…” This final line is omitted from the translation in
Archival Historical Series (see chapter 3, note 86 above).
88 Ibid. “…bloß aus praktischen Gründen und einem mißverstandenen Hochsinn das ihm anvertraute
Vätererbe einer solchen Überlieferung in die Schanze schlagen will…”
present.” In extolling the divine character of the monastic breviary’s tradition, Wolter expresses little sympathy for Marty’s interpretation of antiquity and his appeal to the question, “What would St. Benedict do today?” The claim that Holy Father Benedict would follow the Roman breviary is “a mere assertion.” Rather, modern liturgists insist that Benedict “consciously amalgamated Roman and old-monastic traditions” through his instructions in the Rule. Thus for Wolter, the tradition of the monastic breviary stems from the authority of Rome and the authority of St. Benedict, “rights” and “obligations” that cannot be superseded at will.

From this tradition of ecclesiastical legislation and its duties, Wolter continues with the obligations of the Rule itself. He credits Marty with a deleterious idea: that St. Benedict, the “most holy lawgiver,” endowed his followers “to dispose of thirteen chapters of his Rule,” is an egregious fallacy. Rather, Benedict only permits a different ordering of the psalms if deemed necessary. The “experiment of thirteen centuries,” however, has made it abundantly clear that the Rule’s “‘provisional’ ordering” is more than sufficient. He presumes that the immense weight of this historical argument is

---


91 Ibid., 1564. “Und daß unser hlgst Gesetzgeber es ohne Weiteres dem Gutbefinden der Nachkommen anheimstelle, ob sie ganze dreizehn Capitel seiner Regel abthun wollen, ist widerum falsch.” Wolter refers to chapters 8-20 of the Rule. His choice of “13” chapters versus “12” (as in the letters to Conrad) is a rhetorical point: although chapters 8-20 deal with the divine office, Benedict refers to specific psalms and their ordering only in 9-20 (thus “12” chapters); Wolter wishes to highlight “thirteen centuries” (ca. 600-ca.1900) with “13” chapters.
enough to give one pause before casting the monastic breviary aside. Likewise, Wolter is
well aware of what is at stake, something other readers of the controversy have passed
over in silence. The *Rule* does indeed state that “if anyone finds this distribution of the
psalms unsatisfactory, he should arrange whatever he judges better,” so long as the entire
psalter is covered every week. Wolter realizes that, according the letter of the *Rule*,
Marty is justified in his argument that St. Benedict permits a reordering of the psalms for
his monks to meet the needs of the day. Wolter likely also has in mind another
prescription of the *Rule* that permits the introduction of other canticles “according to the
practice of the Roman Church,” a line that could be used in favor of adopting the Roman
breviary. In other words, what is at stake is not only a tradition but an interpretation of
the *Rule*. By appealing to the reception tradition of the *Rule*, Wolter wishes to discredit
any recourse to specific lines that Marty might use in his defense. It is in the sense of
thirteen centuries of reception history that any “deficiencies” of the present monastic
breviary, which Wolter does admit exist, can be remedied. Any “inadequacies” are part
and parcel of “historical and legitimately developed organisms,” which cannot be
“tailored to a pattern or improved by general theories.” Genuine improvement respects
the tradition and emerges gradually; it does not follow “audacious attempts” in the “sense
of traditionless Americanism.” This line marks the rhetorical apogee of Wolter’s letter:

---

92 RB 18.22-23: “Hoc praecipue commonentes ut, si cui forte haec distributio psalmorum displicerit, ordinet si melius aliter iudicaverit, dum omnimodis id adhendat ut omni hebdomada psalterium ex integro numero centum quinquaginta psalmorum psallantur, et dominico die semper a caput reprehendatur ad vigilias.”

93 RB 13.10: “Nam ceteris diebus canticum unumquemque die suo ex prophetis sicut psallit ecclesia Romana dicantur.”

it is a salvo designed to attract the attention not only of European abbots but also Vatican officials.

From the monastic tradition and the reception history of the Rule, Wolter concludes his argument with a final assault on Marty’s model of diocesan unity through the monastery. The Beuronese abbot credits Marty with the claim that the Benedictine Order “is not a centralizer.” Wolter concurs. However, while Marty uses the premise to argue for a local mission for the Benedictines at the diocesan level, Wolter uses it for his call for greater Benedictine unity through centralized organization at the international level.95 Consequently, he rejects Marty’s diocesan model as absurd localism: “The thought that every monastery should exist in a diocese is a calamitous utopia.” It would only lead to “dissolution, not only of the union of the order but also the specific spirit of the order.” It would place the monastery under the yoke of a “narrow and debilitating diocesan administration.” Rather, monks “in all times have sought and found their freedom from such oppression in Rome,” which has always recognized their “special mission in and beyond the diocese.” Through their “close relationship with the Holy See,” the pope has always recognized monks as their “direct children” and “soldiers on the front lines” in the battle for souls.96

95 Ibid. “Unser Orden sei kein centralisirter, sagte man in St. Meinrad, und eben darum glauben wir, daß der Geist der Gemeinschaft um so stärker darin gewahrt werden und alle Mittel, den Orden dennoch als Ganzes zu erhalten und einheitlich zu beleben, müssen ungewandt und gestärkt werden.” Kleber’s English translation mistranslates the first line as “Our Order needs centralization,” which would signal Marty’s departure from his earlier “stabilitas loci” model; the German confirms that this is not the case. See 2:342, Bishop Martin Marty Series, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.

With these three points – the Benedictine tradition emanating from Rome, the interpretation of the Rule in accord with this tradition, and the imperative of Benedictine liberty through Roman auspices – Wolter constructs a decisively Roman argument to counter Marty’s appeal to ultramontane motives. The Beuronese abbot casts any rejection of these three points as degenerate Americanism, which manifests “tendencies toward a lack of historical sense, established organisms, legitimate guarantees.”

Interestingly enough, Wolter presumes that Marty has already secured the permission from Rome to make this departure from the Benedictine tradition, without the order’s consent, and thus he frames the issue not merely as a matter of an individual exemption but rather of the “future of our great, glorious order.” He concludes by imploring Marty to return to the monastic breviary and avoid a catastrophe he predicts (i.e., the censure of his confreres). Wolter calls upon the rest of the Benedictine Order to pressure Marty to do so, so that St. Meinard, “compelled through the power of the renewed spirit of the order, will undo the calamitous step. Fiat!”

As Wolter’s words met the eyes of abbots around Europe, pressure against St. Meinrad’s reform mounted. However, the greater significance for Beuron’s “memorial” in the controversy emerges in the phrase “lack of historical sense.” In their writings, Marty and the Wolter brothers operate from different historical narratives. On the one hand, Beuron and other European monasteries (including Einsiedeln) see Benedictine

\[\text{[Footnotes]}\]

\[\text{[Footnotes]}\]
monasticism as a fragile “organism” that has been miraculous resurrected and is in desperate need of preservation and protection. Wolter clearly assumes a linear view of history, one in which the tradition gradually develops over time and his handed on to posterity for further prudential development. Marty, on the other hand, sees the Benedictine tradition through the lens of great men (e.g., Gregory VII) and sees moments and opportunities for evangelization through restoration of the founder’s original vision. His reference point for the tradition is not its progression but rather its starting point: St. Benedict and the Rule. These conflicting senses of Benedictine history resonate all the more in Marty’s reaction to the memorial and subsequent correspondences.

**Marty’s Defense against the Campaign**

Marty received some version of Beuron’s “memorial” during the summer of 1874, although it remains unclear whether it was Maurus Wolter’s circular letter or another similar, abridged version sent by Placidus Wolter to Conrad. What is certain is that the memorial caught the attention of Abbot Schmid in Einsiedeln and deeply worried Conrad in Missouri. Once again Marty found himself defending his vision on two fronts: Einsiedeln via Hürlimann on one side, and Beuron via Conrad on the other.

---

99 Kleber maintains the latter. See *History of St. Meinrad*, 254. Hürlimann claims to have sent Wolter’s memorial on to St. Meinrad; it is unclear whether it ever reached Indiana. See 13:1562, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives, SMAA.
After Marty’s April letters to Hürlimann and Kühne, correspondence between St. Meinrad and Einsiedeln refrained from the breviary issue for a time. By late July, however, Beuron’s memorial had reached Einsiedeln, with a personal request that Abbot Schmid clarify both the truth of St. Meinrad’s experiment and the position of its motherhouse in Switzerland. At the request of Schmid, still reeling from illness, Hürlimann composed a tactful response. He assured Maurus Wolter that with respect to the “principles” of his memorial, Einsiedeln and Beuron were “in agreement,” and that Einsiedeln was also baffled by the American abbot’s decision, especially “without the advice of the Order.” Nevertheless, he cautioned Beuron not to pursue the matter further, since he also presumed, like Wolter, that Marty had obtained permission from Rome.

The controversy continued to unsettle Einsiedeln, such that by August Hürlimann composed a chronological résumé of the affair. His résumé traced the progress of issue from when he had first learned about the idea in 1869 to the April 19 letters that he and Kühne had received. Hürlimann further used this résumé to confess his regret that he had not preempted the controversy with a more “energetic” presentation of his opposition.

---

100 For instance, Marty’s July 22 letter to Hürlimann remains silent about the breviary question (although the last page seems to be missing). See Marty to Ildefons Hürlimann, 22 July 1874, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. Coincidently, this was the same date that Hürlimann penned his response to Beuron.


102 Ildefons Hürlimann to Maurus Wolter, 22 July 1874, 13:1562, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Wir sind mit den Grundsätzen, die Sie darin aussprechen, ganz einverstanden; wir wissen auch gar nicht, wie der Herr Abt Martin, dazu kam, den Gedanken, das Breviarium Romanum einzuführen, den er ganz aufgegeben hatte, wieder aufzunehmen, und selben ohne Berathung mit dem Orden gleich ins Werk zu setzen….Vorausgesetzt, daß Abt Martin in Rom wirklich angefragt, so dürfte es denn doch große Inkonvenienzen haben, gegen das Geschehene noch Schritte zu thun.”

103 Ildefons Hürlimann, “Vorbemerkung,” 13:1562, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. This “preliminary remark” refers to “today” as August 4, 1874. Hürlimann seems to have composed this résumé of the affair with a copy of Wolter’s memorial and copy of his response to Beuron.
to the plan when he had discussed it with Marty in person in 1869. This résumé further
records Hürlimann’s claim that he once again informed Marty that the breviary decision
was unfounded, yet to date he had received no reply.\footnote{Ibid. This second letter is missing in SMAA.} This second reprimand, along
with Beuron’s fervor, likely occasioned two letters from Marty to Einsiedeln in
September of 1874. Both letters he addressed directly Abbot Schmid.

Marty’s first letter continues to defend the reform without surrendering any
tenacity. As he did in earlier letters to Hürlimann and Kühne, Marty insists that the
Roman breviary is a “win for us and the entire Benedictine Order.” He express his
resolve to “do and suffer everything” in order to ensure that his reform weathers the
breviary was not fully developed when he last saw Schmid in Einsiedeln, and thus he
presents three main points in its defense. First, he repeats his opinion that the Roman is
“better rounded and altogether more perfect than the Benedictine” breviary, which is
rather a “failure.” The monastic breviary is “not what St. Benedict prescribed,” which
leads Marty to his second point: the ordering of the psalms between the two breviaries.
This difference in ordering is a minor point for Marty. The “substance” of the two “are
the same,” while the “configuration is different,” bearing the “hand of the artist.” In fact,
the monastic breviary only preserves St. Benedict’s “allocation of psalms,” and even this
is “seldom realized in practice.” Everything else comes from the Roman breviary. Differences in numbering or ordering between the two are thus relative, and the Roman can be expanded for use by the Benedictines so that they cover all the prescribed psalms. In the end, the cornerstone of Marty’s first letter is his third point, transcending the other two: the daily breviary of the Benedictine Order must reflect its mission in the Church. This claim rests on two premises: “So is the Benedictine axiom: ‘Let nothing be preferred to the work of God’ [RB 43.3], and the entire religious life is determined by and sustained through the breviary.” Prayer, in other words, forms the monk. To this Marty joins another premise: “Alone is our life not different from but rather one with the Church, and only in her is this life more deeply discovered and understood.” The Benedictine Order “is advanced with Church, both spiritually and materially.” In other words, the future of the Benedictines is inseparable from its relationship to the Church. If the monks of St. Meinrad were indeed “sent to educate priests,” then they “can accomplish this much more easily through the Roman breviary.” Likewise, Marty points to the intense ultramontanism of American Catholic culture as necessitating a clear

---

106 Marty to Schmid, 8 September 1874, SMAA. “Vor Allem ist das röm. Brevier ein in sich vollkommen abgerundetes und abgeschlossenes viel Vollkommener als das benediktinische, welches in seiner jetzigen Form ein fällig Mißrathenes. Das jetzige monastische Brevier ist durchaus nicht dasjenige, welches der hl. Benedikt angeordnet hat, die Psalmen, welche er für die einzelne Tage vorgeschrieben kommen das ganze Jahr hindurch beinahe nie vor.”


allegiance to Rome: “In America the devotion to Rome is so strong, that nothing finds a
voice that is not through and through Roman, and this is the only possible point of
entry.”¹⁰⁹ This is true not only for America but also for the entire Church, as witnessed at
the Vatican Council where it was “evident” that the Benedictines have become the “fifth
wheel of the Church.” If the Benedictines are charged with serving the Church, they
cannot await the Church to “conform to the order,” but rather the order must conform to
the Church.¹¹⁰ Consequently, if the differences between the breviaries are matters of
preference and taste, and the Roman has in fact inspired the monastic, the Benedictines
must conform themselves to an ultramontane Church by adopting its breviary. In doing
so, they surrender nothing of St. Benedict’s original spirit, and rather they only reclaim
his original vigor for the monk’s mission to the Church.

Marty must have thought that his opinions were too forceful in this first letter, as
he quickly penned a second to Schmid only a few days later. In this letter Marty offers
more practical reasons for his decision. He admits (ostensibly for the first time) that he in
fact did not seek permission from Rome for the change, primarily because Einsiedeln had
already made a request on St. Meinrad’s behalf for a special liturgical exception
(regarding the calendar), and Marty did not want to give the impression of
“contradiction.”¹¹¹ He further admits that he did not anticipate that the change “would

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. “In Amerika ist die römische Anhänglichkeit so stark, daß nichts Anklang findet, was nicht
durch und durch römisch, auch ist es der einzig mögl. Einigungspkt….Wir sind gesendet um Priester zu
erziehen, wir werden dies leichter thun mit röm. B…”
¹¹⁰ Ibid. “…In Rom war es uns Allen evident, daß die Benediktiner das 5te Rad am Wagen sind….wenn
der Orden die Kirche stützen werden soll, muß er sich anbequemen und nicht erwarten, daß die K. sich ihm
angepasse…”
¹¹¹ Marty to Schmid, 10 September 1874, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and
Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. “Zu der fürs Publikum bestimmten Rechenschaft erlauben
wir Ew. Gnaden noch ein Wort im Vertrauen. In Rom haben wir keine Anfrage gestellt, weil eine solche
durch den Wortlaut den Bulle Eins. v. die jedem Brevier vorgedruckt ist, überflüssig gemacht ist und auch
deshalb weil Ew. Gnaden in meinen Namen von drei Jahren eine Petition an die Congr. der Riten in dieser
become so quickly known,” since there is much “silence” about “greater matters.”

Marty then offers a practical consideration that appears nowhere else: he and the community are growing old, and to make such a transition between breviaries in later years would be taxing. The learning of new graduals and responsories is best done now rather than later. With this final practical reason, he concludes this second letter with a return to his greater vision: “In the end we perceived the prosperity of our order in America and the solution for its task as depending on this step – whether we pursue a central or marginal position and direction.” Consequently, even in offering a more practical explanation, Marty comes back to his foundational argument that the order exists to serve the Church, and the Roman breviary facilitates this mission.

More than a month passed before Marty received Einsiedeln’s scathing reprimand. Hürlimann forwarded Schmid’s personal comments on the matter along with his own. In Schmid’s forwarded note to Hürlimann, the ailing abbot expresses how Marty has “broken” his “heart,” in that the daughter house to which he has devoted over twenty years has the audacity to introduce another breviary without the consent of the Swiss Benedictine Congregation. He further denounces Marty’s reform as an “arbitrary change” devoid of sound reasoning, one that has produced a “bad conscience” only
because others have noticed. He likewise describes St. Meinrad as a “child of sorrows” (*Schmerzenskind*) that has “separated itself from its mother” and made him as abbot personally “embittered.”¹¹⁵ To this biting rebuke Hürlimann adds insult to injury in his own letter to Marty, enclosing a copy of Schmid’s reprimand. Hürlimann baulks at Marty’s idea that the Roman breviary is somehow the “will of the Church” for the Benedictine Order.¹¹⁶ Papal bulls clearly state otherwise, and the very papal declaration elevating St. Meinrad to an abbey makes it abundantly clear that it is a member of the Swiss-Benedictine Congregation. In bypassing the consent of this congregation, Marty, as abbot, has effectively “lost the footing” of its very “existence.”¹¹⁷ He, like Abbot Schmid, expects Marty to reintroduce the monastic breviary voluntarily and immediately, before Einsiedeln is forced to take the issue up with Rome directly. Hürlimann softens this threat with an olive branch: if St. Meinrad does not hesitate to make amends, Abbot Schmid has offered to provide the necessary monastic breviaries. He warns Marty not to delay, as he fears that Schmid will be dead before this letter arrives.

Einsiedeln’s threat gave Marty pause. In his brief response to Hürlimann, written just before the end of the year, Marty implores pardon for any offense and expresses his desire to recover Schmid’s trust. He also claims that St. Meinrad has sought additional advice on the matter and “prayed even more that God’s will be done.” With these

---

¹¹⁵ Ibid. “Kein einziger auch nur von Weitem stichhaltigen Grund wurde für diese ganz willkürliche Abänderung angeführt; gegenheils hat das böse Gewissen sich noch mit der Bemerkung kund gegeben, ‘Man habe nicht geglaubt, daß die Sache so schnell auskommen werde.’ So ist also mein Schmerzenskind - unsere Filiale - der ich seit mehr also 20 Jahre Alles opferte, was mir in dieser ohnehin so schweren Zeit noch möglich war, zum Abfall gekommen, hat sich getrennt von seiner Mutter, und mir so die letzten Tage noch mit Spott und Schmach erwiedert und verbittert.”


gestures of humility, Marty nevertheless holds his ground: “The only fault, that we can yet recognize, lies in that we failed to secure beforehand the written approval of the Holy Father for our move.”\textsuperscript{118} Unflinchingly he assures Hürlimann that he will succeed in doing so soon.\textsuperscript{119} By the time this self-confident apology reached Einsiedeln, Schmid had died on December 28, 1874.\textsuperscript{120}

By the end of 1874, Marty’s defense for Einsiedeln had reached an impasse because his Swiss European confreres appealed to the same argument from authority that Beuron used in its memorial. For Hürlimann and Schmid, Marty’s primary offense was his disregard for the authority of papal decrees and the Swiss-Benedictine Congregation. For Einsiedeln, the issue at stake was Marty’s arbitrary use of abbatial authority that disregarded true ecclesiastical authority, reflecting the thrust of Wolter’s objections to the reform. For Marty, the issue at hand was the Benedictines’ role in the mission of the Church, manifested as a center of liturgical unity at the diocesan level. Consequently, Marty’s plethora of practical reasons for the Roman breviary, serving this ecclesial mission, ultimately fell on deaf ears in Einsiedeln. What is perhaps most surprising is Einsiedeln’s lack of sympathy for Marty’s diocesan model, which he drew from his experience of Einsiedeln and the Swiss-Benedictine principle of \textit{stabilitas loci}.

\textsuperscript{118} Marty to Hürlimann, 17 December 1874, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. “Wir haben uns seither über die Sache viel berathen und noch mehr gebeten damit Gottes Wille geschehe. Der einzige Fehler, den wir nach Allein erkennen können, besteht darin, daß wir es versäumt haben, die ausdrückliche Genehmigung des hl. Vaters für unsere Schritt vorher einzuholen. Diesen Fehler wollen wir nun gut machen und da der gnädige Herr Sie Güte gehabt hat, mich durch Ew. Hochwürdigen auf denselben aufmerksam zu machen, so bitte ich Sie inständig, bei Hoch. denselben Ihre Fürsprache einzulegen, daß er mir verzeiehe.”

\textsuperscript{119} Marty appears to have written Caspar Willi, bishop of Chur, Switzerland, about the affair. Willi was a former mentor and friend from Einsiedeln, who also provided a preface to Marty’s work on Vatican I (see p. 237 above). Willi in turn petitioned Propaganda Fide on Marty’s behalf on February 25, 1875. See no. 538 in vol. 11 of \textit{United States Documents in the Archives of Propaganda Fide: A Calendar}, ed. Mathias Kien and James McManamon (Washington, DC: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1987), 68.

\textsuperscript{120} Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 223; \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 253n36.
Nevertheless, the issue of stability assumes a greater role in his continued correspondence
with Conrad in Missouri, the other front of his battle against Beuron.

**Defense for Conrad**

Although Marty’s precise knowledge of Wolter’s circular letter is unclear, he
responds to many of its arguments in a letter to Conrad, dated August 3, 1874, shortly
after the memorial (or some version of it) would have arrived in Indiana. 

Marty opens
this letter by thanking Conrad for bringing the opinions of an “honorable confrere of
Beuron” to his attention. 

Marty welcomes the “attack,” claiming that “the sooner it comes, the
better.” He further maintains that all of Beuron’s objections to the Roman breviary were
carefully weighed by the St. Meinrad community before the decision was made.

---

121 Kleber maintains that Hürlimann’s forwarded copy of the Wolter memorial never reached St.
Meinrad, and instead Marty learned of its contents through another version of it that was received by a
monk in Jasper, Indiana, who had close ties to Beuron. See *History of St. Meinrad*, 255n39. It is also
possible that Placidus sent Conrad a shorter version of Maurus’s memorial, which Conrad in turn
summarized in a letter to Marty. In his August 20 letter to Placidus, Conrad acknowledges the reception of
a July 1 letter from Placidus on the “breviary question.” This is likely what Marty responds to in this
August 3 letter. See Frowin Conrad and Placidus Wolter, 20 August 1874, handwritten copy in Folder
“Archives Varia, 1873–1955,” Box 4, Kleber: Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA.

122 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 3 August 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin
Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. “Zu danke bin ich Ihnen verpflichtet für die gütige Mittheilung
des verehrten Confraters in Beuron.”

123 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 3 August 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin
Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. “Es enthält desselben keine neuen Argumente zeigt aber die
Stimmung der Gemüther, die meistens auf unsere Richtung mehr Einfluß übt als die Anschauung der
Vernunft.”

124 Ibid. “Es war dieser Stoß unvermeidlicher und je früher er kommt, desto lieber ist es mir; an eine
gemeinsame Beschußnahme in unseren Sinn war ja doch nicht zu denken und so bleibe uns keine Wahl,
as vereinzelt das zu thun, was wir für das Beste erachten. Schriftliche Diskussion der Sache ist ermüdend
und wird doch kaum zu irgend einem Ergebnisse führen, wenn wir aber mündlich darüber sprechen können,
so werde ich Ihnen leicht leicht die der Mißstimmung zu Grunde liegenden schiefen Ansichten und
Tendenzen im Einzelnen nachwiesen können. Unterdessen mögen Sie sich mit der Versicherung beruhigen,
daß das Schreiber aus Beuron für uns nichts Neues enthält und daß wir alle diese Erwägungen Jahre lang
gelegt und bei unserer Entscheidung auch in die Waagschale gelegt haben.”
“tone” of these objections nevertheless makes it sound “like we have committed a grave
crime.” Marty finds this ridiculous: “And what have we done? We have chosen the better
instead of the good, the stable in stead of the erratic.”  

In the latter portion of this line, the core of Marty’s counterargument for Conrad emerges. For Marty, the Roman office provides a greater stability for the prayer of monks over the course of time, since the monastic breviary has always been susceptible to “change” every time an abbot wishes to revise the direction of his predecessor. The Roman breviary ensures stability, and this is something the liturgies of Solesmes and Beuron cannot offer, because they are “eclectically assembled from old rules and practices, which the current regents see as the most convenient.” This “arbitrariness,” which has been the “tradition of our order from the beginning,” falls victim to the will of later generations. Rather, Marty proposes the “rock” of the Roman breviary rather the “sand drift of personal concoctions and combinations.” Naturally this language of a “rock,” signals an ultramontane loyalty to Rome, since “the movement of the nineteenth century proceeds toward the center.” Moreover, the Benedictines “do not pray, ‘preserve in us the forms’ but rather ‘arouse in us the spirit, with which blessed Benedict, Abbot, served.’” His service was fundamentally to the Church, the “rock” of Peter. In other words, the issue of the breviary comes down to either serving the “eternal promises” of the church or the “temporary”

---


[126] Ibid. “Gerade die Thatsache, daß jeder folgend Abt sich gewöhnlich berufen glaubt, einen großen Theil dessen zu ändern, was sein Vorgänger angeordnet hat, bestimmte uns Alles ohne Ausnahme nach römischer Regel einzurichten, an welcher dann nicht mehr geändert werden kann.”

[127] Ibid. “In Solesmes und Beuron haben sie eklektisch von alten Regle u. Übungen zusammengestellt, was den jetzigen Regenten das Passendsten schein, aber was Willkühr einrichtet, wenn auch aus noch so guten historischen u. logischen Considerationen kann die Willkürr eines Andere auch wieder umstoßen. Das ist in unserem Orden von jeher die Tradition gewesen. Welche Verschiedenheit z. b. zwischen den Klöstern d. Schweiz in Ceremonien des Offiziums i. d. solemnen Messe?”
merits of “human work.”"\textsuperscript{128} St. Meinrad’s choice of the Roman breviary follows the former and eschews the latter.

This remarkable response to Beuron’s attack, practically neglected by Kleber and others, highlights how Marty crafts his argument for the Roman breviary from two opposite ideas.\textsuperscript{129} In one sense, Marty seems to have relaxed his earlier hesitations about the centralization of the Benedictines during his 1868 debate with Wimmer. Since then the Vatican Council has proclaimed the necessity of centralization, and Marty sees the council and its last session on papal infallibility as providential signs of the will of God. Monks should heed these signs, only their center of authority is not some congregation (as Wimmer and even his own Swiss confreres argue) but rather Rome. Nevertheless, Marty refuses to surrender the Benedictine charism of \textit{stabilitas loci} as vital service to the Church at the local, diocesan level. Thus, in light of the council, he tries to bridge the two. He promotes the idea of the Benedictines stabilizing the local church’s prayer through a centralized, Roman form of liturgical prayer (i.e., the Roman breviary). All monastic traditions must yield to this renewed call for Benedictine evangelization from Rome, the center of the Church.

Marty’s initial reaction to Beuron in this letter appears to have troubled Conrad. By August 20, he again informed Placidus Wolter of Marty’s resolve to keep the Roman breviary despite Beuron’s arguments.\textsuperscript{130} In the letter, Conrad confesses that he has

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[2]{Kleber devotes only a sentence to the letter and ignores its greater argument. See Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 254.}
\end{footnotes}
wavered on the issue, accepting for a time Marty’s argument from ecclesial mission. He now finds Beuron’s assessment to be the better opinion. Nevertheless, he requests that Beuron provide additional arguments, since he is convinced that Marty will “be ready enough to switch back, as soon as he realizes that he is in error.” Conrad actually welcomes the controversy, as he believes that if nothing else it reinvigorates the Benedictine Order.

Placidus Wolter responded on September 11, 1874. Rather than providing Conrad with additional arguments, Wolter merely celebrates Conrad’s mutual skepticism of “Americanism” and its alarming tendency to embrace any “opportunity for change and transformation.” Interestingly, Wolter also cites the Benedictine commitment to stability as the complete opposite of American culture: “We promise complete stabilitas; can there be any greater contradiction of monastic life than ‘Americanism?’” In his August 20 letter to Wolter, Conrad did not provide Marty’s use of stability for the Roman breviary, and thus Wolter does not realize that he employs the same principle for a different position. For the statements that Conrad did provide, Wolter brushes them aside as “half true” and disagrees that they are the real issue; rather, what is at stake is the ability of a
monastery to ignore tradition and the wishes of other confreres. Wolter likewise informs Conrad of his brother’s circular letter to other Benedictine abbeys against Marty’s reform. He further notes how the controversy has come to the attention of prominent Benedictine cardinals in the curia, who have denounced the change and discovered that Marty did not in fact receive permission for the reform. This, in turn, has spurred the Congregation of Rites and the Congregation for Propagation of the Faith to investigate the matter. Still, he shares Conrad’s hope that Marty will reverse his reform.

Wolter’s flood of information not only distressed Conrad but it also prompted him to defend Marty. The letter seems to have been Conrad’s first knowledge of Beuron’s vociferous public attack of Marty’s breviary reform and the subsequent curial investigation. Up this point, Conrad appears to have seen himself as a private liaison between Marty and Beuron; now he saw Beuron as an unjust and uncharitable public aggressor. In a diary entry for October 12, Conrad admits “doubt” about Beuron’s objections, since “Martin’s ideas have much to recommend them.” A couple weeks later he expressed his confidence in Marty in a reply to Placidus Wolter. In particular, he defended the “essential grounding” of Marty as “not without merit” and perceived his appeal to papal honor through the Roman breviary as a compelling argument. Conrad never received a direct response to this defense, as Beuron found itself enveloped in the crisis of the *Kulturkampf* and the threat of suppression.

---

134 Ibid. “Was Sie von seinen weiteren Äusserungen zur Begründung des wahrhaft fatalen Schrittes anführen, ist nur halb wahr - aber die Gründe für oder wider sind’s nicht, ondern daß überhaupt ein Kloster es wagen konnte, so vorzugehen gegen die Vergangenheit und gegen all Mitbrüder der Gegenwart.”

135 Quoted in Malone, “Documents,” 319n22.

Conrad shared Placidus Wolter’s comments with Marty, who answered his Swiss confrere in the last days of 1874, on the very date of Abbot Schmid’s death in Einsiedeln. In response to Wolter’s case for an abridged office for a group of Benedictine sisters, Marty notices a double standard. While this change for the sisters is, according Wolter, an instance where the “Holy Ghost has…reformed the judgment of St. Benedict,” Marty points out that such an assessment could be equally applied to the Roman breviary controversy. In the Roman breviary, “undoubtedly the Holy Ghost has changed the offices of the Church and made them more perfect.” If Wolter accepts the guidance of the Holy Spirit over time, “why then should we retain a kind of potpourri made of old and new elements poorly digested?” Moreover, he and other Europeans judge a breviary they do not know: “Of all Benedictines in Europe there are perhaps not ten sufficiently acquainted with the Roman Breviary and therefore they have no idea how much superior is it to the monastic.” This retort shows not only Marty’s continual dismay over Beuron’s obstinacy but also his own intransigency with the Roman breviary throughout its inaugural year at St. Meinrad. For Marty, it was not a matter of tradition blending customs over time; it was a matter of God directly purging old accretions for the sake of the new goals of unity, stability, and evangelization. For Marty, the mutual fault of Einsiedeln and Beuron was fundamentally their insistence on preserving an outdated breviary out of touch with Rome’s mission for the Benedictines. He underestimated, however, how their mutual resolve had mobilized “Roman” forces (i.e., the Vatican) against his reform.

137 Marty to Conrad, 28 December 1874, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. This is another rare instance where Marty writes Conrad in English rather than German. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 242.
138 Ibid. Also quoted in Rippinger, The Benedictine Order in the United States, 52 (with, however, the wrong year at 262n26).
Rome’s Reversal & Marty’s Reaction

As 1875 dawned on a Catholic Europe under pressure from the *Kulturkampf*, Marty found himself increasingly isolated, even in America. Before the new year he had mentioned the breviary controversy in a letter to Wimmer.\(^\text{139}\) Wimmer showed sympathy for Marty’s spirit of change but ultimately dissented from his push for uniformity through the Roman breviary. He confided in Marty that he had also sought to change the breviary for the American-Cassinese Congregation, only adopting the Maurist breviary instead. Beuron and Guéranger (a “staunch conservative”) objected to this idea, and Rome more or less accused Wimmer of “heresy.”\(^\text{140}\) He had since changed his mind, stating, “Uniformity is a nice thing, but variety has its charm.”\(^\text{141}\) Thus even Wimmer, the great Cluniac visionary and advocate for centralization and unity, could not accept Marty’s cause to conform the Benedictine liturgy to the rest of the Church.

In the meantime, a change of the guard in Einsiedeln solidified the abbey’s resolve to force Marty to reinstate the monastic breviary. Basilius Oberholzer (1821–1895) had been elected abbot on January 13, 1875.\(^\text{142}\) By this time Marty’s December 17 letter had arrived, making it clear that the American abbot had no intention of changing the course that he had charted for St. Meinrad. Likely at the bequest of Oberholzer, Hürlimann composed a statement in Latin (“Status Quaestionis”) for the Congregation of Rites, specifying the chronological progression of the controversy and Marty’s reasons.

\(^{140}\) Wimmer to Marty, 24 January 1875, translated in Oetgen, *Boniface Wimmer: Letters*, 382. Oetgen claims that SMAA possesses the original letter; I could not locate it in my search.
\(^{141}\) Ibid., 383.
\(^{142}\) Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 256.
Another curial organ, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith ("Propaganda Fide"), which oversaw the United States, proceeded to request a formal opinion of Oberholzer in April. In his reply, Oberholzer provided three reasons for his adamant desire that Rome rule in Einsiedeln’s favor: Marty had violated several papal decrees concerning the Swiss-Benedictine Congregation, which de facto extended to St. Meinrad and the Swiss-American Congregation; the liturgical unity of the Swiss congregation was at stake; and a restoration of the original breviary would ensure that Marty, an admirable abbot, would “contribute much to the edification of other monasteries.”  

Veiled behind this compliment was Einsiedeln’s ardent desire that St. Meinrad’s blunder would not be repeated in other Swiss-American houses.

During the unfolding of the Vatican investigation, Marty continued to express his unwavering confidence that Rome would decide in his favor. In a letter to Conrad, he disclosed that he had already written Propaganda Fide on the matter and had thus “committed the whole matter to our Holy Father’s own care,” and remained “more confident than ever, that our opus Dei [work of God] is also donum Dei [gift of God]!”

He also rejoiced in how the past year had educated him more in the liturgy “than in the whole period of the preceding twenty years.” Such an experience only confirmed his steadfast belief, voiced earlier in his letters to Einsiedeln, that “with a particularistic

---

143 “Status Quaestionis,” 13:1564-65, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Kleber asserts that this was composed for the Vatican congregation. See Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 257.

144 Basilius Oberholzer to Cardinal Franchi (Propaganda Fide), 12 May 1875, 13:1556-68, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA: “Quia dictus Abbas Martinus alias summo fervore praeditus et optimam disciplinam in Monasterio suo servans, certe multum ad aedificationem aliorum monasteriorum tribuet.” Translated in Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 256-57. See also nos. 1144 and 1207 in vol. 11 of United States Documents in the Archives of Propaganda Fide, 148, 156.

145 Marty to Frowin Conrad, 29 March 1875, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. Again, Marty writes this letter in English rather than German.
liturgy St. Benedict’s Order will not be able to render to the Church the services, for which God has destined it.” Thus to the very end, Marty maintained his confidence that Rome would recognize the inherent merit of Roman breviary, the “gift of God,” for the Benedictines’ ecclesial mission.

Marty was mistaken. On August 23, 1875, the Congregation of Rites informed Propaganda Fide that Marty was to reinstate the monastic breviary. Propaganda Fide relayed the decree to Einsiedeln, who in turn sent the news on to St. Meinrad. The decree did not arrive in St. Meinrad until March 9, 1876, along with a letter from Hürlimann acknowledging that “the mother and daughter have not understood one another for a long time.” Hürlimann could not help to point out how his opinion had prevailed. As a sort of warning to Marty not to repeat such a mistake, Hürlimann added that there was murmuring in Einsiedeln that St. Meinrad could no longer be counted upon as a place of refuge because “so many changes” had taken place and had effectively become “an entirely different order.” As an olive branch, Oberholzer provided St. Meinrad with new monastic breviaries later that spring. For his part, Marty accepted the decree with humility and grace, declaring to the St. Meinrad community that “what
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146 Ibid. See also Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Monk-I” (1982), 236.
147 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 257; 13:1568, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. See also no. 1312 in vol. 11 of United States Documents in the Archives of Propaganda Fide, 169.
148 See no. 1312 in vol. 11 of United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide, 169. Propaganda Fide did not process the decree until November 6, 1875.
149 Hürliman to Marty, 17 February 1876, 13:1569, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives, SMAA. “Mir scheint, daß da Mutter und Tochter schon länger sich nicht mehr so recht verstanden.”
150 Ibid., 13:1569-70, SMAA.
151 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 257. Marty had requested these, claiming that it has been a bad year financially for St. Meinrad. Marty to Oberholzer, 10 March 1876 (M74), 8:1008, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
Rome wills is God’s will and therefore also our will.” He reinstated the monastic breviary immediately,

**Significance**

With a more complete reconstruction of the breviary controversy, its greater significance for the development of Marty’s thought comes to light. Delineating the two strains of correspondence reveals how Marty and his interlocutors talked past one another. Both began from ultramontane premises. However, different interpretations of the Vatican Council, divergent experiences of the concurrent *Kulturkampf*, and contradictory readings of Benedictine history resulted in different conclusions from this mutual premise. Both Einsiedeln and Beuron focused on *monastic* rather than ecclesial unity in the face of ominous threats of suppression, and both maintained that papal authority was the key to preserving this unity. Throughout history Rome had endorsed an organic tradition that had weathered the vicissitudes of history, and this organic tradition needed to be preserved to ensure the future progress of the Benedictine tradition. Marty, on the other hand, focused on *ecclesial* rather than monastic unity. For Marty, the ultramontane spirit of his day invited the Benedictines to return to their roots as liaisons of prayer in the Church, linking the liturgy of the universal, Roman Church to the spiritual life of the local, diocesan faithful. Moreover, this vision further stemmed from a different historical worldview. For Marty, Europe was waning and America was rising; consequently, the future of the order lay in America and the order’s adaptation to the needs of the Church in evangelizing a new continent.
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152 This is a quotation provided by Hobi: “‘Was Rom will, ist Gottes u. darum auch unser Will,’ war as Wort des Obern u. Gehorsam unsere gemeinsame Pflicht.” Hobi to Hürlimann, 15 March 1876, 11:1201, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
Nevertheless, the significance of the breviary debate is more than differences between European and American models of monasticism. At the heart of Marty’s breviary reform was an understanding of prayer as the means to ecclesial education and unification. Behind the facade of the controversy lies Marty’s faith in Benedictine stability as an agent of ecclesial evangelization through liturgical education and unification at the “local” level. His direct appeal to the “local nature” of the Benedictine mission is a clear manifestation of Marty’s earlier advocacy of *stabilitas loci* for the Benedictines in America. For Marty’s vision, local stability is the key to the liturgical education and unity of the local, diocesan church.

There is, however, also a third significance that strikes at the heart of Marty’s reform agenda. For Marty, the Roman breviary is about a return to the original spirit of St. Benedict. Behind his program for ecclesial evangelization through education and unification is Marty’s desire to return the order to the original vision of its founder and the true spirit of the Rule. For Marty, liturgical education and unification were the hallmarks and legacy of the Benedictines, presenting, ultimately, two paths for the future of the Benedictines: either they could becomes antiquated curators of a museum, or they could return to their founder’s vision of monks as zealous evangelizers who instructed and united the church through its liturgy. A return to this original vision demanded a return to the prayer of the rest of the Church. Quite simply, Marty believed that the monastic community could not instruct and unite diocesan priests and laity in something they themselves did not observe. As the next section outlines, alongside this attempt to return his order to its roots through prayer emerged another attempt to restore the original, familial character of Benedictine monasticism through work.
The Conversi Controversy

Marty’s reform agenda comes to light in the other major controversy of his abbatial tenure: the place of lay brothers (conversi) in the monastery. Both Kleber and Rippinger have highlighted Marty’s radical integration of the lay brothers into the rest of the monastic community at St. Meinrad and its social significance. Kleber characterizes Marty as ignorant of canon law and historical tradition.\footnote{Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 248; “Bishop Martin Marty,” 205, 213.} Rippinger counters this by celebrating Marty’s anticipation of Vatican II and the eventual abolition of the lay brother class in the late twentieth century.\footnote{Rippinger, The Benedictine Order in the United States, 150-52.} However, neither scholar points to how this reform informed Marty’s later vision of “prayer and work” for Benedictine evangelization. This integration was not only historically and socially significant, as they aver, but also a theological outgrowth of Marty’s “familial imagination” of the Benedictine congregatio as developed in chapter two. For Marty, the monastic family that prayed together should also work together in the fields. Like the breviary controversy, the conversi controversy stemmed from Marty’s desire to return the Benedictines to the original spirit of Benedict through a literal reading of the Rule.

Like the breviary controversy, a fuller reconstruction is necessary in order to arrive at the controversy’s greater significance in the development of Marty’s monastic vision. Consequently, this section traces the controversy’s development in four stages: (1) the historical background of the conversi; (2) Marty’s reform and its rationale; (3) the reaction of his contemporaries and Marty’s counterarguments; and (4) its greater significance for his vision for Benedictine evangelization in America.
**Historical Background**

The precise origins of the *fratres laici*, also known as the *fratres conversi*, is unclear, but this distinct class within Benedictine monasteries appears to have stemmed from the convergence of two phenomena in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: the spiritual interests of lay persons who were associated with the monastic “familia” and sought “conversion” by emulating the monastic life and its vows; and the pragmatism of reform movements like the Cistercians who wanted to restore the ascetic nature of monasticism while retaining economic self-sufficiency. Gradually a distinction arose between “clerics” and “lay brothers.” The first group comprised educated choir monks who were ordained priests (*pater clerici* or “fathers”) and non-ordained monks (*fratres clerici* or “fraters”); the second group consisted only of the uneducated brothers who did the manual labor of the community (*fratres laici*, or “brothers”). Each group of monks enjoyed different rights within the community, prayed different offices, experienced different novitiates, and occupied different spaces within the monastic complex. Lay brothers were excluded from chapter meetings and often were allowed to profess only simple vows. Entrance into this class was nevertheless voluntary, and it afforded a stable life with the assurance that the community would care for the *fratres laici* throughout their life.

The nineteenth-century revival of the Benedictines witnessed the resurrection of this two-class system, and Wimmer’s monasteries were no exception. The American-
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155 See Bruce Lescher, “Laybrothers: Questions Then, Questions Now,” *Cistercian Studies* 23, no. 1 (1988): 63-85. Lescher’s study is the exception in the dearth of scholarship on lay brothers since the 1950s. His survey traces the arguments against prevalent misconceptions, e.g., that lay brothers arose from the clericalization of monasteries.
Cassinese Congregation actually exceeded other congregations in its large number of lay brothers, which were “central” to Wimmer’s plan for American Benedictine expansion.\textsuperscript{156} When he arrived in Pennsylvania in 1846, he brought sixteen lay brothers with him and secured an additional twenty from Bavaria the following year.\textsuperscript{157} He later found himself reneging promises of equality, and the protest of his lay brothers resulted in a confirmation from Rome that permitted only simple vows for American lay brothers.\textsuperscript{158} Wimmer voiced the opinion of the day that “lay brothers, properly speaking, are not monks” but rather facilitate the contemplative life of others through their manual labor.\textsuperscript{159} He advised Marty to imitate this model for his own monastery, and St. Meinrad did so during its first two decades. Einsiedeln itself had retained this class system (although its lay brothers were permitted solemn vows). Abbot Schmid had included specific guidelines for the admission and work of lay brothers in his original “Instructions” for the mission. These “Instructions” also included a clause that allowed the abbot to alter these regulations if he deemed it necessary.\textsuperscript{160} Once he was abbot, Marty took this clause to heart.

\textit{The Reform \& its Rationale} \\
In the fall of 1872, Marty decided to implement a reform that reflected his familial model of Benedictine monasticism. After consultation with the senior members,

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{156} Oetgen, “The American-Cassinese Congregation: II,” 431. For more on Wimmer and his lay brothers, including Rome’s mediation of the issue, see Rippinger, \textit{The Benedictine Order in the United States}, 148-50.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 148.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 149.
\textsuperscript{159} Wimmer to Cardinal Barnabo, 7 October 1861, quoted in Oetgen, “The American-Cassinese Congregation, II,” 430.
\textsuperscript{160} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 65. See 13:1541, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
\end{quote}
he merged the formation of the lay brothers (“brothers”) with that of the non-ordained choir monks (“fraters”) into a single, joint novitiate. A candidate no longer elected either a “brother” or “frater” novitiate. Rather, the abbot now determined the future of each candidate at the end of the common novitiate, based on his assessment of the candidate’s character, his skills and, the community’s needs. Eventually this merger extended to the entire community, as Marty had the brothers join the fraters and fathers in the choir stalls. Although fathers retained a superior rank in the community, brothers and fraters were now seated according to the date that they entered the monastery. Instead of remaining in the fields, reciting private prayers, or praying the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin in German, the brothers now joined the chanting of the office in Latin. Eventually they were excused from the earliest offices (matins and lauds), yet if they could so much as pronounce Latin they were required to pray along. For this they received training in Latin alongside the fraters, as well as catechetical instruction.

Their meals, recreation, and sleeping arrangements were now combined, forming “one family.” In describing the reform to Einsiedeln, Mundwiler even pointed to Marty’s Cantarium Romanum as a source of inspiration: since St. Meinrad was attempting to “lead people on to a more active participation in the divine service,” the community had
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161 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 243. Kleber claims that this happened in 1872, yet Marty and his confreres do not mention the change until 1874. Kleber’s basis for this date is unclear.
162 Rippinger claims that all members were called “brothers,” including the priests, yet Kleber, his source, contradicts this and states that the priests retained a superior rank. Kleber is unclear about his source for this claim, and Fintan’s letter (see below, p. 1062) only speaks of the brothers and fraters being “mixed” in the choir. See Rippinger, The Benedictine Order, 150; Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 243.
163 Ibid., 243-48; Rippinger, The Benedictine Order, 150-52. See Marty to Hürlimann, 23 May 1876, 8:1010-11, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. Fintan’s letter provides the most detailed account of the lay brother arrangement. For an English translation of most of this letter, see Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 243-44, 246-48.
decided, “why should not monastic Brothers help along?” Thus the idea of the *conversi* reform flowed from the same source as the breviary reform, a source designed to educate and unite the church through common prayer. A reform of work flowed from a reform of prayer and, in turn, reinforced the prayer life of the community.

**Reactions & Defense**

The radical nature of this merger raised eyebrows in Europe. Once again Marty was forced to explain his decision on two fronts: Einsiedeln and Beuron. As with the breviary controversy, a delineation of these two fronts unveils different emphases. Whereas his arguments for Einsiedeln focused on humility in relation to American practicality, Marty’s reaction to Beuron’s disapproval highlighted Benedictine humility in relation to the original vision of the *Rule*.

**Einsiedeln**

In Marty’s correspondence with Hürlimann on the *conversi*, he began with an appeal to pragmatism: “This merger of the fraters and brothers was not planned but rather a necessary result of our poverty.” He noted how St. Meinrad had only one building and could spare only a single monk to be the novice master for both groups. Manual labor (“Handarbeit”), moreover, was more profitable in America than intellectual work (“Kopfarbeit”). The construction plans of the monastery and the demands of harvest time
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165 Fintan to Abbot Basilius Oberholzer, 13 January 1878, SMAA. Kleber’s translation in *History of St. Meinrad*, 244.
166 Marty to Ildefons Hürlimann (“Dekan”), 31 March 1876, 8:1009, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Diese Verschmelzung von Fratres und Brüdern war nicht planirt, sondern eine nothwendige Folge unserer Armuth.” An English translation of this letter (different from my own) is in 4:1415, Box 4, Pioneer Letters, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Rippinger, *The Benedictine Order*, 150-1.
required everyone who is able to join the brothers in the fields: “The lay brothers are not our servants but rather our breadwinners…and whoever’s health and age permits, should earn his own bread.”

Aside from these practical considerations, Marty went further to highlight the inherent virtue of work. He pointed out to his Swiss conferee that manual labor did not carry the same “dishonorable” stigmas that it did in Europe, “nor should it be thought so among us.”

Sharing in the brothers’ work ennobled the lay brothers’ vocation and allowed them to share in the monastic liturgy. If the monastery attempted to “educate the faithful of the world through participation in the liturgy, we must not deny our own people.” Marty went so far as to lament that he did not realize earlier how he had lived as a “Gentleman” dependent on the labors of others. Overall this combination of brothers and fraters reflected both American and Benedictine values: “America is a republic, where one man is as good as the next, and it cannot harm the learned if the sixth and seventh degrees of humility are practiced.”

This final line refers to the degrees of humility in the Rule and intimates the principal rationale for the merger: a return to the primitive spirit of St. Benedict’s teachings.

Beuron

What Marty intimates for Einsiedeln he makes abundantly clear for Beuron. Marty’s efforts to create what he calls “Benedictines of the old type” surfaces in his
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167 Marty to Hürlimann, 31 March 1876, 8:1009, SMAA. “…die Laienbrüder sind nicht unsere Bedienten sondern unsere Brodväter und wenn die Zahl der Patres zunimmt, können wir nicht allen in Schule und Mission brachen und doch muß jeder, dessen Alter und Gesundheit es erlaubt, sein Brod selbst verdienen.”

168 Ibid. “Arbeit ist in Amerika nicht entehrend und soll es auch durch uns nicht werden.”

169 Ibid. “…und wenn wir die Glaubigen in d. Welt durch Theilnahme and der Liturgie erziehen wollen, dürfen wir sie unsern eigenen Leuten nicht verweigern…”

170 Ibid. “Denn ist Amerika eine Republik, wo ein Mann so gut ist wie der Andere und es kann auch dem Gelehrtesten nicht schaden, wenn der 6 und 7 Grad d. praktisch wird.”
additional remarks on the lay brothers in his correspondence with Frowin Conrad in Missouri. Conrad, as noted above, looked to Beuron for guidance, and upon visiting St. Meinrad and observing the new merger, Conrad wrote to Placidus Wolter for his opinion. Conrad explained that Marty had defended his decision on the grounds that there is “no distinction” between brothers and fraters in the Rule, that “every other arrangement is not Benedictine,” and that the organization of European abbeys reflects “the spirit of aristocracy” rather than the Rule.

As to be expected, Wolter did not take kindly to this implicit attack of Beuron’s model. Replying to Conrad, he admitted that the Rule was silent on lay brothers and promoted the liturgical participation of the entire community. Nevertheless, Wolter countered that the Rule made provisions for only a few ordained members, and this was not the case in either Europe or America. Rather, “the Spirit in the Church has changed that in the course of the ages,” and the same could be said of the gradual separation between brothers and fraters. This separation also prevented the “self-exaltation” of the former, and the history of revolutionary monks proved this point.

Conrad forwarded these remarks to Marty. The sting of Beuron’s circular letter on the breviary controversy was still fresh, and this second assault on his leadership only reinforced his conviction that Beuron uttered “absurdities.” He dismissed Wolter’s
argument as “too much phrase and not enough real thought,” the opinion of “Reverend Gentlemen” who treat their lay brothers as “valets” and who “have not been disciplined by the hard experience of practical life.” Moreover, Marty believed that Wolter’s reading of history only confirmed the need to return to the true spirit of the Rule: “All the examples he mentions of revolutionary brothers are from monasteries where the holy Rule had been change.” Rather, “they prove that how sound the opinion of St. Benedict was that the clerici need more humiliation than the laici and that after all a man only becomes humble by humbling himself and not when humbling others!”\textsuperscript{175} This retort is most revealing for Marty’s rationale for the conversi reform: his reasoning clearly stretches beyond American poverty and practicality. As with Einsiedeln, Marty highlights the Benedictine call toward humility, yet his remarks toward Beuron further appeal to the Rule as the normative authority for reforming the conversi in the monastery.

Marty’s experiment with the lay brothers lasted only six years and waned with his absence from the abbey as he devoted more time to the Dakota missions. Despite Mundwiler’s defense of the change as Marty’s prior, the arrangement gradually came under attack from within. By 1877 Isidore Hobi vociferously denounced it in letters to Einsiedeln, citing canon law and claiming that it was inspiring obstinacy and self-righteousness among the brothers. He even requested a visitation.\textsuperscript{176} Bishop De St. Palais feared that Rome would not approve of the arrangement if it were informed, and the abbot of St. John’s in Minnesota, Rupert Seidenbusch (1830–1895), expressed his worry

\textsuperscript{175} Marty to Conrad, 28 December 1874, CAA.
\textsuperscript{176} Isidor Hobi to Abbot Oberholzer, 14 June 1877 (Is 35), 11:1207, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
that the joint novitiate made the vows of the brothers invalid. By the end of December 1878 the arrangement was abandoned.

**Significance**

A reconstruction of the controversy sheds light on its theological value for Marty. Although he was certainly ahead of his time in abolishing the class distinction, Marty’s rationale had less to do with a pursuit of equality than it did with a return to St. Benedict’s monastic virtues of manual labor and humility. The reform stemmed primarily from Marty’s consistent desire to reform his order by returning to the original spirit of St. Benedict. Marty’s words further confirm that he saw the *conversi* reform as flowing from the breviary reform: if monks and laity were to participate in the same prayer, why should choir monks and lay brothers not participate in the same work? For Marty, if monks were to unite the church through their example of prayer, they should also do so through their example of fraternal cooperation in work. As his response to Beuron’s criticism demonstrates, the exemplar behind this vision was the *Rule* itself.

Indeed, a glance through the pages of the *Rule* confirms it as Marty’s primary source of inspiration. Benedict devotes an entire chapter to the twelve steps of humility (RB 7), including the two to which Marty refers: the sixth on regarding oneself as the “lowest” (RB 7.49) and the seventh on humbling oneself in “tongue” and “heart” (RB 7.51). Similarly Benedict insists that rank in the community should be “according to the date of their entry, the virtue of their lives, and the decision of the abbot” (RB 63.1; see also 60.7, 62.5). Marty undoubtedly had this line in mind when mixing the brothers with the fraters in choir. Benedict also makes provision for the abbot to “choose from his
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177 Ibid. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 245.
monks one worthy to exercise the priesthood” (RB 62.1) instead of the monk requesting ordination for himself. Marty likely based his authority to determine the future of each candidate on this line. Aside from these theological reasons of self-denial, Marty also likely looked to the Rule’s chapter on manual labor, especially Benedict’s remark that “when they live by the labor of their hands, as our fathers and the apostles did, then they are really monks” (RB 48.8). This emphasis on the importance of manual labor in the monastic vocation also found a likely source in Marty’s formation in Einsiedeln. Marty would have been familiar with the essay of Brandes, his former mentor, on the “Worth of Work for Students,” delivered and published during Marty’s first year as a professor (1856). Marty may have also drawn from his reading of Mabillon, who insists that scholars need to take up manual labor for the sake of humility. Half a century later, Marty would have found a ready ally in Cuthbert Butler, who in his influential treatise pointed to the Rule’s precept of manual labor as something lost among many of his contemporary Benedictine confreres. Overall, Marty’s conversi reform was the second of two-part agenda to restore the Benedictines to the spirit of their founder, beginning with his own monastery. The controversy over the conversi emerged alongside that of the breviary, and Marty himself saw them as two oars propelling his reform against the waves of resistance from this own confreres. Both reforms sought to evangelize through education and unity. The breviary
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178 Karl Brandes, Über den Werth der Arbeit fur den Studirenden: Vortrag an die Zöglinge der Lehranstalt von Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1856). Nevertheless, it should be noted that Marty departs from Brandes’s opinion that the separation between “learned and unlearned” in the monastery is set forth in the Rule. See Brandes, Erklärung der Regel, 573.


reform centered on education and unity through the practice and example of communal prayer. The *conversi* reform centered on education and unity through the practice and example of communal work. As the following sections demonstrate, this model of prayer and work propelled his vision, and his own life, into a new missionary field in America.

II. Marty’s Scholarship

In his reform agenda and its controversies, Marty did not abandon his program for monastic education and scholarship. Marty’s emphasis on Benedictine manual labor (“Handarbeit) further extended to intellectual labor (“Kopfarbeit”), even though, by his own admission, it was less profitable.  

181 St. Meinrad’s school and seminary continued to expand despite the economic panics and depressions of the 1870s.  

182 It refined its curriculum and began to publish a course catalogue to mark its accomplishments and to attract more students. The seminary’s reputation increased among bishops, and by 1880 the school and seminary boasted over 100 students.  

183 With the monastic school’s foundations set and its life flourishing, Marty once again turned his educational efforts toward those beyond the St. Meinrad community. He had already attempted to educate Swiss-German and German-American Catholics with his translation project in the 1860s. He continued to write for European Catholics in the hope of heightening their awareness of American Catholicism and its local history. However, he now also did the same for a specifically monastic audience, intent on
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181 See chapter 3, p. 288 and note 166 above.
promoting his own reform agenda abroad. Two works from the 1870s exemplify these
two sides of Marty’s scholarship as abbot. His biographers have mentioned them in
passing and have ignored their content, method, and purpose completely. The first is a
short biography of Bishop John Baptist Purcell, penned contemporaneously with his
leadership of Cincinnati. The other is an extensive account of St. Benedict’s life and the
historical development of the Benedictine Order, offering an unparalleled window into
his vision for Benedictine evangelization. A closer examination of both yields a better
understanding of how Marty came to apply his vision of history to Benedictine
 evangelization and to himself.

**Biography of Purcell**

As a supplement for *Alte und Neue Welt*, a German-Catholic family periodical
published by Benziger, Marty penned a concise biography of Purcell in 1870.¹⁸⁴ Little is
known about what gave rise to this work, although one can presume that Marty’s
connection with the Benziger brothers played some role. The humble piece has almost
completely escaped the attention of scholars. Kleber fails to mention the work at all in his
history of St. Meinrad and devotes a mere sentence to the work in his unpublished
biography of Marty.¹⁸⁵ Rippinger also mentions the existence of the biography but
nothing more.¹⁸⁶ However, the historical significance of the work demands further
attention. It offers clear proof that Marty held Purcell in high esteem. This evidence if

¹⁸⁴ Martin Marty, “Der erste Erzbischof von Cincinnati,” *Alte und neue Welt: Illustriertes katholisches
Familienblatt zur Unterhaltung und Belehrung* 4, no. 1 (1870): 21-24. It is not clear whether Marty wrote
the biography before departing for the Vatican Council in 1869 or after his return. Given Marty’s
ultramontane sympathies, and Purcell’s anti-infallibilist leanings, one can only wonder whether the council
had any affect on Marty’s opinion of Purcell.
¹⁸⁵ Kleber, “Bishop Martin Marty,” 133.
further intriguing given Purcell’s position against slavery during the Civil War and, more importantly, his anti-infalliblist, anti-ultramontane position at the Vatican Council. The contents of this work also shed light on why Marty looked to Purcell: he saw the archbishop as an exemplar of Catholic unity and evangelization.

The first lines of Marty’s biography reveal why he values Purcell. Even though the United States is founded on “equality,” regardless of whether, “black, red, or white,” Marty maintains that this “transatlantic republic” still has its “princes” in politics and business. The American Catholicism also has its “princes,” and Marty characterizes them as symbols of the “providential man” and places Purcell among their number.187 This nomenclature of the “providential man” reflects the language and ideas of Marty’s American Catholic contemporaries. Orestes Brownson adopted from Pierre Leroux (1797–1871) the idea of “providential men” shaping the course of history and promoted the idea in the United States through his journal.188 Marty, likely aware of Brownson’s work, applies the idea to Purcell and further shows how other “providential men” shaped the bishop’s life, such as John Dubois (1764–1842) and Simon Bruté (part of Marty’s earlier translation project).189 Marty had intimated a historical vision of “providential men” in his Einsiedeln writings on Strabo and St. Meinrad and translation project of American Catholic biographies. Now, for the first time, he explicitly uses the phrase “providential man.”

The reasons for designating Purcell as a “providential man” emerges in the two accomplishments Marty highlights in the biography. The first is Purcell’s promotion of ethnic equality in the Church: “The quarrels of nationalities is presently the critical cancer of Catholic life in the United States, and to Archbishop Purcell belongs the reputation to have recognized this evil of the age and, despite many barriers, to have destroyed it where he could.”\textsuperscript{190} Marty notes that despite his Irish heritage, Purcell has built churches for German Catholics and has ensured their prosperity at a time when they suffer discrimination in other dioceses. This ability to quell the “partisanship” of American Catholics shows how Purcell embodies the “principle of the apostle to the nations,” St. Paul, and his admonition that in the Church there is “no Jew nor Greek” but only “all in Christ” (Gal. 3:28).

The second testament of Purcell’s greatness Marty identifies as Christ’s call to convert the nation. Purcell has done this first through his nurturing of religious orders in his diocese, the “tools of the propagation, stabilization, and conservation of Christian faith and life.”\textsuperscript{191} Purcell has also heeded this call in his famous public debate with the “Restorationist” Alexander Campbell (1788–1866) and the converts to the Catholic fold won through the debate’s publication.\textsuperscript{192} Purcell is also responsible for two prominent organs of Catholic evangelization in America: the Catholic Telegraph (for English-speaking Catholics) and the Wahrheitsfreund (for German-speaking Catholics, a

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 23. “Der Nationalitätenhader ist bis zur Stunde der bedenkliche Krebschaden des katholischen Lebens in den Vereinigten Staaten und Erzbischof Purcell gehört der Ruhm, dieses Übel bei Zeiten erkannt und demselben trotz vieler Hindernisse, wo er nur konnte, gesteuert zu haben.”

\textsuperscript{191} Ibid. “…Werkzeuge zur Ausbreitung, Befestigung und Erhaltung christlichen Glaubens.”

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid. Ironically, Marty points to Peter H. Burnett (1807-1895) as an example of a convert. Burnett converted to Catholicism after reading the debates, but he was also a vocal racist as a politician in Oregon and California, especially toward Native Americans. Marty was probably ignorant of Burnett’s policies and knew only of his public conversion.
publication that later played an important role in Marty’s own fame). Marty leaves the reader with these examples and expresses his hope that Purcell’s influence in America will continue into the future.

In one sense, Marty’s biography could be cast as mere ecclesiastical sycophancy. He writes about a prominent Catholic archbishop while he is still overseeing his see, and the proximity of Cincinnati to St. Meinrad certainly could not but help Marty’s own connections with Catholics in the area, including Purcell himself. Nevertheless, the manner in which Marty praises Purcell is telling. Not only does the work reflect yet again Marty’s extensive knowledge of Church history in America, but it also reflects how he views the development of American Catholicism. For Marty, the Church develops in the United States through “providential men” who unite Catholics of diverse backgrounds into one fold and evangelize the culture and people around them through religious orders and public forums. His mission for the Benedictines in America is behind this vision of American Catholicism in the biography. His application of this vision to his own order and himself as one of these “providential men” comes to life in another major publication four years later.

St. Benedict and His Orders

In 1874, Benziger published a 207-page book, Der heilige Benedikt und seine Orden (St. Benedict and his Orders). The cover states only that it is a “bonus” (Prämie) for the 38th volume of the Wahrheitsfreund and is written “by a Benedictine in St. Meinrad, Indiana.” This omission has led Marty’s earlier biographers, including
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193 Ibid., 24.
194 Der heilige Benedikt und seine Orden (New York and Cincinnati: Benziger, 1874).
Betschart, to overlook the book entirely. No one, however, disputes that Marty wrote it, as there is clear evidence of Marty’s authorship in the letters of Wimmer and Placidus Wolter.\textsuperscript{195} Both contemporaries acknowledge the reception of the work, praise its accomplishments, and offer charitable criticisms.\textsuperscript{196} From these letters Kleber confirms Marty as the author yet remains completely silent about its format and contents; following Kleber, Rippinger does the same.\textsuperscript{197} This lacuna in intolerable, as the work was written on the eve of the breviary and conversi debates and sheds considerable light on Marty’s rationale for his reforms. The book’s contents reveal not only his vision for his own religious order but also testify to the continuity and development of his thought. A close analysis of its contents demonstrates that the book contains Marty’s direct application of his biographical approach to history to his vision for Benedictine evangelization. In order to arrive at this insight, one must examine the work’s (1) structure, (2) hidden sources, (3) method, and (4) argument. Only then can one appreciate its greater significance (5).

\textsuperscript{195} Wimmer to Marty, 24 January 1875, translated in Oetgen, ed., Boniface Wimmer: \textit{Letters}, 382. Wimmer explicitly refers to the work as “yours” (i.e., Marty’s). See also Placidus Wolter to Frowin Conrad, 6 April 1875, translated and reprinted in Malone, “Documents,” 321. Malone misprints the date as “1874,” which is clearly a mistake given its contents about Beuron’s recent suppression in April of 1875.

\textsuperscript{196} Wimmer takes issue with Marty’s claim that St. Boniface (whom Wimmer refers to as his “patron saint”) was murdered over the possessing of wine. Wimmer denounces this as “scandalous” and states that he would censor it if given the authority. Placidus, receiving a copy from Conrad, praises the “spirit of its author” and ponders whether Beuron should use it for its novices. This accolade is indeed ironic, given Placidus’s later vociferous attack of Marty in a letter over the breviary issue and Einsiedeln (322). Given the book’s ambiguous title page, it is likely that Placidus was unaware of who the author was. He does, however, criticize the typesetting of the book as “very small and crowded” (321).

\textsuperscript{197} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 177-78; “Bishop Martin Marty,” 133. Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Monk - I,” (1982); 230; \textit{The Benedictine Order in the United States}, 120. Rippinger also claims that Marty published a “German grammar” and a translation of the \textit{Rule}. I could find no evidence for this claim, and Rippinger omits these works later in “Martin Marty: Founder,” (2004), 63.
Structure

The title sheds light on Marty’s logic for its structure. Rather than one book, the work is divided into two. The first concerns St. Benedict, the “Founder of the Order” (*Der Ordensstifter*), divided into six sections. It begins with Benedict’s childhood in Nursia and Rome (1) alongside his conversion in Subiaco (2), proceeds to the founding of Monte Cassino (3) and his eventual death (4), and concludes with an overview of the Rule (5) and the Medal of St. Benedict that perpetuates the saint’s devotion to the Holy Cross (6). The second half focuses on the history of religious orders (*Die Orden*, plural) stemming from St. Benedict, divided into an introduction (*Vorerinnerung*) and fourteen sections for each century after St. Benedict (the sixth century through the nineteenth). The book is thus organized as a treatise on “St. Benedict” and “his orders,” exactly as the title signals. His named and unnamed sources illumine Marty’s rationale for this division and its arrangement.

Sources

In his opening of the first book, Marty immediately credits Gregory the Great’s *Dialogues* and its *vita* of St. Benedict as the primary source and inspiration for the book. Since this “Benedictine” pope was only able to “share a little” of St. Benedict’s greater story with “friends” and “posterity,” Marty introduces his own work as “building” upon the foundations of the “little” that Gregory presents in his *vita*.¹⁹⁸ The starting point is natural; Marty’s objective, however, is audacious. One wonders what other sources Marty uses to “build” upon Gregory’s foundations. The following sections are full of details that

no reader of Gregory’s *vita* would recognize. For instance, Marty provides names for
each of the twelve monasteries that St. Benedict establishes and further highlights five
“graces” (or promises) that God reveals to him through an angel.199 Both are apocryphal
to Gregory’s biography of Benedict and obviously stem from later traditions and legends.
Moreover, Marty supplements these legends with discourses on the *Rule* and the “Medal
of St. Benedict,” a testament to Benedict’s supposed devotion to the Holy Cross. These
observations lead one to two unnamed sources that influence Marty’s work.200

Marty’s first source comes from his days in Einseideln: Brandes’s *Leben des
heiligen Benedikts*. As noted above, this volume was part of a three-volume work that
included a translation of and commentary on the *Rule*, and all three volumes are listed in
a record of books sent to St. Meinrad at Marty’s request.201 Brandes’s volume on
Benedict’s life is also based primarily on Gregory’s *vita*. However, like Marty’s text, it
adds a thorough account of Benedict’s devotion to the cross, as well as a history and
explanation of the Medal of St. Benedict.202 Nevertheless, the surest evidence for
Brandes’s influence on Marty is the latter’s quotations of the *Rule* in his book. Marty uses
Brandes’s translation for this section on the *Rule*, minimally altering the German where
he sees fit. Ultimately the first section of Marty’s books reflects the very idea of
Brandes’s organization. Rather than reduce St. Benedict’s importance to the *Rule*, his life
becomes the foundation for understanding the *Rule*. The *vita* and the *Rule*, written

199 Ibid., 20, 70.
200 It is possible that there is a third: Charles Montalembert’s *Monks of the West* (1860). Karl Brandes
produced a German translation of the work (through Joseph Manz in Regensburg). See chapter 3, 227n8
above. The copy that St. Meinrad has today is likely a copy Marty received from Brandes with other books.
Although Marty undoubtedly knew of Montalembert’s work through Brandes, I could not find any clear
proof that it directly influenced this particular work of Marty’s.
201 See above, chapter 2, 190n262.
separately, are intimately bound together in both Brandes’s and Marty’s works.

Benedict’s biography matters as much as his monastic legislation.

The second work hidden behind the book’s facade is less obvious but more significant. For his scholarship, Marty employs a 1607 German translation of *Lignum vitae*, a text on St. Benedict and the various personages and religious orders inspired by the saint. The work was written by Arnold Wion (1554–1610), a monastic historian and monk of Douai. A copy of this text exists in St. Meinrad Archabbey’s collection to this day and is undoubtedly the 1607 copy that Marty used for this work. A comparison of the two confirms this suspicion. Wion’s text begins with the story of St. Benedict himself. However, it departs from Gregory’s *vita* to include the exact same account of an angel revealing five divine gifts to St. Benedict. It further specifies the same names for his early monasteries. However, Wion’s work ultimately gives inspiration and life to Marty’s second half of his book on the various “orders” sprouting from the life of St. Benedict. Wion, like Marty, highlights not a monolithic development of a loyal “Order of St. Benedict” (a late-medieval idea). Rather, for both Wion and Marty, St. Benedict’s legacy lies in the men he inspired, who in turn established various orders that responded, in Marty’s words, to the “needs of the time and place.” Marty, like Wion, focuses on the biographies that stem from St. Benedict’s biography, men who gave rise to new monastic communities. Venturing beyond Wion, Marty goes so far as to compare Benedict to Abraham, both “patriarchs.” Just as thirteen tribes grew from Abraham’s
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205 Ibid., “Vorrede” and “Die Offenbarung S. Benedicti,” 6-7.
206 Marty, *Der heilige Benedikt*, 69. “…je nach den Bedürfnissen der Zeit und des Ordens.”
posterity, so “thirteen different orders” sprouted from the “first family of St. Benedict” to “proclaim and share” Christ’s gospel. The point is rhetorical and not historical, as Marty does not present any clear designation of thirteen specific orders in the rest of his text. He nonetheless presents the second half of the book as a “history of the orders” that, according to him, captures the words of Sirach: “Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers in their generations…” (44:1). The language of “famous men” brings one to Marty’s method.

Method

The use of Brandes and Wion confirms that Marty does not abandon his focus on biographies that was so central to his translation project during the mid-1860s. Like the Purcell biography, Marty is interested in the role of “providential men” in history. Whereas the translation project and the Purcell biography focused on local diocesan men, this work highlights the heroes of Benedictine history. Although such an approach to history defies methodological precision, this vision of history nevertheless forms the skeleton of the book. The focus on biographies further explains why Marty does not present his readers with only a commentary on the Rule or a treatise on abstract principles of monasticism (like Wolter later in 1880). For Marty, the hand of God in history is found in human lives spreading the gospel, and the history of Benedictine monasticism is no exception.
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208 Ibid., 71.
The reappearance of this idea of “providential men” further demonstrates continuity in Marty’s thought. The book on Benedict stems from the same idea found in his 1857 essay on Strabo. As he attempted to do with Strabo, so Marty now tries to reconstruct St. Benedict’s life for his readers. However, now he writes a biography (rather than an autobiography) and places this life in conversation with the lives of St. Benedict’s sons for a larger narrative. Yet the greatest point of similarity between Marty’s work on St. Benedict and his essay on Strabo is the invitation to the reader to emulate the biography presented, to follow the path of St. Benedict and his true heirs. This similarity points to the work’s underlying argument.

**Argument**

Marty’s argument is twofold. He calls his Benedictine brethren both to return to the original spirit of their founder and to revitalize their order by embracing the Church’s call toward evangelization and unity. Hints of the first argument are found in his brief commentary on the *Rule*. Considering that the work is written just as Marty begins to institute his reforms at St. Meinrad, it is striking that he emphasizes the importance of prayer and work side-by-side in his commentary. Prayer he describes as the “first and primary task of a Benedictine monastery;” manual labor he argues “is prescribed for all” since it conforms to the example of Christ himself. Marty even points to Gregory VII’s Roman breviary as exemplifying the spirit of the *Rule*, and quotes the *Rule* on how monks are “truly monks” when they work, just as “our fathers and the apostles lived through the work of their hands” (*RB 48.8*). He further describes the *Rule* as outlining
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209 Ibid., 53, 56.
210 Ibid., 54, 56.
a “monastic family” that knows no class or racial distinctions. These points foreshadow the breviary and conversi controversies that arose the same year these lines were published.

The other side of Marty’s argument is embedded in the Vorerrinnerung introducing the second half of the book. In his transition from St. Benedict’s life and Rule to the history of the founder’s descendants, Marty turns to a familiar theme: a reformed Benedictine “family” finds its life and mission in service to the Church: “The family of St. Benedict shares with the holy Church, to whose service it is called, the character of catholicity in a special way.” This family has “acclimated” itself to all cultures by making itself “local” among all peoples. It has adapted to meet the demands of each age and has done so through two principles. First, it attends to the liturgical office “before anything else” so that, borrowing a phrase of the Rule, “nothing comes before the work of God” (RB 43.3). Second, for the time remaining, “the sons of St. Benedict have undertaken various forms of work.” This work is for the sake of the Church and society. History has witnessed that the “goals” of this family and the “purpose of its existence” have been the “proclamation of the faith, the struggle for truth and justice, the erection of order and morality, and honor of God and the salvation of countless souls.” And now, after Europe has “destroyed its houses” and “plundered its libraries,” the family’s sons “turn to the New World and begin anew in the forests and on the prairies of America” in “every work of enlightenment, progress, and fraternity that Christ brought to
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211 Ibid., 57.
212 Ibid., 69, “Die Familie des heil. Benedikt theilt mit der heiligen Kirche zu deren Dienste sie berufen ist, den Charakter der Katholizität in besonderer Weise. Sie hat sich unter allen Völkern heimisch gemacht, unter allen Himmelstrichten akklimatisirt…”
213 Ibid. „…daß der liturgische Gottesdienst allem Anderen vorgehe: ‘operi Dei nihil praeponatur…”
the world.” Marty repeats these sentiments later when he designates the seventeenth century, the same century in which Wion’s Lignum vitae became so influential and Einsiedeln experienced its own renaissance, as a century of “new life” for the Benedictines. Through the reforms of Trent, monks rose from the “sons of the people” rather than the “nobility” to reclaim “the original character of the school of St. Benedict.” They recovered not only the “divine service” of prayer but also “youthful energy” in the “works of caring for souls and works of charity.” Now, after a generation that has “sunk back to the times of the barbarians,” the Benedictines must once again recognize the “principles of divine providence,” that they must return to the “ancient trunk that still maintains enough living branches” so they may “establish new nurseries [Pflanzschulen] of Benedictine activity.” Thus Marty expresses his “hope” that “all the sons” of St. Benedict will heed this “calling of the Lord.” Marty’s ultimate argument is that the Benedictines are called once again to evangelization, only this time in the New World. His book is fundamentally about an American lignum vitae (“tree of life”) that can restore the world to Christ.


216 Ibid., 188. “….die der Schule des heil. Benedikt ihren ursprünglichen Charakter und ihre gesegnete Wirksamkeit zurückgeben wollten. Statt mit den Söhnen des Adels füllten sich nun die Zellen und die Chorstühle der alten Stifte und Abteien mit den Söhnen des Volkes, und so wurde nicht nur dem unmittelbaren göttlichen Dienste wieder sein volles Recht zu Theil, sondern der Orden wendete nun auch eine ebenso zahlreichen als jugendfrischen Kräfte….Daneben widmen sie sich ebenso treu und hingebend dem Wohle des Volkes, aus dessen Schoß sie hervorgegangen, in den Arbeiten der Seelsorge, wie in den Werken der Wohlthätigkeit.”

217 Ibid., 197. “Doch wenden wir unseren Blick ab von diesem Werke eines verblendeten, in die Zeiten der Barbarei und des Heidenthums zurücksinkenden Geschlechtes, und betrachten wir lieber das Walten der göttlichen Vorsehung, welche dafür sorgte, daß der uralte Stamm noch immer genug lebenskräftige Äeste behielt, um mitten im Sturm…neue Pflanzschulen benediktinischer Wirksamkeit zu begründen.”

218 Ibid., 70.
Significance

In light of its argument, the greater significance of Marty’s work comes into view. The work, written on the eve of the breviary and conversi controversies, foreshadows them while also articulating his rationale for the two reforms. The book places his vision of “prayer” and “work” side-by-side to present a more unified vision and shows how the two reforms are not merely circumstantial but rather constitute two sides to a greater, orchestrated reform of Benedictine monasticism. Marty’s greater intentions fade into the shadows of the work without prior knowledge of the controversies emerging alongside it.

Beyond his program of “prayer and work” for reform, this forgotten work also sheds light on Marty’s vision of evangelization for the Benedictines. It reflects his waning confidence in the ability of European monasticism to weather the Kulturkampf and echoes his concurrent invitation to his European confreres to join him in America, a land that promises a bright future for the order. He invites them to return to the original spirit of their founder by creating “nurseries of Benedictine activity” that heed the wishes of “divine providence.” As he wrote this work, he also used its language of “nurseries” (Pflanzschule) and “divine providence” to describe St. Meinrad to European missionary societies, heralding his monastery as a “nursery of missionaries” ready to create “new centers of Catholic life farther west.”

The work further echoes Marty’s earlier descriptions of a monastic vision that is inherently ecclesial and familial. The Benedictine
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219 Marty to Joseph Othmar Rauscher of Vienna, 11 March 1874, 13:1509, Box 3, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Wenn wir den Absichten der göttlichen Vorsehung entsprechen, so wird die Abtei St. Einrad, das Mutterhaus der Helveto-amerikanischen Benediktinercongregation eine Pflanzschule von Missionäre sein, von welcher immer wieder neue Kolonien ausgehen sollen, um weiter im Westen neue Mittelpunkte katholischen Lebens für die deutschen Einwanderer und deren Nachkommen zu schaffen.” For “Pflanzschule,” see also Marty to Chrysostom Foffa, 14 March 1878 (M86), 8:1015, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
“family” is one that reflects the “catholicity” of the Church itself and focuses on the “local” faithful by reflecting this catholicity in its prayer and work. Although there are hints of this merging of familial and ecclesial visions in the reform controversies, their marriage comes to life in his work on St. Benedict. As the next section reveals, this marriage takes flesh in Marty’s vision of a “double family” in the missionary model for the Dakota missions, one attempting to evangelize through the education and unification of the local ecclesial community.

Finally, the significance of this work is incomplete without an eye to its sources and method. While the work champions a reform at the institutional level, Marty’s vision of history as biography presents the personal embodiment of this reform as the key to its success. In highlighting the historical importance of individuals in the development of the order, the work celebrates “providential men” that renew the Benedictine mission through their lives. In this sense, Seiler’s description of Marty as a “prophet” or “founder of a new religious order” has some merit. Marty’s book is written not only for confreres but also for himself. As the next section demonstrates, Marty applies the vision of this book to his own life, and when he finds its communal dimension lacking, he nevertheless maintains his conviction that he, as a loyal son of St. Benedict, can bring his order to its destiny through personal efforts.
III. A NEW MISSIONARY MODEL

By the end of 1874, Marty’s reform agenda was underway. He had instituted two controversial reforms and published his thoughts on the future of Benedictine monasticism for a wider audience. He had overseen the construction of a new monastery and improved the reputation of the seminary and school. His profile in U.S. Catholicism continued to rise as one of the country’s most prominent abbots. The following year Marty found himself embroiled in two controversies surrounding his reforms of the monastery’s prayer and work life. At the same time he continued to contemplate the expansion of his Swiss-Benedictine model while ardently defending his reform agenda. However, by the end of 1876, Marty had become an abbot absent from this own monastery. His breviary reform had been reversed, and the days of the integration of the conversi appeared numbered. Instead of the cloister of St. Meinrad, Marty took his residence on the prairie of Dakota Territory, over a thousand miles removed from the woodlands of Indiana. His life embodied a twofold contradiction: a cenobitical abbot absent from his own community, and a Benedictine monk, vowed to stability, laboring as an itinerant missionary among an indigenous people. Marty the monk had become Marty the missionary.

When presented with this perplexing point of transition, Marty’s biographers presume that his Benedictine vocation as a monk played some role in his decision to undertake missionary work. Nevertheless, they struggle to outline a cogent path from monk to missionary. Karolevitz is one of the few writers to take up the obvious question: did Marty’s failures in his reform agenda lead him to give up in despair and pursue a
different vocation? He concludes that this theory “can only be conjectured,” yet he does not offer an alternative, and thus Marty’s transition from monk to missionary in Karolevitz’s narrative is abrupt.220 Kleber comes closer to making a connection, arguing that the transition was “motivated by his understanding of the purpose and nature of the Order of St. Benedict” and a “principle of religious life” learned during his novitiate.221 He provides a random assortment of quotations to support his observation and ultimately fails to draw a clear line from his life as abbot to his life as a missionary. The failure of others to expand on this insight stems partly from Kleber’s unfounded claim a few pages earlier that De Smet had directly inspired Marty’s missionary life when he met the famous missionary in person while a student at Einsiedeln.222 Above in chapter one this claim, repeated by Rippinger, was proven erroneous.223 Marty likely learned of De Smet and the story of the Sioux on the Northern Plains through his translation of the Annales, yet there is no indisputable proof that De Smet directly inspired Marty’s transition from monk to missionary. Nevertheless, other scholars follow Kleber and Rippinger, reducing Marty’s inspiration for the Dakota missions to a lone Jesuit missionary.224 In the end, Marty’s biographers fail to show exactly how his missionary enthusiasm flowed from his monastic experience.

220 Karolevitz, Bishop Martin Marty, 58.
221 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 267.
222 Ibid., 264. See chapter 1, 57n118.
223 Rippinger, “Martin Marty: Monk - II,” 376. Rippinger cites Duratschek’s 1947 work, Crusading Along Sioux Trails. However, the page cited says nothing about an earlier encounter between Marty and De Smet. Duratschek does make this claim in her later, 1979 work, Builders of the Kingdom (p. 41). Since Duratschek makes extensive use of Kleber for this later book, it appears that Kleber’s work is the actual source of this fallacy.
224 See, for instance, Terrence Kardong, “Benedictine Stability on the North Dakota Frontier,” Word and Spirit: A Monastic Review 14 (1992): 56, Kardong makes the original claim that Marty met DeSmet during his education with the Jesuits. However, Kardong never mentions the school in Fribourg and provides no citation for this claim.
This failure to delineate the progression of Marty’s thought leads to a second problem in recent scholarship on Catholic Indian missions among the Sioux. Marty’s own words about the Indians of the Dakota missions as “idlers, loafers, and beggars” in need of manual labor lends itself to a misunderstanding that casts Marty in a negative, bigoted light. For instance, in his enlightening history of St. Meinrad’s missions in Dakota Territory, Kevin Abing reduces Marty’s mission to the Indians as demonstrating an “overbearing paternalism” typical for his age.\(^{225}\) Schelbert also follows this trajectory, yet he frames Marty’s missionary endeavors as one of three “daring steps” he took as abbot, alongside his breviary and conversi reforms.\(^{226}\) Here he comes close to connecting the relationship between the reforms and Marty’s missionary vocation, yet Schelbert ultimately misses the point of Marty’s missionary outlook when he compares Marty’s worldview of “ritual,” the “economy,” and the “moral order” with that of Sitting Bull. For ritual Schelbert completely neglects Marty’s monastic background and his emphasis on the unitive effect of prayer; Marty’s insistence that the Indians must learn to work he attributes to the prevailing “Puritan” work ethic of America; and he compares Marty’s Euro-American and “progressive” model of a “Christian family” with Lakota familial structures.\(^{227}\) In all three Schelbert overlooks Marty’s Benedictine worldview behind his missionary vision. The problem stems from a careless quotation of Marty’s missionary letters. In fact, in quoting Marty on the “ideal Christian family,” Schelbert ignores the greater monastic context of what Marty means by “family.” As the discussion of this letter demonstrates below, Marty’s missionary model explicitly centers around a


\(^{227}\) Ibid., 196, 199, 200.
“Christian family” that is none other than the monastery, grounded in “stability” while modeling the virtues of “ora et labora” for the indigenous Sioux.

Responding to both strains of scholarship on Marty, this final section demonstrates how Marty the monk became Marty the missionary in four stages. After (1) outlining the historical context of Marty’s transition, it (2) moves beyond prior biographical accounts to delineate how Marty’s two abbatial controversies provided a missionary model of “prayer and work.” In doing so, it further (3) revisits Marty’s famous encounter with Sitting Bull to show how his biographical sense of history prompted him to use his monastic reforms for his missionary paradigm in Dakota Territory. Finally, in turning to the emergence of boarding schools after the encounter, the section (4) reveals how Marty’s missionary paradigm retained its monastic, familial character of Benedictine evangelization through education and unification, a vision lasting up to Marty’s appointment as vicar apostolic of the territory.

**Historical Background**

The historical background to Marty’s transition from monk to missionary consists of three stages: (1) Grant’s “Peace Policy,” (2) the emergence of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions (BCIM) in response to this policy, and (3) the Bureau’s invitation to Marty to assume the mission of Standing Rock in Dakota Territory. All three stages coalesced to form an opportunity for Marty to put his monastic reform agenda of prayer and work into action.
Grant’s Peace Policy

Francis Prucha, the eminent historian of the U.S. Government’s American Indian policies, describes the nineteenth-century Euro-American missionary worldview as one of “paternalism,” characterized by an “attitude” of “protection, subsistence of the destitute, and punishment of the unruly.” Marty’s contemporaries, both Protestant and Catholic, manifested this attitude toward the indigenous peoples and cultures of the United States, and Marty shared the same perspective and many of its biases. “Paternalism” had guided the federal government’s Indian policies since the American Revolution, and after the Civil War, Washington charted a new political course in its campaign to “civilize” the native by abandoning the treaty movement that had characterize federal policy up to this point.

The new approach was born during the early days of the administration of President Ulysses Grant (1822–1885). The newly-elected war hero welcomed a new political climate in America intent on assimilating the American Indian into modern, Western culture. His new policy became known as Grant’s “Peace Policy” and went into effect between 1870 and 1881. This policy was constructed upon two pillars that later collapsed under their own weight and left the policy in ruins. The first was the establishment of a Board of Indian Commissioners in 1869, consisting of American evangelical philanthropists who could assist the Department of Interior in its handling of Indian affairs. By 1874 the board’s founding members had resigned after it became obvious that the Department and Grant’s administration had no interest in its
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recommendations. The second pillar stemmed from Quaker petitions to minister to Indians on western reservations, inspiring Grant’s administration to assign the nation’s Indian agencies to the nation’s Christian denominations. Civilization was now to be in religious hands. In 1872 the government distributed Indian agencies without any clear method. Envy and accusations of favoritism surfaced, and the “flagrantly bigotry” aired between rival denominations lead to the policy’s demise in 1881.

Grant, a man who participated in a resurgence of anti-Catholic rhetoric during the 1870s, had little interest in religious equality in distributing the agencies. Catholics expected thirty-eight agencies and received a mere seven. They found this to be grossly unfair, especially as Protestant interest in Indian missions began to wane while Catholic interest mounted. However, the Catholic response was inconsistent, at times demanding exclusive rights to agencies based on historical precedence and other times demanding the religious freedom of the Indians to choose their own religion. Nevertheless, the collective outrage among Catholics in America inspired efforts to create an organized, institutional response to Grant’s policy.

**The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions**

Catholic attempts to revise the new government policy finally produced a national office that could lobby Washington for Catholic missionary efforts. Baltimore’s Archbishop James Roosevelt Bayley (1814–1877) appointed General Charles Ewing
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230 Ibid., 1:503, 521.
231 Ibid., 1:512. Peter J. Rahill, *The Indian Missions and Grant’s Peace Policy, 1870–1884* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1953), 34. This decision also came in part from a 1870 congressional act not allowing Grant to appoint military personnel as agents.
(1835–1893), a Catholic war hero, as the official “Catholic Commissioner for Indians Affairs” at the outset of 1874.\textsuperscript{235} At the same time, Father J.B.A. Brouillet (1813–1884), a respected missionary of the Pacific Northwest, became the office’s director and secretary.\textsuperscript{236} Renamed the “Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions” in 1879, the Bureau sought to orchestrate and financially aid the agencies assigned to Catholics while also securing more agencies through political efforts.

From its inception, the Bureau was plagued by disfunction. Many bishops were reluctant to give it any financial support or offer personnel, and Brouillet struggled to secure funds and missionaries for the Bureau and its agencies.\textsuperscript{237} The Bureau further came under attack by fellow Catholics, especially James McMaster’s \textit{Freeman’s Journal}.\textsuperscript{238} Nevertheless, Brouillet received some support. Ellen Ewing Sherman (1824–1888), Charles Ewing’s sister and General William Sherman’s wife, organized an association of lay women in 1875 to support the Bureau.\textsuperscript{239} The work of this organization, the Catholic Indian Missionary Association, ultimately provided the spark that ignited Marty’s zeal for Indian missions.

\textit{Marty’s Mission}

Marty’s missionary life in Dakota Territory began with the wishes of an Indiana laywoman. Maria Giswold wrote Marty in 1876 asking that he introduce a women’s chapter of the Catholic Indian Missionary Association in one of St. Meinrad’s parishes.

\textsuperscript{235} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 263; Rahill, \textit{The Indian Missions}, 118.
\textsuperscript{236} Abing, “‘To Make Them True and Faithful Christians and Good Citizens,’” 158; Rahill, \textit{The Indian Missions}, 8, 100, 138, 176.
\textsuperscript{237} Rahill, \textit{The Indian Missions}, 119-168.
\textsuperscript{238} Ibid., 173. McMaster did not trust Ewing and was suspicious of his connections to General Sherman. Sherman had expressed his desire to exterminate the Indians, something McMaster found intolerable.
\textsuperscript{239} Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 263-64.
Marty appreciated the idea but replied that the local bishop preferred the international Association for the Propagation of the Faith. Nevertheless, he expressed interest in establishing a monastery for Indians like those in Australia. Griswold relayed this interest to Ellen Sherman, who in turn informed Brouillet in Washington. Brouillet immediately contacted Marty and offered him the Standing Rock Agency on the Missouri River, in the heart of Dakota Territory and at the northern tip of the Great Sioux Reservation. Standing Rock was one of the few agencies assigned to Catholics under Grant’s distribution, and Brouillet feared that it would be lost because of a lack of missionary interest.

In one sense, Brouillet’s offer arrived at a favorable moment in Marty’s abbatial career. It arrived only months after Rome’s breviary decision and in the midst of the *conversi* controversy, suggesting that the offer presented an escape from administrative worries. However, Marty’s correspondence prior to the proposal clearly shows earlier aspirations to expand westward. The Engelberg monks had already realized this to some extent with their foundation in Missouri. In a report to Einsiedeln in 1873, Marty maintained that “divine providence” had revealed that “the American West, to which the modern migration of peoples points, is the right area for Benedictine colonies” and opens the “great future” of the order.

---

240 Ibid., 264; Kleber’s paraphrase of the letter includes the language of “prayer and work,” yet he does not cite the letter’s location or date. The letter is dated 22 March 1876 and found in Folder 1, Box 5, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. The original does not contain the phrase “prayer and work.”


242 In one letter, Mundwiler suggests that financial problems at St. Meinrad possibly made the offer look attractive. See Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 267.

Wisconsin had offered Marty new missionary fields. Marty was also likely aware of the recent missionary efforts of Isidore Robot in Indian Territory (present-day Oklahoma). Brouillet’s offer came on the heels of other offers and signs that Marty interpreted as God’s will for St. Meinrad to expand westward.

On May 3, 1876, Marty replied to Brouillet that he would accept the offer so long as he obtained the necessary permission from the agency’s local ordinary (i.e., bishop). Once the necessary permissions were secured, Marty decided that he would leave at once to explore the area and ascertain whether it would be suitable for a monastery. Marty informed his confreres in Einsiedeln about the invitation and his plans for the new mission out West, but failed to inform his own community in St. Meinrad. Rather he waited until the day before his departure to inform the monastic chapter. Looking for volunteers, two came forward: Chrysostom Foffa, a former classmate from Marty’s days in Einsiedeln, and Giles Laugel, a lay brother. Both agreed to wait for Marty’s instructions to join him at Standing Rock. Since he did not know how long the mission would last, the abbot removed his choir stall and invested Mundwiler, who was prior, with full authority. Marty departed St. Meinrad on July 11, the feast of St. Benedict.

---

244 The offers came from Henni in Milwaukee and later Krautbauer in Green Bay. See Henni to Marty, 8 November 1875, in 2:365, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA; F.H. Krautbauber to Marty, 24 January 1876 (M72), 8:1006-07, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.

245 On Robot, see Rahill, The Indian Missions, 173-4. Robot’s work was at the center of McMaster’s assault on the Bureau.

246 Marty to Schmid, 14 May 1876 (M77), 8:1010, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA: “Unterdessen werden wir von mehrere Seiten um Gründung neuer Klöster angegangen, so z.B. Auch von Washington aus eingeladen, eine Indianer-Reservation zu übernehmen. Auf diese weise könnte noch aus Spaß Ernst werden und der ehemalige Pfarrer von Riemenstalden seine alten Tage bei den Sioux-Indianern beschließen.” See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 266.

247 Marty informed Hürlimann that he was going to Standing Rock to found a mission and, since he did not know how long he would be there, he had made preparations as if he were not returning. See Marty to
After a long journey, he arrived via steamboat on July 31, a date significant for two reasons. Since it was the eve of St. Peter in Chains, Marty named the Standing Rock mission “St. Peter,” immediately signifying unity with the “Rock” of Rome. None of his biographers, however, mention the peculiar coincidence that it was also the feast of St. Ignatius of Loyola, a coincidence worth noting since Marty was quickly identified as the successor of the Jesuit missionary De Smet.

**The Missionary Model Emerges: 1876–1877**

As Marty arrived at Standing Rock Agency, he stepped into a foreign world rife with conflict. Tensions between the American Indians of the agency, the civilian agent, and the military forces at nearby Fort Yates were at an all-time high. Distrust was in the air. The U.S. Government had refused to honor its 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty with the Sioux, which had created the Great Sioux Reservation and promised to protect the Indians’ hunting grounds. A gold rush to the Black Hills of southwestern Dakota Territory in 1874 exposed the emptiness of this promise. Instead of listening to Lakota (western Sioux) complaints, Washington ordered all Indians to report to the agencies by January 31, 1876. Several bands of Lakota warriors refused and were deemed “hostiles.” Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer (1839–1876), a Civil War hero, departed from nearby Fort Lincoln near the settlement of Bismarck in May to force

---

249. Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 268. The feast was for the translation of Benedict’s relics to an abbey in France. After Vatican II, it has become the universal feast for St. Benedict, replacing March 21. According to Duratschek, Marty stopped in Yankton along the way to see Mrs. Sherman. See *Crusading Along Sioux Trails*, 72.

250. Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 269. With a Roman eye, Marty expressed his desire to erect another mission on the opposite bank of the Missouri called St. Paul. See Marty to Hürlimann, 6 January 1878 (M84), 8:1014, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives, SMAA.

the bands’ compliance. On June 25, barely a month prior to Marty’s arrival, the defeat and death of Custer in the Battle of the Little Bighorn had stirred up anti-Indian sentiment across the nation as the United States simultaneously celebrated its centennial.\footnote{On the Battle of the Little Bighorn, see, Kevin Sullivan, *Custer’s Road to Disaster: The Path to Little Bighorn* (Guilford, Conn.: TwoDot, 2013); Debra Buchholtz, *The Battle of the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn: Custer’s Last Stand in Memory, History, and Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2012); and Tim Lehman, *Bloodshed at Little Bighorn: Sitting Bull, Custer, and the Destinies of Nations* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 2010).} The American press demonized the Hunkpapa Lakota leader Sitting Bull (ca. 1831–1890) as the vicious aggressor and murderer.\footnote{On Sitting Bull, see Dennis Pope, *Sitting Bull: Prisoner of War* (Pierre, SD: South Dakota State Historical Society Press, 2010); Gary C. Anderson, *Sitting Bull and the Paradox of Lakota Nationhood*, 3rd ed. (New York: Pearson Longman, 2007); Robert M. Utley, *The Lance and the Shield: The Life and Times of Sitting Bull* (New York: Henry Holt, 1993); and Manzione, “I Am Looking to the North for My Life” (cited above, introduction, 2n2). The Hunkpapa are one of seven bands constituting the Lakota; the Lakota, in turn, are one of three language groups of the “Great Sioux Nation” of the Northern Plains that include the Eastern Dakota (Santee and Sisseton) and Western Dakota (Yankton and Yanktonai). The name “Sioux” is a controversial term, likely stemming from a derogatory slur used by other Native American enemies. However, for the sake of simplicity, I refer to the Indians of Standing Rock and Dakota Territory generically as “Sioux” while designating specific subtribes when possible.} Sitting Bull’s evasion of government forces aroused the Lakota who had returned to the agencies, including Standing Rock. The Indians distrusted the agent, and the military wanted to punish all Sioux Indians as retribution.\footnote{Abing, “‘To Make Them True and Faithful Christians and Good Citizens,’” 160; Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 269-70.} A powder key was ready to ignite.

The precise nature of Marty’s intervention in these tensions between the Lakota and government entities is debatable. The evidence blends fact and lore. For instance, there is an unconfirmed account of him saving the agent, John Burke, as Indians attempted to drown the official just as Marty arrived.\footnote{Duratschek, *Builders of God’s Kingdom*, 42.} Later Bishop John Shanley (1852–1909) of Fargo, who knew and admired Marty, reported that he, a “humble and holy monk,” had pacified a band of warriors as they arrived from the Battle of the Little Bighorn, intent on causing an uprising at Standing Rock. Marty supposedly rode out to
meet them, “attired in the garb of a Benedictine monk, galloping toward the sullen, hostile warriors, who received him with great respect.” According to Shanley it was Marty’s “black gown” that reminded the warriors of De Smet and prompted them to heed Marty’s “fatherly advice and pleadings for peace.” Another account recalls how Marty calmed fears during a smallpox epidemic by blessing the Indians with his cross, an action that supposedly arrested the spread of the disease. Regardless of the veracity of these stories, Marty himself claims that he was the Indians’ “only refuge” and had “prevented much bloodshed and misery of all sorts.” This sense of purpose and mission convinced him to stay longer than originally intended.

As he arrived in a foreign land, Marty also brought with him a Benedictine idea that was equally foreign to its inhabitants. A comparison of his correspondence between his arrival at Standing Rock and his stay during the ensuing winter demonstrates how Marty’s idea of “ora et labora” first came alive in his writings while on the prairies of Dakota Territory. Although Marty hints at this phrase before his arrival, it becomes the rhetorical frame of his missionary model after his arrival. Here again the development of the phrase emerges once one separates Marty’s correspondence with Brouillet from that with his Swiss confreres. Doing so reveals how Marty’s vision of “ora et labora” was

---

256 John Shanley, “The Beginnings of Catholicism,” Grand Forks Daily Herald, April 6, 1902. Portions of this article are reproduced in Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 272. The account is certainly romanticized, but its publication, less than a decade after Marty’s death, was never countered by his contemporaries, many of whom were still alive.


258 Marty to Basil Oberholzer, 7 December 1876, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA. Kleber quotes portions of this letter in History of St. Meinrad, 270.

259 For example, just before he received Rome’s decision on the breviary question, Marty expressed his hope to Hürlimann that St. Meinrad could “pray and work” together with Einsiedeln as “one united group of brothers.” See Marty to Hürlimann, 16 February 1876 (M73), 8:1007, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA: “…und wir daher für einander und mit einander beten und arbeiten können als ‘ein Volk von Brüdern...’”
a direct outgrowth of his abbatial reforms and his overall attempt to realize the “regeneration” of the Benedictine Order.

**Reports to the Bureau**

The first recorded appearance of Marty’s idea of “ora et labora” appears in his first letters to Brouillet after his arrival, published later in the Cincinnati German-Catholic Wahrheitsfreund.\(^\text{260}\) The letter is the best firsthand account of the conditions he encountered. He opens his report with great optimism, reporting that “a good many Indian chiefs, some of whom are baptized” greeted him as they “expressed their joy at seeing at last a successor to Father DeSmet intending to stay with them.” Their joy reflected a “disposition” that “could not be more favorable.” However, with this report Marty turns to more solemn news. The agent and the military commander are not cooperating; the commander’s policies are causing unrest among the peaceable Indians; and the “third obstacle” to his mission is the “barrenness” of the land. This last concern Marty deems the most pressing, as “the first condition required to make the Indian self-supporting is to remove him to a country, where his work will bring him a return.” Marty suggests, at the recommendation of the military commander, that Indian Territory is more promising. This naïve idea likely stems from Marty’s knowledge of the reported success of another Benedictine, Isidore Robot, in Indian Territory. As for Standing Rock, the “Ora et Labora of the Benedictines can then never take root in the soil” of the

\(^\text{260}\) Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 7 August 1876, Folder 6, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. A transcription is in 2:394-95, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. A German translation appeared in the *Wahrheitsfreund*, April 4, 1877, 284. Rippinger cites this translation in *The Benedictine Order in the United States*, 259n17. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 272-73.
surrounding land. Thus he concludes that a “missionary station” might be possible, but not “a Benedictine monastery” as he had expressed earlier in his letters.\(^{261}\)

There is little reason to doubt the veracity of Marty’s first report. Yet beyond the question of the Indians’ “joy,” the report sheds significant light on how Marty sees himself as a monastic missionary in Dakota Territory. He has consciously assumed the legacy of DeSmet, a story he has known since his childhood. Nevertheless, he makes it also clear that he has come with a specifically Benedictine mission that transcends DeSmet’s earlier work. He confirms that he has come to “stay” with the Indians and ensure their longterm welfare. It is the search for permanence that prompts his concern about the agricultural conditions of the land. He frames this question explicitly in terms of “ora et labora,” something that is new in his thought, or at least in its articulation. His reasoning for adopting this phrase comes to light in his two later letters that year to Brouillet, both focusing on the “labora” dimension of the mission.

By October 2 Foffa and Laugel had arrived from St. Meinrad to assist Marty in his pastoral work, survey of the various tribes, and attempt to learn the language.\(^{262}\) Later that month, on October 28, Marty once again wrote Brouillet about the conditions of the mission. He repeats his assessment of the area as “most unfavorable now to the material as well as to the spiritual improvement of the Dakotas.”\(^{263}\) To this, Marty adds a scathing criticism of both the government’s policy and the Indian demeanor: “The policy of the United States has made these people a set of idlers, loafers and beggars and as long as the

\(^{261}\) Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 7 August 1876, MUA.

\(^{262}\) Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 274.

\(^{263}\) Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 28 October 1876, Folder 6, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. A transcription is in 2:402, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. Marty typically refers to the Sioux of Standing Rock simply as the “Dakotas” or “Dakota people” rather than differentiating between the “Dakota” or “Yanktonai” bands and the various “Lakota” subgroups at Standing Rock. The term “Lakota” is derived from the western Sioux dialect for “Dakota.”
military shall control them, it will be impossible to change their position and character.”

The government, in other words, needs to relinquish control to missionaries who, according to Marty, have the advantage of divine assistance. It “is not in the power of mortals to change the nature of things” since, quoting 1 John 5:4, only “faith” and what is “born of God” ultimately “overcomes the world.”264 In the letter Marty presents an even more critical argument a month later, asserting that “the main thing is to make the Indians work.”265 Each must have “his own homestead,” be given “animals and instruments” for this land, and “St. Paul’s rule must be gradually enforced: *Qui non laborat, nec manducet* [He who does not work, does not eat].” Marty further provides a reason for this norm. The Indians “never appreciate what is given to them and education and religious instruction would never strike deep roots, if they were offered without cost.” Schooling must have tuition to ennoble it, and as for the Indian culture itself, Marty insists that “there is nothing noble about paganism, whatever infidels may say or write to undervalue thereby the necessity or the benefits of Christianity.” To soften this statement, he adds that the mission must “take the Sioux as they are and be satisfied with small results in the beginning.” Marty has full confidence in this plan, as he is convinced that the Indians will work rather than starve if given the choice, and “if this first remedy prescribed in paradise is brought to bear upon their case, it will prepare the way for all the others.”266 Thus, after four months at Standing Rock, Marty concludes that the Indians needed a spiritually-

---

264 Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 28 October 1876, MUA. “…et haec est victoria quae vincit mundum, fides nostra.”
265 Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 21 November 1876, Folder 6, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. A transcription (with the wrong date) is in 2:403-4, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 273-4.
266 Marty to J.B.A. Brouillet, 21 November 1876, MUA.
guided mission that teaches self-sustenance through work, with a monastery for men and a convent for sisters.

Do Marty’s words toward the end of 1876 reflect a disillusioned, increasingly cynical missionary? Does Marty lack compassion in his description of the Sioux at Standing Rock? Are his first reports to Brouillet nothing more than a prime example of a dominant culture’s ethnocentrism and “paternalism” toward an inferior indigenous culture? Abing answers in the affirmative while noting that Marty was simply a man of his day. Schelbert makes further use of these quotations to argue that Marty shared the “Puritan” approach of America that “viewed the owning of private property as an integral part of civilization and by extension also of Christianity,” heeding the biblical command to “subdue” the earth. This point has some merit, considering Marty’s direct allusion to Genesis in the language of a “remedy prescribed in paradise,” the Garden of Eden. However, while Marty shared many of the prejudices of his contemporaries with respect to Indian (“pagan”) culture, he was also a monk. Abing and Schelbert overlook the monastic lens behind Marty’s statements. Although he has the material prosperity of the Indians in mind, Marty views the Indians as souls in need of the spiritual precepts of the Rule. Manual labor is not so much for sake of private property (something Marty as a cenobitical monk would hardly consider essential to Christianity) as it is for the sake of the soul and a sense of pride, nobility, and equality with Euro-American settlers. It is no coincidence that just before Marty penned these lines to Brouillet he had defended his case for all monks to assume manual labor. Nevertheless, at the heart of this monastic

267 Abing, “‘To Make them True and Faithful Christians,’” 169-70.
269 Marty to Hürlimann, 31 March 1876 (M76), 8:1009, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
worldview was Marty’s consistent search for *stability* for the Sioux. The cultivation of the land ensures the longterm prosperity of the mission and its permanence. This is why he describes himself as someone who, unlike DeSmet, will “stay” with the Sioux of Standing Rock to ensure lasting results. This sense of Benedictine stability behind Marty’s initial vision for the Indian mission gains clarity in his concurrent correspondence with Conrad in Missouri and other confreres in Einsiedeln.

*Correspondence with Swiss Benedictines*

In letters to Brouillet, Marty speaks with a pragmatic vision; in his letters to Conrad, however, Marty speaks with an idealistic vision of “regeneration” for the Benedictine order. Unlike Brouillet, Conrad is aware of the controversies preceding Marty’s expedition to Standing Rock. For this reason, Marty unveils his deeper reasons for his missionary vision, clarifying its fundamentally *Benedictine* character and its realization of his earlier goals in the breviary and *conversi* reforms. These sentiments come to light in three letters written just before his arrival and during his first months in Dakota Territory.

Marty wrote his first letter at about the time Brouillet offered Standing Rock to St. Meinrad. On April 24, just before responding to Brouillet, Marty writes Conrad to express his joy that the two confreres have the same vision for Benedictine missionary expansion: “Your opinion about the missions is also my own, and when we understand the beckon of divine providence, so will we always maintain the right proportion.”

With this Marty adds a line that hints at his intention to accept Brouillet’s offer and

---

270 Marty to Conrad, 24 April 1876, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. “Ihre Stimmung betreffs der Missionen ist auch die meinige und wenn wir die Winke der göttl. Vorsehung verstehen, so wird die rechte Proportion sich immer erhalten.”
realize one of the objectives of his reform agenda, stating that he wishes to accomplish “the regeneration and growth of our order.” He does not elaborate on what he means by “regeneration.”

Four months after his arrival in Dakota Territory and a day before his letter to Brouillet on the Indian necessity to work to eat, Marty wrote his Swiss confrere yet again. After surveying not only the Standing Rock agency but also the various settlements all along the Missouri River, Marty articulates the heart of his vision to Conrad. Marty’s second letter, dated November 20, is one of the clearest descriptions of his vision of Benedictine evangelization. He uses “regeneration” once again, only this time he makes it clear that his intent is to restore the missionary character of the Benedictines. He begins with an historical argument. The “conversion and civilization of pagan peoples was the task of the Benedictines from the beginning.” If they would have continued on this path, “500 million pagans would not be in darkness and the shadow of death.” Marty’s explanation for why the Benedictines, and not other orders, would have been more successful comes to light in two sentences that can be understood only if read together:

The education of several generations is unthinkable without stability, and the family life of a true Benedictine house of worship [Gotteshaus], encompassing material as well as spiritual progress, is the model and ideal of family life, upon which rests the welfare of the individual and society. The Ora et labora is still today the only formula for curing the children of Adam, and both cannot be taught with words.

---

271 Ibid. “Es freut mich, daß man von Eng. Ihnen wieder neue Hülfe sendet - wir wollen im Mai die Regeneration und das Wachsthum unseres Ordens besonders zum Gegenstande unseres Gebetes machen.”
272 Marty to Conrad, 20 November 1876, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. “Die Bekehrung und Civilisirung heideischer Völker war von Anfang die Aufgabe der Benediktiner und wären diesselben an der Arbeit geblieben, so würden nicht gegenwärtig noch 500 Millionen Heiden in der Finsterniß und in Schatten des Todes sitzen.”
273 Ibid. “Die Erziehung mehrerer Generationen ist ohne Stabilität nicht denkbar und das den materiellen wie geistigen Fortschritt umfassende Familienleben eines echt benediktinischen Gotteshauses ist das Muster und Vorbild des christlichen Familienlebens, auch welchem das Wohl des Individuums und der Gesellschaft beruht. Des Ora et labora ist auch Heute noch das einzige Rezept für die Heilung der Adamskinder und beides kann nicht mit Worten gelehrt werden.” After consulting the original handwriting,
A complete understanding of Marty’s vision rests on these two lines. Schelbert, for instance, isolates the line “the ideal of family life, upon which rests the welfare of the individual and society.” He, along with Abing, point out how Marty’s concept of family life conflicted with the Lakota tiyospaye, an extended family structure that centered on kinship rather than a nuclear family. The conflict is undeniably true, yet in omitting the context of Marty’s familial “ideal,” one misses its essence. Marty’s ideal family life is the Benedictine monastery. This family has a liturgical center (“house of worship”) which is the source of its “material as well as spiritual progress.” This familial language for Marty’s monastic model echoes his earlier recourse to the “familial” character of the Benedictines as an antidote to Catholic fragmentation (in both Einsiedeln and St. Meinrad). This latest reference to the monastery’s “family life” further points to his recent reforms within his own “family” at St. Meinrad in his use of the phrase “ora et labora.” Both reforms sought to unite the common prayer of the monastic family through the breviary, and the common work of the monastic family through manual labor. Yet the most telling line of the passage is how its entire vision explicitly rests on “stability,” the core Benedictine charism at the center of the Marty-Wimmer debate in 1868. Thus Marty’s newfound “formula” of ora et labora rests, by his own admission, on the foundation of stabilitas in congregatio.

This familial imagery is repeated in Marty’s third letter to Conrad on the Dakota missions. It confirms that Marty’s earlier sentiments expressed to Brouillet were not ones of hopelessness or cynicism but rather reform for the greater Benedictine family. Written

---

I have altered the translation of the letter as found in Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 267. Kleber renders “Gotteshaus” as “family,” which fails to express the liturgical character of Marty’s monastic family.

274 Schebert, “Conflicting Identities,” 199.

275 Ibid., 198-99; Abing, “‘To Make them True and Faithful Christians,’” 163.
at the beginning of 1877, the letter once again employs the language of “regeneration” in the context of reform: “The momentary setbacks of our efforts for the regeneration of the life of the Benedictine Order definitely belongs to the fulfillment of divine purposes.”

God can “in time effect in common for the whole family” what he and Conrad “have done in a limited sphere.” Marty’s remarks are an attempt to comfort Conrad, who has just received a stern rebuke from Engelberg for adopting the customs of Beuron rather than those of his Swiss motherhouse. Nevertheless, Conrad would have also recognized Marty’s allusion to his own reforms and the firestorm of controversy they provoked from Einsiedeln. Marty further expresses his confidence that their mutual interest in renewing the Benedictines will not be in vain, and he sees recent obstacles as a confirmation that God is guiding the renewal by preserving the unity of the order. He and Conrad could “not have expected that the conservative element would give way with the first attempt for reformation.” However, since “separation would have followed from resistance,” a complete “break” from this element was not desirable. There remains “the hope that with time the whole mass will be captured and assimilated with the leaven” of reform. During this “refining process” one must maintain a resignation that God will accomplish the reform in due time. To this Marty adds a final, surprising note. He sees

---

276 Marty to Conrad, 13 February 1877, File “Abbot Frowin’s Correspondence with Bishop Martin Marty,” Drawer 1, File Cabinet 515, CAA. “Das augenblickliche Mißlingen unserer Bestrebungen zur Regeneration benediktinischen Ordenslebens gehört wohl zur Erfüllung göttlicher Absichten, vermöge deren, was wir im beschränktem Kreise verwirklicht und der Charitas halber zum Opfer gebracht haben, eben deßhalb mit der Zeit Gemeingut der ganzer Familie werden mag.” See Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 259.


278 Marty to Conrad, 13 February 1877, CAA. “Es war nicht zu erwarten, daß das conservative Element sich auf den ersten Versuch dem reformatorischen ergeben würde, wäre auf den Widerstand Trennung erfolgt, so wäre der Riß unheilbar gewesen: so aber ist immer noch Hoffnung, daß die gesammte Masse mit der Zeit von Sauerteige wird ergriffen und assimiliert werden.”

279 Ibid. “Wir können bei der Sache auf keinen Fall verlieren und dürfen ganz ruhig dem Verlaufe des Läuterungs-Prozesses zuschauen; ja unser persönlicher Gewinn ist ein doppelter: der gute Wille, der irdischen Erfolges entbehrt, ist himmlischen Lohnes ein so gewisser und durch solche Erfahrungen
“no other way in the work of conversion” than the models adopted by the Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans in the New World. In other words, Marty sees the mission station system of other religious orders as more promising than one central monastery.

In his correspondence with Einsiedeln, Marty continues with this surprising idea of imitating other religious orders while paradoxically insisting that his reform agenda is still Benedictine in nature. In one letter, Marty speaks of how there must be a “mission house (priory) founded somewhere in Dakota on its border, and then it would better if a second, and third followed.” He explains that this is the best model because “the Indian field is so immensely vast, that with only one house one can only accomplish the task of civilization slowly and meagerly.” He requests, with little success, that other abbeys in Europe assist him in this model. By the end of 1877, James O’Connor (1823–1891), the newly appointed vicar apostolic of Nebraska (whose boundaries included Dakota Territory), had named Marty as general vicar of the vicariate. A month later Marty repeated his call for the Benedictines to adapt to the missionary field. Writing Oberholzer

gelangen wir zu jener ersehnten Stufe, welche Father Baker in der Sancta Sophia pag. 336 Ausgabe von 1857 beschreibt, wo Sie was ich Ihnen darüber sagen möchte, finden werden.” Marty refers to recent translation of Augustine Baker’s seventeenth-century classic, Sancta sophia, or Directions for the Prayer of Contemplation (ed. Serenus Cressy; New York: Dunigan, 1857). The section he cites for Conrad deals with “the exercise of resignation.” Baker argues that the “acts of the will that are the most useful and considerable are those of resignation or submission to the divine will,” as such acts quell disputes, especially religious disputes (336-37).


Marty to Hürlimann, 22 August 1877 (M82), 8:1012-13, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA: “...es muß ein Missionshaus, (Priorat) irgendwo in Dakota oder an dessen Grenze gegründet werden; und wenn ein zweites und drittes dazu kämen wäre es um so besser, denn das Indianergebiet ist so ungeheuer weitschichtig, daß man mit einem einzigen Hause nur langsam und wenig Civilisations Arbeit thun wird. - Wäre nicht Beuron oder eines der östreichischen Klöster zu bewegen, in dieser Mission sich zu betheiligen?”

in Einsiedeln, he relates that the American Jesuits, secular clergy, and O’Connor all believe that “the western states of the Union must be civilized and made Catholic through Benedictine colonies.” O’Connor even requests that Marty compose a circular letter addressed to the abbots of Europe, imploring them to “follow the example of the other orders” and embrace the mission field. Nevertheless, Marty’s flirtation with the models of “other orders” in late 1877 was ultimately fleeting. As the following section demonstrates, Marty returns to the Benedictine principle of stability by 1878.

**Significance**

Marty’s initial correspondence from Standing Rock between 1876 and 1877 indisputably demonstrates the emergence of his “ora et labora” missionary model in the context of a larger agenda to “regenerate” his own religious order. What he describes and proposes in his letters to Brouillet, Marty connects with his earlier abbatial reforms in his letters to Conrad. In particular, his correspondence with Conrad confirms that Marty’s two abbatial reforms were intended as “leaven” for the “regeneration” of the Benedictine order, and that this “regeneration” lies in the return of monks to their missionary roots as men of “prayer and work” among the indigenous peoples of America. These words to Conrad further shed light on the monastic foundations of Marty’s agenda to instruct the Indians in prayer and, most especially, manual labor. This plan to improve both the “material as well as the spiritual” welfare of the Indians stemmed from a greater objective
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283 Marty to Oberholzer, 28 December 1877 (M138), 8:1048-49, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA: “…daß die westlichen staaten der Union durch Benediktiner-Kolonien katholisirt und civilisirt werden müssen….ich sollte ein Cirkular an alle europäischen Benediktiner schreiben und sie auffordern, dem Beispiele der andern Orden zu folgen…” O’Connor had recently visited abbeys throughout Europe seeking support.

284 This circular has survived neither in KAE nor SMAA.
to attain greater stability for the Sioux amid the territory’s political and economic problems.

Nevertheless, Marty’s correspondence toward the end of 1877 presents a problem. The repetition of his idea to follow the models of other religious orders leaves one wondering whether in his pursuit of the “regeneration” of the Benedictine Order Marty had effectively abandoned the Benedictine tradition. Even if he described his model of “ora et labora” as inherently stemming from the “model and ideal of family life” of the Benedictine monastery, was his attempt to “regenerate” his order as scattered missionaries not itself a contradiction of this familial structure? Did his idealism of “ora et labora” in 1876 give way to a more pragmatic missionary model the following year? The answer to these questions lies in the two ways that Marty’s “ora et labora” model manifested itself after 1876. The first is his famous encounter with Sitting Bull in the summer of 1877, an expedition that gained much publicity for Marty among his contemporaries. A re-analysis of this encounter reveals how it was more than a mission to preach and evangelize as an itinerant missionary. Rather, Marty’s journey to Sitting Bull’s camp centered around securing lasting stability for the Lakota. Marty’s retention of the Benedictine charism of stability is confirmed in his model’s second manifestation after 1878: the agricultural boarding school. Both manifestations demonstrate how Marty’s model of “ora et labora” began with the Benedictine monastery as a family of stabilitas.
The Sitting Bull Encounter: 1877

Marty’s efforts to encourage other Benedictines to follow his lead witnessed little success in the years following his arrival at Standing Rock. After two years in the missionary field, he expressed his frustration in a letter to Conrad: “In the name of the Benedictine Order I assumed the Dakota missions two years ago, and did so because neither secular clergy nor other religious orders wanted to embrace this work.” Besides Conrad’s support, “no other Benedictine family has offered either personnel or means to assist me in the work of converting pagans, once so well-known and successful among the sons of St. Benedict.” Yet the same letter also expressed Marty’s indefatigable determination to continue on a path he now saw as part of his life’s destiny: “Already in the days of my novitiate…divine grace gave me the impulse to do that which no one else wanted to do, and since then I have been led by this principle and, perhaps, blessed through it.” What keeps him going, Marty says, is the “awareness” that “he who shed his blood for these souls” in Dakota “has given me the will, and with time, will bring [my work] to perfection.”

Whatever his sense of personal mission, Marty could no longer ignore the hesitation and apathy of most of his confreres back in St. Meinrad. In two years Marty had returned to St. Meinrad for only a short time, and then only after the bishop and

---


286 Ibid. “Schon in den Tagen des Noviziates, deren Sie in Ihrem Briefe gedenken, gab mir die göttliche Gnade den Antrieb, dasjenige zu thun, was sonst Niemand thun will; und ich war seither stets von dieser Regel geleitet und vielleicht auch darin besonders gesegnet. Wenn je so ist mir nun in der Dakota Mission ein Stärk Arbeit zugeteilt, für welche es keine andere Bewerben gibt und ich bin stets von dem Bewußtsein getroöstet, daß derjenige, welcher auch für diese Seelen sein kostbares Blut vergossen, mir das Wollen gegeben hat und mit der Zeit auch das Vollbringen geben wird.”
community had pleaded for his return. His various stays amounted to little more than six months during the first two years of the Dakota mission.\textsuperscript{287} It was clear that Marty’s determination for a Benedictine “regeneration” through missionary work rested with him. This realization prompted Marty to embrace his earlier biographical vision of history at a personal level. Nowhere was his attempt to become one of American Catholicism’s “providential men” more evident than in his self-motivated mission to Sitting Bull. A diligent reconstruction of this encounter shows that his “providential” mission was nevertheless bound to a Benedictine vision of evangelization.

\textit{Inspirations}

The spring of 1877 witnessed an American effort to avenge the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The U.S. cavalry had mobilized a renewed campaign to bring the Lakota warriors to justice for the “massacre” of Custer and his troops. Crazy House (ca. 1840–1877) surrendered in May, yet Sitting Bull escaped with his followers into Canada in an area known as Wood Mountain, just north of the border of Montana Territory. The Canadian Mounted Police tolerated this exile with the understanding that Sitting Bull would respect and observe the laws of Canada. At the same time, the Canadian government had little interest in a permanent exile, as this would disrupt relations with both the United States and neighboring tribes who were sworn enemies of the Lakota.\textsuperscript{288} Amid these new escalations, Marty saw an opportunity to become an heroic agent of peace.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 287-292.
\item Utley, \textit{The Lance and the Shield}, 182-86.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
However one might assess the full altruism of Marty’s mission to Sitting Bull, the record dispels any notion that it was simply vanity. In his letters to the Bureau, Marty confessed his fear that the government wanted to exterminate the Sioux, something he found intolerable. At the beginning of 1877 he told Brouillet that the army reports make it clear that Washington had no interest in civilization but only in the gradual if not rapid extinction of the entire race.\footnote{Marty to Brouillet, 22 January 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:410, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, *History of St. Meinrad*, 276.} As a missionary, Marty saw souls at stake. He wished to prevent further bloodshed and war, fearing that “few” of the Indians and soldiers of the territory were “fit to pass into eternity.”\footnote{Marty to Brouillet, 23 February 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:417, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.} The desire to save these souls on both sides by securing peace catapulted him into the national spotlight.

This greater plan for peace prompted Marty to pursue Sitting Bull’s camp personally. His letters to the Bureau and the U.S. Government speak of a desire to “prevent further bloodshed and misery” by convincing the “hostile Sioux” in Canada to return to the United States and accept a sedentary, agricultural life.\footnote{Marty to Brouillet, 22 January 1877, MUA. See also 2:410-28, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. Marty actually requested that Jean-Baptiste Genin (1839–1900), another missionary with a longer history in Bismarck, gain permission from the Bureau to undertake the mission. Brouillet denied this request and replied that the government already presumed that Marty would go. See Marty to Brouillet, 23 March 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA (no transcription in Archival Historical Series, SMAA); Brouillet to Marty, 30 March 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA (transcription in 2:425, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA).} Behind this conviction was his personal goal to “obtain what is best for the immortal souls, whose salvation is the only motive of our endeavor.”\footnote{Marty to Brouillet, 10 March 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:419, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.} Oddly enough, his letters never name Sitting Bull, although later reports suggest that his interest in the expedition lay in finding out whether the Lakota leader had indeed been baptized by De Smet and was thus a
Christian. Marty secured permission from the Department of the Interior to make the expedition to Sitting Bull’s camp with the understanding that he did not represent the United States in any official capacity and made the journey without any material assistance from the government. With Brouillet’s blessing, Marty departed Standing Rock in early May. Just before his departure, he visited Custer’s room in Fort Lincoln and, writing Brouillet from the “very room” of the famous general, expressed his hope to be “more successful” than Custer had been a year ago, adding “happy would I be if I could sacrifice to God, what Custer threw away for the world!” No line better captures Marty’s sense of “providential men” in his mission to Sitting Bull.

The Encounter

From Standing Rock Marty followed the Missouri River to Fort Peck in northern Montana. There, to his surprise, Marty learned that Sitting Bull had ventured farther north, and on May 18 he departed for Sitting Bull’s camp to the northwest. He took with him two guides to find the location, arriving in the camp on May 26.  
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293 “Abt Marty bei Sitting Bull,” Der Wanderer, September 1, 1877.
294 Marty to Brouillet, 10 April 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:426, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The quotation appears in Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 277, and Karolevitz, Bishop Martin Marty, 55. Neither Kleber nor Karolevitz cite the actual letter’s date and location.
295 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 278. According to the Canadian reports, Marty did not realize that Sitting Bull’s camp near Wood Mountain was in Canada. Manzione finds this hard to believe (“I Am Looking to the North for My Life,” 48n20). However, Manzione erroneously presumes that Marty was acting in an official capacity for the U.S. government, which Marty’s own letters with Brouillet clearly contradict.
296 As Schelbert aptly points out (“Conflicting Identities,” 205), scholars are confused about who exactly accompanied Marty into Canada. Utley identifies William Hasey, an interpreter, and John Howard, a scout (The Lance and the Shield, 188). Manzione names Joseph Culberston and John Brughierre (“I Am Looking to the North for My Life,” 48); The Bureau’s published account in its annals adds “eight Sioux braves.” See “Abbot Marty Visits Sitting Bull,” Annals of the Catholic Indian Missions of America 2, no. 1 (1878): 7. The account of eight Sioux companions is confirmed in Marty’s correspondence with O’Connor. See Marty to O’Connor, 5 June 1878, 2:495, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 278. However, Marty never names his interpreter in his writings.
At this point, Marty’s encounter with the “hostiles” and Sitting Bull becomes enveloped in a labyrinth of eye witness accounts, journalistic lore, official reports, and specious propaganda. All sources confirm that Sitting Bull’s camp received Marty, that the abbot met with the famed Lakota leader on June 2, 1877, and that Marty left the meeting without convincing Sitting Bull to return to the United States. Aside from these points, the story drifts into a fog of contradictory accounts. Some accounts place Marty in the camp for eight days; others fourteen. Some accounts record a cordial welcome; others a cold, wary reception that almost resulted in Marty’s death. The only way to make sense of these accounts is to separate them into three groups: (1) contemporary articles in the American press, (2) Canadian government reports, and (3) Marty’s own letters on the encounter.

Contemporary newspaper reports of the encounter in the United States are both informative and problematic. News of Marty’s journey reached both coasts by telegraph. One of the first reports came from the Bismarck Tribune, noting Marty’s return on June 15, 1877, and providing its readers with a detailed report three days later. This latter report claims to have received its information from the “lips” of
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297 There are also contradictory accounts of the duration of Marty’s stay in Sitting Bull’s camp. The Bureau’s annals state eight days, while a German account specifies fourteen. See Abbot Marty Visits Sitting Bull,” Annals of the Catholic Indian Missions of America, 2:10; “Abt Marty bei Sitting Bull,” Der Wanderer, September 1, 1877.


300 The Bismarck Tri-Weekly Tribune, June 15 and June 18, 1877. For approximately one week between 1877 and 1878, the Bismarck Tribune was known as the Bismarck Tri-weekly Tribune. To limit confusion, I simply refer to the publication as the Bismarck Tribune (its current name). On these articles, see also Utley, The Lance and the Shield, 370n5.
Marty. The article relates how Marty was greeted by Sitting Bull and a band of mounted Lakota warriors and shown hospitality as a “black gown,” including a ceremony with a pipe (further highlighting how Marty made a rare exception to smoke). The author, while unflattering toward Sitting Bull, nevertheless is sober with respect to Marty. Sitting Bull would not meet with him until the arrival of the Canadian Mounted Police, complained to Marty about the abuses of the American government’s Indian policy, and informed Marty of his error in presuming that the terms for returning to the United States were unknown among the exiled Lakota. The article more or less painted Marty’s mission as a quixotic failure.\footnote{301}{“Father Martin’s Visit to Sitting Bull,” \textit{The Bismarck Tribune}, June 18, 1877.}

More favorable accounts of Marty’s encounter appeared in the American Catholic press. An article in the German Catholic periodical \textit{Amerika} (St. Louis), republished in \textit{Der Wanderer} (St. Paul), highlights Marty’s judgment of Sitting Bull as a “demagogue,” crafty politician among his people, and the source of troubles among the Sioux.\footnote{302}{“Abt Marty bei Sitting Bull,” \textit{Der Wanderer}, September 1, 1877.} Details from both the \textit{Bismarck Tribune} and \textit{Der Wanderer} articles reappeared the following year in the most problematic (and yet most cited) contemporary account: the Bureau’s report in the \textit{Annals of the Catholic Indian Missions of America}.\footnote{303}{“Abbot Marty Visits Sitting Bull,” \textit{Annals of the Catholic Indian Missions of America} 2, no. 1 (1878): 7-10. See Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 280n25; Schelbert, “Conflicting Identities,” 185n22.} The Bureau’s report embellishes Sitting Bull’s reception of Marty and furnishes additional details about his personal character alongside the customs of Sioux culture. The report never once provides a direct quotation from Marty’s letters, yet it does quote a portion of the \textit{Bismarck Tribune} article, without citation.\footnote{304}{“Abbot Marty Visits Sitting Bull,” 8.} At the same time, it does not hesitate to create a flattering dialogue between Marty and Sitting Bull, in which the latter expresses
his confidence in Marty as a “friend” because he is a “priest.” Any reader of earlier missionary accounts of De Smet among the Sioux can see how the article attempts to associate Sitting Bull’s alleged hospitality with De Smet’s legacy.

The Canadian Mounted Police reports paint a quite different picture of Marty and his interaction with Sitting Bull. Two reports survive from the two Northwest Mounted Police officers at Fort Walsh: Superintendent James M. Walsh (1840–1905), and his superior, Assistant Commissioner A.G. Irvine. Walsh, the first Canadian official to ride out and meet Sitting Bull after his escape into Canada, left a fragmented memoir on his service career that includes the meeting with Marty. Irvine’s letter on the meeting to his superiors in Ottawa is more reliable. The report confirms many of the details of the Bismarck Tribune report, including that Sitting Bull refused to meet with Marty until Walsh and Irvine arrived. Irvine’s account further discloses Sitting Bull’s initial desire to kill Marty and his two guides and intimates that the Lakota leader’s reluctance to do so stemmed from a desire to show that he respected the laws of his new home. Irvine also provides additional quotations for the June 2 council between Sitting Bull, Marty, and the officers. Sitting Bull reportedly berated the “Americans,” including Marty, for the injustices his people had suffered under the “Great Father,” the U.S. President. After the officers reassured him that he could stay in peace in Canada, Sitting Bull further refused to return to the United States, declaring that his people had found a better home under their new “Great Mother,” Queen Victoria. Furthermore, Irvine’s report records Sitting Bull’s mockery of Marty’s description of himself as a “messenger of God,” a title that challenged Sitting Bull’s authority among those in his band who still retained some ties to

305 Ibid.
306 For a discussion of these sources, see Utley, The Lance and the Shield, 369n1.
Catholic Christianity. Marty had apparently first told the Sioux that they were not wanted in Canada and should return as soon as possible while the conditions were still favorable. Now, after hearing the assurances of the Mounted Police, Marty changed his mind and advised Sitting Bull and his people to remain where the buffalo were plenty and peace seemed promising. This shift infuriated Sitting Bull, and Marty, frustrated with Sitting Bull’s accusations, repeated his conviction that the Sioux should stay and simply left the meeting. Irvine finally takes credit for convincing Sitting Bull to let Marty and his guides leave without harm.\textsuperscript{308}

Marty’s letters help reconcile these two conflicting accounts of his meeting with Sitting Bull. The letters reveal how the encounter seems to have shifted Marty’s opinion about the American government’s Indian policies. Both his optimism and his tone change in these letters, as if influenced by Sitting Bull’s descriptions of the suffering of his people. Marty’s words about the affair are recorded in three sets of letters: (1) two letters to Brouillet, (2) two letters to Hürlimann, and (3) one open letter to German Catholics in America.

The letters to the Bureau are surprisingly the least helpful for attaining Marty’s opinion. On June 9, 1877, Marty wrote Brouillet from Fort Peck in Montana after returning from Sitting Bull’s camp. He speaks only of his greeting by the Lakota and his June 2 conference with Sitting Bull. The latter, he claims, has led him “to the conclusion that Sitting Bull and his followers should henceforth make their home on British territory.”\textsuperscript{309} He claims that the “first object” of his mission has been “secured” and promises more details once he returns to Dakota Territory. By June 29 he wrote again,

\textsuperscript{308} Ibid., 49-50.

\textsuperscript{309} Marty to Brouillet, 9 June 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. There is no transcription of this letter in Archival Historical Series, SMAA.
but never delivered on his promise for more details, citing his own illness and lack of energy. He does, however, confirm that newspaper accounts of his meeting are correct, and asserts that “further action on my part would be useless.”

Marty’s letters to Hürlimann at the same time give a greater sense of his personal thoughts on the “hostile” Sioux. Marty also wrote Hürlimann from Fort Peck on June 9, stating that he had taken it upon himself to “present suitable recommendations to the government of the United States for the preservation of peace and the welfare of this very abused and, until now, pagan Indian tribe.” He tells Hürlimann how he plans to pen a “memorandum” on the Sioux issue in the coming days, “with the hope that then the Order of St. Benedict will lead the most savage and most disreputable nation of the North America into the sheep pen of Jesus Christ.” Marty seems to have composed his “memorandum” not for the Bureau, as one might expect, but rather for the German-Catholic population of the United States through one of its most widely-distributed publications, the St. Louis *Amerika.*
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310 Marty to Brouillet, 29 June 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:433, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.

311 Marty to Hürlimann, 9 June 1877, Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA: “…bin ich in den Stand gesetzt, der Ver. Staaten - Regierung geeignete Vorschläge zu machen zur Erhaltung des Friedens und zur Wohlfahrt dieser viel misshandelten und bisher im Heidenthum verkommen Indianer-Stämme.” See also his June 21 letter to Hürlimann in the same place.


313 It is baffling why Marty did not appeal to English-speaking American Catholics at the same time. I am not aware of any similar memorandum appearing in English at the time (even in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*). There are two possible explanations for this. First, Marty may have written a similar account for Brouillet that does not survive but nevertheless was used for the third-person account in the Bureau’s annals. The other possibility is that Marty planned to send something similar to James McMaster for the *Freeman’s Journal.* Marty maintained a lively correspondence with McMaster on the status of the missions at the time.
Although cited by Kleber and others, Marty’s open letter in *Amerika* remains unexamined. Nevertheless, it is the key to understanding the difference between the Bureau’s *Annals* and the Canadian accounts. Republished in two parts in the St. Paul-based *Der Wanderer*, Marty provides an open letter openly critical of U.S. Government Indian policy. In the first part, Marty argues that government munitions will never work. Rather, he insists that Sitting Bull and his tribe should be given the necessary means, including rifles, to hunt the buffalo herds and fend for themselves, and they should be allowed to cross over the American-Canadian border to follow the herds as long as they respect the laws of each land. In the second part, Marty chastises the American reservation system. He claims that the United States has given land to the Indians that only ensures their starvation while simultaneously breaking the promises of numerous treaties. Rather, the treaties oblige the government to provide for the Indians. He then turns to his readers: “It is however surely not the will of the American people that the Indians confined to the reservations starve and freeze, as is now the case.” For this reason, Marty has come to the conclusion that it is better for Sitting Bull and his followers to be left alone where they can “feed and clothe themselves from the hunt.” Marty goes so far as to insist that other Sioux bands be permitted to join Sitting Bull’s group where the buffalo herds are plentiful, since only when they disappear will these Sioux be willing to take up farming and ranching. However, those Sioux who wish to stay should be given every essential means to farm and ranch along with sufficient
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315 “Dakota-Briefe,” *Der Wanderer*, September 29, 1877; and “Die Indianer in Dakota Territory,” *Der Wanderer*, October 20, 1877.
316 “Dakota-Briefe,” *Der Wanderer*, September 29, 1877. Marty also has high praise for Walsh.
317 “Die Indianer in Dakota Territory,” *Der Wanderer*, October 20, 1877. “Es ist jedoch sicherlich nicht der Wille des amerikanischen Volkes, daß die Indianer auf ihren Reservatien eingesperrt, hungern und frieren, wie es jetzt der Fall ist.”
education. Thus, after witnessing such “bloodcurdling things” among the Indians in their dire state, Marty makes a personal appeal: “I wish to pose the question to each reader of this letter, whether, in the land of progress and freedom, under its constitution, which all nations take as their model, there is really no proper authority which possesses the will and power to remedy such atrocities and to protect the original inhabitants of this land from their intended extinction, which threatens them from all sides?”

This line, concluding the memorandum, is a stark difference from his letters to Washington before leaving for Sitting Bull’s camp, optimistic about the state of the Sioux and the good intentions of the federal government. Rather, Marty’s open letter lambasts the very government he had lauded and supported earlier in the spring. The letter is clear proof that Sitting Bull’s state, if not his very words, convinced Marty to look at the affairs differently.

There is, however, more to the encounter with Sitting Bull than a change in Marty’s mind. The encounter was also the testing of his new missionary model. While his earlier sense of providential men had led him to follow De Smet’s footsteps by undertaking a peace mission, the perilous situation of Sitting Bull’s followers made Marty reconsider the limits of such providential men. As he confesses to Hürlimann in a letter, the secondary objective underlying his “first” objective of peace was the
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318 Ibid. “Darum hielt ich es für besser, daß nicht bloß Sitting Bull mit seinen Leuten auf dem Gebiete bleibe, wo sie nach alter Sitte vom Ergebnisse der Jagd sich nähren und kleiden, sondern daß es auch den übrigen Dakota frei gestellt würde, sich dahin zu begeben. So lange noch Büffelheerden erreichbar sind, sollte man den Indianer nicht davon absperren; wenn dieselben verschwinden, wird er sich um so leichter zu Ackerbau und Viehzucht bequemen. Für diejenigen aber, welche das jetzt schon thun und auf den Reservationen bleiben wollen, muß vor Allem hinreichender Lebensunterhalt gesichert, das zum Ackerbau und Viehzucht erforderliche Material beschafft und dann für gehörigen Unterricht gesorgt werden.”

319 Ibid. "haarsträubenden Dinge…ich möchte aber an jeden Leser dieses Briefes die Frage stellen, ob es denn wirklich im Lande des Fortschrittes und der Freiheit, unter seiner Constitution, die allen Nationen als Muster vorgestellt wird, keine Behörde gibt, welche den Willen und die Macht besitzt, solchen Übelständen zu steuern und die Ureinwohner dieses Landes vor dem ihnen zugedachten und von allen Seiten drohenden Verderben zu schützen?"
conversion of the Sioux. However, he has discovered that many have been baptized by De Smet, but few know the religion that he introduced. In Marty’s encounter with Sitting Bull, he witnesses firsthand how De Smet’s labors among the Sioux have not taken firm root. The Lakota remember the legacy of the “blackrobe” but they no longer trust Christianity because it has come with empty promises. Why learn to “pray” only to “work” a destitute land?

Marty’s answer to this problem confirms that he still sees his own mission through the Benedictine prism of stability. He is not interested in temporary conversions. Instructing the Lakota in Catholic beliefs is not enough for longterm success. Conversion must develop alongside daily sustenance. Thus, in one sense, the encounter confirms Marty’s model of prayer and work. However, in changing his mind about the return of the Sioux, Marty also realizes once again that stability is essential for this model to take hold and flourish. Marty knows well that the soil of the reservations cannot provide the same sustenance that the buffalo herds of Canada promise. Since Marty now understands the American policy for what it is, he realizes that any forced return for the Sioux would only lead to empty conversions at best. Peace, rather, is essential to the stability of a “prayer and work” model. Peace was the objective originally prompting the mission, and now Marty realizes that only stability through peace can secure the permanent conversion of those who desire it. Stability among the Sioux comes when they are not under threat of war and extinction, when those who want to live a nomadic life are allowed to do so, and when those who desire an agricultural life are given the means and skills to realize it.
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320 Marty to Brouillet, 18 July 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:437, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. In the letter, Marty prepares a list of Lakota he claims were baptized by De Smet. He creates the list in anticipation of O’Connor’s visit to confirm the baptized.
Marty’s plan ultimately seeks to provide the stability of prayer and work to those who want it, so that when the “hostiles” can no longer sustain themselves through the herd, they are drawn to this model of prayer and work. Overall, Marty’s personal mission, prompted by a biographical idealism, converges upon an ecclesial vision. His model of prayer and work is not about multiplying baptisms but rather creating stable “nurseries” that produce longterm results. This vision becomes the heart of the second manifestation of his vision: the boarding school.

**The Rise of the Boarding School: 1878–1879**

If Marty’s mission to Sitting Bull exemplified his biographical approach to history, his work with the boarding school marks the manifestation of his familial model of Benedictine evangelization. The boarding school shows how Marty returns to the language of the monastic “family” for his program to regenerate the Benedictine Order through a missionary model of “ora et labora.” His vision for the boarding school just prior to his elevation to the episcopate reflects a continuity of themes from Einsiedeln and St. Meinrad that blend together into a model that unites the monastic and ecclesial “families” though prayer and work.

**The Proposal and its Realization**

As Marty contemplated his mission to Canada in the spring of 1877, he continued with his idea of adopting the model of other religious orders for Standing Rock. At the beginning of 1877, Marty told Brouillet that he was convinced that with “a priest and fours sisters in every sioux village” and “two monasteries as centers” for seminarian
training and the education of more advance students, his plan would succeed. A year later, after his encounter with Sitting Bull and his renewed emphasis on stability, Marty voiced new optimism that a Benedictine mission could in fact take root at Standing Rock, despite its inhospitable climate. On June 21 from Standing Rock, Marty added that learning the Lakota language and creating schools for “the safeguarding of necessary means of sustenance” was the best way to realize the “conversion of these pagans, young and old.”

In September he submitted a “Proposal of Manual Labor Schools.” It outlined a plan of “two manual labor schools among the Dakotas of the Standing Rock Reservation” for male and female, young and old. The proposal sought to expand the current St. Peter mission by founding a new agricultural mission farther removed from the problems of nearby military forts and Bismarck. The schools would require high pastures for cattle, fertile river valley lands for crops, buildings, livestock, and industrial and domestic supplies. In turn, Marty promised to provide the necessary teachers. A month later Brouillet visited Standing Rock to assess Marty’s proposal and wrote a report for the bureau on how the Benedictines “have civilized Europe, and they are the ones to civilize the Sioux, if any can.”

His report described Marty’s efforts as “teaching the Indians religion, daily and hourly,” and instructed them in “the habit and practice of
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321 Marty to Brouillet, 10 March 1877, Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:419, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA: “If I shall ever succeed in placing a priest and four sisters into every sioux village, beginning with the four we have now at this Agency and two monasteries as centers and seminaries of the missionary corps and select schools for the most talented youth of both sexes, but may God’s holy will be done!”


323 Marty’s handwritten proposal, dated 10 September 1877, in Folder 7, Box 4, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:443, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The proposal was presumably sent to the Bureau.
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325 2:447, 453, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.
Moreover, this mission was to be free from government interference, a prospect that promised a stronger religious dimension yet also made its material needs more
difficult.\footnote{2:453, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.} Without government aid, Foffa and Laurel constructed the new mission fifteen miles south of the St. Peter mission. In May Marty brought several Benedictine sisters from Ferdinand, Indiana. At the beginning of 1879, “St. Benedict’s Agricultural Boarding School” at Standing Rock was formally founded, comprising a school for girls, run by sisters, and a school for boys, staffed by the monks.\footnote{2:453, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.}

As Marty attempted to realize his “ora et labora” model at Standing Rock, he simultaneously looked for further developments in the territory. Whereas he had found stark opposition to the idea of “prayer and work” from Sitting Bull, he now found ardent support among other Lakota leaders farther south along the Missouri River. Spotted Tail (1823–1881), the leader of the Brulé (Sichangu) Lakota, and Red Cloud (1822–1909), leader of the Oglala Lakota, had journeyed to Washington in 1877 to petition President Rutherford Hayes (1822–1893) personally for better land and “black gowns” for teachers.\footnote{Duratschek, \textit{Crusading Along Sioux Trails}, 84.} As O’Connor’s vicar general, Marty visited both leaders in the fall after hearing of their much publicized journey. He reported to Brouillet a warm welcome by both leaders, who expressed their “greatest joy” at the prospect of schools.\footnote{The best and most recent account of this school is Abing, “‘To Make Them True and Faithful Christians and Good Citizens,’” 173-75. See also Duratschek, \textit{Crusading Along Sioux Trails}, 60-120.} Marty also thought their lands were more promising for monastic life. Yet even more interesting is how the leaders seemed to confirm his earlier prediction that the Sioux would eventually seek an agricultural model. In his letters, Marty quotes Red Cloud as stating that he had
asked “Grandfather [or “Great Father,” the U.S. President] many a time to send me this kind of man.”

Now, he and his people will “live like white men” since “there is no game anymore in the country” and they must “cultivate the ground.” Marty’s last quotation of Red Cloud is perhaps the most surprising: “We will work and pray and you will show us how to do it.”

The quotation is so close to Marty’s own rhetoric of “prayer and work” and one might suspect that he placed these words in Red Cloud’s mouth. Nevertheless, these quotations in the letter signal Marty’s confidence that these Lakota leaders embraced his vision. In the end, however, these aspirations for Brulé and Oglala met formidable obstacles. Despite the journey to Washington, the government ultimately assigned their reservations to the Episcopalians. Consequently, it became increasingly difficult to realize his plan for schools, as Catholic missionaries had limited access to these reservations.

The problem prompted Marty and O’Connor to lobby Congress for a bill giving full religious liberty to the Indians to choose their missionaries. The bill was never realized, even after Spotted Tail and Red Cloud petitioned the President again in 1879. In the end Marty’s idea for a farm school among the Brulé and Oglala Lakota was not realized until after 1881, when Grant’s policy ended.

Nevertheless, Marty refused to surrender his Benedictine vision for the Lakota. In 1878, during the last throes of Grant’s policy, Marty’s rhetoric of the familial nature of
“ora et labora” emerges. At the beginning of the year, on the Solemnity of the Epiphany, Marty thanked Hürlimann for the prayers of Einsiedeln for the missionary work in Dakota, expressing his joyous conviction that this mission had been assigned not just to St. Meinrad but rather the greater “family of St. Meinrad,” both in the United States and in Europe. To this he joined a line from Isaiah as expressing the reality: “Arise, shine Jerusalem, for your light has come!” A month later he wrote Foffa from St. Meinrad that his own prayers in Indiana were for the “double-family” (doppel-Familie) of St. Meinrad, both in Indiana and Dakota Territory. Writing Foffa again in March, Marty continued to refer to Standing Rock as a “nursery” (Pflanzschule) of Benedictine missionary activity. After returning to Standing Rock in June with two more monks from St. Meinrad, Marty again set out to visit the various Catholic settlements of the territory. By the end of the summer, he lamented that the Standing Rock mission still failed to produce “any Christian Indian families.”

In the fall of 1878, Marty combined these images of family, biblical fulfillment, light, and a nursery in his detailed report to Brouillet. This letter, overlooked by Kleber completely and quoted piecemeal by others, is arguably Marty’s most significant missionary letter before becoming a bishop. In the letter, Marty describes his most

---

337 Marty to Hürlimann, 6 January 1878 (M84), 8:1013-14, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA. “Dass diese herrliche Aufgabe dem Orden des Hl. Benedikt und der Familie des hl. Meinrad zugehöret worden ist…”
339 Marty to Chrysostom Foffa, 12 February 1878 (M85), 8:1014, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
340 Marty to Chrysostom Foffa, 14 March 1878 (M86), 8:1015, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, SMAA.
341 Marty to O’Connor, 16 August 1878, transcription in 2:509, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.
342 Marty to Brouillet, 9 October 1878, Folder 4, Box 5, Series 1, BCIM, MUA. Transcription in 2:520-23, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. Rippinger reproduces a portion of this
recent meetings with Spotted Tail and Red Cloud and the hospitality he received from both. He quotes Spotted Tail as stating that “the blackrobe is the kind of teachers we want and no others.”

In a similar manner, Marty quotes Red Cloud as maintaining that his tribe must “now do as the whites” and expressing his confidence that this would be possible once Marty established a school at their agency. From this Marty comes to the conclusion that he has “found the whole nation anxious to have Catholic missionaries, churches and schools, and if I had the men and the means, it would not be a very long nor difficult work to make them Christians.”

Once again he presents his model of smaller missions in each village where “Indians young and old would assemble in the chapel morning and evening” and then “work willingly under the direction of the man of God.” With this he lauds the holiness of the sisters who have already attempted to create this model amid “hardships and privations,” quoting the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866).

After sketching this need and its remedy, Marty uses the letter to return to his earlier confidence in a decidedly Benedictine model rather than one emulating other religious orders. Marty insists that at the center of this system of smaller missions must be a monastery “on a favorable point in the Dakota country.” Such a monastery would follow “the same plan if not the same dimensions as the abbeys created one thousand years ago in the wildernesses and among the barbarous nations of Europe.” This monastery, moreover, would serve a twofold purpose: “Such a home of God will not only secure the divine blessing, without which he that plans and he that waters, nothing
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343 Marty to Brouillet, 9 October 1878, MUA.
344 Ibid.
345 Ibid.
profits, but it will also be center of life and action.” It will be “a retreat for bodily and spiritual restoration” for the “surrounding population” of Indians, and “will exhibit a bright model of Christian life in its liturgical, moral, and social aspect,” from which the Indians will “learn how to work and pray, how to cultivate their soil and their souls.”

Then, in the most remarkable line of the letter, Marty describes this monastic model not as a group of superior monks representing holiness to an inferior people, but rather as constituting a local ecclesial family: “In no distant future the sons of Saint Benedict shall thus see themselves surrounded by a double family, the monastic and the rustic community, both united by faith, labor and common prayer.” He is convinced that from this model communities “shall arise everywhere” in “the midst of the boundless prairie so long unapproachable.” Once again he turns to the words of Isaiah for imagery: “You shall go out with joy and be led forth…for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.” With such a grand vision, Marty adds one caveat. In the past such a model benefited from royal patronages (like Einsiedeln); in America, such a model is at the mercy of the “sovereign Christian people” for financial and spiritual support. This point is clearly directed at Brouillet and the Bureau, to which Marty adjoins: “One thing seems to be certain - that if the Indians do not become Catholics soon, the fault is not theirs.” With this line, Marty closes one of his last reports to Brouillet as a Benedictine missionary.
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346 Ibid. Marty alludes to 1 Cor 3:7. The transcription in SMAA erroneously replaces “secure” with “serve.”
347 Marty to Brouillet, 9 October 1878, MUA.
348 Ibid. In the original (not reflected in the transcription), Marty quotes all of Isaiah 55:12-13. It is one of the few times he does not use the Latin Vulgate but instead the English King James Version.
349 Marty to Brouillet, 9 October 1878, MUA.
The Convergence of Themes

This significant letter to Brouillet is unquestionably a summation of Marty’s vision for Benedictine evangelization in America. Its language ties together themes and images that stem from his experience in Einsiedeln, mature in Indiana, and resurface anew in the Dakota missions. Its framework repeats a conviction found in his reaction to Sitting Bull: for his “ora et labora” model to work, the Indians must work “willingly” and not be forced. Otherwise, the effort is in vain. Moreover, Marty’s missionary paradigm of “prayer and work” is not simply one imposed on the Indian population, but rather one that begins with the monastic community itself. The model in fact forms “one community,” composed both of “monastic and rustic” elements. In other words, the monks pray and work alongside the indigenous population. Yet the monks also ensure a true “home of God,” a line that directly corresponds to the image of a “Gotteshaus” in Marty’s November 1876 letter to Conrad on the necessity of “prayer and work” for the “children of Adam.” Marty’s centralization of this model in a monastery is moreover in clear continuity with the excurrendo model that he advocated in his leadership of St. Meinrad. He envisions every village with a church and school that is supported by monks from the central monastery, rather than a network of priories like Wimmer’s congregation. In this sense, Marty never abandons his Swiss-Benedictine idea of “stabilitas loci,” and even on the prairie the monks’ mission is at the local level by serving individual villages.

Nevertheless, within this convergence of past ideas, the most noteworthy element of Marty’s monastic model is the language of the “double family.” This language goes back to Marty’s understanding of the Benedictine sense of community from his days in

350 See chapter 3, 326n273 above.
Einsiedeln, an understanding of a lasting, eternal family that he exhibited in his essays and sermons in the *Stiftschule*, instituted with his contributions to the St. Meinrad mission, and now applies to his missions in Dakota Territory. Marty’s “familial imagination,” so central to his leadership of St. Meinrad in its infancy, is now applied beyond the cloister. Marty extends this familial model to the laity, a trajectory already present in the breviary and *conversi* reforms. Moreover, this transformation of his earlier abbatial reforms continues to find its foundation in his idea of Benedictine stability. In his “prayer and work” paradigm, Marty never abandons his pursuit of “stability in the community,” inspired by his Swiss-Benedictine roots. Thus, it is little surprise that toward the close of 1878 Marty wrote the abbot of Einsiedeln to compare his mission, “positioned at the entrance of the American alps,” to the story of the “throne of grace,” the *Gnadenkapelle* of St. Meinrad, that converted Alpine Switzerland a millennium ago.351

**EPILOGUE: THE MONK BECOMES BISHOP**

As 1879 dawned, Marty entered a year that would transform his life and his mission. He began the year with a renewed mission to Sitting Bull. Like his original 1877 expedition, this second mission was prompted more by a search for stability in Dakota
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351 Marty to Oberholzer, 27 November 1878 (M89), 8:1018-19, Box 2, St. Meinrad Abbey Letters in Einsiedeln Archives, SMAA. “…Ist uns den Andern die Aufgabe gestellt am Eingange der amerikanischen Alpenwelt hölzerne Kapellen und Schulhäuser aufzurichten, wie sie ehemals zu Bollingen und im finstern Wald gestanden. Mariens Macht und Barmherzigkeit ist immer die gleiche und der Gebetshülfe unserer lieben Confratres an ihrem uralten Gnadenthron wollen wir die Bekehrung dieses heidnischen Volkes verdanken, das seit Jahrzehnten um katholische Priester und Lehrer gebeten hatte, ohne sie zu erhalten.”
Territory than a personal mission to convert the famous Lakota leader. Although war was no longer on the horizon, Marty complained of continued unrest among the Lakota of Standing Rock so long as the “hostile” Sioux remained exiled in Canada. With reports of dwindling buffalo herds, he feared that Sitting Bull’s stubbornness would lead to the starvation and death of his people during the next winter. He continued to see his mission as one “to exhaust all efforts and myself for the Dakota people.” In July he journeyed to Ottawa and Washington to convince both governments to remedy the plight of Sitting Bull’s people, stating to O’Connor that he “must first save their lives if I shall save their souls.” After speaking with President Hayes, Marty was convinced that he could assure Sitting Bull’s people a safe, peaceful return to the United States. Marty returned to St. Meinrad only to discover that Rome had appointed him vicar apostolic (or bishop) of the newly created Vicariate of Dakota Territory. Yet even before the papal bulls arrived,
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352 Marty to O’Connor, 2 May 1878, transcription in 2:546, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 313.
353 Marty to O’Connor, 2 May 1878, SMAA: “…my determination will always be ut impendar et superimpendar pro gente dakota.”
354 Marty to O’Connor, 8 June 1878, transcription in 2:548, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 7, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. See also Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 312-13.
355 Kleber, History of St. Meinrad, 314-15. There is considerable confusion in biographies of Marty on when exactly he was appointed. Kleber follows the original three documents: (1) a bull naming Marty as “Titular Bishop of Tiberias,” dated August 8, 1879 (as it was customary to link new vicariate appointments with an ancient apostolic see); (2) a bull creating the “Apostolic Vicariate of Dakota,” dated August 12, 1879; and (3) another bull, also dated August 12, 1879, that officially names Marty as the “Vicar Apostolic” of the newly erected vicariate (see Kleber, 320). Copies of these documents are in Box 1, Martin Marty: Abbot and Bishop, Official and Personal Papers, Abbatial File Series, SMAA (the originals are in Sioux Falls, South Dakota). Kleber claims that St. Meinrad learned about the bulls in late July via newspapers (before they were published, it appears) and thus welcomed Marty as a new bishop at St. Meinrad in the first days of August, between his meeting with President Hayes in Washington and his departure for Bismarck (314-15). The official bulls arrived first in Milwaukee (the metropolitan see overseeing the new vicariate) before being sent to St. Meinrad in October (320). Duratschek follows Kleber’s scholarship (Builders of the Kingdom, 54). The problem with Kleber’s dates is that they do not adequately explain why the St. Meinrad community had no scruples in celebrating Marty’s episcopal appointment (end of July) before the documents’ official proclamation (early August). There is another strain of scholarship, ostensibly originating in Einsiedeln, that cites July 14 as the date Marty was “named” vicar apostolic and September 22 as the date he was “proclaimed.” See Kuhn, “Bischof Martinus Marty,” Alte und Neue Welt 31 (1897): 287. Following Kuhn are Gruwe (“Martin Marty, O.S.B.”, Paradiesesfrüchte 21, no. 8 [August 1915]: 218), Beschart (Apostel, 81), and Rippinger (“Martin Marty: Founder,” [2004], 75). Fitzgerald presents a curious combination of both strains: she states September 22
Marty departed unabated for Sitting Bull’s camp in August. With Mounted Police escort, Marty found the camp again, only to discover the sudden absence of buffalo.

Unlike the 1877 expedition, the records of Marty’s second encounter with Sitting Bull are more obscure and almost completely ignored by scholars.\(^\text{356}\) Besides a handful of letters to O’Connor and the Bureau, updating both on the progress of his journey, two newspaper accounts survive that provide some details. The first appears in the *Jasper Weekly Courier* in August 1879, shortly after the news of Marty’s episcopal appointment.\(^\text{357}\) This local Indiana newspaper claims to have interviewed Marty just before his departure for Sitting Bull’s camp. Marty’s characterization of Sitting Bull in this published interview repeats earlier descriptions from 1877. After describing himself as a “friend” of the Indians, Marty speaks of Sitting Bull as a “demagogue of the most ultra description” who drums up “hatred for the whites, especially Americans.” He then describes his new mission to “break Sitting Bull’s influence by drawing away from him as many of his followers as I can.”\(^\text{358}\) He avers that many of Sitting Bull’s followers wished to return to America in 1877 but feared retribution from their leader; now, Marty believes, Sitting Bull is weak enough that his followers will return, even though he is himself “irreconcilable.”\(^\text{359}\) At the same time, Marty chastises the aggression of the U.S. Army as only adding fuel to Sitting Bull’s tirades against Americans. Rather, Marty

\(^{356}\) One exception is Schelbert, “Conflicting Identities,” 206-7. Schebert claims that Marty arrived on August 22, 1879. Marty’s letters and newspaper accounts do not corroborate this. In fact, he was still in Bismarck on this date. It is furthermore interesting that none of Sitting Bull’s biographers mention this second meeting.

\(^{357}\) “Father Martin and the Indians,” *Jasper Weekly Courier* August 15, 1879. Transcription in 3:552-59, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 8, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. The author claims the interview took place on August 7.


\(^{359}\) Ibid.
expresses his belief that the United States should treat the Indians as “individuals” like the Canadians, by which he means that they “do not war on the whole for the misdemeanors of one or a number of its members.”

Asked if he has any fears for his life in returning to Sitting Bull’s camp, Marty responds that the Indians would “rather give their lives than that any harm should come to me. I am as a father among his children when with them.”

The other source for Marty’s second encounter is a third-person report in the *Bismarck Tribune* that appears after Marty’s return. The anonymous author refers to Marty as the “Bishop,” states that he “knows Sitting Bull well,” and describes the Lakota leader as “a passionate, obstinate and unreasonable Chief.” Unlike the *Bismarck Tribune’s* 1877 article, this report paints Marty in a superior light. The author claims that Marty met with Spotted Eagle, who had assumed leadership of the exiled Lakota. At Marty’s request he assembled the other Lakota elders for a council, yet “Sitting Bull was not invited by the Bishop personally…as he knew the Chief’s stubbornness and he did not wish to show him any attention whatever.” At the same time, Sitting Bull himself had no desire to attend, “not that he had any contempt for the Bishop, but he knew beforehand just what the Bishop wanted.” The other Lakota leaders welcomed Marty, listened to the bishop’s invitation to return to the American agencies before the buffalo herds disappeared. Nevertheless, the report goes to tell how the leaders did not see any reason to leave since the buffalo still sufficed for their needs, even though they addressed Marty
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360 Ibid. Marty makes a similar argument about treating the Indians as “individuals” in “The Indian Problem and the Catholic Church,” *The Catholic World* 48, no. 287 (February 1889): 583-84.
362 “Counsel with the Sioux,” *The Bismarck Tribune*, November 7, 1879. The article is on the front page of the newspaper. A transcription is in 3:564, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 8, Archival Historical Series, SMAA.
as “a good white man” who “speak[s] the truth.” Marty respected this decision and returned to the United States.\footnote{363}{“Counsel with the Sioux,” \textit{The Bismarck Tribune}, November 7, 1879.}

Marty made his way back to Bismarck by November and reached St. Meinrad just before Christmas. On December 18 he formally resigned as abbot and on February 1, 1880, he received episcopal consecration in the presence of Wimmer and other American Benedictine abbots.\footnote{364}{Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 321.} The new bishop departed for Dakota Territory only a week later and established Yankton, in the far southeastern corner of the territory, as he episcopal residence.

A little over a year into his episcopacy, Marty’s prediction came true. The exiled Lakota gradually returned to the United States, and on July 19, 1881, Sitting Bull himself returned and surrendered at Fort Buford in Dakota Territory.\footnote{365}{Ibid., 316. On the events leading up to the surrender, see Robert M. Utley, \textit{Sitting Bull: The Life and Times of an American Patriot} (New York: Holt, 2008), 211-46.} At the news Marty commented, “My own attempts seemed unavailing, but now my expectations are surpassed by the results.”\footnote{366}{Marty to O’Connor, 15 August 1881, transcription in 3:637, Bishop Martin Marty, Box 8, Archival Historical Series, SMAA. Quoted in Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 316.} Marty visited Sitting Bull during his imprisonment and attempted to secure his release from Fort Randall so that he could join his people at Standing Rock.\footnote{367}{Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 318-320.} He pleaded for “mercy and justice” with the War Department and implored Brouillet to find “something I can do for Sitting Bull,” since the Lakota demanded “actions, not words.”\footnote{368}{Marty to Brouillet, quoted in Kleber, \textit{History of St. Meinrad}, 319.} Marty succeed in 1883. By the mid 1880s there were hints that the once cold relationship between Sitting Bull and Marty was turning into a warm, if nonetheless cautious, friendship. According to Duratschek, Sitting Bull visited the St. Benedict Agricultural School upon returning to Standing Rock and implored its
students to “learn all you can” while he thanked his “Black Robe friends for their goodness and kindness.” There is also significant evidence that Marty, during an *ad limina* visit in 1885, presented a buffalo hide to Pope Leo XIII on Sitting Bull’s behalf. Marty also continued in vain to convince Sitting Bull to become Catholic amid erroneous reports that he had succeeded. The sudden murder of Sitting Bull in December of 1890, along with Wounded Knee Massacre during the same month, prompted Marty to establish a lay Catholic Sioux Congress every summer to boost Lakota morale. Marty supported these congresses until his death, and they later inspired the present-day Tekakwitha Conference. Even this lasting vestige of Marty’s legacy bears the mark of Catholic sodalities from his Swiss years.

**CONCLUSION**

The present chapter offers a new insight into how Marty’s monastic background gave rise to his missionary efforts. It moves prior scholarship beyond its assumptions to
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371 An example of a commonly cited report for Sitting Bull’s conversion is “Sitting Bull Becomes a Catholic,” *New York Times*, April 13, 1883. Rumors spread both that Sitting Bull converted and that he refused to convert because he did not wish to be monogamous. In 1886, Marty dispelled these rumors, claiming that they were unfounded, that he had personally instructed Sitting Bull in the Catholic faith, and anticipated his conversion during the summer. See “Sitting Bull’s Preceptor,” *Milwaukee Daily Journal* February 11, 1886. There is no clear evidence that Sitting Bull ever converted to Christianity, let alone Catholicism.

show definitively how Marty’s abbatial reforms inspired his missionary model.

Stemming from his earlier vision of *stabilitas in congregazione* for the troubled St. Meinrad community, Marty’s new vision of evangelization begins with internal efforts to reform the prayer and work structure of the monastic community. Both the breviary and *conversi* reforms sought to educate and unite the monastery with the local church, thus reflecting Marty’s persistent recourse to the Swiss-Benedictine model of *stabilitas loci*. In Dakota Territory, Marty takes these earlier reforms and applies them to a new model of *ora et labora*. Prior scholarship has failed to recognize both the originality of Marty’s rhetoric and how this idea of “prayer and work” correlates with his earlier abbatial reforms and their controversies.

Moreover, this chapter has demonstrated how Marty’s larger agenda to “regenerate” his own order centered on three goals: a return to the original vision of St. Benedict, and vision of providential men shaping the course of history, and the zealous pursuit of missionary work. Likewise, Marty’s vision of history not only inspired his mission to Sitting Bull but also forced him to return to his earlier vision of stability. In the end, the chapter outlines how Marty’s missionary model of “ora et labora” flows from his monastic vision of *stabilitas in congregazione*. In applying the familial character of the Benedictines to an ecclesial mission, Marty creates a vision of evangelization centered on the monastery’s ability to educate and unify the faithful through prayer and work.

Was Marty’s vision one of “overbearing paternalism” as Abing and Schelbert claim? Marty certainly shared the prejudices of his day. He viewed indigenous Sioux culture as inferior to his own. He saw himself as a “father” to the Indians, evangelizing them through prayer and work. However, Marty’s “paternalism” stemmed more from his
Benedictine roots than from a campaign to lead the Sioux toward the progress of modern civilization. Marty’s historical worldview was restorationist, steeped in a sense that his mission was to return to the past for the sake of the present. His mission was to pass the torch of Christianity just as his Benedictine forebears had done so for the indigenous tribes of Northern Europe. This vision had its own biases and penchant for Romantic exaggeration; nevertheless, it was different from the racist worldview of many of his American contemporaries. Marty’s “paternalism” ultimately stemmed from his role as a Benedictine abbot (from abba, “father”). This sense of fatherhood was more than just a benevolent bequeathal of superior knowledge and technology to an inferior people. It was a sense of complete and unreserved sacrifice of his own life for a community. This Benedictine vision separated him from De Smet and other missionaries. His vision of evangelization was always of a father educating and uniting a community through example and self-sacrifice. He witnessed this idea in Einsiedeln; he learned and lived this idea in St. Meinrad; and he applied this idea to his missions among the Sioux.
CONCLUSION

The present dissertation began with a historical encounter and posed a theological question: how did Marty the Benedictine monk become Marty the itinerant missionary? Focusing on the three stages of Marty’s monastic vocation, this study presents an answer: Marty combines old and new elements of his Swiss-Benedictine experience to form a vision of stability in the community that he later develops into a missionary model of prayer and work. In other words, Marty takes the Rule’s principle of “stabilitas in congregatione” (RB 4.78) and transforms it into a Benedictine missionary model that he articulates as “ora et labora,” employing, ostensibly for the first time in American Benedictine parlance, a motto that continues to inform monastic evangelization in America. From beginning to end Marty employs a restorationist history, centered on the biographies of “providential men,” to advance his vision, eventually propelling him to embody his own monastic vision as an itinerant missionary.

Moreover, in tracing the development of Marty’s life and thought, this study has demonstrated that at the center of each stage is a vision of the Benedictine monastery as an agent of lasting conversion through the education and unification of the local ecclesial community. For the first time in scholarship, the first chapter has recovered two essays that Marty penned in Einsiedeln during the first stage of his intellectual and spiritual development (1834–1860). The essays focus on monastic education and ecclesial unity by combining old elements of Einsiedeln’s Swiss-Benedictine tradition with the new ideas and exigencies of Marty’s mid-nineteenth-century Swiss-Catholic milieu. Likewise, by rediscovering and reconstructing Marty’s debate with Wimmer over the nature of stability in the Rule, the second chapter has shown how Marty grounded his initial vision
for Benedictine evangelization in a Swiss-Benedictine, *excurrendo* model of *stabilitas loci*. As administrator and prior of St. Meinrad (1860–1870), Marty further transformed St. Meinrad’s monastery-school-missionary work model through monastic, scholarly, and pastoral contributions that adapted earlier ideas for the local ecclesial community in Indiana. Finally, the third chapter has reanalyzed two monastic controversies that consumed Marty’s abbatial years in St. Meinrad (1870–1880). Transcending previous studies, this chapter has further shown how these two controversies over monastic prayer and manual labor at St. Meinrad inspired and informed Marty’s original model of “prayer and work” for his Benedictine missions in Dakota Territory. Even as an itinerant missionary, Marty never abandoned the “familial imagination” of his Benedictine roots, an idea that manifested itself in his missionary pursuit of a “double family” through prayer and work. Underlying all three chapters is Marty’s consistent vision of evangelization through monastic education and ecclesial unification.

Nevertheless, the full breadth of Marty’s legacy as a bishop in the Dakotas ultimately lies beyond the purview of this dissertation, which focuses only on Marty’s transition from a Benedictine monk to a missionary bishop. The story of his years as vicar apostolic (1879–1889), later as the first bishop of Sioux Falls, South Dakota (1889–1895), and finally as bishop of St. Cloud, Minnesota (1895–1896), have been told elsewhere and would require another dissertation. Consequently, this dissertation does not analyze the complicated history of each Benedictine mission in Dakota Territory. A reassessment of each mission would require wrestling with a constellation of institutions, personages, circumstances, and biases. The relationship between each mission and its indigenous population varied tribe to tribe, missionary to missionary. Some enjoyed
surprising, albeit complicated successes. For instance, Marty later invited the Jesuits and the Sisters of St. Francis to assume the St. Francis and Holy Rosary Missions among the Brulé and Oglala. Today the Holy Rosary Mission continues as Red Cloud Indian School.\(^1\) Other missions, however, were dismal failures, corrupted by disreputable priests, uncharitable sisters, and unfortunate political events.\(^2\)

Furthermore, this study remains silent about Marty’s personal legacy in North and South Dakota. Among his own Swiss-Benedictine confreres, his legacy inspired one monk from Einsiedeln, Vincent Wehrle (1855–1941), to continue to pursue a vision of a monastery on the prairie through the founding of St. Gall Priory near Devil’s Lake and St. Mary’s (later Assumption) Abbey in western North Dakota.\(^3\) In South Dakota Marty’s legacy also inspired the creation of a mission named after him (Marty, South Dakota) and the Swiss-American Blue Cloud Abbey, both specifically devoted to the plight of Native Americans.\(^4\) The Swiss-Benedictine sisters whom he invited to Dakota Territory later named their college in Yankton, South Dakota, after him (Mount Marty College).\(^5\)

Arguably his greatest legacy lies in a quotation from St. Katharine Drexel (1858–1955), a Philadelphia heiress who funded many of Marty’s missions, founded her own religious

\(^1\) The most recent work on these missions is Kreis, *Lakotas, Black Robes, and Holy Women*, 19–68. Kreis’s original work uses the Jesuit archives in Munich, hitherto ignored by scholars.

\(^2\) One of the most controversial (and arguably bizarre) legacies is that of Francis Craft (1852–1920), a convert and missionary at the Rosebud (Spotted Tail) and Standing Rock agencies who attempted to create an order of women religious from Native American women. The project blended optimism and personal hubris with ecclesiastical rebellion. See the work of Thomas W. Foley on this topic: *Father Francis Craft, Missionary to the Sioux* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 2002); and *Faces of Faith: A History of the First Order of Indian Sisters* (Baltimore: Cathedral Foundation Press, 2008).


\(^4\) See Robert Karolevitz, *With Faith, Hope and Tenacity: The First One Hundred Years of the Catholic Diocese of Sioux Falls, 1889–1989* (Mission Hill, SD: Catholic Diocese of Sioux Falls, 1989), 179-81, 190-98. St. Paul’s Mission (Marty, South Dakota) was transferred to the local tribe in 1975; Blue Cloud Abbey was dissolved in 2012.

order devoted to the marginalized (Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament), and became a
canonized saint in the Catholic Church: “I believe, that to Bishop Marty’s visits I may
partially ascribe the missionary vocation which God in His mercy has vouchsafed to me,
and I also believe that had I not met Bishop Marty my whole future career might have
been entirely different.”6 All of these legacies remain unexamined. Nevertheless, this
dissertation, through the insights of its three chapters, invites a reassessment of Marty’s
episcopal years in light of his monastic, Benedictine vision of *stabilitas in congregatione*
and *ora et labora* for evangelization in America. One cannot fully grasp Marty the
missionary and bishop without first understanding his intellectual, spiritual, and cultural
roots as Marty the son of St. Benedict.

---

6 Katharine Drexel to Peter Behrman, 22 July 1922, Katharine Drexel Folder, Box 8, Kleber:
Biography of Martin Marty Series, SMAA.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY MATERIAL

I. Unpublished Sources in Archival Collections

Briefwechsel zwischen St. Meinrad und Einsiedeln und über St. Meinrad (Amt A, RG I-II). Klosterarchiv Einsiedeln, Kloster Einsiedeln, Canton Schwyz, Switzerland.

Bureau of Catholic Indian Mission Records and Conception Abbey Indian Mission
Records. Special Collections and University Archives, Raynor Memorial Library,
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Frowin Conrad Correspondences. Conception Abbey Archives, Conception Abbey,
Conception, Missouri.

Predigten Martin Marty's. Stiftsbibliothek Einsiedeln, Kloster Einsiedeln, Canton Schwyz,
Switzerland.

St. Meinrad Letters in Einsiedeln Archives Series, Pioneer Letters Series, and Albert
Kleber Files. St. Meinrad Archabbey Archives, St. Meinrad Archabbey, St. Meinrad,
Indiana.

Society for the Propagation of the Faith Records, Congregatio de Propaganda Fide
Records (ca. 1600-1880, 1893-1908), Ludwigs-Verein Records and Leopoldinen-
Stiftung im Kaisertume Osterreich Records. Archives of the University of Notre
Dame, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

II. Published or Semi-Published Sources by Martin Marty

Marty, Martin. Afterword to Die ersten Beschlüsse der Vatikanischen
Kirchenversammlung lateinisch und deutsch. Translated and edited by Marty Marty.
Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1870.

_____________. Cantarium Romanum: Pars Prima, Ordinarium Missae, Studio et
Sumptibus Monachorum Ord. S. Benedicti Conv. St. Meinradi, Ind. Cincinnati and
New York: Benziger, 1869.

_____________. “Das apostolische Vikariat Dakota.” Münchner Fremdenblatt 10
(1885): 5, 23, 27, 62.

_____________. Dr. Johann Martin Henni, erster Bischof und Erzbischof von
and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers, 1888.

Der heilige Benedikt und seine Orden. Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers, 1874.

“The Indian Problem and the Catholic Church.” Catholic World 48, no. 287 (Feb. 1889): 577-84.


“Das Vereinswesen und die studierende Jugend.” Programm zum Jahresbericht über die Erziehungsanstalt...Maria Einsiedeln im Studienjahre 1857/58. Einsiedeln, 1858.


III. Translations and Critical Editions of The Rule of St. Benedict


**SECONDARY MATERIAL ON MARTY**


**TOPICAL/BACKGROUND SECONDARY**

I. Benedictine Monasticism in Europe and America


Zum Gnadenquell: In der Meinradszell: Eine Anleitung für die Wallfahrt nach Maria-Einsiedeln. Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1912.


*Verzeichnis der Mitglieder der Marianischen Sodalität in Einsiedeln (1853-1932).* Einsiedeln, 1932.


II. European Social and Intellectual Context


_____________. *Enlightenment and the Creation of German Catholicism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010.


III. U.S. Catholic Context: National and Local


**IV. Missionary and Native American Context**


Interesting quotations of Marty from 1878 letters in Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions


"Who is to Blame for the Little Big Horn Disaster?" The American Catholic Quarterly Review 1, no. 4 (Oct. 1876): 712-42.