

Letters and Passages Omitted in Volume One

S. 24a.

February 3, 1802, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

We, the Vicar General and Administrator of the Diocese of Bazas, approve the present decision reached by Fathers Fabas and Pouget in accordance with the powers received from us by virtue of a special commission, and we will that it be executed according to its form and tenor.???meaning

Here is the “decision” mentioned by Father Chaminade.

1. We, the undersigned, archpriests and assistant administrators of the Diocese of Bazas, in virtue of a special commission given to us by Father Chaminade, Vicar General and Administrator of the said diocese, to take cognizance of and to settle immediately a business matter of the parish council, and the matter of the church of Saint Jean in Bazas, went to that town and in the sacristy of the church of Saint Jean in Bazas convoked the lay commissioners whom we had appointed last year to oversee the repairs which were to allow the church to be used for the Catholic liturgy. These commissioners showed us their receipts and expenses, and in our opinion they have accomplished the task entrusted to them by restoring the church to a state of regularity and decency commensurate with the means which the charity of the faithful had given them for the purpose; for this they deserve our praise and thanks.

2. The commissioners, without authorization it is true yet with very commendable zeal, did gather the contributions which the faithful destined for the support of the priests in charge of the church of Saint Jean, under the direction of Father Pouget, the pro-rector, and of his secretary.

From the account of their receipts and the list of subscriptions, we find that they have on hand a sum of 823 francs, three bushels and six pecks of grain, and 14 bushels and 18 pecks of rye. In order to distribute these they would need to consult Father Chaminade, the vicar general and administrator who, in fact, by answering their appeal of August 15 on September 2 pointed out the method to be followed in making the distribution. We have not been able to determine why the commissioners did not adhere to the method prescribed in that letter. According to the papers these gentlemen??? have produced, it would seem they made a second distribution; this illegality and inequity cannot be concealed because in addition to the lack of authority on the part of those who took this upon themselves, no consideration was given to the status of the ministering priests or to the length of their tenure. Consequently, in the hope of correcting this injustice as far as possible and because Father Pouget, the only person who could complain of the first distribution, agreed to accept the *fait accompli*, etc., we stipulate that Father Pouget, the president of the group of commissioners, will ask Father Chaminade to determine how to distribute the 48 francs and the 18 bushels of grain still in the possession of the commissioners, and of which we constitute them the custodians until the matter is settled.

3. Father Pouget, the pro-rector of Saint Jean, and the commissioners have set up an interim collection box into which the faithful may deposit their Mass offerings for the souls in purgatory. Until August 21 these offerings were turned over to the pro-rector, who is officially charged with having the Masses said. From the book of receipts and expenses which the commissioners have shown, it would seem that on that day, August 21, according to the testimony of Father Daurensan, a priest attached to the church, these commissioners opened the collection box and proceeded to distribute the offerings to the priests of the city and of the surrounding area, except for a sum of 90 livres of which M. Herman Gast, one of the commissioners, is still the custodian. Consequently, and considering that the commissioners are in no way authorized to make this distribution themselves and that all the rules governing this matter and the particular custom of the diocese indicate the beneficiaries of these funds, we

hereby order that a special collection box for the souls in purgatory will be installed in one of the chapels of the church of Saint Jean; that collections taken up in the church will be deposited there in the presence of the faithful; and that the key will be confided to the pro-rector, who will personally allocate the Masses to the priests in charge. As to the 86 francs now in the possession of M. Herman Gast, we agreed with Father Pouget that M. Herman Gast will turn them over to the priests at the request of Father Pouget, the Pro-rector.

We further direct that the present ordinance, which sets up guidelines for the future, will be sent to Father Chaminade for confirmation and then placed in the hands of the pro-rector in his capacity as president of all the meetings of the commissioners.

4. Because the year has run its course and because according to the regulations of the parish corporation the commissioners are to be reappointed, and because time did not permit us to proceed immediately to this nomination, we have decided to accept the resignations of M. Rez, M. Funat, M. Anglade, M. Calvial, M. Doumazilles, and we ask the remaining commissioners to continue in their functions relative to the restoration and decoration of the church of Saint Jean until the Ecclesiastical Superior has proceeded to a new appointment.

Done and decided in the sacristy of the church of Saint Jean in Bazas, in the presence of Father Pouget and the commissioners, this 18th day of January, the year one thousand eight hundred and two.

Fabas, Archpriest and Assistant Administrator of Bazas
Pouget, Archpriest of Saint Raphael, Assistant Administrator

*

Here is the text of the legacy "in the form indicated on the reverse of the letter," as mentioned in note 3 (letter no. 92a to M. Lapeyre, Auch).

Between the undersigned Mlle Jeanne Françoise Socadaux, owner, inhabitant of the city and commune of Auch, and M. Joseph Guillaume Chaminade, priest, canon of the metropolitan church of Saint André in Bordeaux, it has been agreed as follows.

The aforementioned Mlle Socadaux sells, cedes, and transfers by these presents to the said M. Chaminade, who accepts at his own risk, peril, and fortune and without further guarantee on the part of Mlle Socadaux than those contained herein,

Three buildings and a yard, all contiguous, formerly a dependency of the church of Saint Orent of the town of Auch, one of the buildings bearing the name of Chapel of Saint Marguerite and the third the title of Our Lady of Good Hope; the yard to the north of said chapel of Our Lady of the Conception where formerly stood the chapel of Saint Vidal. The items mentioned are bounded on the east by the garden of the priory of Sarrony, on the north starting from a building called the Saint Orent barn, to the public road, the chapel formerly dedicated to Saint Joseph, on the west by the cloister of Saint Orent, and on the south by the buildings of the ancient priory. The present sale also includes the following:

1. A 15-foot right of way on the grounds of the ancient church of Orent, starting from the portal which is north facing the vacant lot between the house of Dupeyron, wine merchant, and M. Gelart, innkeeper, this right to expire of the church ceases to be a place of worship.

2. The right to possess in common with the heirs and representatives of the late Jacques Lodoyer, architect, former owner of the items to be sold, the grounds of the ancient cloister and cemetery of Saint Orent, without the power to erect or to allow to be erected any structure, except the right of ancient lights and openings as reserved in the original title.

3. All other rights and privileges, both active and passive, described in the said original title without any guarantee, however, on the part of the seller.

The items described above, belonging to and sold by the aforementioned Mlle Socadaux, who had bought them from M. Gaspard François de Batz, proprietor, inhabitant of the town of Auch, by private contract, in duplicate, in said place on October 31, 1810, and signed by de Batz and Jeanne Françoise Sodacaux, the elder; said deed was registered in Auch on January 14, 1811 by J.B.M. Vidault, who received 88 francs.

The items that were sold had belonged to M. de Batz, who had purchased them from the late M. Jacques Lodoyer, architect, inhabitant of the town of Auch, by another private contract in duplicate, in the said town, on the 35th of thermidor in the year 8, signed de Batz, son, and Lodoyer, registered at Auch on April 19, 1810, by J.B.M. Vidault, who received 76 francs.

The said late Jacques Lodoyer had obtained all the above items along with others at a national auction sale.

The aforementioned Mlle Sacadaux delegates the said M. Chaminade to manage and pay this annuity, beginning on January 24, 1818, to the heirs and representatives of the late Jacques Ledoyer in a single payment, yearly, on June 24, the capital being claimable if the annuity is not paid for three consecutive years. This will be executed by theaforenamed M. Chaminade, who agrees to it, in such a fashion that Mlle Socadaux and M. de Batz, its author, can in no way be inconvenienced in the future either by the 100 franc annuity or by the principal, should it become claimable.

Should the aforementioned chapels no longer be used for worship, M. Chaminade will have the right if he sees fit, at his own wish and without guarantee, to return to the said M. Lodoyer all the items ceded and sold, just as the said M. Lodoyer had consented to the sale on 25 thermidor of the year 8 to M. de Batz without recourse or redress against the latter or the present seller.

As title to the property, the aforementioned Mlle Socadaux has given to M. Chaminade, who acknowledges its reception, both the bill of sale with the personal signature of Lodoyer made in favor of de Batz on 25 thermidor of the year 8 and that of October 30, 1810, de Batz to Socadaux, along with other related documents. The sale will go on public record as soon as one of the parties requests this; however, the costs will be charged to M. Chaminade.

For the execution of these presents, both parties have complied with all the rules and regulations.

In duplicate, at Auch, the - - - of July, 1817.

* * *

S. 94b. To M. Vechambre, Périgueus
December 18, 1817, Bordeaux
(Rough Draft, Agmar)

You should have received by post a notice to the effect that we were sending you a bill for the sum of 5,376 francs, 66 centimes which, with the courier's signature, would act as a receipt for the monies which you will be refunded.

M. David Monier, our friend and a lawyer before the royal court whom you met here, is the bearer of our invoice; kindly make your payment to him. Because his passage through your city gives me an opportunity to receive some news about my brother and his family, please give our friend any information he may want about your town; I will then be doubly indebted to you.

Also please give the bearer the remaining items in our file and your receipt for the expenses listed in your letter. I hope to have other occasions to show you our trust and esteem and also to be of service. Accept with this assurance the expression of the sentiments with which I claim the honor to be your very humble and obedient servant. . .

* * *

S. 102a. To Bro. David Monier

August 28, 1818, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Friend,

Can you and I meet after three o'clock to go to Canton de Rode? We will get back to our respective offices as soon as possible. I have some important information for you respecting the elder M. Saverden.

* * *

S. 103a. To M. Changeur

September 15, 1818, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

The gentlemen from Agen have just left. Our two consecutive retreats have given me more satisfaction than work. It was only this morning that I had time to peruse the architect's estimates. Whatever is decided, to sell or to keep this property, I believe it is urgent for all necessary repairs to be made. If you agree, Brother Brougnon will tell you what is to be done.

* * *

S. 106a. To M. Changeur

October 6, 1818, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

If M. Mathieu was aware of the state of the affairs of the heirs Lafaye, he should have told you so; we would not have lost precious time.

* * *

S. 108. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

November 4, 1818, Bordeaux

. . . and before her admission, etc.

Sister Saint-Joseph has just lost her father. She will come into considerable fortune. Before his death, her father had arranged to bequeath his fortune to his three children, all sharing equally. Actually she may receive from 15,000 to 20,000 francs. She also has a right to the property belonging to her mother. In two weeks she will know where she stands. She is improving day by day.

I have never had much hope that Sister Trinité would return after her first withdrawal.
Do not let your property worry you. . .

*

Father Pouget has the character of the country. . .

I hope M. de Pinaux will take care of all your uncle's affairs. I hope to see him today or tomorrow. He will leave for Paris only around the 15th of this month. You may proceed with Mlle de Bernard. If she seems to be a proper candidate for the Institute, see whether she can increase the amount of her dowry and whether instead of a pension she or her parents could not make a similar arrangement with the capital.

You may share, by union and participation. . .

* * *

S. 108a. To the King, Paris

January 4, 1819, Bordeaux

Father Chaminade, Honorary Canon of the Metropolitan church of Bordeaux, especially commissioned to the service of the auxiliary chapel in question, has the honor to explain the following to Your Majesty.

By an ordinance of November 12, 1804—21 brumaire in the year 4—the Archbishop of Bordeaux erected the chapel of the Madeleine, situated in the aforementioned city, into an auxiliary chapel for the parishes listed therein.

This ordinance, a true copy of which is enclosed, proves that the erection was approved by the Prefect, that it was in answer to the desires of the faithful, and that the pastors and their assistants were consulted.

The petitioner was immediately given charge of the said oratory, and he has discharged his duties to the best of his ability. Fourteen years of experience have confirmed the usefulness of this institution. To suppress it would be to inflict serious harm to the morale and to the religion of the neighborhood of this chapel.

However, at the time of the erection, it was not deemed necessary to obtain royal assent; this has just recently been brought to our attention. Sire, one word from you can remedy the situation, and only you have the authority to do so.

Under these circumstances the petitioner has recourse to Your Majesty and begs you graciously to confirm the ordinance of the Archbishop of Bordeaux dated November 12, 1804, erecting the chapel of the Madeleine as an auxiliary chapel.

The faithful and the petitioner who is their spokesman pray daily to heaven for the health and the prosperity of Your Majesty.

* * *

S. 108b. To Count de Tournon, Prefect of the Gironde

After January 15, 1819, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Your letter of January 15 authorizing the establishment of the Little Society for the Work of the Auvergnats and promising to secure the approval of the government strengthens the belief I have always entertained in the principles guiding your administration, and particularly in your concern for the very least of the people under your administration. I leave all further developments in this matter in your hands; this is the best way I know of showing both the confidence I place in you and the feelings of respect I entertain for your person, and with which I remain, Honorable Prefect, your. . . .

P.S. I believe the work with the young Savoyards of Paris is supported by zeal only and has no official status.

* * *

S. 109. To Pope Pius VII

January 18, 1819, Bordeaux

A list of the indulgences granted to the Sodality of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin established at the Madeleine, in Bordeaux.

List of indulgences attached to the Sodality of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, presently established in the church of the Madeleine in the city of Bordeaux. [*According to the terms of the petition, an asterisk indicates that this indulgence had not been present in the former concessions.*]

Plenary indulgences granted to the living, the dying, and the dead.

To the living. To each sodalist on the day of his reception or through the intermediary of the director, in or out of the confessional.

On the day of the week (the day of his choice)??? on which he has received the Eucharist and assisted during that week at one of the instructions given during a meeting.

To each sodalist, on the day indicated below and under the usual conditions:

- each day of the Roman stations according to the Roman missal;
- on the Feasts of the Nativity and the Ascension of Our Lord;
- on the Feasts of the Nativity, the Conception* and its Octave, the Annunciation and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin;
- on the Feast of Saint Joseph*;
- on the day of the monthly general Communion, with the sodalists of the Madeleine or, if he is away, by receiving Communion on the indicated day in another church*;
- on the last day of each month for those who have recited daily the Little Office of their group.

To each of the faithful, sodalists or not, who will have made the exercises of the annual retreat during at least five days with the intention of bettering himself, and who will have participated in a general Communion on the last day.

At the hour of death. To the founders or restorers of the Sodality before the Brief of June 2, 1803, conformably to the Brief.

To the founders or restorers who promoted the Sodality before the Apostolic Decree became effective.*

To both when receiving holy Viaticum if their infirmities are not a hindrance, and in case they are, on invoking orally or mentally the holy Name.

To each of the sodalists in danger of death or gravely ill who will be encouraged by the director to patience and resignation, after receiving Communion if he can and after reciting three *Our Fathers* and *Hail Marys* for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff and of the Church, and to whom the director expressly applies the indulgence.

After death. For a deceased sodalist for whom an authorized priest will say a Mass, using one of the altars of the oratory or, if the Mass is said in any church, by a priest sodalist.

Partial indulgences of seven years and of seven periods of 40 days [quarantines], to every sodalist for each of the exercises, acts, or prayers given here:

- for each attendance at a public or private exercises of the Sodality;
- for the recitation every day of the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception prescribed for the men, of the Office of the Sacred Heart of Mary prescribed for the Young Women, and for the act of acceptance of death which serves as the Office for the Mothers of Families*;
- for the nightly examination of conscience;
- for having reconciled two or more enemies;
- for each visit to a sick sodalist;
- for having asked God to heal a sick person, for a good death,, for the terminally ill, or for the repose of the soul of a deceased person at the time the church tolls his passing;
- for attendance at the church funeral of a sodalist or of any one of the faithful.

The general conditions for gaining a plenary indulgence, in addition to those indicated for the indulgences given above, are

1. to be sorry for sins, to be humble, to have recently received the sacrament of healing, and to receive the Eucharist fervently on the day one wishes to gain the indulgence;
2. on the same day, to visit a church or oratory of the Sodality; in case there is no such church or oratory, to visit the church designated by the director; failing this, to visit the principal church of the district;
3. on the same day, to receive fervently five *Our Fathers* and five *Hail Marys* for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff;
4. on the feastdays of the stations of Rome, to recite seven of those prayers, as it is prescribed for these stations.

A single document appended to the petition whose object is to obtain, or to have confirmed, the above indulgences and privileges.

* * *

S. 109. To the Minister of the Interior

After January 19, 1819, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

The Minister's request for documents leads us to believe that Father Chaminade expressed himself poorly in his petition. His Excellency does not seem to understand that the ecclesiastical and administrative documents of 1814 validating the existence of the oratory needed only the royal sanction.

Various priests succeeded each other as directors of the oratory of the Madeleine before the Conordat. After the organization of the Church of France in 1802 and the law of germinal in the year 10, it became necessary to obtain the authorization from both powers to hold exercises of worship in this chapel. The archbishop's ordinance announcing the consent both of the Prefect to the request of the faithful interested in the continuance of this oratory and also of the three interested pastors—all this goes to prove that the preliminary conditions were fulfilled and that only the seal of sovereign authority was missing from the legal formalities. This is the gist of the petition presented today by Father Chaminade.

There is only one possible explanation for the communication by His Excellency to the parish council and then to the municipal council, and this would be because the costs for the exercise of worship would be assumed by the parish, or in a subsidiary manner (in case the latter had insufficient revenues) by the city. This would be the situation if parish functions took place in the oratory under the authority of a pastor just as in the case of an annex; but the Madeleine is not in this category.

The building was sold during the Revolution. The chaplain is responsible for the rent and for all other expenses arising from the worship. He has no salary and no parish duties. Both on a spiritual and a temporal plane, this chapel is a true "special oratory"; it was labeled an auxiliary chapel or "mission" only to extend its services to the various parishes of the south of Bordeaux, where the churches are further apart.

We conclude that the faithful of the three parishes and their pastors were agreed on the utility and the necessity of preserving this chapel. But in the absence of all pastoral responsibility, the neighboring pastors were not obliged to any form of inspection. There was also no reason for the parishes to assume any financial obligation which their own insufficient revenues would have obliged them to refuse. Also, it would be impossible to allocate the assistance because the chapel is a service to each of the three parishes individually, but not collectively, nor does it help each parish as a whole.

The priest who celebrates Mass there agrees to bear the expenses incurred by the chapel. He is bound to this service by no commitment, by no obligation other than his zeal. He will continue his work as long as he can, or as he wills. The oratory is essentially his property; it is public only insofar as it opens its doors to the faithful of the neighborhood.

It is ideally situated for that purpose, and this is why it was authorized to function as an auxiliary chapel. All that is requested is the royal authorization to maintain the chapel as a special oratory, receiving the faithful for service which do not conflict with their parish activities, with no financial burden on the parish corporations. Therefore, His Excellency with the understanding of the three neighboring pastors, the opinion of the archbishop, and that of the Prefect, has sufficient grounds to ask His Majesty to approve the continuance of the oratory of the Madeleine, which is so useful to the faithful.

* * *

S. 115. To the President of the Court

No date [1819] , Bordeaux

. . . at 7 o'clock sharp on Rue Lalande, no. 2.

It was my intention, Monsieur, to call on you again, full of confidence in your benevolent intentions. I have asked M. Laroque to be my representative; I join my request to his and ask you to postpone the session at which his case will be appealed. His lawyer is away but hopes to return shortly.

* * *

S. 116a. To Count de Tournon, Prefect of the Gironde

February 17, 1819, Bordeaux
(Autograph Rough Draft, Agmar)

Conformably to your intentions and to those of His Excellency the Minister of the Interior which you shared with me in your letter of the 8th of this month, I have kept only the most salient features of the Statutes of the Society that proposes to aid the young boys from Auvergne. I would like this initiative to proceed according to your wishes, Monsieur Prefect, and I am willing to take charge of the work. Were the government to authorize the project with or without modification and also to dispense with the stamp tax on subscription sheets and application forms, the sum realized would be equivalent to several subscriptions, unless they are already exempt because of some law applying to charitable institutions and of which I have no knowledge.

You are familiar, Monsieur Prefect, with the section dealing with internal government which is well developed in the prospectus and which I declared to be optional in answer to your recommendation for brevity.

* * *

S. 116b. To Bro. David Monier

March 3, 1819, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

We are further than ever from our objective, my dear Friend. A second letter from the Minister to the archbishop asks, in substance, that reference be made to his first letter of January

19. We will need to consider seriously what our next step is to be. Perhaps we will have to turn to the children from Auvergne.

* * *

S. 116c. To Archbishop d'Aviau of Bordeaux

March 1819, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

Excellency,

At the request of a good number of the faithful from the parishes of Saint Paul, Saint Eulalie, and Saint Eloi who desire a continuance of the religious services provided by the chapel called the Madeleine, encouraged by the response of the pastors and assistants of the said parishes who were consulted on the purpose of the petition, and with the consent of the Prefect of the Gironde inasmuch as he was concerned, we acceded to the wishes of the faithful and allowed them the use of the chapel by our ordinance of November 12, 1804, or 21 brumaire of the year 13.

At the same time we named as priest in charge Rev. G.-Joseph Chaminade, Honorary Canon of our metropolitan church.

You are aware, Your Excellency, that the Lord has showered blessings on the work that has been done in this oratory. The fervor of a great number of the faithful has been maintained, and many souls have been won over to virtue and faith. In order to give the oratory a firmer base, I believed it best to ask the King to add his seal of sovereign authority to my ordinance.

His Excellency the Minister, the Minister of the Interior, has looked with favor on my petition. In his answer he asks me to comply with certain conditions, one being the consultation of the parish council of Sainte Eulalie on the services which the chapel can render.

Concerning an estimate of the expenses incurred by the opening of this chapel, Your Excellency, our intention is not to burden the parish by asking it to supplement any lack of funds, the revenues of the parish being already insufficient. On the contrary, the oratory is the private property of the person in charge, and he is responsible for any necessary repairs. Although I have no doubt that this is his intention, I believe it is good to mention it here.

His Excellency the Minister of the Interior seems to desire that these formalities will be taken care of as expeditiously as possible. The Prefect of the Gironde, to whom he wrote concerning his involvement, calls on me to request a consultation with the parish of Sainte Eulalie. In his letter the first magistrate expresses himself greatly in favor of the oratory and concludes with these words, which you will find very interesting. "Father Chaminade does not, apparently, ask for a new title, but merely that he keep a title which he already possesses and which was granted to him 14 years ago."

I am. . .

P.S. The meager income, although insufficient, would be a compensation. However, any donations or legacies can be accepted only by a parish.

* * *

S. 116d. To the Chairman of the Parish Council of Sainte Eulalie

March 1819, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

I was surprised at the hesitation of the council of Sainte Eulalie to call a meeting to discuss the matter proposed by His Excellency the Bishop, and so I made inquiries to obtain the reason. I was given to understand that the archbishop's letter was not clear enough to be brought

before the members of the Council. Secondly, the topic for consideration was not stated with sufficient clarity.

Now as to the first objection, a casual glance at the law will convince anyone that the council is fully authorized to meet in response to the archbishop's letter of March 10. But to grasp the purpose of the meeting, we must read more carefully, for the letter is very succinct. I asked only one thing of the King: the assent of his royal authority to a situation which has existed for 14 years by designating the chapel of the Madeleine as an auxiliary chapel, or mission, as it is stated in the constitutive ordinance. The archbishop put it this way. "Father Chaminade, desirous of giving more stability to the constitution of this auxiliary chapel, petitions the King to grant him the seal of his sovereign authority." Is the purpose not clearly stated?

The Prefect of the Gironde, writing to the archbishop on the matter, saw this in the same light. I believe I can recall his exact words. "Father Chaminade is not asking for a new title, merely the confirmation of a title which has already been granted to him and of which he has been in full possession these last 14 years."

The term auxiliary chapel, or mission, must be understood only according to the terms of the constitutive ordinance. This is how I have always interpreted it, and do so now. Here is the actual text of the explanation I gave to the Minister of the Interior after my petition to the King. "From the spiritual and temporally point of view, this chapel is really a private oratory; it was parishes of the south of Bordeaux, etc." It has never been interpreted otherwise, and I am distressed that it could have been given another meaning.

Monsieur, if you believe any other point needs clarification, in the name of our friendship and as good neighbors, let me know. But in the absence of any obstacle, I would be greatly obliged if you would call a meeting of the council using the ordinary procedure.

* * *

S. 116e. To the Chairman of the Parish Council of Sainte-Eulalie

March 1819, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I am writing to you, Monsieur, to report what I hear in various circles and to share with you some reflections on the matter which I have made under other circumstances. You may make use of my remarks as you wish in the interests of religion, for I believe it is concerned here, as you may judge from what follows.

It is rumored that while the parish council of Saint Eulalie concedes that my oratory is of some value to the cause of religion and public morality, it is empowered to decide either that the ordinance authorizing it must be confirmed purely and simply, or that the confirmation can be granted only on the condition that a sum of 1,300 francs will be paid annually to the council. I would perhaps never have given credence to this second alternative, had I not previously had a similar experience.

May I draw your attention to two things regarding that proposition—I mean the principles upon which it is based and the consequences it may have. To make an establishment taxable because it is useful to religion and to public morality! If payment of this kind were in fact exacted, it would meet with great public disfavor. This alone would alienate a number of people. A religious person will not accept this financial haggling over religious and moral values.

The consequences could be even more far-reaching. Suppose a tax were to be imposed on an oratory on the boundaries of the parish, even if it were less than the 1,300 francs suggested—are we to conclude that the parish itself, where the services are more varied, the space incomparably more vast, and the attendance greater could be subject to a proportionately greater tax by the proper authority? Protest as you will that you are unable to meet your own expenses, you will be told that if the oratory, which has but one-tenth or less of your resources, seems to

you logically taxable, and you will have condemned yourself—just compare. Furthermore, it will be most natural for the parishes of Saint Paul and Saint Eloi, with a greater number of parishioners attending services at the oratory than those of Sainte Eulalie, to follow the example and to give notice that they also wish to impose a tax. Next, if you add that the oratory pays a high rent and public taxes, two types of expenses from which the parishes are exempt, the latter will be expected to contribute more, again compared to the chapel.

The conclusion to be drawn from these considerations, Monsieur, is that the imposition of a tax means closing the oratory; let there be no misunderstanding on that score. The revenues dreamed up by an impulsive and mischievous public amount to a wretched sum collected for the most indispensable maintenance and cleanliness of the building.

It is no secret that in the interests of religion and to help the poor, the one who cannot pay for his seat is admitted free. This practice prevails whenever tact requires it. Modes of taxation have no place in this haven of retreat. To introduce them would be to nullify the spiritual advantages, which I have found to be very real and which cannot be entirely disclaimed.

I could go on with these reflections for anyone who would be interested. To you, Monsieur, I will simply repeat: allow Christ to be adored in all simplicity where people are glad to adore him. I know the impact this recommendation will make on your soul.

Please accept. . .

* * *

S. 118. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

March 29, 1819, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

. . . *that might attract too great a crowd.*

Allow Sister Appolonie to continue her practices, but let her always take the necessary precautions to miss as rarely as possible the exercises either of the novitiate or of the chapel.

With respect to Sister des Anges, my dear Child, carry on with the program you have outlined. Be a real support to the young workers you spoke of; encourage and instruct them. The Spirit of the Lord will help you find a way to satisfy the desire God has inspired in them.

I cannot find the uncle of the young woman you sent to me. She cannot enter any community, and serious disadvantages will result if she is sent to the Miséricorde. I will place her in a boarding establishment for three months; at the end of that period, we may be able to do something for her.

I wish you, my dear Child. . .

* * *

S. 118a. To Pastor Ripolles, Talence

April 15, 1819, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Your short note of March 13, coming from Rome and of which you sent me a copy, contains two remarks and three direct questions. I will reply to them.

First Remark. It says that the indulgences—that is, those that are requested—can be delivered only by the secretary in charge of the Briefs. This means an expense of 100 francs for each of the three Briefs I am asking for.

Answer. In France, we make no essential difference between rescripts, briefs, bulls, and other apostolic letters. We consider them at their face value, irrespective of their name, provided

they come from the Sovereign Pontiff and deal with spiritual things. This is why in carrying out an assignment in France, it does not matter whether faculties were granted by rescript, brief, etc.

However, the regulations of the Roman chancelleries and secretariats may have decided otherwise. The banker charged with making the demand must deal with these Roman regulations. We must trust in his ability. We depend entirely on his competence as he follows the immediate procedures. However, we will ask the banker to observe the strictest economy because of the poverty of the petitioning Orders and because their support and encouragement are very useful to the Church.

Second Remark. In Rome, it is the opinion that the Sodality of Bordeaux does not possess the privileges *ab antiquo* because we have no proof that the confirming Brief is registered with the mother sodality, as are those of other sodalities.

Answer. The Brief in question is dated June 2, 1803, and was granted by a legate *a latere* in virtue of his special powers, *re speciali auctoritate concessa*, as it is stated in the Brief. It is an established principle that the letters apostolic delivered by legates *a latere* are not null if they have not been formally made public in Rome according to the Roman protocol. This would be contrary to the nature of the legation, to the needs of the matters the legation is to treat, and to the understanding between respective sovereigns. To check on the authenticity of the brief, a person simply consults the register of the legation; ordinarily the original stays in France, while an authentic copy may be in Rome. Now the Brief concerning the Sodality of Bordeaux can be found in register no. 2, page 509 according to a note added at the time of its proclamation by the legate Caprara or by his secretary.

Furthermore, it could be affirmed that the registration of briefs granting favors is an external formality and is practiced in the case of briefs of a spiritual nature from the Sovereign Pontiff. To omit the registration is not to invalidate the concession granted. However, ever since registration has been obligatory, any non-registered letter is regarded with some suspicion and even doubt as to its authenticity. However, for letters which antedate or postdate the ruling, omitting the registration has no effect on the privilege solicited provided the authenticity of the letters can be demonstrated.

None of the privileges granted by Saint Peter and by his more immediate successors were registered, nor were those that were accorded during the captivity of the Sovereign Pontiffs. Those granted by legates *a latere* or by others were registered only very recently, etc. Yet the status of the various churches and societies of the faithful throughout the centuries has not been questioned because of this omission. Concerning those sodalities said to be affiliated to the Roman sodality, they are probably of recent origin and have appeared only after the ordinance. Earlier sodalities must not be dismissed on that account.

However, if my answers are considered merely as comments on the Roman decision, well and good; but should the authenticity, the seniority, and the legitimacy of the favors which the Sodality of Bordeaux has been enjoying for more than two centuries be attacked, I do not doubt that the theologians and the cardinals will side with it. I come now to the more direct questions which are put to me.

First Question. Your banker in Rome wants to know the year, the month, and the day of the meeting of the Sodality of Bordeaux to see if it might be affiliated to that other sodality already affiliated to that of Rome, the mother of all sodalities.

Answer. The sodality in Rome has been declared the mother of all sodalities, and it is considered essential to recognize this title and to respect it. Moreover, it has been a condition imposed on all sodalities of that nature so that it is not only a matter of custom, but a duty to recognize this maternity. However, many sodalities, offshoots of the Roman body, were born at almost the same time, some only two years later. I should perhaps give the two dates that concern the Sodality of Bordeaux, the first referring to its actual creation and the other to its confirmed affiliation. I will explain these dates; the first would be the birth of the Sodality on December 5, 1584, and the other its confirmation on January 7.

1. The Bull *Omnipotentis Salvatoris nostri* published by His Holiness Pope Gregory XIII on September 5, 1584, which is considered to have established the sodality of the Roman college, authorizes the institution not only of school sodalities but extends to all the faithful under the care of the Jesuit Fathers “sodalities or confraternities of persons outside the college and even of the devout faithful in Christ of the said Society.”¹

2. The Bull of His Holiness Pope Sixtus V, the one who extended in a special manner the sodalities and their indulgences to the kingdom of France, is generally given the date 1586 (this date is found in all the books outlining the practices of the sodality), but in the new edition of the collected bulls (vol. 1, p. 169 ff.) it bears the date January 7, 1587. This bull authorizes the Fathers called “of Jesus” to found in France sodalities among various categories of people, much like those attached to the religious house in Rome. They will have the same rules as those of the Roman college with the adaptations required by the customs, the conditions, and the status of the persons. “These sodalities will be attached to those of Rome as offshoots of the same head and daughters of a common mother.”

Affiliation in this case results from its constitution and not from a subsequent registration. The Sovereign Pontiff who created these sodalities expressed himself as follows. “We, therefore, raise these confraternities or sodalities to a very worthy rank, so that both students and also other faithful Christians may be encouraged to become members of such sodalities, and we bestow all and every indulgence and privilege, plenary or other, both on the aforementioned primaria and also on all the individual colleges or houses of the said Society.”²

From time immemorial the two bulls we are concerned with have been presented to the faithful of Bordeaux as sure titles, approved by their bishops and sanctioned by the civil authorities. Ever since that time, which antedates any person’s memory, the sodalities have functioned on the strength of these titles. The only argument that could be adduced as proof that the approval of the Bordeaux sodality, which is lost in the mists of time, does not date from the primitive title, is that the Jesuits were not established in the city at the time of the two bulls of 1584 and January 7, 1587. But this objection does not hold water because our chronicles inform us that the Jesuit Fathers were established in Bordeaux in 1573, with the active cooperation of the General of the Order. Our historians also record that when the Company of Jesus suffered suppression and exile, it was exempt from these trials in Bordeaux and Toulouse, so that the sodalities were centered in these towns, the more important being Bordeaux. It is a fact that since the Bull of Pope Sixtus V on January 7, 1587, and until 1763 when the company was dispersed, the sodality of Bordeaux flourished without interruption. Several religious of the Company residing in Bordeaux maintained the piety and the practices of the sodalities. With the years, the number of affiliates diminished but little. Several of these religious and some of their sodalists were still living in 1785 when, as we know, the Bull of His Holiness Pope Pius VI granted the same privileges and indulgences to the Capuchins of the city. This leads us to talk of this bull of Pius VI and address the question raised by the banker in Rome.

Second Question. Someone would like to know the year, the month, and the day on which the bull of confirmation was published, and also if it was sealed with lead or with the fisherman’s ring, and this in order to avoid 24 years of research!

Answer. The petition that was sent mentions that the bull was destroyed during the public disasters of those last years. It was impossible, therefore, to note the month or the year or any other particular, and it was in order to replace it that the petition was sent. We find a quotation from this bull, but not the date, in the petition which was sent to the Cardinal Legate in France

¹ *Sodalitia sue confraternitates exteriorum dicti collegii nostril, ac etiam aliorum Christi fidelium Societatis praedictae devotorum.*

² *Ipsas confraternitates seu sodalitates condignis titulis extollimus. . . ut igitur tam scholars quam caeteri Christifideles eo promptiores ad ejusmodi sodalitia ingredienda reddantur, nos omnes et singulans tam plenarias quam alias indulgentias et privilegias tam dictae primariae quam singulis aliis in quibusvis dictae societatis collegiis vel domibus impartimus. . . .*

(1803) and also in the cardinal's answering brief. The petition asked for the same benefits, privileges, and indulgences which His Holiness Pope Pius VI of happy memory had granted to the sodality which had been established in the former convent of the Capuchins, under the title of the Immaculate Conception. It was a successor to the sodality of the Jesuit Father, as we have already stated. The Archbishop of Bordeaux seconded this petition. The Cardinal Legate responded as follows: "In virtue of the special apostolic authority graciously granted to us by His Holiness Pope Pius VII, we impart these indulgences to you, some of which were granted by Pope Pius VI of sacred memory in the usual manner and form to the aforementioned pious association."¹ In the margin we read, "Having read the present letter, we agree that its provisions will be put into practice in our diocese."² At the bottom is the great seal of the legation, and on the right the registration mark, L 2:509, meaning page 509 of the second register of the legation.

This clear mention of the bull of Pius VI is attested to by the petition, by the legate *a latere*, and by the Archbishop of Bordeaux. But the date and the nature of the seals are unknown, and the bull itself was lost.

Third and Last Question. Should the letters apostolic contain the old statements in full, or does it suffice to mention that all the indulgences granted by former Sovereign Pontiffs are confirmed? Will the three briefs contain the same statement?

Answer. 1. For the brief concerning the sodality, it is desirable that the statements will be given word for word and in full. However, this does not prevent introducing it with "while confirming all the indulgences granted by previous Sovereign Pontiffs" and adding the statements verbatim.

2. Concerning the brief authorizing the grouping of some men in Bordeaux under a stricter rule, no general statement can be expected. The petition asks for indulgences in four explicit cases and for a group apart from the sodality. There is nothing to confirm or renew; the Pontiff is asked to grant four favors.

3. The same applies to the women's group at Agen. It seems to me fitting that the three conclusions reached in the three petitions would appear in the three briefs. The third petition, which has just been answered, would lead someone to believe that the interested party had not bothered to read the others. He is hereby encouraged to read them and to obtain in due form whatever concession he is able.

P.S. April 15, 1819 [in Father Chaminade's hand]

Reverent Pastor, here are the answers to the questions sent by your Roman friend. If in your opinion they are satisfactory, please send them on immediately to avoid unnecessary delay in the concessions we are seeking. With but a moment's reflection one concludes from this answer that the sodality of Bordeaux and its affiliates are linked to the ancient sodality of the Roman college, thanks to the brief from Cardinal Caprara of June 2, 1863, which merely gives or transfers the indulgences granted to the sodality of the Capuchins of that town and thanks also to the fact that the sodality of the Capuchins was the same as that of the Jesuits. The brief of the Capuchin sodality is lost, as also the copy which I myself sent to the Cardinal Legate. However, the authenticity is proven by the excerpts, by the petitions, and by the existing brief from the Cardinal Legate which is so often quoted in new petitions address to the Holy Father, and also in my answer to the questions. Only the dates are uncertain. If the loss of the brief granting the transfer of the sodality of the Jesuits to the Capuchins and the uncertainty of the dates are still a problem, Reverend Pastor, then you could ask that everything contained in the petition be granted as new favors, as if a union never existed, but establishing *de facto* this union to the old sodality of the Roman college and to all its affiliates, etc.

¹ *De speciali apostolic auctoritate a SSo Pio PP. VII nobis benign concessa indulgentias de quibus in precibus alias a Sancta memoriae Pio PP. VI concessas introscriptae piae unioni iisdem modo et forma communicamus. Sig. J.-B. Card. Leg.*

² *Visis praesentibus litteris ut in nostra diocese suum sortiantur effectum annuimus. Burdigalae 7 junii 1803. Sig. Card. Fr. Arch Burdig.*

Now as to the other two petitions, the ones from the religious group of men in Bordeaux and that of the religious women in Agen, they present no difficulty, and it is to be supposed that their study and response will not be as expensive as for the sodalities; no research is needed, no proof of affiliation required, the time needed is so short, etc.

I close, Reverent Pastor, with a prayer that you redouble your efforts. I hope the favors from our Sovereign Pontiff will contribute to the growth and stability of these three institutions, which already show such tangible and gratifying results.

* * *

**S. 119. To Father Rouquet, Pastor of Libourne and
To Father Maurel, Diocesan Missionary**

April 6, 1819, Bordeaux

. . . for all exercises of piety, prayers, religious instruction.

After you have suggested this first step, it might be good to inscribe in different registers those who present themselves. This inscription should include the name, the age, the profession, and the address of each one. Have a separate register for the men and for the women of the Sodality. Each of the registers can have two sections: the Fathers of Families separate from the Young Men, the Mothers separate from the Young Women.

There will, therefore, be two registers and in each register two sections, one for the older sodalists and one for the younger. In the section for the Fathers of Families will be inscribed all those who are or have been married, also the bachelors over 36 years of age. In the section for the young people will be the names of all those who are admitted, between the ages of 16 and 36. The Mothers of Families are the married women of whatever age and spinsters over 30 years of age. In the second women's section will be all the young ladies between 14 and 30 years of age.

The men of both sections will appoint a leader and two assistants. There is one leader for both sections and one assistant for the Fathers of Families and one for the Young Men. The same procedure will be used for the women's sections. The leaders must accept their responsibility with a whole heart; they must not lack prudence and not allow anything that might give rise to censure or protest on the part of the authorities. The meetings are concerned only with religious matters. If you can accomplish all this, then have the men and the women meet on different days every two weeks for a pious reading and for mutual encouragement. The Sodality could also agree to attend Sunday Mass, at which the more fervent could proclaim their unity at the communion rail.

The biweekly meetings could take place until Pentecost, at which time I think I could pay them a visit, although I am not yet able to determine the exact date. Meanwhile, Father Maurel and I will meet and plan whatever is necessary.

I will gladly devote my first free moments. . .

* * *

S. 122. To the Bishop of Le Mans

June 25, 1819, Bordeaux

Having been entrusted with an apostolic mission by a decree of March 28, 1801, I had to limit my sphere of action because of my weakened condition. My activity did not range beyond the former diocese of Auch and those of Bordeaux and Agen. It was never my intention to extend my mission territory as far as Mans. However, one of the pastors under your jurisdiction asked me in his letter of April 19 to affiliate a sodality of his parishioners, of which he is the director, to the similar Sodality in Bordeaux which is in my charge. While I could not proceed with this

affiliation in my capacity as director of the Bordeaux group, I could do so in virtue of the apostolic mission confided to me. I thought any such action on my part, taking place in your diocese, might be null and void unless it were done under the conditions imposed upon me by the Roman sodality. My letters patent as missionary are worded in part as follows: “appointed the same [G.-J. Chaminade] Missionary Apostolic, however, under the direction and dependence of the Ordinary of the diocese in which he will conduct his mission; he will obey him at all times and will obtain the faculties from him before engaging in his mission. . . .”¹

* * *

S. 122a. To Mme Vauguyon, Le Mans

June 25, 1819, Bordeaux

(Rough Draft, Agmar)

When I promised on the occasion of your passage through Bordeaux to give you an answer about the affiliation which your zeal suggested and which your worthy pastor so ardently championed, I could foresee neither the work overload that awaited me nor the difficulties inherent in the proposition.

The absence of a new sodality foundation in Libourne, the backlog I met on my return, and the usual long litany of accidents hindered me from devoting myself ostensibly to the affiliates of Le Mans, although I had them constantly in mind. The object of my love also became the object of my constant solicitude. I was afraid that after all this time my letters to you would no longer find you at Barèges, so I believed it best to wait either for your return or for a word. I was rewarded with the latter in the form of your interesting letter of the sixth of this month, to which I am now replying. I hope your charity will overlook my delay and understand that it was all against my will. I can expect no less from a soul whom grace seems to have chosen to accomplish great deeds.

Let me tell you in two words what troubled me the most about your affiliation. I do not think it can take place regularly without the express approbation of the Ordinary. This is due to the conditions imposed on apostolic missions and to the concessions granted by the Roman court to sodalities. The letter from your worthy pastor may be official because of the signature of the secretary of the Bishop of Le Mans, but it does not mention the bishop’s approval of your petition. For this reason I have been of the opinion for some time that at your next interview, you would take it upon yourself to see to that matter. There has been so much delay already that you would harm your cause by waiting any longer.

I have therefore decided to go ahead in virtue of the authorization granted by the saintly Bishop of Bordeaux in what concerns this diocese. As to the affiliation in the diocese of Le Mans, I leave that up to the will and approval of your bishop. At the same time, I most humbly beg his pardon for this sort of involuntary anticipation, which was due to an excess of zeal on my part. I enclose a letter to your pastor, to whom I should have written long ago, and beg you to make more eloquent excuses than I can. I trust in your prayers, and I invoke the Divine Son through his Mother Mary to bless you and your pious friends.

* * *

S. 122c. To Mme Vauguyon, Le Mans

June 25, 1819, Bordeaux

¹ “. . . eumdem (G.J. Chaminade) deputavit missionarium apostolicum sub directione tamen et dependentia ordinarii loci in quo per eum missions fieri contigerit, cui omnino parere debet ac veniam prius una cum facultatibus ab recipere.”

(Autograph, Agmar)

Agenda

1. The rest of the 1,000 francs to M. Mathieu (Elisabeth)??? of December 1, 1817, paid for the third trimester on June 12, 1819: 25 francs.
2. Auguste Sainte Maris of Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port, Rue des Trois Conils, no. 72
3. Sodality of Bazas; see Brother Collineau's letter.
4. A convent founded at Villefranche de Rouergue in Querci by M. Marty, the principal of the *collège* of that town. See the letter from the superior of the Daughters of Mary, Agen, June 4, 1819.
- 4a. Apostolic Brief.
5. Write to M. Capdeviele, Pontac near Paul . . . the Bishop of Agen . . . M. du Jardin . . . Mme de la Grâce . . . M. le sup. Fedas . . . Izambert in Libourne . . . to M. Sav. Giraud, lawyer in Libourne . . . to Mlle Lachapelle; to Condom; to M. de Rivière; to Mme Varenne in Saint Etienne; books from Sainte??? Anges for Auch; to Mme Fedar.

* * *

S. 129. To Father Barrès
November 18, 1819, Bordeaux

P.S. As I was wrapping the memorandum, I noticed that a number of mistakes had slipped in because of the haste with which it had been copied. It would have been shorter if the author had had more time to write or to copy it. In any case, he was in a good frame of mind when he wrote it.

Memorandum on the Collineau Matter

It seems we are again calling into the question of ordaining Brother Collineau while dispensing with the seminary, except for the retreat of the ordinands. There are three answers to that question. One is sufficient it is a good answer. If each one is good, all three will be useful. Here they are; you be the judge.

The first two answers are very similar to the ones that satisfied one of the most saintly personages of the Church. In the Church we must be faithful to tradition and have the backing of an authority for everything we do.

To those who wished to exclude him from the sanctuary, Saint Athanasius used to say, "The thing has been decided with justice and wisdom." It is fitting that a third answer be given here without scorning in the least that of Saint Athanasius. The candidate for ordination has been dispensed from the seminary requirement and assigned by the same authority to certain tasks which it would be most inadvisable to abandon. We will go into more detail about these three answers and perhaps also say a few words about the motives or the more specious pretexts for reopening the discussion of a topic which has already been judiciously decided and which cannot now be debated with seriousness and propriety.

1. The matter has been decided.

The authority of the bishop is all that is needed to confirm this statement. He took it upon himself to make this decision, to give this promise, and this promise was accepted with confidence and respect. What the pontiff says comes from God, according to our belief. A promise of this nature is its own guarantee, and I wonder if those who would see it revoked have thought of the consequences. Circumspection is recommended, even if the reasons were weighty and clear. Any countermanding on the part of authority is like taking one stride forward but slipping back two on treacherous ground, or even falling on one's face. The harm done is more

serious when the authority is a holy one. One seems to want the very wisdom of religion to be fickle and subject to the foibles of the day.

The same mistake was made by a priest who was well on his way to sanctity, for he was a companion of Saint Bernard. After the holy sacrifice, this cleric announced to the assembly the effects of a loaf he had just blessed and had distributed—nothing less than the healing of all the sick who would partake of it. And the priest who acted as his deacon added, “Those who eat of it with the required dispositions, that is, those required by the rule of our faith.” “Even without these dispositions,” interjected Saint Bernard, full of the Spirit of God.

For the sake of argument, let us suppose that His Excellency told Brother Collineau that he would be admitted to the priesthood and that his deacon, who was let us say as holy as Saint Bernard’s, adds these words to the promise. “If Brother Collineau observes the other conditions and spends the required time in the seminary.” However holy this deacon may be, he still insults the hierarchy, the authority and the sanctity of the Pontificate. Let us excuse him because of the purity of his intention, but we are convinced that Saint Bernard would repeat, “It will be done.” Isaac refused to retract the blessing he had given to Jacob; once the edict is pronounced, it is carried out.

Although it is pointless now to add anything to my first answer, may I say that the Vicar General remembers the promise made by His Excellency and can testify to it. Furthermore, the matter was referred to the council and the decision of the council upheld the promise. Finally, it can be stated that the candidate was examined by the council with the purpose of studying the exemption of which he was the beneficiary. After this, if the only person who could change anything refused to take part in the examination and the decision, common sense ordains only one thing: the said individual should be charted with the administration as a whole and be given the pastor’s crozier.

If it were true—no one thinks so or can believe that it is—that the opponent to the ordination of Brother Collineau had announced to the seminary that he would have the decision rescinded, it would be all the more reason not to retract it, in order to bring back to the observance of his Rule the one who should give the example of obedience, for the present and future edification of the seminary and for the dignity of authority which in these matters is not sufficiently respected.

Now to my second answer. The question had been decided justly and wisely. Let us make no mention of the religious instruction or morality of the candidate. That is not under attack. In this case, justice and wisdom were served by complying with Church regulations and with what was fitting in the circumstance. Can the Church authorize the ordination of a well-known candidate who has not spent any time in the seminary? We must answer in the affirmative if we read Church history. However, there have been abuses. Some were ordained without sufficient examination. These two reasons make seminaries necessary.

How, does it follow that where no abuses are to be feared, and in a very special and well-known case, must we proceed as if there were abuses or a strong presumption that they existed? In sound logic, in physics, in any discipline, we can say that when the cause is removed the effect disappears. No law can have greater extension than its cause. The defect of a shared administration lies in that it can be based on different principles because all power tends to ramification. But to want the director of a seminary to reverse the decision of an archbishop is going a little too far.

What circumstances warranted the dispensation from the rule obliging formation in a seminary? They are of three kinds; at least, I do not find any more in this case. First the case where the person lives in a religious house that is recognized as regular. Secondly, when the person has professed publicly for a time or for a lifetime complete faith in purity and in the apostolic life. Thirdly, when the various needs of the church make it imperative to protect solid vocations and, on a lower plane, not to reduce to the same level the numerous but different designs of Providence. Let us summarize these three types of circumstances.

1. Basically, even in those dioceses where greater insistence was placed on a seminary formation prior to ordination, certain houses of comparable regularity and strictness replaced the seminaries. Proof of all this is found in all Orders, regular, cenobitic, and ascetical, the world over, even in France as long as they had the protection of the law. The reestablished Orders, although less numerous since the recent persecutions, with all the more reason enjoy the privilege. Does the one who has bound himself by strict vows need to lay them aside in order to follow a mitigated rule? No one will take offense if we point out that there are houses where the rule is the same as in the seminaries, yet is somewhat more austere. This is not a reflection on the regularity of seminaries; it is an admission that houses do exist which are just as perfect, or more so.

There is no reason why a religious should be taken from his monastery, his life and his desert, and placed in a seminary. There is no reason to deprive him and his Order of his priesthood because he has had no seminary training. I could cite here those Orders which do not have the same austere life, yet have the same Father; I mean all the Orders of Saint Benedict. No one, I dare think, will deny the principle. But it will be asked, to what house is the person in question attached? The opponent of the ordination can say no more.

2. The only answer he deserves is that his is not to judge such institutions, nor to ask that they defer to him. He may be told that the archbishop has read the rules and statutes of that house, has approved its purpose, and has agreed above all to see it in operation before applying for the authorization of the Holy See. He did so, convinced that it would be wiser to draw up a tried and more perfect statute than to be forced to apply later for corrections which, although proper, would weaken his authority.

The archbishop was good enough to bless the first religious grouped around him not once, but at intervals, repeatedly. He visited the house of Institute and gave it his blessing. He urged them to multiply like the wheat of the Lord. Since the Institute could not progress without the abundant graces of Jesus Christ, the archbishop added his appeal to that of the Order at the feet of the Holy Father, to solicit the salutary blessings and privileges which were subsequently granted. Finally, a chapel and the Holy Reserve were granted to the new Order and are standing proofs of the archbishop's approval. One word may suffice here. Are those to whom the Holy of Holies and a sanctuary are entrusted worthy to keep and guarantee the regularity and the conduct of the one they choose as priest for this sanctuary?

As I have said, this is all the Reverend Superior of the seminary needs to know. I should have said that he was not to share the secret which he had confided to the prelate who pronounced judgment by his actions—having recourse to the Holy Father, granting holy concessions and privileges to both persons and cloisters. Ever since, this house where the pontiff himself spent some time, which he approved and blessed, has become a holy place. There is only one way to degrade this new nursery of militants destined for the sanctuary: to accuse them of lapses in faith or morals, after which it would be concluded not that Brother Collineau must go to the seminary, but quite the contrary, that he and his like be barred from it. If the house has been blessed and chosen by our venerable prelate, if it has not degenerated, if there is hope that religion will be consoled and ardently defended by its images, God willing, it must be held in just as high esteem as the seminary. When the authority has so decided for an ordinand, the same authority must not be controverted.

We have seen that the decision was made with justice and wisdom, but another thought strikes me here! How can someone doubt that a decision made by His Excellency the Archbishop, with the advice of his council, after an extraordinary examination of the facts, is one of justice and wisdom? I catch myself committing a serious fault, which I humbly confess, in attempting to answer such a strange question. After the prelate, his council, the examination and the decision, who is holy enough to want the decision to come from someone else? After the prelate has joined his voice to the petition addressed to the Holy Father, proclaimed the house and its purpose

worthy of a blessing, set up a sanctuary for the Most Holy, who would dare say that the house does not have the qualifications of a seminary?

3. There is a third answer, and here it is. On the strength of the promise that Brother Collineau would be admitted to Holy Orders without being obliged to spend more than the ordination retreats in the seminary, he was given charge by the same dispensing authority of certain works which may not be abandoned without disastrous consequences. Among other things, Brother Collineau is in charge in the Bordeaux area of the work named after Father Fénélon. This enterprise was authorized by the Prefect of the Gironde, by the mayor of the town, and by an ordinance of the king and has been placed in the care of a bureau of which the archbishop is president. This work entails a civic and a moral responsibility. Brother Collineau is charged with the management of the work, and if he is forced to go to the seminary, the work will collapse. On the other hand, both he and his Order will be punished by being refused ordination if he does his duty and stays at his post.

In the second place, when the promise of a dispensation from the seminary was given, another work was submitted for the archbishop's approval, and the question of the seminary is not foreign to it, as I will explain briefly.

One of the boarding establishments most highly rated by the citizens of Bordeaux for the quality of education it provides to young people from good families had to close its doors under circumstances which only Providence could control. This was a blow to religion which seemed inevitable, since the land did not belong to the school. Every imaginable sacrifice was made by the Institute, but to no avail. The Society to which Brother Collineau belongs was in a position to prevent or to repair the harm by sacrificing itself for the public good; it had three days in which to decide. The archbishop was chosen as arbiter, and he asked the Society of Brother Collineau to make the necessary sacrifice. The Society accepted and obeyed. One of the seminaries of Bordeaux chose this occasion to lure one of the professors of the school. The Society and Brother Collineau, on the promise that he would be dispensed from the seminary, was sent to fill the gap . . . his course on the classics is on the curriculum.

If the decision relative to the seminary is rescinded, then the judgment rendered by the arbiter, the archbishop, must also be rescinded, for to tell a Society to do something and then to withdraw the means is neither just nor wise, nor an act of religion.

Now that you have my three answers, let us look at the objections, the subject of my last article.

Under what pretext can someone repudiate a decision that bears the stamp of justice and wisdom, one called for by the circumstances?

First Objection. Exceptions are harmful to a rule. They weaken it; they make it important.

Answer. This objection goes counter to general experience, which says that exceptions confirm the rule; and this is true. Why is that? Because the rule results from a just cause; only when the cause is unjust is there an exception. Hence the exception bolsters and confirms the rule. Now the general purpose of a seminary is to safeguard the doctrine and the morals of those Destined for ordination. This is a just cause, and we must not deviate from it lightly.

Now if faith, doctrine, and morals are guaranteed to the one who stays in a house that is well reputed, whose public practices are the same as those of the saintly deacons of the early Church, whose lifestyle is that chosen by man ordained religious, then to insist on the necessity of a seminary formation is to misconstrue and to weaken the purpose. To refuse to admit the just exception is to reduce a rule to a whim; it is no longer a life-giving principle.

Second Objection. The seminarians in turn will begin to grumble, to complain, and to emancipate themselves.

Answer. Must the mutterings of the evil-minded be quelled by injustice to the others? Could this be truly effective? Protests will not be voiced by one who has been taught respect for the decisions of sacred authority; they will give weight to the accusation that the pupil's sin is on his master's head. The remedy preventive or tardy? Let the teacher not attack what he should

respect and what he teaches others to respect. They will protest, it is claimed. The answer to that is very simple: equal opportunity to those of equal right; justice to whom justice is due. Let them perform similar or equivalent deeds; if they are dealt with unjustly, they can complain not about the justice done to others, but only about the injustice done to themselves.

It is said that they will complain? But many will rejoice because God has humbled them, just as I have blessed the Lord who has asked me to justify his work and in this trial to accuse only my own unworthiness. They will slacken in their submissiveness? If they have been poorly instructed and trained, yes—but instructed by the superior, the very one we are challenging! I guarantee the contrary, for it must not be imagined that I have anything against him except a burst of zeal that led to a little intolerance in my regard. I can respect one whose only fault is the degree of high-mindedness and virtue he brings to his office.

I trust that with some reflection he will see the justice and the wisdom of the decision he was unable to shake, and which cannot be altered.

* * *

S. 129a. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

December 13, 1819, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

While I have no intention of prying into the state of your fortune or of your bank account, I wish to consider here the importance of the establishment in question. Given the country and the religions, which are in many respects opposed to ours, the enterprise is not an ordinary one, however simple it may seem at first glance. At stake is the salvation of the country, at least of those faithful who have not renounced their faith. It means that in this country the Church will move toward a decisive victory over the errors of our estranged brethren. I do not say that we must venture without sluggishness, but I do say that we have to outdo ourselves and gauge our efforts by the needs and by the advantages of success. I believe that what I say is God's truth.

On the basis of these facts, it seems to me that you must do two things. First, allocate at the proper time 3,000 francs with no strings attached. Were you to abstain, too many would follow your example. Secondly, that you use your influence to obtain from the monies pledged the sums most urgently needed. It is better to make sacrifices than to allow the project to stagnate.

Now if, as I am given to understand, this last suggestion is not necessary and if the pledges and the monetary gifts are sufficient, then naturally your unconditional subscription could be deferred; you may even be the last to contribute if your influence is such that all have fulfilled their pledges.

I do not intend to develop a financial plan, but I think I get the general idea, especially when a man of your caliber is implicated. I wish the funds needed to rebuild the house of God were not already tied up, but it was never my policy to build reserves at a time when eloquent ruins do not allow us to put off the work for another day. However, whenever it is necessary, one project will come to the assistance of another. This is another reason we do not need to worry unduly in our undertakings.

I regret the length of some of these details. I wish I could say to you, as the apostles did to the first Christians, that God is our help and our strength, the rest is nothing. I pray God will give you courage, just as God gave you the inspiration to embark upon this project. I pray for you and your town.

*

Extract from the first part of the letter to M. de Lacaussade

He praises his prudence, is satisfied with the premises, does not approve the repairs made by the proprietor and finds them useless.

What about the secrecy to be maintained until the operation is concluded and the needed funds procured? The secrecy is enjoined upon us by the compromise which made it all possible, but which does not exclude a later unveiling. The funds are not to come from a founder; he has launched many an enterprise, but the stream must not be congested.

A compromise is necessary, and it is to be followed by an appeal to all zealous souls and by trust in Providence. For his own security and in order to stay within his means, he reserves the right to withdraw within the first three months. Funds will be sought once we are in control of the property. If Providence does not intervene, the deal is off.

* * *

S. 129b. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

January 3, 1820, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Your last letter convinced me that the proposed project no longer created any difficulty between us, that it was now up to you. Your last letter also proves that you wasted no time but expedited everything with praiseworthy prudence. In spite of the preliminary planning, we should expect something to go wrong somewhere. Now to my mind, nothing has gone amiss in the most essential part. I mean, your opinion of the quarters which you still claim to be sufficient and nicely located.

I note also that the price and the terms are not quite the same as first quoted. On the whole, I find something good and something bad in the new proposals. I leave it up to you to get the best possible deal. However, here are the points upon which I want you to insist.

The cost. It would be preferable to pay half in two years and the rest in four. The buyer should have the option of paying it all sooner, after proper notice, provided each payment amounts to not less than one-fourth of the total. I think you see the advantage of that condition, and I need not explain. Under the above terms, the first payment should be made after more than one year because we would see to the cleaning and the necessary repairs to the edifice immediately after occupancy.

If the terms of the sale, with the above proviso, and the inspection by a third party do not seem feasible to you, then abandon the project. I do not believe your trip to Agen would help. A comparison would be of no use because the quarters presently occupied by our ladies is not the model we should follow. They are on the verge of leaving it for another which has just been purchased. This is the former convent of the Augustinians with its adjacent gardens and fields. In the house everything remains to be done, even the chapel or oratory, but we are about to see to it. As for you, keep working at the rest homes.

Concerning the project I mentioned to you on how to create enthusiasm with the help of our Divine Master, I merely want to be sure that my plan is not revealed too soon; this means the bill of sale, a private agreement, stipulates that the public contract will not come into effect before three months, an interval which will allow me to make all necessary arrangements. Also the secretary of our Sodality is about to leave for Agen and less important points, and both coming and going he will spend at least half a day in our town. Arrange with him whatever is most advisable. I told him to be perfectly frank with you about my attitude, and I do not doubt that between you, you will forestall any future embarrassment. Give me all the facts so that an unflinching decision can be made and a review of the case would be superfluous.

I am sending you through the secretary a little parcel which your mother sent me, knowing that I was sending someone to the high country. I also profit by this opportunity to give you my very best wishes for health and happiness during the new year, a happiness which we find

in the bosom of God in this world, just as it is promised to us in the next. May God bless your project.

* * *

S. 132a. To Bro. David Monier

January 26, 1820, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Friend, how is your health? I am enclosing the letter from M. de Lacaussade; you could answer by the noon mail. I am afraid I will not be able this morning to attend to the business of the settlement. I must spend the morning at many other things. In any case, I will see you before nightfall, and I will not leave you until everything is settled.

Brother Collineau's ordination date has been fixed. Accept my blessing.

* * *

S. 136. To M. de Lacaussade

April 3, 1820, Bordeaux

. . . M. David, on his return, if he is not already at Tonneins. . .

If he were at Tonneins, but without it, he could write to Agen and send the form with your address; you would have it in a couple of days, and then you could go ahead. With this same post I am writing to Mlle de Trenquelléon and asking her to comply with what Brother David says or writes.

This young lady, Mlle Yannach, co-purchaser, is the one. . .

P.S. Just as I was about to mail this letter, I received one from Brother David in Agen. He praises the acquisition in Tonneins and adds, "But it does not seem that M. de Lacaussade wants to take the purchase upon himself unless he has a guarantee. He spoke to me of the Mother at Agen; I thought on the contrary that Mother and the others would be fully occupied with their new enterprise and that the desired secrecy forbade my mentioning it."

Sir, why hesitate to go ahead? The letter I am sending to Mother de Trenquelléon is in an envelope addressed to the lady in question, who will transmit it. Come to an understanding with him; either way, the risk is the same. A little more trust in the Lord; this is God's work.

* * *

S. 139. To Mother de Trenquelléon

May 29, 1820, Bordeaux

My dear Child,

You did well to accept Mlle Virginie Drenne. She will be a boarder within the community. She seems desirous of following the exercises with the postulants, so there are no complications thus far. When she comes, suggest she do just that. If she were to aspire after anything else, which I doubt, let me know. However, do not have her undergo any of the trials of the postulants unless she expressly wants to. As a result of the latest favors from Saint Joseph, I am able to guarantee you 3,000 francs. These are not the 3,000 of Sister Anne, but what is the difference?

The temporary interruption of your occupations. . .

P.S. There will be many opportunities to communicate with Bordeaux after the fair to be held at Agen. Sister Sacred Heart can write and tell me everything she thinks will interest me.

* * *

S. 141a. To M. Barrès, Vicar General

June 17, 1820, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

I would like to have a brief interview with you some time before six or seven this evening. I tried unsuccessfully last evening. If you have reason to go to the convent of the Sacred Heart, I would be greatly obliged if you were to stop here in passing. Or tell me at what time I can have the honor of an interview with you at your residence.

I am most respectfully, Monsieur, your very humble and obedient servant.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 143. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

July 12, 1820, Bordeaux

P.S. M. Marty has written to me. I will tell you about it at some other time.

* * *

S. 144. To Mlle Laure de Labordère, Laval

Before July 13, 1820, Bordeaux

1. You will make no general or extraordinary Confession; you will accuse yourself of no serious sin of your past life under the pretext of greater self-revelation.
2. When in doubt about whether you have confessed a sin of your past, do not accuse yourself of it now.
3. Be convinced that you have not willingly entertained bad thoughts unless freely consented actions followed. Under no pretext must you accuse yourself of impure thoughts, still less explain them in the confessional.
4. *Always preserve the peace of your soul. . . .*

* * *

S. 144a. To Bro. David Monier

October 5, 1820, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

If M. Lassime will accept 5,000 francs in payment and allow the interest to accrue, he can have the amount in cash tomorrow. Since the loans mature later than I thought, I will make all the arrangements. Half the interest demanded by M. Lassime will be used to discount the notes.

My dear Friend, I beg you to tell M. Lassime to make up his mind and not wait until it is too late. It is now four o'clock; if M. Lassime has not seen you or if he has retired, please call him.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 147. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

November 19, 1820, Bordeaux

It is possible that they will reach Agen on Wednesday evening.

M. Menville had already loaded his trunk when your letter arrived. His aptitudes must not be judged by the letter he wrote to M. Dardy; the latter was indiscreet in showing it. M. Menville can be most useful to him if he knows how to approach him. I did not insist with M. Dardy that he take him on. Every time he told me M. Menville could do the job, I always stated for him the precautions he would need to take, etc. Moreover, he will do as he sees fit. The young man will leave, just as he asked me to. It is only after M. Dardy's letter in answer to M. Menville that the latter left M. Godon.

If M. Dardy has lost two boarders, it is not because of the teacher or of the letter. The loss predates the letter, and M. Dardy blames only the bad atmosphere in the convent. M. Dardy thereby proves the flimsiness of the charge.

I hope it will not be difficult for you to persuade. . . .

* * *

S. 154a. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

April 6, 1821, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Yesterday I received your notice that 4,000 francs would be delivered by courier. I received the sum this morning. I had prepared everything. Here, in short, is how I proceeded. I had Brother Clouzet rewrite notes maturing at different dates, six months being the shortest term. I negotiated these notes at 4% per annum using neither broker nor legal paper. Since Brother Clouzet was paying 5% interest, I added 1,000 francs to the sum of the notes merely because of the difference in interest rates. Had I been loaned only 5,000 francs as I asked, the three of us—M. Lapanze, M. Rothéa, and I—would have furnished each 1,000 francs.

However, the 4,000 francs will be useful, I hope. In general, it is difficult to borrow money except at exorbitant rates. But for gilt-edged securities or a sure investment, money can easily be found and at a moderate interest. Some people are kind enough to consider my signature as a good guarantee.

It is too late to write to our good superior, for the postman is about to pass. Please give her and her community my heartfelt paternal greetings and tell her she may accept Babet Corday as a boarding postulant. I will come back to this at some other time.

Please tell Brother Laugeay and the convent no longer to address anything to M. Richon. I am forever being asked when you will return. I would have sent you an obedience long ago, but I was afraid you would not be in a receptive mood. This fear I carry about with me, for I do not know the reasons for your prolonged stay. Had I been better informed, I might have been able to help you free yourself sooner. Brother Lalanne advanced to the sub-diaconate tomorrow. May the Lord grant you his help and his grace.

* * *

S. 154b. To M. Louis Rothéa

April 27, 1821, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

Monsieur,

I had a talk with M. Duguet about the error that slipped into our agreement. He is favorable to all our previous arrangements—that is, I would give him 114 francs for each of the 2,000 pages of fine print, and also 100 francs per sheet for each of the other 2,000 sheets; for the last 1,000 I would not pay for the composition, which he set at 30 francs.

His honesty and frankness incline me not to hold him strictly to this agreement. I suggested a rebate of 10 francs per sheet for the fine print and 7 francs 10 sols for the pages in typescript, “*petit romain*,” which means that I will give him 161 francs per sheet for the 3,000 sheets of fine print, and for each of the 3,000 in *petit romain* 142 francs and 50 centimes, or 142 francs 10 sols. In truth, if I had not believed there was an advantage in printing 1,000 sheets more I would not have ordered it. M. Duguet is aware that I hesitated greatly, both because the sum involved will be tied up for an unknown number of years and because the book is not exactly as I wanted it.

In any case, I want to see this thing through and to continue giving M. Duguet some work; on my behalf, make him the proposals I have suggested. If he accepts them, as I hope he will, have him correct the contract or accept the one outlined in this letter. If he refuses, which is not likely, then he can consider my offer as null and void.

P.S. If it is not too late, ask M. Duguet to include among the various prayers the apology to the Sacred Heart taken from the “Christian’s day,” page 320; the only change to made is this double title: “Apology to the Sacred Heart, or Visit to the Blessed Sacrament.”

I am sending a Rule of Life to M. Duguet. He can include it at the end of the Manual. I have just this moment received a note from him. He says he paid out 500 francs on Monday. I did not expect him to spend such a sum so soon; however, if he needs the money, I will see that he gets it.

* * *

S. 155. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

May 6, 1832, Bordeaux

P.S. I am sending an obedience to Brother David. I will give an answer to the old and yet still young Sister of Charity Marie Songe; let her wait in peace.

* * *

S. 162a. To M. Lala, at Sarlat

June 23, 1821, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Nephew,

I have just time enough to send you Firmin’s letter; signs of hope have appeared in the last few days. Let us be patient; I will shortly share some of my thoughts about his welfare, provided his conduct is satisfactory. Give my friendly greeting to Sophie.

* * *

S. 162b.. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

June 26, 1821, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

It was always understood that the lodge would be kept. It is to be expected that it will be of some use later, not only as a deterrent to thieves and scoundrels but as a place of rest during certain recreations. It should be remarked that any repairs that are made must not prejudice its later usefulness. Go ahead, then; you could have done so without consulting me. It would have sufficed to tell me that you found the repairs necessary and that they would cost 250 francs.

I wonder if her lack of experience led Mother Teresa to have recourse only once to Mme Verdier. Suggest that she do so more frequently during her illness. If it seems serious enough, daily recourse would not be too frequent.

To give you an answer to the boarding house problem is not that simple. Should we hold out the hope that boarders will be accepted? Of course, soon, after the grape harvest. Should we take advantage of the fine season and gather the materials? Before answering in the affirmative, I wish you could have M. David leave Agen for two or three days, if he cannot leave permanently. The cost of these short trips is minimal when one has the time to make a round trip, or to use a public vehicle. I will write to him immediately after this letter, if possible. While you are there you could also discuss from every angle the project for a boys' school. This will save me time as I wait before deciding. I will ask the Lord to bless these projects, the town of Tonneins, etc.

* * *

S. 163. To Archbishop d'Aviau of Bordeaux

July 7, 1821, Bordeaux

. . . the impossibility of meeting the expenses if the separation. . .

[I am forced to take this stand for the general good, also because of the impossibility of making this expense. However, Your Excellency, I believe I should inform you that since last year, I owe ---francs which I borrowed from the Society at Rue des Menuts in order to help the young Auvergnats. I was hoping to pay this debt by reactivating the pledges which have been neglected since Brother Collineau left for the seminary. Besides, I have --francs to pay because of the extraordinary expenses we had this year, some of these resulting from our work with the first communicants which had not been discussed with me or with Brother Collineau. Do you think, Your Excellency, that in all justice I should be deprived of resources on which I counted, that I should be burdened with debts; or on the contrary, do you not think these gentlemen who have taken over the work and who are now receiving the contributions, for instance the Prefect, etc., should bear these expenses? They may take all the time they need to repay the ---francs.]

Thus, Your Excellency, a word on your part. . .

* * *

S. 165. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

July 10 1821, Bordeaux

. . . by reason of the fervor of these good Carmelites.

[My dear Son, yesterday I received a letter from M. de Lacaussade asking that I write to you, using his address at Tonneins. I did write on Sunday (the day before yesterday). Your letter of Sunday evening and a careful study of our situation induce me to come to a decision with respect to the proposed boarding establishment in Tonneins. I am writing to M. de Lacaussade with this post. I will copy or have copied that letter and will enclose it with this one, for your guidance. Consider null and void anything in my letters to Agen or in those you will find at Tonneins which is contrary to what I will write immediately to M. de Lacaussade. I will stop for the moment.

* * *

S. 166. To M. de Lacaussade
July 10, 1821, Bordeaux

This process is helpful to the donor.

However, a short written agreement must guide you from the outset. At appropriate times you may provide donors with receipts.

I am stopping now. . .

* * *

S. 168. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon
July 24, 1821, Bordeaux

. . . avoid advancing blindly or, as it were, feeling our way.

I received a short note from Brother David. The manuals left on Saturday in the care of a trustworthy boatman. They will be eight days on the way; even though the way-bill specifies seven days, the boatman asked for eight, and I agreed.

I hope to leave next Monday. . . .

P.S. I wrote to the director of the Sodality in Pau, intimating that he was to ask the parents of Mlle Figarol to allow her to come to the convent at Agen for the week during which I will be there. I am not counting on it, but if she does come, I hope she will be well received by Sister Xavier.

* * *

S. 170. To M. de Lacaussade
August 8, 1821, Bordeaux

I hope we will go to Tonneins on August 16.

I have seen to it that Sister Cathérine's elder sister stays in the convent; the younger will be lodged in town and put to the test.

Accept, Sir, I beg of you. . .

*

P.S. Brother David offers you a token. . .

M. Lacoste will take care of your bills. I will see to it that you get your answer, should he not give it to me in time for me to forward it to you before my departure. M. Lacoste is very busy.

* * *

S. 172a. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins
August 28, 1821, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

In spite of my straitened circumstances and the fact that, in view of your generosity, I did not expect another bill, I will accept and pay your bill for 500 francs. On my trip to Verdélais I was unable to obtain a preacher for your parish. I will try again at the very first opportunity. I

must also make greater efforts to obtain a loan, either in Paris, Bordeaux, or some other commercial center; this is a delicate matter.

The sub-prefect of Marmande received me with great courtesy and assured me of his protection for all our establishments in the territory under his jurisdiction. He would have liked to have a system of free elementary schools set up in Marmande. There is a building which is not bad, but it will require extensive repairs for which presently there are no funds. It seems he will try to raise money by subscription; he will be the first to contribute.

In the last two mail deliveries, Brother David informs me that the general council of the department has put us in charge of all the elementary instruction in the department of Lot-et-Garonne. Brother David committed himself, to begin with, for the four chief towns: Agen, Villeneuve, Nérac, and Marmande. Several council members petitioned for their hometowns. It grieves me not to see Tonneins on the list; we have been negotiating for over a month now. I would really like to see Tonneins get the preference. I am merely giving you a general idea, for I myself do not know all the details. The minutes of the meeting are not yet available. My information is based on some jottings.

P.S. I am pressed for time so that I cannot write to the convent, but I am keeping it in mind.

* * *

S. 173. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

(sequel to vol. 1, part 2, p. 356)???

September 21, 1821, Bordeaux

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, Missionary Apostolic, approved by the Ordinary, Superior of the Institute of Mary, to our Daughters of the aforesaid Order who are established in the city and diocese of Agen, peace and mercy in the Lord.

Following the remonstrances which were made to me concerning various articles of furniture which certain members bring with them into a house of the Order when they enter as postulants or novices, and on the return or restitution of these same items when the occasion presents itself, I have believed it useful to make the following regulations, applicable to the house in question.

Article 1. A house may not receive any furniture or movable property from a postulant, a novice, or any other candidate admitted on probation unless an inventory in duplicate is made, one copy to be kept by the Mother Superior and the other by the candidate who brings in the aforesaid furniture.

Article 2. The inventories in duplicate of the furniture and movable property of those candidates who were admitted before these presents, and which were not drawn up, will be drawn up at the latest within the week following the reception of the present ruling; the Mother Superior will acknowledge reception of said regulation.

Article 3. A candidate who is withdrawn by her parents, or who leaves of her own volition if she has come of age, and for whatever reason, will take along all the belongings she brought with her. She will acknowledge reception of these at the bottom of her duplicate inventory, which she will then surrender.

Article 4. Any monies the candidate may have brought will be noted in the inventory, and restitution will be duly made of the amount along with the rest, except for the amount agreed upon for room and board covering the duration of her stay in the house.

Article 5. Those candidates who declare that they have made their wills with the proviso "that their heirs will have right to their movable property, either on the word of Mme de Batz de Trenquelléon or without inventory," or who would otherwise have disposed of the said furniture

on behalf of one or more residents of the convent, are alone dispensed from the obligation of making a duplicate inventory and of leaving a copy with the Mother Superior.

Article 6. The Mother Superior of the convent of Agen is charged with the execution of this order.

Done at Bordeaux on September 21, the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-one.

* * *

S. 174a. To M. Barrès, Bordeaux

October 1, 1821, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

I have the honor of offering M. Barrès the sincere testimony of my deep respect and of remarking that I would have dissuaded the Fathers of Families from writing that letter if the bishop had not seemed inclined to support them by allowing them to hope for a fixed date on which to visit the prisons.

G.-J. Chaminade

* * *

S. 180. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

December 4, 1821, Bordeaux

. . . spread to all our beloved Daughters.

[P.S. I was about to seal this letter when I received the enclosure. My dear Child, see what you can answer this young woman. I have informed her through her brother that she should henceforth correspond with you. I know nothing more about her than what is contained in that letter, that she is not from Marsillac where she is living with her father, that she works in a tax bureau but at Gap. Only after a lengthy correspondence, I surmise, will you know what to do. In the district of Gap there are many young women who are well off and who lean toward the religious life. We must not dismiss them too hastily.]

* * *

S. 185. To Mother Saint-Vincent

December 20, 1821, Bordeaux

My dear Daughter,

Follow your brother's advice. Write off that debt of 4,500 francs by selling the claim you have in Paris.

I have no recollection of Rosine Malespine, and still less of having accepted her.

You are right in fearing to see subjects enter. . .

* * *

S. 186. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

December 20, 1821, Bordeaux

. . . to return to Bethlehem (?)

[I will write to Tonneins, to Mother Thérèse on behalf of Sister Ursule and perhaps also to the latter. I enclose Brother David's answer in the case of Sister Cathérine; I like it.]

I may have let myself go. . .

* * *

S. 186. To the Companion/Novice (???) Sisters

January 10, 1822, Bordeaux

“ . . . and peace upon the earth to all those who are of good will.”

Mlle Gayet acted wisely in choosing to become a Sister of the Presentation and to prepare for her acceptance.

I say this again. . .

* * *

S. 188. To Bro. Louis Rothéa, Ribeuuillé

January 25, 1822, Bordeaux

. . . as we will have in receiving you.

Your brother has surely spoken to you about the Ligorists. The little that I know about them comes from excerpts taken from the writings of their founder, who was beatified. If they are truly religious and if they are ready to give up their philosophical system, I would accept them with pleasure into the Institute. It is said that the writings, and especially the system that appears under his signature, are not really his. In any case, I want to systematization, especially not in the field of ethics.

Your brother will answer the various points you bring up in your interesting letters. *What he will surely not tell you. . .*

* * *

S. 189. To Father Foziède

February 10, 1822, Bordeaux

. . . the indulgence granted by the bulls of the Sovereign Pontiffs. . .

[As part of the second step, Reverend Director, the candidate will come to you for Confession. She will make a general Confession of all her failings, followed by an act of sincere contrition. Then as you bless her, she???)you will pronounce the words, “By the authority bested in me, I hereby empower you to share in all the graces, privileges, and indulgences which the Apostolic See has granted to our pious association, in the name of the Father, of the Son, etc.”]

I beg of you kindly. . .

* * *

S. 189a. To Mlle de Courrèges, Pau

February 10, 1822, Bordeaux

(Rough Draft, Agmar)

My dear Daughter, for I may call you that the moment you become the Head of one of our Sodalities; I have no doubt that you will perform your functions as prefect to the general satisfaction. The goodness of Our Lord is my assurance, and his grace will never be lacking when

you need it to promote his own work. Be faithful to it, my dear Daughter. I will recommend this intention especially to our Good Ford.??? From the bottom of my heart I ask him to give you every blessings.

* * *

S. 191. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

March 19, 1822, Bordeaux

I hope to speak longer of you to the Good God than I will speak. . .

I am exactly of the same opinion as the council. Several times I was on the point of writing the same thing to you or to Mother Teresa; I was absolutely against any other decision. I did write to her, but I was not at all pleased with the answer she gave me through, I believe, Mother Teresa. Write to Mother Teresa that she must tell her, as gently as possible, that she is free, that she can put of the habit and withdraw. Send Sister Angélique only after Sister Ursula has left. Should the latter remain in Tonneins, Sister Angélique must have no dealings with her. You have made the correct decision in the case of Mlle Latourette. You may admit the young woman temporarily, since she appears to interest you so much. You can tell me more about her shortly.

We must never drive to the limit. . .

* * *

S. 192a. To Bishop Croÿ Solre of Strasbourg

March 23, 1822, Bordeaux ¹

(Autograph, Agmar)

In the midst of your exalted and important functions, will Your Excellency remember his friend from Bordeaux, from Gascony? O, how grateful I am to you for having given me permission to enter the Institute of Mary, which was born actually⁸ on the banks of the Garonne. I can find no words to adequately express my joy, and I owe it all to you. When will I see the good which is being done in the land of the Garonne also being accomplished in the Rhine country? You are familiar with the work that is being done at Ribeauvillé and the progress of the new novitiate. The purpose of this letter is not to give you details, which only Father Mertian should share with you.

A worthy priest, who told me that he was your protégé while he was in Paris and who is actually preaching the Lenten sermons at Notre Dame in Bordeaux, visited me in my solitude. I do not understand the impulse which led him to offer to transmit one of my letters to you. I cannot relieve that he wanted a recommendation to Your Excellency from someone as insignificant as I am. I was most happy to oblige because this gave me an opportunity to express to you my hearty and well-deserved thanks and my deepest gratitude.

* * *

S. 192b. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

April 4 1822, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

¹ This is an autograph rough draft by Fr. Chaminade; but the author is really Louis Rothéa. It is included here because it contributes to an understanding of his spirit.

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, Honorary Canon of the metropolitan church of Bordeaux, residing at no. 2, Rue de Lalande, do ratify and confirm everything that has been done to date by my proxy, who is named below, for the establishment, the administration, and the curriculum of the Free Schools set up in the town of Agen in the house known as the Refuge, department of Lot-et-Garonne, after I personally visited the said schools and found them conformable to my designs.

As in the past, I again appoint as my general and special proxy with the power of attorney M. David Monier, lawyer, to whom I delegate the power to act in my name and to do what is necessary and appropriate to give the aforesaid schools the greatest stability and proficiency possible, and also to found similar establishments in the towns of Marmande, Nérac, and Villeneuve-sur-Lot, also in all the other cities and chief towns designated to him by the civil authorities, to see that each and every one of these establishments will be administered from a central location according to the same principles and under a unified command.

To this end, he is to address to His Majesty our King and to all those who hold delegated authority and enjoy his trust and who would be acquainted with the fact the Petitions, Memorandums, Statutes, and the articles of the Rule required for the purpose mentioned above, giving details, developing the principles if necessary, even consenting to any modifications and submitting to any condition which could be imposed for the public order and safety. Also, if necessary, to accept the help either of the local authorities, of the administration of the department, or again of all persons disposed to further this kind of work.

Meanwhile, to take any provisional measures which the circumstances may dictate. Petition His Majesty for the edict necessary to erect the institution in question, and by reason of all the foregoing, of the circumstances and consequences, to draw up and sign all documents, agree to all conditions, submit all proposals, set up residence, and in general do everything that I would do myself, forbidding him only the substitution of promising, etc. . . . obliging, etc. . . . giving up, etc. . . .

Done at Bordeaux under my personal seal this fourth day of April, in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-two.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

S. 193. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

April 18, 1822, Bordeaux

Nevertheless, the thing must be thoroughly examined. . .

The demand by the convent for a loan of 4,000 francs to help pay the 8,000 francs to the American leads me to believe that those 8,000 francs are due immediately, that all formalities have been completed, etc; otherwise you could have borrowed from various funds, for instance 1,000 francs which would have been repaid if in the interval the convent had received nothing that could be used as a refund.

The frost has done us great harm. . .

* * *

S. 195. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

April 26, 1822, Bordeaux

P.S. I am surprised that you said nothing about the approbation, which is so essential. I do not have the time to reread my letter.

* * *

S. 196. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

April 30, 1822, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

I will dispense with any remarks, which would be useless anyway, on the necessity under which you labor of waiting for the prefect. I understood you to say that with a loan of 4,000 francs until August, the convent would be able to repay, although with difficulty, what is owed to the American woman.

The father of M. Dûnes, the deacon, came to Bordeaux. Nothing new of a serious nature transpired, but I judged it best that the son leave with his father; both were happy with my decision. I immediately informed Father Mouran and asked him to communicate with the archbishop, etc. My letter arrived at Agen before the young man had rejoined his family. His Excellency must have been relieved to find that you knew nothing of the story behind this candidate.

You say there is no management in the free schools. . .

*

. . . always with wisdom and moderation.

In your account of this new obstacle, you could have skipped the part played by M. Larodère.

Let us do what we can. . .

*

Far from being able to give you this news by the present mail. . .

Even though I foresaw the expense, I find that as soon as I lay down this pen, I must send 600 francs to cover it.

You are probably reserving for yourself. . .

* * *

S. 197. To Father Maimbourg, Colmar

May 9, 1822, Bordeaux

. . . is the Sisters of Providence would have to suffer as a result.

From your description of the situation, I conclude that in Colmar you have a system of Christian schools for young girls and that you have entrusted the direction to these nuns rather than to the Sisters of Providence, who run schools of this type. The distinction may appear metaphysical, yet I deem it extremely important.

If the German sisters have a true religious spirit and if they comply with the Method in their work, there is nothing to prevent them from entering the Institute of Mary as Companion Sisters, as we way. The same thing could happen to the French nuns, if they had that calling and no irrevocable commitments. If they did enter, it is likely that they would not stay in Colmar, but they would be dispersed among other communities.

\ I believe your German nuns and our French nuns would not find themselves too discomfited if they were together at Colmar and I were to appoint a superiors of German origin. I speak of a woman who is well liked and regarded by both religious and the public. It is said that God fashioned her with great generosity, whether in her physical beauty, in her solid and general common sense, or in the kindness of her heart. Her virtue far surpasses her natural qualities. She

is presently superior of the convent of Tonneins. Her German mother spends her time in prayer and is living in seclusion in the convent of Agen; she has no responsibilities.

*

. . . if the collège were directed by religious of the same Institute!

2. We have a small number of good religious who could provide the needed help; we hope to have more shortly. Here is what could be done. (1) M. Baumlin, principal; (2) the seminary of Strasbourg would provide the teachers we need. This would enable us to get through the first year. I know that M. Baumlin turned down the position as principal of the *collège*, that he has been ill and is looking forward to his retirement. However, he might accept if he were to enter the Institute because then (1) I would give him a good vice-principal who could become principal in a short time; he is too young to be appointed now. (2) M. Baumlin could retire in Bordeaux when the time came. When he knows more about the Institute, he will see that in Bordeaux he will find all that he needs.

As far as personnel to be obtained from the seminary of Strasbourg is concerned, that should not be too difficult, whether on the part of the worthy superior who directs the house or of the Prince, your Bishop, who would gladly approve anything we could do for that important portion of his diocese.

Here you have, Reverend Father, the few reflections. . .

* * *

S. 200. To Bro. David Monier

June 7, 1822, Bordeaux

P.S. M. Trocard would like to get all the information possible on Pierre Coulet the younger, farmer, of the parish of Sauvagnac in the canton of Roque, department of Lot-et-Garonne. Sauvagnac is at most two leagues from Agen. M. Mouran, to whom I extend my hearty greetings, will easily be able to render this simple service.

I wanted to write to the superior of Agen, but the Verdélais problem took up all my time. I will not forget her or all my dear Daughters. I hope to be able to send them a few good candidates. My respects to M. and Mme Lacoste and their fine family.

* * *

S. 205. To Bro. David Monier, Agen

June 21 1822, Bordeaux

We must take care not to miss each other.

The superior of Agen and the entire convent are distressed because Sister of the Incarnation has been suffering from a bad cold for the past six weeks. This sister's health is very delicate. Perhaps she, better than the doctor, can indicate what precautions should be used to recover her health.

Whatever accommodations furnished us. . .

* * *

S. 209. To Mother Saint-Vincent, Agen

August 16, 1822, Bordeaux

. . . but with neither trouble nor disquietude

The simplest thing to do, it seems to me, is to invite M. Lacoste to come and see you; then you can tell him, very simply, the story of the bank draft. It is to be expected that he will invest it for you until November 25 at the rate to which you have a right. Neither M. Barsalon nor any other stockbroker has more solid stocks in his briefcase. You can consider M. Lacoste as your temporal father—I mean the temporal father of the convent. Let me know everything that is happening.

Let Father Mouran follow the promptings of his heart in his dealings with M. Darfront. Ask him only to let you know when, urged by his goodness, he intends to advance you the money.

During my stay in Tonneins. . .

*

. . . full of selfishness, seems to live but for herself.

I have to stop here. Perhaps Father Collineau and Brother David will go to the convent looking for possible letters. If I can, I will write to them from Villeneuve.

May the blessings of heaven come upon the Good Mother. . .

* * *

S. 211. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

September 24, 1822, Bordeaux

I will begin with your last letters.

It is unfortunate that the matter of the three postulants is not revolved. What a loss of time, and what interior commotion in the community as a whole! God be praised. Let us again discuss the three members, the topics of your last council meeting. . .

1. Sister Angélique. . .

* * *

S. 215a. To Bishop Jacoupy of Agen

October 29, 1822, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

Excellency,

I believe it was in May that I detected in M. Choppy des Anges an inclination toward the religious state; he entered the Institute of Mary last year. I wrote to the superior of the seminary of Limoges on the matter and asked for his permission to withdraw. He was gracious and sent it to me. I have kept it to this day, for I had no reason to present it sooner to Your Excellency.

For some time now M. Choppy has been expressing his regrets, Excellency, at having deferred so long the reception of the Holy Orders of the diaconate and the priesthood. I was about to ask you to accept him in your major seminary, but when I broached the subject to him, I was surprised that he preferred to go to the major seminary in Agen. He gave me several weighty reasons for his choice. I urged him to see you personally and to ask to be accepted as a priest of your diocese, to give his reasons for enter the major seminary of Agen, and to wait with respect and submission for your orders.

With sentiments of deepest respect and most humble obedience. . .

* * *

S. 215b. To the Rector of the University

November 9, 1822, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Monsignor,

I have already had the honor of recommending to your consideration Father Collineau as the future principal of the *collège* of Villeneuve-sur-Lot. Your Excellency was kind enough to appoint Father Collineau to the post we had chosen for him. I was all the more pleased at this favor as it contributed, I believe, to the restoration of the schools in the Lot regions, in the areas of the fine arts, morality, and religion.

Today I feel it is my duty to draw Your Excellency's attention to an incident related to this same *collège* of Villeneuve. It is the purpose of this letter, and here are the facts.

In his desire to acquit himself faithfully of his charge, the young principal of Villeneuve surrounded himself with teachers, prefects, and collaborators to whom discerning people did not object too strenuously. It is one of the most indispensable conditions that they are to contribute to the installation of good and strict discipline, which is so important.

Professor Clamejanes was promoted and appointed titular teacher of one of the most important classes in the school. However, last year M. Clamejanes was the object of censure; it was even said that criticism of his conduct on a certain occasion was public and widespread. Whether he is fully responsible for these incidents or not, a change will be useful both to him and to the school. This truth is much more self-evident in the region than elsewhere.

This change, which was requested by the young principal, could be refused only on the basis of insufficient evidence, or because of some error which escapes us at the moment. There is danger, and imminent danger, for the school, for you are justly considered, Monsignor, as the one who revived serious study. He wrote to me about his case because I suggested that he be given the position, because I alone persuaded him to accept, and because he considers it his religious duty to be docile to me as a disciple is to his first teacher.

I may not deprive him of my intercession, however ineffectual it may be under the circumstances. I can certainly add nothing to what your farsightedness will dictate for the good of morality and religion. The public censure, whether well-founded or not, which is leveled at M. Clamejanes requires that he be changed. A transfer is even more useful and necessary today because the principal of the *collège* was obliged to report on M. Clamejanes and to declare that in his opinion, the young teacher was guilty of unbecoming conduct. The mind of the young principal was swayed by a wish to placate public opinion, and he had to do his duty. I no longer consider the collaboration between teacher and principal a possibility, and this sorry situation is another misfortune added to the public disfavor into which the teacher has fallen. The restoration of this interesting school could be forever aborted or indefinitely adjourned.

In the case of a transfer, could the difficulty of finding a new teacher be used as a pretext? The simple answer to this would be that the principal of Villeneuve will procure the services of a teacher with acceptable capacity and morality. If necessary, I would like to vouch for the promise made to Your Excellency, because you are aware of the objectives I pursue in this matter and that my preoccupation for many years now has been to form teachers who instruct both by their example and their doctrine, in matters touching morality, religion, and respect for our king.

If there was a time when my students thought it prudent to remain in the shadows, this precaution was no longer necessary the moment Your Excellency became the mouthpiece, the sponsor, and in a way the very soul of that most precious department of higher administration. At your appointment, we felt that the king had just conferred the greatest boon on all the subjects of his kingdom.

I intimated to Father Collineau that he was to take up his new post without delay. My offer of a substitution because of the teacher transfer that is requested is a second concession. I make no reference to others, which will be discussed in due course. Those of my disciples whose competence would assure them a place on the faculty of the university would be disenchanted if they were forced to associate in some district or other with men whom sound public opinion would repudiate.

The transfer of M. Clamejanes, admittedly a proper move, may be a good thing for him, also. He would be spared the perhaps unmerited blame of which he is the victim. He will be happier elsewhere, and he deserves to be. There will be no interruption in the improvement of the *collège* of Villeneuve. The Academy of Cahors will not be unduly strained if they have someone who can fill the position; it will cost it nothing if we provide the teacher.

Without detriment to M. Clamejanes, I would like to remove the obstacle to the general welfare which his presence constitutes. I would even like to see him get credit for his goodwill, for by his consent to a transfer he contributes to the general good. If he did??? not consent, then the interests of an attractive and populous city, the restoration of the *collège* after years of neglect, would seem to demand it. It is up to you, Monsignor, in your wisdom to decide.

This letter provides me with the happy opportunity of expressing to Your Excellence the deepest sentiments of sincere esteem and respect which have animated??? for many years. . . .

P.S. Father Collineau must have expressed his hesitation to you as to the manner in which the children who claim to have Protestant parents must follow the religious exercises in his *collège*, for the city has offered these children neither temple nor minister nor religious instruction, unless they take advantage of those of the *collège*.

* * *

S. 220. To Bro. David Monier

January 18, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . *an injustice to the heirs who have no need of privations.*

On the other hand, it is true that the venerable Father's right to raise the price on delivery is permissible under civil law; however, his conscience cannot approve. He has promised to include the books that are not catalogued, and here is where we could negotiate; but the venerable Father will not. His director, M. Bournac, suggested that he insert the clause "the books not inscribed in the catalogue" because he was attached to them, he knew the value, and without this clause they would not have been sold or delivered.

The prompt and faithful carrying out of the contract. . .

* * *

S. 221a. To Father Conne, Bordeaux

February 29, 1823, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I am informed of the following two things concerning the library that is to be delivered. First, that you reject the two mediators who were to solve the problem. Then, that you feel it is necessary to have a well-known person, whose spiritual director you are, resolve the differences. I doubt whether either of these alternatives was conceived in your own mind. If someone suggested them to you, I know you will give them up after a little reflection. In any case, the decision is up to you. I want to have the matter settled, and I am asking you where you stand on both counts.

* * *

S. 226a. To Bro. David Monier

February 26, 1823, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, canon of the metropolitan church of Bordeaux, do appoint and constitute as my agent in general as well as in special matters M. David Monier, formerly a member of the bar of the city of Bordeaux, to whom I give the power in my stead to go to Vesoul, department of the Saône, and to other localities in the same department or of adjacent departments as the case may be, to take cognizance of whatever pertains to the château of Saint-Remy, of the estate and of the adjacent lands, to acquaint himself with the deeds and documents concerning the said properties on what they encompass and on the appurtenances, and to arrive at a price, set the terms, and agree to the same. Likewise to grant and agree on all reservations and suitable modifications as he will see fit; to arrange all mortgages, exceptions, subrogations, and to give and to accept all invoices and bills of sale, sign all papers, establish residence, to vary in whole or in part the powers given to him in these presents and in general to proceed with the negotiations with the present owners as I would, were I present, promising my approbation and committing myself to it conformably to the law.

Done by private contract in Bordeaux on Gebruary 26 in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-three.

* * *

S. 228. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

March 4, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . against the expenses to be made.

I will drop a line to M. Bardinet and ask him to take care of three different matters for me: the matter of the house at no. 3, that of Mme Dubroat, and also that of Mme de Laugeay. I will ask him to see you about the necessary information. Please advise the porter.

With this mail I am planning to direct. . .

*

Agen does not merit that a brother be assigned. . .

I almost feel like writing to M. de Lacaussade and asking him to pay the 300 francs interest he owes, unless I absolve him of the debt. Does the farmer who lived in the house just sold owe any back rent? Who owes that? Who will see the debts are paid? Allow Brother Rothéa to keep the draft for 1,400 francs and explain to him all the other papers he may need during your absence.

* * *

S. 230. To Father Bardenet, Besançon

March 4, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . acquainted me with your plans for Saint-Remy.

I do not know why I did not think of it. Unless I attribute this failure to the absolute confidence I have in the vicar general. I should have looked closer to home.

Be kind enough to excuse me from your heart. . .

* * *

S. 233. To Bro. David Monier

March 31, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . sorrow because Father Collineau believed himself obliged to dismiss. . .

He caught him in a serious offense against morality, reserved a place on the mail coach, and packed him off.

. . . Father Collineau would have liked you to notify Father de Vassal. . .

*

. . . if we recognize in him the required dispositions. . .

M. de Lacaussade has purchased a little vineyard for the convent of Tonneins; it is only a short distance from the convent and is valued at 3,000 francs. It was bought in the name of the superior. M. de Lacaussade will manage and care for it during his lifetime, will take form it the wine he needs, etc. In two hours I expect to receive someone who is to give me a small house to help with our schools. It is valued at between 2,000 francs and 100 louis. He thought I would need a notary, but I gave a pure and simple bill of sale with a simple contract.

M. Clément was so ineffectual a teacher that we believed it prudent to invite him to give up his class, which he did very willingly. He left without more ado for his native region. Today M. Bouzeran is substituting, but he is staying at the Madeleine. Finally, M. Dubosc returned all the papers concerning the house at no. 3, Rue Lalande. Father Bardenet turned them over to M. Pérèz, but I still believe it is better when I take care of things personally.

At Saint-Laurent everything is coming along. . .

* * *

S. 234. To Bro. David Monier

April 23-25, 1823, Bordeaux

The tenants of house no. 3. . .

The matter concerning Mme Dubroca was brought to a rather satisfactory conclusion; 300 francs were granted to the husband. The case of the Laugeay family is in progress. Father Bardenet fears that it may go to court.

I cannot tell how much. . .

* * *

S. 234a. To Father Bardenet

April 25, 1823, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Diploma of Affiliation

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, Missionary Apostolic and superior of the Institute of Mary, having received letters from Father Tharin, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Besançon asking whether we would be willing to found a central house of the Institute in the Saint-Remy area (district of Vesoul, canton of Amance, department of Haute-Saône in the aforesaid diocese, afterward, acting on our orders M. David, secretary general of the said Institute, our agent appointed to visit the aforementioned properties, turned in his report on April

4. It has been decided by me on the advice of my council that the establishment should be founded, and in consequence all measures taken to guarantee the foundation and its stability.

Considering that the report from our agent informs us that whatever advantages the establishment has to offer are due principally to the generosity, the zeal, and the piety of Father Bardenet, priest and member of the missionary society of Granpré near Besançon; he has read the report and knows the sentiments of Father Bardenet and his willingness to help in the development of the project and of the works of the Institute, as also the many good and sufficient testimonies he has given us, both of his Christian charity and of his wise and discreet prudence in all things.

By these presents, signed by our hand, we have affiliated the most honorable Father Bardenet to the Institute of Mary erected in Bordeaux under the title of the Immaculate Conception, and of which we are the director, so that the aforementioned now shares in the prayers, good works, and merits of the said Institute, and we ask him to say Mass once a month on the day of his choice, since he is dispensed because of his office and his priesthood from other prayers; all this conformably to the briefs granted by our Holy Fathers Pius VI and Gregory XIII, and by the Sovereign Pontiff gloriously reigning.

Done at Bordeaux on April 24, 1823, countersigned by our Secretary General.

* * *

S. 236. To Bro. David Monier, Besançon

May 21, 1823, Bordeaux

All of them took part in the meeting.

The matter of the Laugeay family seems to become more confused just as it was about to be cleared up. M. Reynier received 4,000 francs which he immediately turned over to Father Bardenet, who divided it into quarters; I was given 1,000 francs some hours before Brother Laugeay's sister received 3,000 francs. She claimed the money and declared that she would pay their father's debts. While waiting for further instructions in the matter, I sent the 1,000 francs to Brother Laugeay in Agen. Meanwhile, Mlle Laugeay withdrew the power of attorney from M. Reynier and also from her brother and her mother. She has taken things into her own hands and intends to manage everything. She will have nothing to do with Father Bardenet, either. She wants his files and has taken her own lawyer; M. Reynier (who had not wanted a commission) is now asking for one. Father Bardenet protested that he could not turn over the papers without your consent, and that you might want an honorarium especially for a consultation that you had granted. Another inquiry has just been opened by M. Desgrance, son-in-law of M. Martignac. A detailed report on all the incidents would be lengthy indeed. (1) Should the money be divided into three or four parts? I seem to remember your telling me that it would be in three parts and a little pension for the mother. (2) Should we give up the documents? (3) I think Brother Laugeay should keep as proxies both Father Bardenet and M. Reynier, otherwise we would lose the drift of the matter and any possibility of benefitting from the estate. (4) Brother Laugeay referred me to his will when I questioned him about the division into three or four parts; do you recall the terms of that will?

Father Caillet is in retreat.

* * *

S. 236a. To M. de Lacaussade

May 23, 1823, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Your letter, whose contents you had discussed with M. Lacoste, arrived via Agen. I have nothing to remark about the first item save to admire your shrewdness. We must wait until January 1, 1824. As to the second item, in order to hasten things I will have a copy made of the section of Brother Laugeay's letter which deals with it. I have to husband every minute of my time. I assure you of my sincere and respectful consideration.

Copy of Brother Laugeay's Letter

M. Lacoste showed me a letter he had received from M. de Lacaussade. It is addressed to you, but M. de Lacaussade wanted M. Lacoste to take note of its contents. You will find it opened and enclosed. It deals with the project of the free schools for Tonneins. M. Lacoste would have liked to write to you himself on that and on other topics, but he is too busy. He told me orally what he wanted you to know and asked me to write to you today, for the matter is important.

The General Council will meet next month. M. Lacoste, who will draft the various documents, must hand in his manuscript in a few days to the prefect. The latter informed M. Lacoste that the question of our school had to come again before the council, not in view of any aid to the schools of Agen but to plan the founding of new schools in other departmental districts. We must appreciate the fact that the prefect has made these overtures and not turn a deaf ear, but rather be thankful and try to profit by them.

This is what I think and what I advise M. Lacoste. Since the towns of Marmande and Nérac expressed no desire to profit by their allocations, the prefect told M. Lacoste that he would give more funds to Villeneuve. M. Lacoste replied that Tonneins had presented a petition for its school and that it would be normal to give it first consideration. The prefect did not discard the idea. M. Lacoste considers this a favorable sign and believes now is the time to act in favor of Tonneins. First, the mayor of Tonneins should write to the prefect describing the advantages of free schools to his town and expose his own desires and the satisfaction he would experience if the council would be in favor of a work which is highly praised for its performance.

M. Lacoste insists that the mayor of Tonneins must write immediately to the prefect, for the lest delay could mean failure; in a few days, no more applications to the council will be accepted.

P.S. I noted what concerns Justine in yours of May 20 and will send M. Lacoste the information dealing with the petition. I will add several reflections to guide him before he presents his document to the General Council of the department.

* * *

S. 237a. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

May 27, 1823, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I wish to inform you that I propose to make my annual visit to Agen in the first days of June. I will spent at most one day in Tonneins, my first time around. I should rather like to be in Agen during the General Council meeting of the department. I wish you would tell Mother Teresa when you see her. . . . I will drop her a line in spite of my haste to avoid having to spend time making a visit. Please accept the assurance of my respectful devotedness.

P.S. I have not finished reading your reports to the municipal council; I will return them to you. Here is the first part of the last letter I received from Brother David, dated May 17, from Besançon. "Good Father, I have just signed the deed which makes you the proprietor of château Saint-Remy, called Château de Rosen (pronounced Rose); 400 acres within the walls and about 125 acres outside the enclosure make up the estate. The buildings are of such size, solidity, and of

a new style that is beyond price. These buildings cost 1,500,000 francs, or a million and a half. This is the absurdity of the century, which God has allowed for his greater glory.”

* * *

S. 238. To Bro. David Monier, Paris

June 3, 1823, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

I am answering your letter dated May 26 which has just arrived from Vesoul. It seems you did not receive the two letters I sent to you in Besançon, always to the address of Father Tharin. The second last I had written before hearing of your arrival in Besançon, and the last was in answer to yours of May 16 and 17. In them I expressed my satisfaction at the importance and the happy outcome of the negotiations which were so burdensome and absorbing. I explained why I had included that expression which so exasperated you, contrary to my expectations. My second last contained the same sentiments and for the same reasons. I also broached other topics; you had better make inquiries about those letters, although they can compromise no one or nothing. It is wise to claim them.

I thank you, my dear Son, for your consideration. . .

* * *

S. 239. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

June 10, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . two or three days before the council.

Brother Rothéa will give you the small packet of letters and the article which we forgot to leave with you when we passed through Tonneins.

Everything around here is getting along tolerably well.

* * *

S. 241. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

Villeneuve, June 17, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . that I asked Father Lacoste to answer it.

Twice I wrote to you in Paris at the address you had given me. The first was in answer to your letter from Vesoul, and the second written in Agen in answer to your first from Paris. In both I asked you to return those I had written to Besançon, and also the two issues of the newspaper of Lot-et-Garonne. I made a point to answer promptly anything of urgency in your letter. Before giving me your Paris address, had you given me others besides that of Besançon?

I cannot understand how. . .

*

I am hastening to end this letter. . .

When you write to Father Bardenet, do so with wisdom and caution. According to the information I have received, a revised list of the members of the colony must be made. In the past, I have made several annual visits. The priest who was to form part of the colony has just had a three-day fever; the future director has just been taken ill, etc. Who will collect the dues for the

first two weeks? Probably the treasurer you appointed after asking Father Bardenet to keep an eye on the operation.

I ask you, my dear Son, to tell Father Caillet. . .

* * *

**S. 242a. Ordinance for
The Establishment of the House of Saint-Remy**
July 16, 1823, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest and Missionary Apostolic, director general of the Institute of the Children of Mary, with the authorization of the Ordinary, have decreed as follows.

Article 1. A central house of the Order is established on this day in Saint-Remy, canton of Amance, district of Vesoul, department of Haute-Saône, in the château and appurtenances and on the lands which we have purchased on May 17 last at the given location.

Article 2. The manor of the château and the cloistered areas will be determined and designated within a month's time at most by the agent who will be named hereafter; the rest of the buildings and property will remain at our disposal.

Article 3. The director, a priest, the appointed superior, the Heads of Zeal, Instruction, and Temporalities who are the constituted officers of the established house have been named by me as follows:

Father Rothéa, priest, Director of Saint-Remy
Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Superior and Head of Zeal
Bro. Bernard Gaussens, Head of Instruction
Bro. Bousquet, Head of Temporalities.

Article 4. The following are to go to Saint-Remy and place themselves under the Heads and officers mentioned above: Brothers Pierre Dubarri, Jean Pascal Bermon de Sandarède, Jean Coustou, Jean-Baptiste Constant, Augustin Molinier, and Antoine Marres, all six from the novitiate of Saint-Laurent.

Article 5. In consideration of which the personnel of the house of Saint-Remy will consist, for the time being, of the superior and nine members.

Article 6. In order to comply with Article 2 above and to proceed with the required installations and to take the means needed to get the central house of Saint-Remy in operation, and until that has been achieved, I hereby appoint as special agent Brother David Monier, Secretary General of the Institute

Article 7. The execution of these presents is entrusted to our aforementioned agent.

Done at Bordeaux, July 16, 1823

Signed by Fr. Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, Superior General

And countersigned by the Secretary General, David.

The undersigned Secretary General of the Institute of Mary, agent named to supervise the installation of the central house of the Order at Saint-Remy, Haute-Saône, and to take the means needed to get the house into full operation, hereby ordains that the ordinance of July 16 given above be copied integrally into the register of the house of Saint-Remy, and that the secretary of said house confirm without delay.

Done at Saint-Remy, August 17, 1823

David, agent in charge of the installation of Saint-Remy

* * *

S. 244. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

August 3, 1823, Bordeaux

... he will receive two supernumeraries for the schools this week.
I am surprised that you have not as yet received an answer from Mme de Portets in Paris with respect to the 6,000 francs.
Mail as few letters as possible. . .

* * *

S. 244a. To M. Lapaue, Bordeaux
August 13, 1823, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

I helped to pay the cost of transporting Father Conne's library to the boarding house on Rue des Menuts.
The opposition of our two religious was not serious and merely passing; they deserve my full confidence, just as they already enjoy all my affection. Fraternally and respectfully. . .
G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 245. To Bro. David Monier, Saint-Remy
August 17 and 18, Bordeaux

... when there is nothing very pressing.
I will send this to the address you included in your last, that is, your third letter.
You seem surprised. . .

*

The delivery of Father Conne's library. . .
Will it really be done? I asked Father Rothéa for the dossier on the matter, and he looked for it in vain; so did Brother Auguste. It is inconceivable that you took it with you. If you should have taken the catalogue, perhaps you also took the deed, and several other documents along with it? What do you make of it? What can we do? Where do we look for these documents?
Tell Brother Clouzet, I beg you. . .

* * *

S. 245a. To Bro. Auguste Brougnon-Perrière, Bordeaux
August 19, 1823, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, without departing from the tenor of the agreement I have with Father Conne to buy his library, promise to advance the dates on which the payments of the 9,000 francs are to be made. I still owe him as follows: 1,000 francs immediately after delivery of the library, another 1,000 within the year, 3,500 in three years, and another 3,500 in five years, always dated from the delivery of the library—which date will be that on the receipt which I will give him on receiving the books.

Furthermore, I promise Father Conne to date the receipts as of August 1 of the present year, provided he delivers the library immediately. In witness whereof, at Bordeaux, August 18, 1823.

GH.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 249. To Bro. David Monier
August 31, 1823, Bordeaux

. Our three travelers, with the young Philippe. . .

It was only yesterday, the morning of August 30, that the driver sent his daughter to claim his 200 francs. I had received your letter and note of August 22. I read the note to the daughter and asked her if she would have her father come over or accept the 157 francs 10 sous herself, and give me a receipt which included the 42 francs 10 sous for oats received, the total being 200 francs. The daughter asked that her father be excused, accepted the money, etc.

Today, September 1, I continue my letter. The driver and his daughter showed up one hour later. I was in church, and they did not want to disturb me; he said they would go home to breakfast. Neither he nor the daughter called again.

Our religious postulants are preparing to leave. . .

*

I have evidence of a lack of right judgment. . .

You had forgotten that just before we crossed the bridge, you said as we spoke of your address that it would be preferable to address them to Father Bardenet at Faverney.

I had certainly taken notice. . . .

* * *

S. 251. To Bro. David Monier
September 15, 1823, Bordeaux

. . . the other from Brother Clouzet, dated September 5. . .

. . . both postmarked Vesoul, and all those that came from Saint-Remy have the same stamp. The address you gave me if I needed to reach you was via Vesoul and Faverney, to Saint-Remy. Here is the reason, I believe, why you are not receiving my letters (for I answer promptly): they are stopped at Faverney, which has no mail delivery; but there is one in Vesoul, and the steps you have taken to assure prompt service apply only to Vesoul. I am going to risk sending this letter, which is a mere notice. Should you receive it before my previous letters, the one I wrote a very few days ago to Brother Clouzet, the one Father Rothéa wrote to you, inquire in Faverney; you will find them all there.

At each letter you wrote me. . .

* * *

S. 253a. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins
November 2, 1823, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Your replies to the articles which the mayor submitted to you at the request of the sub-prefect seem appropriate and to the point. I presume that M. Lacoste would give a similar appreciation.

Could the answer to the first article not read, "At Tonneins there is a convent of religious woman who call themselves Daughters of Mary." For the entire fifth article, it might be good to add, "the religious do not envisage with enthusiasm the suggested separation. They would prefer to follow the practice of the convent of Agen and give free instruction." I would be grateful, Sir, if you would give to the superior of the convent of Agen and also to M. Lacoste the articles which the sub-prefect desires and also the answers which you provided subsequently, after consultation with M. Lacoste. The replies from Agen should be the same as those from Tonneins. At Bordeaux, the mayor sends all ministerial questionnaires to the superiors of the convents. Two weeks ago, I was consulted by the House of Mercy. I will come back very soon to your remarks on free schooling. I must hasten to catch the next post.

* * *

S. 266a. To M. de Lacaussade

January 6, 1824, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Please excuse my tardiness in answering your letter of December 4. This delay would have been prolonged had your letter of January 1 not obliged me to reread the first. I recalled that the ladies R ---had written to the minister.

I can answer affirmatively to the two questions which are raised by the complaints of the ex-inspector of the Academy. A petition must be presented to the minister by the proprietor to obtain permission for burial in the lodge. It seems, in fact, to be imperative. The project you send me seems to be well planned. If these ladies are informed of the complaints of their neighbor, perhaps they should mention it in their petition, unless the authorities are unwilling to endorse them.

I was absorbed by this question when your letter of January 3 arrived. Prayers must have been said from the first moment at our novitiate of Saint-Laurent. However, I will write to the prefecture of Agen; I hope I will say nothing that might compromise you. They may suspect that I am kept informed by you of everything that is going on; what is the difference?

I come now to the second question. I do not believe it is opportune to install a vault in the lodge because (1) the neighbor has already complained, and (2) we are severely strapped for funds.

I will tell no one about the sacrifices you are making to set up this little convent; but now and then I will pray to God to consider and accept them like those that Abel offered to him. I also beg God with all my heart to grant you all the good things I wish for you at the beginning of this new year; especially do I want you to have in this world everything that can lead you to sovereign bliss.

You do well to remind me that I must pay Mme Verdier 6,000 francs. At the moment I cannot see how I can pay her because other debts for considerable amounts are also due. I keep in mind that the ladies from Agen have a like sum coming to them in Paris. In order to rid myself of such importunities, I will write immediately to press or delay debtors and creditors. I would like to have the exact date in July when the money is due, and the address of Mme Verdier. She will not be sorry to have us replaced by a professor of law from Paris, a Royal graduate.

The establishment of Saint-Remy in the department of Haute-Saône is the cause of many headaches and difficulties. Is this a sign of the great good which will come of it? That would be encouraging.

P.S. Although I have not written to our dear Daughters of the convent of Tonneins, they are too often on my mind to be mistaken about my true sentiments. At the moment two other houses of the Daughters of Mary take up my time and my attention.

* * *

S. 268a. To Father Paga, Agen
???
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Missionary Apostolic, director of the Sodality of Bordeaux and of all those affiliated to it, etc., after all the inquiries we have made into the prudence, zeal, and talents of Reverent Paga, Priest, one of the directors and professors at the minor seminary of Agen, have named and do appoint by these presents director of the Sodality of Christian women which we have established in his parish church and director of the Sodality of men in Agen, with the approbation and consent of the Bishop of Agen and without impugning the distinction which our venerable son Father Mouran, the superior of the major seminary, has as Director General of the Sodalities of men and women.

In consequence of which Father Paga will direct the Sodality for me at Agen and will preside at their general and particular meetings, will receive sodalists, grant them indulgences—in short, will full in their regard all the duties of zeal which I would perform if I were present; his is now the responsibility, etc.

* * *

S. 269a. To Father Vernier, Missionary at Bauprès
January 27, 1824, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

Our superior,¹ who is ever mindful of all the establishments he has founded and who is particularly attentive to the welfare of the diocese of Besançon, has expressed to me his uneasiness at the slight progress made by the new community of Saint-Remy and has informed me of the new assignment he gave to Brother David. He orders him by this post to spend some time in Paris. When I speak of the slight progress noticeable in the budding establishment, I am not referring to the progress in virtue; it would be hard to find such true fervor elsewhere. Our Good Father is referring to the development of the works of the Institute of Mary.

Because of Brother David's long absence, another religious must be sent to stimulate and develop the house. I have reasons to believe that I will be given this assignment. But who am I to work at such an interesting project? I am turning to you, Sir, and to M. Breuillot; you are aware of my confidence in you both. If obedience sends me to Saint-Remy, I will immediately have recourse to you for advice. I am without experience, so I will come to you as a child to his father. I will do only what you suggest.

As you present my most humble greetings to this worthy M. Veuiller, please inform him of my imminent arrival and tell him how I long to see and embrace him.

Before my departure I would have loved to know what you think of the establishment of Saint-Remy, what is the opinion of the archbishop, of M. Bruillot, the superior of the seminary, the pastor of the cathedral, etc. Especially of Father Bardenet.

¹ The rough copy of this letter is in Fr. Chaminade's handwriting; he wrote it for Fr. Caillet, who actually signed it. The paragraphs introduced by Fr. Caillet are in Italics.

It is normal that I would write personally to the latter, but I do not know him and I already have so many proofs of your high regard that I thought I would ask you to do it. If you could write immediately, you would be rendering me a great service. While I await this favor and the pleasure of seeing you and of discussing very openly with you, I ask that you remember me in your prayers.

P.S. Just between us, I understand that the Good Father, who has full confidence in Brother David, is however not very happy with the manner in which he is working at the Saint-Remy project. He is guided too much by human considerations; have you noticed anything of the kind?

* * *

S. 273. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

March 11, 1824, Bordeaux

My dear Child,

I am sending you (1) a small packet of papers for M. Lacoste, unsealed so you and Mother of the Incarnation can take note of the contents. Please seal it immediately and send it on. (2) Two letters from M. Castex. (3) The plan of Piétat; you and Mme Belloc, who saw and visited the place, can then write your remarks and send them on to me. Do you see any objection to the presence of Mother of the Incarnation at Condom when the contract is signed so that she can see to the repairs and the preparation of the place? She could take along a good companion, or even Mme Belloc. They could stay with the ladies of the de Trenquelléon family, where they could live very religiously. Besides, I can give them rules of conduct which they can follow.

You can write to Mlle Momus that it is not up to you to describe to Mlle Sénac how to reach Agen; that is her affairs, and besides, Mlle Sénac is not a child. She is 29 years old and must manage on her own; if she presents herself at the door of the convent, receive her warmly.

My dear Child, follow with simplicity. . .

* * *

S. 274a. To M. Castex, Condom

March 23, 1824, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I agree with you that M. Lacoste's fears are unfounded. He can judge for himself when he sees the copy of the authorization from the prefect of Gers.

In the agreement on Piétat, I would like to see the proviso inserted that the purchasing ladies may sell or dispose of the movables of the main house. I would appreciate it if you gave M. Lacoste the first draft of our purchase agreement, which has been completed. In a very few days he will bring it or send it to you with the authorization necessary to make a public contract. He is writing to him with this post. Mlle de Lachapelle and her companions who will make up the little colony for Condom would like to take possession of their new house immediately after the essential modifications have been made. Once in their convent, they will have the necessary repairs made.

The moment I hear that all obstacles to the contract have been overcome, I will write to the Archbishop of Auch. We will take possession and install ourselves as soon as possible. You will have a large share in the good this new house will do; you are, so to speak, its kingpin. Without you, the project probably would never have materialized.

I am most respectfully. . .

* * *

S. 278. To Father Caillet, Ribeaupillé
March 31, 1824, Bordeaux

. . . or at least to see what you are lacking.

I had written to you at Saint-Remy, but you left before my letter arrived. I was writing principally about Brother David, but circumstances are different today, and there is no other choice. If Brother David persists in staying on at Saint-Remy, deprived of all spiritual and civil power, he cannot prevent us from setting up the establishment as we see fit. But again, Brother David will not be able to stay on at Saint-Remy when he finds out that father Bardenet and the entire community know that he has no authority of any kind.

In the same letter I say nothing about the means Father Bardenet could use to buy back the 125 beds he had sold to the seminary, and what I am prepared to sacrifice to accomplish this. From your letter I gather that Father Bardenet has some other method of assembling the retreatants.

I also spoke to you briefly about M. Farine, asking that you write to him urging him to use the motives and means offered by religion and virtue to break those ties. You could try to make him see that until we have provided for existing or recent establishments, until we have trained several more good candidates, we cannot plan a Swiss foundation, however much we might want to.

I will not comment on your round of. . .

* * *

S. 280. To M. Castex, Condom
April 5, 1824, Bordeaux

I have the honor of responding to your letter. . .

I see that M. Lacoste has sent you a copy of the decision. If the administrators could appreciate the remarks which I took the liberty of making in my last letter, everyone would be happy and nothing, it seems to me, could block the sale. I will have a copy of this letter sent to M. Lacoste.

In the same mail I received a letter from Mlle de Lachapelle. . .

*

. . . by a sale, pure and simple?

Mlle de Lachapelle mistakenly believes she sent me a copy of the agreement; I never did receive it, but I have a good idea of its contents from the four little items I have just copied for you.

I come now the second portion of your letter. . .

* * *

S. 282a. To M. Castex, Condom
April 18, 1824, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

In the next to last mail delivery I received a packet of letters from M. Lacoste containing the projected agreement he had sent to you, along with a letter explaining the same, plus remarks

by the administrators of the hospices, without signature or date, and which seems to be a reply to the projected agreement sent by M. Lacoste. In the packet there is also one of your letters in which you seem to look upon the reply of the administrators as an ultimatum. M. Lacoste and Mlle de Lachapelle suppose I am familiar with the projected agreement presented by the administrators of the hospices of Condom; in spite of this presumption, I have never received it from anyone.

Sir and honored colleague, I have been perfectly frank with you in my last letters of March 30 and April 5. Why not sell to Mlle de Lachapelle, as one would to any stranger, by a pure and simple sale, just as it had been requested from the government and that the government had approved? In the demand presented to the government, both the small and large lots were included. In its wisdom and moved by its interest in the welfare of the region, the administration would not allow the sale to a buyer who would have pulled down the purchased building and thought only of profit for himself. It found a buyer who, far from destroying the ancient hospice, wants to repair, remodel, and add to it, who would make it promote the public good of religion, morality, and the education of youth. Both wisdom and the public good would be well served. So far I see no reason for adding a condition to a pure and simple sale, such as I had understood it, and such as everyone would inevitably have understood it.

What gave rise to the difficulties confronting the sale and to the conditions that now encumber it? It is the six-year exemption from interest granted to the purchaser so that needed repairs might be made. Well, if the administration fears this concession might eventually be to the prejudice of the hospice, let a clause be placed in the contract binding the actual purchaser or his heirs, in the event of a withdrawal from the building, to reimburse the yearly concessions in whole or in part, or better yet, return the hospice known as the Piétat, as also that part of the exemption shown not to have been devoted to useful repairs and house maintenance; and if any objects included in the actual sale have been alienated by the purchaser, he would also reimburse the value of those objects.

There would still be one difficulty, it seems—the exemption made for the little cemetery. However, in the first place, this exception had never been made. Then does it not form a part of that little plot which the government promised to sell? I do admit that the mayor's intention to make an exception is praiseworthy; I understand that a public road was to pass through the spot. In any case, in deference to the mayor, a clause could be added making an exception for the sale of this plot of ground if it were needed for a public road project.

I had to interrupt the dictation of this letter for two days because of the Holy Season. In the interval, I received your letter of April 13 in answer to mine of April 5. Your remarks would not deter me from a sale, pure and simple, to which the above conditions could be appended. Not that you and I have not considered the good motives and the honest intentions of the administration, and to give you an idea of my confidence, I did not break off negotiations when I was notified of the opinion which they were to submit to the government. I was also aware that reversibility could turn to the advantage of the new owners; but if such was the intention, why not leave the option to the buyers, or at least not express it in a manner which was almost insulting to the Institute of the Daughters of Mary. As I said, I have not laid eyes on the sales contract presented by the administration, but I do know that when I was informed of that clause the underlying supposition was far from honorable and could, at the very least, stir up some people.

I do not hesitate to repeat that the administrators are very well-meaning, and I hope to have the opportunity to give them some proof of my respect and gratitude. But they must realize that sooner or later, they can be replaced by some scrupulous persons who will have no inkling of the single-mindedness with which these men have drawn up and modified the bill of sale.

Let me sum up these thoughts and all those contained in my letters of March 30 and April 5. (1) We agreed on the price for the two lots, 20,000 francs; (2) 6,000 francs or six years of interest which is granted to the purchaser for repairs to the buildings; (3) full use would be made of these 6,000 francs, if the clause I suggested above is introduced into the text. The present

difficulty is due entirely to the format of the bill of sale, which to a person of experience is an essential weakness. Because I feared the introduction into the document of some clause which could have been disadvantageous, I wanted M. Lacoste to agree first, for he knows our method of procedure. But between us, Sir and honored colleague, why look for a formulation of this bill of sale other than the one which conforms to the nature of the contract? We are in agreement on all the essentials of the sale. It is now just a matter of the expression, of the clauses that further the interest neither of the sellers nor of the hospice, nor of the buyers. In this situation, why not choose the middle course, a pure and simple sale with the simple proviso reserving to the seller all the advantages which he claims?

I thank you, Sir, for the information you so kindly furnished, so that the new community may enjoy the use of the chapel; I will put it to use immediately if your answer to this letter leads me to believe that M. Lacoste will be invited to come to Condom to validate the bill of sale. He will leave Agen only if he has the power of attorney from Mlle de Lachapelle. M. Lacoste is sufficiently tractable to accept the few modifications needed to placate some of the administrators but are without importance for the new community or for the Institute to which it belongs. With this mailing I am sending him a copy of this letter. He knows that I have my mind set on this establishment, but he is aware also that in all my transactions I want wisdom and prudence to preside and that one of the essential forms of prudence consists in judicious foresight.

I do not intend to busy myself with the material needs of the community until the sale is consummated. I will not abandon this new venture to an undeserved fate.

You will certainly find this letter too long and rambling; this is because I do not have time to make it any shorter! I am finishing its dictation on the holy day of Easter; I truly believe this work, which is all for the glory of God and the important concerns of religion, will not be harmful to sanctification. Monsieur and dear Colleague, I again offer you my most sincere regards.

* * *

S. 284. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Saint-Remy

April 21, 1824, Bordeaux

He was surprised that you had not written. . .

Time is too short—even the retreat will have begun by the time this letter reaches you—to make any reflection on the retreat itself. You will have done and will continue to do all in your power so that we might, from this our first attempts, judge what the work holds in prospect once it is fully launched. I do not understand what you tell me about the other thousands of francs that are to stimulate interest in a seminary for school teachers, and to pay the room and board of the more promising students. What do you mean by a seminary for school teachers? I would more easily understand a normal school—but a seminary for school teachers in a brothers ‘school, themselves school teachers, who are preparing candidates for the religious life who are also school teachers! Would these two institutions not militate against each other’s interests? Perhaps I did not quite grasp what you wanted to say. In any case, do what you can and for the best, but do not settle on any particular type of institution until I have a clear idea of its nature and its relationship with the works of the Institute. Perhaps your letters to the Rector of the Academy and to the Archbishop of Besançon may enlighten me somewhat.

I have just reread what you wrote to me. . .

*

. . . where Catholics seem to be favored more and more.

I will write immediately to Agen about those 800 francs of Sister Geneviève Prêtre. As things now stand, M. Farine will be replaced only if he can withdraw before his substitute arrives. If the two sisters of M. Farine could stay temporarily at Saint-Remy without disturbing, you could continue to examine them during your brief stay, especially the one with the religious vocation. With what she writes to me and what you observe, I will more easily make up my mind. You could talk to Father Bardenet about their stay.

Let the former Ursuline Sister write to me. . .

* * *

S. 285a. To Father Castex

April 26, 1824, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I have the honor of writing, with this post, to the Archbishop of Auch (1) to ask him for permission to establish the Daughters of Mary at Condom, and (2) also to permit Father Lagutère to say Mass at Piétat, etc. I am sending this letter to M. Fenace asking him to plead my case with His Excellency. Father Maurel has not yet returned from the mission he is preaching at Pujols.

With this same post I am writing to M. Lacoste urging him strongly to go to Condom to conclude that matter; I am sending him a copy of your letter of April 20 and of the one I am writing to the Archbishop of Auch.

I have some hope that a spinster with considerable revenues will board at Piétat as soon as the Daughters of Mary are installed there. She may even join the community. Today this woman expressed to me her desire to help the poor of Condom, even after her death, in the form of a substantial endowment. Let us hope that Providence will come to the assistance of this establishment, undertaken solely for the glory of God.

I am concerned about the condition of your health. However great our dependence on your zealous activity, this must not be at the expense of your health. I am, Monsieur and honored colleague. . .

* * *

S. 286. To Archbishop de Morlhon of Auch

May 4, 1824, Bordeaux

I am, etc. . .

I so wanted to write to you, my honored friend, but I am unable due to the rush of affairs just at mail time. I can only say that a copy of the letter I had the honor of sending to the archbishop was inadvertently sealed and placed in an envelope destined for M. Fenace, who was not able to plead my case as I had asked him to. Please give my excuses to His Excellency and above all to M. Fenace.

* * *

S. 286a. To M. Lacoste, Agen

May 4, 1824, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

My worthy Son,

Thanks to the Bishop of Agen I received your short note of April 29. I was somewhat surprised at your departure for Condom after my last letter to you, to which I had added the letter

I was writing to the Bishop of Auch. I asked the archbishop for his permission and patronage for the establishment of the Daughters of Mary at Condom, and on this favor depended the purchase of Piétat. If you have really left, he will be astonished that we did not take pains to answer him immediately before any further negotiations. If you have really left, Father Castex will do the best he can; I will write to him with this mail delivery.

Your remark, my worthy son, that this business was poorly launched is only too true, but whose fault is this? Only much later was I told that their conclusions were sent to the government. When I agreed to the purchase of Piétat, I meant a simple purchase, with no other condition than that of price. My only stipulation was that Mlle de Lachapelle make the purchase not as a religious, but using her family name. Whatever deception I felt on hearing of the discussions, I concealed this until I heard that the prefect of Gers considered government consent unnecessary. Since then I have protested, and you know how vehemently. Was there anything else I could say or do? Could I and should I have done so sooner? You will be doing me a favor if you tell me what I should have done better; your remarks may be of use to me in future negotiations of this nature.

* * *

S. 287a. To Archbishop de Morlhon of Auch¹

May 4, 1824, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Father Larribeau, the Rector of Loupian near Damazan in the Garonne region, impelled by his piety and his intelligence, assembled under his direction the most fervent people of the neighborhood. Their zeal was directed toward the important work of instruction for the poor country children. Mlle de Trenquelléon contributed spiritually and financially to this holy project, gathered the children of the family in the castle, and at times had the joy of bringing Protestants into the Church.

Father Chaminade, who had succeeded Father Lacroix in Bordeaux, had charge of the two Sodalitys of men and women, which had been meeting for years to encourage one another to fervor and to the practice of charity. These sodalitys were authorized by the Sovereign Pontiff, who had granted them abundant indulgences. Ten or twelve years ago, this holy priest met the above-mentioned Mlle de Trenquelléon at Villeneuve d'Agenois. Their conversation soon turned to piety. The young woman spoke of Father Larribeau's nascent sodality and of its good works. "Just like ours," said Father Chaminade. Would you like to become affiliated to it and to profit from the graces and indulgences it offers? This suggestion was adopted with enthusiasm. She spoke of it to her director and to his penitents. Her confessor detected the hand of God in this project, approved their good purposes, and committed this precious flock to Father Chaminade's direction.

Father Chaminade turned the good intentions of these fervent women to good account. They soon gathered in a rented house in Agen. The example of their virtues and their warm-hearted instruction attracted many women of all ages and conditions, and in a short time the town of Agen was renewed to the point that young people who refused to attend dances and balls, provoking the rage of hell and of its minions, drew down a mild form of persecution on men's gatherings which were doing much good in their sphere but which were denounced as suspicious by a fierce and suspicious tyrant and were forced to dissolve.??? Meanwhile, the Ladies' Sodality was growing in numbers, in virtue, and in external works of charity. It bought a house which was

¹ This notice was sent to the archbishop to complement the letter he had received some days earlier from Fr. Chaminade in Bordeaux, asking for permission to establish the Daughters of Mary in Piétat and to have Fr. Lagutère or a priest of the archbishop's choice say Mass for them.

larger and more suitable than the one they had first rented and, in the end, 45 of them chose the cloister and became novices and professed religious. Just like bees, these pious women have already swarmed and sent a small group to Tonneins, where for the last few years they are bearing the same fruit of charity as at Agen. As they multiply, they are obliged to seek asylum elsewhere and find other means of making themselves useful.

The administrators of the hospice, who were aware of the great good these women could do in Condom, proposed to Father Chaminade to grant him the Maison de Piétat, a former hospital for men, recently joined to the women's wing, and to give him favorable terms if he would promise to devote it to the same charitable purpose, so beneficial to the poor, convinced that the establishment could serve no more useful purpose than that for which it had been founded. Father Chaminade accepted the proposal of the administration. They agreed to the terms of the sale. The prefect has authorized it. Only the approbation of the Archbishop of Auch is lacking, and this must be accompanied by a permission to have a priest to minister to the house.

In no way will the diocese be inconvenienced by this arrangement. At Condom there is a priest who from his youth has been attracted to community life. Three times he tried to enter the Order of the Carthusians, but it was too rigid for his constitution. The town can easily spare this holy priest, Father Lagutère. He is extremely reluctant to engage in the parochial ministry and refused the parish of Cannes, the least demanding of all. He is already 65 years of age and would willingly take it upon himself to say Mass daily at Piétat. There may be a problem on Sunday, when he has to say the 11 o'clock Mass at Saint Peter's. However, in spite of his reluctance to say two masses, he would do so at the archbishop's request. Binating would not inconvenience Saint Peter's, and the Daughters of Mary would have the happiness of a morning Mass.

These are the details which should have accompanied Father Chaminade's letter.

* * *

S. 286a. To Father Castex, Condom

May 18, 1824, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I am afraid that all our concern and all the pains we took to provide a house at Condom for the Daughters have been wasted. I find myself obliged to abandon the project because it is impossible to agree on the terms of the sale. I have sought counsel in the matter from an old lawyer who is very sharp, intelligent, and especially versed in civil and religious matters.

Just as I finished the above paragraph, your letter of May 13 arrived. I thank you for describing the manner in which the matter was treated, and it is too bad that it took such a turn. The administration will sell only on orders from the king, but the sale does not conform to the royal Ordinance! What guarantee do the buyers have if governmental authorization is needed for the new clauses which the administration has introduced into the contract? How can someone hope to obtain this authorization without first complying with the ordinance? Let me explain. Royal Ordinance sets the sale price; in the contract the price is reduced by an amount equal to the annual concession, and these 6,000 francs must go toward the maintenance. It is only to guarantee that these 6,000 francs will not be lost to the administration that free schools are planned! And yet, this deal is so binding that should the buildings for some reason not be used for free schools, by that very fact the buyer would lose the property in question.

In all justice to the administrators, I do not believe they meant any harm to the Sisters who would take charge of the establishment and who devote themselves so zealously to the public good. But, Monsieur, can I allow such clauses to stand in that first sales contract? Will the successors of the present administration be of the same mind and heart? Here I omit a host of considerations which present themselves.

It seems to me, Sir, that if you could agree with M. Lacoste and M. Lachepelle???, everything could easily be arranged. There are three things to be considered here: (1) the sale of the real estate; (2) the 6,000 francs conceded; and (3) the special case of the laundry.

1. The case of the real estate. This involves the pure and simple sale of the hospice of Piétat with its appurtenances and annexes to Mlle de Lachapelle, with the consent of her father, etc., which, according to the ordinance of His Majesty of January 29, 1822, and that of the Minister of the Interior of September 23 last. . . . In this act the administration may imply or state that it favors this buyer because she agrees to set up an establishment for the daughters of Mary, thus guaranteeing that this hospice, which is a superb monument in Condom, will never be demolished; and furthermore, that the local people will have available the educational and instructional resources for their children because the Daughters of Mary will include among their charitable works the founding of free schools everywhere they go. For this reason, the administration agrees to remit the interest for six years on the sale price, and this in order to help them with the repairs, etc.

2. If because of this first contract fears are expressed as to the use to be made of the 6,000 francs, could a paragraph not be introduced stipulating that the buyer, in the name of the Daughters of Mary, is obliged to open schools for the free instruction of the local children for as long as the period of grace corresponding to the 6,000 francs, with the obligation, if free schooling is interrupted before this time, to reimburse that part of the 6,000 francs corresponding to the services still due? This paragraph or second contract could easily be suppressed. Then the administration would need only to make mention of the 6,000 francs in its budget. In any case, I do not believe this second contract would need any authorization but that of the Prefect of Gers.

3. I understand that no special mention needs to be made of the laundry, if it is considered a part of the building. The buildings themselves are not too large or spacious; we must see to it that the alley between them is sealed off.

These, Sir, are my last remarks. You will note that I am not seeking to pick a quarrel and that we are really conceding more than was first agreed upon. I readily agree in order that the administrators may more easily carry out their good intentions. To avoid any future lack of agreement, if the administrators are favorable to my suggestions I can have the contract drawn up here by a lawyer who is well-versed in such dealings. You understand that I wish to compromise neither the administrators nor the Daughters of Mary; the rights of both must be respected. This would lead to a prompt settlement of the matter. Should the gentlemen have a contrary opinion, we will have to abandon the project. This will not be our fault; then you can turn your attention to some of the other houses you have already mentioned which may even be better adapted to the project and where the transactions would not be so difficult as in this case.

Should the gentlemen accept my suggestion, I ask you to send me copies of the minutes of their meeting and of the Royal Ordinance; these documents will be helpful when we draw up the bill of sale. I am enclosing the letter I wish to send to the Archbishop of Auch. The administrators will find therein a further proof that the free schools are high on our agenda. Your rewards will be great, Sir, if as I hope they are in proportion to the pains you have taken with the establishment of the Daughters of Mary in Condom. Respectfully yours. . .

* * *

S. 288. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Saint-Remy

May 17, 1824, Bordeaux

Brother Clouzet wrote to me during the retreat. . .
. . . he also wrote to Brother David and included a letter from the Secretary of the Agricultural Society of Vesoul
He tells me that the eight-day retreat. . .

*

. . . he speaks only of his health.

On the bill are included the 91 francs which you received for him. So you have nothing to pay, one of the two ornaments will stay at Saint-Remy, as I understand it.

I am ending here so this letter may leave. . .

* * *

S. 293a. To Father Castex, Chaplain at Condom

June 1, 1824, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Almost immediately after receiving your letter of May 28, I sent it to my council along with a copy of the contract. My council was absent, but on their arrival they sent me the remarks which I will have copied for you. (See below.)

I am truly sorry for all the incidents which obstruct our plans to establish the Daughters of Mary in Condom, and I regret more deeply the opposition shown to the parents of Mlle de Lachapelle; but what can I do? I have agreed to all the terms of the sale suggested and put forward by the administrators. I want to see a sound contract which will give rise to no worry or bickering later on. Am I wrong? Would M. Lachapelle himself agree to it? The more adamant the administrators are with respect to these clauses, the more the buyers have to fear. The difficulty seems to stem from the six annual rent remissions granted by the administrators. If they wish to promote this establishment and at the same time guarantee its use in the education of indigent girls, why do they not include a clause which expresses their wishes, that is not in contradiction with the sale, and which does not expose the purchasing religious to ever-present and eternal apprehension when in their house. Frankly, I would prefer to provide them with the funds necessary for the repairs to the hospice Piétat than to accept those six annuities under their conditions.

I am writing in all haste to show you my goodwill, and also that you may share these feelings with M. Lachapelle and with Madame his wife. The postman is about to pass. Sincerely. .

Remarks (Referred to above)

“To repossess” is a very ordinary and, as the author admits, a superfluous word, neither adding nor subtracting any right. This is not true of the expressions used in Article 4. This article was unacceptable in its first draft because it contained a perpetual threat of repossession by the seller, even if the buyer’s intent was above reproach. It remains not to be seen whether the new clause infirms??? The concession or if the concession is solely dependent on whether the buyer fulfills the conditions.

In this case, the proposed condition remedies nothing because the original shortcoming has not vanished; it is found in the expression, “if by some chance.” It matters little if we add “especially by some action resulting from the will of the purchaser or of his agents.” This *a fortiori* clause does not suppress the other; on the contrary, it confirms it. It should be stated simply, thus: “Article 4. If for any reason due to the will of the buyer or of his agents the buildings sold are not used as per agreement, the aforementioned lady or her agents will cease, etc. . . .”

Note that the council accepts this rectification only with respect to the clause in question; it does not make the contract, as such, acceptable. For with this new clause, the perpetual threat of

repossession without formality still obtain, and this is not acceptable. I will explain, at least in part, why.

1. No loan or mortgage can be obtained using as collateral a building which can be repossessed; this possibility nullifies any such deal.

2. If no mortgage can be obtained, then for the same reason no money can be invested, no repairs made, for we must not hazard our own resources more than another's.

But it is argued, if you are well-intentioned, you are assured of keeping the property, and your expenses and repairs will not be lost. Not true, for although I may not wish to disrupt the agreement because of the resulting chaos, external circumstances may lead to it.

First Example. When the Church law underwent a change, some religious persons wanted to act as in the past; but they will be taxed with ill will.

Second Example. Not so long ago, the government of the king decided to appoint women teachers to take charge of the girls' schools. In Agen a lady you know was chosen, and this resulted in the closing of several schools. The lady then refused the offer, and order is being restored.

We run the risk of intrigues, pressures, jealousy, and more. Instead of all these difficulties, which would always be present because of the terms of the contract, it would have been reasonable to admit temporary conditions irrespective of the time factor; but a perpetual threat of repossession is a cause of distrust and perpetual bickering. It seems to me that Article 4 should simply read this way.

Article 4. The buyer promises and commits herself to obtain the authorization to organize free schools in the buildings concerned, and this within six months from the present date, or to justify any impediment which may have caused a delay; and if after one year she has not obtained royal assent to the plan, the administration would repossess the property without any recourse to legal procedures."

Such a clause would render useless any addition to Article 1, such as "committed by their state to education." The word "state" supposes that they are authorized by their civil, legal status, which is not the case. However, everything is in order of the obligation to make the establishment conform to legal requirements is assumed.

Someone could read into the present formulation a lack of confidence in the government, as if he foresaw that the government would change the destination to which both parties agreed. Such distrust has no place in such a contract. The expression "for any reason" implies the same idea. Have the following possibilities been contemplated—fire, complete destruction of the buildings, famine in the land, loss, occupation by the enemy? The word "reason" includes all such events. It is damaging to the entire document. It is entirely improper, to my mind; it must not be used. I could write on and on about this and other ideas. Were the parties to meet face to face, they would soon agree, for everyone seems eager and willing; but each in his corner sees only one aspect. Either we must seek good counsel or arrange a meeting.

* * *

S. 297. To Father Castex, Condom

June 7, 1824, Bordeaux

. . . like the one that had been projected.

I had the contract proposal drawn up and have sent a copy to M. de Lachapelle as proof of my goodwill. I suppose M. Lachapelle has shown you the letter I sent him. I will await his answer. I have just received yours of the fourth of this month.

Let us not be discouraged.

*

Most certainly some great advantage will be the result. . .
We will gratefully accept the help offered by M. Lacave.
I offer you, Reverend Father, a new token of my respectful attachment.

* * *

S. 299. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Saint-Remy
June 16, 1824, Bordeaux

They can easily be put to the test in the schools of Saint-Remy.
In fact, I had forgotten to tell you that the 75 francs had been paid by M. Allègre himself. I have answered you several times about those 1,000 francs. That would not stop me from sending them to you if I had them. We have a candidate who would like to join the Institute; he has 1,500 francs in cash. I want to accept him, but only for Saint-Remy; on the other hand, he dreads the long journey. Should he decide, I will send him to you with all his money, which I will have changed into gold.

All is finished with respect to the Mlles Gramagnac.

* * *

S. 299a. To Father Bardenet, Saint-Remy
June 25, 1824, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur and Worthy Collaborator,

I beg your indulgence for a error which my young secretary allowed to slip into my letter of June 6. You protest, and justly so, at the expression “which was in excess” in the phrase “in spite of the importance of the account which was in excess.” The error is due to the fact that my secretary, who often takes my dictation, had heard “in excess” instead of “annexed.” I signed the letter after he had read it back to me, but I did not reread it myself. Here is the phrase I dictated: “In spite of the importance of the account which was annexed to it.” You must understand, Sir, that although I did find your account to be exact and reasonable, it did seem to be to be excessive—but not to the point that it dimmed my consolation and joy at the letter to which it was attached. I am astonished that neither Father Caillet nor Brother Clouzet, who should know my feelings and the pains I take never to offend anyone, did not suspect a secretarial error.

Brother Clouzet writes to tell me that you will need 3,000 francs in two or three months. I will write and ask him to be careful of the money he receives or that I will procure for him by various means. I asked for a delay of one year to refund the 6,000 francs, to give us sufficient time to pay back the sum and not be overwhelmed. Moreover, Sir, if you negotiated a loan for a longer term for Brother Clouzet, you could be refunded from that loan without implying that the purpose of the loan was to refund you. When I authorized Brother Clouzet to pay you the 6,000 francs within one year, I thought the term ran from the date of my letter, June 6, or even June 1, and not from the date of the accompanying letter.

Sir, I believe soon I will be able to withdraw Father Caillet from Saint-Remy. Help us to set up this establishment on a solid footing. I will do all I can to help you; I really have my heart set upon it.

I intend to leave on July 5 for my annual visitation. I will stop in Agen for the express purpose of choosing among the Daughters of Mary those who will make up the new communities of Bordeaux and Condom. Condom used to be an Episcopal city; now it is in the Archdiocese of Auch. Respectfully. . .

* * *

S. 301. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Saint-Remy

June 29, 1824, Bordeaux

You should also bring along a copy of the descriptions. . .

Come to an understanding with Father Breuillot and see whether he will not once and for all take charge of the projects we have underway, either the construction, the repairs, or the secretariat, and help us secure funds, candidates, etc.—in a way, to be our representative of the Institute of Mary in Saint-Remy. He knows Father Bardenet and how to secure his cooperation. I believe we must not make any permanent deal with him; for this reason, I agreed to pay the 6,000 francs, and I gave him an annuity of 600 francs. But we must not put him aside. So we will write to Father Breuillot, or rather correspond very frankly with him as between friends who team up for a good and worthwhile purpose. I would like to send him a diploma of affiliation.

The answer of Brother Clouzet about the Constitutions. . .

* * *

S. 302. To Father Castex, Condom

July 2, 1824, Bordeaux

I believe that God wants us to recompense them in this world. . .

The sum of 3,000 francs which the commission would lend us cannot be put into better hands than those of Mlle de Lachapelle. I have no objection to giving her the title of religious, especially if it is not found in the purchase contract, as it is our intention. Besides, one is a public act and the other, I imagine, will be a private deed.

I propose to leave for Agen. . .

* * *

S. 303. To Archbishop de Morlhon of Auch

Condom, July 14, 1824, Condom

. . . also a copy of the blessings accorded by His Excellency. . .

Before having it copied, I read it to Father Castex and Father Lagutère, who are familiar with the customs of the parishes of Condom. He remarked that (1) the second rather than the third Sunday of each month must be chosen; and (2) that the forty hours' devotion was held in Saint Peter's during the three carnival days. If Your Excellency does not find this to your liking, it could be transferred to Sexagesima and the following two days, or better still, to the three Sundays of Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima. The Daughters of Mary have a brief from the Sovereign Pontiff granting them a plenary indulgence on each of the days of the forty hours' devotion.

Yesterday, the city of Condom gave proof. . .

* * *

S. 307. To Father Perrey, Besançon

August 12, 1824, Bordeaux

. . . certain ones are meant to form our souls to good and to virtue.

In the former, we discern the will of God inviting to certain lifestyles those who are destined by Providence to exercise certain functions or missions.

I find it very difficult to believe that the good God wants. . .

* * *

S. 311. To Mother de l'Incarnation, Condom

August 22, 1824, Bordeaux

I will aid you all I can in bearing the weight. . .

You have not failed against obedience by having the altar built with the least possible cost, for we had decided on no particular model. You were rushed, you used your discretionary power—be at peace. The superior misinterpreted my letter advising her to answer your inquiry on the parlor, as far as I recall. Do not worry about it. I see no objection to closing those intersections, provided you do so in such a manner that they can easily be opened when needed.

The classes will be better beside the garden. . .

*

It is not your work you are doing, it is God's.

If it were for the community alone, I would suggest leasing the laundry for 200 francs. But since you have boarders, the parents might refuse to send their young girls for fear of the powder depot. Revoke that lease. If you find an honorable lessee you may rent it out, but not by contract. Lodge your gardener, if not immediately at least in the near future, where you can easily call him by a bell if necessary.

I have wanted to write to you all. . .

* * *

S. 315. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

September 20, 1824, Bordeaux

Possess your soul, my dear Son. . .

Allow Brother Pascal to withdraw, but not as one belonging to the Institute. Give him no paper to that effect. His passport should make no mention of it. See to it that his coach fare to Bordeaux is not charged to us, as happened with the weaver, Joseph. We will not receive him here.

While writing to Father Caillet and sending him my notes. . .

* * *

S. 317a. To Bro. David Monier

December 5, 1824, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

You must have realized from M. Bardinet's letter in answer to your remarks, of which I had informed him, that you and he are following two different lines of reasoning. It is clear that there will be a court case or a loss of the 600 francs, plus interest. You could help by writing a statement which, after tracing the history of the matter, would prove that we have a right to compensation, somewhat as you explained it to me in your last interview, quoting as far as

possible the laws which favor our cause. M. Bardinet claims that we are subject to the law governing registrations and that there are no exceptions. He bases himself upon the opinion of several people whom he has consulted. He is prejudiced and will listen to no argument. The only thing to do is to draw up a clear statement. His honesty will force him to read it; others will do the same. This should be done as soon as possible, for M. Biernès may be insisting and we must be ready. However, take care of your health, my dear Son, and believe me your. . .

* * *

S. 317b. To M. Ponton d'Amicourt

December 9, 1824, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Will I have the happiness of jogging your memory?¹ I hope M. O'Lombel, who was gracious enough to present me to you, will be kind enough to excuse me if you should chide me for my too long silence. Today, now that I have returned from the long journeys at the service of my superior, Father Chaminade, Founder of the Society of Mary, may I ask for your advice and protection in the following circumstance?

It was our wish to establish a secondary school on the vast property of Saint-Remy, department of Haute-Saône. We wanted to have Father Rothéa (one of our religious priests) as head of that institution, although he has little competence in Greek, physics, and mathematics. It was agreed with the Rector of the Academy of Besançon and the archbishop that he would present a petition to His Eminence the Grand Master of the University asking that he be dispensed from the examinations on those three subjects. I append the straightforward but negative answer to this petition.

Although Father Rothéa has pursued serious studies, it is not surprising that he has only a superficial knowledge of subjects which were not required in his day. True, the university today requires—and rightly so—studies in Greek, mathematics, and physics, and we would be the first to bow before the wisdom of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, were Father Rothéa someone on whom the curriculum of the institution depended. This is not the case here. But how can we convince His Excellency that the Institute of Mary will provide all the necessary teachers for this school as it develops and as the enrollment increases? That the teachers and their principal are guided by. . . ?

It is regrettable that neither the Archbishop of Besançon nor the Rector have described to His Excellency the true state of things, and that dispensation from these three subjects was sought. His Excellency should have known something of the Institute of Mary and of its venerable Founder; but while he may have recalled this, was he made aware of the type of instruction involved here from the petition presented by Father Rothéa?

We now take the liberty of addressing ourselves to you, Sir. His Excellency is seeking only the general good, and in his wisdom he will easily find the way to reverse his decision without compromising himself. I believe this is just a matter of having him understand the situation. You are well placed, Sir, to profit by the first opportunity which presents itself. You may even inform him of our intention to have the Institute of Mary approved by the Government.

In your opinion, Sir, will the Chambres??? at this session study seriously the question of public instruction? Do you believe the time is ripe to petition for the legal and civil authorization of the Institute of Mary? Should the answer be affirmative, what should we do? Oh! If in your goodness you could point out to us the steps we should take! I hope I have not bored you with the length of this letter. I hasten to assure you, Sir, of my deepest sentiments. . .

¹ Fr. Chaminade wrote this for Fr. Caillet, who signed it.

* * *

S. 317c. To Bro. David Monier
December 10, 1824, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am sending you the dossier of the house at no. 3, Rue Lalande and of my business with M. Biernès. I have read and reread article 2109 of the Civil Code. After your explanation of the differences between family sharing and the division of the inheritance between husband and wife, and also because I was under the impression that no chattel mortgage could be taken out on what M. Fontblanc said was left. I thought everything was settled. However, the reading of this article 2109 reawakens my doubts. Here we are talking of a mortgage on shared property. M. Fontblanc has a right to compensation from M. Lafargue's part of the inheritance. According to the terms of the article, he seems to have observed the formality of registration within 60 days, etc.

As soon as possible, my dear Son, let me have an itemized account of what I owe M. Biernès and send it along with the dossiers. May the peace of the Lord be with you!

* * *

S. 320. To Bro. David Monier
January 9, 1825, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am sending you the paper I have just received entitled "Reply to the Letter Sent to Father Chaminade" (it is your letter on the Biernès matter) and the "Memorandum To Be Consulted." M. Biernès is putting pressure on me to end this business. I wish you could take care of this as soon as possible. I am adding your letter to the memorandum; you may need it.

My dear Son, I have had very extensive interviews. . .

* * *

S. 320a. To Baron de Razac
After January 10, 1825, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I have just been handed your letter of January 10. It was addressed to Brother Auguste, but he feared that if he answered with his customary simplicity and openness he might fail in the respect which he owes you. Because the matter discussed in the letter in no way concerns him, he decided not to show any further interest in something so unrewarding. Therefore, Honorable Baron, I myself must answer since you took the pains to present your interests and to contrast them with what may be called mine.

First, may I thank you, Monsieur le Baron, for your courtesy in recalling old memories. Thank you also for your allusion to the 1,000 francs which I turned over to M. Estebenet. But I must thank you above all, Baron, for your series of maxims on simplicity, candor, the danger of verbosity, and on the detachment we should have from temporal things. Baron, all these things you have said in an extraordinary manner. Reading them in your letter, one feels the love for them growing. If excerpted and collected, these statements would make profitable reading.

May I ask you now, Monsieur le Baron, why it is that when I go from the maxims to the matters which inspired them, I am struck by a contrast which is truly distressing? Surely this

contrast alienated the worthy young man who has acted as our go-between in this matter. And that contrast alone is responsible for the unpleasant answer which I am obliged to give you.

Monsieur, here is my answer, and with God's help, as you put it, I hope I will not fail against the truth and not confuse Christian charity with a complacency which for both of us would be conducive to injustice. As to the greater or lesser degree of deprivation to which my project may be exposed, I commit everything to the will of our God. One of the most appreciable losses in this world would be that of the goodwill you seemed to promise us before this miserable confrontation. I believe the following considerations will help us regain your esteem; at least I will try to do nothing which could forfeit it.

A word about your mention of the 1,000 francs which I gave to M. Estebenet. To bring up the subject letter which was not addressed to me, and with no hint that the sum was paid for you or to you, is most un-businesslike and confusing to our bookkeeping. You owed me a pure and simple receipt for the transaction. Really, I should not have paid without this receipt, but the alleged urgency of one of your deals required this payment, and I made it out of deference. The receipt I expect is very simple. You can hardly refuse it. You have not sent it simply because you believed it was unnecessary, and I see nothing wrong in that. I am convinced that you will sent it as soon as my request reaches you.

Would that this were the only thing we had to discuss! But you, in turn, Monsieur le Baron, make three claims concerning the 90,000 francs in our contract. I will list these claims and examine them. The concern (1) the additions to the house in question done long ago by M. Gombaude; (2) the two gashes on the staircase and the 30 francs I charged you for your share of the repairs; (3) the marble plaques from a small fireplace about which you express some doubt as to your ownership. Here are my answers, Monsieur, and my remarks on these three points.

With reference to the furnishing added by Chevalier Gombaude, I do not understand why in your letter you call them movable goods, detached from the house. This is pure nonsense and a pretext to allege or to think that I knowingly bought the furniture of the tenants along with the house. Baron, Sir, had that implausible intention crossed my mind, I would have said so and asked for your forgiveness. But it was far from my mind; there is no proof, not even a suspicion, that I did so. Chevalier Gombaude removed all his furniture; he never complained that he had been inconvenienced by us; he hauled everything away in perfect freedom.

Although you labeled those transformations "movables," your very honesty could book this equivocation for long, and immediately on the very next page you refer to things that could be dismantled, that the house in question did in fact suffer some dismantling. Chevalier Gombaude could have been forced to restore everything so that not a trace of the damage could be seen. The fact that there was no damage simplifies things. I do not care to engage in a dispute over such matters with Chevalier Gombaude. He has all my respect, and I would not want to antagonize him over such a trifle.

If before agreeing to the contract, Monsieur, you had required me to bear the cost of the demolition or to pay for what was erected years ago, and if I had accepted that condition, I would have undoubtedly been bound to it. But you admit that no such condition was imposed, to which you add this fact—that as you showed me through the building, you were careful to point to the transformations, now attributed to Chevalier Gombaude, declaring them to be advantageous, suitable for the purchaser and for which he would be willing to pay a higher price, with no mention of any secret reservations on the part of Chevalier Gombaude or any other. My dear Baron, what would the 90,000 francs have purchased if you had reserved parts of every section of the house? Let us forget, if you will, this regrettable misunderstanding.

I now come to the two gashes in the staircase, only because you provoke me to do so. The agreement concerning the staircase is a closed chapter; I agreed to pay for the two removals and have done so. I have been freed from my promise. For your part, Baron, you agreed to pay 30 francs to cover part of the damage, and my trust in the word of the Baron de Razac is such that I consider it paid. However, I do not know what to make of the almost caustic regrets about this

little agreement of ours which I read in your letter. Do you really think Baron, that the deal was a bad one? There are those who tell me that with 600 francs I cannot repair the mutilation. Who stood to gain by this? We are talking here of your escutcheons, not those of another. There were two bas-reliefs of no great value to anyone but you. Do you really believe those objects could be classed as furniture? In your letter you seemed to express yourself in uncertain terms. You would have been in error, for how could the objects have been called movables? You realize, of course, that when I agreed to the 30 francs I knew nothing of the object of your agreement. You made the suggestions, Baron; you changed the conditions, you quoted the 30 francs, and I agreed merely because I sought to please you. I do not regret my action, although the damage caused by the removal proves that more than 30 francs were involved here.

But were the objects movable? Were you mistaken in wanting to buy them back and claiming the right to remove them to the detriment of a house that no longer belonged to you? Now, I am not familiar with the laws governing this case, but if they favor the common good, as it is claimed, this must mean that the panels that form part of the edifice belong to the proprietor and not to the owner of the furniture; otherwise, the said owner of the furniture could carry away the entire house, piece by piece. I am told I have lost 600 francs, but I am not in the least concerned. In this you will note, Baron, that I satisfy your desire to see us detached from temporal things.

I still must speak of the marble trimming of the little fireplace. Please bear with me, Baron, as I tell you what I think. Do you know why you are in doubt about those poor marble plaques? The answer is simple—because you are not sure, in spite of our agreement, that the marble belongs to you. Otherwise, you would have spoken of them much as I did about the 30 francs for the two gashes to the staircase.

Do you want another argument? Here it is. You gave your orders concerning the staircase. You had free access to the house; the marble slabs could have been removed at the same time. They are embedded in plaster; a jolt would have loosened them and yet, the two items were taken from the staircase but not the marble plaques. Why not? Again, the answer is simple. The reason is, Baron, that you did not believe you had a right to them. How is someone to explain the request you make today for the marbles only? I believe I can see the reason, and with your permission I will explain without taking any liberties with the simplicity of the truth.

A little peevishness, justified or not, caused by the staircase problem and by Sir Gombaud, may have recalled other details that influenced our conversation. You may have recalled, although erroneously, what was said about the marble slabs and the bribe which you linked with them, although the two were entirely distinct. As far as my memory serves me, here are the facts. I was offering you a sum somewhat less than what I finally paid for your house. You tried to get more, and in doing so you mentioned a bribe, you manifested your attachment to some details of your house; even the fact—you assured me—that King Henry IV had spent some time in it, and many other things. Your fondness for the little fire place was hinted at. As for the bribe, I thought that since neither you nor I had used an agent, the bribe was in the nature of a second offer, under a different name. The 500 francs you suggested were forgotten.

About the fireplace, I can say that according to my plans, the small room housing the little marble chimney could disappear, for I had no intention of using the marble elsewhere; were that the case, I would keep your wishes in mind. But later, Monsieur, a great change took place in our relationship. I paid for all those discussions with so many thousands in francs that the memory of our little difference completely vanished. I made every sacrifice in the interest of religion and for the house that would serve it. I went beyond your estimate of the value of the house, beyond its commercial value. The deal was a profitable one for you, and I admit that you committed no injustice in taking full advantage of it. You were happy with the 90,000 francs, one-third down payment for your security and a first mortgage for the rest. What better deal could you have made? If you had brought up our first discussions, our first skirmishes as I call them, you would have risked losing everything. You were too smart, Sir, to compromise 90,000 francs

because of a few pieces of worthless marble. We made no agreement on the marble, and none was promised.

And yet, Monsieur le Baron, my original intention concerning the objects, in case the room and fireplace disappeared according to plan, remained the same. To state freely what I intended to do in no wise obliges me, yet my intent has not changed. Why should your letter to a third person deprive me of the satisfaction I anticipated the moment I was able to dispose of the articles? Was this the only time I hoped to please you without being obliged to? Did I not give you sufficient examples? And if I did so, who could say that it was a meaningless or false gesture on my part, a mere pretense of politeness? Both nature and time have left me vulnerable; everything I said I felt deeply.

Please excuse, Monsieur le Baron, whatever harshness you may find in my explanations; do see in them only truth and the desire to avoid hurting you. Still greater is my desire that we remain united before God, pardoning these distractions from the good we should be seeking, these failings and faults to which we are all subject, supporting each other in justice when necessary but always with charity. Should you doubt my explanations, Monsieur le Baron, have them compared with yours and let me know the results. You and I may be in error, but neither you nor I would want to remain in that error without enlightenment.

I am. . .¹

* * *

S. 321a. To Bro. David Monier

February 1825, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Is there any way you could extricate me from this business with M. Biernès, for instance by paying Mme Coste (her mortgage for 4,600 francs) and she could let me have 600 francs? I would pay the 600 francs to any one of my creditors. I would no longer be the one pleading; there may be other ways of going about it, it seems to me. However, I have no time to take care of it. We can talk on our way to Saint-Laurent; you are coming to dinner.

My dear Son, M. Biernès has just left me. He claims to have seen you since you received the memorandum from M. Bardinet. He believes the memorandum contains the opinion of M. Pérèz, just as we had planned. I did not discuss with him but sent him to you with the promise that I would ratify whatever you decided. It seems he would want a third opinion; I told him I want what you want, and if you agree to that, you should add your reasons to the memorandum, etc.

We made no mention of the consultant's fee; if you agree, I think we should share that. If you were of M. Pérèz's opinion or if you won over M. Pérèz, then I believe M. Bardinet and even M. Biernès would follow suit. At least if he wanted advice, he would pay for it himself. May the peace. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 322a. To Mother de l'Incarnation, Condom

February 11, 1825, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

¹ This letter will be replaced by letter no. 324a.

My dear Daughter,

Shortly you will receive a short instruction, my dear Daughter, on the observance of Lent which you will share with the superior, Father de Cadignan. I have news from Father Fenace. I also received Father de Cadignan's letter and will presently inform him of Father Fenace's sentiments. I do not have time even to read Father Caillet's letter to you. This morning I sent Mother Emmanuel's letter to Mme Vergne with my postscript. From time to time, read the "Guide for Superiors in the Institute of Mary." May the Lord grant you to always fulfill your obligations.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 322c. To M. de Lacaussade, Tonneins

February 13, 1825, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

The thread sent by Sister Adélaïde's mother seems to make good cloth. If you agree and if you feel a similar cloth would be more expensive, see to it that 50 kg of the thread is purchased and delivered to a weaver. Also at least 25 kg of tow are needed, the type agreed upon between herself and Marie.

I have a note from Brother David for you. I am sending this by mail although Justine is leaving in two days; I was told it was necessary because of the purchase of the thread. With best wishes.

* * *

S. 323a. To M. Bardinet

February 13, 1825, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

No matter how carefully I study the Biernès matter, I cannot hope to see it settled by conciliation. I would have liked to spare him the court costs if he takes that route. He does not want my mediation, it seems. Therefore, we must have recourse to the only remaining means. I will not defend this case but will await the court's decision to see whom I will pay.

Can I prove my goodwill more convincingly than by giving him 2,000 francs under these circumstances? He asked me to consult, and I did; not let him consult his lawyers if he believes mine are incompetent. I cannot imagine a good lawyer not blaming him for not wanting to conciliate.

Please, Monsieur, inform M. Biernès of my last decision. I will write to Brother David in case he goes to the former's residence first, rather than to yours.

* * *

S. 324a. To Baron de Razac, Paris

March 1825, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I did not attribute much importance to the claims which M. de Gombaud made shortly after the sale of your house. Today the matter has taken a serious turn. M. de Gombaud has already taken some energetic steps, turning first to Brother Auguste. He went so far as to threaten to drag him before the justice of the peace. Fortunately, Brother Auguste lived up to his

reputation for gentleness and honesty, both in his writings and in his speech. We were waiting for an answer to the two letters he sent you, hoping that your answer would bring a settlement. We waited a long time, longer than Sir de Gombaud anticipated. Your letter came finally, and Brother Auguste, who was my agent in the matter, gave it to me so I might answer it.

My first impulse was to give up everything that was claimed. Nothing is so precious as peace. But in spite of my inclinations in this direction, several considerations deterred me. Let me state simply, Baron, that our money lenders were beside themselves when I told them of the difficulties which exist between us. In fact, Sir, if you would consider the problems for a few moments, you would find that it is not complicated and that our right is as genuine as that of Sir de Gombaud. Here is a short and clear explanation.

You allowed me to visit your house and to show it to visitors more than once. I even visited it with you, and with you we went into the wing occupied by Sir de Gombaud. You made no mention of the claims we were to expect from your respectable lodger. Far from doing so, one day you said as you showed M. de Gombaud's room to Brother Auguste, "Here is an apartment that is ideal for a teacher." After several visits we agreed on a price, and we drew up the papers. Some days later, M. de Gombaud informed me that according to his lease, he had the right to dismantle and remove all the additions and decorations in his apartment. I told him the sale was an accomplished fact, and any complaint must be addressed to you; however, I charitably offered to inform you myself. He answered that he would have everything removed unless we reimbursed him for what he had put in for a very modest sum. I then imposed a condition, that all this must be included in the plan Brother Auguste had for alterations, and asked M. de Gombaud to see him about it. I added that if it were accepted, we would have it evaluated and the money given to you. This was done, and Brother Auguste informed you.

After this short account of the facts, is it not easy to recognize our right and that of M. de Gombaud? His right is based on his lease; he says so, and you do not seem to contest the fact. Is ours less evident? We bought the house just as it stood, just as you showed it to us. You certainly did not intend to see us anything that did not belong to you! I am convinced of this—yet did you not actually sell articles which M. de Gombaud had the right to take? You were not aware of it, I am sure, but must your oversight turn to your advantage and to our loss? To your advantage, for you pocketed the money; to our loss, for we will have to pay M. de Gombaud. Finally, and now we are dealing with perfect justice, you have been compensated for??? And that sum you will now give to him.

Moreover, Sir, you have the right to contest the evaluation if you find it too high. This is why we did not contest it ourselves. Our reluctance has been just as great as our answer has been delayed; perhaps it is this reluctance which so displeased M. de Gombaud. I admit unhesitatingly that I believe he is acting honestly. But what could we do without you? As I read and reread your letter, I thought I grasped the reason for your misunderstanding and for the worries you are causing us, doubtlessly in innocence. You seem to lump everything with the furniture; the additions, the partitions—in a word, the various repairs M. de Gombaud has had done to the wing of the mansion he occupied. I believe it is sufficient to point out your error without providing proof.

After reasoning in this fashion, I resolved simply to ask you to consider the matter for a few moments and to recall the main facts.

Enough of this, Baron, and would that nothing of this nature ever comes between us again. However, I cannot suppress my surprise at reading in your letter that "it was due to a misconception that you were asked to contribute to the repairs of the main staircase; that it was perhaps due to an error that you were left in doubt about whether you would or would not get the fireplace of the little parlor overlooking the garden on the main floor." The first item was the last to be discussed by us. The terms had been agreed upon, a compromise had been reached when you spoke to me for the first time about your escutcheons. I replied that I had no real notion of what you exempted from the sale. We agreed that the staircase would suffer from the removal,

that you would give 30 francs for the smaller of the repairs, and I accepted the more onerous expenses. Pray, where is the misconception? If there is one, tell me honestly where it lies.

Let us talk about the fireplace. It was during the second or third interview that you again stated your price and added that you reserved the entire fireplace for yourself, or offered a 500 franc bribe. I answered firmly that there could be no question of a bribe between us, that since I did not know the objects you requested, not even the premises, I could not arrive at a decision. I added in all sincerity that if that room were to be demolished during the repairs, I would remember your attachment to the fireplace. However, that was not a promise. You know now that I had given up that purchase, that we formulated new proposals, and that only the escutcheons were reserved.

As I conclude this long letter, Baron, I beg you once again to examine this whole matter. I know your sense of justice, your loyalty, and even your disinterestedness, and I do not doubt for an instant that you will cease these vexations, which I never should have suffered. If you accept the evaluation made by M. de Gombaudo, I immediately will give him the money. I will then draw up a bill and send it to you. We will know where we stand, and I have every reason to hope that our decisions will receive prompt implementation. One more word. Should you not see things as I do, Sir, I would ask you to consult some person in whom we both have confidence.

P.S. This letter was ready to leave, Baron, when Brother Auguste sent me one from Count de Saint-Exupéry along with his answer by return mail. The Count informs Brother Auguste on the part of M. de Gombaudo that M. Titta has already drawn up a document for our signatures. Brother Auguste answered that he was only an agent in these negotiations, that he was sending me his notes and that I was to write to you. In fact, Brother Auguste is only a volunteer agent, as I pointed out to M. de Gombaudo, for I had no time to visit the mansion, to listen to his claims, and to write to you also concerning your interest, to allow M. de Gombaudo to remove the partitions, doors, etc., if these were not included in the new plans. Although my honest efforts have not been rewarded to date, I do not regret them, and I hope you will never cause me to regret them. To that end, I am substituting this letter for another which my lawyer had drawn up according to the articles of the law. One word from you, Baron, and justice will be done to M. de Gombaudo and to me. But I beg you, send that word promptly.

If I agreed to allow my counsel to draw up my answer, this was because M. de Gombaudo had already chosen his (M. Titta, a lawyer you know). The tardiness of your answer has undoubtedly ill-disposed him; he will not have believed our frankness. Perhaps he will agree with you interiorly but will want by pestering you to obtain the 500 francs he claims and leave us to come to an agreement by ourselves.

* * *

S. 325a. To Baron de Razac, Paris

March 22, 1825, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

I beg you again to give me a direct answer to my last letter, and more particularly to send me a receipt for the 1,000 francs I gave you for past interest due. I repeat my offer, Sir, to pay M. de Gombaudo whatever you believe you owe him because of his claims. I will deduct this amount from my next interest payment. I am respectfully yours. . . .

* * *

S. 325b. To Count de Saint-Exupéry

March 22, 1825, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

It has seemed to me that the shortest and the simplest way to obtain the result which you so justly claim was to write again to Baron de Razac. I hereby send you a copy of my letter. I hope M. de Razac will finally open his eyes, especially if you yourself have the goodness to acquaint him with the ideas we exchanged at our last interview. He is implicating both of us in a matter which is not really one of any consequence. I am with a profound respect. . . .

* * *

S. 325c. To Count de Saint-Exupéry, Bordeaux

March 24, 1825 place???

(Copy, Agmar)

If, as you say, I am to be taken to court for trying to reconcile M. de Gombaudo and M. de Razac, the event will be most extraordinary indeed, and one which I could not foresee. I would be vexed indeed if you, as an intermediary, were to approve of such an action. The only thing I agreed upon with you was to see whether it was possible for me to have M. de Gombaudo surrender his rights and to induce M. de Razac to admit yours. I say that I had to find out how to bring this about. I was told that it was not proper to assume a debt which was being contested by the debtor, that M. de Razac and M. de Gombaudo were close relatives, that they could not agree and therefore I could not help by taking on the latter's' debts, that the best thing to do was to be an open mediator, offering to pay if M. de Razac billed me, who would shortly be his debtor. In all this I merely offered my good services. I would be offended if the good I wanted to do turned to evil.

You suppose wrongly that I have leased my house and that a third person is now the tenant. My house is not for rent, and the repairs I am making are mind. I cannot see how one can demolish anything for a third person in a house which one cannot claim to have been fraudulently bought and paid for. I thank you for obliging words in the midst of so much misunderstanding.

Please accept the expression of my highest regard.

Letters and Passages Omitted in Volume Two

* * *

S. 326. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 29, 1825, Bordeaux

In your next letter, give me all the necessary information about this. . .

You had mentioned that in Saint-Remy you had found a suitable candidate who could be sent to Colmar. If my memory serves me, you said he was the son of a carpenter and that he knew both languages, French and German. However, you sent a cattle herder who looks sickly and who knows nothing! Can you not see that you are compromising me and your establishment?

I would be of the opinion. . .

* * *

S. 326. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 29, 1825, Bordeaux

P.S. This letter was about the leave when our last, which was undated, arrived. I read it and also that of Father Rothéa, which was enclosed. I can find nothing to change or to add. I will try to write, or to have someone write, in a few days.

* * *

S. 329b. To M. Pérèz

April 10, 1825, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

I am asking you, Monsieur, to be my surrogate in answering the summons on the part of M. de Gombaud. Should the matter have a sequel, I beg him to confer with M. Louis Brochon, whom I will consult when the time is ripe. I have the honor of again expressing. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 333. To Viscount du Hamel,

Mayor of Bordeaux

April 20, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . the city would not be depriving itself of any advantage. . .

A considerable area would still be available for use by the prisons and the city hall. The lot between the prisons and the rear of the houses on Rue des Augustins measures about 120 m by 60 m. I am asking for one-half of that, the part behind the Razac garden—that is, 60 m in every direction.

The project which the city may entertain of extending Rue Candale through these grounds up to the law courts building would in no way prevent it from giving a favorable answer to my request. On the contrary, these grounds will be sold sooner or later, and I promise to keep only provisional possession of the future street site with the obligation to yield to any requisition as soon as a road is opened to public use.

Finally, persuaded that an administration. . .

* * *

S. 334. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

April 24, 1825, Bordeaux

M. de Razac would have done me a favor by giving me a note about them.

As I write, my dear Son, I am handed the exit permit of young George and two letters, one for you and one for him. In my next letter to you I will send you a summary of their contents. Tomorrow I will go to the novitiate of the Daughters of Mary, and I will see what can be done for the daughter of M. Luard, the shoemaker. I do not believe we should accept him at Saint-Remy, even if he seems to be willing to convert; at least his conversion would have to stand the test.

I need not tell you. . .

*

P.S. I am not telling you how deeply I appreciate. . .

P.S. 2. M. Billecoc wrote to M. Changeur that he should keep the promise he made to you of the offer of his services.

P.S. 3. I have just become aware that I have not dealt with a very serious matter for which an irate M. de Razac blames Brother Auguste. One of Brother Auguste's letters, which M. de Razac has shown you, seems to have convinced you. You write the following: "M. de Razac declared formally to Brother Auguste that a contract existed between him and his cousin, and he is shocked at the claim that it was not generally known. He showed you a letter from Brother Auguste which states the reservations made by M. de Gombaud and which proves that M. de Razac had spoken of them with him from the very beginning."

M. de Razac could have been spared all his indignation if he had only reflected for a few moments (1) that it was only later, after the least had been signed, that he informed Brother Auguste of his contract with M. de Gombaud. (2) Brother Auguste's letter which he showed you is dated October 2; that strikingly frank letter does really mention the terms of the lease which M. de Razac spoke of at the time I have just referred to. (3) I, and not Brother Auguste, claim to have become aware of the least about three months after the contract because M. de Gombaud only told me about it then, and Brother Auguste had had no opportunity to discuss it with me. I am limiting myself to a simple expose of the facts without giving these gentlemen the benefit of any reflection or reasoning. If there is a court action, I want my lawyer to do the same, even if we were to lose.

* * *

S. 335. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

April 28, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . normal schools and schools joined to the arts and crafts.

My dear Son, the day after your departure I received from Agen a large packet of letters addressed to you. I am sending you only the one in the first envelope; the others are for various people whom you are to meet on your trip or who would like to meet you.

May the Lord, my dear Son, shower upon you. . .

* * *

S. 338-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

May 3, 1825, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

You are already aware through Father Caillet that our Brother Constant could not be dispensed from the draft by the Council for Public Instruction; the documents which could have procured the dispensation according to law arrived too late at the university. Because according to law he was to be dispensed, I did not believe it proper to use any means other than those he has and which are evident, such as poor health, etc. When I noticed how slow they were at Agen to provide the father with his certificate, showing that he had consented, and did in fact consent to a 10-year term with the university, I asked the Prefect of Agen to have him transferred to the prefecture of Vesoul, where he could be examined and discharged as unfit for military duty. I hope the Prefect of Vesoul will consent to an extraordinary review council if necessary. He is better placed than anyone else in authority to judge that it is no one's fault if the young man is so late in presenting himself; it is due to the poor communications over long distances. I do not doubt that he will find favor with the government by submitting to this procedure. All the university heads, especially the Minister of Public Instruction, expressed true concern because young Constant's papers arrived too late; I was told in a letter that the only alternative was a military discharge because this was possible and because we did not want to take advantage of the law.

Father Caillet writes from Paris that he fears the 3,000 francs granted by the General Council of the Department of Haute-Saône will not be forthcoming this year. However, this is not yet certain; we will soon find out. You could refer to this when you see the prefect about young Constant. It is very likely that the Society of Mary will be approved shortly. Could these 3,000 francs not be placed in reserve and applied to the same purpose by the next council without detriment to next year's grant? The house could then borrow and provide funds both for the normal school and for the teachers' retreat this year.

On this same journey to Vesoul, you could see the banker and ask him if he could take from my account the 6,000 francs you must pay him on June 1 next. It is a great bother and costly to have such a sum transferred either to Vesoul or to Saint-Remy. Last month I wrote to Brother Rothéa at Colmar asking him if he could easily transfer that sum to Vesoul. He said he thought he could and that he would let me know in a few days. I am still waiting for his answer. If the banker (I do not remember his name) prefers to divide the sum and make the necessary arrangements with his branch so I could pay it back in installments after June 1, you will of course pay the interest. Let me know immediately the results of your interview with him so that I can arrange to pay him back. Brother David had already spoken to me of his honesty; I should like to commend him for it, for I consider done to myself what is done to my administrators. I allow my banker to draw from my account on ten days' notice, at any time, a maximum of 6,000 francs, redeemable in at least three stages, with interest at 3.6%.

I suppose, my dear Son, that Father Caillet keeps you informed about his negotiations in Paris. It seems the Society of Mary will receive its approbation in a very few days, along with the establishment of Saint-Remy, the normal school, etc., etc. May the peace of the Lord, my dear Son, be with you and with all my dear Children at Saint-Remy. I embrace you tenderly.

* * *

S. 339. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

May 7, 1825, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I wrote to you on May 2 or May 3 through His Excellency the Minister, and I was going to continue my last letter when on May 6 I received yours of the first. I am dropping all other matters to take up my pen for you.

My dear Son, act with holy liberty during your stay in Paris and all through your travels. In whatever you may find embarrassing, see what faith and the spirit of the Institute would order or permit you to do. Think of what I would advise you, were you in a position to consult me. You can then pursue your course in peace.

I have just written a letter to Brother Clouzet which he was to show to the Prefect of Vesoul. In it I discuss three things only: (1) our young Brother Constant, (2) the 3,000 francs, and (3) the 6,000 francs we owe the banker in Vesoul. If the 3,000 francs are not allocated by the Minister of the Interior this year, the prefect could reserve them and the General Council of the department could add them to the sum they would allocate next year for the same purpose. In this way there would be no interruption, the Saint-Remy establishment could proceed either by borrowing, etc. . . .

My dear Son, I would very much have liked to see the two retreats for the teachers take place a few days after your arrival in Saint-Remy. Apparently your main reason for not waiting until September, as the Rector of the Academy of Besançon seemed to wish, is the normal school and the students who would be sent there in June, July, and August. But would it be very inconvenient to send them only between July 1 and October 1, or even, if two months are absolutely needed for the holidays, could we not split the three-month period, one and one-half or two months toward the end of the summer and before September 1, and the other around November 1? The young teachers would profit by the return. Other arrangements could be made, but I would like to see this one, for it is to the advantage of our young teachers. It is not surprising, though, that in the beginning there should be some difficulty in arranging the schedule; I hope things will go more smoothly next year.

My dear Son, I have received a long letter from M. de Razac, dated April 27. I would have answered immediately, but you told me he had just written to M. de Gombaudo. I cannot understand why that letter is not signed or dated. In his blindness, he insists that he sold me only what belonged to him; he gives the reasons for the slowness of his answers, etc. If only in reply to Brother Auguste's first warning he had said, "I will not pay the amount evaluated or presented by M. de Gombaudo for the partitions, doors, woodwork, etc., that he built in his apartment, although I sold you the mansion without informing you of the lease which gave him the right to claim compensation or to take with him all these items." If, I say, M. de Razac had answered clearly either Brother Auguste or me, I do not doubt that given my temperament, I would have made the little sacrifice rather than have a dispute with two people I respect most highly. If I proposed two solutions of the problem with M. de Gombaudo, this was to keep the peace and to avoid a scandalous court case where M. de Gombaudo claims Brother Auguste bought the partitions and notified M. de Razac of their estimated value with no mention of the basis for his rights, etc.

M. de Razac claims that I suffer from illusions to the extent that I am blind! But why did he not, in all charity, tell me or others the cause of my blindness? Is that an answer to say, "You are under an illusion; I never did intend to sell what did not belong to me, I could not, should not, etc.," when I tell him honestly that I only found out about three months after the sale that M. de Gombaudo had a lease, to become angry because he had told Brother Auguste less than three months. . . . Is that not to avoid the question, to skirt around it? The truth is that he sold the mansion just as it was at my visit, with no reservations, either written or oral, before or during the signing of the contract. The number of days or months after which he made his revelation is not important. This wretched matter causes me to lose more time than I could redeem with 300 or 600 francs. I would not have said a word about, had I not detected, in an interview with this respectable Baron, a tendency to believe his story. If I refuse to plead, if I am ready to let them have what they want, I will still believe I was forced to buy what is taken away. To excuse M. de Razac, I will believe (1) that he never thought to tell me of the lease agreement with M. de

Gombaudo, (2) that he never wanted to sell something which did not belong to him, and (3) that he is deluded if he thinks he does not have to compensate an honest buyer to whom he has sold articles which he thought were his and pocketed the money. I will stop here.

* * *

S. 340. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

May 9, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . whose virtue and ability would be well known.

I remarked in my last letter, my dear Son, how I had always considered the matter between M. de Razac and M. de Gombaudo to be a simple one. I will see to it that the lawyer who will defend me, M. Louis Brochon, receives a brief account of it. Only if M. de Gombaudo persists in attacking me. The account will present to the court my sales contract, tell of the late appearance of the lease agreement between M. de Razac and M. de Gombaudo, show how because of my many occupations I agreed to let Brother Auguste receive the estimates covering the material to be repossessed by M. de Gombaudo with the consent of M. de Razac; how he immediately informed M. de Razac, the only one who should compensate him; how because of M. de Razac's long silence M. de Gombaudo had imagined that Brother Auguste had bought the repossessed objects for 550 francs according to the estimates which had been sent to M. de Razac.

. . .

I could not finish this letter before mail time, so I told young Brother Tissier to inform you that you could consult M. Billecoc about the shabby and miserable case, and you will find out who is blindly laboring under illusions here.

You would do well to befriend M. de Vassal, give him my best regards, and suggest that he have nothing to do with M. Allègre—that the latter did want to join the Society of Mary but never did and most probably never would be admitted.

The law concerning the religious. . .

* * *

S. 340-2. To Bishop Jacoupy of Agen

May 13, 1825, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

Excellency,

Before permitting young Brunet to ask you for his exit permit, I have studied him and have tested him at some length. I hope we will not regret the considerable sums that will be spent on his education. He does not seem to be possessed of those vices which some rumors attribute to his parents.

I believed the time was ripe, Your Excellency, to ask the king to give his approbation to the Institute, or the Society of Mary. Father Caillet is prolonging his stay in Paris for that purpose. This is a serious step, but it seems to go favorably. As soon as a final decision is reached, I will inform you. The discussion of the Statutes and of related subjects in the offices of the Minister keeps me so busy that I hardly have time to go and tell you what is happening. For the same reason, I have not written to you about Father Serre. Had he explained his situation more clearly, no matter how strapped for priests you may be, you would surely have allowed him to come to us. I am. . . .

P.S. please give my regards to Father Trincaud and Father Liaubon. I am including, Excellency, the baptismal certificate of Brother Brunet for authentication.

* * *

S. 342. To Fr. Georges Caillet
May 16, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . copy of the fourth edition of the Statutes of the Society of Mary.

In both copies Brother Tessier, the secretary, is afraid he may have omitted a word in the first statute. He believes he wrote simply the "Society" instead of the "Society of Mary is," etc. If you can catch this in time, it will be easy to correct without needing another copy; it is not an important omission. Should you not receive it in time, the meaning is given by the title.

I am sure, my dear Son, that you are not forgetting. . . .

* * *

S. 343. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris
May 19, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . I have not had as much as two minutes to think it over.

M. de Gombaud insists on suing. The case will be heard shortly in a court of first instance. This evening I will see M. Brochon, our defense counsel. I will let him know that M. de Razac is willing to come to an understanding, or rather that we are all willing. I will urge him to prolong the hearing as much as he can. I will let you know the outcome, if I can. The first mail delivery will be on the eve of Pentecost.

May the blessing of the Lord, my dear Son, come upon you. . . .

* * *

S. 346. To Fr. Georges Caillet
May 30, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . I will have him come to Saint-Laurent for the remainder of the year.

I have made a compromise with M. de Gombaud. We are appointing M ---, the president of the Royal Court and a member of parliament; he did not go to Reims, but he must now be back in Bordeaux. M. de Gombaud must have left for Paris; he will stay with M. de Razac and will ask him to sign. The president will pass judgment on any point which may be a bone of contention among the three of us. Please take care of any documents they may want to send me; send them along as you did the letter from the Duke de Montmorency, with the archbishop's mail. I informed Father Gignoux, the archbishop's secretary, the first time you followed this procedure, and I hope there will be no more delay in the mail delivery.

What might well be the distinctive mark. . . .

* * *

S. 349. To Mother de l'Incarnation
June 10, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . according to the views of the Institute of Mary.

I did not realize that to prepare a lodging for Father Lagutère in the old laundry would cost 1,500 francs. Perhaps if we gave him purely and simply this building with the adjacent grounds, he would slowly install himself according to his whim and fantasy. I would hope so, for his own good and that of the convent. If that is not possible, we will have to rent it, but without a

lease, because we may have the funds later; the building is very suitable for a chaplain like Father Lagutère.

In the beginning we accepted Sister Julie for school work, she seemed to humble and simple; how can she consider herself a servant today? If she cannot overcome her pride, she will have to be changed; is it perhaps because she is in her native country? Before we removed her from Tonneins, everyone was most pleased with her.

* * *

S. 350. To Fr. Georges Caillet

June 16, 1825, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

It was with joy that I received your letter dated in Saint-Remy but stamped in Paris. Yours of June 1 from Besançon I received on June 7, about one and one-half hours before the mail was picked up. I took advantage of this to answer you immediately and sent the letter to the seminary of Besançon. I did not have time to have a copy made. You could write to Father Breuillot and ask him to read the letter and then to forward it to you in Paris in the mail pouch of His Excellence the Minister, etc. In that letter I weighed the pros and cons of buying the establishment in Vesoul and discussed the 20,000 francs of Father Bardenet.

This short letter has no other object. . . .

* * *

S. 351. To Fr. Georges Caillet

June 20, 1825, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

You must have received a letter dated June 17, I believe, instead of June 16. I did not have a copy made, nor of the one I sent to Besançon on June 7 or June 8.

In my letter of June 16, my dear Son. . . .

* * *

S. 351. To Fr. Georges Caillet

June 20, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . I have just received your letter of the 15th. . . .

It is too bad that M. de Gombaud and M. de Razac will not hear of a compromise. A long time ago, I set aside the funds needed to pay the interest owed to M. de Razac. I will not do this until we have a settlement. Is the matter not muddled enough without making it worse?

I am sorry I am not able to speak to you more about God, but the postman will be here soon. I hardly had time to read your letter. I will try to send you something by tomorrow's mail. Most heartily yours. . . .

* * *

S. 352. To Fr. Georges Caillet

June 23, 1825, Bordeaux

You will see to it if there is still time and if the Rector. . . .

I have asked Brother Clouzet for a replacement for Brother Constant in case he is not exempted. I am surprised that Brother Clouzet, who certainly knows the means we had at our disposal for obtaining the exemption of young men of value to the Society, has had no success whatsoever in this case. One tactic we used was to send the young man to a prefecture other than the one where he was born. I had told M. Lacoste of this practice, and he will be surprised that it did not work. Several young men now living in Bordeaux but natives of other departments were sent here, and all were exempted—at least all those I know. The prefects and the review boards were not strict with those of their departments. Write again to Brother Clouzet; perhaps he will be more bold and more assiduous.

May the Lord, my dear Son, grant you his mercy and his peace.

* * *

S. 354. To Fr. Georges Caillet

July 5, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . in proportion as I reread its various articles.

You found that the letter I wrote to you from Besançon lacked precision (June 7). I told you that I kept no copy. Therefore, I can explain only the paragraph which you quote. I reread your letter from Besançon in order to understand the paragraph in question, and I see now that I attributed to Father Breuillot what you said about Father Bardenet, that he was allocating to some other good work the 10,000 francs he wanted to give. I supposed that the seminary of Besançon had no pressing need, and that Father Breuillot was going to buy the house in Vesoul or would offer us the money to do so, thereby hastening the time when Providence would give us the means to purchase it.

Since that time there seems to be some means. . .

*

Several young men are learning the sign language . . . succeeding well in it.

You did well, my dear Son, to recall the letters of June 8, 11, and 12, for Father Bardenet's proposition had completely slipped my mind. As you can see from what I have said above, after greeting Father Bardenet for me, you can tell him that I am disposed to accept the 20,000 francs which he is to pay to M. d'Argenson next November. It will make it easier for me to pay the 5% interest on the much larger sums we will borrow in Alsace. However, I cannot give him a final answer (1) until he gives me the 20,000 francs in promissory notes and (2) until I know exactly when I can convert them into cash. I suppose this would be some time in November, at a suitable date, at which time I could negotiate with the seminary of Besançon for the purchase of the building. Because these are long-term notes, further negotiations will be necessary. I imagine the 20,000 francs can be paid to M. d'Argenson from the sale of the property of Sisters Cavier and Ignace; the latter has reached her majority. After I receive an answer from Father Bardenet, I will find the best way to pay off the entire debt. Moreover, as he remarked, if we do not have the cash, we could still borrow.

When you have finished your work in Paris, will you go to Saint-Remy. . .

*

That is all that is needed for the accomplishment of the good. . . .

Things would be different if Saint-Remy were not a property.

I am a little astonished at the variations. . .

* * *

S. 356. To Fr. Georges Caillet
July 10, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . by the practice of the Christian and the religious virtues.

My dear Son, I am sending you copies of the agreement which M. de Gombaudo had asked for, and of the letter Brother David had written to me when he had me review the agreement which M. de Gombaudo refused to sign. M. de Razac is familiar with both documents from having discussed them with his lawyer who, in general, is not very conciliatory. With his love and disposition for peace, I am surprised he will not sign.

You have done well in following the advice. . .

* * *

S. 358. To Fr. Georges Caillet
July 15, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . had we learned beforehand that the king had sanctioned. . .

Once we know Father Bardenet's reaction to the last propositions which you put to him along the lines of what I wrote to you, I will see what can be done with Father Breuillot about the house in Vesoul, and at the same time about the other establishments. My dear Son, meet M. Vallet and his 13-year-old son; if you detect in them all the good that rumor confers on them, send them both to Saint-Remy.

I am taking and rereading the copy of the letter. . .

*

. . . both may come to our minor seminary in Bordeaux.

We can only be thankful for the goodwill manifested by the pastor of Ildgenen and by M. Gasser; however, I do not see what I could base my decision upon. Do you see clearly in the Landser matter? I see no difficulty in accepting the nephew of Brother Griffon. Besides, I am at a loss to understand what Father Rothéa means when he adds, "Bernard Fischer, brother of the young novice, can hardly wait to be received into the novitiate." I have taken note of the wishes of Mme Wendling and of the widow Waller.

If any establishment is made. . .

* * *

S. 366. To Bro. David Monier
August 1, 1825, Bordeaux

P.S. Father Conne's heir is exasperating with his insistence on seals; he is making me lose much time. Do the heirs have a legal right to immediate possession of their inheritance?

* * *

S. 369-2. To M. O'Lombel, Paris
August 3, 1825, Bordeaux

I had the most important topics of our correspondence condensed into recommendations. I have added what the nature of our business made necessary after advice from my Institute. To explain each item would be a long undertaking; I trust your sense of justice and your knowledge of the business world will compensate. However, if you have any question or need any additional information, your request will be given the usual consideration.

Now concerning the procuration, I have deleted the power to “purchase such lands, properties, and buildings as the proxy desires.” Not that I do not trust you with this power, but its very vagueness would lead someone to suppose I had gigantic and ambitious projects in mind, which I do not, and which would be contrary to the edification and simplicity which the Institute expects from us all. Otherwise, the procuration is very like its first draft, and the few words of explanation change nothing of substance.

You realize, of course, that only my complete trust and confidence in you allow me to send you this procuration. The 14 points of instructions I am including, of which you will please send me a signed copy, only protect me against you or your heirs. However, I am completely at the mercy of third parties with whom you deal in my name. Any misfortune you might suffer would implicate me. Any unfavorable attitude among your heirs could be disastrous for me. On these two counts, my instructions are a possible guarantee, but I am aware that my interest in the project lures me on, and I am putting myself into the hands of Providence. May it protect your person and guide your actions, on which I rely because God wills it do.

* * *

S. 369-3. To M. O’Lombel, Paris

August 3, 1825, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

1. M. O’Lombel, having promised to buy the large Richelieu mansion and its outbuildings situated on Ile Saint-Louis, Paris, is authorized by the procuration accompanying this instruction to make public this purchase under the name and responsibility of Father Chaminade, and therefore all costs pertaining to the said mansion and all obligations to the person or persons selling the same will be legally binding on Father Chaminade.

2. The purchase will be for the sum of 20,000 francs, payable as follows

50,000 as down payment the day the contract is signed

49,000 six months after the date of the signing

24,500 on August 6, 1826

28,000 on August 6, 1827 at the earliest

Note. This agreement may be held in abeyance until two annuities have run their course, one for 24,000 francs and the other for 4,000, for which the mansion is mortgaged. Payment will be made only 6 months after these annuities have been paid off.

24,500 on August 6, 1828

24,000 on August 6, 1829

200,000 Total

3. Interest on the 150,000 francs after the down payment of 50,000 will be 5% beginning on August 1, the present month.

4. The cost for registering the sale and making the necessary declarations has been estimated by M. O’Lombel to be of the order of 15,000 francs. Cost and commissions may amount to another 3,000 francs, making a total of about 18,000 francs.

5. M. O'Lombel assumes full personal responsibility for the above payments, at the specified times or when legal payment is required, none of which is the concern of Father Chaminade.

6. To make these payments, M. O'Lombel will be furnished sums from Paris to set up the Institute of Mary on the premises purchased to that end. He may also use the sums accruing from the material administration of the mansion, which would operate as a retreat house for ecclesiastics of all ranks and for worthy seculars. M. O'Lombel would assume the material administration according to the particular regulations yet to be outlined, so that everything favors the sanctification and salvation of both retreatants and directors.

7. Should M. O'Lombel be forced to obtain loans to provide temporarily for his needs, he may mortgage and give as special guarantee only the real estate he will have acquired in the name of Father Chaminade or that he will later acquire in the same name and under new powers, but in no case will there be a general mortgage on the whole.

8. No bids for repairs or construction which M. O'Lombel will consider necessary can be approved, promised, rendered obligatory, or granted until M. O'Lombel has discussed them with the Father Chaminade, and the latter will authorize them only if the funds needed for payment are sufficiently guaranteed without prejudice to the payments on the sale price at the stated intervals.

9. Exempt from the previous authorization are the maintenance and the incidental repairs with total annual cost of less than 2,000 francs, except for those given on three months' notice from M. O'Lombel, who will explain the method of payment.

10. All incomes and expenditures will be entered into a ledger without blank spaces. All correspondence will be kept on file, and all letters received will be numbered and classified. A perpetual inventory of the furniture is to be kept. Every three months, or more often if necessary, damaged articles will be noted and surplus items will be duly inventoried.

Father Chaminade or a designate will inspect and sign these three books. The three registers will be kept up to date and will be open for inspection, as also the record of orders, current business, notebooks, and other documents. A general review will be made on August 6 of each year, and M. O'Lombel will send Father Chaminade a certified copy.

11. M. O'Lombel is responsible for the persons and actions of his substitutes and for any court action they may engage in without formal authorization.

12. The person charged with the spiritual administration under the authority of the archbishop will be given by Father Chaminade, and under his orders, large rooms for meetings and the retreat exercises. The chapel and lodging will be assigned according to a plan by Father Chaminade after he has explored the buildings or studied the plans of the same. All furniture to be used for chapel services, for meeting rooms, and for private rooms will be the responsibility of the administration, which will keep an inventory of the same. Father Chaminade is personally responsible for the subsistence of the missionaries and their assistants. It is left to his judgment until new provisions are made.

13. If, God forbid, any difference of opinion arises in the implementation of the above articles, we will invoke the binding decision of one or three arbiters, one chosen by each party and the third one acceptable to both parties.

14. The present directive is made in duplicate and signed, one for M. O'Lombel and the other for Father Chaminade.

G.-Joseph Chaminade, Bordeaux, August 3, 1825
M. O'Lombel, Paris, August 8, 1825

* * *

S. 369-4. To M. Rauzan, Notary
August 1825, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Appeared before M. Rauzan, notary, G.-Joseph Chaminade, honorary canon of the church of Saint Andrew in Bordeaux, residing at no. 3, Rue de Lalande, who by these presents has constituted as his special and general representative M. O'Lombel, proprietor, living in Paris, no. 7, Rue de Sèvres, whom he empowers for himself and in his name:

- to purchase, according to price, charges, clauses, and conditions acceptable to him, the large Richelieu mansion and its outbuildings located in Paris, Béthune dock, Ile Saint-Louis
- to include all conditions in the said contract
- to determine the down payment and the terms with or without interest and to be given a receipt
- to ask for a transfer of all titles and related documents
- to ask for the removal of all liens and to received from the sellers a report on such removal
- to oversee the payment in cash, to comply with the law for the settling of all mortgages and for registration
- to open all bidding or to waive all rights
- to obtain the loans necessary for the purchase, and to secure them with mortgages on the property or other goods designated by the buyer
- to specify the purpose of any loan
- to agree to any transfer of privileges from seller to lender
- to make all repairs, restorations, and constructions, and for this purpose to choose al contractors
- to deal, to compromise, to come to terms
- in case of a dispute, to apply to the courts when necessary
- to choose lawyers and arbiters, to obtain a judgment and to see that it is carried out
- to ask for all orders and contributions, to agree to compensation, and to pay all creditors
- to forego all court action
- to sign all acts, to substitute in whole or in part the present powers
- to inhabit the house, and in general to do everything necessary to secure the interests of the buyer.

Promising. . .

Done and passed at. . . .

* * *

S. 370. To Fr. Georges Caillet

August 8, 1825, Bordeaux

If God is with us, who will be against us?

Your last two letters do not indicate clearly whether the draft of our statutes, which you presented to the State Council, is the same as that shown to the Council of Public Instruction, or if you simply added to the former the articles 18 and 19 which were dropped from the latter. You know there were other deletions, such as the mention of the retreats to be given to the teachers. This retreat provision, along with articles 18 and 19, made it similar to the statutes of the normal schools. Even adding articles 18 and 19 to the draft would present to the council an incomplete picture of our normal schools, which are not houses of formation for our young Teaching Brothers, but for the lay teachers in primary schools. Not surprisingly, M. le Baron, the reporter,

thought he had detected something suspicious, underhanded. Reflect, my dear Son, but pray especially; then act in all confidence.

I am passing over to you, my dear Son, my answers to the questions. . .

* * *

S. 370-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

August 8, 1825, Bordeaux
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Let me continue while my replies and the letter I have just written to you are being copied. I believe that to attract the attention of the newspapers at this time would do more harm than good. You must have received the procuration I sent to M. O'Lombel for the purchase of the Richelieu mansion. I would not have sent it, had I know he wanted to use my name only if the Society of Mary were authorized to act before the purchase. Because I do not know what is the best thing to do, I am allowing things to take their course. Personally, I would prefer that he make the purchase in his name and that we plan to set up an establishment on the property. Let me know when the purchase is made, so I can take all appropriate measures to follow through with this plan.

I will not forget the lady's demand for affiliation. I have just received three letters from Saint-Remy, one from Brother Clouzet, one from Father Bardenet, and one from Father Rothéa. Brother Clouzet complains almost bitterly that you have not yet set the retreat dates. He informs me that the General Council of the department of Haute Saône has set aside 2,400 francs for the teachers' fund. Father Bardenet is willing to relinquish the 20,000 francs in notes and another 20,000 francs, but for only one year. I do not think you told him exactly what I said, or perhaps he did not read you correctly. I will look into the matter and give you my decision. I have not yet opened Father Rothéa's letter so as not to miss this mailing. I will try to write to Saint-Remy tomorrow.

* * *

**S. 370-3. Answers to the Questions Posed by
Baron Cuvier, [Reporter or Court Reporter]**

August 8, 1825, Bordeaux

1. What is the true purpose of the Society of Mary?

Primary instruction (art. 1), including the principles of the Catholic faith, gospel morality, and a sincere attachment to the monarchy (art. 2). These two articles are so clear that the question is unwarranted. This is the only answer we can give to an explicit request for information.

2. What do you mean by a commitment? A permanent commitment? At what age are these made (art. 4, 5)?

A commitment is a promise by a member to give his services to the Institution and to obey the orders of the superiors. A permanent commitment is of the same nature, but is made for life. A reciprocal obligation is created, and the Society which recognizes him as a member promises to take care of his needs. Article 3 could be explained by adding "for life." The rest is clear enough. Temporary commitments are made after 16 years completed, and permanent commitments after 21 years completed.

3. How do you explain a Society with all goods in common?

Just as it is understood in the Civil Code, no more and no less.

4. What is this direct authority which the Superior General exercises over all the members of the Society (art. 11 of the first draft and art. 10 of the one presented to the State Council)?

It is an authority exercised without means and without an intermediary (see the Dictionary of the Academy); it is delegated at will and when deemed necessary.

5. The Superior General is a priest and has direct authority over all the members; should this Society develop, spread, and become numerous, should each newly-elected General not be confirmed by the king, or each election be approved by His Majesty (art. 11 and 12)?

These questions would have to be examined seriously if the houses became numerous, but as long as they are small in number, the question is premature. The ordinary control is sufficient, exercised by a Minister of the King.

6. What are the rules governing internal discipline, and why not reveal them to the State Council (art. 14)?

The rules deal with retiring, rising, prayers, pious exercises, the new school year, dress, and other necessary interior regulations. If it is a desire of the Council, a long and detailed list can be provided; this was not considered proper.

7. Articles 18 and 19 of the statutes presented to the Council seem to set up a minor seminary with the members of the Society who are priests along with the others who are lay?

Our schools are not minor seminaries, although it does happen that some students have the vocation to the ecclesiastical state and that the principal and the chaplain continue to train them without drawing them away from the priesthood; they even try to make these young men better equipped to function in public schools. As to the question about the presence of priests and religious in the house, the Order as a whole provides an answer. Who, if not the priest, would teach the principles of the Catholic faith and of gospel morality (art. 2)? Who if not our young religious would give primary instruction (art. 1)?

8. Why is the tenure of the Superior General for life and not temporary, as in the case of his successors? According to your Rule, what is the director's term of office? Do all the members have equal right to vote?

The actual Superior's mandate is for life because he is the Founder and, as such, is presumed to be best equipped to maintain and develop the spirit of his Institute until it has attained solidity. The common experience of all Orders proves the need for this. A new leader might alter or inconsiderately upset what he did not firmly establish and what time has not consolidated. In all other cases, superiors are appointed for a three-year term. All perpetual professed members have the right to vote.

* * *

S. 371. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 9, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . regarding the reimbursement of the 20,000 francs in one year.

Sums for a similar amount will be available in Alsace, but the properties sold there may not be paid within the year. Given a two-year time limit, the convent will be in full operation and possibly even self-supporting from the dowry of some of the sisters. If M. d'Argenson could get an earlier refund, if we were not importuned too much, the banker in Vesoul could take care of the situation. I believe Father Bardenet would find it to his advantage if he had at least two years to repay; any sums we could amass during those years could be invested with the bank, etc. Father Bardenet knows the practice well.

A brother of mature age would be needed. . .

* * *

S. 372. To Fr. Georges Caillet [, Paris]

August 11, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . everything, and always with prudence, discretion, and moderation. . .

Since in the petition to the Minister of Finance it was stated that the Richelieu mansion would become an establishment of the Society of Mary, you need not have asked for the recommendation of the Bishop of Hermopolis. I had told you and M. O'Lombel that my acceptance of all his pious and generous offers depended on whether the Archbishop of Paris would admit the Society into his diocese, etc. The Bishop of Hermopolis was right to refuse you, but you were wrong to ask him for what he could not grant.

The day before yesterday I received the short enclosed letter from Victor, dated July 6. Please see what M. Bourgeois wants, and especially what is possible. Tell him I received his pamphlet, and I will forward the two packets that came with it.

Take information about the medals. . .

* * *

S. 373. To Fr. Georges Caillet [, Paris]

August 13, 1825, Bordeaux

In your letter of August 9, I was pleased to receive the details concerning the O'Lombel matter and that of the statutes. I will use them when the time comes. Continue as you have been doing, but do not expect me to comment on each of your remarks and do not interpret my silence as either approval or disapproval. If I am silent, this is because I lack sufficient information to pass judgment or I see no need to answer; that is all you must conclude.

This being understood, I will not answer your important questions, or those of some urgency. The deal with M. O'Lombel has been decided; it must be pursued without delay. But it must follow my guidelines. I believe M. O'Lombel is not inclined to stray from them. He sent me a signed copy of my instructions to him; I am satisfied, and I will acknowledge. In few words, here are the essentials pertaining to the purchase.

1. The contract will state that 50,000 francs has been paid.
2. Incidental costs will be covered by a promise to pay in six months, or they will be paid immediately.

On Point 1. The procuration gives M. O'Lombel authority to make all arrangements and to take all precautions concerning the 50,000 francs, between the signing of the contract and the paying off of the mortgage. Although the contract mentions payment and receipt, the money will remain in the hands of the notary or other trustworthy person.

On Point 2. Were time not given for the payment, we would be subject to fiscal regulations and a double tax. Verbal promises or half measures will not do; the delay must be legal, or not at all.

ON the validity of the purchase and the form of the contract.

I should have liked M. de S - - - to be consulted; in his absence, ordinary care by the notary, who is unknown to me, will have to do; his qualifications do breed confidence. Read this part of my letter to M. O'Lombel; then I will not have to repeat these things to him. I would like to have a copy of the contract as soon as possible.

I may not and cannot give you an answer on the statutes until the official copy of the article arrives. Any other action would merely prolong the uncertainty, the variations, and the gropings???. You will have a prompt and decisive answer as soon as the State Council gives me its views and its principles, and this will happen after the reading of the official articles.

What the persons think when you have consulted in Paris. . .

* * *

S. 373. To Fr. Georges Caillet [, Paris]

August 13, 1825, Bordeaux

Great successes have come to us from the observance. . .

As I told you, I will wait for the official notification by the State Council, after which you will be given a prompt answer.

You must be neither surprised nor cast down. . .

*

P.S. 2. That was a regrettable accident to the child at Saint-Remy. The only way to prevent the children from incurring risks is to supervise them constantly.

* * *

S. 373-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

August 16, 1825, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

Not having any further news from you (your last letter was dated August 9), today I wish to comment on your letters of August 6 and August 9 which received immediate answers because of their importance. In the first you point out that three articles will have to be deleted at the request of the State Council. To avoid any misunderstandings, I accepted. I asked you to have two copies made, one in strict compliance with what M. le Baron, the reporter, demanded, and the other with a few added words of explanation, etc. In your second, you bring up the word “primary” added to statute 17. Since the word merely obscures slightly the general meaning of the statute, you may add what you suggested in your first letter.

I was in such a hurry when I received your letter of August 9 that fearing some irregularity would slip into our negotiations with M. O’Lombel, I sent your letter to Brother David to obtain his reactions on this and on the suppression of *tous biens* in article 5. I received them just as I was sending off your letter of August 13; you must have it by now. In a postscript I said I was abiding by my letter of August 11 concerning the deletions requested by the State Council. Brother David did not know this; he quoted me as saying I would give the council an immediate answer as soon as you had one for me. I did not have Brother David’s reaction to the suppression in article 5. The others in the July 12 draft are not important. *Une Société universelle de tous gains* [a non-profit organization with all goods held in common]; it is that, and the word *universelle*, while it puts us in this category of institutions, does not remove the difficulties created by the inclusion of buildings among the goods of its members. The heirs will be the ones to cause trouble, whatever precautions we take . . . (I will continue on another sheet.)

How will the goods acquired by the Society in the name of the Superior be understood (article 12)? I do not know if it would be unwise to reveal the probable scope of the article or how article 5, with its deletion, could be interpreted. I know the council will insist on the notion of *main morte* [goods of religious Orders are inalienable]. I can think of two ways to come to terms if we have a friendly chat with the council or with the reporter: (1) to admit a *Société universelle* and even *de tous biens*, but considering only the establishments as goods; (2) simply and purely to admit *Société universelle* but, to satisfy fiscal regulations, with a clause stating that the average age at which the members pooled their possessions was 33 years. I am not reasoning this way, my dear Son, to make you retract what you have already done under my orders, but simply that you

understand your assignment more clearly. I must stop; the mailman is almost here. The peace of Christ be with you, my Son.

P.S. You know, of course, that I almost never reread my letters.

* * *

S. 375-2. To M. O’Lombel, Paris

August 22, 1825, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I, Guillaume-, etc., for all the services which M. O’Lombel has rendered and is still rendering in Paris to the Society of Mary and in particular to our beloved son Father Caillet, a priest of the Society, and after the special request for affiliation which the said M. O’Lombel has just sent me in his letter of August 17, which letter contained on the part of the petitioner, etc.

Note. Instead of “by the reigning Sovereign Pontiff,” by Pius VII.

For Mme Marie Dolores Rizo O’Lombel, on the special request for affiliation sent to me in a letter of August 10, 1825, by the said lady, which letter expressed a sincere desire to share in the good works and the efficacious prayers of the Society of Mary, in view of the selfless devotedness of her spouse to the Society of Mary and according to the testimony given by our beloved son Father Caillet, priest of the said Society, to the edifying life and conduct of the worthy lady, to her tender devotion to Mary, to the faithful practice of her religious duties, and to her charity toward her neighbor, by these presents. . .

* * *

S. 376. To Fr. Georges Caillet [, Paris]

September 15, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . *both dated September 5.*

I have included a copy of Pastor Bader’s letter to Father Rothéa, dated August 29. I will answer all three in this letter.

I am not astonished. . .

* * *

S. 380. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 30, 1825, Bordeaux

Yesterday I received your undated letter. . .

It strikes me now that the one I thought was Father Rothéa’s was really from Mme Mouillet.

The young theologian from Strasbourg. . .

*

I gather from both letters that the first was written on November 20.

Always send theologians that give promise. . .

*

. . . they were going to receive Brother Constant.

I am expecting an answer from Father Bardenet. Father Caillet had already written to him concerning both Gray and Father Agathange. I believe he wrote also concerning Brother Constant. You seem not to have received his letter, to judge by your last two; perhaps he has not received word from Father Caillet. As to the Echenoz establishment, we will see if it is feasible. In your reply, add that the Daughters of Mary are cloistered.

We do not happen to have a locksmith to send to you as yet. . .

* * *

S. 383. To M. O'Lombel
December 6, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . there is justice and truth in these two outlines. . .

Man falls often, but he rises again; this is how we must look upon this and be more careful in the future. I cannot urge you strongly enough to abide by the limitations of your written instructions as my proxy in the case of the proposed Paris house. No hardship or delay must make you deviate from them; the instructions, a copy of which you signed, were carefully considered; you must follow them. This should answer your latest request for guidance in the matters of the Society. You have the written directives, and one of its articles promises new instructions once the old have become outdated.

I have little to add to the inquiries contained in your letters of November 4, 13, 17, and 28. My dear Son, eventually I will deal with them all. Only your letter makes mention of a ten-year generalship. This article must be part of official statutes, which have not yet arrived. I wrote to His Excellency to send me the approved statutes; I will wait until they arrive.

There have been so many delays in the purchase of the mansion that we must have patience. God's will will be done, my dear Son; simply follow your written instructions. What you tell me about Orléans can be summarized in two points: for the Church, it is a most promising city, and Father Franchet, assistant to one of the parishes, is partly responsible for this condition. I will keep these two facts in mind, and I thank you for the edifying news contained in your letter. I will send you the manuals at the first opportunity. Brother Weber has arrived. I have already answered the rest of your letter.

The Marchioness of Rentry has the answer. . .

*

. . . blessed with an income of 600 francs.

. . . to some capital; but in this case his contract is his guarantee. See for yourself if this contract is valid. Mme O'Lombel arrived safely at her first destination; I pray to God that she may have a happy journey.

Letter of November 28. It came with the royal ordinance; it speaks of the word sent to the Count de Chabrol and of related matters. I have sent an answer. I am most indebted to Mme de Milanges for her share in this exchange; it is not her fault that the notice contained two passages with which I disagree. This excellent lady may even correct the inaccuracies. Again, I trust in your prudent action. The count's answer to his sister merely shows how convinced he is that in our Society, instruction is confided to competent people. This is the commitment I made before God. The prefect's confidence is securely founded, and I have more faith in it than in any borrowed reputation to which I have no right. See M. Dufresne, my dear Son, and if you can remove this cause for complaint, however minor it may be, which bothers me.

The Archbishop of Paris may be in the condition. . .

*

. . . an accomplished fact, or when one appears desired.
The delay in the negotiations for the mansion disrupts our plans; we must exercise patience.

This is, I believe, the entire purpose.

* * *

S. 384. To a Religious
September 15, 1825, Bordeaux

. . . I must not substitute a different one.
. . . and from which I could not dispense you.
The agreement made with God is irrevocable.

* * *

S. 386. To Bro. David Monier
January 10, 1826, Bordeaux

P.S. However busy you may be, do not forget the Tonneins matter.

* * *

S. 386-2. Excerpts from the Minutes of the Council
January 16, 1826, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

On January 16, 1826, after the induction of the officers and the assembly having set itself up as a Council, the Superior General said he thought it fitting that the Society should have a religious and durable sign commemorating the public recognition. He asked the Council to deliberate on the matter and to choose a suitable sign.

After discussion, the Council is unanimous in its approval of a sign to commemorate the civil recognition of the Society. Many opinions were expressed on the appropriate sign, and the Council found them all practicable and acceptable. The Superior General, with the advice and in the presence of his Council, decided and declared as follows.

1. On November 16 a votive mass will be celebrated in every house of the Society, as long as it will exist.
2. After the Gospel, the celebrant will read the following extract from article 2 of the Statutes of the Society. "The essential purpose of the work of the Society is to spread and preserve, in children and youth, the principles of the Catholic faith, of evangelical morality, and a sincere attachment to the monarchy.:"
3. After Holy Mass the choir will sing the *Exaudiat* and the celebrant will say the prayer for the King.
4. The timetable for November 16 in each house of the Society will make mention of the obligations noted above and will add, "that the solemnity of the day and the prescribed prayers are in commemoration of the public recognition of the Society of Mary, and this is due to the goodness and wisdom of His Majesty, Charles X, our King, who gave us the letters patent on November 16, 1825."
5. The superior of each house of the Society will see to the implementation of this directive.

Signed in the register by the Superior General and by the Secretary, as also was this copy.

* * *

S. 387-2. French: To Bro. Louis Rothéa
Letter from a Notary
February 1826, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Before Jean Baptiste Mathurin Rauzan and his colleague, notaries royal, in Bordeaux appeared the undersigned Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, honorary canon of the Church of Bordeaux, Superior General of the Society of Mary based in the city of Bordeaux, where the said Chaminade resides at no. 2, Rue de Lalande.

Who, by these presents, has constituted as his special and general agent M. Louis Rothéa, a Brother of the said Society of Mary, professor in the schools of Colmar, depart. Of Haut-Rhin, whom he so constitutes in virtue of his aforementioned quality as Superior General of the Society of Mary, so that he might accept in his name and in the name of the Society all donations and transfers which might be made by Father Mertian, Superior of the Institute of the Brothers of Christian Doctrine in the Diocese of Strasbourg, either in virtue of his title as Superior, in his personal capacity, or conjointly with anyone having a claim thereto; particularly to accept in virtue of the said donation and transfer the château called of Saint-Hippolyte located between Colmar and Ribeauvillé, with the other buildings, yards, gardens, and detached lands.

Also to accept in virtue of one of these titles all other furnishings and real estate belonging to the schools under the direction of the said Brothers, disciples of the aforementioned Sire Mertian, in the purviews of the said diocese of Strasbourg.

All according to the responsibility, pacts, clauses, and conditions agreed to between the said Sire Mertian and the deputed proxy, either for the ulterior service of the schools which would be transferred or for the special allocation of all or of a part of the furniture and real estate for the purposes mutually agreed upon by both acting parties. To reserve specifically in the document in question the approbation and acceptance of the donation, the specification and the modifications on the part of the Council for Public Instruction, or of His Eminence the Minister Secretary of State to the Department of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction.

For all these given reasons to sign all acts, to signify every consent, to establish residence, and generally to do whatever the said Sire could do to insure the validity of the documents to be presented, promising, etc. . . . obliging, etc., . . . renouncing. . .

* * *

S. 390-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet
March 28, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Instructions for Father Caillet Relative to Saint-Hippolyte

1. He will go to Colmar to be informed of the details of the negotiations undertaken by Brother Rothéa. Whatever the steps already taken are, and whatever he learns of the matter, he will act and will have the Brothers comport themselves as if the matter were nonexistent. He will note that by the signing of the Ribeauvillé contract, Brother Rothéa's procuration was terminated. It was beside the purpose and without authorization that a visit was made to Strasbourg and an inventory was made at Saint-Hippolyte.

Negotiations with the Brothers of Father Mertian, who had the option of joining us, were premature. Such relationships merely strengthened the chains already binding the Society of

Mary by a document. We must never reopen any dialogue on the matter because the contract bound the Society in the same manner in which an employee is hired and then dismissed under any pretext when he is no longer needed. We will never found a house on that basis.

2. Nor must we blame Father Rothéa or Brother Laugeay. Their simplicity is preferable to the ruse they would have needed to defend themselves. Zeal and confidence led them into difficulties; they must be told to have less self-confidence. They say they are weak, but outside their schools they act as if they were strong. More harmony between words and actions is needed; great prudence will serve them well in the future.

3. Father Caillet will take with him to Strasbourg a copy of the Saint-Hippolyte contract and other documents and instructions pertaining thereto. He must not have the contract registered at the mortgage bureau, nor must he act upon it.

4. Should Father Caillet meet persons who know of the Saint-Hippolyte operation, he will simply tell them that the council of the Society has not accepted. Should Father Caillet wish to give more details to persons of note, he will speak of some internal matter with which he is familiar: payment for services instead of a donation, exchange of favors with a third party, a change of donees, the nullity of conflicting regulations on the part of the two institutions, legal irreversibility, the propriety of giving the house to His Excellency, who along may freely dispose of it.

5. Father Caillet will not go to Saint-Hippolyte.

6. He will go to Ribeauvillé to see Father Mertian and give him the enclosed letter. Father Caillet will give no other explanation than that contained in article 4 above; if need be, he will excuse himself for not discussing matters for which he has no mandate.

7. Father Caillet will go to Strasbourg and deliver into the hands of the bishop the letter from the Superior General of the Society of Mary.

8. He will then deliver the letters patent and the statutes of the Society, along with any related documents, and he will ask that they be registered with the diocese in the following days. He will ask that the document witnessing to this registration, drawn up in the office of the secretary at the bishop's request, will be sent to me. Father Caillet will obtain all necessary documents to be used on the visit to the Archbishop of Besançon.

9. Father Caillet will give the Bishop of Strasbourg a copy of the letter written by the Superior General of the Society of Mary to Father Mertian, containing the refusal to accept Saint-Hippolyte. He will add a copy of the minutes of the Council of the Society.

10. Should His Excellency accept them, we can forget Saint-Hippolyte. Should the bishop wish to make any observations, Father Caillet will receive them respectfully and will ask his leave to send them to the Superior General in Bordeaux for an answer.

11. Father Caillet will ask His Excellency of Strasbourg for permission to tend to some business while waiting for an answer.

12. Because Father Caillet will be traveling after sending the dispatches to Bordeaux, he will forward the addresses of sure??? Persons where he can be reached.

13. Father Caillet will act in such a way as to earn the goodwill and the protection of His Excellency, both toward the establishment of Colmar and toward any other present or future foundation.

14. On his return from Alsace, if he has not done so before, Father Caillet will pass by Besançon to give the archbishop the letters patent and the statutes and ask that they be registered, as he did in Strasbourg, in conformity with article 8 above.

*

Contingency Recommendations in the Saint-Hippolyte Matter

1. His Excellency of Strasbourg may not accept with pleasure that the Society of Mary is abandoning the idea of a foundation in Saint-Hippolyte. In this case, His Excellency must be told

with insistence that his power is supreme, and that if he exercises it, he will soon be convincing enough. But Father Caillet will take no additional action; he will make no promises and no commitments; he will merely write to me. His Excellency's secretaries should write down his intentions, if the bishop does not do so himself.

2. When talking about Saint-Hippolyte, it should be maintained that the only important consideration for us was the fusion of the two male institutes. Even if the building which is called the château and its little garden were much larger, this would not influence our decision. One property or another, we will always find one large enough. But two institutes can hinder each other; it is better to have only one, at least where the population is not dense.

3. We must bear in mind that the downfall of even a small institution can harm the large one which survives; it is worse if they coexist. Those members who would be tractable if there were one institution bargain to see where human nature would enjoy greater advantages, and by hesitating, some members are lost.

4. Great wisdom is needed if a fusion is to be achieved. In some ways, we have salt water which must be mixed with sweet, without spoiling the latter. But give the Society of Mary freedom of action; it has more means and ore practice in the matter. Let us rely on God's help, for God cannot refuse us if our intention is right.

5. Nof if in fact Father Mertian agreed to allow his members the right to keep some furnished house so that if they left their institute and did not care to join ours, they could return to the world with a certain quantity of goods belonging to religion, this would be a temptation for such members and an obstacle to a possible fusion.

6. A change of habit is another problem, they claim. The man who is a religious only because of his habit is no religious. The man who wants to be religious in his heart and wishes to show it by a habit must be encouraged in his weakness. The complete religious will go to the heart of his state, which is everything, and the rest is nothing. If he prefers some habit, this will be because it will have been worn by a greater number of saints. It is said, for instance, that Saint Paul the hermit wanted to have the cloak of Saint Athanasius and did receive it upon the owner's death. It is said that Saint Augustine, father of the cenobites, wanted to have the cloak of Saint Paul the hermit, made of palm bark, and that he wore it on solemn occasions. Anyone wishing to tend to virtue in a habit with such an eminent history should so do; he will benefit greatly. It was decided at the discussion on fusion that any change in habit would be granted only after repeated demands. It was seen that the objection was based on vanity, or a fantasy which for some was the cause of their downfall.

7. If this notion of donation is abandoned as an impracticable illusion, we must agree, as we did before the contract, to a transfer of all schools, statutes, and deeds and proceed regularly to a union.

8. Of course, Father Mertian's cooperation would help greatly. When he withdraws, or claims to wish to withdraw, he is acting contrary to what is done in the case of a transfer or a fusion. Those who are well-disposed to see the project succeed are united outwardly; only the one who is against the union will have nothing to do with it.

9. There can be no agreement without mutual respect. The love of Christ makes everything simple; without this full and absolute love, there is disunion. We accuse ourselves of not possessing this charity, but we believe that if we had it, we would have supported and created it in others. The virtue of Christ would have acted through us.

10. Before going any further, we should inquire whether Saint-Hippolyte is the result of a confiscation from immigrants or condemned persons.

11. In the entire matter, Father Caillet must always keep in mind what is prescribed in article 1 above.

S. 390-3. To Father Mertian, Saint-Hippolyte

March 29, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I have just received a poor but I imagine a faithful copy of the agreement which you signed at Ribeauvillé with Brother Rothéa. I would be embarrassed to confess my emotions on the topic. The agreement seems to oppose all that we wanted to do, you and I, contrary to every understanding which I believed we had between us. I wonder what our intention was. To myself, I say that it certainly was to revive your masculine order, to give it stability, and as much as in us lies, to set up a stable administration. The document which came to my notice would produce the opposite, the contrary to the vision we had in common. The fourth condition eliminates every possibility of stability. In substance, this statute says that in the event the boarding house is not successful, the property or building would change hands, legally and simply because of the situation. If my people and I spend years to establish and perhaps make the work flourish, how could we consent to see it slip out of our hands for some cause independent of our actions and will? So many things could bring about a collapse: a fire, an invasion by an enemy (the border location), a famine. In addition to events due to major causes, there are the passions, the intrigues within the Society. Enemies will react, the authority will make claims, one moment of frustration and then the irreversible downfall.

An institution is doomed to instability if day in and day out it must depend on the seasons, on politics, and on all the passions rampant in the world. To allow this is to condemn the institute to instant death. The contract says that if the institute is attacked, it must feel despoiled—which is an invitation to attack. It is impossible to set up a wise administration.

It is not possible to keep the terms of our purchase a secret. It is difficult to keep this kind of mystery; there would be something underhanded about it. Besides, information on properties for sale, entries in public registers, make a secret impossible. Just imagine a strike action by four teachers, or a dozen boarders, or by some disgruntled or seduced novice; the operation comes to a halt, and the Society has nothing for its pains. What could the strikers do? If their demands are not met, they will be vociferous in the extreme; they will cause the directors to abdicate in virtue of the contract and because of interrupted services.

I do not believe you realize how extremely vulnerable that article 4 makes us. The author should have realized that according to its terms, it would be just as possible after 200 years as on the first day to deprive of true ownership those whom you intended as owners of your property. It is giving with one hand and taking with the other; it is to make a mockery of a promise.

If a famine were to occur, can I guarantee food and the necessities if I have only the premises? Your contract merely gives housing the right to use it until the day when that service would be accidentally interrupted. I will not continue with these reflections. This is not the agreement which we had accepted. The writer certainly missed our point. God, who directs the mind and heart, must have wanted it this way. I do not blame you personally. Let us love one another, and may the will of God be done. Besides, the contract which is so obnoxious bears its own compensations. It will not give us the means to reestablish your Order, to guarantee lasting stability to your houses, or to introduce a wise government.

But this clause fostering instability, which was so unwisely introduced, foreshadows the consequences of this instability. It is your wish, the contract says, that if the domain of Saint-Hippolyte “falls”—that is the word in the document—it does so into the hands of the bishop to use as his wisdom sees fit. I agree with your purpose, the only one mentioned in the bill of sale, and without hesitation I will resign into the hands of the bishop, convinced that he will find a use for this property with more wisdom than I could.

In the hope that I have complied with your wishes, I pray that you hear my petition. I am, as usual, with all respect. . . .

P.S. I also had to submit the contract to the government of my Order, as it is stipulated, then the Council refused because (1) while specifying a donation is merely allowing a leasing of services, the contract is revocable at any time; (2) were we to call this a gift, it would be null because a return to a third party is forbidden by law, and because a second received is substituted for the first, which annuls the gift to both; and (3) no reparation can be made for invalid acts. However serious these reasons may be, in my opinion they are not as important as the absence of stability, the impossibility of setting up an administration which is protected from every reasonable attack.

* * *

S. 390-4. To Bishop Tharin of Strasbourg

March 29, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I am sending you one of the priests of my Society in all haste and with complete trust in Your Excellency. You will remember him, for he has met you on former occasions. He is the very faithful and obedient Father Caillet.

He has a double message to relay to you. The first is to show you the letters patent from the king dated November 16, the Constitutions of the Society of Mary, and the Statutes approved by the Royal Council. Our Constitutions place us under the jurisdiction of the Ordinary in the diocese where we have establishments. I am happy to place a segment of my Society under the authority of a prelate to whom the Society owes its finest house, that of Saint-Remy. I hope the protection you granted to us as Vicar General of Besançon will not be lacking now that the voice of the people and the wisdom of the king have given you the see of Strasbourg. You did not hesitate to give your approval to our schools in Colmar; today we are asking the same favor, plus another.

Your Excellency, in my petition I ask that our letters patent and our statutes will be registered in your diocese, and that you look upon us as faithful members of your diocese.

The second part of Father Caillet's message deals with the dialogue between Father Mertian and me. Until a recent event, I had believed we were discussing a fusion of his masculine institute with mine. A document emerged from all succeeding discussion mentioning a donation which a recently traced plan of the property does nothing to recommend. There are so many aspects to this so-called gift that I find it prudent not to go into details. But there are still two clauses in the contract that worry me. One says that the contract must be submitted to the government the other, that if I do not make use of the donation, the domain will be subject to your wishes. By the use of the word "government," I believe it was intended to circumvent my formulation; mine stated that the gift would be accepted by the Council of Public Instruction—that is, by His Excellency the Minister who is Secretary of State of this department. The word "government" was to encompass everything. But when used by the Society of Mary, the word means its own government, as defined by article 12 of the statutes. The government of the Society is composed of the Superior and of the three Assistants who form his Council. The latter must approve every purchase; a refusal is a veto. The Council met and rejected the acquisition, giving its reasons. This being the case, this acquisition for me is invalid.

There remains the second clause, to the effect that a non-use of the acquired domain would have it revert to you, to be disposed of as you wish. In this case, I give up any claim to the pretended acquisition, and in your wisdom, Excellency, you will find some use which will profit religion.

I wrote to Father Mertian, asking his assent to my rejection alleging that under his conditions, the house at Saint-Hippolyte would have neither stability nor good administration, and no guarantee of survival from one year to the next.

The Council of the Society studied the case from other points of view. I must allow this regularly formed Council its freedom. It is far from making a faulty judgment in this case, but even if I consider its opinions as mere remarks, I cannot assume responsibility for an establishment which might very well do some good, but which will be perpetually unstable and will have an administration that is powerless. Such an arrangement should never have been suggested and must be abandoned.

The answer I am giving Your Excellency concerning Saint-Hippolyte is from my Council, which is an integral part of the administration. I enclose a copy of my letter to Father Mertian informing him of my refusal of Saint-Hippolyte. There will be other occasions when people dedicated to primary education will not have scribes drawing up religious contracts as if they were dealing in mistrust as the world does, and opposing iniquity with iniquity.

In any case, let us steer clear of such examples and of the difficulties such contracts entail. I believe Father Mertian is innocent in all this, and that his scribe was unfamiliar with the straightforwardness necessary in all preliminary discussions. [check French for this paragraph]

I trust in God who has allowed this course of events so that, as I disassociate myself from this enterprise, it may be managed by a surer hand.

Your Excellency, please accept my refraining from the possession of Saint-Hippolyte as a mark of the high esteem and deep respect with which I am . . .

* * *

S. 390-5. To the King, Paris

March 29, 1826, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Sire, you have graciously recognized the Society of Mary and given it a civil existence. Its purpose is to spread the benefits of education to the most populous sections of your people. I considered it a duty to have the occasion solemnized in the various establishments of which I am the Superior General.

But I have the obligation and the desire to present to Your Majesty the decree which will forever recall the anniversary of your graciousness and the gratitude of the members of the Society. In the name of all my members, I wish to render homage to you and to express those sentiments of love and veneration with which I am, Your Majesty. . .

* * *

S. 390-6. To Countess d'Hanache

March 31, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Madame Countess,

Your letter of February 26 was received with the consideration it deserved. It tells of your charitable works and of the Christian prudence you have exercised in their administration. It will be easy for me to observe the discretion you ask, but should I fail in this, no harm could possibly come to our neighbor. You explain clearly why you wish to retain control of the work in which you are engaged and not to be remiss in the service Providence asks of you. The gentleman you refer to [M. O'Lombel] has great gifts and a solid piety which make him an invaluable ally. I almost said that these would entitle him to be found on the right side when the final separation between right and left takes place.

This gentleman informs me that an establishment of my servants of Mary in Paris would find a fertile field to till, to sow, and to reap. I am not aware of his contributions in this field, but

from various statements from high ecclesiastical and civil authorities, I learn that he was consulted advantageously. How could I not listen to him when he asks to do good? I was happy to receive this good Christian in my home. Everything about him confirmed the high opinion I had formed of him. I acquiesced to his desire and authorized him to purchase a building and to make the modifications listed in my instruction.

The high opinion you have, Madame Countess, of the religious sentiments expressed in his correspondence merely confirms my confidence in him. As long as his zeal is reported to me in letters like yours, I will have no cause to worry, and yours proves that his zeal is above reproach. I should be most happy if one day your prudence tempered a zeal which may be too ardent; I do not believe he would be put out if you did so. It was a privilege to have this worthy correspondent be the reason for your modest and edifying letter, the opportunity for asking to be remembered in your prayers, and to tell you with what sentiments I . . .

* * *

S. 390-7. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

April 10, 1826, Bordeaux

After your departure, the idea occurred to me that in common courtesy the Bishop of Strasbourg should be advised by mail of your coming visit and of the two messages you were to bring to him. I did write to him on April 1. My letter merely repeated what I had said on March 29, and you have that. I could not guess that the prelate would be relieved of his see. Should anyone mention this second letter sent to Strasbourg and which should have preceded your arrival, simply say that I considered it a duty, and that you know it conforms on all points to that of March 29 which you have already delivered.

I have on my desk your letters of April 5 and April 6. I note with pleasure that you and your young companion made the journey to Paris without incident, save the one or two very cold nights you experienced. The psalms say, "Let ice and snow bless the Lord." We must be content with what blessed the Lord. These little happy or unhappy incidents must also be profitable to us in this world; you are well aware of these things.

So you did not meet our Sisters of Amance, even after your hasty departure. However, they did arrive safely. Please pass on the news to interested people. You can imagine that I had no idea you would meet in Paris the two prelates you were going so far to see, nor that Father Mertian would be there after your encounter with him in Alsace. God does arrange everything. However, none of this must change your itinerary or alter any item of your instructions. Your letter of April 6 seemed to show some hesitation; I think a little rest will steady you.

The negotiations which the bishop of Strasbourg would like to see resumed between us and Father Mertian should motivate you to reread the paper entitled "Contingency Recommendations in the Saint-Hippolyte Matter." Your line of conduct is indicated, but not the details which would be involved in the organization. It would be useless to plan before we were assured of the material and the personnel. The same thing would have happened if you had negotiated in Alsace, rather than in Paris. In either place you would have had (1) to propose the resignation of Father Mertian the delivery of his statutes and constitutive documents, article 7 of your instructions, and (2) to listen to the proposals on the donation of Saint-Hippolyte if it is purely and simply article 1 of the same. On these two points, you ask me what is the opinion of the Bishop of Strasbourg. He would like a transfer of the property and of Father Mertian's institute, but will Father Mertian agree? We cannot profit by his absence. You saw that even the minor restrictions, to which Brother Rothéa had agreed, were sufficient to block the project. However, I will add some explanations to your instructions so you can answer questions which may be put to you. I will touch on various points which, as I see from your letters, you might find embarrassing. I will have something to say on the location of Marast, etc.

You ask me if you are to go to Strasbourg, Arbois, and Saint-Claude in Alsace, points not indicated in your instructions. You also ask about Saint-Remy, Besançon, and Franche-Comté. You believe you are exceeding your instructions; in your mind you are separating instructions from obedience. I will repeat what I have said, and which some reflection on your part would have led you to conclude. I imagine the business you took care of in Paris and elsewhere is definitive. But after the Mertian matter, do you have nothing in view for Alsace or Franche-Comté? And if Father Mertian does not sever the relationship, will you not have more to do than before?

You want me to fix your itinerary from here. I wish I could, but I feel you may have to start on the right rather than on the left, and my directives might stop you halfway. Consider your assignment in the light of obedience and of your instructions, and try not to cover any territory a second time. Since you are traveling with Father Bardenet, I believe you should first agree with him. You would know when you were to meet, what roads to take, what to visit on your way down and what on your return. Unless I am mistaken, you were to go from Paris to Saint-Remy, then to the Jura, Arbois and other towns, then to the Doubs, Besançon, etc., then to Haut-Rhin, Colmar, Saint-Hippolyte if need be (that is if we agree to accept the schools), then to Bas-Rhin. Your trip would look like this.



You could return to Paris via Nancy and Châlons. However, you may have to change this itinerary; secondary roads may be shortcuts. Get the advice of people who know the region. Father Bardenet will be your best guide.

I will continue to list your instructions tomorrow. I could not do so sooner. From my paternal heart I give you my blessing.

P.S. Get some information concerning M. Saint-Guy d'Izon.

* * *

S. 390-8. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Paris

April 11, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Today I am writing about what we have agreed to call your instructions. You ask for added instructions, and although I believe they are superfluous, I told you in yesterday's letter that I would send them on. I will do that now. If this makes you reread and grasp the details thoroughly, some good will come of this chore. However, a danger may threaten you here: the more you read, the more muddled you may become. I will not have you the victim of indecision, to run the risk of regrettable consequences. You have instructions relative to

- (1) Paris, 4 articles
- (2) Saint-Hippolyte, Colmar, Ribeauvillé, Strasbourg, Besançon, 14 articles
- (3) the probable (then) and now actual negotiations with Father Mertian, 11 articles
- (4) your obedience in the case of Arbois for the Daughters of Mary and other establishments of normal schools, without explanatory details, these being left to your judgment.

I am linking these four directives to the contents of your letters. Some will be outdated because they refer to finished business or to projects impossible to carry through. Others may be fulfilled partially, and others you will fully attend to in time. Now if after this new wording of four of your instructions and after yesterday's letter some doubt should persist about the others, I will explain them latter. I still have the following to tell you.

Father Lalanne's books must be made available to M. O'Lombel until Father Lalanne revokes the permission. Do not concern yourself with Hoffman or Dominique, unless you meet them accidentally; then, show your compassion and ask them to behave. At Saint-Remy, Colmar, and wherever you meet our religious note the good and the bad, and you can report to me on your return. If the funds voted for Saint-Remy are available, good, but do not count on them; but it was good of you to look into the matter. When you write, give me the number of the instruction which you have followed or neglected, and whatever bothers you about each article. I have commented on every word of your letters, but as I have already said, I fear that all this writing adds no light and does not make your conduct easier. I am expecting you to tell me how you have solved your many "ifs." If our gentlemen leave, if Father Mertian does not come, if he does not accept, if he submits new conditions. . . . I note many other "ifs," but they get us nowhere. As I wait, I recommend you to the blessings of God who makes and who dissolves; may he do with us as he will. Always your Good Father,

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 391. To M. O'Lombel
April 11, 1826, Bordeaux

Let us be careful about anything . . . under any circumstances.

Reread your instructions, my dear Son, for you must constantly refer to them. You will find that if the mansion is to be purchased, you must be able to make a down payment of 50,000 francs. Then if the building is worth 200,000 francs and one-fourth of its value is paid, we can borrow the rest in a town where large sums are available. But I would not consider it honest and upright to say, "Nothing is paid; lend us the total amount." Please, my dear Son, reveal this project to no one; it would go counter to your instructions, and I would be forced to deny it. Happily, you have committed this fault in thought only, and the harm was avoided the moment I drew your attention to it.

Should a charitable organization wish to lend us 50,000 francs, so much the better. Then we could see how to find the rest. The Society of Mary must not operate on credit alone, and without guarantee.

Providence will provide for everything. . .

*

P.S. A thought occurs to me; it seems rather strange that the mansion which you were urged to buy on short notice should still be on the market after many months. Why were you pressured with the pretended competition? Why did not of these competing buyers purchase? Was it because the asking price was too high, or because the neighborhood makes it difficult to sell? I am merely conjecturing, asking questions; I see no answer.

* * *

S. 392. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon
April 8, 1826, Bordeaux

. . . to present the matter in the light most favorable to you?

I am asking these questions because about certain remarks made by the world you add, “They are true.” But when you consulted me, how could you expect me to guess something about which you said nothing, which could not be suspected from this distance, and about which public reaction makes you say, “It is true.” Mother Saint-Vincent’s frankness may be praiseworthy, but her affirmation that the opinions of the world are to be despised would have value only if you, my dear Child, and she had never given cause for such criticism. She has no argument with you, it is true. How can she dismiss it and still despise the rumors? You have not handled the situation wisely, or at least not prudently. If the world’s criticism is just, greater harm must be avoided, and what has been caused must be repaired. What reassures me at the moment is that the worry you had and the desire to confess must have led to the “It is true.” Both you and Mother Saint-Vincent must, separately, examine the situation before God and write to me your conclusions. Mother Saint-Vincent believes her financial state is secure because she has a certain number of bank notes. Do not let her be fooled. If she does not have a just right to this money she will have to return it, whatever ill-advised expenses she may have made. It is best that she include one of those notes in her letter.

In the meantime I still presume. . .

*

. . . all types of human helps and religion were put within her reach.

Her intention, which she has since confessed, of giving herself entirely to the interior life did not seem appropriate in many aspects. But while I acquiesced, I made it understood that she would set up housekeeping in the new building and limit herself to that work. Making the infirmary into a chapel was a poor decision. I thought the small building at the end of the terrace and opening onto the fields would have been chosen; you transformed the linen room into an infirmary. I do not know what you can do, but the superior’s room must not be shared or used for some other purpose.

For what remains, I have a very strong desire. . .

* * *

S. 393. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

April 18, 1826, Bordeaux

. . . to give her only the one which may indicate far less.

Choosing an upper room may be better for your health, but your office is needed for the administration. Has that cottage near the fields, which from your letter I thought was reserved for the pious Mme de Clairefontaine, no disadvantages?

The best in all this, I think, is that I come to Agen. . .

* * *

S. 393-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Strausbourg

April 21, 1826, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

I have your letter from Paris dated April 16, containing the report on your activities in the capital and your explanation of the three questions sent to you by Brother L. Rothéa of Colmar. I will answer both.

You were wise to adopt the advice of the Bishop of Strasbourg on your dealings in that town. I want Father Liebermann, the Vicar General, to approve your plan for conciliation and to help you with Father Mertian. As I reread your letter, I feel you are not sure of the exact nature of your instructions, although you tell me you have received them. Article 6 gives you a model of the agreement that can be made. If it is not accepted, no further discussions must take place, and all must be left to the will of God.

You will have to postpone your petition to have the letters patent and the statutes of the Institute of Mary registered until the bishop returns; but that will be 10 or 12 days after your departure. If the vicars general do not grant the registration, wait to obtain it from the bishop. I am writing for the official copies of the statutes which you promised me. I hope they bear an official signature from the person in charge of that department. We must accept what we are given and try again later.

You did well to cease dealing with M. O'Lombel. I approve your action with respect to the manuals. I gather from your letter that you were unaware of the appointment of the Bishop of Strasbourg as tutor to the heir to the throne, the Duke of Bordeaux. It would have been appropriate to congratulate him. Do so as soon as possible. Now to the three petitions from Brother Rothéa.

For the first, I authorize M. Laugeay to take charge of the normal school at Saint-Remy; I am writing today to Brother Rothéa. For the second, referring to the Mertian matter, I can only repeat what is contained in both your first and second series of instructions. No one is authorized to go ahead in this matter. Louis Rothéa's procuration has expired. I do not approve of what he did when he exceeded his prerogatives, and I would strenuously disapprove if he continued to meddle. In turn, you must do nothing else but propose the little project, no. 6 of your last instructions.

I come to your last question about grouping the novices left by Father Mertian, and the conditions of their acceptance. Your instructions specify that when the time comes, the pros and cons will be weighed carefully and all will be done with the prudence that should characterize the Institute of Mary. But have we reached that stage? Are Father Mertian's statutes and letters patent familiar to you? What can you do and say before being given these documents? You have no grasp of your instructions; you speak as though you were never given any. To avoid repeating myself, I must say "Read your instructions." To all questions you must simply answer, "My instructions allow, forbid, or make no mention of it." If you do this and if you write to me faithfully about each transaction, our relationship will be simple and you will proceed with confidence. Try to enter into the spirit and accept the blessings which my heart loves to give you in Jesus and Mary.

* * *

S. 393-3. To M. Becanne, Rector at Moncassin

April 21, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Your desire as expressed again in your letter of April 14 as relayed to me by Brother David, and I intend to satisfy it as far as it lies in me. Therefore, I urge you to take the following means which will see your wish granted for the glory of God and of his holy Mother. You must

1. draw up a list of the sodalists who meet regularly and whom you wish to affiliate.
2. appoint a provisional leader, let us call her a prefect, and two assistants to share the work and to act as advisers and helpers for the prefect
3. give the title and patron of the church in which it is established
4. your special request must be voiced, and also your offer to be the local director of the group.

My intention to make a tour of your country may enable me to bring my answer to you. Things have happened in a very unexpected fashion. But I have finally decided that my trip will take place in four weeks or so. Meanwhile, if you can send me the required information, I will do my best to bring the requested affiliation to Tonneins along with the related instructions. I will announce my visit, and if I do not meet with you I will leave everything with the pastor of Tonneins or with M. Royère. I am already bound to you with generous sentiments in Jesus and Mary.

* * *

S. 393-4. To Bro. Louis Rothéa, Colmar

April 27, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Father Caillet writes to inform me from Paris of the three questions you put to him in your letter of April 13. You were asking if Brother Laugeay should be authorized to direct the normal school at Saint-Remy. I do so authorize, and without offering explanations. He is to return to his post as soon as his mission is accomplished. Meanwhile, things will continue at Colmar as was explained to me by one of your staff. I cannot judge the efficacy of this temporary arrangement; see to it that nothing will be wanting in the interval.

Your second question dealt with the repairs Father Mertian had promised to undertake at Saint-Hippolyte, and your third with the proposed fusion with the Brothers and novices of Father Mertian's institute. These last two questions are none of your concern at present. The contract you signed at Ribeuville marked the end of your delegated powers. I disapproved of it because you exceeded your authority. Whoever took charge in Father Mertian's name did him and us a disservice; you have no authority in the matter. You had none after signing the contract, yet I am told that you have been very busy since then. I disapprove of those acts, and more so of what you might still do in this unhappy matter. You are powerless; keep out of it.

Father Caillet will read you the articles of his instructions that concern you. Your misguided zeal has carried you away; you seem to realize that you have been led into error. Please meddle no more in the Mertian matter, or with the Saint-Hippolyte problem. How they will turn out is God's will.

Do not let my insistence trouble your peace. God willed that you would fail. My it profit you spiritually; resignation and humility are always profitable. I bed God to grant you both; if he does so, they will not be the least of his blessings.

* * *

S. 394. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

April 25, 1826, Bordeaux

. . . they acted with great independence.

Let Mother Saint-Vincent follow her ideas on the maintenance of order outside the convent; I have no preference and no advice to give in the matter. Let her act with her usual uprightness. On another occasion God through his grace will add those qualities which are no less essential because of our holy state.

What can we foresee and advise for the future? Let me mention two things now to avoid blame later. I have already mentioned the first—to press with the repairs to the house so it might suit Mme Clairefontaine. That was my first promise and yours also to her, and if this is not done the rest is useless. I will never stop repeating that this first promise in no way infirms??? The

second: to admit her into the convent so her piety may find nourishment and increase. Again, her admission must not be at the expense of the improvements to the house. I mentioned this previously, and I want you to promise me that in your answer. I want the house she is to occupy to be ready to be blessed when I come to Agen; give me grounds for hope in this matter.

The second thing I foresee and advise is the final payment on the house in Tonneins. The set date is fast approaching, and it will be upon us before we know it. There are still 6,000 francs to pay, perhaps more because the interest was not completely paid last time.

I will see about the other of your many interests. . .

* * *

S. 394-2. To Father Bardenet, Abrois

May 1, 1826, Bordeaux

Monsieur and Respected Colleague,

I have received your letter of April 13 and the two decisions voted upon by the municipal council of the city of Arbois. I find it strange that single vote should cover a multitude of subjects, but I imagine there are reasons for proceeding in this fashion. Not knowing the circumstances, I suppose nothing else could be done. However, I wanted to bring up the point because it is worthy of note and may have serious consequences. It will not if the official authorization of both the prefect and the ministers is granted. However, these people will not approve if they feel that some of the conditions tend to implicate the city financially and necessitate the consent of the government. That would involve us too deeply. For instance, if they feel that a sale of communal property requires previous evaluation and publication; if they believe some of the conditions will force them to include the property in future budgets; if they find that because the following are concerned, they must be consulted—the Minister of the Interior, the War Ministry, the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, and perhaps that of Finance. I do not know what will come of all this; it can only be explained by the importance of the project and the public good which may result.

I point out these facts to convince you of the importance at the moment of obtaining the authorization from the prefect and the ministers. So far, we have only the vote of the council, which gives us no title but which is a mere first step to the purchase and our entry. The decisions ask the mayor to follow the usual legal channels; until this is done, we have not advanced a single step. I am telling you this so you may start out on the right foot. Anything not legally correct in our dealings with a simple commune would be worthless. I believe you have been sufficiently warned; the rest is up to your prudence and to the friends who have at times been too helpful, something about which we do not often complain. Now as to what concerns us more directly, either in the discussions or in your letter.

I believe the report should not have specified the classes to be formed: a free class, two classes with varying tuition requirements, a boarding facility. Taken literally, this would mean four sections with a further subdivision among 12 or 16 schools—impossible. That there was room for 150 in the poor classes should not have been stated. If only 100 came from the city, we could be charged with non-fulfillment of our contract! Let us hope that these matters will be cleared up when the Sisters get their permits. It will be stated that they will accept the poor who present themselves if these observe the rules of the school and use the quarters assigned to them. The Sisters will reserve other quarters for the day students, the boarders, the various levels of instruction for those paying tuition. The Sisters must be allowed to settle these matters in their own way and under their superior's guidance. Going into details would hamper their administration and place a constraint on their own methods.

The Sisters will need legal authorization, but that will be possible only after certain formalities concerning the property, as the mayor said. This is another reason the administrative authorization I mentioned earlier should be procured as soon as possible. The property must be

transferred legally before the religious body can ask to occupy it. There must be an inquiry to prove acceptability and utility; the written consent of the Bishop must be obtained, and the special permission of the municipal council which debated the measure.

The municipal decision does not permit the admission of our nuns (1) because they are not mentioned, (2) because it contains no report of a preliminary inquiry or the bishop's consent, and (3) because they were not a party to the discussion. I mention all these points now so that we might find all the means to expedite matters, and so we will not be hindered once we begin installing ourselves. If you agree, I can deal with our Sisters' matters once the formalities of the purchase are taken care of. Two aspects will need our closer scrutiny. One, the mention in the Arbois discussions of a possible repossession of the Capuchin property by the commune or by you and your agent. The others, the sums you ask me to provide for the transfer of the Sisters.

On the first point, I think it only just that you should get the property if its original disposal does not take place. However, a slight change in the general law concerning religious is needed; without it, the law is powerless. The law stipulates that the goods will profit the donors only if a pension is given the Sisters whom an act of God has prevented from continuing their services. You will admit that it would be foolhardy and difficult to try to change the law for this and other unforeseeable cases. And yet, the decision made would require just that. However, once the Sisters are admitted, the problem vanishes. Besides, in your letter you ask that your expenses be paid from the early returns. I agree, for that will enable you to engage in other good works.

Once your expenses are covered, the property will be clear, and I do not see how or why it could revert to your agents. They would come into the property directly, and into its monetary value through your will. If the property is ever returned to you, then you must have been the donor. If you are the donor, your expenses are not to be reimbursed.

The funds necessary in the beginning would be a personal gift of mine to Arbois, which has no need of it. As for our Sisters, they have followed the example of the apostles, to whom Our Lord said to carry neither staff nor purse; they must not be made to change in this. It would be tampering with the spirit of the Institute. They give everything, their care, their days, their thoughts of every moment.

I would be reimbursed before you for any expense, for ownership in my case is not so strongly linked to it as it is for your heirs. If you will, we can exchange ideas on all this later. Let us place ourselves at God's disposal. I will try to provide worthy personnel, and you the means and the housing. You will find help from the good people of the neighborhood, while I must go alone and far afield to find my staff. I should not speak in so human a fashion, for it is true that God does with us as he wills. We will serve him as we see fit. May God accept our service; let us remain united to him, to Jesus and Mary. With sentiments of religious affection, I am, sir and most honored colleague, . . .

P.S. The essential now is the legal authorization for your purchase. If all is ready in September, our Sisters will be ready also.

* * *

S. 395-2. To Father Calmels, Rector, Besançon

May 2, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

The superior of our house in Saint-Remy sent me the confidential letter with which you honored him on April 12. He also shared with me the provisional answer he gave you. In this answer, the superior kept in mind the spirit of the Institute of the Children of Mary when he told you of our intention to do all in our power to uphold and improve public instruction wherever we are called.

Reverend Rector, when in your kindness you call us to the interesting town of Gray, not far from Saint-Remy, we cannot refuse; we must now find ways to implement the appeal. Your personal recommendation and the great confidence which His Excellency, the Bishop of Hermopolis, has in you would have banished all hesitation, were we not bound by a duty of state to help the project. We find consolation and encouragement in the attitude of the administration and of the people of Gray, which you describe. We will prepare ourselves most seriously. It would ill become us to send you a principal of doubtful capability; we must find one who will be satisfactory. This necessitates a series of highly inconvenient replacements, as your experience will confirm. To make these substitutions less painful, I must make them gradually. Should you approve of my method please let me know, and I will set the process in motion without delay so as to complete it at the desire time, just before the holidays. This is not the best of times, however, but I believe I can do it if all other conditions are fulfilled.

You seem to know one of my prospects, Reverend Rector, and you would like to have him carry out your plan. He is the type of person we know would suit you. I cannot grant him to you, however, for he would be too sorely missed. But I can find someone who will be just as satisfactory. Your project and ours, Reverend Rector, will be more surely realized if you, in turn, can help me in making some of the replacements rendered necessary by our new contribution to the town of Gray. All I need from you is a word of recommendation, an official act. I have two people who have proven their capacities in the field of education. They need only to be informed and practiced in the method under competent guidance. Their vocation has stood the test of years; one is subject to an archbishop, and the other to a bishop. One word of recommendation, I believe, would induce these worthy prelates gladly to free these men. Personally, I have always looked upon worship and instruction as the branches of the same tree, and I believe the archbishop and the bishop would be worthy of commendation if they allowed some of their young men to be used sparingly in the field of instruction. The greater number of the French prelates agree with me. Right now, I know of only two who do not. I am not blaming them; their responsibility is enormous. They are engaged in so many excellent undertakings that their contrary opinion in this matter does not grieve me. I look upon it as the plan of God, and I do not blame them.

Although I do not blame anyone, could you not, Reverend Rector, have His Excellency the Bishop of Hermopolis intervene and thus effectively obtain for me the help I need? Would it be indiscreet to have His Excellency write, for instance, that because public instruction is profiting by the use of one or more religious who are sorely missed by the Institute of Mary (whose Superior General is Father Chaminade), he would look with favor on their replacement by persons with an aptitude for this work and who would be trained for it? A general recommendation of this nature would do no one any disservice. If you think it preferable to apply only to the two, the bishop and the archbishop, who do not admit that the lending of one of their men could merit for them an abundant increase in new priestly vocations, I would give you their names in confidence, and I would point out the two seminarians who are restrained by obedience from following their inclination and whose steadfastness deserved to be rewarded (see note A).

I know you will look kindly on my petition, Reverend Rector, and that you are at this very moment busy with the details of this good work. When we reflect that there is only one period in a man's life devoted to learning, if he cannot profit by it he will always give mediocre service, whatever his calling. I am most respectfully. . . .

Note A. Father Larrieu, a young cleric, in the business office of the seminary, who is under the authority of the Archbishop of Auch. Father Brothier, a young cleric in charge of a chapel of ease, under the authority of the Bishop of Périgueux.

P.S. Is the institution a full-fledged *collège*? If not, what is the highest class? Are there any special classes? How many boarders can be accommodated? What is the condition of the furnishings, and who is responsible for them? Etc. Information of the nature can be of help in the planning stage.

* * *

S. 395-3. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Saint-Remy

May 6, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Your letter from Colmar was dated April 24. It contained your new address at Saint-Remy, where you hoped to arrive on May 1. If your assignment was successful, it must be due to a special act of Providence calling you to help Saint-Remy. The inopportune illness of Father Rothéa must have surprised and pained you. We were deeply touched here, and our dear ailing Father was recommended to our prayers; we hope God will show his mercy in the person of this faithful servant of the Institute.

I wrote to Brother Clouzet today asking that Father Rothéa be granted a period of convalescence, preferably more than necessary. This is not advice; it is an order. See that it is carried out, and let no false zeal or pretended need veto this precautionary measure. Under the circumstances, I believe you should postpone your journey rather than leave Saint-Remy without indispensable clerical services. If need be, could you get a priest from the metropolitan church of Besançon or from the Missionaries of Beaupré, who have shown such zeal for good works? Do your best; if you cannot find anyone for the spiritual services, stay there and write to me.

You have probably heard that Msgr. Tharin, Bishop of Strasbourg, whom you were to visit shortly, has had an accident on leaving Paris. His coach was damaged, he suffered bruises, and his vicar is in a worse condition. The secretary is the only one who was unharmed. Consequently, His Excellency went back to the capital; I do not know when he will return. Until he does, your trip to Strasbourg is postponed. On the other hand, the Mertian matter is a series of nothings. Follow your instructions when they say we break off negotiations. Nothing could be worse than new misunderstandings in which they seek to embroil us after that with Brother Rothéa and the so-called "donation." I had suspected that the lawyer had done Father Mertian a disservice; now he wants to become personally involved. I wish him luck. The intervention by the Vicar General availed him nothing; are we at fault? Let each one direct his own Institute as he sees fit. We will keep ours, and we will find enough to do.

The suggestion that we accept some of Father Mertian's brothers in our schools but not combine our Institutes is not feasible. If this led to reciprocal exchange, to experimentation in both institutions, dislocation and laxity would result. Without reciprocal exchange of Members? How can we be sure? What guarantee would we have that exchanged personnel, once trained and useful, would not be recalled? These are idiotic schemes which must be recognized as such.

We did inform one or the other of Father Mertian's religious who preferred the Institute of Mary that with Father Mertian's declaration, they were relieved of all promises and obligations to him; and if their conduct was above reproach, they would be accepted into the novitiate. One of us informed Father Mertian of this, but no official pronouncement was made.

Finally, if Father Mertian expects us to come to the help of his Institute, he will infallibly answer my last letters to him. I do not find it opportune to give you any power other than to receive his answer and to forward it to me. According to your letter, you are asked to express your views in writing, although you yourself are given only oral replies which are contradictory. Can you not see, my dear Son, that you are being tested and that Father Mertian, who is clever, knows very well that this is time wasted? Your only assignment is to have those documents registered in Strasbourg. You were to read to Brother Rothéa that section of your instructions which concerns him. He writes to you and to me as if he had not read them. What else can I tell you except to follow your orders. Stop being a party to this charade, now that you have been

refused the lawyer's signed document. Let them believe . . . are we dealing with a nincompoop? Really, you are made sport of; do not play this game any longer.

With this same mailing I am writing to Brother Rothéa, asking him to drop this silly business. I will be expecting news about the dear cleric you are to help. With a very paternal heart, I pray to God for you both.

* * *

S. 395-4. To Bro. Louis Rothéa

May 6, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I received your very short letter of April 23 enclosed in one for Father Caillet. You still have that same desire which for the past few years has tempted you—to salvage Father Mertian's Institute. There must be some good in that intention, always supposing you had in mind the glory of God and the salvation of several religious; but the number of rebuffs you have suffered should have disillusioned you. No reaction to the description of our methods, the year you spent at Ribeaupillé, the fictitious donation they were going to foist on you, all that you have done beyond your assigned powers and after the termination of your mandate, plus a host of other details—all this does not open your eyes or enlighten your mind! You will perish in your dream.

You tell me new proposals were made today, proposal we should not reject, according to you. Where are these new proposals? What weight did such words have in the past? Your letters explain this in a way which I would not care to repeat. Let us simply say that they wish to fan our desires, to keep them alive, and that there are no proposals. I wrote and received no answer; do you know what that means? What do you think should not be rejected? This, you say, that Father Mertian would like to disband his Institute, give his brothers their freedom, compensate some, and let us have the rest. Please tell me how you nullify the letters patent from the king; how with a few articles of furniture you can compensate those who have a right to them because of their state? How do you dismiss those not worthy of compensation, and how do you confer riches on the others?

My poor Son, do you wish me to consult those who have no understanding of these matters, and that we become endlessly embroiled both with the government and with persons who have been more or less grievously deceived? An institution with letters patent from the king can only be dissolved by another grant of such letters. Neither Father Mertian nor anyone else is above the king. He and I might believe the Order dissolved, yet both be wrong and blameworthy.

You add that under the above conditions, Father Mertian would give us Saint-Hippolyte, make repairs, etc. My dear Son, if by betraying the king's trust, nullifying his acts, being accomplices in the desertion of some, accepting the less worthy and accepting a state of permanent insecurity, you were to offer me a kingdom, I would refuse it. I will not describe the headaches such an error would cause; I merely repeat the instruction Father Caillet was to transmit to you. You have no powers; wait until I receive an answer. When God wants the event to take place, it will not meet with such obstacles. Because God will not move their hearts, let us keep our peace and bless the Lord.

I have asked Father Caillet to take possession of the documents concerning Saint-Hippolyte; neither you nor he make any mention of these in your letters. I certainly do not want to send another visitor. As to the plan you suggest, prepared by Brother Laugeay and approved by our people in Colmar, I will examine it when I receive it. However, if you have friends in that town, try to get some financial help. In one of your letters I read that the town is slow in coming to your assistance, that the item is not even in its budget. Am I wrong?

In one of my earlier letters I allowed Brother Laugeay to go to the normal school at Saint-Remy. Neither Saint-Remy nor Colmar has confirmed this move. While we abandon the Mertian matter, my dear Son, let us try to establish more solidly the curriculum, the order, and the discipline in our schools. In the sight of God, it will be to our advantage and to that of your students; we must bend all our efforts to this. May my prayer obtain this favor for you.

P.S. Those due for military service this year are exempted. I will immediately send the list to the prefect and keep you informed.

* * *

S. 397. To Bro. Louis Rothéa

May 11, 1826, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

In your letter of May 2 I received your two promissory notes, one for 1,000 francs and the other for 309 francs 85 centimes, drawn on Combe and Dumas of Paris. I will take care of them and will do with them as you specified; the first will be used for the Schemder children, and the other will be deposited in the general account. I believe the problem we had with the other draft for 1,000 francs on Combe and Dumas has been solved. They were repaid with interest and cannot complain.

Your recent letter of May 4 comes on the heels of the other of May 2. I noticed that you were troubled; I will put aside my answer to the first, the more easily to answer both.???

You seem to believe, my dear Son, that you are being blamed. . .

Why did I not answer a letter which had reached me two weeks before the Ribeauvillé deal? Why did Father Caillet's instructions to you arrive six weeks after that same deal? Why were you not told to strictly follow your instructions about your rights as proxy?

Even if you continue to ask questions. . .

Three words on your three questions should set you straight. The letter you sent two weeks before the deal did not say you would put off signing for two weeks, or that you expected an answer to the question. I could not know that an answer would have helped you. Moreover, my answer would have been, "Follow your instructions." Just that: follow you instructions.

From the six weeks that, according to you, Father Caillet. . .

As to your doubt about whether an agent must follow instructions, it would be difficult to explain unless you are really troubled. Granted, an agent can do better than expected, but he must not do worse, or deviate from his assignment. Is an agent chosen to do anything other than his assignment?

At Ribeauvillé you were led into error. . .

I will not go into the rumors which are abroad in Ribeauvillé and elsewhere concerning the Mertian matter, or into the new proposals you are not commissioned to make to me . . . or into the attitude of M. Bernhard. The past has been subject to scrutiny by competent people. When Father Mertian really wants what you say he does, he will answer my letter in which I blame only the author of the document, who interpreted the thought of neither of us. I do not even know the name of the author; I merely judge his actions.

As regards those confounded articles of furniture. . .

Evidently you are absorbed by imaginary difficulties; you do not seem to fathom the real ones. Our merger with Father Mertian's Institute, which is established by the king and whose statutes have the approval of the State Council, is impossible without new letters patent, new statutes, and Father Mertian's consent, for neither he nor I can nullify the king's action or the approval of the council. Let Father Mertian keep everything, or furnish those documents. Without the proper title no person, no article of furniture, and no house can be changed without a serious breach of religious laws. I had nothing to refuse those poor teachers, and not for an instant did I

want to be unjust toward them. When Father Mertian refuses to understand this, what can I do? Declare war on the king and on the State Council? Through foolhardiness or an act under any other name, to risk having the charter of the Society of Mary revoked?

My dear Son, see where lie the real difficulties. . .

* * *

S. 398-2. To the Prefect of Haut-Rhin

May 15, 1826, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Honorable Prefect,

In accordance with the instructions given me by His Excellency the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction, I have the honor of sending you four certificates attesting to the fact that the four Brothers of the Society of Mary who are called to the army—Troffer, Hunolt, Weber, and Geiger—all four from your department, have contracted the legal obligation to serve for ten years in public schools, conformably to article 13 of the law of March 10, 1818. In their name and as their Superior, I have the honor of asking that each of the four be dispensed from military service in conformity with that ruling.

Further instructions from His Excellency inform me that should any of the brothers abandon public instruction before the expiration of his term, I am to inform you, Sir, who have granted the dispensation. I will not fail to do this, should the case present itself. I am with sincere expressions of respect. . . .

P.S. The four brothers are of the class of 1825 except for Brother Troffer, who was of the class of 1824, as noted in the dispatches from His Excellency. Brother Troffer has already been dispensed, and the certificate we request is merely to rectify an error in the dispensation granted last year.

* * *

S. 400. To Fr. Georges Caillet

May 15, 1826, Bordeaux

. . . which had to be brought to a finish with the least embarrassment.

Trusting that this would be the case, I gave him my opinion of the complication introduced by the decision of the council of the commune. It was passed by a large majority, but it still had some opponents. I am not overly worried about my unknown opponents; I am vexed by the complicated decision of the Council dealing with

- the police barracks; the parish house; other communal properties, which have been or will be sold
- the exchange of buildings after agreement on their estimated value
- moneys going into communal coffers, unauthorized
- the purchase of a new house for the pastor, hoped for
- planning for a water supply, not for the commune
- the annual grant to the institution
- future budgets, including all annuities
- donations to pay for the residence of the pastor.

All this from one stroke of the pen, one decision made by a council which, I am certain, is exceeding its powers in some instances. I find this new procedure so novel and so strange that I will consider it seriously only if it receives confirmation from a higher authority. The lesser

authority is that of the prefect. Should he hesitate, we must approach the ministries, and how many there are! War, justice, finances, interior, ecclesiastical affairs, public instruction—what a lot of people to consult about nothing! Bypass them? This is possible, but at the slightest word by our opponents, at the least hint of our intent, everything collapses in a moment, the building is sealed, the bank account garnisheed, the livelihood of the persons compromised. I did not hide these dangers from Father Bardenet, but trusting in him and in his knowledge of local conditions, I simply asked him to obtain the administrative authorization, and on that condition along I promised him personnel for next September.

Since then I have gone further; I have chosen the personnel. You can imagine that after these maneuvers and the present state of our dealings, I find it most strange that you tell me Father Bardenet is hesitating between the Society of Mary and some other Society. Let the good man apply to another Order, and not have me remove from their posts people who are irreplaceable. I would be gravely disappointed if I could not do the good I hoped to do, with his help. Father Bardenet told me he expected our sisters to help financially in the development of his Institute. I compared our sisters to the apostles with a knapsack, a staff, and dusty feet. I cannot help him if he does not understand this. I asked him if he expected me to make a donation to the city of Arbois, which has no need of it. I am still waiting for an answer. I believe he has none. Hurry your explanations, that we may straighten out this mess. Return to Arbois if necessary, and beg Father Bardenet to tell me what we can expect from each other. If I could meet him face to face, we could clear up all misunderstanding.

I am holding back all the preparations by our sisters. . .

* * *

S. 401-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

May 23, 1826, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

Your letter and Father Bardenet's arrived at the same time. My earlier letter to this worthy collaborator was not given the proper interpretation. It breathed trust and confidence. I pointed out the necessity of receiving the approval of the Municipal Council's decisions, either from the prefect or from the ministries. This certainly could not prejudice our cause. Moreover, I promised to send along a colony of our Daughters of Mary when he would need them. I believed this to be helpful on my part and reassuring and consoling for him. He does not intend to apply to any Institute. You assure me that he will comply with all the legal formalities, either at the prefecture or at the diocesan bureau; but I never doubted his goodwill in this matter. I merely pointed out what the prefect should approve, and I only shared a portion of the fears I have in case of a definitive refusal.

I did not tell him that this very year, a certain prefect wished to authorize one of our establishments, but that the minister ruled that he would have to bear the expense himself. You must admit that it is worth entertaining doubts until permission is given. How can a friendly piece of advice be construed into ill will? I want to guarantee the survival of the work and to second any courageous effort, but you call this discrediting and discouraging.

I believe I am doing more than anyone for the approbation of our sisters. I did not think I had to explain my actions and in order not to inconvenience anyone else, I said I would look after it personally. It is evident that I am not varying from my remarks, which you say caused some merriment and great satisfaction. I simply must take the means to attain my objective, that is all.

I had said I would contribute at my discretion to help defray the expenses, and I asked if a gift from me were truly necessary. Did the word "gift" wound anyone? It could have, anywhere except in a charitable institution.

The spirit of abnegation of our sisters is a consequence of their vow of poverty. What can I do or say to the contrary? If they do not have what they need, of course they will suffer. Were they not so disposed, the Institute would not function as it should.

It is pointless to discuss the expenses you mention. It is not a matter of finding funds here and there, but rather of knowing whether I am committing myself to endless expenses. If they are limited, just what services am I expected to offer to Arbois? This topic has never been broached. What am I expected to contribute for a limited time? I have just received a similar request from one of our American colonies. I do not fear discontent, or that another Institute will be sought out.

Moreover, I am never offended by these things. Such unforeseen things happen all the time. We may agree the next time we meet and, God willing, everything will be settled. I believe we all want to do the right thing.

Geiger, whose father was worried, is dispensed from the service. The Prefect of Haut-Rhin received the certificate from the minister, with others for various of our brothers. Brother Rothéa has been informed and knows of the steps taken by the prefecture; you were told of similar procedures required by the Haute-Saône. Father Bardenet will hear from me with the next post. I could do no better. Give my fatherly love to my children at Saint-Remy, also to Brother Laugeay. God grant you peace and understanding in the management of your schools.

* * *

S. 401-3. To Bro. Louis Rothéa, Colmar

May 24, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I read with pleasure from your letter of May 14 that you are beginning to enjoy more peace of mind. What on first impression seems good is not necessarily so, as in the case of Father Mertian. We must not be unhappy if this good priest revives his Institute through his or other efforts. It may be that after a period of vacillation and weakness, this Institute may do great good. I do not believe I have anything to add to what I said about the brothers who would be freed from any commitment to Father Mertian. Let yourself be guided by the little I have written already on the topic.

Certificates of efficiency are demanded by our royal institution; we must have them. However, they are issued on the strength of the letters of obedience which I send. I will have this matter ready to present to Haut-Rhin as soon as our statutes and letters patent are registered by the See of Strasbourg. I will write concerning this to the bishop, to the prefects, and to the rector. I believe I also will write to your wise and worthy pastor of Colmar.

What a consolation I find in what you tell me of your schools and first communicants. On the other hand, the illness of Brother Weber is a hardship. We will pray for him, as I am sure you are doing. Your salaries and finances will be placed on a sound footing when your registration allows you to discuss your legal existence, while you continue teaching according to the spirit of the Institute. Let us both ask God to continue his merciful help. Pray for a father who loves you in Jesus and Mary.

* * *

S. 402. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

May 28, 1826, Bordeaux

. . . and to render their conclusion with all the more precious.

The first meeting will be with you or with your replacement. Takes notes on the topic discussed. Thus prepared, we will soon have a good grasp of each point.

The second meeting is for all officers, members of the Council; each prepares notes on her specialty, as indicated.

The third meeting has four purposes, each with subdivisions. More than one session will be required; it is important that the outline be followed strictly, not to waste time.

At least four sisters are on the Council, along with the Mistress of Novices and another member by right. It would be awkward if all the topics could not be prepared by the sisters; one sister might prepare two or more topics. Useful results are to be expected. See that each topic is presented in turn, with appropriate notes, one or two topics per sister; do your best.

The fourth meeting is in two parts—the Third Order, and the Sodality. We can have two meetings, but successively. See to it that the Heads of these two bodies have well-prepared but simple notes.

At the fifth meeting, we could go into details, but try to limit these by asking each sister to prepare her text well; this may be written to facilitate explanations.

Let me finish, as I did for my enclosed visitation plan, by remarking that whatever concerns Confession and gospel instructions should not be treated in a familiar meeting. You will be told when to discuss both direction of conscience and community instructions.

If I have succeeded in explaining myself well. . .

*

. . . her reports about every other house of the Institute.

Note. Special questions about individuals and personal interests are not to be discussed at this time.

See: Second Conference.

*

The advantages or embarrassments she experiences, etc.

Note. Anything of a personal nature would be reserved for another meeting.

Third Conference.

* * *

S. 404-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Colmar

June 1, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am including a copy of the letter which I am sending to the Bishop of Strasbourg. You will note that the letter contains the gist of the instructions I gave you concerning the Mertian matter. The outcome, which is still very problematical, must be left in the hands of God. Our minds in the matter are miles apart, and at that distance anything is possible. I am ready to overlook and forget the whole thing.

If Father Blanc wants to exercise M. Schemder's procuration, let him do so, but he must send me the draft of the procuration to make certain it contains all the necessary powers. People in that area should know what is needed; here we can only guess. Memorize the rest of your instructions; when you feel they have been complied with, go to Colmar and then to Saint-Remy, where you will find an order calling you back. May the peace of the Lord ever accompany you.

P.S. The postscript to the bishop's letter will inform you that I received your letter on May 25, and that your procuration will come to you through the bishop's office. In it you are subordinated to the judgment and decision of His Excellency, which does not mean that you may not speak for the Society. However, you must show that you are always ready to defer to His Excellency. Happily for our works, Providence has given us a person who in every sense is a good pastor.

* * *

S. 404-3. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Colmar

June 20, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I the undersigned, Superior General of the Society of Mary, hereby empower Father Caillet, for and in the name of the said Society, or at least in his indicated capacity, to accept the agreement joining my Society with that known as the Society of Father Mertian, in the Department of Haut-Rhin, both being legally approved by the Government.

To agree to the incorporation of such members who do not want to withdraw, on the condition that they agree to submit to the examinations and tests imposed by our statutes,

To accept the transfer of the various houses listed in the act, to assume the obligations which Father Mertian had contracted toward the commune,

To receive and accept all donations in the form of movables and immovables and anything destined for the installation, equipment, and maintenance either of a novitiate or of schools now standing or to be founded,\

To agree to all repairs to be made by the donor to the schools and buildings ceded,

According to all the above, to consent to and to specify all clauses or conditions, even and particularly the nullity of the so-called former act of donation which had the same purpose, but to which the parties could not agree.

To sign all papers, establish residence, to promise to seek from the Government the legal union of the Societies of Father Mertian and the Society of Mary.

It is understood that the procurator in charge will act on the advice and with the authorization of His Excellency the Bishop of Strasbourg, who will be asked to give this mark of attention to institutions which are of interest to the people of his diocese.

At Bordeaux, the residence of the Superior General of the Society of Mary,

June 20, 1826

* * *

S. 404-4. To Bishop Tharin of Strasbourg

June 1, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Your Excellency,

I had the honor to send you two letters, and I hope to receive an answer shortly. Both dealt with the reasons I wish to give Your Excellency for refusing the so-called donation of Saint-Hippolyte by Father Mertian.

I refused because this donation should properly be made to you, to meet the needs of your diocese. I believed I should formally renounce in your favor an apostolic means which only seemed to be first offered to me.

Please look graciously on my intention, Your Excellency, one which leaves me ready to obey your every command. Father Mertian knows my intention, although he has studiously left me without an answer.

I was informed by various letters that some of my religious have since looked favorably on Father Mertian's suggestion to donate the Institute to the Society of Mary in a legal manner. But these were my instructions to them.

- (1) To do nothing without Your Excellency's approval.
- (2) To contravene none of the statutes of Father Mertian and the royal ordinance concerning them. Therefore, they were to wait respectfully until both documents were forthcoming and made known.
- (3) To respect all objects already consecrated to religion and belonging to Father Mertian. Was this ruling given too strict an interpretation? Did anyone wish to embarrass Father Mertian before the merger? I am not aware of any examples, and that strictness would go beyond the orders I gave to my members.
- (4) To work immediately at uniting both Institutes.

Through this quadruple plan of action, I hoped to fulfill indispensable obligations, to uphold disciplinary rules, to respect the demands of religion, the royal sanction, and your own pastoral authority which was to put order into everything.

Someone wrote to me that the third article of these instructions was interpreted in a manner not conformable to religion; that I was refusing a few paltry articles of furniture to certain religions of Father Mertian who, for some unknown reason, wished to withdraw. My answer was immediate and proper—that I neither would nor could dispose of objects which had been consecrated for religious purposes, even if they belonged to my Order, and that I was in duty bound to dissuade anyone from such actions. I added that to prevent anyone from acting irresponsibly in this matter, I was willing to offer to each a sum equal to double the value of the objects they claimed, for example twelve francs instead of six, and so to exhort them to respect and leave objects that were properly called "religious."

From Father Caillet's last letter, I hear that the undue rigor against the poor of which I am accused in distant places has reached the ears of Your Excellency. I do not know who showed such zeal, probably with the charitable intent to see me changed???, but they were unaware of my prompt reaction to this travesty of my real intentions. I must not allow this pretended scandal to gain credence with you or with any of my colleagues. I know that the answer I gave above will be satisfactory to you. As long as we are of this world, God will allow us to suffer these trials, but his consoling grace is always present, one of the most effective being the advice our bishops are ready to give us. Please tell me, Excellency, what I must do and, above all, to what extent I must be humiliated for Christ and with Christ.

Again, I offer to abandon into your hands, Excellency, the offer made to me of Saint-Hippolyte, insofar as it is useful or necessary, and so you may be perfectly free to use this building for the needs of your diocese. The second object of my previous letter was to have Your Excellency accept from Father Caillet the king's ordinance authorizing the Society of Mary, along with the annexed statutes. I again beg Your Excellency to have these documents registered and deposited in the archives of your diocese. You know of my submission to your jurisdiction ever since I sought to legalize my institution. By repeating this gesture today in conformity with the terms of the king's ordinance, my first wish is granted, and I have done my duty. Please accept the homage. . .

P.S. I am waiting for the registration of the king's ordinance in order to solicit from Your Excellency the permission to establish our brothers in Colmar, and to give them the obedience upon which their certification depends.

P.S. 2. At this very moment I have received a letter from Father Caillet, who announces that Your Excellency has studied the Mertian matter and that we may be able to come to terms. That was the purpose of the above letter, and I will not change a single word. Until now, I had no

reason to expect a happy conclusion to this matter, and I did not believe my power of attorney was needed. After this new turn of events, I offer you this procuration, adding that I can change it to suit your purpose. I have always had the highest confidence in your advice and your decisions. After acceptance, Your Excellency will kindly give it to Father Caillet, to use as it was intended.

* * *

S. 404-5. To M. O'Lombel, Paris

June 6, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I wrote to you in great haste to answer your two letters as soon as possible and to inform you of the departure of young Veltner, who must now be in Paris. I hope the young man can be cured of the infection to his eyes. I had no time to comment upon your remarks about the mansion on Ile-Saint-Louis, but I understood you to mean that the price for the house had been raised, and that it was common knowledge that buildings of this nature had lost one-third of their value, because of the times, with no prospects of increasing but rather of losing more of that value.

It was providential, therefore, that we had not borrowed, especially because we were not able to make a down payment. When buying property, we must be able to make a down payment of at least one-fourth or one-third of the purchase price. Borrowing the rest is not imprudent, provided the price asked for the building is the true market value and resale under similar conditions is always possible. These rules covering the purchase were in your instructions, and it is to your credit that you did not deviate from them. Otherwise, where would we stand with that drop in value of thirty percent? Let our policy be earmarked by prudence, and we will suffer no loss which could strike at the very heart of our religious institutions. We are acting in God's name, and in conscience we must be able to pay what we purchase for our mission.

Apostolic works will never be lacking. I agree with you that the Society of Mary can take the initiative after suffering a certain number of setbacks. God's plans and designs go far beyond the present. We must not act prematurely; may God's will be done.

Here is a matter which I can leave to your zeal and your prudence. Father Calmels, Rector of the Academy of Besançon, contacted me through a second party and then wrote personally, asking that I provide a principal for the *collège* of Gray, in the Department of Doubs. In two letters to him, I accept and promised. I assured him that the person I had in mind was highly qualified and that to free him from his present post would require a number of displacements, but that everything would be completed by the end of next September. I have received no word since, and now I am almost forced to make personnel changes without knowing the decision made by Father Calmels. Is the worthy cleric ill? Is he involved in other public business which has made him forget this? A thousand other hypotheses come to mind.

I have Father Calmel's address in Paris at the Ministry for Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction. You are well known at the ministry and should be able to get some information; please see the Rector, in my name, and obtain an answer. I believe it was indiscreet of me to ask Father Calmels to intervene for the Institute by suggesting that the minister use his influence with two of our bishops to allow two of the seminarians, whom I have approached and who are willing, to come to our aid. I did not propose this as a condition for my cooperation, but as a normal form of collaboration. It was not considered in this light. I am telling you this so you may be aware of the situation. Does Father Calmel's hesitation stem from the apprehension you mentioned in your letter? I do not share that opinion, as I told you, but keep me informed. I again assure you of my paternal affection in Jesus and Mary.

* * *

S. 406. To Father Mertian
June 24, 1826, Bordeaux

I am giving them my entire . . . without any reserve of any kind.

The Bishop of Strasbourg informs me that the procuration I had sent to him for Father Caillet bore some mention of an inventory of furniture not to be found in any document, and that I must send another power of attorney with no mention of an inventory to be made, without prejudice to your own intentions in this respect.

I will copy my first procuration, dropping the words “inventory” and “furnishings” and will send it to Father Caillet with a copy of the 11 articles, in case he should not have kept them. Moreover, I will send him another procuration, pure and simple but notarized, for the acceptance of the items described in articles 6 and 7 of the agreement. The agreement of Ribeauvillé will be treated as nonexistent, or it may be annulled if you wish; the results will be the same.

Nothing prevents me from adding to the Saint-Hippolyte donation that the buildings may not be used for schools and institutions for females, if this is still your wish as expressed in your letter. However, it must be remarked that I accepted the donation in my capacity as Superior of the Brothers of Mary and for my Society, and therefore to say that its use is not for women may be premature. I may be wrong, but do not let the thought stop you; I bow to your superior vision.

As soon as I have the statutes before me . . .

* * *

S. 407. To Fr. Georges Caillet
June 23, 1826, Bordeaux

God does not leave us always in desolation.

I was happy to learn of the steps taken by Father Bardenet at the offices of the prefect and sub-prefect. What they said about the ministers’ authorization is much the same as what I wrote earlier. We must not cover the same ground again, but see to it that the civil authorities look upon the purchase in a purely administrative capacity. Patronage, passing favors which negate a law, in time leaves a trail of threatened unfriendliness and almost inevitable disaster. Please take note, and now let us pass to something else.

Now for your personal line of conduct. . .

*

. . . that many of them do not know at all.

In addition to these general notions which you must try to assimilate and observe, there are others touching your mission.

3. The handwritten procuration which I am sending is the same as the one I had entrusted to the Bishop of Strasbourg. The only difference is the impression in the new one of a mention of the furnishings and of the need to take inventory. In spite of this deletion, in his letter the bishop states that Father Mertian intends to give away the furnishings, except for two or three pieces. After the bishop’s decision, the stipulation expressed in my two previous letters no long holds—that we could not be a party to a donation of articles consecrated to religion. The bishop has weighted the advantages and disadvantages, and we abide by his decision and deal with those authorized to make further decisions.

4. At the same time, you will receive a notarized procuration; it covers the acceptance of the donation of Saint-Hippolyte and of the school buildings up to no. 10, inclusive. To please the

Council we had to add the clause that the transaction must be authorized by the Royal Council of Public Instruction.

5. When the transfer is made you are to receive all the documents, statutes, ordinances, decrees, and all titles to the property before the time of Father Mertian.

6. Note that until we have these papers our hands are tied, and we cannot ask for the merger of the two Institutes. I was sorry that this simple request of mine caused some grief.

7. Once I have these documents and the private deed pertaining to the donation, I still cannot act until the Bishop of Strasbourg recognizes me as Superior of the schools and brothers of Alsace. You must request this appointment as discreetly as possible.

8. Should the formalities drag, after I have clear title we will set up a provincial administration; but we are not there yet.

9. Return to Strasbourg, as you say in your letter of May 13. Sign three copies with the bishop as mediator. Article 11 calls for registration at the bishop's office; see to it, so we can get the certification if it is needed.

10. Do this unpretentiously, unhurriedly. You are merely acting under orders and to render a favorable report. If anything goes wrong, give me the circumstances and reasons in a letter.

After you have made the effort. . .

* * *

S. 408. To Father Calmels, Besançon

June 26, 1826, Bordeaux
(Rough Copy, Agmar)

While I do regret that I did not receive the encouragement I sought, this is not because my plea remained unheeded. Any disappointment is more than compensated for by the interest you have shown and which His Excellency manifests toward our Society. My discomfiture comes from the fact that I may have appeared indiscreet, and that I probably was for asking something that was not quite proper. I am convinced this was a lack of tact, unrelated to my temperament or intention. I believed the intervention I wanted would imply no use of authority, but would take place only if circumstances were favorable and a real advantage could be obtained. I promise, Reverend Rector, to be more discreet in my future demands.

Whatever anyone may have thought, what was at stake had so little import that no sooner had my letter reached you than I came to an understanding with one of the bishops, and the other will soon find that it is expedient to help institutions which work for the common good. I was ill-advised to complicate this incident with a charitable intervention which had for its purpose a general cooperation in a good work. I will refer to it no more, but limit myself to the question of the *collège* of Gray, my consent to provide a principal being unrelated to the mediation I solicited for another purpose. Let me now discuss the *collège* of Gray.

Reverend Rector, you may count on the person promised for this *collège* in my earlier letter. You have his name, his address, and his qualifications. I need say no more. In turn, I must be informed of your acceptance so I may prepare him for this assignment and find a replacement. This is only in the project stage now, but if it is prolonged unduly it could be harmful to the existing order. You have until July 20 to decide, and I can hardly be informed of your decision before the end of the month. That leaves me August and a part of September to dispatch the principal and to take care of general matters.

I thank you, Reverend Rector, for informing me that the *collège* offers secondary education. About philosophy I can only say what the former students said of something they lacked: *desideratur* [it is to be hoped for]. We will soon look into it, I hope.

This subject according to the needs of the collège. . .

Without further details I can affirm, Reverend Rector, that your hopes to have a principal like the one I provided for Villeneuve will be satisfied; and the latter is chaplain, professor, and director of his *collège*.

He will know very well that no man is perfect. . .

* * *

S. 409. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

July 12, 1826, Bordeaux

If all does not leave with this same mail. . .

Father Caillet complains of the tardiness of my answers. I reassured him two days ago. I addressed all my letters to Colmar, usually entrusting them to Brother Rothéa, especially the last three. The first contained my procuration with my seal, as requested by the Bishop of Strasbourg. The second, another procuration, notarized this time, authorizing the acceptance of the donation. I think this letter will not find Father Caillet at Saint-Remy. I would not want the letters to be forwarded by Brother Rothéa to Saint-Remy and have them cross Father Caillet going to Colmar. If there is still time, arrange so that this will not happen.

The young priest I announced to you. . .

* * *

S. 411-2. Correspondent Unknown

No date [July 17, 1826?] , Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

I have never been Mme Dubosc's adviser in her temporal affairs. My state and my occupations would not allow this. On occasion, I may have given her some advice, which she was free to follow or to disregard. Had I been the adviser of Mms Dubosc, I would have immediately turned to you; in fact, from the letters you wrote to her and which she showed me, I formed a high opinion of your common sense and intelligence. We would have gotten along famously. May she find the wise and calm adviser she needs and give him the confidence needed to conclude everything successfully.

* * *

S. 412-2. To Father de la Haye.

Secretary to the Bishop of Strasbourg

September 15, 1826, Colmar

(Copy, Agmar)

I have finally achieved the merger of the Institute of the Brothers of Strasbourg with that of Mary and have taken possession of the mansion of Saint-Hippolyte. I am sending the papers to Father Liebermann so he may deposit them in the bishop's office.

From the account of the sale you will receive and from the copy of the letter I wrote to the Vicar General, you will see how the sale was concluded. I did not believe it was necessary to point out to Father Liebermann the kind of contradiction between the utterances of M. Xavier Mertian and those of his brother, Father Mertian. The former told me there were no more brothers in Strasbourg, that one had already left and the other would retire. Father Mertian smiled as I repeated this to him. He told me the two brothers were in Strasbourg, but that he did not deem it necessary to convoke them.

I will abide by your advice in my dealings with the Rector of the Academy. Should I send him the names of the brothers who did not join the Society of Mary, but who will continue to teach? They no longer have a superior and are in a class with the lay teachers. I would be most grateful if you could give me your views on the matter and include anything that might be of interest to the Society of Mary. I will accept with thanks any comment you may wish to make on my procedures in Alsace. I am certain I must be making many mistakes. You could address your letter to Saint-Remy via Vesoul (Haute-Saône); I am. . .

* * *

S. 413. To Bro. David Monier

October 1, 1826, Arbois

I am suppressing many reflections, as you may easily notice.

The 2,400 francs which I had asked the superior of Tonneins to keep until further orders were to cover the travel expenses of the religious of Arbois. If Condom is short of funds and if the convent of Agen cannot help, the 500 or 600 francs could be taken from those 1,000 Louis. If Mother Emmanuel could be withdrawn from Condom for three or four months with no adverse effects on the boarding establishment, we would be willing to accept her; besides, Condom would benefit also. As to Mlle Dardy, use great prudence in trying to induce her to come to the Bordeaux meeting, unless she must substitute for Mother Emmanuel. It would be good if both could go to Arbois; then we could have Mother Emmanuel return and Mlle Dardy would be very happy to come to Arbois, as I had given her reason to hope, and to be with Mother Emmanuel. See what you can do without offending anyone.

I am bringing along with me a young ecclesiastic from Alsace. . .

* * *

S. 417-2. To Father de Cadigan

November 7, 1826, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest and Missionary Apostolic, Superior General of the Society of Mary,

Having been informed by our very dear Son, Father Caillet, priest of the Society of Mary, that Father de Cadigan wanted and even asked to be affiliated with the Society of Mary, already aware of the personal qualities of the worthy petitioner and desirous of giving him a proof of our gratitude for the services he has rendered and still renders to the Institute of the Daughters of Mary as superior of the convent of these sisters, established in the town of Condom,

Urged by the good and sufficient examples he has given of charity, discretion, and prudence in all things,

Have by these presented, with our signature, affiliated by the fact our most respected Father de Cadigan to the Society of Mary, whose central house is in Bordeaux and of which I am, in my unworthiness, the Superior General, so that the above-named may share in the prayers, the good works, and the merits of the Society and of the associations affiliated to it and which will be in the future, and in consequence, that he may profit by the privileges and indulgences attached to the affiliation, that he will pray for these graces by celebrating holy Mass once a month on the day of his choice, being dispensed from the other prayers by reason of his office and of his priesthood.

Done in Bordeaux, November 7, 1826,
Countersigned and sealed by our private secretary.

* * *

S. 420. To Bishop de Beauregard of Orléans

December 2, 1826, Bordeaux

*He needed the authorization and the consent of a third party. . .
... if he availed himself of his former rights
... the fitness or unfitness of a religious body. . .*

* * *

S. 420-2. To M. Pothain, Retired Notary

December 2, 1826, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

Your letter arrived one day after that of the prelate. I answered His Excellency by pointing out, as I ought, that the Saint Mesmin project was yours and not mine; that far from adopting it, I had declared my incapacity because no arrangement had been made with the episcopal authority which has jurisdiction here. I remarked further that when you talked to me, you did not have the final say, that a third person was involved, and finally, that its appropriateness for a religious Order had to be studied, and that would take time. Under the circumstances, I was far from conceiving a project which, by being concealed from the bishop, would challenge his authority.

Your gentle and excellent bishop took a most Christian attitude and asked me for the documents that would explain our Institute. These are now being copied, and if someday His Excellency gives his permission, I will readily listen to your proposals, which must not appear as a project of which I am the author.

Monsieur, I cannot refuse your petition to be admitted among the children of Mary. I have taken note of your request and the date of your letter. If we ever establish ourselves in Orléans, you will be received there after conscientiously complying with the tests and conditions, the reception of the sacraments, a confessor approved by the Ordinary and known to us, a desire to perform good works preferably as a member of a team rather than as an individual, and other requirements, just as simple, which will allow you to fulfill your desire.

Your letter informs me that, far from resuming the practice of law, you think only of business ventures which you propose to undertake. I will certainly rejoice at the successful outcome of your case with your creditor. I am certain that you need peace of soul; you will enjoy this only after your affairs are in order.

May God grant you what he knows you need. I will remember you in my prayers. This is the first fruit of the affiliation you seek, and which I grant to you in Jesus and Mary.

* * *

S. 422. To the Pastor of Aire

December 20, 1826, Bordeaux

*... before the church of Aire had been placed in your charge. . .
... otherwise it would have entrusted to you without fail.
Here are the facts.*

* * *

S. 426. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 10, 1827, Bordeaux

A certain number of days ago he answered me on this subject. . .

. . . just as I told you when I was writing to him.

There is a great deal more importance than you seem to believe.

* * *

S. 431. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 20, 1827, Bordeaux

These considerations seem much greater than they really are in themselves.

For example, Do you not think I would have honored your draft for 240 francs, had there not been a mistake? Such was the inaccuracy that the ablest financier could not have avoided it. Many days before Father Bardenet informed me, Mlle de Nouillan asked me to pay a certain sum from a refund that was due me. I asked her where her letter came from, and she said from near Montpellier. Twice she asked me if I had received any word about this transaction. I artlessly answered "No." However, the last time she asked, I had received a letter from Father Bardenet in which he said, "Brother Clouzet must have asked you to pay a draft for 240 francs in Bordeaux; the good ladies trust that you can advance them that sum." I saw no connection between Mlle Nouillan's request and Father Bardenet's letter; in fact, I was glad I had not invested the 240 francs in what seemed the good intentions of the worthy Mlle, in order to reserve them for Father Bardenet's draft, which you failed to mention to me. The money has been kept on hand until this day; I will put it to use, now that you have taken care of the matter yourself. I must admit that after waiting so long for that draft, I thought you must have made Father Bardenet change it from payable on reception to one with several days' grace.

My dear Son, please send a copy of the above to Father Bardenet, and also to M. Beau. It seems to me that if your soul had been at peace, you would not have been so put out by this miserable incident. I can hardly believe that Father Bardenet, who is experienced, did not explain more fully how he was drawing on me, and especially that he did not immediately advise me of the action. I will write to Father, but make no mention of the draft. Do not forget to send a copy of the above to both Father Bardenet and M. Beau. A copy should be sent to anyone else who may be involved in the matter.

You tell me, my dear Son, "Over here letters are being received. . ."

* * *

S. 432. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

April 9, 1827, Bordeaux

Nothing ever happens without the order and the permission of God.

Enclosed are two letters, one for Brother Dubarry and the other for Brother Brunet. The first is not sealed, and you may do with it as you please. If you think he should be sent back here, give him the letter, sealed or not, as you see fit. In this case, I do not believe you should give him money for the trip, but get him a place on the coach leaving Vesoul for Paris. Vesoul might even give him a ticket all the way to Bordeaux, and then you could refund the office at Vesoul. Otherwise you could write to M. O'Lombel in Paris, no. 7, Rue de Sèvres, and ask him to reserve a place on the coach for Bordeaux. As usual, you pay half the cost and I would pay the other half upon his arrival, in spite of my penury.

You tell me, my dear Son, that it would be urgent. . .

* * *

**S. 432-2. To Mlle Faivre,
Head of the Saint-Jacques Hospice, Besançon**
May 7, 1827, Bordeaux

Madame Superior,

I was away when your letter of March 7 arrived in Bordeaux. Shortly before, I had received word from Brother Clouzet, the director of our house in Saint-Remy. Both reassure me on the question of establishing the Brothers of Mary in the Saint Jacques Hospice. Brother Clouzet adds, "The board of directors would like to have the shops run by the Brothers of Mary, and the Mother Superior was advised by the board to write to me." The direction of the shops may be in the hands of the Society of Mary without necessarily changing all the shop teachers. They would be replaced in time, unless they felt called to the religious state. For instance, I believe I can soon replace the head shoemaker. I may be able to pay you a short visit toward the end of the summer; you might have the board write to me about the project, or you yourself could write to me. You will always find me ready to support your good project. I am respectfully. . .

P.S. Please give my regards to Sister Tharin.

* * *

S. 433. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet
May 7, 1827, Bordeaux

. . . to do all we can, but in peace and confidence.

I had sent you notice of a claim made by Sister Emmanuel, today Sister Léocadia, on the Mayor of Amance, I believe.

A short time after you wrote, you should have received a procuration in due form from Brother Olive. I was informed from Moissac a few days ago that it had been sent. I will have another one sent to you and made out to Brother Gobillot so he can sell all his furniture. He has just sent me a list of 27 items he is offering for sale. The entire amounts to 2,727 francs 50 centimes.

Take good care of Brother Brunet.

*

. . . might be able to find for you just what you need.

What you really need is a teacher who can handle all the courses and present the students for examination when you think they are ready.

Dear Bro. Louis Rothéa, who is now head. . .

*

P.S. The postman is waiting; that copy of the letter for the superior of the Saint-Jacques Hospice will have to wait.¹

* * *

¹ The copy of the letter to the superior will be annexed to letter no. 434. The text of that letter is no. 432-2.

S. 434. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 15, 1827, Bordeaux

Today he is in retreat.

I am glad that Jean, his wife, and little girl have left Saint-Remy. I already knew about your trip to Alsace. Brother Rothéa and Brother Laugeay, each in his own way, had told me what had transpired, but no one had told me of the 18-year old German girl. I think you acted wisely; however, if there is nothing unseemly in her desire to see Brother Walliser, you could correspond with her with Arbois in mind, but preventing any meeting with Brother Walliser. You might see to it that he will not have occasion to meet her at Saint-Remy, but if a trip to Arbois is in order, you could take Brother Walliser along; with him you could see the young German at the parlor grille.

I have some hope that our three establishments. . .

*

Perriguy is also too weak-minded. . .

In a recent letter I urged you to have him replaced at Besançon and to send him to Saint-Hippolyte, where he can teach Latin. He is getting along well now, especially with Brother Romain.

At the novitiate of Saint-Laurent I have

*

. . . you could be my traveling companion.

In separate letters I will take care of the retreat master and M. Maillot's affiliation. You should have said something to me about the religious attitude and the merits of the latter. I will enclose a short letter to Brother Brunet, which you can seal before handing to him.

I embrace you very tenderly. . .

* * *

S. 434-2. To M. François Chaminade, Périgueux

May 29, 1827, Bordeaux

(Rough Copy, Agmar)

My dear Brother,

I am happy indeed that I was able to guess that your anonymous emissary did not have your confidence and that I did well in not volunteering mine. However, the visit of this emissary had some effect, since I felt obliged to tell you what transpired. I also wish to answer your letters of the past January, hoping that in the three-month interval you have acquired peace of soul. All I asked at the time was a short answer indicating that you had accepted my reply and would act on it.

The entirely different tone of your answer convinces me that time has not mellowed your stand, dictated as you put it by interest and need. Because of this admission on your part, I will not complain of your conduct, and I do not know what threats are more patent in your last than in your previous letters. I am really grieved at your disturbed state of mind. May God pour out his balm upon you. The spiritual calm and peace which come from God are his greatest gifts in this world. You may call this a sermon and resent it, but it is a sermon I preach to myself, and it can do no harm to wish others may benefit from it.

In any case, I promised to answer your letter of last January, and this I will do. You will thank me for insisting very little on what is beside the point. But I will touch on all aspects so you may be convinced that I am not avoiding anything; your disturbed state is the only cause which seemed to call for silence as a remedy.

Let us dispense with the dignities and possessions which you attribute to me. I have none and desire none, but since it pleases you to call me wealthy and powerful, I must attribute these to your generosity. They are simply nonexistent. I also will overlook your accusations that I have neglected my family. The facts prove the contrary. They are self-evident, as we say. Your objections to my advice and your complaints show that I am more concerned with my family than they would like.

You claim to have understood the advice I gave you, to be silent and to allow me to do the same. You had no difficulty in understanding this, for we have been in agreement in the past. We said we must not aggravate the harm we may have caused in the heat of a first discussion. Your letter proves that you remember this, and that is all I meant by a recommendation to silence. But according to you, this case is different! My dear Brother, if you say this is not the time to keep our agreement, then there will never be a time! You say and insist that you want to share the inheritance. In a calmer moment, my dear Brother, you would chuckle at such a request. You know that when there is no inheritance, it is folly to demand one. You also know that your sister, in her long last years of life, lived off the charity of others. You demand today for a share in the inheritance is very similar to the request you made to see the will. I told you to look for it, and that your wish was as fruitless as it was strange. Today, I am saying the same about your desire for an inheritance which exists only in your imagination. You graciously offer me half of this treasure; I thank you and tell you to take it all. It is better to smile at these things than to squabble about them.

Again you claim that 40 years ago your sister had 7,000 livres, and that she loaned them to me. I wonder where you got that figure and the loan, or the benefit of that sum for 40 years. Your imagination is lively, but it is not dealing with facts. If I remember correctly, our sister had invested some money in a public utility, which later was nationalized. You were asked to lay claim; what happened? I do not know, but if you were successful the title of heir, which you claim, allows you to profit by whatever funds you recovered. You also claim that after many years in a home, our sister withdrew 3,333 francs and 35 centimes. But after the description you yourself give of her condition and the expenses caused by her illness, can you ask if after 18 or 20 years there is something left from that tiny sum?

Besides, you would have done better to ask for information from your nearest relatives who were at her deathbed and closed her eyes. They must have told you; I merely saw to it that she was honorably buried. Why did you not claim the inheritance, until there was nothing to claim? Why did you not have the will probated within six months? As for myself, I never wanted to be the inheritor; I have only prayers to say for the soul of the deceased.

I would like to see peace reign again in your soul, to see you turning your talents to useful purposes, just as I said when you came to see me. Pipe dreams are a waste of time and sometimes become more painful than the loss of material goods. I hope my willingness to answer such futilities has placated you. Please believe in my very real affection. . . \

P.S. I made no comment on the expenses you say you made for our sister, and on your right to the inheritance. There would be too much to say, and all to no purpose. But I am convinced you could not have had a better business manager and housekeeper, worth more to you than you could pay. Your misfortunes prevented you from doing her justice, but you can still keep alive the spirit of gratitude.

* * *

S. 435. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 30, 1827, Bordeaux

. . . that Brother Brunet may have all the care. . .

Urge Father Rothéa to apply himself to his teaching; he has the qualifications. The more interest he shows, the more his students will benefit. I will take note of the comments which you made while on your trip to Alsace. Brother Gobillot would like to follow Brother Olive's example, but two things restrain him: his brother-in-law cannot pay cash, and the fear of depriving his mother before her death. To the first objection I countered that we could give his brother-in-law the time he needed, since he is solvent. To the second, that we would sell on condition that his mother would have use of the small house where she dwells. Before leaving Saint-Remy, perhaps you could see how and when these arrangements can be made; then when you pass through Bordeaux, you could be given a regular procuration if it is warranted. I believe you have found the sum of 1,500 francs sufficient to settle the affairs of Brother Olive. I immediately will send a shoemaker to Saint Jacques Hospice in Besançon if you can send me one who can work in leather, cut, etc. Otherwise, I will wait also in the case of our good Brother Seguin until you come to Bordeaux, and you can judge for yourself whether these two are suitable.

Are we to receive subjects who have nothing. . .

* * *

**S. 435-2. To Father de Lachapelle,
Director of Ecclesiastical Affairs**

August 8, 1827, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I thought it my duty to advise the Daughters of Mary to obtain the benefits of the law relative to the authorization and the legal existence of religious congregations and communities of women. To date, they have only five communities, all observing the same rule. I was about to have them formulate the statutes based on their Constitutions and Rule, and to submit these again to the Bishop of Agen, the cradle of their order and the seat of their motherhouse, when I heard there was a set of statutes pretty much the same for all congregations or communities asking for authorization, in order to avoid possible lengthy discussions in the State Council.

I am about to leave for Paris. If you would be so kind as to send me the form in which you wish us to present our statutes when we ask for the authorization for both the Institute of the Daughters of Mary and for their motherhouse at Agen, I could arrange to have all the papers ready before my departure. M. O'Lombel will have the kindness to go to seek your advice, which he will relay to me with any material you may wish to add.

I have made no mention of the main purpose of my trip to Paris. M. O'Lombel knows I have full confidence in you and will surely have told you so. I am, with all due respect. . .

* * *

S. 435. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

October 18, 1827, Paris

. . . beg of him not to delay doing so any longer.

In your letter of October 9, you tell me you are still without a teacher and a Master of Novices. I hope to remedy the situation. The teacher will be Carrère, whom I discussed with you. I have written to Colmar asking that he be released and arrive at Saint-Remy for All Saints. I am sending Brother Galliot to Saint-Hippolyte as a teacher of French and also of Latin, in case

Brother Etignard is too heavily burdened by some higher class, which I doubt. I told you repeatedly that I wanted Brother Pelleteret in Bordeaux to continue his studies, but I will let you have him as long as he is needed for Latin, for supervision, and to help Brother Fridblatt. As for Father Meyer, I gave Father Lalanne some good reasons why he should come to Bordeaux. When he passed through Colmar he told me, but at greater length, what you noted in your letter.

It would be necessary, my dear Son, to send me a report. . .

* * *

S. 440. To Adèle de Batz de Trenquelléon

November 1, 1827, Bordeaux

. . . I will seriously examine and study how this might be done.

About those 10,000 francs—you would do well to withdraw 3,000 first. For the rest, urge the purchasers to pay as soon as possible. Once Mother Saint-Vincent has the 3,000 francs, let me know the mood of the buyers. I approve all the steps you have taken to have M. Larribeau lodge with M. Gay. You can lease half the small house to the two edifying ladies Mother Saint-Vincent spoke of. The rent will be 500 francs per person, a modest sum, for 600 would not be too much, provided they have the means to pay.

I must stop, for I am pressed for time. Some other time I will reply to some items of your letter to Mother Saint-Vincent. Take care of your health.

May the Lord shower upon you his most abundant benedictions!

* * *

S. 447. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 28, 1828, Bordeaux

If I happen to make any changes, I will tell you about them.

You say that with a little persuasion the pastor of Ormay could come; but, you add, he owes you 4,500 francs. What is to be done? Here is the way I see it. Whether he comes or not, you are not sure of receiving the 4,500 francs. If he does come, he will have added expenses for moving and setting up house in a new parish. On the other hand, if he goes to Bordeaux he will sell all his furniture and will pay his debt. If I remember correctly, he estimated the value of those furnishings at 1,000 francs. From a financial point of view, it is preferable to have him leave.

I embrace you tenderly. . .

*

P.S. They tell me that Brother Carrère is eligible for the draft this year. If that is the case, a proof of his teaching assignment should be furnished as soon as possible, or have his height measured at the prefecture of Vesoul and have him exempted because of his small size. What of Brother Brunet? He carries about a valid reason for dispensation, for upon examining his papers his baptismal certificate gives his date of birth as May 23, 1807, in the commune of Boé, canton of Agen, etc. He is on this year's roll, and Brunet will be next year. We must be careful to forget no one and keep a check on our people. It is worth it.

* * *

S. 448-2. Rules for the Observance of Lent, 1828

February 1828, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Strict fast for everyone 18 years and over.
Fast every other day for those 18 years old.
Young people, 12 to 15 years, reduce lunch by one-third; no dessert at dinner; even reducing by one-half, etc.

Young people under 12, no wine at lunch.

Farm workers and locksmiths are dispensed from the fast at whatever age.

Note 1. No one may be dispensed from the above rules without the express permission of the superior.

Note 2. During Holy Week, those who were judged capable of profiting by the rules are readily granted permission to add other privations. The Good Father allows those who fast every day to fast daily if . . . and to the young people who are most eager to advance, the permission to deprive themselves and even to fast every other day.

* * *

S. 450. To Mother Saint-Vincent

February 27, 1828, Bordeaux

. . . observe the effects the first concessions will have produced.

You make no mention of the procuration you sent to Condom. As soon as it is couched in the proper terms, inform M. Chaudordy so he may take the necessary steps to withdraw the sums now deposited with the Receiver General. He knows exactly what should be done. I am surprised at the slowness of the simple proceedings. Had all the heiresses been at Agen, it would have taken a day, and already more than a month has passed. M. Cuahdordy may need for his guidance the notice which the Receiver General sent me before my departure from Agen. I am enclosing a copy.

You will not forget to inform me the moment you receive the 2,500 francs that are coming to you. I received 50 francs for three months' board for a child staying with M. Dardy. Please give him a receipt.

Put great order in all the catechism instructions. . .

* * *

S. 456. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

April 28, 1828, Bordeaux

P.S. I have no time to put order among the pages of this long letter. Please take care of it. Please give the enclosed package to the parents of Brother Bardin (deceased).

* * *

S. 460. To Mother Saint-Vincent

May 27, 1828, Bordeaux

. . . no one knows what is going on in this matter.

After your remarks, I decided to leave Sister Geneviève Prêtre with you and to find someone else suitable for Alsace. I told Father Caillet of my decision, and he was very much of the opinion that Sister Geneviève Prêtre was the one to send to the new foundation, that we should send you one who arrived from Arbois to take charge of the parish, etc. I doubt she can

also be of some use in the garden. I am referring not to Sister Ursula, but to Sister Julienne. Father Caillet also believes you should be given Sister Xavier; she requires a great deal of attention, but she also needs to be kept fully occupied. You could have her teach the classes, give catechetical instruction to the girls, etc. Whom do you think we could send to Arbois? Someone who could teach and take care of the boarders.

In spite of the great need we have had. . .

*

There are more than 250 women at the Miséricorde now.

M. Dardy came to fetch his daughter Julia. We had insisted that he do so. He has placed her with the Dames de la Croix at Aiguillon.

I really believe, my dear Daughters, that you should not receive. . .

* * *

S. 460-2. To Bro. Jean Chevaux, Saint-Remy

June 17, 1828, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I hope I have not delayed too long in answering your letter of March 24. In my opinion, no irregularity prevents you from striving toward ordination, toward your sub diaconate, and you may continue to receive Holy Orders. But why have these doubts surfaced only with the approach of the sub diaconate? Should they not have been present at the minor orders? I have a certain number of questions I wish you would answer after conferring with Father Rothéa, who accompanied you to Besançon.

1. You say you submitted your case to the examiner, the Vicar General; did you not seek previous advice? And did this first counselor have any doubts? Now I ask (1) after your case was explained, what arguments were presented by you or by Father Rothéa? (2) Was the case argued in a similar manner before the Vicar General?

2. The solution offered by the examiner was based on the principle *In dubiis stat praesumptio in favore superioris* [in case of doubt, the presumption is always in favor of the superior]. I want to know how he applied this principle to allow you to proceed. Who is the superior understood here?

3. Are the canons of the Gallican Church in force in Franche-Comte? I am not asking whether the secular courts would have decided conformably to the decrees of the French clerical assemblies. However, if the Byzantine Church adheres to universal Canon Law, then most certainly what the canon calls “one’s Ordinary” can only mean the head of an assembly of the French clergy, while elsewhere he would be the bishop of one’s place of birth or residence, the one granting the title or benefice. As far as I recall, this is the interpretation given by Boniface VIII.

Should you want to consult on this point, my dear Son, do not do this in writing, for I do not believe you would be given an answer. But when you or Father Rothéa or some intelligent person from Saint-Remy happens to go to Besançon, an interview with the aged rector of the seminary or with one of the vicars general, preferably with Father Loye, could be arranged. This will not dispense you from answering this letter.

The Bishop of Bayonne refused the See of Besançon. What were the reasons? Only too late did we know the man. I realize, my dear Son, that you are very busy, perhaps even overloaded; in time you will know what I am going through. Have patience, keep calm, be faithful in your prayers, and believe in my personal interest and fatherly sentiments.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 460-3. To Mother Saint-Vincent, Agen

June 23, 1828, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Daughter,

On June 2 I sent to Father de Lachapelle the documents containing the authorization for the community of Arbois. At the same time, I consulted him as to the procedures to be followed by the heirs of Mme de Trenquelléon so that the Daughters of Mary might come into the inheritance. I pointed out to Father de Lachapelle that among the heirs must be counted the convents of Tonneins and Bordeaux. I also asked him how you, as the representative of the Mother General, could donate your dowry, which is in excess of that permitted by law. Father was kind enough to give me an answer. I am enclosing a copy of his letter which clearly explains the steps to be taken by you and by the heirs. Because you may not fully understand the import of the letter, I will make the following observations.

1. When drawing up the list of inherited items, include the mansion which serves as the convent of the Daughters of Mary at Tonneins and the house at no. 1, 2, 3, Rue Mazarin in Bordeaux which serves as the novitiate for the Daughters of Mary. That will settle the matter of the houses of Tonneins and Bordeaux, since they belong to the Daughters of Mary of Agen.

2. You must see in yourself a double identity, one the private person and the other the Superior General who represents all the Daughters of Mary. The private person may donate to the Daughters of Mary of the community of Agen, and the Superior General in Council may accept what she gives as heiress and what she gives in her private capacity.

3. You will need two separate documents, one describing the gift from the heiresses and the other your private donation. M. Chaudoroy will draw up both documents and also your statement of acceptance.??? This ledger along with the one from Father de Lachapelle will give him all the instructions he needs. Should any unforeseen difficulty arise, he can consult me, but without delay. Follow the procedure outlined in Father's letter—that is, the Bishop of Agen will need to give his approval.

My dear Daughter, may the peace of the Lord be with you.

P.S. I have just received your last letter and a copy of that of the clerk. Please send me immediately a detailed account of all the succession duties, along with the agreement, under private seal, between brother and sister. I will answer all your latest letters.

* * *

S. 470. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 19, 1829, Bordeaux

... to find out if weaving might not be really harmful to him.

My dear Son, I wrote you a long letter on December 10, but it was returned to me. The Ministry had not stamped it, and the pastor of Vesoul refused to pay for it. It left along with one addressed to the pastor of Saint-Remy.

The letter M. Peter wrote to you reveals the true state of his soul and shows how thankful we should be that he has left us. I need not go into details.

Brother Gobillot is far from being the first man in the world.

* * *

S. 472. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 17, 1829, Bordeaux

. . . more in accord with your views and the steps you are taking.

I believe I can send you a good teacher of French; I will say more in a few days. Tomorrow I hope to be able to send you the procuration whereby you can be dispensed from paying the taxes on doors and windows. The notary is M. Rauzan.

I wrote to M. Christian yesterday. . .

Therefore, see what you can do. Add whatever you can to the 1,000 francs. Brother Farey received word from his brother-in-law that he had sent you 400 francs. In a few days I will send you M. Perrin's bill. Payment of this should restore your bank balance, if it has been depleted by me. Your package arrived postpaid. The documents and papers you are going to send should be mailed to me directly.

I embrace you tenderly. . .

* * *

S. 473. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 26, 1829, Bordeaux

I am destining the latter for Saint-Hippolyte;

. . . however, he will leave only after I confirm his appointment. I will send no one to Saint-Hippolyte unless I receive satisfactory answers to the letters I have written.

I have received from Besançon a second crate of books, 957 copies. The shipping charges amounted to 69 francs. I counted 957, but there may be more. The crate weighed 410. This letter was copied by someone other than my usual secretary, who was overworked today.

I told you nothing about Brother Moulinié, but in the past I have written some strong things about him to Brother Laugeay, and again more recently about the innovations he introduced at Sainte-Marie-aux Mines. In your letter of January 26, you ask me to explain the two or three lines copied from my letter to Father Lalanne. "I am writing at greater length than I intended, my dear Son, because I realize that a copy of this letter could prepare Brother Clouzet, etc." The meaning is simple. Father Lalanne sends me a bill; I make certain remarks; I send you both the bill and a copy of my remarks. Was this not to prepare you for his next letter?

You halted the binding of the 2,000 manuals on woven paper. This you could have done for 2,000 other manuals, but not for those on woven paper. The sale of the first would have promoted the sale of the second. I advise you to have some of the woven paper manuals bound with a more finished and elegant appearance, some even gilt-edged.

I will say nothing about M. Christen, for I imagine he has shown you the letters we have exchanged. As I reread your letter of February 20, my dear Son, I am pained by the excerpt you gave me from his four-page letter. As to the 80 francs which you are claiming from Colmar for Brother Hunolt's trip, I think the entire matter is confused. When Brother Meyer returned, he gave you 200 francs, which you considered as a gift but the others considered to be a deposit. When Brother Meyer left for Saint-Remy, you gave him 100 francs for the trip, and 80 francs for Brother Hunolt's, which you took to be a loan to Comar, whereas in Alsace it was thought that you were merely returning Brother Meyer's deposit.

My dear Son, you may substitute Brother Rollinet for Brother Oliver at Colmar, as Brother Rothéa requests.

I should have many more things to tell you. . .

*

P.S. At Colmar, my dear Son, you could replace M. Olivier with M. Rollinet according to the request from Brother Rothéa. I would have some other things to tell you, but I must finish by embracing you tenderly.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 474. To Mother Saint-Vincent

June 13, 1829, Gray

This is what I wrote concerning you.

“During my visit to the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, I spoke to him about the donation; he says the estimated value given at registration was sufficient. Mother Saint-Vincent fears that by writing to the prefect, she would be compromising herself; see whether she can write without that danger. Could she not give him the estimated value quoted at the registration? If you think so, I would be greatly obliged to you if you sent her a model of the letter she needs; she could merely copy it.

“I believe, Monsieur, that you know the prefect of Lot-et-Garonne. Because you are entrusted with the matter, do you think it would be proper for you to write to him? I am informing Mother Saint-Vincent that I have the honor of writing to you, and to console her I add that perhaps it is not in the designs of God that these donations take place. For some time now, there are rumors of a change in the Government.”

Father Mémain does not recall informing me that the prefect had personally taken the matter of M. Dalle in hand. He had even told him there was no need to write to the Government about it. I answered Father, and he has not brought up the subject since. I considered the matter closed and thought no more about it. I have no document on hand, but he can always get a copy from the notary. If I find a copy in Paris, I will willingly do what is needed to obtain that pension. The prefect could easily see to it.

I am, as it were, on retreat here at Gray. . .

* * *

S. 475. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

June 21, 1829, Gray

My dear Son,

I am sending you (1) a letter for M. Regés; after reading rereading it, please seal it and give it to him. You may have Father Rothéa read it before handing it to him; (2) a short letter from M. O’Lombel which I found in a packet addressed to me; and (3) a brief note to Father Rothéa.

Our work with the editing of the Constitutions. . .

*

P.S. By mistake, Brother X. put M. O’Lombel’s note in M. Regés’ letter and sealed it. Open and read it before giving it to him.

* * *

S. 476. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

July 3, 1829, Gray

My dear Son,

You did well not to give M. Suhard the 25 francs he was requesting. Over a week ago, I heard through M. O'Lombel that he was back in Paris. M. O'Lombel inquired whether you had advanced him some funds for his return. I will be able to reassure him.

If you long to see me. . .

* * *

S. 483. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

October 8, 1829, Paris

In any case, I will send you Brother Fridblatt.

I am astonished at the withdrawal of Brother Gegneur; before my departure from Saint-Remy he seemed to have definitively chosen the religious state. It is to be feared that Brother Faret will not enjoy much authority at Saint-Remy, where it is known that he is only a candidate for the normal school.

I will leave a note for M. O'Lombel asking him to find you a good music teacher.

Father Rollinet presented himself before the archbishop. . .

*

I will answer him later on in regard to. . .

Do not lose sight of the pastor from the diocese of Autun, and also of the young pastor from the diocese of Besançon who came to see me at Gray.

M. O'Lombel will faithfully carry out your wishes with respect to the booksellers.

By the last mail I wrote. . .

* * *

**S. 483-2. Ordinance of the Superior General
Of the Society of Mary**

October 20, 1829, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, Superior General of the Society of Mary, established in Bordeaux, the site of the motherhouse which was authorized by royal ordinance on November 16, 1825, according to the terms of article 36 of the ordinance of February 29, 1816,

Given the above-mentioned ordinance relative to the Society of Mary, along with the 19 articles of the statutes,

Whereas the register required by articles 9 and 10 of the statutes wherein are to be written in order and without blanks the dates of entry on probation, of the professions as also of the withdrawals, should contain first of all the names of the first members already tried and approved at the time of the approbation of the Society by the said ordinance,

Whereas the delayed inscription of these first members of the Society had as sole cause and effect to put their perseverance to the test,

Whereas it was stipulated that one year of formation would be mandatory, and three subsequent years optional, four years in all, which have almost expired, the time has come to put an end to this interim arrangement and to establish conformably to the statutes the order of entry, of profession, and of withdrawal of the original members, and also that of the members admitted since the royal ordinance, and to see that no further tentative arrangements will be tolerated,

For the above reasons I do decree as follows:

Article 1. The register must be kept in the motherhouse of the Society of Mary, conformably to article 9 of the statutes appended to the royal ordinance of November 16, 1825, and will be put to use, and all inscriptions must conform to the said article.

Article 2. The names and dates of professions of both the original members who antedate the royal ordinance and of those admitted since will be inscribed in the order given in the appended table and certified by me. The dates and years of probation and profession will be entered as given in the appended table.

Article 3. Any member whose name is in the table but who is not presently in the motherhouse may be registered subsequently, either by coming to the motherhouse or by valid representation, giving the date and duration of probation or profession; the validity is not affected by the fact that the order of the appended table has not been followed.

Article 4. In the future, except for the case mentioned in the above article, entries will be made regularly, without delay, and will conform to article 9 of the statutes.

Article 5. We reserve the right to settle, by a separate decree, the case of tardy entries in houses of formation already authorized by us, conformably to article 10 of the statutes. Said houses must have a system similar to but separate from that of the motherhouse.

Article 6. It is the responsibility of the Secretary General of the Society to provide certified copies of the said inscriptions and of those that will be made in the course of time to the members requiring them, in the occupations and houses to which they are called by us.

Article 7. A copy of this decree will occupy the first pages of the register, before any entry, to guarantee proper registration, and it will be quoted whenever information is extracted from the register.

* * *

S. 486. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

October 28, 1829, Bordeaux

I will have one made temporarily by M. O'Lombel.

The three candidates I asked Brother Bouillon to bring along were his young brother and not his older brother, his nephew, and young Gouverd, who was working with his father. I am writing that you will contact M. Duchemin, a hatter, on your trip to Paris, should that take place next December.

You will have to make a trip to Besançon.

*

As regards Brother Troffer. . .

He has just written to tell me that Brother Marandet will have to be replaced, and that a teacher of singing is urgently needed. Later I will drop a note to Brother Delcamp; meanwhile, he will have to go to the normal school, unless he is there already, for studies as soon as classes resume, and be under the tutelage of Father Chevaux.

The matter of Rheinackern is very serious.

*

I will let you know about the results. . .

I will have something to say about the Germans to be sent to Saint-Hippolyte, especially the tailors.

You know, my dear Son, the tender friendship. . .

* * *

S. 489. To Fr. Jean Lalanne
November 6, 1829, Bordeaux

Faults of irritability and of sensibility. . .
And of secret weakness or laxness

*

. . . to harbor illusions in regard to his faults.
. . . these faults and these illusions have plagued him all his life.

*

. . . which his self-love causes him to make about himself.

This self-seeking was very subtle at times. He would occasionally work himself up to contrition, and he truly wanted to repent in the hope that contrition would free him from what he called his illness. In a word, his self-love blinded him to the fact that his sins offended God; he saw only his own distress.

Father Bouly has earnestly asked me to write. . .

* * *

S. 490. To Fr. Jean Lalanne
December 4, 1829, Bordeaux

P.S. In your next letter, let me know whether Brother Weber can address letters to the pastor of Vesoul or to the prefect.

* * *

S. 491-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Saint-Remy
December 10, 1829

The Good Father, who is very busy, has asked me to suggest that you read the short letter addressed to M. Rognin and to act in consequence. The next time you write, please tell us whether we can send your letter in care of the pastor of Vesoul. I am asking you this for the fourth time. And so . . . your unworthy brother recommends himself to your good prayers. (Signed) Weber.

* * *

S. 491-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet
December 16, 1829, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

When your letter of November 30 arrived, I had already answered the previous one and acknowledged receipt of the draft for 600 francs. You must have received it at Saint-Remy; it was dated November 25. I am sending these few words to Saint-Hippolyte, as you requested.

I can add nothing to what I have already told you about the matter of M. de Raineville and the convent of Rheinackern. You will find Father Fritsch, the pastor of Schelestat, harboring the same notions as I described to you. You can take advantage of this in your relationships with the diocesan coordinator, Father Rittling. He very justly thinks highly of the wisdom of the pastor of Schelestat. I suspected that he wanted me to consult him, which I did.

You tell me that Father Meyer and Father Bouly. . .

* * *

S. 495. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Saint-Remy

December 30, 1829, Bordeaux

Write to me and tell me all about this abbey. . .

In the matter of young Peg, you must simply write that it was through error or oversight that you demanded only 200 francs for his room, that it is 400 francs not counting his board. Neither Brother Clouzet nor Father Bardenet ever quoted a mere 200 francs. Taking into account the number of years before his ordination, Father Bardenet would have wanted his parents to pay in a lump sum, with refunds if needed, and I readily agreed. It would have been much more practical for his parents to adopt this plan. The *Collège* charges the day students 130 and some francs, at least; this is for the grade XII students, and perhaps less for the other classes. I had just been given two scholarships for day students to schools of the Society of Mary. When M. Blanc arrived, Brother Auguste enrolled him among the boarding students and will pay for him, as he does for others he sends to the *collège*. Blanc and Peg are not very religious and appear among their schoolmates as shadows in a painting.

I encountered mailing difficulties when routing the mail through the Ministry, but under the new minister everything is back to normal; there had been a change in personnel, it seems.

I am not sending this long letter. . .

* * *

S. 496. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 4, 1830, Bordeaux

I cannot say anything to you about Rheinackern. . .

On December 16 I wrote to you at Saint-Hippolyte; I am sending this letter there, too.

You must have received a letter from Father Lalanne. . .

*

I am writing to you at Saint-Hippolyte; you make no mention of my letter. I will try to take into account the remarks you made at Saint-Hippolyte, at Colmar, and at Ribeauvillé. I do not have the cook Father Meyer had in mind when he spoke to you. It is unfortunate that no one was trained by Joseph. Brother Gaussens complains bitterly that to fill his two vacancies, we must send him Brother Chauty. (1) It is a fact that he can do nothing. (2) He was a newcomer to the Society, which he did not know. It was like sending him an idiot with no redeeming features. It is almost as if we did not want the establishment to succeed. I have already spoken of this person, and also of the other I sent from Paris to Father Chevaux, and of the suppression of the novitiate to Father Lalanne. In any case. . .

Try to send to Courtefontaine. . .

*

It is not Father Rothéa who complained.

I have already written to Brother Gaussens on the topic of economy, and I will write again. He was supposed to apply to Saint-Remy only with my permission. He should have allowed Brother Houlné to leave when told to do so. These special and personal decisions make administration very painful and embarrassing.

All appears to be going well in Courtefontaine. . .

* * *

S. 496-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

January 12, 1830, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

It was both before and after your last letter that I learned the true situation at Rheinackern. The promise Father Fritsch wanted to exact was reported to me three times—by the superior of Rheinackern, by you, and by the Superior General. After your first letter on returning to Alsace, I wrote sternly to Father Liebermann that we hesitated to withdraw the religious from Rheinackern because he seemed to want to intervene. However, since we could foresee that such an action would be fruitless, he was to agree with the pastor of Marmoutier on the ways and means of withdrawing the religious and their belongings without fanfare and without scandal. I also wrote to the pastor of Marmoutier and sent him a copy of my letter to Father Liebermann. I also sent some words of consolation to the superior.

Later, on hearing of the effect which Father Liebermann's intervention had on Father Fritsch and to have a clear conscience, I believed I should advise the Superior General to send a procuration to the superior of Rheinackern (1) that she might buy the buildings, the church, and the outbuildings for 3,500 francs, and so to retire the mortgage on them. The procuration must stipulate two conditions; first, the restitution by Father Fritsch of everything he had received from them to the religious who made up the community, and this in the form of goods or money, to their satisfaction. (2) That all the gifts and offerings made to the chapel of Rheinackern would no longer be entrusted to Father Fritsch, but will serve for the maintenance of both the chapel and the convent according to the decision and the authority of the Bishop of Strasbourg. All this was written in great detail and sent to Father Liebermann and to the Rector of Marmoutier. I have written also to the superior of the convent. I hurriedly wrote a second time, for fear that the provisional arrangement had been made pending the reception of the procuration from the Superior General.

It is almost certain now that the two conditions required for the acceptance of the sales contracts, especially of the second, settle everything, which means that Father Bardenet is almost assured of being able to begin building his new convent. I remarked to Father Liebermann that if the Daughters of Mary do remain in Rheinackern, it will not be to set up a boarding establishment for Alsatian girls, that the building of the necessary units which would be needed would be too expensive and that, moreover, the location of the convent would not be the most favorable for the purpose, but that the convent could be used to house and edify the pilgrims and also to educate the young women of these regions.

I wanted to give you this information without delay. I hear that you and Father Lalanne take turns in absenting yourselves from Saint-Remy, which means that Saint-Remy has two superiors. Because it cannot be helped, you must see to it that what one has decided or done during his stay, the other will not suppress or change upon his return. I embrace you tenderly.

* * *

S. 497. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

January 15, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . sisters will fall back from Rheinackern to the Abbey of Acey.

Your suspicions are correct; there are good reasons for offering 3,500 francs to close the entire matter, in spite of our difficult financial situation.

I am writing to Brother Troffer and asking him to send me the 100 pistoles he received from Brother Périguet. To buy those four looms (there are only four) at the present time would merely hamper us, for we have no one to work them. There is a nice one at Besançon which M. Trop-de-fer brought last year; I do not know whether I will have it shipped to Saint-Remy or to Bordeaux. I sent a young weaver to Saint-Remy, one who was fairly good at his trade. Before using him, it was my intention to have him trained without delay, but to the religious life. But upon his arrival he is made receptionist along with the young Fischer. I do not know what has become of him; all I know is that he was bored to death from the very first days and was very upset. Do not think those 100 pistoles will be of great help. We will have to practice the strictest economy, and I will have to ask Brother Clouzet to send me everything he has on hand.

There is nothing to prevent Bouillon from going to Besançon for a few days. I will see about this while I write to Brother Troffer.

I am stopping here and wishing you the best. . .

* * *

S. 498. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 20, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . regarding what you tell me about Saint-Hippolyte.

It is not yet time to change Bro. Louis Rothéa from Colmar. I have already asked either you or Father Lalanne to send Brother Olivier to Colmar if a substitute could be found for him at Saint-Remy. I did not order this, but since his dismissal was urgent and inevitable, everything possible must be done at Saint-Remy to find a replacement; he can always return once a good sacristan has been found.

Father Chevaux has written on January 12. . .

* * *

**S. 499-2. To M. Blanc the Elder,
Music Teacher, Dole**

January 28, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I have received from M. Blanc a letter dated December 25 and inquiring about his son. I delayed answering because I could find very little good to say about the young man. His heart, marred by the passion of love, often distracted him from his studies and other duties. The fire that was camouflaged??? By dissimulation, restraint, or fear finally broke out. His secret correspondence with a girl in Besançon came to light. This intrigue is of long standing. Last year he seems to have had enough strength to control any excess. However, his last trip to Dole and Besançon rekindled his feelings for this girl who, he admits, is constantly in his thoughts. Let me give you but one example of the worry he is causing us. Recently he left the house after four in the afternoon without permission and returned after eleven. When he was asked why he had no coat, he said he had given it to a beggar, etc. This was his silk jacket. These secret escapades and

their shameful motives, which he sometimes partially confesses, left us no choice but to send him back to Dole, for fear of a serious accident.

After we had decided on his departure, I asked him if he would not wait until we had written to you to obtain the money for the trip, or if he preferred to go on foot as far as Paris and I would advance him the funds necessary. He said he would much prefer to go on foot. In case something might happen on such a long journey, I asked another young man who had planned to walk to Paris next week to leave earlier with our young man; I gave him 50 francs for any expenses they might have between here and Paris. I could not trust the young Blanc with this sum.

When I arrived in Bordeaux, I had to pay 50 francs to the coachman; our correspondent in Paris had advanced this sum to guarantee that both young men would not go hungry on the trip. Between the two, they had foolishly spent more than 60 francs. They purchased silly things, like a multi-colored hat; he had actually asked for permission to do this before leaving. I told him I would settle all accounts with you. That bonnet??? would have attracted attention during all his travels and might even have created suspicions. Please come to an understanding with Father Lalanne for all funds advanced. I will send him a copy of this letter. In Paris, please advance him the funds he needs to get to Dole. If you want him to go by coach, I advise you to notify our correspondent to pay for his seat with the money which you send him. Address everything to M. O'Lombel, no. 21, Rue de Sèvres, Paris.

* * *

S. 500. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

January 29, 1830, Bordeaux

My dear Son, I wrote to you a few days ago through the Ministry about the complaints which Father Meyer had against Brother Clouzet. Father Chevaux had sent me a short excerpt of that letter from Father Meyer, and I wrote to all three, Fathers Meyer, Chevaux, and Brother Clouzet. I will not bring up that topic again; I hope it has not had any untoward results.

This one is to inform you of the dismissal of M. Blanc, and so that you may be aware of all the facts, I will send you a copy of my letter to M. Blanc, the music teacher in Dole. I told you recently that there had been some progress in his behavior, and that was true. In a private interview, he had listened to the voice of religion and of reason. He seemed to be doing well for a few days, but then his passions got the upper hand and he no longer listened to the voice of religion or of reason, and he gave us the grief which I describe in my letter to his uncle. I believe it is only recently that he began writing to the young lady in Besançon. I have a rough copy of one of his last letters, which I have not read yet.

His presence was harmful to young Peg. Although the latter is a bumptious little man, I believe he is still unspoiled. While his religious dispositions may take the upper hand, he is too weak and too small a candidate to warrant out making great sacrifices for him. Our dealings with his parents must be characterized by frankness.

I have just received the answer to the note. . .

*

. . . and not simply one of tolerance and permission.

I am sending this directly to Saint-Remy so that you might be informed at the same time as M. Blanc in Dole.

Let us take courage, my dear Son, and let us recall that without. . .

* * *

S. 501. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

February 3, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . and furnished to receive six sisters.

Father Liebermann begged me to write to you and to comment on an expression which you used and which you ascribe to him when he urged you to have patience until he had done his utmost to convince Father Fritsch to accept the suggested arrangements. You will understand how pained he was when I send you a copy of the letter which he sent me on January 12.

I am writing to you directly, my dear Son, to avoid any delay. I am writing to you about that pitiful matter involving Father Meyer and Chevaux. I am writing to Father Meyer and enclosing my letter in one to Father Lalanne, the principal at Gray. Some days later I again wrote to Father Lalanne, at Gray, but recently I wrote to him at Saint-Remy about the dismissal of M. Blanc.

It is possible that I will have to write to you. . .

* * *

S. 502. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

February 15, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . yesterday I got all your messages from Paris.

I will not comment on the remarks you made recently about the need you felt to make changes in my decisions concerning the novitiates and the boarding normal school at Saint-Remy. What is aggravating is that any similarity between the plans for this novitiate and that of Bordeaux or that of the establishment of Saint-Remy is not intentional, and that Father Chevaux is still not able to distinguish between problems that are inherent in a plan and those that arise from not being able to do everything at once, or, in a word, to distinguish between essential defects and the accidental ones due to circumstances of location, or shortages of all types, etc. There are defects which are present in any kind of institutions, but which are gradually eradicated. However, it is useless to discuss these at this time, and I will come back to them later and you will see what importance I attribute to all your remarks and suggested procedure.

I am pleased that you found space in the mansion to add a wing to your boarding section, and that you gave up the idea of installing it in the attic.

I am going to answer the two questions you ask. . .

*

See, my dear Son, if even this might not be too much.

Brother Clouzet adds that, the way things are going now, expenses will be 3,000 francs more than last year. This thought I address to your wisdom. You did not mention if the town repaid the 1,000 francs you had loaned it. I am 7,000 francs in arrears in my payments right now. I did not expect it to be that much this year, but I was counting on more coming from Saint-Remy. I also expected something from Gray. Again, I rely on your wisdom to take from that something what you consider most urgent.

I am surprised you did not receive my letter dealing with the dismissal of M. Blanc before your departure from Gray. I suppose that he is now in Paris and that you have seen him at M. O'Lombel's house. I had announced his arrival to M. O' Lombel. I will not repeat here this young man's scandalous story, which obliged us formally to dismiss him. My letter must have been readdressed to you, and M. O'Lombel will have told you about him. I will write to Mme de

Chifflet about young Peg, but you should have told me about this lady and given me her address. The young man, it would seem, knows no one of his own family.

As regards M. O'Lombel, explain to me in your next letter. . .

* * *

S. 503 To Fr. Jean Lalanne

February 22, 1830, Bordeaux

M. Pommez came last night to inform me that you were still expecting to hear from me. I wrote to you very shortly after receiving your letter from Paris. My last letters were written on the 15th but they did not leave Bordeaux before the 17th. Mine must have crossed the one you wrote to M. Pommez. In my letter I asked you to transfer to Saint-Hippolyte the diploma of boardinghouse master which Father Rothéa had in Saint-Remy. I added to the letter Father's Christian names and the date of the diploma. Brother Weber had forgotten these details, but he added them two days later. You must have received that addition.

On the twentieth of the present month. . .

*

It is by these long explanations that a zealous teacher. . .

I think you have already met M. Bourgeois. I have an important matter which you can settle with him very simply, but do not put it off. When I was in Paris, M. Bourgeois made his will and named me as his beneficiary. In spite of his goodwill, he found it very difficult to have it processed. He left it with one notary but, finding it impossible to make an appointment with him, he transferred it to a second. He had always hesitated to deposit it with the first man I had recommended. This notary is deputy mayor. I left Paris not knowing with whom he had deposited the will. I wrote to him several times, but he never did reveal that information. I must know positively with whom he deposited that will. As an alternative to this deposit he could make three copies, one of which you would send to me, one which you would keep, and one which he would keep in his desk. It could be enclosed in an envelope on which he could write simply, "This is my will and testament." If he did deposit it with a notary, get the man's name and do not bother him any longer.

Here are a few thoughts on the matter which you can use wisely. M. Bourgeois does not want M. O'Lombel to become acquainted with his affairs and seems to prefer that we deal directly with him. Because of my age and my activities, it is possible that I will die before M. Bourgeois does. In that event, I suggested he name M. O'Lombel; this is legal, but he did not like the idea. I told him that at a more opportune time I would give him another name. M. Bourgeois has two types of assets. He has a considerable patrimony over which he has been feuding with his sister for years. He has other assets accumulated over the years, on which he depends for his livelihood and his charitable ventures. All his affairs are in somewhat of a mess, and an heir would have a difficult time finding information and documents. We had agreed before I left Paris that he would gradually initiate me into his financial situation; he has not done so and will certainly not do so. He wrote me several times that his pastor was breathing down his neck and that he did not have the courage to turn down all the offers of good deeds presented to him. The best thing to do, once you have won his confidence and his friendship, is to sound him out on one matter after the other, to make notes, then to read them back to him for verification. Concerning family matters, he will give you the name of the person who was his go-between and from whom you can get all the details. Consult M. O'Lombel as little as possible in this matter. It would be best to visit him occasionally.

* * *

S. 503-2. To Mme de Chifflet, Besançon

February 26, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I have wanted to write to you for some time, Madame, but I waited until I had some good news to give you about young Peg. Ever since his arrival in Bordeaux, he has not manifested those good sentiments which were his when I stayed briefly in Saint-Remy. I can inform you with pleasure of a considerable change in his favor. Today he gives us every hope that he will become a good religious and a priest. However, this is only a hope. I fear for the streak of smugness in the little man. In Bordeaux he was not admitted into the highest class.

I said I would accept him at Saint-Remy at the same rate of 400 francs, not counting his modest needs and the scholastic fees. When he spoke to you, Father Lalanne was absorbed by other matters and confused the tuition asked of a young man opting for the primary instruction with that required of M. Peg and others who are pursuing their studies. I told Father Lalanne that I would correspond with you directly. I am with all respect. . .

*

Mme de Chifflet's Reply
Besançon, March 14, 1840

I cannot tell you how surprised I was when you asked me for 400 francs for little Peg's tuition, exclusive of his pocket money and the scholastic fees. I have in my hands a letter from Father Lalanne which says that "the terms you suggest for young Peg seem reasonable enough considering the disposition of the youth, and we accept them although they may become a burden for us." This is taken word for word from Father Lalanne's letter. The charitable persons whom I found to interest themselves in Peg are willing to give 200 and not 400 francs for his board, and to pay for his needs and his journey. Yesterday I read your letter to two people who had contributed, and they told me they could not give more; nor can I. I cannot in justice withhold from other needy persons what I am giving them. Those who have spent considerable sums on Peg can no longer do so. Let him earn his living as others do, they will say, giving lessons in French, Latin, etc. How little we can count on the vocation of a youngster, even after the dispositions he had shown previously. I am, Monsieur. . .

* * *

S. 503-3. To Mme de Chifflet, Besançon

March 28, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I had the honor of pointing out to you that Father Lalanne was mistaken as to the terms under which young Peg would be accepted in the novitiate of Bordeaux. I explained things very clearly and repeatedly when I passed through Saint-Remy. Father Bardenet was to discuss the terms with you. Father did go to your address and tried to see you and all those interested in the young man, or rather the boy. All were on holiday; that is the answer he gave me at Arbois, where Father Lalanne came to see me.

When I left Arbois, Father Lalanne was in charge of all the arrangements. It is not surprising that Father was in error; he has to deal with others who are not following a course of

studies and whom we sometimes accept for 200 francs. Father would have pointed out his error immediately, but he had to go to Paris. He asked me to write to you, which I did.

Do not think, Madame, that with 400 francs for his board we would not have been obliged to make certain sacrifices on his behalf; but I decided in his favor because of intellectual and Christian dispositions, in spite of . . . etc.

However, Father Bardenet, Father Lalanne, and I decided we had shown enough consideration; besides, young Peg's parents are in comfortable circumstances, and I am surprised to see you class them among the poor.

At first I thought I would send a copy of your letter to Fathers Bardenet and Lalanne, and to come to terms with you and with the parents of young Peg. However, I believed it wiser to send you this second letter. I must tell you, for your consolation, that the young man is again manifesting all the fine sentiments he displayed at Saint-Remy and which induced me to accept him and to accede to his parents' wishes. I am. . .

* * *

S. 505. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

March 3, 1830, Bordeaux

. . .with the project regarding the circular of our Lords, the Bishops.

The first dispatches, that is those of February 22, contained letters that continued to deal with that old business I had in Paris during my first trip. I am giving you an answer in this letter addressed to Mme de Carayon Latour. There is no point in having you involved in these matters.

The first dispatches arrived directly through the post, but with the stamp of the Ministry costing 3 livres and 12 francs. I do not understand the confusion. Was the packet, the one addressed to His Excellency, opened and the contents placed in another envelope addressed to me? That would be somewhat mischievous. Your packet could simply have been given to the post office. I mention this for your own guidance. The other two packets dated February 25 arrived today postpaid.

You make no mention of M. Blanc. He left with M. Maupetit under clear skies, but that changed soon after and bad weather set in. I have no word about either of them. I wrote to Mme de Chifflet about young Peg. I explained how distracted you were when you explained the terms to her and said that you were thinking of someone else. M. Peg seems to be doing well since the departure of M. Blanc.

Be very careful when dealing with the matter of M. Bourgeois which I explained in my last letter. While M. Bourgeois loves and esteems M. O'Lombel, he does not have much confidence in him. Speak the least possible about M. O'Lombel and bear no message to him, at least not about the will. In M. Bourgeois' will, M. O'Lombel is named the heir in case I die before M. Bourgeois. M. Bourgeois introduced this clause only out of kindness. I told him I would recommend some other person, and I would have done this had he answered my first request, that is, if he had give me the name of the notary with whom he had deposited the will. This information is needed in Paris. M. Bourgeois could die and his relatives put everything under seal before the notary could be informed. If he does not care to deposit the will, have him give you the will and then send it to me.

Neither you nor M. O'Lombel say anything about the mission of Father de Solages and especially about the young missionary I housed for nearly three months and for whom I advanced 200 francs which, according to M. Lombel, would be refunded by the chaplain, Father Braun.

I am going to follow your letters. . .

*

. . . still some weakness in the attachment he has for his parents.

In my last interview with him, I arranged to add a pension to the modest revenues they had mentioned and this, he admitted, would enable them to live honorably. He gave me no further answer, but he is still attached to the Society.

He has a friend, a young assistant pastor. . .

* * *

S. 506-2. To M. Geiss, Rector of Marmoutier

March 5 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I have the honor of sending you a copy of the letter I am writing to Father Liebermann, along with a copy of the conditions under which I would agree to have our religious take over the convent of Rheinackern. I wrote to Brother Rothéa, the head of the primary schools of Colmar, and told him to see that all these conditions were fulfilled. Any action depends on both Father Fritsch and the Bishop of Strasbourg, and the latter will do nothing, as I point out to Father Libermann, until Father Fritsch does everything that is justly asked of him. However, even though Father Fritsch does his share, if the See of Strasbourg does not intervene as it must in a foundation, then the religious would have to leave. If their departure causes a scandal among the population, neither the religious nor their superiors will be to blame. You can imagine my consternation at this time, launching a new foundation because the previous one was a failure. I hope the Blessed Virgin will protect both foundations because we are going to all that trouble for the glory of her name.

May I ask you, Reverend Rector, to inform the religious of the Rheinackern of all these events and to offer them some consolation in the midst of the uncertainty which has been theirs for so long? I have no doubt that they will submit to all the dispositions of Divine Providence. I am always. . .

* * *

S 508-2. To Father Maimbourg, Pastor of Colmar

March 10, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Please accept my grateful thanks for all the trouble you have taken with the establishment of Rheinackern, and for the hospitality you have extended to the religious when they were forced to abandon it. I will not go into detail, for you are almost as familiar as I am with what has transpired. I can only say that I do not believe there has been, since the birth of Christianity, anything so bizarre in a religious foundation. Most devotedly yours. . .

* * *

**S. 508-3. To Father Liebermann,
Vicar General, Strasbourg**

March 10, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I have just been informed that Brother Rothéa has been obliged to remove the Daughters of Mary from Rheinackern. He must have informed you of the move. You must have received the

letter I sent you some days ago in which I agreed that the nuns would not leave until further efforts had been made. However, the scandalous scenes and the consequent disorders caused in the convent by Father Fritsch banish any hope you might have placed in his promises to you and to Brother Rothéa.

This letter has for its sole purpose to thank you for the pains you have taken with this unhappy foundation. I hope you will continue to take interest in both the Society of Mary and the Institute of the Daughters of Mary. Let us hope that no other Father Fritsch will come along for a long while.

* * *

S. 508-4. To Father Geiss, Rector of Marmoutier

March 10, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I had the honor of writing to you recently that Father Liebermann and several other noteworthy people seemed to retain some hope and wanted to delay somewhat the execution of the orders obliging the religious to abandon Rheinackern. However, because of the scandalous scenes created in the convent by Father Fritsch and the resulting disorders, you yourself saw how useless further negotiations were even before you received my last letters.

I am aware of the interest you have shown in this unhappy matter and all the trouble you took. I am most grateful and would like to show my gratitude should the occasion present itself. Meanwhile, please accept my heartfelt thanks. I am. . .

* * *

S. 508-5. To the Deputy Prefect of Saverne

March 10, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Honorable Deputy Prefect,

I do not know how to express all my gratitude for the interest you have shown in the Daughters of Mary during their stay in Rheinackern, and above all for the protection you have given them in the midst of their unimaginable harassment, to say the least, by Father Fritsch. I will remember all my life the wisdom and the firmness of the administrative action of the Deputy Prefect of Saverne.

Please accept my thanks and this mark of my respectful gratitude.

* * *

S. 508-6 To the Rector of the Academy of Bordeaux

March 13, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I have the honor of acknowledging the receipt of the certificates of profession for the following: Kientzler (Georges), Claude (Christophe), Oeuvrard (Alexandre), Moral (Victor), Rey (Pierre), Chopard (Jn-Bte), and Huguenin (Fr.-X.), all members of the Society of Mary.

Reverend Rector, should I send these certificates directly to the prefects of their departments of origin, or to the parents of the young men, who would then use them as the need arose?

If my representative has the pleasure of meeting you, you may transmit your answer verbally. I am. . .

* * *

S. 508-7. To M. de Portets, Paris

March 15, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I have the honor of sending you the documents relative to the two donations of December 22, 1828, to wit: (1) the two acts of donation, (2) the two corrected forms, (3) the petition of the Superior General in view of the authorization from His Majesty, (4) a copy of the letter from the Prefect of Lot-et-Garonne requesting a rectification of the two acts of donation, (5) a letter from Mme Fonbonne Labastide and from Mme your sister. In his letter the prefect asks that the appraisal be made by experts and that all items be submitted to him for an opinion by himself and by the bishop.

My Council and I feel that the appraisal by experts was not demanded by the ministry; furthermore, it would be useless because all the items were appraised at the Registry. Moreover, it would have created untold difficulties. My Council and I also believe all the items should be handed over to the Minister without passing through the hands of the Prefect of Lot-et-Garonne. The Bishop of Agen expressed his views on the first acts of donation and on the last two of acceptance.

Unless you think otherwise, Sir, I do not believe you will have to add the letter from the Prefecture to the documents to be presented to His Excellency. I add it here for your benefit and in case it is needed. I believe you have only to present to His Excellency the acts of donation, their correction, and the petition of the Superior.

I do not know if Father Lalanne had the pleasure of meeting you before his departure from Paris. I asked him to see you, to inform you of the dispatches I was sending to you, and to present you with my compliments and a mark of my high regard. I am. . .

* * *

S. 514. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

March 31, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . in sufficient time to have an excellent result.

I will write again. I want Brother Fridblatt to go to Courtefontaine; I understand that he was not of much use to you in Saint-Remy. He will have Brother Gaussens come to you with copies of both methods. See that he understands them clearly, that he appreciates them and knows how to use them; then he can leave for Bordeaux with companions Poux, who is at Courtefontaine, and Marandet, who is in Besançon. These changes must take place as rapidly as possible because delays are frustrating when so many changes take place at the same time. I will write to Brother Clouzet about various things that concern him particularly. I am also writing to Brother Fridblatt, for the normal course is finished at Saint-Remy. Olivier will have to go to Courtefontaine. If Joseph is still at Saint-Remy, Marres will have to be sent there as we decided at the beginning of the year. They need a cook and a handyman.

*

P.S. The Good Father asks me to tell you that for lack of time he was not able to write to Brother Clouzet or to several others. He hopes to be able to do so shortly. He also wants to inform you that the Rector of the Academy of Bordeaux has just died. (signed) Weber

* * *

S. 515. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

Early April, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . by the good results they would be producing.

When I received your letter I had already written to Ribeauvillé to put a stop to the matter between the Rector and Brother Collin. I had written to both, and I am certain the Rector will no longer ask for the removal of Brother Collin. Brother is really at fault, especially in the dismissal of M. Batel, and he has made other mistakes as I learn from a summary of the Rector's complaints sent to me by Brother Rothéa. When you get to Ribeauvillé, you can ask Brother Collin for the last letter I sent him, and also for a copy of the one I sent to the Rector.

As regards the normal school in the Upper Rhine district. . .

*

. . . especially if the front of the house is fairly spacious and free.

About the sister at Arbois who has a right to an inheritance of 40,000 francs, I can suggest nothing better than to have her write a valid procuration in favor of M. Xavier Rothéa, who lives in Sundgau. This procuration must give him in essence the power to settle all the affairs of the religious. I will write to M. Xavier Rothéa as soon as I am informed that the procuration is on its way. The few details you give me on the matter prevent me from suggesting anything else.

I have already assigned Brother Fridblatt to Courtefontaine, as you must have seen in my earlier letter. Father Chevaux mentioned that the Normal School course had been abandoned, and you speak of a resumption of the same. Those few words are not enough to go on. I understood that the course had stopped for this year. Is the resumption for this year, or only for the beginning of the next? If it is only for the next, you have plenty of time. Send Brother Py to Bordeaux.

I have just received your letter of March 29.

* * *

S. 516. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

Early April, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . you will judge suitable that they tell their parents.

Brother Decamp wrote me along letter on his way to Saint-Remy. At the same time, I received some unwelcome news about his conduct. I have wanted to write to him every day and also to you, so we could make some decision in his case. Brother Rothéa informs me that Brother Delcamp was to be drafted this year, that he had been called before the review board by the Prefect of Haut-Rhin, and that Brother Rothéa had declared to the prefecture that the young man resided in Saint-Remy, department of Haute-Saône. Brother Rothéa is furious because Brother claimed to be only 19 years of age. He is consoled by the fact that he will be rejected because of his small stature. We will discuss him once this matter blows over.

I have heard nothing of Brother Carrère since I left Saint-Remy. Where is he and what is he doing? Brother Batel has committed some errors, but that was not the reason for removing him from Ribeauvillé. The two rather insignificant letters he sent me reveal more incapacity than malice in the man. What has become of him? What am I to say to him?

I have never lost sight of Ebersmunster. I am dealing directly with the pastor of the Madeleine and Brother Troffer about the Bellevaux matter. It is progressing satisfactorily, and I will tell you about it when it is settled. I wrote to Father Lalanne outlining what had to be done for Courtefontaine; he must have passed the information on to you.

In your letter of March 15 you refer to my answer to yours of February 4. I cannot find that letter, only that of January 30, which you may not have posted until February 4. Please let me know if this is not the case. The matter between Brother Colin and the Rector has come to a happy conclusion. I am writing to Saint-Hippolyte. I do not believe the pastor of Colmar is too pleased with Brother Toussaint. I sent Brother Wuillelard. Brother Rothéa has just informed me that you sent Toussaint the elder to Saint-Hippolyte as infirmarian. It seems you were most happy to be rid of him.

I have no doubt that the absences of Father Lalanne. . .

* * *

S. 520-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

April 1830, Bordeaux
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I have received a letter from Brother Fridblatt dated April 4. He does not seem to have been informed of his new mission in Courtefontaine. On the other hand, his letter is most satisfactory. If he is still in Saint-Remy, tell him I will answer him with a long letter to Courtefontaine. It was through Father Lalanne that I gave him his assignment to replace Brother Gaussens, not as head of the establishment but as assistant to Brother Galliot, who was appointed director before arriving at Courtefontaine. Brother Houlné wrote me a very fine letter from Ribeauvillé in which he admits his wrongs and says he could have acquitted himself of his assignment in Courtefontaine had he wanted to. He asks to be sent there as a penance and says he will work zealously, etc. I agreed, and I have authorized Brother Rothéa to give him an obedience in my name. If Brother Delcamp is exempt from the draft, if he wishes to return sincerely to God and to lead a truly religious life, he can join Brothers Gaussens Laugeay, Marandet and Poux, as I wrote to Brother Gaussens. I believe Brother Marres is in Courtefontaine. Tell Brother Laugeay that I took care of Sainte Marie-aux-Mines some days ago and that I informed Brother Bader, who had consulted me. I authorize you to give obediences to all these men. If you give a collective obedience to many, give a special one to Brother Laugeay; have the mayor vouch for your signature and stamp it with the seal of the city hall.

Brother Roux, the shoemaker, sent me a rather nice letter. He is happy at Saint-Remy but is disturbed by the visits of his relatives. He constantly asks me to come here. The older Brother Soleil, our master shoemaker, has the same desire as Brother Roux and often asks me to send him a good distance from his relatives. It is to everyone's advantage to satisfy both these men, who possess the true spirit of their state. They can trade places; as soon as Roux has left, let me know and I will send Soleil.

Finally, I am enclosing M. Perrin's statement; I have a few remarks to make about this bill. (1) I include two years of room and board because the fourth semester began already on March 22. (2) There were many irresponsible actions on that trip with M. Peter??? from Saint-Remy to Bordeaux. After going part of the way on foot toward Bordeaux, they took the coach and went through Paris. On their arrival in Bordeaux, they had to pay 56 francs for the coach. (3) They had intended coming on foot, so they left their trunk behind; its transport cost 66 francs 75 centimes. Except for these, you would be surprised, as was his mother, at the few expenses they incurred on this long grip. I must admit, in all justice to the young man, that he is careful with money. I have nothing against his purchase of a compass and of a book on geography, for I

encourage him in those studies to which he feels attracted. Also, his mother gave her approval. (4) The gold watch which his brother, or rather his mother, gave him involved some expense, but it also helped him progress in the spirit of renunciation. I did not want to test him too much so I allowed him to keep the watch. I bought him a simple cord for the watch. Soon after, the face was damaged and had to be replaced by one in enamel. Again, sometime later, the watch was dropped and a part broke and had to be replaced. On thinking it over, he realized that a gold repeating watch was not suitable for a young man who was preparing to make a vow of poverty; he brought it to me. (5) I do not know if all the small sums we advanced are on the bill, but anything omitted cannot be considerable.

I am not writing to Mme Perrin, but please give her my regards and tell her how happy I would be if she came to visit her son in Bordeaux. When you send the bill you could simply copy the remarks I have just made.

My dear Son, I embrace you tenderly. I am very happy indeed to see you advancing steadily along the path of the religious virtues.

* * *

S. 521. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

May 9, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . same as that of the eighth but continued in Colmar.

That abominable matter involving Brother Laugeay has taken all my time. Everything is calm at Sainte Marie-aux-Mines. Attempts are being made to quash the judgment against the accused, or at least that it will not be derogatory. I have written to the Prefect, to the Procurator of the King, to the Bishop of Strasbourg, to the Rector of the Academy, to the Mayor, etc., etc. Brother Laugeay has crossed the border. I will say no more. Let me add that Brother Cholet was held in high esteem by the authorities of the city and by the parents and students. Brother Louis Rothéa made this remark from Sainte Marie-aux-Mines. The classes were at their peak when the Rector of the Academy made his visitation, and he seemed very satisfied. Brother Laugeay leaves debts in the amount of 7,000 or 8,000 francs.

Your letter in which you indicated the assignment you gave to Brother Fridblatt crossed mine with my intentions for the man. I trembled as I decided to place him with Brother Galliot, his friend of long standing. The confusion here is due to the fact that Father Chevaux announced the closing of the normal course at Easter, along with the story of Brother Dussot. I had nothing of importance in view for Brothers Fridblatt and Olivier until the end of the year. When I got the news I wrote to Saint-Remy telling them of my surprise. No answer. However, I had privately decided to replace Brothers Gaussens, Gobillot, and Valincourt the elder, and told Brother Clouzet so in case he had any comments. Finally, spurred by the need at the Bellevaux establishment, knowing that you had nothing of consequence for Brother Fridblatt and that the normal course had been suspended, I made all my appointments for Courtefontaine, Saint-Jacques, Bellevaux, etc., and had the men leave. See how disagreeable all this is! I still do not know how I can remedy things. An incidental yet very real difficulty: how will I pay for all the travel expenses? Brother Clouzet gives me grounds for hope, and that is about all. Brother L. Rothéa shows more concern, but what an abundance of extraordinary expenses he has!

Brother Clouzet had told me that Brother Marres was available. If Joseph did not leave, I had no reason to believe that he was at Gray. On the contrary. You tell me you are going to send Brother Gausses to Alsace to try out the methods, but how can this be done without a replacement? Would that not be dealing a mortal blow to Courtefontaine? I cannot blame Brother Rothéa for asking, but I do blame him for asking for Vogel and Edel, especially Edel. Vogel could be used after a little polishing and if we continue to educate him.

You have doubtless written directly to Father Collineau.

*

. . . is just the matter of a slight misunderstanding.

Ever since the last sacristan left the church at Colmar, Brother Rothéa has been asking for one, and with reason. However, he is asking everywhere, and that is wrong. I have one for him, and I am telling him so in order to appease him and Father Maimbourg. However, I am waiting till winter is almost over. Villemard was still here and ready to leave when Brother Rothéa wrote to tell me that Brother Clouzet would have sent him Toussaint, if he was not ill, but that he would send him as soon as he is well. I am writing now to Brother Rothéa and telling him that Villemard will leave soon. Brother Rothéa will have had time to cancel the Toussaint appointment. I added, as far as I remember, that I preferred Villemard for Colmar and that I had reasons to believe that Brother Clouzet has told me very little about him since he returned to Saint-Remy and fell ill. I did not think you would be involved/mixed (???) in this. Before you mentioned it, Brother Rothéa had written simply to tell me that the man had been sent to him to take charge of the linen at Saint-Hippolyte. I did not answer and would have kept silent except that I notice a little pique in your letters, seasoned with some fairness.

As soon as I had received the new project. . .

*

. . . after having made a copy of these for myself.

I suspect, my dear Son, that the letters Brother Weber wrote to Brother Fridblatt are not of recent date, that is, since the last time you mentioned them to me. Should that be the case, you must tell me exactly what the situation is. Brother Fridblatt sent me a rather good letter in which he informs me that you told him that he would be destined for the normal schools, and that he should prepare himself. I then wrote to Brother Clouzet that I would give him an answer in Courtefontaine, and also that I was pleased with his letter. I never thought that writing to Brother Clouzet would lead to such bewilderment.

It is your wish, my dear Son, that when I want to name subjects. . .

*

. . . make the Superior a mere slave of all passing opinions.

After receiving notice of the disappearance of Brother Laugeay, to avoid a calamity and to correct a pressing need I am making a series of changes and replacements. I made a chart of all our personnel in Alsace and studied the needs of our houses. I drew up lists, had them discussed and studied, and moved names from one list to another. In case, because of the shock felt in Alsace, things are not what they seem here, I sent these lists to Brother Rothéa with the power to issue obediences unless other serious problems arose. The only problem was at Amerschwir, where Cyriac was not behaving. He felt justified in changing the assignments of those members who did not meet his expectations. Brother Cholet is not what is needed at Sainte-Marie; Houlné, who was notified in a special letter to go to Courtefontaine, has now been sent to Saint-Hippolyte.

I have to finish this letter rather bluntly. . .

* * *

S. 525-2. To Bro. David Monier

June 12, 1830, Bordeaux

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I notified M. Rauzan last night to be ready to sign the first document tomorrow morning at the latest. That is, the one involving Mlle de Maignol. [Fr. Mme Maynot] I have the 26,000 francs on hand. I wish you would inform M. Pommez, or rather have him sent for, to explain the portion he has to pay. I gave M. de Razac the money coming to him. Meanwhile, if Brother Auguste has not arranged with M. Pommez for the interest on the 20,000 francs, he may do so now. I am going to spend the day at Saint-Laurent.

* * *

S. 526. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

June 12, 1830, Bordeaux

I reread it and I am now answering it.

I received the 500 francs as part payment for the room and board of M. Perrin. I did not expect the other 500 francs sent to Father Caillet on July 21, 1829. That sum was to have helped him in the difficulty he was experiencing at the time. I will send you immediately a letter for Mme Perrin giving details about her son.

You know, my dear Son, that for a very long time. . .

*

. . . it had cost us so much to have them finally put in order.

M. Laugeay is condemned to five years in prison and to the loss of his civil rights for the rest of his life. There is also a fine of 300 francs and the court costs; I don't know who will pay these. He appeared before the court as a teacher at Sainte-Marie-aux-Mines.

I have written to Brother Gaussens. . .

* * *

S. 530-2. To Father Imbert, Pastor of Moissac

June 30, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

My Respectable Son,

You made me wait a long time for an answer to my letter of May 5. The Bishop of Montauban was absent and you wished to consult with His Excellency about the Lauzerte matter. I can only praise your wisdom. I will admit that Brother Mazières is not qualified to head an establishment, whatever its importance. His incompetence is all the more evident in the one of Lauzerte precisely because the director must be very much in evidence, and he does not have enough schooling, enough amenability, to allow Father Marrieu the respect which is his due. It may also be that there is more self-esteem, ambition, and stubbornness in him than I thought, and which I attributed to his lack of education and common sense in his handling of Father Marrieu. The latter lays the blame on the absence of moral qualities. He believes his unfavorable report on his colleagues is due to his desire for leadership; now that he has it, he is drunk with his superiority, etc. Father Marrieu tries to prove his assertions by giving me examples. I do not believe there is any advantage in discussing these at this time. I have given this serious thought, my dear Son, before writing to you about keeping or giving up the direction of the little establishment of Lauzerte. I may have soft-pedaled the motives that made me decide, and you may not have presented them to His Excellency as I see them, as they actually appear to me. I

will present?? expose them again, and you and His Excellency will be better able to judge the situation.

1. I have made it a rule never to send less than three brothers to an establishment. If I consented to send only two to Lauzerte, this is (1) because the two there were joined by the teacher of Latin, who followed the same rule although he did not belong to the Society, and (2) because of my regard for you and for your promise that all would soon be normalized. Because of this practice I have refused several small establishments, particularly that of Saint-Porquier.

2. If I sent someone else to Lauzerte—for under no circumstance can I leave Brother Mazière there—I foresee the same problems, although they may not be so acute if I send a director with more education, more intelligence, and especially more patience. The problems would be real either because of the character of Father Marrieu, or of the co-option?? by the commune, or of some other drawbacks of this nature. To appoint a supervisor who would control everything for this little establishment, as you suggest, is impossible. The only supervisor possible is the director himself. To appoint another would compound the problem, for the new supervisor would claim to have authority over the director, which would be worse.

3. I cannot consider as motives for abandoning Lauzerte the little acts of pettiness at the meetings with the community, or the expenses caused by the establishment, or again the continual, painful discussions. These are secondary motives, but joined to the first two they do have a certain weight. I am sorry, my dear Son, to have to enter into these disagreeable details, but I owe it to our friendship and also to the protection with which His Excellency has honored us. I do not think it will be difficult to replace our brothers, and to your advantage perhaps. This could be done in a short time if you had a good normal school in your diocese.

My dear Son, I still intend to go and see you and to give you further proofs of my entire and respectful devotedness.

* * *

S. 536-2. To Bro. David Monier

July 10, 1830, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Please consider Mlle Bernède's letter as if it were written to me personally and I had passed it on to you. Answer her, console her, and if this matter can be activated??, please take care of it. Father Rauzan has been informed that M. Lala will not return until he has been paid. He seemed to be very grateful to you and to Father.

* * *

S. 537-2. To Bro. David Monier

July 29, 1830, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I have just received your letter of July 27, and I hasten to reply. Since we had agreed that you would leave Bordeaux for Agen within a week after my departure, I did not believe it was necessary or tactful to remind you.

As soon as Mlle Bernède received your second letter informing her that she needed 200 francs to obtain certain documents essential to her case, she spoke to the Mother Superior, who deemed it advisable to have her brother advance the sum; he did so without hesitation. She sent the sum to you in a promissory note due August 10 but which you can invest immediately.

When Mother Superior advised her to approach her brother, she told me that even if her brother refused her she would be able to obtain the sum, but that it was fitting that she speak to her brother first. No one has ever refused to help this young woman; I think this is the first time she has had to ask for money.

As I told you and Father Rauzan, I saw my nephew only on his arrival in Bordeaux. Father Collineau requires good care, especially during these hot days. When I left Bordeaux he already had a fever.

You did well, my dear Son, to oppose a second showing of the “*Comédien*.” Would that you had done so for the first. It is inconceivable that Brother Auguste should allow such performances. I say “allow,” for it cannot be that he invited them to the school. At Agen there is a great deal of talk about him and about his poorly-run boarding house. It is reported that great mischief took place during the absence of Father Collineau. Take care of your health, my dear Son, especially during this heat. I was most comfortable and undisturbed on the steamboat; I traveled by night to Agen.

* * *

S. 537-3. To the Mayor of Lauzerte

August 19, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

From your letter of August 14 I surmise that I will encounter serious hardships if I remove the brothers from your town, and I am far from wanting to do so. When I mentioned that I was going to give up the direction of the school of Lauzerte, I was told that teachers had been sought elsewhere. I certainly did not know that our withdrawal would cause difficulties.

In any case, Your Worship, after your kind words I will continue to provide Father Marrieu with two teachers, but only after taking all the necessary steps to avoid the trouble we have had under the existing conditions. I am. . . .

* * *

S. 538-2. To Father Barthelemy, Pastor of Lauzerte

August 30, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

The letter with which you honored me from Agen on August 17 arrived in Bordeaux on August 27. It crossed the one I wrote to the mayor of your town. I delayed my answer somewhat for I thought the mayor would have told you of my agreement to continue to send you two teachers.

I am very pleased, Reverend Pastor, at your decision to have the Brothers of Mary teach in your schools. When faced with a problem I will then turn to you, for as pastor you are the natural supervisor of such establishments. Just as I was about to write to you, I received a letter of thanks from Reverent Marrieu. With your permission, I will include a short answer along with this letter. I am most respectfully yours. . .

* * *

S. 538-3. To Father Marrieu, Pastor, Near Lauzerte

August 30, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I was about to answer Father Barthelemy, who expressed the same sentiments as the mayor, when yours of August 27 arrived; I will answer it immediately.

I had in fact decided to give up the direction of your schools for the reasons which I have had the honor to provide to you several times, and which I explained recently to the mayor in order to quash all the calumnies that were rumored about me. His Worship the Mayor described the deplorable effects which our withdrawal would have on you and on the children of the town. Had you been assured of another administration for your schools, the withdrawal of the Brothers of Mary would have had no harmful effect on your town. The change would have been less of a shock if it had been known since last May. However, now that you, the mayor, and the pastor of Lauzerte are convinced that serious hardships would ensue if the Brothers of Mary do not return next year, I do not hesitate to promise that they will. I do not suppose the change in the town's administration will create any opposition.

With your permission, Reverend Pastor, I will not discuss the misunderstandings I have had with the mayor during the past year. I did not lay the blame on any one individual. I even hinted in a letter to Father Imbert that they may be due to Brother Mazières and his lack of basic formation. This I concluded from his own letters. However, I did not imply that he did not act in all honesty, or that he may have been unjust. I am. . .

* * *

S. 540-2. To Father Barthelemy, Pastor of Lauzerte

September 12, 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

Conditions

1. That the school premises and the community quarters will be adequate. That a fire can be lighted in winter, without risk. Some floors are so bad that the air passes through the cracks and holes.

2. It is desirable that parents of the students will be able to communicate freely with the director, and Father Marrieu should not seek to know what was discussed. The brothers' parlor where such free conversations can take place seems very narrow and poorly located. Please see how this can be improved.

3. I believe it is imperative that Father Marrieu uses his lodgings as if he were alone in the house, and that the brothers do the same. Father Marrieu must not act as their director or their superior; this should also be the case with the pupils of the schools. If he notices that the brothers are not leading a regular life, are not conscientious teachers, or are not teaching well, he should be kind enough to notify me, and I will act in consequence. Acceptance and dismissal of pupils must depend on the brothers, or at least be exercised by them.

* * *

S. 550-2. To Bro. David Monier

October 25, 1830, Bordeaux
(Autograph, Agmar)

I beg Brother David Monier to provide the procuration which Brother Costou needs because of the death of his widowed mother. The young man will give him documents, along with my regards.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

P.S. Brother Coustou's aunt, sister to the deceased, went to Montlard to obtain the documents, which she gave to M. O'Lombel to give to me. The brother-in-law says the deceased left 6,000 francs in cash.

* * *

S. 552. To M. O'Lombel

October 27, 1830, Bordeaux

. . .whether we write to you by land or by sea.

As soon as I receive the check I will turn it over to M. Lanthois to pay for current expenses. I will also give him the two letters you left for him, along with the one you are writing to Condom. I will let him know that you are sending me a check; any partial payments will be noted on the reverse until the entire amount is spent. I will send off the letter to M. Berryer and will write to the Comte Alexis de Noailles, who should be at Noailles at this time. Any change in the plan we have adopted will be for the better.

If, my dear Son, during your stay in Madrid. . .

* * *

S. 552-2. To M. Lanthois, Bordeaux

October 27, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

Your cousin left according to plan the day before yesterday. He left two letters for you and a third for the Superior of the convent of Condom. He informs her that you have been kind enough to replace him in the care of his two younger daughters, and that you will contact him when it is necessary in the course of their education. This last letter is to be enclosed in the one you will write to the Superior of the convent of the Daughters of Mary in Condom, advising her that you have accepted becoming the guardian of M. O'Lombel's two daughters.

In his last letter to you, M. O'Lombel appoints you his proxy in the attempt to recover the rather considerable sum owed by M. Berryer the elder. This matter will require us to meet briefly.

I am flattered, Monsieur, that the absence of M. O'Lombel gives me the opportunity to communicate with you, whom I have always held in high esteem. I am more than ready to give you a proof of my high regard at any time. With these sentiments I beg you to accept. . .

* * *

S 559-2. To Bro. Auguste Brougnon-Perrière, Bordeaux

November 12, 1830, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

I kindly ask Brother Auguste to answer Mme Laurenceau for me, and to give her the reasons her check for 500 francs was never cashed. Maybe Brother David would like to reread the draft of a letter he prepared for me. You may make use of it.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 559-3. To Mme Laurenceau, Widow, Pans

Oct. Nov. 1830, Bordeaux
(Copy, Agmar)

I am sorry for the worries you have been having; you know their causes, and that I only have a share in the resulting nuisance. As soon as the document of last August 8 appeared, my lawyer shared his misgivings with M. Faugère, your lawyer, who is usually ours. I told you how difficult it would be for me to pay you without compromising my own interests. The documents are being checked in the office of M. Faugère. Until I receive procuration from M. Rosaz, I have told Brother Auguste to agree with M. Faugère on the method of transferring 500 francs to your account. This letter has but one purpose—to prove to you my goodwill. I am asking both M. Faugère and Brother Auguste to inform you of everything and to put your mind to rest. Had we met when you came to Bordeaux, or if you had at least seen my lawyer, all these irritations could have been avoided. Madam, I am most respectfully yours. . .

* * *

S. 560. To Mother Saint-Vincent

November 15, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . but it must inspire love.

I have sent you a third promissory note for 550 francs in Raganeau's name. All three notes, of which you have been informed or are informed by this letter, total 1,400 francs. All are payable on demand.

After the death of our pious and beloved. . .

* * *

S. 562. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 20, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . and handed to me by Brother Mémain.

Your very long silence had me worried that some accident had happened to you. Mme de Chifflet just wrote to tell me of her astonishment at seeing young Peg arrive without warning, for he was the bearer of no letter, etc. She wants an immediate answer from me. I am mailing this at the same time as my letter to you and am sending you a copy. If you have lost my letter and the accounts, why did you not advise her of the departure of the young man?

M. Deshayes seems to have given you a sob story. Why is it that since there was a question of sending those 600 francs, he has not seen his banker? Was it not through his banker that he would receive my receipts? If there was a mistake in the first letter of my name, the banker would have known that this name was not known in Bordeaux, etc. You were in Rouen over a month ago, and I still have no news. Do you know who his banker is? Would he be in Rouen? In Rouen it is very easy to have checks drawn on some firm in Bordeaux because of the numerous contacts between the businessmen of these towns. M. Deshayes the younger could give you some details; he could also write to his father. Tell him that now that he is established in Saint-Remy, he should write me and give me a detailed description of his interior life.

I am thanking God that your voyage has been. . .

*

. . . the letter does not have the form of an order, it has all the force of one.

I will soon send you M. Perrin's bill. I wrote recently to the Mme Perrin. As soon as possible, send me the 4,000 francs from M. Oeuvarard and Huguenin. Two hundred or 300 francs more will be coming from M. Huguenin under the new terms; I will let you know when they arrive.

Father Lalanne some time ago remarked. . .

* * *

S. 562-2. To Mme de Chifflet, Besançon

November 20, 1830, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

I received your letter of November 12. In the interval I had received one from Brother Clouzet in which he tells me that he lost M. Peg's statement.

In early October, Father Lalanne and Brother Clouzet went to Bordeaux. Young Peg had already asked me to go to Besançon as a boarder, or to Gray or Saint-Remy, so he could continue his studies. He feared the results of the revolution, and also he did not feel up to observing the timetable of the house. After a thorough examination of his case, it was decided that young Peg would be sent back to you in the company of two virtuous young men.

Brother Clouzet was the first to leave, and I asked him to give you (1) a letter from me with an account of the young man and (2) a statement of what he owed. Brother Clouzet was to be in Besançon several days before the arrival of M. Peg. I did not doubt that everything would happen as planned. Although Brother Clouzet gave me no account of an interview with you, I did not worry because I knew that young Peg had arrived in Besançon.

However, I must tell you of a little incident which took place during the night before their arrive in Besançon. The young man who held the purse found 26 francs missing when they left the inn. M. Peg was questioned by M. Bousquet, the head of the charitable institution in Besançon, and although he noticed the agitation of the young man he did not charge him with anything. M. Peg had no money, and he would have been suspect had he made any purchase. The bill given to Brother Blouzet amounted to 330 francs, 200 francs for tuition for one year, 160 francs for the trip, and the rest for his upkeep. I put the tuition at 200 instead of 400 francs because you refused to accept the error made by Father Lalanne. You told me I was free to send him back; however, because of the severe winter and the possible loss of a year of schooling, I decided to wait for the holidays and to rely on your sense of justice. I would have kept him longer had he been more disposed to adopt the state to which he seemed attracted. His behavior as a student was flawless; he studied and deserved the commendation of his teacher. His trunk which is being forwarded contains all the trophies he has won. With two more good years of study he will be ready to pursue an honorable career.

I am going to write to Brother Clouzet. You could save him a trip to Besançon either by sending him the 330 francs, the amount of the lost bill, to which 35 francs for scholastic dues should be added. Anything else is left to your sense of justice and your generosity. Or you may pay M. Bousquet at Saint Jacques Hospice, but after informing Brother Clouzet in Saint-Remy.

* * *

S. 564. To Bro. Louis Rothéa

December 3, 1830, Bordeaux

My dear Son,

I had just finished this letter when I received one from Brother Cholet dated November 30. He tells me that your brother gave him permission to visit his family. There he made an

agreement to purchase a house built by his brother. There was a mortgage for 300 francs on that house alone, and he still has to pay 800 francs, 500 by next October 28 and 300 one year later. The public contract he signed is a public scandal for all those who know that he is a religious. The payment of his debts will give rise to another scandal, for everyone knows that he has nothing and can possess nothing. Should he pay from savings from the house of Sainte-Marie-aux-Mines or from any other establishment of which he might be director, the scandal would only be worse. The case is more complicated than you had first described it. Brother Cholet adds that he has especially consulted the pastor of the town and his cousin, the mayor. I will make no decision until I learn how his advisers were able to solve such difficulties. Send Brother Cholet a copy of the two paragraphs of this letter that mention him. I do not intend to answer him directly.

Along with this letter I am including the statement given me by Brother Cholet of the income and expenses of Sainte-Marie for the past year. This statement does not indicate the deficit left by M. L. when he left, nor the actual deficit. Brother Cholet must tell Brother Nicolas to make his request to me directly, to let him know that he consulted with me, and to give him my address.

* * *

S. 564-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 9, 1830, Bordeaux
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I received your letter of November 21 with the 409 francs as final payment for the tuition of M. Oeuvarard and M. Huguenin. Toward the end of last spring or early summer, I do not remember which, I had in my hands a letter from the Oeuvarard family to the young man who was then at Moissac, which said that you had asked for 500 francs at first, and then sent a bill for about 300 francs, and that they were sending payment for the same to Besançon. I believe it was to M. Piéloup. I think this is what happened, especially after your mention that what you had received was for final payment.

I am happy that you agree with my notion of the management of Saint-Remy and Marast. You may see me adopting more of your ideas. The financial administration of Saint-Hippolyte is a shambles. I have just confided it to Brother L. Rothéa. He retains the title of director of Colmar. and I have given him Brother Coustou as sub-director or replacement. I wrote to him about the letter Father Xavier sent you and which you referred to me. After all my complaints, I close my letter by telling him I am authorizing you to borrow 8,000 francs, adding that I would exhort you to furnish all or part of that sum. Do what you can, my dear Son, and let him know that all you needed was my approval; you will find this enclosed.

I certainly do not believe that the houses in Alsace need no visitation; however, visits will not accomplish much if their organization is faulty and the personnel incompetent.

Your letter crossed another I was sending you containing the bill destined for Mme de Chifflet. I believe the matter is settled and I should be receiving the amount shortly. Your 400 francs arrived just two days before a bill for 400 francs of flour was due, and I was without funds. Do your utmost to send me something every now and then. Our locksmith machine is progressing but is the cause of many unexpected outlays. The lathe is in operation and helps with the other parts to be added. I don't think a similar machine could be manufactured for less than 12,000 francs. I would never have allowed its construction if Brother Seguin had told me the true cost. If Saint-Laurent is not a financial failure, or even if it is, the machine could be installed there or elsewhere and from its proceeds we certainly could support a number of young men.

I glanced at the bill Father Lalanne sent me. It is useless to make any remarks today, but imagine my quandary when I compare this account with what I had expected. I do not see how

we can owe 120 francs, much less 200, to M. Paringau. I am surprised at Father Bardenet's veiled threats to dismiss the religious of Acey because of the superior's poor accent and blaming the poor number of boarders on that accent. The superior is not there to teach; besides, the institution is to serve young ladies of the middle class. A change of superior might bring a change of accent and more French manners, but it would mean a loss in the qualities a superior should have, especially in a new community with limited resources. In any case, can the situation be remedied by threats, and threats made to those who have no power to remedy the situation? From your letter does it not seem that he laid the burden upon you? However, out of respect for Father Bardenet, speak of this to Father Lalanne and see if there is no easy way to give him satisfaction. If there is a sister at Arbois who could be superior and who is available, the Superior General could be approached. This is not the time to be making changes or to be traveling.

At different times I have asked for a copy of the bill of sale of Saint-Remy; you have always forgotten to send it to me. Please send me a copy so I can decide on something I would like to have done. May the Lord, my dear Son, grant you peace.

* * *

564-3. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

December 10, 1830, Bordeaux
(Original, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, proprietor of the château and grounds of Saint Remy, Department of Haute-Saône, do authorize Brother Clouzet (Dominique) to borrow the sum of 8,000 francs, to promise to pay the interest agreed upon, and to give every legal guarantee just as I would do myself. I do so empower.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 569. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 16, 1830, Bordeaux

. . . right after having written to Father Lalanne.

Try to expedite the matter with Mme de Chifflet and whatever must be done with that of M. Deshayes. According to the detailed circumstantial evidence furnished by M. Keller, there is no doubt that M. Peg took 26 francs from the pocket of his guide. Because this theft is no longer a suspicion but a certainty, Mme de Chifflet cannot refuse to add those 26 francs to young Peg's bill.

It is in these same fears that you have. . .

* * *

S. 572. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 14, 1831, Bordeaux

. . . all was now ended and should be left alone and forgotten.

Insist, with decorum however, with Mme de Chifflet, and do not forget the 35 francs we paid for his scholastic fees and forgot to add to his bill of 330 francs. Justice would demand that she add also the 26 francs which young Peg pilfered from his guide. She should not hesitate, especially since the tuition was given as 200 francs and that I have never asked for less than 400;

this was due to an error on Father Lalanne's part, which I pointed out immediately, that he asked for 200 instead of 400.

I told you that M. Deshayes had written to his son; he confirmed this by his statement??? when you passed through Rouen. He had promised to send the sum to Bordeaux but his son wrote to tell me that you wanted it sent to Saint-Remy and from there it would reach me in Bordeaux. I told M. Deshayes that you must have had good reasons for your suggestion; at the end of December you tell me about the exchange of letters between father and son. I cannot understand his type of "circumlocution."

You are doing well in taking care of. . .

* * *

S. 576. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

January 25, 1831, Bordeaux

. . . because the very idea is excellent.

I will send you M. Perrin's bill immediately; I would have done so with this letter if I did not have to answer a note from Father Lalanne which has just arrived. Do not forget M. Peg's bill or the 600 francs owed by M. Deshayes.

* * *

S. 578. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

February 12, 1831, Bordeaux

. . . which will bring me some commission or charge

especially from M. Deshayes. I am surprised that I have not as yet received the payment for young Peg's bill.

It would be difficult for anyone to get an idea. . .

*

. . . some creditors move heavily in debt themselves.

I am sending you M. Perrin's statement amounting to 422 francs 95 cent. Please send me that sum and add whatever you can to it. Accept only a draft on a reliable firm. M. Pidoux gave one to Brother Galliot made out on a Paris firm and it was cashed here without hesitation.

Two or three days ago I wrote to Father Lalanne. . .

* * *

S. 580-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

February 25, 1831, Bordeaux

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Along with your letter of December 18, I received your draft drawn on a Parish firm for the sum of 965 francs. I need not tell you how welcome it was; any form of legal tender is welcome in times of difficulty, all the more so now when that difficulty is extreme. My dear Son, M. Perrin is in an entirely different category from those whom you admit as novices.

1. M. Perrin's youth and light-mindedness have precluded his reception among the novices. However, so as not to stifle the good sentiments which the Spirit of the Lord inspired in him, it was right to rear him religiously but not as a full novice. This process has been rather successful. He makes daily progress in common sense, he is settling down, and is becoming more attached to the service of God; but he has not yet become what he should be.

2. I accepted among the novices those whom you sent me without inquiring about the tuition they were paying. If you examine your accounts, you will note that you are indebted to me. I have never considered M. Perrin other than a boarder, who might develop leanings toward virtue and the religious life. We have never changed the rate of tuition at Saint-Laurent or at the Madeleine; it was 400 francs for those who could afford it.

3. I can't think of any case when we allowed an arrear of two years in the tuition. I am not blaming your policy; you made it.

4. When the young men make their profession, we see in a kindly way what they can contribute toward their room and board, in gifts, etc., as a kind of dowry. Last month, for instance, the father of Brother L. Rothéa sent him 200 francs for his board, and another 100 francs for incidentals.

5. When you spoke of charging for the bed I did not think you meant the value of the article but more its use as it is done in several boarding establishments. Around New Year's, Mme wrote to her son that she had paid his board and only his bed was left to pay. The young man told me he did not understand, so I told him the meaning of the term; the question never came up again. To settle all disputes with Mme Perrin I am going to write to her. Write up her account as you see fit, put it in the envelope, seal it and give it to her.

You insist, my dear Son, on asking for Brother Seguin and some good workmen. I'll see if I can't stop the work on our machine during these calamitous times and then I'll send you for or five workmen, but on two conditions, (1) that you send them back to me when I ask for them, which will be when I can prudently continue with the work; (2) that you pay for their return trip. The expenses will not be that great, for all the men I can send you can make the journey on foot; they are all healthy. I may add a young carpenter. Answer me by return mail, and send me the funds for the first part of the journey.

You are making Saint-Remy produce as much as possible; that is very good. But do not invest all our revenues; reserve a good amount for me to tide us over. Of what good are future advantages if we collapse now? This is what I had in mind when I listed your duties as manager of the properties of Saint-Remy and Marast.

I wanted to answer Father Lalanne but I cannot do it for the next post. Tell him that the Minister sent in time to the Rector of the Academy of Bordeaux the acceptance of the contracts of our young men, but then he demanded impracticable conditions. I wrote to him and gave him what I considered very good reasons for him to order the delivery. I have no answer yet, but that does not surprise me, in view of the grave events in Paris.

Meanwhile, let him do the best he can. He can always present to the review board (1) the contracts for 10 years, (2) proofs that they are teaching at the normal school of Saint-Remy, the testimony of the mayor of Saint-Remy or, at least, the legal signature of Father Lalanne. I am sending you a copy of these contracts. I must stop; I embrace you most tenderly.

* * *

Letters and Passages Omitted in Volume III

* * *

S. 584-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

March 29, 1831, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I received a short letter yesterday, dated March 21, from Father Lalanne in Besançon. He wrote in haste. He was impressed by the wisdom of the advice you have been given in Besançon, the same that the Rector of the Academy had given him. He left for Paris the next morning. He adds that my answer to the first letter he wrote about the matter will follow him to Paris. He wants me to write and express my wishes, but he forgets to give me his Paris address. I have no idea where he is staying, and I hesitate to write blindly. However, I did write this morning to M. de Rubelles, who would like to meet him, and I asked him to find out where he is residing. I suggested the Foreign Missions, the Comte de Noailles, and several former members of the Royal Council of Public Instruction. M. de Rubelles is no longer at the address I had given Father Lalanne; he is now at M. Cart, no. 14, Rue de Clery (for M. Adolphe), I believe you know Father Lalanne's Paris address. He may notice that he did not include it in his short note from Besançon, and it may be on the way. Last year, when he was in Paris, he never told me where he stayed. I thought he was with M. O'Lombel, and that is where I used to send my letters.

Not one but two answers are on the way, and the first may have arrived. Father Lalanne wrote in duplicate, sending one letter to Bordeaux and the other to Agen. Because it was urgent, Father Collineau answered immediately and informed me of the letter and the answer, but briefly for lack of time. The next day I received a copy of both the letter and its answer. The same delivery brought me word from Father Collineau and the letter addressed to me in Agen. I answered blaming him for his clumsy procedures. I explained what I wanted him to do. The only difference between my advice and that you received in Besançon was that instead of leaving for Paris I was having Father Meyer and the Minister of Public Instruction write to him. I advised him to see the Rector of the Academy. I did not dare advise his departure because of the riots which are so frequent in the capital. However, today there is some hope that a change in the Ministry will take place and consequently less trouble and disorder, at least during his stay in the capital, which should be as short as possible. I believe he will have brought with him the agreement with Father Meyer, provided it is accepted. That is essential. If he cannot now obtain his diploma of head of an institution, let him at least obtain a delay and, if possible, the permission to pass the examination at Besançon. It would be deplorable to have to spend a considerable time in Paris, or to have to return there shortly. Father Lalanne asks me for a letter of recommendation for the Comte de Noailles, the deputy. I cannot send it because I do not know his address. But he will be well received if he mentions my name. The address is 95 Place du Palais Bourbon. He will deal with the same person that Father was supposed to see when he left Bordeaux with you. Father did go there, but did not meet him; he left my letter but not his address. M. le Comte gave it to me, but only one month later while he was still waiting for Father's visit.

If Father Lalanne needs the protection of two distinguished lawyers in Paris, he could see M. Berryer the elder and M. Berryer the younger, who is a deputy. M. de Noailles knows them very well, especially the deputy. These gentlemen would certainly do their utmost to help Father. I have an important financial matter in the hands of M. Berry the elder, and M. de Noailles is acting as my proxy. I was about to write to Bordeaux, to M. de Noailles' business manager, seeking for information. My financial situation is critical; I would accept any sum on account, at

least the interest on the capital that was due last January 1. I would have instructed Father Lalanne about the whole matter if I had had his address. When you receive a letter from him, give him the gist of what I said. I wrote to you recently, a rather lengthy letter. The answer must already be on the way. Although I am pressed for time, I nevertheless embrace you tenderly.

* * *

S. 586. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

April 15, 1831, Agen

Along with my answer to the letter announcing the grand affair, I sent you one which I had just written to Father Bardenet. I asked you to give it to him and to endorse its message as best you could. I believe you have received it.

I wrote to Brother Clouzet some days ago telling him to send Brothers Seguin, Etignard, and Pésant on their way, and to see that they had their passports and all the exemptions from the service were in order. I was just informed that Brother Seguin's case is not in order, but that every means will be used to see that it is rectified. Brother Clouzet need not worry if there is some delay. They have been ready to leave for the past five or six weeks.

* * *

S. 591. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 27, 1831, Agen

. . . copy of this deed, which Father Bardenet will have given you.

I am surprised that I have not had news from Mme Perrin for so long. She was to go on a trip this spring to visit her daughter, a nun, at Aix-en-Provence, then come to Bordeaux to visit her son. Circumstances will have made her abandon the project.

Send Father Caillet all the money you can. Mme Perrin can pay the entire year's tuition because the second semester is well on its way.

Father Caillet writes to me that he does not know what to do. . .

* * *

S. 597. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

July 19, 1831, Agen

. . . the language of faith and reason.

I recently sent you a letter for Mme Perrin.

I will not come back to the article. . .

* * *

S. 599. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

August 7 to 9, 1831, Agen

. . . while teaching them to read and write.

Saumade may have made a sour face when he was assigned to the kitchen. His health never did stand up in that kind of surroundings; but we are sorely in need of farmers. From time to time Saumade has given proof of his ability, but he very much needs to be sustained by

religious motives. Valincourt is not so sentimental, but he is fearful and submissive when his master is present. If God grants us peace we will be able to make better arrangements; meanwhile, let us do all the good we can.

If Father Bardenet is not satisfied. . .

*

. . . nothing in this letter but what is very friendly and honest.

Mother Superior's statement has been very badly interpreted; she could not have said such a thing under the circumstances. However, let us not insist, for she said it with the best of intentions.

My dear Son, not only would I have no anxiety. . .

* * *

S. 599-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

August 23, 1831, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Bordeaux informs me that you have sent Father Caillet two small checks of 200 francs each, drawn on the royal treasury. You do not write. I suppose you are doing your best to send me a considerable sum, knowing the critical nature of our position.

I am able to settle all my accounts with the Institute of the Daughters of Mary. The operation is progressing satisfactorily. I presume that our respective accounts balance, or almost. To close everything I must know the exact sum Saint-Remy has received from Sister Léocadie, who was known as Sister Emmanuel when she joined, I believe. She was headmistress of the boarding establishment at Amand. Today she is at Acey. If you have any account with Sister Geneviève Prêtre, please let me have it. Also give me the exact amount you spent to have them travel to Gray, or rather to Arbois. Let me know of any expense you may have made, without reimbursement, for the religious of Arbois or Acey.

I presume that Brother Galliot will have given to Father Lalanne or to you the important document which the pastor of Courtefontaine entrusted to him. It is an excerpt from the royal register of the Department of Public Instruction and the minutes of the meetings of June 23, 1829, at which were discussed the normal schools of Saint-Remy and Courtefontaine. If Father Lalanne has not received it, let him ask Brother Galliot for it; he will need it.

I am writing to our poor Brother Saumade. He is to be conscripted this year. This candidate will be lost to us if he is not handled correctly. He is difficult to guide; he requires a mixture of severity and gentleness, of religious??? and friendship, and that is not easy. Imagine, my dear Son, all that a fatherly heart would like to say to you. I know your situation, and I never forget that we are in the midst of a revolution.

* * *

S. 599-3. To Mother Visitation, Agen

August 16, 1831, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Daughter,

I believed it best to allow the beautiful Feast of the Assumption to pass without bothering about our accounts. I have been looking them over, comparing as bookkeepers say the "debit"

with the “credit.” Before a final settlement I thought it best to allow you to go over your first results. I added to my account a certain number of items which were unknown to you. I take the responsibility for some of yours for the following reasons.

1. The two indemnities, because these have nothing to do with the goods or the revenues of the community with which we are alone concerned here. When I discuss these with the heirs, I will consider them unforeseen income having nothing to do with the foundation; they could not even have been foreseen.

2. I explained Sister Anne’s case.

3. Considered from the point of view of justice, the tuition of 800 francs which Mlle de Magnol paid was not owed exclusively to the Daughters of Mary, but was due to the relationship between our two Orders. Under the impression that I was responsible for all the expenses in Bordeaux and having seen at times my straitened circumstances, she found a discreet way of helping me. I spoke about this to Mother Gonzague, who overlooked the difficulty rather than give me an answer. If you are not impressed by my remarks on this item, there is another way of judging its truth or its falsity. But it would be imprudent to use it.

I readily agree to the refunds because your first item, the expenses made by your community for the brothers of the house of Agen, either for food, laundry, clothing repair, and also the provisions you sent to Bordeaux—even though all these expenses were always considered by you as acts of charity—I am happy to see them amply compensated for. Although the second item under compensation is almost negligible, I insist on it because it will include several amounts that I have received, but which you did not enter into your accounts. I remember one of them: the tuition for two or three terms for the brother of little Aimée, which I believe I had M. Dardy pay to Mother Saint-Vincent. I also received the tuition for the first two quarters of little Timée, ???30 francs a month for Sister Anne Moncet. I believe this amounted to a little more than 4,000 francs.

I am skipping some items which I do not recall, although I believe you have kept track of them yourself. For instance, 2,000 francs from Mother Saint-Joseph, née de Casteras, which were paid in Bordeaux. In your first draft, you indicate only 1,500 francs from Mother Marie Thérèse, as part of her dowry. When an entry is doubtful, it should be so stated. I must stop, my dear Daughter; I hope that from your answer I will be able to draw up a definitive balance sheet. I am not referring here to the accounts still outstanding in the northeast of France, and for which I will write immediately. I have no duplicates, either of this letter or of the accounts; please send both back along with your answer.

I wish you peace in the Lord, which is the greatest of all known goods.

Tuesday evening, August 16, 1831

* * *

S. 601. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

September 23 and 25, 1831, Agen

If I delayed getting it off, it was only because of the force. . .

It is possible that on first reading my letter you misunderstood the expression I use to explain my reasons for not publishing. That which I call “of content” might better be called “of form” of the prospectus. Basically, what you say appears good to me.

But this is enough. It is even too much. . .

* * *

S. 602. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

September 25, 1831, Agen

At another time I will give you more details. . .

Mme. Perrin, you say, left for Nîmes and then for Bordeaux. What can she do in Bordeaux? I am at Agen, and so is her son. I will have someone write to her at Nîmes. I do not know whether the letter will arrive there on time.

Get yourself up-to-date regarding public affairs.

* * *

S. 604-2. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Bordeaux

October 1, 1831, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

I spoke to the proprietor of the baths on Rue Ségur. He takes care of all the business matters of the ladies on Rue Mazarin; in particular he negotiated the lease of the house in which they reside. He knows perfectly well that we rented no. 1 with the permission to use the old chapel, or nos. 2 and 3, such as they were, with no obligation to make any repairs. They cannot have forgotten that because we insisted very much on this condition, and he is the one who drew up the lease. I believe this gentleman, whose name I do not know, will see to it that these ladies adhere to the contract and will not instigate an unjust lawsuit. Otherwise, you would please send me the wording of their statement granting power of attorney which the Daughters of Mary will have to give.

* * *

S. 607. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 5, 1831, Agen

My dear Son,

I received a letter from M. Perrin in Lyons in the first days of October. It contained another for his brother who is in Agen. In both he announced that his mother, who fell sick in Nîmes, could not continue her journey to him, and that he had difficulty getting her back home. He was her secretary. The mother asks for a statement of what she owes and offers to pay the amount in ???case. She also asks me to give her son 60 francs, which she will repay on arriving. M. Perrin adds that if I prefer a draft on a company in Parish or Bordeaux for what his brother owed me, he could send it to me after my answer to Madame his mother. M. Perrin adds finally that he is not familiar with the formalities required to have his brother exempted from military service, and he asks me to send him the necessary papers.

I delayed writing in spite of the urgent need we have of funds because of two successive retreats I had to preach and also because of other business which I could not postpone. I do not have with me at Agen the statement required by Mme Perrin, but you have it in your office. See if the tuition was charged up to the month of September; I believe I have it only for one semester. Your bill should therefore include 400 francs for the full year, plus 200 francs for the current semester. I will write and explain things to her and tell her that you have her account and will bring it to her for a settlement. Send me the amount of that bill immediately. I beg you not to delay. There has already been too much delay. Besides, I have nothing but good to tell Mme Perrin about her son. The young man seems to be daily mastering his levity; he was one of the most edifying at the retreat.

My dear Son, you sent me the amount which you had loaned to Arbois. But have you not received some partial payments? If so, tell me the amounts; if not, say so. Twice have I asked you the same question, and twice you told me the amounts you had loaned. When you answer me, you

should have my letter before either from Saint-Remy or from Gray, with the approximate ??? You tell me of the little ??? that left Saint-Remy but nothing that left Gray and was sent to Acey. If you do not remember, you could write to Mother Gabrielle and ask for a detailed list, without giving any explanations.

I am ashamed to place our needs before you so often. . .

*

P.S. Just as the mail is about to leave, I recall that you mentioned the demands which M. Saumade made of you. I will come back to that. I am surprised at his demands, especially when he is faced with this conscription. I discussed with Father Lalanne various means for obtaining a dispensation from military service. His last letter made no mention of it. I believe all our young people everywhere will be dispensed this year, except him.

Enclosed is a copy of what I am writing to Mme Perrin about her bill. Please press the point.

S 607-2. To Mme Perrin

November 5, 1831, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

I do not have a copy here in Agen of the statement of the money advanced to your son, but I had sent one to Brother Clouzet before coming here. Nothing of any consequence has been added since. I have asked Brother Clouzet to visit you. You can settle the matter with him concerning the tuition and the 60 francs advanced to your son. One year's tuition, or 400 francs, was due in September and 200 for the current semester. I say 60 francs advanced to him because I am his bursar. Because of his commitment he cannot carry any money. If he has a real need, he asks for money and he is given what is needed.

* * *

S. 609-2. To M. Saumade, Saint-Remy

November 23, 1831, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

What a difference between your letter of November 11 and the one you wrote on leaving Bordeaux for Saint-Remy! I do not intend to comment on the conflicting sentiments or on their causes. When you came to Saint-Laurent, an agreement was signed between your tutor and Brother Clouzet, who was then director of the house. You seem to have forgotten what transpired about three years ago; then, just as now, you were going to leave the Society, all our accounts were put in order, and I notified your parents. In answer to your entreaties and because of certain signs of true repentance, I consented to your stay. But it was just as if you were entering for the first time. The terms of the agreement were nullified. I am surprised that you have forgotten, and yet I explained things very clearly to you.

You are correct when you say that, if you have some account to settle, this must be done through Brother Clouzet; he alone had signed the agreement. If you are what you have become, whom can you blame for your constant misconduct which has caused me so much worry and solicitude? I hope, however, that the good sentiments you had on the day of your first Communion will resurface sooner or later. I desire this, my dear Son, from my heart, which always has the feelings of a father for his son.

* * *

S. 610. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

November 24, 1831, Agen

. . . that I am very far from doing anything against the holy canons.

Enclosed is my answer to M. Saumade. Concerning M. Pimouguet, I have nothing to add to what you have in my last letter. I cannot send you a tailor right now; I may be able to find one before the spring. The dismissal of the one who was at Saint-Laurent last year was rather sudden. He had certain whims, but he could have persevered; his fellow countryman is much more fickle, but he is holding his own. If he did not leave with the other, this is because he is ill. I do not say this to complain. You will perform a minor miracle if you turn Brother Fridblatt into a true religious. Brother Galliot was wrong to tell you that you could have the services of Brother Claverie. When I replaced him at Courtefontaine, nothing that I said could lead him to suspect that I had no task for him.

The regimen, my dear Son, which you have undertaken. . .

* * *

S. 610-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 26, 1831, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

Enclosed is a copy of the letter which I sent to Brother Saumade and which I inserted into one for Father Lalanne. Thank you for the little details contained in the first part of your letter of November 4, although they are very distressing.

Brother Bousquet immediately informed me of the decisions which you and Father Chevaux made at Besançon. I confirmed them in my answer to Brother Bousquet. I will return young Edel to you. Geng is alone at Ebersmunster; he is caretaker of the large buildings and works in the extensive gardens. He does a good job and seems to be liked by everyone. When the opportunity presents itself, I will take him away from there. But it will not be easy to replace him. He has just sent 30 sacks of potatoes to Father Rothéa, and Father is overjoyed. I wish we could dispense with outside help. Father Chevaux had a few suggestions to make with respect to the hired help you might need at Saint-Remy. I answered immediately that above all I wanted order and harmony to reign there.

You hint that we are guilty of many imprudent actions in Alsace; you seem to believe I am aware of them. How can I be when, you speak so vaguely about them?

At the beginning of the month I sent you a letter in which, among other important topics, I mentioned that I was writing directly to Mme Perrin. I asked you to settle our accounts with her according to her wishes. I wrote to her directly because I sent her son's contract to serve for 10 years in the sector of public instruction to her, so she might immediately indicate her consent, have her signature certified by the mayor of the commune and that of the mayor by the Prefect of Vesoul, and send it back to me, for time is of the essence. Here we are on November 26 and I have no word from you or from her. It would be unfortunate if the Rector of the Academy of Cahors could not obtain the dispensation from military service because of the delay of that document.

In your letter of November 4, I received your check for 72 francs and the promise of a larger sum in a few days. In my last letter which crossed yours to which I am replying, I spoke very plainly as to one of my older sons, whom I love dearly. My feelings are always the same. It pleases me to recall them to you, and I embrace you with paternal tenderness.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 611. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 3,4,5, 1831, Agen

My dear Son, your message of last November 22. . .

Your check for 990 francs, I have sent to Bordeaux. Father Caillet had just written that he did not know how he was going to pay two bills that were due.

I am satisfied at your promptness and efficiency in dealing with the account of Mme Perrin. She still has not signed the agreement allowing the hiring of M. Nicolas. I am always??? afraid that this delay will hurt his case; I wrote to her more than a month ago

Thank you for all the information you have given me about the funds furnished to the convents of Arbois and Acey. I will tell you later why I needed that data.

Twice I looked over the balance of your receipts. . .

*

If the professors and supervisors and supervisors will be. . .

that is where the professors and supervisors will be,

. . . then very few will be present for the community mass.

* * *

S 611-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

December 21, 1831, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

This is the answer to your last letter which bears no date but which was in reply to mine of November 26. In another I had acknowledged receiving a money order for 990 francs; you must have received it many days ago. Let me first talk about Brother Saumade.

Your letter arrived at the same time as one from Brother Saumade to M. Boudel, his surrogate tutor, in which were two copies of his contract to serve for 10 years in the primary schools of the Society. One of his uncles, Lafite by name I believe, came to inform me of his nephew's decision. He was very happy that his nephew had finally opted for the Society. I had not seen this gentleman since the month of March, shortly after I arrived in Agen. I read him the letter which Brother Saumade had written me from Bordeaux when he left for Saint-Remy. He was very pleased with it, for it was filled with good sentiments. Then I showed him the letter Brother wrote me on November 11, which is entirely inconsistent with the profession he wishes to make. I then recalled the statement of his indebtedness at the time when the young man first wanted to leave. He did not leave, but the bill was sent to M. Duparque, a lawyer, to be given to the members of his family (Saumade's tutor is dead, and M. Duparque is the lawyer, the friend and confidant of the whole family. His uncle had difficulty understanding the change in the ideas and sentiments which had taken place in the young man. Only after a long and serious interview did he discover the mystery, the key to it all. Brother Saumade has a brother-in-law in Tarbes who is in great financial difficulties. The young man might have a means of helping her husband. The latter or his wife would have invited the young man to come and learn the watchmaker's trade with them. (Several letters from his sister have passed through my hands, encouraging him to stay in the Society until he was of age.) M. Lafite grasped the situation and said he would write to his brother, a pastor in the diocese of Tarbes, to impress upon his niece that young Saumade

was not in the Society in virtue of an agreement between himself and his tutor, and that upon leaving he would be given almost nothing. About his contract to each for 10 years in the primary schools, I said, (1) that I could not accept a copy of this contract after his nephew signified that this was not his intention; that I could accept it on the condition that his parents admit he will have nothing coming to him if, in spite of all his protestations, he leaves upon attaining his majority; (2) that I explained the contract and how the formula had changed since the revolution, and that it would not be accepted; (3) that he would never be exempted using the formula given by the Ministry and the Academy unless he first obtained his first degree certificate after an examination which is usually quite difficult. Several Academies give teachers' permits first and only afterward accept contracts for 10 years, and in my opinion, young Saumade is not able to obtain a second-degree certificate; and (4) that so far I have found no means of getting his exemption from military service other than to have him hired as a substitute teacher in one of the Society's normal schools, and that I had written twice to the superior of the establishment of Saint-Remy during the last summer but had received no answer, which was probably due to the fact that the superior had changed his mind.

It was decided (1) that M. Bourdel could write his consent at the bottom of the contract. ???[I remarked, however, that it would be better to separate the two, so that the formula not appear on the contract], (2) that I would write to Brother Saumade and describe to him the miserable state that would be his upon leaving the Society, that his brother-in-law was in no condition to receive him, etc., etc. I told M. Lafite that I could not list all those woes to his nephew, that it would seem that I wanted to hold him back, to force him by the description of these impending difficulties, that his parents would write to him what they thought best. M. Bourdel must have written to him and sent his consent on December 7. I promised to write and urge him to take the means I indicated to be exempted from the service. I would have done so, but I was expecting a letter from the young man which you had announced but which I have not yet received. In the light of the young man's dispositions and his situation, see with Father Lalanne what you can do for him. You could even read this letter to him. I am truly sorry he has not lived up to the good sentiments he so often expressed to me and has not followed the advice I have given him so paternally.

I had intended to answer the other items in your letter, and I will do so shortly; this must leave by the next post. If you follow the same procedure as for M. Pézant you will not succeed, and you will be losing precious time. Have M. Pésant hired as an auxiliary, either at Saint-Remy or at Courtefontaine; I believe I have explained all this to Father Lalanne. Furthermore, my answer will soothe any hurt you may have experienced from something in my letter to Father Chevaux. I embrace you tenderly.

* * *

S. 612. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 30, 1831, Agen

My dear Son, I really owe you a answer to our letter.

My answer dealt with only one incident, that involving young Saumade. You must have received this letter. I have a word from him in a letter to M. Jacquot. I am enclosing my answer to that; please give it to him, sealed if you wish.

I was aware of most of the administrative defects. . .

*

I will add only one more reflection. [more text in letter?]

Edel must now be in Saint-Remy, so there is nothing to add concerning him.

My dear Son, I am pressing you tenderly. . .

* * *

S. 613-2. To Bro. Jean Coustou

January 22, 1832, Bordeaux

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Your letter dated January 13 arrived on January 19. I was very busy, so I asked Brother Troffer, who had just arrived from Bordeaux, to write to you and to restore your equanimity. You tell me that Brother Perriès will have to submit to the law of conscription. How is it that he wrote to me some months ago that he had plenty of time before his turn came? How is it that, if he erred about his age, he said nothing to me in his last letter, in which he tells me of his illness and his change? How is it that without advising me, after insistently demanding a replacement and receiving one, you want to have Brother Perriès admitted as a communal instructor even though he is tubercular to the point that the doctors forbade him to teach? Surely if he is due this year, he had enough time to arm himself either with tuberculosis or another serious ailment so that he would be exempted because of his illness. On leaving Colmar, you had to obtain for him a certificate of incapacity for military service from the doctors, from the mayor who is a doctor.

Now, my dear Son, let us look at the decision of the committees and the letter from the mayor. This decision says: "Considering (1) that the Superior of the Society of Mary, in ignorance of the law governing primary instruction, has removed from the communal school Brother Bertin, a teacher regularly appointed and installed, without asking or obtaining his leave of absence, and (2) that the same superior has appointed as successor to Brother Bertin one named Perriès who has been substituting for him for nine months, without taking any steps to solicit his appointment by the authorities established by the law of June 28, 1823; because of this abuse of authority, etc."

The Superior answers that he does not believe he has abused his authority, for he has the right to change the personnel in his establishments any time he believes he has a serious reason for doing so. Moreover, he has never forbidden his men to submit to the laws governing primary instruction. Teachers thus replaced by his authority do not have to obtain a severance permit because they quit their posts by that very fact. It is sufficient for the replacement to have all the qualities required to fulfill the functions of the vacated position.

The only blame that could be cast in the present instance is that the head of the establishment did not present the replacement to the authorities; the superior presumed this would be done. The bylaw obliges all persons who have replaced one or the other above-mentioned teacher would have to give up their positions within three weeks dating from the publication of the present bylaw.

The Superior replies that the three persons concerned would present themselves within the prescribed delay and would resume their posts if that were possible, and that those who could not would resign. The superior does not know if two of the three have contracts with their administrations that were similar to those of Colmar. The mayor of Colmar, who is charged with enforcing the bylaw, can testify to the respect which the Superior of the Society of Mary has for the authorities of the town where some of his establishments are situated. Should any of the three named teachers not be able to fulfill his duty, then his replacement will temporarily have no salary. His Excellency the Minister of Instruction will decide whether the Superior of the Society of Mary has exceeded his authority in the present instance.

There you have my answer to the bylaw of the committees and to the letter of the mayor. You may copy this and give it to them. There is nothing in this answer that you could not have said, for you know the law. Did I ever tell you not to present the replacements? You may have

told me that your procedure is simpler and that it dispensed you from painful and useless steps. I may not have answered you, given the confidence I had that you could never do anything to compromise yourself, and, a fortiori???, to compromise me.

For the first time, I hear that two signatures have been forged, one by you and the other by the novice Rohner. Of course I would never have approved of the forgery.

I had Brother Lambert replace Brother Perriès, who is ill. He should be sent to Marast if Brother Bertin has not been accepted in Marast by the Academy and the committee. I was not told this, but I have reason to believe it. We have to reason the same way about Brother Keller, who is not in Sainte Marie-aux-Mines. If he can be freed from his present post, he can resume his assignment in Colmar and then he can be replaced by one of your men. As to Brother Charpin at Kaysersberg, I do not believe there will be any difficulty in having him stay on in Colmar; he can be replaced by Brother Morgenthaler.

My dear Son, I believe I have answered all your questions. I exhort you to foster your interior life in spite of all the business you must attend to. Salvation above everything; always our own sanctification in the midst of the troubles and agitations of this world. Please accept. . .

* * *

S. 614. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

February 8, 1832, Agen

You know you are one of my older children. . .

I think everything has been arranged so that Brother Perrin may be exempted from military service. You tell me, my dear Son, that you have opened an account at the boarding section of Saint-Remy, and others at the farms of Saint-Remy and Marast. That is good, my dear Son, and something such as establishing a bookkeeping system that had to be set up. You know that is what we had agreed upon. At least I will now know what I can count on. I would find it hard to tell you of the losses we are sustaining and what our needs are. At the end of this month I will have to pay a debit of 1,000 francs; do the impossible to send me a money order for that sum so that I may have the time to send it to Bordeaux.

Before going any further. . .

*

Let it be to your profit before God. . .

Father Chevaux will tell me of his desire that the Brothers either go to Mass on Sundays and feastdays in the little chapel, with his reasons, or that they continue to do as proposed by Father Lalanne. He may discuss this directly with Father Lalanne. In my first letter to Father Lalanne, I will try to remember to speak to him about your title in the house.

On Father Lalanne's last letter. . .

*

I tell myself what I so often say to others. . .

I now refer to your letter of January 11. You used correct tactics with Brother Saumade. I have his letter. My answer is enclosed. He is greatly mistaken if he thinks he has a right to something like 9,000 or 10,000 francs. His uncle figured it out, but we can come back to that if he perseveres and sincerely reforms.

I imagine that, not receiving any answer. . .

*

How can we believe this young man would study theology. . .

In the middle of the school year, on another level and using other methods, Centrain would do better in his studies at the Madeleine than at the Sainte-Marie boarding house, where he would be with Brother Huguenin. That has been Father Collineau's opinion since the beginning of the year. Brother Centrain cannot be useful at Saint-Remy. I believe that Brother Chopard. . .

I notice that Marast is also causing you worries. You seem to have taken the proper means to guarantee that you would be paid.

I thank you for the details you give me about. . .

* * *

S. 615-3. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

March 8, 1832, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I was about to answer your letter of February 21 when I received your letter of March 1 with the enclosed money for 1,000 francs. I wrote to Brother Bousquet yesterday asking for the 300 francs he had reserved for me and for the 180 francs which Brother Huguenin had paid to M. Pidoux. These checks came in too late, and Father Caillet had to borrow twice, once on March 1 to pay for flour and the second time to redeem a promissory note which was due only yesterday. I made no mention of the first because I thought I would receive Brother Bousquet's 300 francs in time, for I had written to him before I spoke to you about the 1,000 francs. This little recital is not a reproach for your tardiness, for you sent your money order as soon as you could. Brother Bousquet may be to blame for not following instructions. I hope you will settle things by sending me another money for the sum of 316 and 180 francs.

When he got to Paris, Father Lalanne wrote asking if I had any orders to give him. I had none, so I did not answer. One of my letters must have reached Saint-Remy after his departure for Paris.

Since the work on the swimming pool is so advanced and you have a contract with the mason, you must finish the construction. Father Lalanne had never mentioned this or anything else he had ordered, either for the fields or for the orchard in front of the château or for the park, etc. All our correspondence revolved around problems of authority.

I found out that Brother André Stoffel had been sent to Saint-Remy by Father Rothéa, but only after the move had been made. Let Brother André learn what is necessary in the exercise of his trade, for he is rather weak in general, but the main reason he is at Saint-Remy is not studies but for an increase in piety and the fear of the Lord, to control his excessive light-mindedness, etc. Please relay this to Father Chevaux.

When you have balanced your account, my dear Son, I will know what I can ask of you and what I can plan for. I know from experience that the times are hard, but because I foresaw this, already at the beginning of the revolution I told you to keep separate accounts for the two properties of Saint-Remy and Marast, and for the income from room and board; to make only those expenses that could be turned into revenues; and to make the repairs and constructions which were absolutely necessary. My correspondence with Father Lalanne, which you aptly call "active," had no other purpose than to support your position and what had been decided.

I do not doubt, my dear Son, that your position is a difficult one, and I will try to give you whatever attention and consolation I have in my power. I embrace you as a father embraces his well-beloved oldest son.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 618. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 26, 1832, Agen

I have more need of this than you perhaps imagine.

My dear Son, the money order which I had asked for and which you intended to send me was for 1,000 francs. No mention was made of the money you might find with M. Pidoux or in the house of Besançon; everything was necessary and urgent.

I am very happy to note that you are continuing. . .

*

. . . in any case he could find the suitable addresses. . .

According to the word I have on Brother Jacquot, either from him or through Father Lalanne and Father Chevaux, I would allow him to be ordained at Easter provided that (1) his confessor testifies that he has a true vocation to the ecclesiastical state and (2) Father Lalanne subjects him to a solid examination on his theological treatises, and judgment would be passed not only on his acquired knowledge but also on his judgment, his intelligence, and his learning abilities.

The first time Father Lalanne spoke to me about him, he compared him to Brother Fridblatt. I told him that comparing and associating him with Brother Fridblatt in view of the ordination gave me a very poor idea of the man. Father Lalanne said that his comparison was faulty, and that Brother Jacquot's character, and I believe he added his temperament, were very different and superior to those of Brother Fridblatt. Since then he has not mentioned the matter again.

I have just received a seven-page letter from Father Lalanne, and he is far from discussing ordinands and ordination. Because time is short, you would do well to speak to the confessor of each; I do not believe they have recourse to Father Lalanne. Let them examine before God if they are all that they should be to be promoted to Holy Orders. The confessor should also be present at the examination; it is a custom in the diocese of Besançon for the confessors to give their opinion on the promotion of their candidates to Holy Orders. Most of Father Lalanne's letter concerns you, directly or indirectly.

Father Lalanne is up in the air. I no longer reason with him. . .

* * *

S. 622-2. To Mother Gabrielle

April 8, 1832, Agen

I am answering your letter directly. . .

The letter addressed to both you and to the superior of Arbois was dated March 9 and not February 17, as you tell me. I do not know if there are any other mistakes in the copy of my letter to the superior of Arbois. You do not seem to have felt its force or its gravity.

One of the principal reasons I have not acted. . .

*

. . . the explanation I wrote to the community council.

In any case, my dear Daughter, at the present date you must have received (1) a copy of a second letter to the superior of Arbois dated March 23, (2) a copy also of my letter to Mother of the Sacred Heart.

You will find, accompanying this letter. . .

* * *

S. 622-3. To Mother Marie-Joseph, Arbois

April 8, 1832, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Daughter,

I wrote to you on March 23 and sent you a copy of my correspondence with Mother of the Sacred Heart and asked you to send Mother Gabrielle a copy of my letter and that correspondence. Today I am sending you only copies, (1) of an answer to Mother Gabrielle to one of her letters which has just arrived and (2) of a letter I wrote yesterday to the Mother Superior of Agen.

Take courage my dear Daughter, the Good Lord is trying us; let us kiss his paternal hand and remain in faithful to him. May he shed abundant blessings on you and on all our dear Daughters in Arbois.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 623. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

April 24, 1832, Agen

. . . since the Revolution, is not to have ourselves spoken about.

Saint-Hippolyte is quiet, the teaching staff is united, and no changes have been made. Father Rothéa's fears about Brother Fridblatt are founded.??? I am surprised that Father Lalanne is suggesting a change, after all the good he has told me about Brother Fridblatt.

Yes, my dear Son, I am very interested in your agricultural labors.

*

I am told that Brother Saumade attained his majority on April 17. His sisters or brothers-in-law are going to Agen to settle some family matters. Was Brother Saumade invited? Does he have a birth certificate to prove he is of age? It seems that the most he will receive from his uncle is between 1,000 and 1,200 francs. That is a most involved business. I will soon send a draft of a procuration; let him keep quiet and remain in peace. I will see to it that justice is done him.

* * *

S. 627. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 24, 1832, Agen

I had just finished answering you and Brother Saumade, my dear Son, when I had the visit of his sister and his brothers-in-law. It seems that everything will be settled without a lawsuit against their uncle. I told them I had just received a word from Célestin [Saumade]; he has the

power of attorney his sister had sent him. They said they would write to him from here; I added that Célestin would sign nothing that did not come from me, that his presence here would serve no purpose because he was not equipped to discuss such complicated matters; if he were here, he would have to choose a wise and knowledgeable counsel. They all left without coming to a decision. Something is not very clear here; the uncle did not come back to see me. Patience yet for a while. Brother Saumade must not write anything; I will tell him what he is to do.

My dear Son, do what you can. . .

*

*. . . But let it be done without the expenses. . .
that a transfer to a large hall would entail;
it will suffice that it be done with decency.*

* * *

S. 628. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 29, 1832, Agen

Let us submit to them with complete resignation.

When they had concluded their affairs, the sister and the uncle of Brother Saumade, M. Lafite, came to see me. His brother-in-law must have sent him a power of attorney, the same, they tell me, that his sister had received from her husband. I asked to see it before it was sent, but in vain. I insisted that the young man could sign nothing I had not seen and approved.

In any case, have a notary give Brother Saumade a general power of attorney authorizing his proxy to represent him in all family matters, and specifically (1) to ratify, if need be, the partition of the family possessions, (2), also to ratify the sale of his own share, (3) to receive the proceeds and amounts due and to give a receipt for the same, (4) to settle with his tutor or with the widow (his tutor died) anything outstanding for his services.

It is said that until his death the tutor (M. Bayle) ???received from M. Lafite the interest on the assets of the minors, but he never did render an account before his death. He sold everything he owned and bought a property in his wife's name; the latter claims she owes the minors nothing.

The power of attorney should bear no name. I will see to it that the name of a solid citizen, familiar with business matters, appears on it; he will study all the documents relating to the matter. Brother Saumade's share amounts to something like 800 livres, and his sister's also. To avoid a lawsuit, M. Lafite gives to both 100 francs more than the value of their share. Also to avoid a lawsuit, Brother Saumade's sister says she enounces??? what M. Bayle had obtained for them, something like 300 and 500 francs. Please obtain that procuration, with no names, and send it along as soon as possible.

I wrote to you, my dear Son, as well as to Brother Saumade. . .

* * *

S. 628-2. To Archbishop de Cheverus of Bordeaux

June 2, 1832, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Superior General of the Society of Mary, assume the responsibility for M. Fontaine, a member of the said Society, even should he withdraw from it, so that His

Excellency, the Archbishop of Bordeaux, who had the kindness to incorporate him into his diocese, will never have him as a dependent.

Done at Agen, where I am presently on business for the Society, June 2, 1832.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 631. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

June 18, 1832, Agen

If you have not yet asked Brother Saumade to draw up that procuration, as I asked you recently, please do it now. All his relatives, particularly his uncle M. Lafite, are impatient. They would like to see the end of the whole matter.

Father Lalanne has just written me a rather long letter.

* * *

S. 632. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

June 23, 1832, Agen

I am going to explain myself.

Father Lalanne maintained that if he were to be truly superior, the office of temporalities should be subject entirely to him, and he should name its incumbent. Father has always considered the administration of the property of Saint-Remy as the function of the office of temporalities. However, Brother Clouzet had similar ideas, and he interprets to his own advantage what I say about that office. The result is a misunderstanding between him and Father Lalanne, an unavoidable collision, and Father may have rightfully complained at times that he was superior in name but not in practice.

For more than 18 months Father Lalanne has contested the article of the Constitutions defining Brother Clouzet's attributions as Head of Temporalities, and he has always considered the administration of the property of Saint-Remy as a responsibility of the Office of Temporalities. However clear and well-reasoned my numerous answers on this point have been, Father was never satisfied. His reasoning, according to your reports, is keen and fair, up to a point. I am not surprised that in the disputes he has had, he successfully argued his point. Why could my answers not have established a distinction? Undoubtedly because in my correspondence I took too much for granted. But (1) by the same order I confer on Brother Clouzet three separate and distinct functions and (2) in subsequent letters I clarify his duties, and above all I recommend that he habitually make a distinction between the administration of the properties of Saint-Remy and Marast and the financial management of the community of which he is the Head of Temporalities.

It seems, from all that you tell me, that Brother Clouzet

*

. . . a reply from Brother Clouzet and your own observations.

At this point in my letter I received a communication from Brother Brunet. After describing in metaphors the troubles that are plaguing Father Lalanne, he writes of the moldy bread, of which you have some knowledge. Do you really believe, my dear Son, that there exists a Rule under which a person is appointed director of a house, be it even a boarding establishment, where the said superior does not have the duty to see that good bread is served? And if the superior has that right, is it not the duty of the buyer to serve good bread? I do not mean that the

steward must discard bread that is moldy or too dry, but that he must try to use it according to its degree of deterioration. I quote this example because this is the one that is actually adduced???. However, this is true for every possible case involving the diet. It is unthinkable that as Head of Temporalities, Brother Clouzet has not grasped the limits of his authority in the field of economy. The Rule was a very wise one and has proven its worth over many years. Some cases may be encountered that have not been foreseen, but why not present these cases and have them resolved? What code of law dispenses a defendant from recourse to the jurisprudence of the courts? But again, this is not how these things were considered; in the face of arbitrariness I had to react. If the Society rejected long-standing rules without replacing them with tried new ones, it would be without a constitutional basis.

You must suffer, my dear Son, from all these mistakes. . .

*

. . . the way of life; faith and charity alone make us walk on it.

I have always doubted Brother Fridblatt's ability to attain his goal; even when he seems to tend to perfection, he is merely seeking himself. If you study him closely, you will note that his judgment is not always sound. He states a principle but does not draw the natural conclusions, etc. If he has faith and the fear of the Lord, as seems to be the case, these divine favors seemingly do not occupy the place they should in his soul. I do not believe he possesses much ecclesiastical science. The more he thinks he has, the more skeptical I am. It will be hard to decide whether he should receive Holy Orders. Be patient and see to it that he does not disturb the others.

Brother Fridblatt, you say, insists on being presented for holy orders.

*

He has only obeyed a formal order.

I think you have reasons to worry about Brother Jacquot unless he breaks his friendship with Brother Fridblatt. I have no comment to make as yet on the three ecclesiastics of Saint-Claude, nor on the Bavarian. Brother Pelleteret the elder was dismissed from Bordeaux only after we had tried everything. He was refused entrance to Saint-Remy, but he was free to present himself. See what you can do about this case.

I will say nothing about the four new lay postulants or the two working men who are still undecided. Brother Diringue is very unstable. He shows little faith and not much religion, although his passions are strong. He was accepted, I suppose, because we needed a baker, and he was put to work immediately. You will need great prudence and firmness to dispel his worldly ideas and sentiments. Brother Jamingros should have left the Society long ago, or have been asked to leave. Before deciding anything about Brother Etignard, you must see whether a simple diet of vegetables is really harmful to his health, or if this is just a natural repugnance which he is not courageous enough to overcome. I do not recall that he ever complained of the diet at Saint-Laurent, yet it is about the same as at Saint-Remy.

Is there really a vocation to the religious state as there is. . .

* * *

S. 634. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

July 13, 1832, Agen

. . . accept consequences likely to be very annoying to the establishment.

You would be taxed with superior wisdom if you thought the move to be fitting, good and necessary. It is too bad that the students and the teachers have been aware of these difficulties.

I like music very much, and I desire that it be taught. . .

*

Let us bless his holy Name in whatever happens!

For the time being I will give no other answer to Brother Clouzet and Father Meyer. Tell the former that I have received the power of attorney for Brother Saumade, that the young man's affairs are progressing favorably, and that I am waiting for their conclusion before answering his recent letter. Enclosed is an answer for Brother Fridblatt; you may read it then seal and deliver it.

Take good care of all your people. . .

* * *

S. 636. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

July 22, 1832, Agen

. . . can you not you imagine the same for me?

In your letter of July 4, my dear Son, you discuss the plans of Brother Clouzet, and you reject them as impracticable. Then you suggest several of your own. You seem to think that in my letter to Brother Clouzet I approve every one of his suggestions. This is completely false; let us not muddy the waters, for the problem is simplicity itself. In order to restore union and concord, so sadly disrupted at Saint-Remy, you suggest that the boarding establishment be treated separately from the property; then you propose that I allow you to appoint your Head of Temporalities for the residence.

In view of the difficult times in which we live and anxious to have peace at any price, I accede to your wishes under three simple conditions. The first would include the reasons for my permission; the second gives the scope of the permission and how to use it; the third is left up to you. There is a question of a pure and simple separation. Before allowing this, I wish to consult Brother Clouzet and Father Chevaux—not that my consent depends on their acquiescence, but in case I should take some precaution which I do not foresee. On the next day, June 18, I sent Brother Clouzet an excerpt from the letter I was writing to you, dealing with the separation. He erred when he said the plan was of his conceiving. I had only one plan in mind in my letter to him, the one contained in the excerpt from your letter.

I cannot understand why, if we all go ahead with honesty of purpose. . .

* * *

S. 639. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

August 9, 1832, Agen

. . . for the divine service in the chapel

Brother Clouzet has no clear understanding of the attributes of the Head of Temporalities. He believes that if the Head is dependent upon the Superior, both the exercise of his functions and the Society which conferred the office would be harmed. However, it is useless to discuss this aspect because Father Lalanne wants a separation, and especially a separation of the accounting. According to his plan, he is right. When I acceded to his request under three simple conditions, I foresaw it and looked upon it as necessary. The burning question is not whether the Society of Mary will find in it more advantages than losses, more or fewer headaches or satisfactions; the

true question is the preservation of peace. This was Father Lalanne's motive, and this is the reason I agreed. It is more a cease-fire than a true peace. I made sure he understood this when I insisted that the plan was temporary. I explained to Father why I was loathe to agree to his wishes.

I surely desire, my dear Son, that all your dispensations. . .

* * *

S. 640. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

August 24, 1832, Agen

Eight years to the realization of your teaching projects. . .

Involving a number of selected students whose education you would supervise to the very end.

I always admitted to you that I thought the collège's educational. . .

*

. . . in this you find yourself neither the gainer nor the loser.

The question of the debts contracted by Brother Clouzet must also be settled. To eliminate all discussion, I would say that all current active and passive debts must be the preoccupation of Brother Clouzet so that you will not be engrossed in the liquidation. But there is also the question of the long-standing debts, some caused by the furnishings and repairs to the château, others by the addition of buildings and by the increase of the productivity. Among these is an annual pension of 1,200 francs to Father Bardenet. I believe Brother Clouzet should take care of this himself. Of the first type of debts, there are the 4,000 francs borrowed from M. Pidoux and the 3,000 francs received from Mme Chevaux. Because the plan is temporary, it is not logical to leave these debts entirely to you. Your responsibility is for the simple interest due to Mme Chevaux, and the compound for M. Pidoux; Father Caillet may be able to pay all this or not. This will simplify matters for you, and Brother Clouzet will be relieved somewhat. I need not add that you must take care of the buildings and furniture as a good father of a family would, to use the terms found in similar arrangements.

As regards the repairs that the separation requires. . .

* * *

S. 641-2. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

September 10, 1832, Agen

(Autograph, Agmar)

I am sending you a prompt answer to your letter of September 8. Although I did not express myself about the matter of M. de Laurenceau, I have not ceased thinking about it. However, I thank you for volunteering some ideas of your own; this will be of assistance if I do not know how to profit by the present to prepare for the future.

Our indebtedness to M. Latour to the tune of 20,000 francs weighs heavy on my heart from the first moment, and Brother Auguste's behavior has aggravated it. I am haunted by the thought that links the one with the other; it is rarely a pleasant one. Our debt has more serious consequences than you know. Your zeal in improving the property of Saint-Loubès is another proof of your interest in our embarrassing situation. I have often thought of using this property to discharge our indebtedness. Then I said to myself, "That is not possible, for Brother David has

not suggested it.” Then a word to Brother Auguste, and I received that consoling explanation; however, I did feel sorry because of the pain it caused you.

Many uncharitable things have been said in the past about the donation of the Armenaud brothers. Everything was done secretly. When I did find out about it later, I had to be content with berating those responsible. I had no inkling that the document was irregular in form, and the notary’s reputation for honesty and competence was common knowledge. M. Caron has great influence over M. Armenaud the elder. I believe he could easily persuade him to draw up a conventional contract, especially if no expense were involved.

My dear Son, my letter suggesting those three articles will help to jog your memory. I believe I commented on each one in my answer. All that I can recall with any exactitude is that Brother Auguste would withdraw, taking with him all that he had on entering, and that he offered his services to the residence until we could find him a replacement.

My dear Son, take care of your health, and believe in my most steadfast and sincere friendship.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

P.S. Some other time I will talk to you about M. Dubari, a young man who needs much vigilant care.

* * *

S. 642-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Saint-Remy

September 10 and 11, 1832, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

In my letter of last June 17, I acceded to your wishes to separate completely the administration of the residence from that of the property of Saint-Remy and from all unrelated aspects. This means you expected to have your own accounting and to name your own Head of Temporalities who would be responsible to you alone. You gave as the reason for the move the necessity to adopt a measure which would guarantee understanding and union between us.

However, my dear Son, I accepted under three conditions which were (1) that the separation would be temporary; (2) that you would live in the château and use some of the property, such as the gardens, for the residence, as would a lessee responsible for the upkeep and repairs but with no power to make a fundamental change without a written permission; and (3) that you yourself would decide what you could do for the community. From the date of the acceptance of these conditions, all income, as the parents settled their accounts, would find its way into the common coffers—tuition, bed and board of the boarders, etc. However, this decision will become effective only when I have done some investigation of the situation.

In your answer of June 26 to mine of June 17 you say, “I received your letter on Sunday, the Octave of the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, and I thanked God for the wise condescension with which he inspired you and which will be the salvation of our establishment. I thank you also, but I would be more satisfied if you appeared more convinced of the pertinence, the value, and the need of the measure to which you agree.”

Since June 25 I have considered both sides of the question. According to some information coming from Saint-Remy, and apprehensive that that you might not have fully grasped the meaning of my three conditions, I thought it best before approving the project to write to you on August 23. I told you, in brief, that my reasons for the provisional nature of the agreement were (1) the respite needed to catch my breath and (2) to reestablish as soon as possible order and unity, those essentials that are conformable to the spirit of the Society of Mary. I remarked about the second condition how awkward it would be if, while I was establishing

order and unity so essential to its administration, changes were made in the halls the leveling of partitions, etc. This restriction is always in force. As to the third condition, I leave up to you to decide the rental to be paid for those occupying rooms in the château. You leave it up to me. Taking everything into consideration, I do not believe 50 francs per boarder is exaggerated, and this contribution should be paid, like the tuition, every quarter in advance. It will help support the other part of the community.

Finally, I pointed out that the rental for beds used by the boarders is, they tell me, 20 francs per year; this should be given to the community. I also told you that you would have to pay Brother Clouzet 5% simple interest on the 3,000 francs received from Mme Chevaux, and also the compound interest on 4,000 francs to M. Pidoux, but only as long as you are director of the residence.

Because your letter of September 1, in answer to mine of August 23, contains no comment, everything is settle as outlined in this letter. You can proceed with the separation as soon as you have formally indicated to Brother Clouzet that you accept all the conditions listed in this letter. May the peace of the Lord be always with you.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 643. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

September 23, 1832, Agen

In the temporary provisions I am insisting on there is no mystery.

I gave you two reasons in the letter which you are answering. The second condition is only a consequence of the first and gives the purpose. Besides, my dear Son, is it seemly that two people vowed to poverty should stress financial considerations? I thought it wise to agree to the separation in order to avoid more deplorable results brought about by your constant resistance.

I look upon this separation as a moral evil, which, I think. . .

*

. . . that everything that I do say is true and clear.

Although the bed rental is included in your prospectus along with school supplies and laundry, you should have no trouble making the separation. When I wrote that condition, I had in mind 20 francs per bed. Should you lose something at that rate, it cannot be much. When I spoke of that section of the community living in some of the rooms of the château, I used the short term, community, as is usually done (and no one is misled). However, in my letter outlining our final arrangements, I refer to the two parts of the community. We are not talking here, my dear Son, of the respective rights of two parts of the same community, absolutely and definitively separated, but of a temporary separation. That part of the community living in the château makes no demands upon you. I believe they will not even know of the arrangements that have been made. They must know of the separation, for reasons of regularity and obedience. Whether your service to the community is called help, or fraternal assistance, or a duty, has no importance, provided you keep the arrangements that have been mutually agreed upon.

As to compensation, I discussed that aspect in my letter of June 17. Here is what I said. "From the date of the acceptance of these conditions, all income, as the parents settled their accounts, would find its way into the common coffers, tuition, bed and board of the boarders, etc." Any other procedure would have led to endless discussion and misunderstanding. My dear Son, I want no more of that! When I spoke of the compound interest on the sum owed M. Pidoux, I wanted to fix the sum you would have to pay Brother Clouzet on that debt without being taxed with usury. The debts must still be in Brother Clouzet's name and in his care. While you are not

obliged to settle long-standing debts, you may certainly do so when you are able (in whole or in part), and you could soon be able if your expenses for the residence are reasonable.

My dear Son, I cannot grant the altogether general request. . .

*

But you have lights. . . . I am stopping.

In the postscript of your letter you tell me that we must decide on how to share the personnel. You say that only one novice was destined for the normal school (M. David). Unless you have another who can more competently take charge of a division of the normal school, you will have to leave him there. His must not be a part-time novitiate. But if you lack a good teacher of writing, you could share Brother Hunolt with the boarding school. Brother Gaussens leaves tomorrow for Saint-Remy. He has been ill all this year; the trip to Agen has helped him, and he is now well enough to make the trip to Saint-Remy. Worry over his condition disturbs him to some extent. Besides, I learn from Saint-Remy that the Rector of the Academy of Besançon did not see his plans materialize. He may now be less hostile to the normal school of Saint-Remy, especially if it is well organized.

I can say nothing about the trips made by Brothers Brunet and Guillegoz, for nothing can be done. Not being aware of the circumstances, I can say nothing positive about the exchange between Paris and Saint-Remy. The question is very delicate, especially to have someone make vows before his novitiate and to send him to Paris.

I must stop this long, perhaps too long, letter; at least. . .

* * *

S. 643-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

September 23, 1832, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

My answer to your letters of September 7 and September 11 will be short; I will send you a copy of my answer to one from Father Lalanne of September 8. In my answer you will discover a new development in the definitive agreement I sent to Father Lalanne, of which you must have a copy. When you write, please acknowledge reception of my letters of such and such a date. Brother Gaussens will leave tomorrow for Bordeaux; he has made a tolerable recovery. I will send obediences to Brothers Hunolt and David. If what I tell him is not sufficient, I will send an obedience also to Brother Claverie. Brother Dormoy writes not to tell me of his distaste for the château, but of the proximity of his relatives, just as he always did when I was at Saint-Remy.

As to the division of assets, I decided everything in my first answer to the separation. If Father Lalanne needs funds for repairs or for the opening of school, satisfy him as much as you can on the condition that he will reimburse you from the tuition, and as soon as possible. Do not discuss with Father Lalanne; hold him to his agreement with me, but your firmness must always be tempered with sweetness and openness. May the peace of the Lord be always with you.,

* * *

S. 646-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

October 29, 1832, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I have received your short letters, and just now the note you inserted in the letter from Father Chevaux. On opening it I found the money order you promised several times and which Brother Galliot also had announced. You delayed, I suspect, to allow it to increase in value.

Although I had a myriad things to take care of, as soon as I heard that the separation had taken place, I appointed Father Chevaux the superior of the new community, to which I added the title of Head of Zeal, while he retains that of Master of Novices. At the same time I sent Brother Gaussens an obedience appointing him director of the normal school and Head of Instruction. You are always Head of Temporalities but with no other dealings with the business of the residence than to oversee the conditions I imposed on Father Lalanne. I have just informed Father Lalanne of the appointment of Father Chevaux. I also voiced my displeasure at the discussions you had with him about the allotment of the furniture; neither of you has the required authority. It would have been more prudent to send me a list of all the movables, along with your individual needs. It does seem that in general the practice of the vows of poverty and obedience is not too much in honor at Saint-Remy. The struggle which has lasted three years (God grant that it may be over!) has done great harm to Saint-Remy, not only to the religious spirit but even to the letter. I will do what I can to remedy this serious evil.

I will write to Brother Saumade; if he is well enough, you may send him to Courtefontaine. I will recommend the move. Meanwhile, someone must learn to bake bread.

In answering my letters, my dear Son, please indicate the dates and contents of my letters. Cut the expenses caused by the separation to a minimum, as I suggested several times, because it can be only temporary and brought about, as it was, by the circumstances. Not that there should not be some sort of separation, but they are all of the same family We will see in happier times. Write as soon as possible, and believe in my paternal tenderness.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 647. To Fr. Léon Meyer

October 29, 1832, Agen

. . . to fulfill your duties in the best possible way.

For three years Father Lalanne has been stubbornly struggling with me to become completely independent at Saint-Remy. Twice he even threatened to break away from the Society. Finally, last summer, he suggested as a means of establishing peace, the separation of the residence from the property. I agreed on three conditions, the first being that the separation would be temporary—that is, until I could reestablish a unified authority in the place.

This seemed to please Father, and he immediately thanked me. He would have liked me to acquiesce with pleasure. I have never disguised from him my sorrow over the move, and that only my desire for peace and the revolutionary times in which we lived induced me to agree.

I do trust Brother Clouzet, but not blindly. Only recently has Father Lalanne complained about Brother Clouzet, especially once when moldy bread was served at the boarding house. Ever since, he has been striving to have the property of Saint-Remy. Father is convinced that as superior he must oversee all material things as well as the personnel. Such an authority has existed nowhere in the world. It would seem he had never revealed his true intention to anyone in this community, but he has complained now to one then to another in the community about the way Brother Clouzet carried out his assignment. I have never attacked Father's intentions, for I have always believed them good in his own mind and in his heart; but five or six times. Had Brother Clouzet been disobedient in matters that were of his competence, if his behavior as steward of the house were reprehensible, had he refused to listen to the complaints of Father Lalanne, the latter had only to tell me and I would have seen to everything. This is what I am telling him today in a letter I have just sent. But let us forget all this, and pray to God. The Good

Master we serve will not forget us. I hope even that a great good will come from the evil we deplore.

Brother Galliot, the director of Courtefontaine. . .

* * *

S. 648. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 14, 1832, Agen

. . . the sad state in which my letter of October 29 must have put you.

Lest I forget, let me acknowledge receipt of your money order for 559 francs coming from Brother Rothéa. I also received the 1,000 francs enclosed in the letter to which I am replying. This sum includes 300 francs from Brother Galliot and 200 from Brother Bousquet. I will notify each one. The other 500 francs are from your account.

You ask me, "What crime have I then committed?"

*

But why make me inferior to those I have drawn. . .

. . . into religious life. . .

. . . in the Society of Mary, and in particular of the one. . .

* * *

S 649-2. To Bro. David Monier

November 21, 1832, Agen

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

With pleasure I greeted the arrival of the compromise plan, signed by M. Auguste. I will hurriedly have a copy made, I will sign it and send it on to you in exchange.

My dear Son, you have launched the settlement with M. Auguste too successfully not to carry it to the limit. As soon as the arbiters, chosen and willing, have accepted, we will try, M. Auguste and I, to agree on all points that might present some difficulty. I will submit all writings to you, as to my counsel, and you will decide when we are to have recourse to the arbiters for a decision. The matter should progress rapidly unless M. Auguste puts obstacles in the way. Until now, M. Auguste speaks only of compensation for his personal debts, of the revenues from his assets. This is a serious point, especially since he has no recollection of the amounts. Once that is decided, I think we should discuss his accounts; you will check these and send them to me with your remarks. If you agree, I will so inform M. Auguste.

Concerning the appointment of arbiters, I do not believe my presence in Bordeaux would be useful; it would merely delay matters, or even worse. Let us make the least noise possible. Agree with M. Auguste, I beg you, both as to the appointment of the arbiters and your relationship with them. If minutes are kept of this appointment, M. Auguste will sign a copy which you will send to me for my signature, or use any method that will be better and more rapid. If you think the arbiter you choose might show reluctance, you could sound him out first, even in my name. I will then write to him anything you suggest.

Be assure, my dear Son, of my perfect devotedness.

* * *

S. 650. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

November 29, 1832, Agen

My dear Son,

I am of the opinion that all the items on the list presented by Father Chevaux that antedate the settlement, or that you have not expressly promised, should be struck off. Also the bill for those books that came for the teachers. This way, if you are not starting in the black at least you are not in the red, except for those debts you yourself have contracted. Now repay the 1,200 francs loaned you by M. Brunet, the 900 francs you were loaned in cash, and the 160 francs for the flour. As far as *boni* is concerned, I think there would be hardly any, at least of any consequence; from what I hear there is rather a deficit. I will study the matter when I have all the information. At the present time, let us think only of establishing a real peace, that union and charity may resume their rule, and that each one may observe the conditions of the separation, good or bad, until we arrive at an altogether religious system.

My dear Son, you tell me you have a surplus of articles you do not need and which no one seems interested in. Here is what Brother Clouzet writes on November 2.

“Father Lalanne is still waiting for your answer about the mattresses, blankets, two new bedsteads, a writing desk and other articles which I want you to dispose of, as also the musical instruments, especially those used by Brother Hunolt; a flute, a clarinet, a bassoon, and a primitive harp. Should he keep these? There are many other articles at the château. Two years ago I had a collection of sketches brought in from Mulhouse for linear drawing; can we keep these?”

“I had asked Father Chevaux to see Father Lalanne about vestments and chapel linen; He has just told me that he refused all such articles sent by Father Lalanne because they were all worn and could not be sued without violating the canons of the Church.”

This is followed by many details on the library and the books which compose it.

Try, my dear Son, to end everything amicably.

* * *

S. 653. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

December 10, 1832, Agen

Wisdom in handling matters, you will find yourself more at ease.

I agree that you limit the number of boarders to 55 for this year because of the expenses entailed; I will so inform Brother Clouzet.

As regards the wall of separation. . .

*

Doubtless, there was no question of Greek.

Your reasoning, my dear Son, on your rights to communal lumber because of your property assessment seems entirely just in the purely civil order. But to keep the present relationship between you and Brother Clouzet, the wood should be divided equally between the two communities, and Brother Clouzet should pay half the property tax. I think it would be prudent that this will be known only to you, Brother Clouzet, and Father Chevaux.

The reasons for not sending you Brother Bonnet. . .

* * *

S. 654. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 10, 1832, Agen

As you see, it is not by halves that I have confidence in Brother Gobillot. . .
You must buy not only M. Ricot's part, but also that of Brother Gobillot. The first half you will pay as agreed; the second, that of Brother Gobillot, you will agree with him on an annual payment of 350 or 400 francs, this sum to be paid to the Society of Mary by you for the time that he will remain in the Society; should he leave, then the annuity would be paid to him. M. Gobillot does not wish to tap his income from the sale of his property; he has complete trust in our own solvency, and he is not opposed to your reselling the property and banking the proceeds.

Once you have bought the property you can lease it out taking care that the lease can be revocable at will in case you should wish to see it, unless the lessee has objections. . . . I will come back to this topic. Tell Brother Gobillot I give him permission to deal with you in this matter.

I have answered most of the questions which you. . .

* * *

S. 656. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

December 30, 1832, Agen

. . . by mild insinuations, instructions, exhortations, etc.

You did well, my dear Son, to continue to teach at the château; Father Lalanne now realizes that you cannot go on, both for the reasons you mention and also for those of your health. He asked me to have you replaced by Brother Bonnet. Believing the change in him was sincere, I answered that I would willingly have acceded to his wishes, but that for serious reasons I could not, at least for the present. He was to do his utmost to lessen your burden.

I have not been able to take up my pen since the last retreat. . .

*

I feel so keenly the need for it.

I am sorry about the incident with the horse. In case of any difficulty or doubt, why not divide the rest in a manner to compensate for this trifling incident? I would like to believe that since your last letter, the furniture has been divided between you in a just and fraternal manner. I do not intend to write to Father Lalanne or to Brother Clouzet about this unless they do not follow my instructions. I believe I made these abundantly clear. If we apply strictly the religious principles to the case of the horse, it would be wrong of Father Lalanne to claim the proceeds. It did not belong to him; he merely had the use of it. But because both Father and Brother had in mind the separation when the horse was sold, although nothing had as yet been decided and each had at heart the interests of his respective community, I believe Brother Clouzet should refund him half the sale price.

I have just reread what you say about the division of the furniture. If Father Lalanne has not changed his mind about his first plan in this regard, please tell him from me to reconsider it. I was truly sorry to see that peace and union still did not reign at Saint-Remy. Tell me later what happened.

Brother Claverie is not strong in grammar.

*

. . . the opportune time for speaking has yet to come.

Although Father Rothéa asked both Saint-Remy and Bordeaux for a replacement for Brother Claverie, he was unsuccessful. I will send him one immediately. He is wrong to suppose that Brother Bouverete was sent to the little communal school at Courtefontaine.

Brother Clouzet has excellent qualities. . .

* * *

S. 656. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

Agen. December 30, 1832, Agen

. . . a reliable and competent counselor and support.

If Brother Pimouguet has finally decided to accept direction and to follow orders, you can hasten his departure for Agen. His whims are well enough known here so that the more egregious ones can be checked. I will include a short note for him in this letter.

I will give you, my dear Son, no other presents.

* * *

**S. 657-2. An Agreement between the Daughters of Mary
And the Society of Mary**

December 30, 1832, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

Between the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, the said Institute being represented by Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, Superior General, Sister Louis de Gonzague, *née* Mlle Poitevin, Mistress of Novices, and Sister Visitation, Head of Temporalities, and Sister Marie Louise, Secretary of the Council . . .

The Society of Mary represented by Father Chaminade, Superior General.

The undersigned, having made a study of our joint accounts for the period from July 25, 1831 to September 18 of the same year, during which time the invoices, ledgers, and other papers were examined, just compensations for exchange of goods were made, said goods not having a fixed value, and the accounts of Milles Thérèse and François Schneider and Mlle Durrenbach were kept up to date, we affirm that the sums received by the Society of Mary amount to 67,762 francs, 50 centimes; and without including the sums advanced by the establishment of Saint-Remy to the convents of Arbois and Acey, of which we have not yet received an exact account. Therefore, the Society of Mary is indebted to the Institute of the Daughters of Mary for a sum of 12,064.80 francs, from which it will subtract the amount advanced to the convents of Arbois and Acey once these accounts have been verified, without prejudice to the sums which the Institute of the Daughters of Mary have coming to them from Alsace, either from the Milles Schneider or from Mlle Durrenbach, that is, 6,300 francs from Milles Schneider and 2,000 from Mlle Durrenbach.

The undersigned point out that these joint expenses were made (1) to buy and repair the convent of Tonneins, (2) to buy and repair the convent of Bordeaux, both of these being the property of the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, (3) to maintain during seven years the novitiate which had been transferred to Bordeaux, (4) to maintain assets, both in Bordeaux and in Alsace, of 20, 364.80 francs.

The present document was read by both parties, is accompanied by all the details of the joint accounts and especially by the audit of August 30 last; both parties have signed and declared it mutually satisfactory.

Made in duplicate, in good faith, at Agen, September 18, 1831.

Because Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, Superior General, hesitated to sign this audit and expressed the desire to have all the accounts reexamined by Sister Emmanuel, *née* Mlle Lhuillier, Head of Instruction of the convent of Condom and presently at the convent of Agen, the said Superior General felt obliged to submit the whole to an ecclesiastical Council, wise and enlightened and worthy of all confidence—these examinations, investigations, and consultations resulted in no change in the statement of September last but merely delayed the signing until today, October 30, 1831. Because of the absence of Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, the present statement will be sent to her for her signature, for before her departure she took cognizance of all the investigations made by Sister Emmanuel and had the approval of her Council.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, Sup. D.F.D.M.

Sr. L. de Gonzague, *née* Poitevin, Mother of Novices

Sr. Visitation, Head of Temporalities,

Sr. Louise Marie, Secretary

Sr. Emmanuel, Head of Instruction at Condom.

We, the undersigned Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, Superior General of the Daughters of Mary, and Father Chaminade, Superior General of the Society of Mary, after a careful examination of these accounts which were submitted to them, have concluded that the sums advanced to the convents of Arbois and Acey by the Society of Mary amount in all to 3,861 francs, which sum being subtracted from 12,064.80 francs which the Society of Mary hereby declares itself in debt to the Institute, yields 8,203.80 francs. In witness whereof we have signed the present statement in duplicate.

At Agen, December 5, 1832

G.-Joseph Chaminade

Sister Saint-Vincent Labastide, Sup. Gen. of the D.M.

12,064.80 F — 3,861 F = 8,203.80 F Received on account, 4,759.50 F, Agen, November 22, 1832

I, the undersigned, after careful deliberation and having observed that Father Chaminade, our Superior General, either through generosity or kindness, had omitted to include various items which he had furnished to the Daughters of Mary, which in total would amount to a sum higher than that which he had declared, I begged him to accept to be dispensed of the debt of 8,203.40 F mentioned above and to accept a receipt for the same.

In return for the loyalty and thoughtfulness of the Mother Superior General, I renounce the secret satisfaction I had reserved to myself of declaring myself debtor to the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, and I accept the sum of 8,203.80 francs mentioned above, and which she included with her copy of the statement on the condition, however, that through loyalty or thoughtfulness, she never again reconsider what may have been omitted in my indebtedness, and that all statements, bills, letters, and other writings containing such material will be burned.

In witness whereof, at Agen, December 30, 1832

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 658. To Bro. David Monier

January 7, 1833, Agen

. . . have the goodness to draw up the plan for me.

I consider it an advantage that Brother Gaussens is now at Saint-Remy and cannot replace me in this delicate situation.

You tell me, my dear Son, "No doubt there will be some deficit. . ."

*

Then calumny is in a favorable condition for its evil work.

M. Auguste first suggested that he could compensate for the debts he had on entering the Society by the revenues from his assets which went to the Society. According to him, these debts amounted to something like 6,000 francs. I thought it best to refrain from answering until both sides had signed the compromise. Let him now make me a suggestion. Now, is it not imperative first to know the full amount of his indebtedness? I believe that it is more than 14,000 francs, and I am certain it is more than 13,000 francs. If the revenues received are given in compensation for those debts, then (1) M. Auguste would leave richer than when he arrived and (2) we would have to evaluate those revenues. Now it has been proven that those revenues, especially from M^élac, were hypothetical because (a) of the high cost of cultivating the property, (b) of the plantations and improvements with which he enhanced the value of his assets. Could I not put this question to you—should we draw M. Auguste’s attention to all the expenses made at M^élac? *And ???*(c) I cannot say that M. Auguste’s case has been foreseen in the states approved by the government. You should remember if it is.

The most difficult thing to achieve in this matter. . .

*

. . . ambition is not to be displeasing to our great Master.

The only business letter which the Armeaud Brothers received from their mother in Saint-Loubès was the one informing them, last year, that he would turn over to me the proceeds from the sale of the wine, completed or projected. I do not believe I need to send this on to you. They sent me no copies of their correspondence; I cannot suppose they kept any. I think we should go ahead.

I hope I have entirely answered your letter. . .

* * *

S. 660. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

Agen, January 14, 1833, Agen

. . . recourse must be made to an authority superior to his.

What is Brother Clouzet’s authority today, both as Head of Temporalities and as administrator of the properties of Saint-Remy and Marast? In what is he and must he be dependent on the director? These two questions seem to embarrass you. The answer flows from the principles I have given you.

I explained to you how the Head of Temporalities depended on the superior; the task of administering would naturally belong to that head and would be part of his office. I made a distinction between the two because of their necessity and their importance. I foresaw possible disorders from the very beginning, and therefore I outlined the duties of each of these offices. For instance, he had to make a distinction between the expenses and revenues of the properties from those of the residences, etc. This must be done now that the communities are separate, just as it was done before. I believe that with the contributions of the community of the ch[^]teau, we will find ourselves better off than before the separation, especially if the residence and the normal school flourish.

I will say a word to Father Lalanne to persuade him. . .

* * *

S. 661. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

January 23, 1833, Agen

. . . the place that I have given him in my heart.

Father Rollinet has written me a very fine letter; he wants to make his novitiate in the house designated for that purpose. I asked Father Chevaux to profit by his goodwill and his initial fervor to, etc. . . . I hope to be able to answer Father Rollinet very soon. I see no reason why he could not continue to give lessons in theology to Brother Etignard.

I am not rereading this long letter. . .

* * *

S. 664-2. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Bordeaux

February 13, 1833, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I felt I should write again to M. Auguste after your letter and my prompt answer to the same. Brother Troffer will undoubtedly have something to add to it. Enclosed is a copy of the one I am sending to M. Auguste. I embrace you tenderly.

* * *

S. 666. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

February 23, 1833, Agen

. . . to determine the object of the vows that were to be made.

In your report on the state of the notebook entitled *Institut de Marie*, of which you have made a faithful copy, you say that one-third of the way through the notebook you encountered “three lines of consecutive dots.” These three lines mean that there has been a lengthy omission. Everything after these was omitted except the four and one-half lines at the end which begin, “The state of each house, etc.” The same lines are repeated both at the end of the general impressions of the *Institut de Marie* presented for the approbation of Mgr. d’Aviau, and at the end of the notebook, in order to express what had been omitted and indicated by the dotted lines.

By means of the note on page 8 and by this repetition, I indicated clearly enough that the particular regulations, called details of government, were not to be considered as definitive articles of a constitution.

On account of the very great confidence I had. . .

*

It is useless here to give you the reasons.

Here I am referring only to the first notebook and to its misuse, not because of any malicious intent but for lack of reflection and experience. Besides, the true copy of this first notebook will be very useful to us; we are fortunate that it has been found. I also hope to find the original

It has already been a week since I began writing to you. . .

* * *

S. 667. To Fr. Georges Caillet

February 28, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

I have just sent word to our notary in Agen about the procuration relative to the deceased M. Laforgue. I will send it to you along with the agreement which should be in the hands of M. Raccouillat by next March 6.

You had better see M. Loustau, the ironmonger, and after assuring him of my friendship, tell him that I will do my utmost to settle my account with him, but that in view of the situation it would be to his advantage to wait and to be patient; I simply could not forget him.

I believe later on in the month I will be able to pay young Durant, the cooper, the 100 pistoles I owe him. I remember nothing of the papers that were uncovered; let them remain where they were found, but see to it that they come to no harm.

You may tell the master bakers. . .

* * *

S. 671. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 13, 1833, Agen

. . . you will understand why I delayed my answer for some days.

You tell me, my dear Son, that the value of the fields adjacent to M. Nicot's property has dropped in estimated value from 3,600 to 3,200 francs because of the devaluation. I imagine Brother Gobillot's share must be placed at 1,000 francs. That drop of 2,400 francs is considerable and could lead to complications. How did you ever manage to have the brothers-in-law agree to that sum of 2,400 francs? I would have needed this detail in my dealings with Brother Gobillot. You were right in not buying that section of the house from M. Nicot; but did you buy Brother Gobillot's section? You allow me to suppose so. However, you should have said so directly. If you did buy it, how much did you pay? You would have done well also to tell me how Brother Gobillot comported himself throughout the negotiations.

It would seem that the blacksmiths use rather large pieces of wood. You know that as a rule, the timber is cut every 10 years and that the stands of trees at Marast have not been touched in 15 years. Are there no merchants in the country who would buy wood of any age? I believe it would not be a good investment.

One cannot judge, my dear Son, the effectiveness of a retreat. . .

*

. . . in the eyes of God there is lacking to it a single virtue.

Your conduct during the past four years has been most edifying.

Your resistance to Father Lalanne must have been very painful. . .

*

. . . To Father Chevaux to profit by this time of first fervor.

I did not immediately answer Father Rollinet; my answer was ready to be mailed when I heard that he had left. I did not send it.

If it is possible that Father Rollinet would have succeeded. . .

* * *

S. 672. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

March 14, 1833, Agen

. . . wherever the name of the Master is to appear.

However, this does not prevent Brother Clouzet from taking interest in it. Father Lalanne's written statement will receive added support from all the care he devotes to it. But Brothers Gaussens and Clouzet must show a united front, and always seem to be in agreement.

If Father Lalanne repeats his demands. . .

*

. . . tell him that I wrote you that he was not to be admitted.

By this same mailing I am writing to Brother Etignard and to Brother Fridblatt. I am enclosing the letter in this envelope. I will add a postscript to Brother Etignard's letter about M.J. As I was writing to Father, I could not recall what you had told me in your letter to which I am replying. Speak of it to Father Lalanne.

The diocese of Besançon has had a great loss. . .

* * *

S. 673. To Bro. David Monier

March 29, 1833, Agen

The elder Brother Armenaud wrote to his brother at Villeneuve last January, stating that he agreed with you.

* * *

S. 678. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

March 29, 1833, Agen

Furthermore, since his entry he has always been edifying.

I answered almost immediately that the sheet must have been slipped into Brother Langué's letter. You must have received it. At first I thought the one I had just received was in answer to mine. In the first agreement I made with you, you continue to speak of your boarding establishment just as in the past. I asked Brother Clouzet to improve the financial status of the Sainte-Marie residence. I wrote to him, as I told you, and described in broad outline the difficult situation I face because of the finances of that house. I shared with him the means to be taken to improve the situation, etc.

When I received your letter, I told Brother Clouzet. . .

* * *

S. 679. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

April 4, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

As soon as it was necessary to replace M. Auguste, you suggested Father Curot. I expressed my fears that he might not be fit for that new assignment, and also that he might

embarrass me because of his scruples. You did reassure me, although somewhat tardily, about the first source of my fears. As to the second, you felt his scruples would vanish in the midst of so many occupations. I thought at the time that the nature and gravity of these scruples had been exaggerated. However, they have just been confirmed. If you are not aware of them, please have a talk with Father Chevaux. He will undoubtedly tell you what he wrote to me earlier. Here is what Brother Mémain of Bordeaux wrote last March 30.

“Father Lalanne has written a very fine letter to M. Auguste. Without repeating all the good he has to say about him, or the reflections of M. Auguste, I will tell you what he said about his coming to Bordeaux, or at least this is the gist of his letter on that topic. ‘I cannot leave Saint-Remy to go and replace you, but Father Curot will be your substitute. We will meet during the next holidays, and we will organize everything.’

“M. Auguste claims that only Father Lalanne can replace him. He would like to see this for the good of the boarding establishment, and the reasons he gives are good and sound. For the same reasons, I am even more strongly in favor of Father Lalanne than he is. It is so essential that the boarding school be viable, that it be improved even, but I am afraid that with Father Curot it will lose much of the prestige it presently enjoys. M. Auguste is always ready to help in every way possible for the upkeep and the prosperity of the house, and to remain as long as it will be necessary. He told me yesterday that had Father Lalanne come, perhaps he would have stayed on under certain conditions, and Father would have had the support which he never enjoyed. This was just between us, and he would not like this to spread and make any settlement more difficult. He added, ‘I don’t know what I will do; I will see; I have no plan, no project.’”

I would have sent you, my dear Son, an urgent obedience. . .

* * *

S. 680. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

April 5, 1833, Agen

I am sending him a third by this same mail.

I agreed to Father Curot only because Father Lalanne claimed that he was competent and because he did not believe that the boarding establishment could survive his departure from Saint-Remy. I gave him all my objections concerning the choice of Father Curot, even mentioning his scruples, but he was not impressed. In my letter today I beg him to confer with Father Chevaux about their seriousness. Besides, I point out to Father Lalanne all the precautionary measures that could be taken with the secondary boarding school, and this with respect to the teachers and also to the parents of the pupils. If he can agree with me, there will be no more discussion, and I will take all the necessary steps. Father Lalanne can send me Father Curot. He can have him spend some time at Agen. It would be imprudent and even risky not to overhaul the Sainte-Marie boarding house while freeing it from its debts. A concurrent action is needed. To wait until the holidays would mean the death of the work.

I am hoping it will be possible to make the liquidation. . .

*

I hope you will finish by finding what you are after.

Brother Perrin shows no improvement, although his conscience is bothering him. The evil has made such progress and his infidelity is of such long standing that I think a conversion is not possible, or that it will not last if it does take place. I told him that his mother would not come to see him after Easter; she is hoping to see him at Saint-Remy. In vain would he bring up Saint-Remy; I would never send him there in his pitiable state. He told me you wanted to have him there, that you were going to put him in charge of the watch repair section. However, he admits

two things: first, that he is not equipped to head a watch repair section, and that he can be sent to no other house unless he changes radically. A clock repair shop is being set up at Saint-Remy; however, watches will also be repaired. When I passed through Paris I made arrangements to have Brother Huault??? board there, where he could have learned the trade and not been exposed. However, you informed me shortly after my return to Bordeaux that you had dismissed the young man, so I made no mention of my plans.

During the spring laundry period, I asked Father Lalanne to pay you for the entire semester according to our agreement. I told him that this was all you could send me, and that you were going to do so as soon as you received it.

Change and perseverance, my dear Son.

* * *

S. 682. To M. Auguste Brougnon-Perrière

April 9, 1833, Agen

. . . even the constituent principles of our Society.

Solid answers must be based on facts and principles. Here are the facts upon which your first proposition is based.

1. The sum total of your debts.
2. The sum total of the revenues from your assets—we have a fair idea of what these sums represent.
3. A third fact, admitted from the beginning and therefore which need not be mentioned here, that you were one of the founding members of the Society.

These principles guiding our separation must be the same as the constituent principles of our Society.

These constituent principles are of two types. . .

*

. . . as regards the facts and the constituent principles of our Society.

Your remarks would lead someone to believe that you had no part in the request for authorization, and that you merely tolerated the statutes. You also seem to believe that the statutes are a new regulation. You are wrong on both counts.

— For the first. Brother David was, as you admit, our agent for everything that concerned the civil authorities; in this capacity he exhumed, so to speak, from the civil code the means of reconciling our civil actions with our religious commitment.

— I could draw up a concordance here; were you really interested, you would see it immediately.

— It is possible that Brother David did not show you his work, but I supposed that he was sufficiently aware of the feelings of all.

— As to the second point, you say you merely tolerated the statutes; here your memory fails you completely. You rejoiced at their approval; at several of the council meetings, you helped formulate our gratitude to the King, to the Ministers, and to the Director of Ecclesiastical Affairs for the royal ordinance and the approbation of the statutes.

— You were appointed one of the three principal Heads of the Society.

— Your appointment was sent to the Government along with the others.

— You were always a member of the council in your capacity as Head.

— I could recall other facts, but you say the only thing you remember about them is that you did not contradict them; I find this difficult to believe. In your remarks you say that when we speak of the changes which have taken place in the Society, we are apologetic and pretend that

nothing has really happened, that what we wanted formerly is what we want not and have always wanted.

— It is true that some are indignant when mention is made of changes in the Society because, in truth, there have been none and there is no reason to believe that there is something in the ordinance and in the approved statutes which is not conformable to the letter and the spirit of our first Rule. I do not think you would class among changes those abuses which have been introduced, especially into the establishment which you direct and against which I have always protested.

— It would seem that you make no reference to anything that might seem new in the statutes approved by the Government, on the supposition that they were accepted along with their new obligations.

— But what seems to exasperate you are the new regulations introduced some years later, and to which you refused submission; that, you claim, is the reason for your withdrawal.

Allow me, Monsieur, to direct my remarks to some of the observations you have just made and to examine with you some of the expressions you use, so you may grasp their full import.

You speak of new regulations. . .

*

. . . that we would simply and purely hold on to the old regulations.

I wanted to know—and that was the purpose of the study made by each member—if the new formulation contained anything opposed to the old regulations. If you had found it so, was it not your duty to inform me, orally or in writing, so that it could be corrected? When I sent them to be studied, I never ordered anything that might be contrary to the old regulations, but I forbade the making of any changes.

How, then, can you say that we wanted to introduce. . .

*

I am stopping now on this article.

These changes motivate your withdrawal; but, Sir, if there are no changes, if things are as they have always been, how can they motivate your withdrawal? When you thought you perceived some, why did your zeal and attachment to the Society not lead you to point them out to me? That was your duty as Head. Read the early regulations, and you will see that this is spelled out for you. You say that as soon as someone speaks of changes in the Society, they hear protests to the effect that nothing has really changed. Why, then, do you not prove that something has changed? If you cannot point to true changes, I ask you again, how illusory is the motivation for your withdrawal? But what is more serious here is that you cannot withdraw without breaking those bonds which are sacred and indissoluble in nature, except through a higher authority. However, if you break them for illusory motives, such as those supposed changes. . . . I must stop here. . . . I will continue to examine your remarks.

You claim that none of the statutes are observed in the Society, either those approved first by Mgr. d'Aviau or the civil statutes approved by the Government. You dare to say that we have been going steadily along without any fixed rule. And basing yourself on these two assertions, you maintain that according to the first, any acquisitions the Society would make would be the responsibility of the lay members only.

Let me tell you that what you say was never part of the plan, approved and adopted, that I have before my eyes, where the subject is not even mentioned. Therefore, acquisitions made by ecclesiastics are not contrary to the rules and regulations of the Society.

It is possible that on occasion it was said in the early days that such and such a work would more fittingly be confided to lay religious, and it is not surprising that the acquisitions on Rue des Menuts were placed in charge of four lay persons. Once the Society developed and acquired a reputation, the circumstances changed, and the initial drawbacks vanished.

For this reason, the establishments of Saint-Remy and of the Rue du Mirail were confided to ecclesiastics. The Government itself, which knows that the Superior General is a priest, attributes to him all gifts made to the Society, such as the property of Marast and the château of Saint-Hippolyte. But this does not prevent the superior, according to circumstances, from appointing lay religious as directors.

Thus, for instance, M. Auguste was placed in charge of the large house attached to the de Razac mansion after the mansion itself had been bought in the name of the superior. Also very recently, a brother was authorized to purchase properties from M. Nicot and M. Gobillot. True, you voiced your fears after the purchase of the Razac mansion; but your protests at various times seemed to stem from the fact that, from lack of confidence in you, the purchase was not made in your name.

In order to prove that the statutes were never enforced in the Society, you suppose one which never existed. You provide no proofs for those you call the second ones—that is, those that were approved by the government. You protest that one of the articles you do not like has been applied to you. But these statutes have always been applied according to circumstances, and this could be proved by an entire series of documents dealing with houses in general or with individuals in particular.

What can you say if the statute applies to you? You are the first to whom the statute applies, you are the first who, having invested both your assets and your person in the Society, have decided to withdraw. It cannot surprise you that the statute is applied in your case.

. . . you admit being the first member of the Society. . .

*

. . . to the rules and laws that govern ordinary societies.

But what do you mean by “ordinary societies”? Are not ordinary societies, with rules and regulations, defined in the Civil Code? And it is precisely one of these types of societies that we have formed (1) religiously and (2) civilly (Code Title IX). Religiously, by the profession of vows. Because the Government does not recognize this religious contract, it was asked to authorize one in which all goods and earnings were in common. It did authorize one in which all earnings were in common (no. 1827); it probably feared that indirectly it would be approving the profession of perpetual vows. In any case, the statutes of the Society of Mary approved by the government are not new. They are contained in the first. The approbation was sought because of prudence, and to maintain order in the Society. Sufficient precautions cannot be taken against human inconstancy and frailty. All the time that you were constant, you were happy with these precautions. The office you exercised in the Society gave you the opportunity to practice them.

After about 15 years spent in the Society of Mary. . .

*

When you entered, you were in debt for more than 14,000 francs.

Supposing those debts could be balanced by the revenues from your assets, does it not follow that you leave us with over 14,000 francs in your possession? The 14,000 francs which you claim accrued to the Society from your assets in no way benefited the members of the Society of Mary. No one has anything of his own; everything is used for the common endeavor. You would make the Society liable for 14,000 francs from which it drew no benefit, but which you used according to your whims to further the work in which you were interested?

We could reason in the same fashion about the excessive expenses made on the property of Mélac, and also perhaps for the house of Chartrons. When I speak of Mélac, I do not refer to the mansion but rather to the property, which was considerably improved. Improvements to the Chartrons house went beyond mere maintenance. In the expense accounts for Mélac, costs for cultivation are included in the costs for expansion and improvement. Had you made no other proposal but that of settling all accounts with the Society, we would never have spoken of the earnings of your assets; we would have rejoiced because you were bidding farewell to associates who had nothing but friendship and kindness for you. You would not have withdrawn without the means to set yourself up in the world according to your wishes, limited only by the spirit which must animate the entire Society and your own condition.

You have always been aware of this, ever since we have been speaking of this business. If my answers to your suggestions seem heartless, you are at fault because in all honor and conscience I can only answer according to truth and justice.

My first letter to the man you chose as our common counsel was to tell him of my belief in that legal axiom, *Summum jus, summa injuria* [a too rigorous law spawns injustice]. I did not propose any indemnity. . . . I must stop.

What can I say, Sir, about the sums which you say you have, either in cash or in outstanding accounts? Because these were trifling sums, it is not surprising that I had no knowledge of them when I was financing the first days of the Society. I would be tempted to say that these small accounts should be classed in your favor, if I did not feel obliged to tell you that we must treat these amounts as we must any class of assets.

I will not repeat what has been said about the revenues from either Mélac or the Chartrons house in compensation for the 14,000 francs paid by the Society for your debts, unless you mention it again and tell us the origin of most of those debts. You say that “3,000 francs were spent on the property, 5,189.95 for repairs on the building and 2,815.95 on those made on the country house. The total for the repairs is 8,011 francs. The enterprise showed a profit for the Society; therefore, it is just that it should pay. The repairs put the buildings into shape and resulted in a profit; should he not be reimbursed for those repairs?”

The answer is that debts breed more debts. They were made so that the property could be bought and exploited???, but it is still true that these properties had a value, and that the value of the property was diminished by the amount that had to be paid. If today you became sole owner of the same, you would not have these debts and you would be that much richer. The origin of these debts merely shows that you did not contract them by illegal or immoral means; everyone who knows you, knows that.

When you came to the Society, you still had to pay a pension of 400 francs to Marin of Launay. You say this was paid for only one year because the Society boarded him so as not to have to pay it, and used him according to his talents. Actually, he was superfluous, although we did draw some advantage from his services. In this case, I agree to pay whatever you believe is fair.

In your second proposition, Sir, you ask that M. Estebenet’s mortgage on your house and property be paid. You were told that this matter depended upon M. Estebenet, that he had already refused to consider this in spite of strong arguments, but that in the event you found it necessary to sell he might agree. You were told that for the time being, it would be almost impossible to accomplish because the properties of the Society in Bordeaux were heavily mortgaged, and also because of debts you so imprudently contracted without the approval of the Society and even against formal orders. All these facts are undeniable.

To free you from the debts you contracted, about five years ago I borrowed 20,000 francs by mortgaging my assets, which I consider to be those of the Society. That very considerable repairs were made without the knowledge and even against the orders of the Society is a well known fact and needs no proof, for the Society guarantees the payment of all debts contracted by you in the pretended interests of the Society.

I say “Pretended interests” because on the whole, those repairs were poorly conceived and poorly executed. I know, however, that you had nothing but the best of intentions in everything you did. In the note appended to my answer to your second proposition, I said that in all our dealings with you there never was any question of mortgaging the boarding house. The question never came up in my talks with M. Estebenet, and at the time the contract was drawn up; because I had no part in it due to my preoccupation with the odd manner in which this business was being conducted, I do not recall any mention of a mortgage.

As soon as you informed me, Sir, that there was a mention of it in the contract, I told you I would have none of it. I maintain that stand, now that you bring up the topic again.

About your third proposition, that all fruits of the harvest should be turned over to you along with the furniture and articles you brought with you, I find nothing in your remarks that would incline me to change my first reply. You say, “I demand the harvest in compensation for the harvest I was expecting when I entered.” There can be no more question of compensation for one harvest by another than there is for your personal debts by the revenues accruing from your assets. A harvest is a movable good and must be treated as such. Study the civil code, then see the statutes of the Society based upon this code.

As to the furniture, I had asked you to make an exact inventory because none was made when you entered, for the simple reason that we would never let you leave the Society without the furniture and because it is difficult to allocate what cannot be recognized. Common opinion holds that these items were of little consequence, and if any are still in existence they are at least 15 years old. However, some may still be found at the country house, where they have always been.

I am stopping here, Monsieur, my observations. . .

* * *

S. 684. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

April 12, 1833, Agen

. . . will not be able to leave before the other two have arrived.

By this same mailing, I am writing to Brother Clouzet that he will have to pay for their trip. I am also asking him to put up the separating wall and the iron gate in front of the château as soon as possible. He is also to bear the expense of this work.

I did not think it opportune to speak to him about the repairs to the interior, but I did speak to him about the appointments, without mentioning names, and about the organization of the two boarding establishments, so that peace and understanding may always reign between the two communities.

Please send me a copy of the two community timetables. I am also discussing with Brother the loan we will have to get, and I am asking him to see you about borrowing at Gray according to the terms I have outlined. . . .

Do not forget to write to Father Bardenet. I am writing to Brother Galliot and announcing the arrival of Father Meyer. I hope I do not forget Brother Guyot.

Furthermore, my dear Son, let us continue to pray. . .

* * *

S. 685. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain

April 19, 1833, Agen

P.S. Add the copy of this letter to the copy of the “State of the Societ of Mary. . .” which I am sending to you. Insert the title “Answer of M. ---to Brother Mémain the elder, his representative in the matter of M. Auguste.”

* * *

S. 685-2. To M. Labordère, Bordeaux

April 19, 1833, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

We must both practice patience in our task of compiling, balancing, and settling accounts that are in the hands of women only, ladies who are full of the best intentions and most scrupulous. Using number, I will sum up the remarks suggested to me by the reading of the account which you sent to me and which must not have taken too much of your time.???

First Remark. On June 20, 1832, Mlle de Magnol sent me a short summary of the interest which I had collected for her. Over three semesters I had received 1,950 francs. From myself or from Father Caillet, she received 950 francs, which leaves 1,000 francs.

In my answer to Mlle de Magnol, I said I accepted her bill, and that I would immediately see to it that she received a small sum, since she was in urgent need, and that I would ask M. Rauzan to pay the rest of some amount he owes me. Soon afterward I sent her 150 francs, and I received 120 from M. Rauzan. I also informed Mlle de Magnol that we had forgotten to add 60 francs to another item of 40 francs, making a total of 100 francs. This sum was advanced by the convent so she could travel from Jégun. The 40 francs was the last entry on her expense account. All three items come to 330 francs and are to be deducted from the 1,000 francs.

At the time when Mlle de Magnol asked me to collect the interest due to her from M. Auguste, the director of the Saint-Marie residence, I had not received more than for three semesters; this can be verified by referring to her own business manager, and my account tallies with him. Moreover, the books of the establishment can be consulted, and they are always in order.

However, for the moment I am basing myself on the statement she has sent me. Mlle de Magnol has been informed of the two slight deductions, that of M. Rauzan and that of the 60 francs; mention is made of these in my correspondence with her.

Second Remark. Whether the 1,000 francs in item 4 of the bill from the convent appear in the statement is not important. But since all other moneys received by me are mentioned, I believe it should remain; for the same reason, I would leave the 1,620 francs which I received at three different intervals as indicated in items 6, 7, and 8 of the same statement.

You aptly remark that the 1,200 francs of item number 6 should appear on the statement, and also the 1,620 francs which I received. There was no mistake, for the 420 francs appear in both places.

The problem and the ambiguity in the convent account stems from the fact that instead of one entry of 1,620 francs received by me there are three, because in fact I did receive the money at three different times. In this the convent books agree perfectly with Mlle de Magnol's account.

Third Remark. You want to subtract from the expense account the 80 francs listed as items 18 and 22 because they are posterior to the agreement made in October of 1830, stipulating that incidental expenses by Mlle de Magnol would be taken from the tuition (800 francs).

Item 22 for 40 francs is not a boarding expense; it is part of the sum we gave her when she left the convent at Jégun. It is in the same class as the 200 francs which I advanced to her when she was still at Jégun.

In her account it is explained this way, "advanced to Mlle de Magnol by Father Chaminade." You state that she does not admit this. If she does not deny receiving the 100 francs and leaving for Jégun, that admission is sufficient, for I never asked for more than 60 francs, as I say in my first remark.

I cannot explain as precisely the 40 francs in item number 18; I do remember that we bought her different articles of secular clothing from various merchants. This has nothing to do with the articles she was given as a boarder. If Mlle de Magnol remembers this, we do not need to discuss it again; otherwise, I will ask the convent for an explanation. They may still have the receipts from the merchants. I did not relay your comments to them, in order not to disturb them. If you agree, Sir, we will let this expense account stand at 5,980.88 francs.

Fourth Remark. You have added 4,50 francs because of an omission in item number 10 or 12; just as you wish. Ordinarily we overlook small differences which appear in lengthy and old accounts. The size of the difference in this case merely shows that on the whole, the account is exact and in order. You may have noticed that the convent did not include the board for a period of less than one month; I noticed this, but I did not think it was necessary to draw attention to this oversight.

From these remarks, Sir, which I have the honor of making to you, I believe that our first survey is correct and that my account of the interest amounting to 26,000 francs which I had collected for Mlle de Magnol is more than balanced by what she left to the convent. If Mlle de Magnol has erred to her detriment in the account she sent me, and which I have outlined for you, since to err is human, I will be her humble debtor.

I thank you, Sir, for all the trouble you have taken to set her mind at rest. If she cannot rid herself of all the debts she has contracted, I am always ready to use the means which I discussed with you. I have always been concerned for her welfare, but for entirely disinterested motives. Proof of this is to be found in our relationship to date, and I believe the Lord allows her these worries so that everyone she consults can see that my dealings with her were not for the sake of her money, but for the spiritual and temporal happiness of her person.

* * *

S. 686. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

May 6, 1833, Agen

I am sending you all I have, and as you see, even a little more.

Brother Perrin would do you at least four times more harm than good. Brother Huguenin would do you no harm, but I do not believe he could help you right now. I think he would suffer greatly. Maybe he will be of some use next year; we will look into it.

I did not know a bursar at the major seminary by the name of Father Giraudeau. I knew a Father Picard; perhaps he preferred this name because he is from Picardy. I hear that when he was in his own country, he intended to leave the Sulpicians. In any case, I do not have a letter from him, and we have very few personnel with which to open new houses. When I hear from him, I will know what to answer.

You did well, my dear Son, to write to me even though you are. . .

* * *

S. 688. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

May 24, 1833, Agen

. . . pay it back only during the last quarter of the year.

Father Curot is the source of great worry and embarrassment; there is some hope that he may recover. You say nothing about Mme Perrin. Even though she knows her son is not doing well, she wants to make the trip to Agen to see him. His behavior is always irregular; you should see him, as I recommended, unless you have already done so.

I am stopping here. While writing this letter. . .

*

P.S. I have reopened my letter and have broken its seals in order to enclose the money order with which you can claim the package which our three travelers brought with them.

* * *

S. 690-2. To Bro. Pierre Deshayes, Rouen

June 1833, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Father Lalanne has just informed me that your sister and brother-in-law would like you to yield to them your part of the inheritance from your parents in exchange for a sum of money of lesser value. Father Lalanne must have told you that in general, this could not be done unless the party selling his share provides a mortgage on goods in his possession. Besides, yours is not the case, my dear Son, for you have no movable or immovable goods; instead, you have your spiritual Good Father who will willingly vouch for you and if necessary, will mortgage the château and property of Saint-Remy for the amount they will allow you for your share.

Sell for cash only; however, if the full amount is in cash but partly in short-term notes, you may accept. Check the signatures, however. The receipt you give should indicate the nature of the sums paid to you.

I can take part in the negotiations only through an authorized proxy. I immediately will send a procuration to Brother Clouzet, who will take the bill of sale of the château and property of Saint-Remy, along with a certificate from the mortgage bureau showing that the property is not mortgaged. Do not promise or do anything until Brother Clouzet gives his consent. Acknowledge this letter and keep me posted on the outcome. You can write to me directly at Agen. I embrace you heartily.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 693-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

June 27, 1833, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I received your last letter from Vesoul dated June 19, and in the meantime I have been reflecting. I have also received some news that will help me in what I am going to say.

1. It seems to me most appropriate that you do not come to Bordeaux from Saint-Remy to discuss the question of the Saint-Marie residence, because Father Lalanne is leaving Saint-Remy. You realize this yourself, so I do not need to insist on it.

I will send the elder Mémain. He will do what he can, and I think that will be very well indeed.

2. You may know that Brother Deshayes was not able to sell his inheritance, which amounts to almost 100,000 francs, a sum which is beyond his imagining. I have just advised him to go to Saint-Remy unless he can borrow from friends without compromising anyone, which is not likely. I do not believe his trip will have lessened your concern about borrowing. It will not take 60,000 francs to put the residence in shape and to completely free M. Auguste, but they will

be needed in the course of the year. However, we do need some money to begin the year. I am already sure that one of our main creditors will not press his case and may even lend us more, with Father Lalanne coming (I mean M. Jules Pomès). Your brother is also a large creditor, and for many years he has owed me 3,000 francs on which he has faithfully paid interest. He loaned this money to the residence, that is to M. Auguste. You could ask your brother to remain quiet for some time, to repay my 3,000 francs, and to break our contract. You could tell him that he would be more certain of getting his money back, in cash or in furnishings; this would be to his advantage.

Brother Mémain has several rich relatives in Bordeaux, and they might come to our assistance. We can always try to get the most out of the Saint-Loubès property, also from the letter of credit to the Armenaud brothers which is worth more than 10,000 francs, interest included. I think we could go ahead if we had 10,000 or 12,000 francs to start with. I will send Brother Mémain the moment you find that sum. If you cannot borrow it all from one source, try several. Stay on the spot, continue to deal; with order, work, and a good overall economy, slowly if painfully we will free ourselves from debt. Send me all the money you can, and we can make a start. It is good and even necessary for Brother Mémain to precede Father Lalanne. Once the latter is free from Saint-Remy, he can leave; I will have him spend a few days at Agen, and by early July we can keep our commitments.

3. I allowed Father Lalanne to take Brother Bonnefoi along with him on the condition that the only expenses he would make would be those we had agreed upon, and should any extraordinary expenses be envisaged, he must first obtain my authorization.

4. You know that Brother Goux was the cook at the residence. I convinced Father Lalanne that he should find another because of Brother's excessive expenses, and also because the kitchen stove was harmful to his health. Shortly after Father Lalanne's passage??? in the community, Brother Goux had two nervous breakdowns bordering on folly; he was sent to Agen. He returned to Bordeaux about three weeks later. While he is not completely cured, he displays nothing like those two seizures, at short interval, which he had in Bordeaux. I wrote to Bordeaux asking that he be occupied with light tasks. He has a replacement in the kitchen. I thought of having him spend a few more days at Agen and then to send him back to you, but not before consulting you. You would have plenty of work suitable for him. Father Chevaux, it seems, has trouble finding a good laundryman, and Brother Goux likes you very much; he often recalls his former superior with pleasure, but he is fearful of Father Lalanne. Could Saint-Remy provide a good cook? M. Marès the elder came to see me Tuesday evening and wanted to know if his son would ever be assigned closer to home. I told him we could call him to Bordeaux, that the only drawback was the difference in the cuisine but that this might be overcome. The father seemed pleased at the prospect of seeing his son in Bordeaux, but I told him that his son could not go home. If Brother comes, he will have to be replaced at Saint-Remy before Father Lalanne's departure.

5. The young man called Joseph who washes dishes at the château received a letter from one of his relatives asking how to send him 4,000 francs, the price of some lands he had inherited. Father Lalanne, who had been refused permission to borrow 3,000 francs, admired the ways of Providence at this news and sent the young man with Brother Bonnefoi to pick up the money and to see the remaining portion of his inheritance—or at least his claims to it, for his father, although aged, is still alive and accommodating. Father Lalanne would pay his debts with these 4,000 francs and would have sent me the surplus, had the sale taken place. Father says his debts amount to about 4,000 francs and that he was owed more than 12,000 for tuition and loans, but he would not ask but wait until September. I wrote and told him not to insist on being paid.

6. Father Lalanne would have wanted the plan of the front portal to be completed before his departure; I do not know if he also meant that of the separating wall. I told him I would write to you, since these things must be done. Father added that the residence should pay for these projects if it could. I told him this was immaterial, since both communities have to give an

account of their receipts and expenses. It was not quite the same for Father's administration. But such reflections are pointless. Do not do or say anything that might disturb the harmony that reigns, and which must always reign between you.

I have received and sent the money order dated July 1. My dear Son, I think it would be a good idea to tell the Prefect of the Department of the plow you have invented. If he himself could not see it at work, he could appoint someone to do so and report to him. I embrace you with renewed tenderness.

* * *

S. 693-3. To Fr. Georges Caillet, Bordeaux

June 28, 1833, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

See M. Castelnau on Rue de Gourgues. He is one of the former magistrates who was kind enough to accept arbitrating between M. Auguste and the Superior of the Society of Mary. Ask him why no decision was reached on the propositions of M. Auguste, although both sides were ready with their documentation. Brother Mémain withdrew on the advice of the respectable magistrate. After Brother Mémain's return to Agen, M. Auguste wrote to me asking for all approved and authentic Rules and Constitutions. I complied on the spot, and your yourself sent him the Constitutions of the Daughters of Mary with permission to use any article he might need. M. Auguste wrote again, saying this was not sufficient, that he had found a lawyer (I do not know who) and that this man needed copies of all constitutions, etc.

I replied to M. Auguste that the matter between us had nothing to do with the nature, the value, or the opportuneness of our Rules, that in his remarks he had stated that the Society of Mary had no fixed Rule, that in practice we took no notice of any Rule, that there were constant changes being made, etc. I refused. M. Auguste's only possible answer to that is that I made exceptions to the authentic regulations and granted these to individuals or to entire communities. These are facts which M. Auguste may recall or may have confirmed.

However attentively a lawyer may read and examine the Constitutions and Rules, he can never guess if they have been followed or neglected with the permission of the superior. I immediately acquiesced to M. Auguste's demand, for I want him to convince himself of the error of his accusations; but I must not allow him to stray from the question. Should the arbiters wish to verify the truth of my arguments against M. Auguste, I am ready to provide them with all the documents they require. Please ask these arbiters, my dear Son, if I can go ahead with the reopening of the boarding school while I await their decision. This was supposed to take place in early July, and we are almost there. Father Lalanne expects it, and I have everything in readiness. However, M. Auguste told Father Lalanne that his affairs were at a standstill. Toward me he maintains silence. What am I to think? What am I to do?

Should M. de Castelnau ask to see this letter, my dear Son, give it to him in all confidence. Listen to his answer and relay it to me immediately.

May the peace of Christ be always with you.

* * *

S. 694. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

July 25-30, 1833, Agen

. . . chastisement which will do much toward his sanctification.

Brother Deshayes can tell you himself everything that took place at Rouen. While in his homeland and with his family, he lived a truly religious and therefore edifying life. The Lord permitted certain incidents that militated against the young man's success. Wish him well. I have just received a letter informing me of his arrival in Saint-Remy on the 17th; I will write to him immediately.

Until the present, all the attempts at borrowing. . .

* * *

S. 695-2. To Mlle Laure de Maignol, Bordeaux

August 3, 1833, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

On April 22, M. de Labordère, after considerable work, sent me a summary of your account both with the convent and with me, and I find that I am your debtor. My answer of April 29 must have confirmed the accuracy of my first statement. I thought the matter closed when, two months later (June 28), without referring to the comments I had made, M. Labordère added to the account the interest on two sums you received to cover the expenses of your novitiate, and for these I am also your debtor.

The first amount is for 1,000 francs given to me by Mlle de Lamourous. The second, for 1,620 francs, was deposited with the convent and used by me at three different times. This sum was credited to you by the convent and appears in the accounts. Any question of interest should be discussed with the convent, and not with me. I reimbursed the convent for any moneys I used coming from you or from others. I did not earn a centime thereby, and my accounts are in perfect order.

This discovery of the interest that might be due to you, my dear Daughter, is not important. If you address yourself in all confidence to your aged Father in your need, that is perfectly proper. Do you want him to be your debtor when according to your accounts you owe him a trifling sum, or do you owe the convent, which comes to the same thing? You could pass judgment if you read carefully my answer to M. Labordère of April 25. I did not answer his last letter, for I intended to send someone to Bordeaux on other business, and he would have taken care of this also. He did leave, but I did not have time to fully explain our accounts. So I decided to write to you directly. If you are still not satisfied, I will send him the accounts and the correspondence dealing with the matter, and I will accept whatever you decide. I would be most sorry to cause you any grievance, for I have always wanted the best for you.

Please believe, I beg you. . .

* * *

S. 696. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 4, 1833, Agen

We must, it seems to me, begin right there in consequence.

You have closed the accounts of the secondary boarding establishment after the departure of Father Lalanne, so all entries for tuition and advances to the boarders have been closed. Father Lalanne sent me the figures; they come to more than 8,000 francs, but advance payments would be accepted only from the first days of September. Give me an exact account of all receipts and expenses, of all assets and liabilities. Have Brother Bonnefoi help you, but check his work; send me the results so I know exactly the financial situation of the secondary school residence. I think Brother Bonnefoi will be willing to help; if not, have Father Chevaux give him an order.

Henceforth, my dear Son, I would want at Saint-Remy. . .

* * *

S. 698. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

August 11, 1833, Agen

. . . have him examined in theology by Father Fontaine.

If you have M. Jacquemin's address, write to inform him that Father Lalanne has been sent to Bordeaux, that you are not familiar with the matter, that if he wants to discuss it with you he should start from the beginning and go into more detail.

You may continue to address yourself to the confessor. . .

* * *

S. 698-2. Notes

August 16, 1833, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

[Papers containing the accounts which Mlle de Maignol had with the convent of the Daughters of Mary and with Father Chaminade. These are not part of the correspondence of Father Chaminade; however, they are mentioned so historians may be alerted; they can find them in the Archives at AGMAR 1.17.698-2.]

* * *

S. 699. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

August 18, 1833, Agen

P.S. Here is the address of the brother-in-law of Brother Curot: M. Débouche, innkeeper at Chassey les Montbozon, via Vesoul, Chassey, Haute-Saône. I am enclosing a short letter from Brother Centrain for Brother Clouzet.

* * *

S. 700. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 26, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

I have received your last two letters, one stamped August 1 and the other August 9. In the second there was a money order for 350 francs, redeemable on August 25 in Paris. The letter which I said was stamped August 1 is really August 17 and is your last.

Father Lalanne had left me under the impression that both boarding establishments had the same music teacher. Your reason for giving only 5 francs per month is good. We can expect that our good old soldier will reduce the fee again if the number of his students increases. It is too bad that this fee is a separate item; it is difficult for the public to understand.

My dear Son, my decision to combine the public exercises was not formal, but was for the purposes of cementing unity. From the date of Father Lalanne's letter and of mine, it is easy to see what I would have wanted. You tell me about another meeting resulting from your letter and from the first decision made after the simple explanation by Father Lalanne. I hope, my dear Son, that henceforth you will do your utmost to establish and consolidate unity between the two

communities and their members. That is the principal purpose of my correspondence with Father Chevaux.

I had early knowledge of the pitiful matter of the prospectus. It seriously distressed me, and you know that I wrote to Father Chevaux about it. I believe he will have understood all that I said about maintaining order and subordination. You or he must let me know if there is anything more to be done.

You seem to me to have clearly understood. . .

*

. . . await with confidence the blessing necessary for our labors.

On rereading your letter, I note that Father Chevaux never dines with the community and that he is never with them in recreation. A superior may eat where he will, especially at the head of his community. Actually, he allows Father Fontaine, the head of the residence, to preside. He can go to the refectory when it pleases him, to see what is going on, but any remarks are made to Father Fontaine in private. In the dining room or elsewhere, should he notice something amiss in the management, he could and should speak to you about it in private. When he calls a meeting of the community council, he must invite you because you hold one of the important posts. It might be good once in a while if he did not eat at the head table, although he should not make it a habit. I need not tell you to relay all this to Father Chevaux. I wrote to him personally about his room.

In view of our present financial straits, I have no objection to the postponement of the construction of the iron railing. Besides, once that is in position, it will not mean the end of our expenses. A porter's lodge and appurtenances will be needed. I do not suppose that the ones at both extremities have been repaired and put in order.

I am thankful for the small money order. . . .

* * *

S. 701. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

August 30, 1833, Agen

. . . stamped in Vesoul with all the notes it included.

Then you will be able to give conferences. Once the year gets on the way, we may see more clearly what can be done along that line. I have nothing to do concerning Brother Deshayes; for the moment, he is traveling.

Concerning the retreat, it is evident that it is to be. . .

* * *

S. 701-2. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

September 1, 1833, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Our arrangements with M. Auguste are progressing, although very slowly. This is undoubtedly the design of Providence, to which we must submit. Conformably to these agreements, the 18,300 francs in notes which he has given you and which are still in your hands must be returned to him. Please see to it, and consider the receipt for the same as freeing you from any obligation you believe you may have contracted toward him.

M. Auguste claims only 18,300 francs because, he says, two of the bills have been paid. You will remember that the two paid bills, with those on hand, amount to a total of 20,000 francs, borrowed from M. Latour during the year.

With the assurance of my undying friendship.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 701-3. To Fr. Jean Chevaux, Saint-Remy

September 1833, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

The enclosed letter gives the conditions under which I grant the permission to Bro. Jean Adam Dürr. He should give you a copy of his short letter so you can see if they have been observed. I will make no copy of this, in order to expedite the matter.

Father Meyer requests permission to have the four postulants visit with him at Courtefontaine. I promised to write to you about it. Brother Dürr may not go along. You may appoint Brother Dumont in charge of the other two for the entire trip. You will decide what they will do en route. They can easily make the journey on foot, if they put in the time. Give them what they need for the trip there; Courtefontaine will do the same for their return. I am expecting the information I requested for Father Fontaine.

I am surprised that I have received no further news about Brother Deshayes after the letter from Vesoul. I was surprised that you let him go along to Besançon and was unsure if he could borrow anything there. Everything is in the hands of God. May the peace of the Lord be with you.

* * *

S. 701-4. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Bordeaux

September 12, 1833, Agen

(Autograph, Agmar)

I have been informed that Brother Guillegoz was at Agen the night before last; he traveled with Brother Deshayes from Toulouse. The latter is still at the inn. I am afraid he will repeat and multiply at Agen the scandals he caused at Saint-Remy. I may have more consoling news to give you before the end of this letter.

Father Fontaine has written another letter after the one I discussed with you. It arrived yesterday. Because I do not believe he will have shared the same thoughts with you, I am sending you a copy. I reacted as he did when I read the prospectus. I have not had time to read it carefully; I imagine there are redeeming features. Brother Brunet also has written; all the teachers seem to be fired??? With the ambition to carry out your plan to the full. His admiration for you is constant. In his very long letter he tried to discover the main reason for your absence; sometimes the absence of a single person, all things being equal, shakes public confidence. I have never seen anything so logically developed coming from his pen.

I have just returned from distribution of awards at the Daughters of Mary. Before leaving I talked with Brother Deshayes. He has overcome his main illusion and asks to be received into this house. His bag arrived as I was leaving. He was especially touched because I had spoken to no one, not even to you, about his scandalous behavior. He had said nothing to Brother Guillegoz, who ignored everything. Father Chevaux gave proof of prudence in this delicate and difficult situation.

Father Caillet has written twice asking that the retreat for those in Bordeaux would take place as usual at Saint-Laurent! He would like you to preach it, believing humbly that a change would be for the better. Arrange with him what would be most convenient.

For the holidays, I believe I can give Saint-Remy a rather good confessor who can also be the chaplain. There might even be two instead of one.

. . . I am continuing this letter, which I will send you through Brother Chopard. You have a good proctor in the person of Brother Etignard. The more I encourage Father Curot, the less he progresses. However, he is advancing. He is not made for solitude and will have to be kept very busy. He may be ready for the fourth year and the school activities. For the ninth grade you can count on someone from the Madeleine; I do not believe you should use Bro. Justin Soleil because of his father and his brother.

The French class in Bordeaux was always considered the most important. If as I fear we do not find a suitable teacher, it could be given to M. Auguste; if the class has lost prestige, it could be revived in quality and numbers by M. Auguste if he gears his teaching to those not interested in other classes.

You should have no financial troubles if your lifestyle is simple. As you say, Brother Bidon will need and receive advice when he makes important purchases. Both Brother Prost and Brother Bonnefoi appear to satisfy my requirements for the man I am seeking; I still have not made a choice. Father Fontaine has listed them in his personnel; he wants two new members. Are you not worried about Brothers Dürr and Rohmer, leaving them at Saint-Remy? As to Brother Dumont, he will be working under your very eyes; you can continue to train him to Piety, etc. Rohmer has not finished his studies—he still has his philosophy, which is given in a two-year course at Bordeaux. The teachers are excellent. He would mature and would acquire logic, which is essential at all times and in all things, and he would be trained to the religious life. A second year of physics would help Brother Dürr. At Easter you thought it might be good to have Dumon, Dürr, and Rhomer at the Madeleine; be careful lest we make a false step. Brother Fridblatt seems to be mending; I promised him a letter of encouragement. When I am less rushed, I will explain everything to you. May the peace of the Lord be always with you.

G.-Joseph Chminade

P.S. Father Curot is better since yesterday.

* * *

S. 702. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

September 25 and 26, 1833, Agen

. . . *I was then not able to write to you myself.*

Father Lalanne had the same and even greater fears. Although he is in favor of a general administration, he takes every means to prevent its realization. His letter yesterday dealt exclusively with that, and he sent me the enclosed note. On the other hand, his short letter displays a most amenable spirit. I immediately answered that I was pleased at the purity of his interest in Saint-Remy, that I had already taken measures more severe than those he suggested, and that while I had not discussed the matter thoroughly, I would inform you of everything.

My dear Son, you need great wisdom and patience.

* * *

S. 704-2. To Brother Leroy, Saint-Remy

September 27, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

I am very happy to be able in my first letter to you to grant the wishes expressed in yours of September 12. You may go along with the four who will leave Saint-Remy for Bordeaux, and I include you in the obedience I am sending them. Because we will be neighbors, I will add nothing but the assurance of my tender affection.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

P.S. If you find it too taxing to make the journey on foot, take a coach.

* * *

S. 705. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

September 29, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

The long letter I send you some days ago was to urge you to be very careful in your administration of the temporalities in order to allay the fears that your management is excessively severe. I sent you some comments by Father Lalanne on that score. I sent a copy of the same to Father Fontaine. See that you get along with him and with Father Chevaux. Dispose and regulate everything to eliminate the very possibility of a complaint. Here is what Father Lalanne has to say.

“I have just received a letter from M. Pronet the younger, who clamors for justice. He claims Brother Clouzet has called on him to pay a debt of some 3,000 or 4,000 francs. He can prove that it costs him 1,500 francs to do the laundry, but Brother Clouzet wants to give him only 1,200. I had promised him, and Brother Clouzet had concurred, that he would be paid for his expenses; that is mere justice. I will answer that I have written to you and that you will give your orders to Brother Clouzet. We can do without the malicious gossip of this man to discredit the house at this time.”

My dear Son, I need to add no reflection; terminate your dealings with this man, at whatever cost. Three students have been assigned to the château to follow a single French course; two have already been boarders, and the third is a brother of one of them. You intimidate them. They will not come if they are not made welcome. I will tell them that they have been accepted, provided they are well-behaved and do not brag about their status, and that is all you require of them.

It is said, my dear Son, that on your bills the price of shoes. . .

* * *

S. 706. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

September 29, 1833, Agen

I am writing to Brother Clouzet, my dear Son, to inform him that you will accept in the French class the three students you mentioned, but that they will not brag about being in a French class at the château.

. . . and I am entering into all possible details. . .

* * *

S. 706-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

October 26, 1833, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Your letters of September 29 and October 7 arrived during the retreat; the aftermath was even more hectic. The letter of October 9 addressed to Brother Mémain found him absent, and he still has not returned. It concerned this business of the liquidation. When he returns I will speak to him about the Victor Morel matter and will come back to you.

You ask Brother Mémain what Brother Perrin is doing. I can tell you that he left during the night to meet his brother in Lyons. From there they will go to their mother, who must be in Besançon. He left without my consent and was deaf to my serious exhortations. He promised to be back here in early November. I countered that I had no faith in his word, that one who is unfaithful to God for a long time can easily be unfaithful to man. However, his conduct has been above reproach. I believe I told you that I would not send him to Saint-Remy until his behavior was more Christian and more regular.

Father Fontaine may keep an account of revenues and expenses, etc., provided he gives you a copy. These are only running accounts; your ledgers must be in order so that (1) you will be more at ease and less distracted; (2) Father will gradually become acquainted with the method without detriment to temporal affairs and without loss of time; (3) most of the parents will not need to see you about making payments; and (4) critical people will be appeased more quickly. You are correct when you say that the remarks made to you, if taken literally, would lead to confusion. Father Fontaine has shared some of your remarks with me and has added some of his own. I replied that it was not possible, after all the remarks I have made to him, to you, and to Father Chevaux, that you did not know what I wanted. My dear Son, the management of our affairs must be simple, satisfying to everyone, one in which your personal involvement is real yet discreet. It must be spelled out sufficiently so that both Father Fontaine and Father Chevaux are satisfied with it. The latter would explain the system to the teachers, and if they were satisfied, any lingering suspicious would soon vanish. An outline of the system would be sent to me and to Father Lalanne. My dear Son, do not underestimate anything that can contribute to the peace and harmony of our hearts. Work at the sanctification of individuals will depend on this union; there is still much room for progress.

When I wrote to Father Fontaine, I did not mention what you say in your letter of October 8, that Father Lalanne accepted students for French studies at the secondary residence under the same terms as at the primary. I had already answered this question, either to Father Chevaux or to Father Fontaine, about three students who I believe had already been to the secondary school, where most certainly the terms were not the same as for the primary. I said that you should be informed and that you would not be opposed to it. Have him read my answer and abide by that. I agree that Father Lalanne should have the right to inspect the secondary establishment at Saint-Remy; this is dictated by propriety and prudence, as you can see if you read the long letter I have just sent to Father Fontaine, a copy of which I will forward to Father Lalanne. The purpose of this inspection is to preserve existing conditions and to better them, but not to change their nature.

In my letter to Brother Fridblatt, I assign him to the primary residence or the normal school. I told him you will give him ample time to study theology. Brother Hunolt wrote from Besançon on October 16 and most ingenuously told me of his problems. In my answer I tell him that at Courtefontaine he can find remedies for his spiritual infirmities. If he goes, I will recommend him to Father Meyer; if he goes, as it seems probably, you can have Brother Bouveret. You would then have four rather good teachers: Brothers Gaussens, Bouveret, Fridblatt, and David. You tell me that Brother Hunolt is in charge of the music for the concerts given at the château. If he is not there, you fear that this will suffer. I do not understand. At the château there is a very good music teacher, with a high salary, as you know. Moreover, in his letter he does not seem to believe he will change for the better at Saint-Remy. He is his own worst enemy, and it may be that he may take courage if we offer him an opportunity.

My dear Son, I did receive the money order for 500 francs; it is something, a drop of water in a lamp that is fluttering, as you say in a confused metaphor. After what we have gone through, I can believe it without your affirmation. I hope you will soon extricate yourself by introducing strict order in your administration, and by making only those expenses required to keep things as they are. Also, if you really keep your eyes open, you may spot unexpected resources. We have launched a vast operation, and we must bring it to a happy conclusion. You realize that I am worried because you alone give me a helping hand in the state in which I find myself.

Bro. Charles Boillon has written me a long letter, but I am so busy that I will be able to reply only in a few days. Tell him for me not to worry, to be good, and that I will give him an answer soon.

I will willingly send you formal regulations, but in the meantime, see that a precise rule is given to the secondary residence. I agree with you about Sion in Lorraine. Father Lalanne is in correspondence with them; I wrote to him twice because I saw that they were deviating from what had been agreed upon with you, as you had guessed. Please accept my paternal embrace.

P.S. Give Brother Claverie an obedience in my name; have him go to Salins under the direction of Brother Troffer.

* * *

S. 707-2. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

November 8, 1833, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am sending you a copy of the original agreement; it fell into my hands without any warning or observation. I thought it had been drawn up by M. Faye. If I had thought it was the work of M. Barada, I would have made other remarks than those in my letter to M. Faye.

1. Although I am Superior of the Institute or the Congregation of the Daughters of Mary, I do not act for them in temporal matters. They are not even aware of my legal case with Mlle de Magnol, or the cause for the same. The Daughters of Mary have never had any quarrel with Mlle de Magnol. When M. De Labordère came to Agen, he went to the convent to see whether there was anything ill—considered about Mlle’s promise to pay 800 francs for room and board per year. He was perfectly satisfied with his findings, and when I met him afterward, he said that the Daughters of Mary should not concede, for they had always acted honorably. Then it was our task to verify and compare the sums paid to the Daughters of Mary and the receipts which Mlle de Magnol had received, and everything tallied.

When he came to Bordeaux, M. de Labordère wanted to compare my accounts with those of the Daughters of Mary. My answers must all be contained in the papers I gave to M. Barada; I believe I also sent copies to M. Faye. I never spoke to the Daughters of Mary about this nuisance because I was persuaded that the truth was the only thing being sought. From my answers, it is evident that I never acted as administrative head of the Daughters of Mary, and that I must never accept that function, as the title of the agreement seems to suggest. It seems I would need their power of attorney; I do not know why, for their accounts are clear and in order.

2. The statement claims that the community still has an account to settle with Mlle de Magnol. There has been no settling of accounts, not in the sense in which the business world understands this expression. However, something equivalent did take place. Mlle Laure de Magnol’s bookkeeper balanced the accounts, and it seems the lady owes the convent 811.28 francs. Everything was peaceful until outside counselors raised doubts. However, the accounts still stand such as they were when Mlle de Magnol withdrew; no error or omission could be found. The statement would seem to imply that Mlle de Magnol left the convent without any

concern for her financial status with respect to the convent. Now, Mlle de Magnol was too considerate for that.

3. The statement says with respect to my account with Mlle de Magnol, “The parties did not agree on the disposal of the interest accruing from the sums invested.” The parties did agree. The administration of the Sainte Marie residence managed the interest, as it had always done. With her consent, I drew this interest for her during the rest of her stay in the convent, and also when she boarded at Gaguin and with her brother, the pastor. When she came to Bordeaux, she wrote to me that henceforth she would take care of the matter herself, and I agreed. It is false to claim, as the statement does, that the parties were not in agreement.

4. Further on it says, “On the advice both parties were given after receiving various accounts and memorandums, etc.” By parties I imagine that the arbiters are meant, for personally I never had any difficulty. Mlle Laure de Magnol has two accounts, one with the Daughters of Mary with whom she stayed for more than five years and one with me. Both are very clear. There was no ambiguity in these accounts as long as Mlle de Magnol took care of them. They became foggy when she ceased to do so and left it to people who by their criticisms drove from her mind the circumstances surrounding the entries. That is when M. Barada, a lawyer, was instructed to pursue me, but he had the kindness to forewarn me. I do not want to go to court but to see justice done to all of my creditors. I am willing to let them have, without contest, anything which I do not believe I owe, however clear and evident that might be to me. To this end, I am asking M. Faye to be my arbiter and to have full authority to settle this business with Mlle de Magnol.

I believe it is good, my dear Son, to add these reflections. Please repeat them to M. Faye. Have them copied, for I have made none. I must stop, for the postman is about to arrive; I wish you courage and the peace of the Lord.

* * *

S. 711. To the Entire Society of Mary

November 12, 1833, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

[Paragraph one of letter 711 speaks of two formulas; they are given here.]

I, the undersigned, having attained my majority, have promised in the month of October 1843 to observe in their substance and form, for three years, the statutes of the Society of Mary which were approved by a royal ordinance on November 16, 1825, and to be faithful to the rules and customs of the said Society. In witness whereof I have signed.

Saint-Remy, April 29, 1846

*

We, the undersigned, after carefully examining the benefits which our young people can derive from the Institution of the Society of Mary and the particular and personal advantages of the same; after having read and studied the statutes of the said Society, approved by royal ordinance of November 16, 1825, and having taken cognizance of the elements of the Civil Code quoted in the said statutes, do commit ourselves to join and adhere to the said Society according to the rules and spirit of this Society as it is defined in the Civil Code, title 9, chapter 2, section 1. Should we withdraw of our own free will or should the Society no longer want our services, we promise never to claim anything for our work or for the use of the furniture we may have brought with us or for the use of our real estate, present or future. Along with our whole-hearted devotedness and our confidence, we want everything to remain with the Society

itself. We also promise to conform to all regulations and to see to their observance, should we be raised to some position of authority.

In witness whereof we have signed at Saint-Remy, October 25, 1851

* * *

S. 713. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

November 16, 1833, Agen

. . . well served, the blessing of the Lord will be upon Saint-Remy.

Why would Brother Dürr not take the German class at the château if he can do so competently? I do not believe we should insist with Brother Fridblatt against his will. I suppose that with Brother Hunolt remaining at Saint-Remy, you will have sent Brother Bouveret to Courtefontaine where he is indispensable. Brother Troffer seems satisfied with Brother Claverie.

It would seem that M. Bouillon has recovered from his illness at home, for he is now working at some trade in Besançon. We found some excuse to withdraw, for he could not get along with us.

The answer which Father Bardenet gave you. . .

* * *

S. 714-2. To Fr. Jean Chevaux, Saint-Remy

November 20, 1833, Agen

(Autograph, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Mindful of the pain you must have experienced at the defection of Brother Deshayes, I suggested to him that he should immediately inform you of his instant and sincere conversion.

Brother Clouzet informed me many days ago of the return of the students to the primary residence, but not a word about those of the secondary section. I would need this information to decide whether it would be fitting and useful to have Father Lalanne go there from December 8 to December 24. Are most of the students back? Did they return on the strength of the promises made by both Father Fontaine and by him that he would be there at that given time? My dear Son, you or Father Fontaine must give me that information without delay; you could even send me the names of those boarders who have returned because of that expectation.

Father Lalanne had written to the Rector of the Academy of Besançon that if he were not back in the office at the beginning of the school year, he would seek a position elsewhere. Did Father Fontaine receive his degree of Bachelor of Arts? I do not need to say that both must continually prepare themselves, but without undue concern or without overwork which would be harmful to their health. Give me a thorough account so I may know what to do. I also hope to receive very shortly the list of points on which you, Father Fontaine, and Brother Clouzet are agreed in order to set up an economical administration under the direction of Brother Clouzet.

My dear Son, may the Lord shed abundant blessings on you, on your work, and on the entire Saint-Remy establishment. I embrace you most tenderly.

* * *

S. 715. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

December 3, 1833, Agen

. . . no longer even consider the place as belonging to the Society.

I was greatly surprised, my dear Son, that you had kept Brother Bouveret at Saint-Remy; he was merely substituting for Brother Hunolt, who was first called to Courtefontaine but whom I left at Saint-Remy for the very good reasons he gave me. Courtefontaine has a good number of teachers, perhaps too many, but none can replace Brother Bouveret in the essential role he is playing. For the moment, I cannot give you a replacement for him. I never imagined that he would not return to Courtefontaine. To solve your problem, you might reduce the number of French classes from three to two. The students would not lose anything, and the load of the teachers would not be substantially increased.

It is very evident that another priest is needed.

*

. . . because of a lack of subjects.

If the Academy of Besançon is too inflexible, Father Lalanne will transfer his diploma to one of the two who are qualified and leave things just as they are.

I am very sorry, my dear Son, that as yet you have not set down guidelines for your financial policy with respect to the château. I told you and Father Fontaine, and I made it abundantly clear, that my intentions were to have a single business administration for the two communities—that is, that there would be only one manager. However, because this unification presented great difficulties, I agreed that there would be no change in the administration of the secondary boarding establishment. It was possible to arrive at a system that would have satisfied everyone; this system was to be described to me for approbation and to guarantee future peace and tranquility. Had this been done, Father Fontaine would not have used funds arbitrarily, as you tell me. This is basically contrary to the spirit of our Constitutions, to the general practice of all communities and societies, and still more so to the religious spirit. Father Fontaine may be excused because of the manner in which Father Lalanne expressed himself; his action may be overlooked for the sake of peace. However, we must take every precaution to avoid abuses. I know this means headaches for you; but after suffering so many to get us where we are, can you not put up with minor ones?

As to your remark that you do not intend to pursue your debtors who are in default, I believe you have only a single valid reason, and that is Father Fontaine. What difference does it make if this is ascribed to you or to the head of the residence? It was understood here that, right or wrong, the real manager would not appear exteriorly. What is the difference, provided everything runs smoothly? But you say that Father Fontaine will not keep exact accounts, that you fear he will make mistakes. When Father realizes the importance of this type of exactness, he will submit to the system or he will ask that it be modified, etc., etc. This simplifies your work; you will be less bothered by both parents and students. You say that the tuition paid at the beginning of the school year was one-third less than last year but you do not indicate the reason, and so I cannot comment.

I am not surprised that Father Chevaux should be very tired.

* * *

S. 717. To Fr. Georges Caillet

December 7, 1833, Agen

My dear Son,

I am sending you five documents copied one after the other on very light paper to cut down on the postal costs. The first is a circular which I am sending to the whole Society; the second, an ordinance dated November 12 giving the purpose of the other three documents. The

first of these is the formula for the perpetual vows which must be signed by all those who have made their perpetual profession (you first of all).

In approval of the above, Bordeaux - - -, 1833
Caillet, Assistant General

The second, or the paper marked "4," is the formula for the three-year professed (the cross indicates where the professed will sign).

In approval of the above, Bordeaux - - -, 1833
for 18 months, or one year

The fifth, marked document "3," is for inscription purposes. The postulant does not have to sign, but the sheet must contain the information required. For each one, please indicate names, family and Christian, etc., etc. I will copy them into the large register, as required by article 9 of the statutes of the Society of Mary.

You understand, my dear Son, that we will have to obtain a copy of each vow formula on two separate sheets of fine paper, signed by each of the candidates. You will repeat this procedure at the Madeleine and at Saint-Laurent and give me the results. Later we will see about the Sainte-Marie residence. There may be some difficulty here because of the absence of Father Lalanne. I told him we might await his return before going through with the project.

I am very happy that M. de Saget has confided in you. If you believe he is truly sincere, I will write to him. I am willing to do anything to save his immortal soul.

Since the revolution, I no longer send any list of. . .

* * *

S. 717-2. To Fr. Jean Chevaux, Saint-Remy

December 9, 1833, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

You have been ill, and you may still be unwell. Truly you are overworked. You can hardly take care of everything, at least in a competent way. I hope you would have a priest confessor, at least for the boarders and at least toward the end of October. Not long ago I wrote to Brother Clouzet and showed him how to overcome this difficulty with little trouble, and perhaps to the advantage of his houses.

You are too few to have two novitiates, one for the brothers and the other for the ecclesiastics. For the time being, have the priests decide on their vocation in the postulate. When you have postulants willing to give up their commitment to their diocese, send them to Bordeaux. Follow the rule you set down for the novitiate. As soon as I can, I will send you some directives on this important aspect.

Father Lalanne will visit with you; let me know the results. I was surprised not to receive details about the return of the students to the secondary residence, and nothing on conditions there; yet Father Lalanne wanted an early decision on his trip to Saint-Remy.

I am sending you, unsealed, my answer to Father Jacquot. Read it, seal it, and give it to him. The young man seems to be well-inspired and has a good character but is not versed in the religious life. I believe he is of limited intelligence. Patience and kindness are called for. He will need encouragement and instruction, and since he may pretend to know everything, he must be assigned appropriate readings on which he should be questioned.

My dear Son, accept the expression of my tender affection.

* * *

S. 720-2. To Fr. Charles Rothéa, Saint-Hippolyte

After January 4, 1834, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am sending you five papers copied one after the other on very light paper to keep down the postal costs.

The first is a circular dated January 4, 1834, which I am sending to the entire Society. The second is an ordinance dated November 12 which points out the purpose of the other three documents. The first of these is the formula for the perpetual vows which must be signed by all those who have made their perpetual profession, you first of all.

In approval of the above, at Saint-Hippolyte - - -, 1833

Signed: Rothéa, Superior of the Establishment

The second (which is document 4) is the formula for the three-year profession of vows; each one who has made this profession must sign. (The cross is where the professed will sign his name.)

In approval of the above, at Saint-Hippolyte - - -, 1833

For 18 months, or one year

The fifth document is an explanatory note. The postulants do not sign their inscription, but their paper must contain all the information required. See that you fill in their Christian and family names, etc., after which I will copy them into the large register as required by article 9 of the statutes of the Society of Mary.

You understand, my dear Son, that we will have to provide a copy of each vow formula on two separate sheets of fine paper, signed by each of the candidates. You will repeat this procedure at Ebersmunster, through Brother Clerc; at Saint-Marie-aux-Mines, through your brother; at Colmar, through Brother Coustou, etc., in all the houses of Alsace. Those establishments which wish to use their own formulas can send them to me directly; those who prefer to add their signatures to yours can send these to me once the process is complete, etc.

* * *

S. 721. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

January 9, 1834, Agen

P.S. I had just sealed this short letter when I received yours and one from Father Fontaine. Both of you must keep me informed of everything that is happening and of the steps you have taken to forestall any mishap.

* * *

S. 722. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

January 15, 1834, Agen

*I wrote to Brother Clouzet that you . . .
. . . might agree . . .
. . . to invite one of the good pastors. . .*

* * *

S. 723-4. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

January 18, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

You can pay M. Deshayes the younger through the father, the sum of 250 francs and also the court costs. I have in my possession letters from the father in which the tone is very different from that he uses with the bankers. I will write to him very soon; meanwhile, keep on paying.

I had just answered the covering letter to the formulas of profession when I received one from Father Lalanne giving me the real reason why neither he nor you had read the article in the circular concerning M. Auguste and Father Collineau. I accept the reason, and I may add that he should have spoken to me sooner; he would have saved you some mild reprimands.

Brother Perriguet again brings up the incompatibility of his function as receptionist with that of wardrobe keeper. He cannot hear the doorbell. Visitors become impatient, fret and fume, and scold him bitterly, and he believes he is responsible for their behavior. Please tell him that in answer to his letter of December 21, I consulted you on the matter. Could someone warn him of the presence of a visitor when he is about his linen job? His letter is not at all critical; he does not shirk the work, but he would like to put an end to the offenses against God.

I must stop. Two days ago I wrote to you about Brother Brunet. May the grace and peace of the Lord be yours.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 742-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

January 26, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I was telling you recently that you must come to an understanding with Brother Mémain about the debts of the Sainte-Marie residence. I immediately shared this idea with Brother Mémain and told him to write to you about it giving you a list of all the debts that are due this year, and to send me a copy of his letter. He has just sent me the letter; I will send you a copy I am having made.

Brother Mémain describes only the needs of the residence, but Father Caillet writes to me today and says he needs 2,000 francs to pay debts that are overdue and to face the immediate future without too many worries. In addition to this, I need 900 francs to honor a promissory note close to that figure, and a similar sum toward the end of June. There are many other debts, not of M. Auguste's making, which we can postpone by paying the interest.

With the creditors' consent, we may be able to delay paying two capital debts of 20,000 francs each. These creditors are very importunate. We would well to settle, at least with M. Latour.

Do not be too frightened by the item of promissory notes due between now and June 15, amounting to 18,167.84 francs. I think Brother David has these and can take care of them. I will check and let you know.

Do you know a M. Lassigne at Courtefontaine, a novice who after his theological studies went into business and became a traveling salesman? He has a reputation in temporal affairs. I had intended to send him to the ecclesiastical novitiate in Bordeaux, but I will send him to Saint-Remy instead if you need a steward at the château to relieve you of part of your duties.

Would it not be wise to sell the property you bought from Brother Gobillot and his brother-in-law? You might even make a profit, for you bought it when the real estate market was

weak. Finally, my dear Son, let us not worry unduly, but rather strive for composure. I embrace you tenderly and wish you the peace of the Lord.

* * *

S. 724-3. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Bordeaux

January 27, 1834, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

. . . what you call “speculation” must never be condoned, except in extreme cases. And we must never allow ourselves to sink to this extremity. When Providence is our guide, that is another matter. . .

* * *

S. 724-4. To Bro. Pierre Deshayes, Saint-Hippolyte

January 31, 1834, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

Only a very few days after I had written to your father in answer to a letter I had received from him, I heard of the check you had drawn on him, how it was not accepted and was returned, with costs, to the banker whose anger was fanned by the invectives your father wrote to him and aimed at you and at the Society of Mary. I immediately ordered Brother Clouzet to redeem the check and to pay the surcharges caused by its return.

Your father’s letter which I was answering dealt with the statement of your debts which you had given to me. He blamed his tardiness on the illness which afflicted both him and your mother. He added that he had begun to carry out my suggestions. You can imagine my surprise, my dear Son, when I learned of the neglected check and his letter to the banker of Besançon. I have several of his letters, one especially where he authorizes me to make whatever expenses are necessary for your return and says he will accept them all, provided they are not beyond his means. All his letters are extremely courteous and reveal a perfect honesty and a great love for you. True, you had led me to believe the opposite; but it is also true that I had reason to believe that his harshness toward you was a means he thought necessary in order to cause a change of heart in you. I even praised him for knowing the right attitude to take in the face of your attitude. I did not initiate our correspondence. From one of your letters, he suspected something was wrong. Can you blame me for believing your father rather than you? The facts prove that you were telling the truth, but could I believe such unworthiness on the part of your father? I did not believe it was necessary to write to your father, or to reveal all that transpired between us two. All this is too much. . . . I also have a copy of a letter you received at Strasbourg. M. Auguste never was able to make out the name of the sender and therefore could not answer, so he sent the original to Brother Clouzet and a copy to me in Agen. You know the rest. But the chapter is closed at Besançon; you will never hear it mentioned again.

You are now at Saint-Hippolyte because Father Rothéa, who has taken a fancy to you, asked for you. I sent you to the one who showed the most interest in your unreserved return to God. I also told Brother Coustou about your assignment. We all thought you were well on the way to recovery, but now it appears that you are seriously ill. Well, my dear Son, do you think you have exhausted our friendship and our love? If you are truly penitent, I will ask Father Rothéa to keep you and to take care of you, however demanding the care required by your disease. You effervescent passions and the trouble you have caused us are overshadowed by the advantages you wanted to procure for the Society. Be at peace, my dear Son, bear your illness with patience and in a spirit of penance; you are blessed in that the Lord has deigned to chastise

you. How great was the danger to which you exposed your immortal soul! I am sending this open letter to Father Rothéa to let him know what has transpired between us and to fire his zeal for the salvation of your soul and for the welfare of your body. Your entire person will always be dear to me. Please believe in my inviolable attachment.

P.S. Of course, you will not find at Saint-Hippolyte the full gamut of the treatments which are to be found in large cities. However, you will find what is so rare elsewhere, a concern inspired by love and the blessings of the Lord, more precious than all the resources of medicine. Besides, Providence is sending you there; always want what God wants.

* * *

S. 724-5. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

February 3, 1834, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

The postman has just brought me your letter of January 23 and one from Brother Deshayes, who is in Saint-Hippolyte. For your guidance I am sending you a copy of this letter and of my answer, and a copy of my letter to M. Prouhet.

I was going to discuss with you the young cook whom Father Lalanne is sending to Saint-Remy. However, from Father Lalanne's letter I hear that you can to an understanding with him. Let me add that if any difficulty should arise because the young man is a stranger to the Society, you could get around it by saying that he is a postulant. I have spoken to the young man about this. I agree with Father that if the young man receives proper training, he will soon declare himself. However, I think it would be wise to take him on as a stranger whose passport is in order and who has applied for a job as a cook. I have my reasons for suggesting this. I told the young man that the 3,000 francs we were offering is no guarantee of steady employment because the moment the Society had a qualified religious, the job would be his. The young man should reach you at the same time as this letter.

However painful the news of accidents and irregularities is to me, do not spare me the details. No sooner had I received your letter than I wrote to Brother Deshayes suggesting a remedy that should prove efficacious. My letter crossed one from him confirming the news you had given me. I wrote again and further elaborated on my remedy. Further action will depend upon his reaction, which should be prompt.

I am sending you inscription forms for the novices. I must stop, the postman is coming. I embrace you most tenderly.

* * *

S. 724-6. To M. Prouhet

January 1834, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

I have made inquiries so as to settle this matter of yours with Brother Clouzet. You were right to bring it to my attention. I have learned that you had agreed with Brother Clouzet to cancel your least at the beginning of February 1834, and the time has come. What have I decided? There can be no question of compensation. On the one hand, you claim 1,500 francs; on the other, Brother Clouzet has good reason to believe that the 1,000 francs he promised you is good compensation in this case. I think we should split the difference. With this mailing I am asking

that you be given 1,250 francs on the condition that you cancel your lease and withdraw as agreed.

* * *

S. 726. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

February 11, 1834, Agen

My dear Son,

I am very glad that your register containing inscriptions and admissions is in order according to ordinary standards. We consider it authentic, but as an attestation it is no longer sufficient since the approbation of the Society because (1) the wording of the formulas for vows is not necessarily according to the spirit of the statutes and (2) because Saint-Remy was not recognized by law as a central house. I will come back to this item. Meanwhile, continue as in the past.

Brother Gaussens is the victim of pitiful illusions concerning his health and its maintenance. A complete cure is not probable. Treat his condition with circumspection so his illusions may be least harmful to his sanctification and least disturbing to your community.

I have repeatedly seen by your letters, my dear Son. . .

*

. . . the concern one puts into avoiding a death blow.

Any complaints emanating from the secondary residence have so far been related to the diet. The main concern was to make Father Lalanne's absence less noticeable. The young men you were sent as a cook seems skillful and docile enough to practice economy without lessening the quality of the service. In short, you must put your heart, your mind, and your energies into the Bordeaux operation, but without in any way prejudicing Saint-Remy. . . .

Your last letter crossed one of mine telling you about Brother Deshayes. If you can do so without spending too much time, try to speak to him to have him abandon his disorders; do whatever you can and pray greatly for him. You may be sued for the sums he placed in your hands, so I will send you a list of all the debts he has contracted, the expenses he has caused us since the beginning of his lapses. Continue to report to me everything that you observe.

Here is what Father Lalanne writes on the fourth. . .

*

. . . Gentlemen, of my sincere and respectful attachment.

Brother Rousse has been notified by his brothers that his father does not have long to live. They sent a procuracy to be returned to them in case of his death. Brother Rousse did not believe it would be wise to send it to them and consulted me. I told him to excuse himself, but that as a mark of confidence he was sending it to you, his former superior. You will find it enclosed. One career ends and another begins.

Send me, my dear Son, a bill of exchange for 900 to 1,000 francs. . .

* * *

S. 726-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

February 22, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Brother Galliot tells me that Brother Gaussens is on his feet again and back in class. Also that if Brother Bouveret does not return from Courtefontaine before Easter, he would lose many other boarders who insist on learning writing and singing. Several, I believe he said seven, have left for that reason. Besides, he knows for a fact that Brother Bouveret is not happy at Saint-Remy.

I received a rather woeful letter from Brother Hunolt, dated January 26. From my answer you can tell the tone of his letter. I think he wants to go to Courtefontaine from Easter to the end of the year only to be able to visit Besançon every Thursday. I still think he prefers to reside in Saint-Remy.

I expect to receive without fail at the end of the month the 900 or 1,000 francs I asked for. You know how vexing it would be if trust in my good name were to be undermined in Bordeaux. With my tender embrace. . .

* * *

S. 727. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

February 25, 1834, Agen

. . . to join you all as a missionary.

I told Brother Clouzet of the arrears in the cook's salary. I think he will have shared with you the little I told him.

The entertainment given by Brother Langue. . .

* * *

S. 731. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 4, 1834, Agen

Brother Lassigne is 32 years old.

I received an answer from M. Prouhet in which he regrets the loss he has suffered and sends me a bill for more than 1,600 francs. I had Brother Bonnefoi answer him; he had already rejected a similar bill presented to Father Lalanne. Nothing new concerning Brother Deshayes.

I am told that the younger Brother Etignard has recovered from his serious illness. He would very much like to return to Bordeaux; however, I have heard very little mention of him even from his mother.

It is good, my dear Son, that you tell me all you know. . .

*

. . . and who really retrieved their losses.

I always forget, my dear Son, to speak to you about young Crétin, a carpenter; he is still irked because he did not receive a ring at his profession and no effort has been made since to get him one. Without seeming to have been coached, you might get him one and have it blessed before he wears it. I embrace you, my dear Son, with all the tenderness of my heart.

* * *

S. 732. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

March 7, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

. . . before the tribunal of the justice of the peace.

Among the papers I sent you, you will find Brother Deshayes' account and proof that he intended to pay for all the trips inspired by his follies and unconventional behavior. You wrote that you wanted the father's permission to initiate a settlement of accounts with him. Did the 1,600 francs you speak of come from the father? How was the transfer made? If you dealt directly with the son, are you not troubling the waters by asking for the father's authorization? Why deal with the son? Why did you start negotiating before asking the father's permission? Only in case you owed the young Deshayes some money, after a friendly understanding or an arbitration or a court pronouncement should you ask the father's permission to pay him the money. This is my opinion. . . .

Brother Mémain had loaned a little money to Brother Deshayes. I do not know if he recorded it in his books before this letter. Brother Mémain spends his time preparing for his examination in view of a superior certificate.

I wrote to you three or four days ago. . .

P.S. M. Deshayes sent Brother Mémain a note written by you, asking for 200 francs per year for bed and board, which would now add up to 400 francs. Brother answered that it must have been a mistake on your part, since the ordinary rate is 400 francs per year for the novitiate.

I am sending you, Sir, the summons I received yesterday ordering me to appear on April 7 before the Justice of the Peace of the canton of Amance, instigated by M. Deshayes. Please represent me, and since you have also have been summoned for the same thing, I hereby authorize you to deal with the matter both in my name and in yours, to settle amicably or to contest, to defend our rights and also to make the concessions you judge advisable; in a word, to do whatever I could do myself. In witness whereof. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 726-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

March 14, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

Monsieur,

You are already in possession of my power of attorney to manage and administer the château and lands of Saint-Remy, and by these presents you are also authorized to proceed with the sale of the lands that are detached from the main property, to give a bill of sale for the price agreed upon, to accept the money, to give a receipt—in a word, to do in this case everything that I could do myself. I hereby approve all your dealings. In witness whereof. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 740. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

May 14, 1834, Agen

I did not have time to add any reflection.

When M. Deshayes mentioned the sum he had paid, it was always 2,400 francs: 2,200 to you and 200 he had given to Father Lalanne. He did not reclaim the 200 francs, which you had not received. Never by writing or orally did I respond to his demand. I have since thought that

there was justice in what he was asking; your books show 1,600 francs which you received from him; his father paid another bill for 600 francs that I sent him. You yourself gave him a letter I wrote from Rouen and although he protested somewhat, he finally paid it. The son may not know these facts, for they never came up in our conversations. I recall these facts so that you will not be surprised if he mentions them. Does he have his father's letters? He never spoke to me about. . .

If there should arise some honest method of settlement. . .

* * *

S. 741. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

May 21, 1834, Agen

. . . but will occupy yourself essentially with him.

Be careful how you open the proceedings before the court of first instance in the Deshayes matter (if it ever does come up for a hearing). The settling of accounts is the only question to be discussed; every other aspect must be avoided. Have an understanding with your defense lawyer.

Please accept, my dear Son, my tender embrace.

* * *

S. 742. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

June 2, 1834, Agen

. . . so as not to be tempting Providence.

Moreover, my dear Son, Brother Mémain sent you a list only of those debts that must be paid this year; most of these are in M. Auguste's name. Others are not of his making and yet had for their purpose to extricate him from critical situations. . . .

I am pleased at the way you are handling the Deshayes and Prouhet cases. Please accept my tender embrace.

* * *

S. 745. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

June 20, 1834, Agen

My dear Son,

I am answering the letters received from Brothers Bonnet and Fridblatt with no hint as to how they reached me. You did well to open them and to send me only the copies.

I have received with interest, my dear Son, the details. . .

* * *

S. 747-2. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

July 5, 1834, Agen

(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am answering without delay your letter from Vesoul dated June 28 and mailed June 30. Your plan will at least have the temporary effect of paying those 20,000 francs at 21% interest

that we owe to M. Latour. However, you must try to get at least 10,000 francs to M. Auguste, and time is too short to apply to Alsace or the Midi for the money. In a letter received yesterday, M. Auguste tells me that he can operate with 10,000 to 12,000 francs.

I have just written to Brother Galliot, urging him to come to an understanding with you in the important matter of the liquidation. Brother Bousquet cannot do much, but he has plenty of goodwill. Brother Olive must have received my circular on the subject. I do not believe he can be of much help. I will inform him of the dealings he should have with you; he is wary of surprises. You may be able to meet the deadline if you wait for the contributions from Brothers Galliot, Bousquet, and Olive, but they will send you all they can. I think Brother Galliot especially can be of considerable help. I have just authorized him to spend 400 francs to replace Brother Verrier in case his name is picked for the service; some other expenses also for another; whatever. . . . He will send either cash or a promissory note. If these notes are due later than September, why not accept them? Let me say that if you wish to get results with Brother Galliot, you must see him and discuss things seriously, but in a friendly manner. You will have little success by mail. I will write to Father Fontaine concerning the feastdays, the expenses, and the three scholarships and will report to you.

I have just received Brother Gaussens' reaction to my answer to his long letter. I will write again. I am writing in haste, with each delivery, this Saturday evening so that there will be no delay. It is always with pleasure that I embrace you, my dear Son.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 753. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 13, 1834, Agen

. . . to put into Alsace the order that is actually reigning there.

M. Auguste must have told you that M. Latour refused the 10,000 francs, but that he gave us one year in which to pay the full amount. M. Auguste suggested that I use the 10,000 to pay other urgent debts. I replied that I was very anxious to have him pay all his debts, that he could borrow these 10,000 francs, that we would do our utmost to help him pay off his debts. I will try again through Brother Rothéa to get an estimate from the directors of the *boni* for next term. These directors could send their notes to Brother Rothéa, who would combine them into one or two promissory notes made out to you. You would have less trouble negotiating with these than with many notes of lesser value. Moreover, it is easier for Brother Rothéa to cash the notes he will receive.

Have I told you that the hail had done a lot of harm. . .

* * *

S. 755. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 26, 1834, Agen

. . . an ordinary suitcase containing my personal belongings.

M. Auguste must have described to you the actual state of his affairs. M. Latour has decided to accept the 10,000 francs. M. Auguste could not come up with 2,000 francs, so I had Brother Mémain send him a promissory note for 1,200. I think everything came to a head last Thursday or Friday. The note for 1,200 francs is due in three months. The widow Coste, to whom 3,000 francs at 6% were due, has just died. Her heir wants the full payment; he will get it within three months. I will send you all the details of M. Auguste's accounts; you will be able to plan the

liquidation better. Brother Mémain has been so busy since that agreement with M. Auguste; I doubt whether he has read it.

I am longing to enfold you within my arms. . .

* * *

S. 756. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

August 29, 1834, Agen

I will have to make several stops on the way.

I have received your letter of August 20 with the news about the sad events of August 19 and 20. I have just informed Father Lalanne. Try to see the officer who arrested the young man and without seeming to have made a special trip, try to get the gist of the charges. I have two letters from Father Fontaine that arrived together. I will give him a verbal answer. However, I will write to Father Lalanne to explain why he needs Brother Dürr.

Continue with M. Auguste. . .

* * *

S. 763. To Fr. Léon Meyer

March 12, 1835, Saint-Remy

. . . united to Our Lord dying, and dying on a cross.

I am thinking of Brother Destaing, not only because he is the infirmarian but also because he is ill. I forget what you once ??? me about Brother Destaing; it seems to me that this is the first time I have heard of him.

Yesterday I wrote to Father Bardenet to have. . .

* * *

S. 772. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain

Saint-Remy, April 27, 1835, Saint-Remy

. . . and the prudence of sending it.

What you tell me must be the result of an astonishing error: that what Brother Clouzet wrote to M. Auguste was not at all what the latter expected, it greatly discouraged him, etc. I have had no reaction from Brother Clouzet.

M. Jados wants to be repaid (8,000 francs) by the end of the month, and we are almost there. On the other hand, you need 25,000 francs. These demands have apparently paralyzed Brother Clouzet.

I have explained to Brother Clouzet how m. Auguste. . .

*

. . . that concern the suppliers and the table service.

I have no recollection of what you told me about M. Dubaril. Before I answer you, please give me all the facts. I would like to see him come back, provided he is truly sincere.

My dear Son, it is very good for you to you change from Agen. . .

* * *

S. 775. Notes on the Government of The Establishment of Ebersmunster

May 22, 1835, Ebersmunster

6. When the functions of a principal office become too ramified, the incumbent may appoint auxiliaries who will be subject to him as he is to the Superior.

7. The Head of Instruction. In addition to his supervisory role over religious instruction in the entire community—that is, (a) over the orthodoxy of the religious instruction given by the Head of Zeal; (b) over religious instruction in case the Head of Zeal does not habitually speak in a Christian manner; (c) over the choice of books for the community library and to be distributed to the members of the community—has charge of the various masters or teachers whom he must guide in their teaching of the arts and sciences, but always under the supervision and authority of the Superior.

8. The Head of Zeal and also the Head of Instruction always defer to the Superior when the latter takes upon himself the responsibility of the religious instruction.

9. The Head of Work has charge of all his assistants when his administration is extensive, as well as all the employees under his care.

10. The Superior has authority over his principal Heads, not to disrupt their management but, on the contrary, to see that they carry out their duties faithfully and well.

11. The authority of the Superior consists in seeing to the observance in time and place of all the regulations of all the offices, and also of the general regulations. His authority is very general and has for its purpose the maintenance of everything within the sphere of his government. Delinquents who are subject to a particular Head are admonished by the Superior through that Head, to whom he makes his remarks, his criticisms, his reprimands, etc. However, the Superior cannot arbitrarily dispense from the rules and especially from the general regulations; this is especially true of the principal Heads. In exceptional cases, when permissions are needed, the matter is brought to the council. The discretionary power of the Superior or a principal Head would be used in case of urgency.

12. Only the General Administration can change the personnel.

13. At Ebersmunster, where the Superior must make long and frequent absences, there is a replacement who in his absence or even when he is present and the former deems it necessary has the full authority of the Superior with this difference—that if the Superior has given orders with respect to the management of the community or a fraction thereof, he must observe them so that there will never be an overt difference of opinion in the direction of the exercise of authority.

14. In those houses where there is a novitiate, as in Ebersmunster, a Master of Novices and the assistant must be appointed, especially when the Master of Novices has other functions. The Master of Novices may be considered a principal officer, always under the authority of the superior. The sphere of influence of the Master of Novices is extensive; it will be defined. The same should be done for the other principal offices.

15. All provisions will be stored in a pantry; Brother Xavier will have one key, and Brother Fisher another.

*

The Council of the Community of Ebersmunster

Whereas the present Superior of the establishment of Ebersmunster cannot reside habitually in the community,

Whereas it is important to combine all the principal Offices under a single directing Head,

Whereas the authority of the Heads of the various establishments is limited to ordinary cases, those foreseen in the Rule,

It is necessary for a wise distinction to be made between ordinary authority and the extraordinary one reserved to the General Administration.

We have decided there will be a Community Council, composed and described as follows.

Article 1. The Council is composed essentially of five members, six when Father Rothéa, the superior of the establishment, is present.

Article 2. The five members of the Council are Brother Clerc, Head of Instruction and director of the residence; Father Metzger, Head of Zeal and Master of Novices; Brother Loetsch, Georges, assistant to the Master of Novices; Brother Xavier Rothéa, Head of Work; and Brother Fischer, Bernard, assistant to the Head of Work.

Article 3. Although according to the Constitutions of the Society of Mary the Head of Zeal exercises the functions of the superior and takes his place in the latter's absence, exceptionally and until further notice Brother Clerc will replace him, and in that capacity will assume the authority of the superior. The superior or his representative will preside at the Council meeting (see the notes on the government of the community).

Article 4. The Council will meet regularly once a week at the most convenient time and day of the week, and extraordinarily when the superior or his representative deems it necessary.

Article 5. The councilors must be present at the weekly extraordinary meeting (this is binding in conscience) when possible. Even though the time and day have been fixed, these may be changed, with the president's assent, when circumstances warrant such a change.

Article 6. One of the five members will act as secretary. If necessary, a non-member can be appointed secretary to be responsible for the minutes; he would have only a deliberative vote. The register of the minutes will be checked and initialed by the Superior General. The secretary will write a more or less lengthy report of each meeting; this is obligatory after the approval of the minutes.

Article 7. Novitiate matters that are of the competence of the Council will be reserved for discussion until the superior himself can preside; the Council will then have six members. The Council appoints its secretary.

Article 8. As superior, Father Rothéa has so far exercised two distinct roles: that of founder of the establishment of Ebersmunster under the direction of the General Administration of the Society of Mary, and that of first director of the establishment. He has had almost unlimited authority over the institution. Today, now that the establishment has been accepted by the Society in its present form, with a novitiate for Alsace alone, Father Rothéa's authority has been reduced to that of a director or superior of an establishment.

Article 9. The director or superior of an establishment has authority over the three principal Heads—that is, the Heads of Zeal, of Instruction, and of Work, over all aspects of their administration. In a question involving an exception to the general or particular regulations, he decides only after having consulted the Council of the community, as it will be stated below. He sees to it that the decisions of the Council are implemented.

Article 10. Because the representative of the superior has the latter's authority, his actions must always conform to those of the superior. Only with the superior's permission can his representative continue in his functions in the presence of the former. This permission is sought each time the occasion presents itself. At other times, he is merely the assistant to the superior.

Article 11. The Head of Zeal is also Master of Novices. In this capacity he is like all superiors, Head of Zeal, of Instruction, and Work—that is, he has immediate action over all the offices for which there is no substitute; without prejudice, however, to the action of the superior of the establishment, of which the novitiate is only a part.???

Article 12. The role of the assistant to the Master of Novices is, in and for the novitiate, what that of the representative of the superior is for the entire establishment.

Article 13. To relieve the Head of Zeal whose concern extends to everyone in the institution, there may be several assistants. In the residence and with the boarders there is Brother Clerc; among the employees and assistants to the Head of Work there is Brother Fischer.

Article 14. The Head of Instruction has, so to speak, as many assistants as there are teachers or people employed in the education of the students at the boarding school. There must be perfect understanding among them. All opinions and feelings must come to a focus and have only one direction.

Article 15. When the Council is composed of five members, a decision will be adopted only with a majority of four. When the Council has six members, the vote of the superior must be one of the four when the measure is one upon which the Council can make a final decision. Minutes will be kept of each meeting and the motivated stand of each member noted.

Article 16. If the majority is only three out of five, or four out of six without the superior's vote, and if one of the councilors insists on a decision because of the importance of the measure, the minutes will be sent to the General Administration.

Article 17. Anything beyond what the regulations allow or that would be an exception to what they forbid is brought before the Council. Anything, that is, whatever is classed among the moral, the religious, or the temporal orders. Whatever takes place within the residence is subject to the director, even the particular expenses of the boarders. By him or in his name, the bills are sent to the people responsible. Here, the Head of Work is merely his secretary, his bookkeeper. He may have a secretary or a bookkeeper, but he bears the full responsibility. Relationships with the outside are matter for the Council.

Article 18. Neither the Council nor any one of the Heads can suppress or change an article of the regulations, or change approved methods, or authorize extraordinary expenses unless because of urgency recourse to the General Administration is impossible, in which case the Council uses its discretionary powers while informing the General Administration. Some permissions and changes to an accepted rule which the Council feels necessary to give or to make are never more than temporary exceptions and cannot affect future actions.

Article 19. See III, 2, p. 311.

*

Notes on the Office of the Head of Work at Ebersmunster

This office has jurisdiction over both Ebersmunster and Saint-Hippolyte. At Ebersmunster, it has the management of the boarding school and the novitiate. Although this office is quite extensive, it can be managed easily with care and conscientious bookkeeping.

1. In the residence, Brother X. Rothéa will be given a substitute who will always have 100 francs of petty cash to take care of incidentals; he keeps a detailed account of the use he makes of this sum.

2. Brother X. Rothéa will give the superior or his representative 40 to 50 francs for accessories for both professors and boarders; Brother Rothéa will receive an itemized account of this money.

3. Normally, Brother Rothéa will advance nothing to the boarders without a note from the director of the residence.

4. Brother Rothéa can combine the management of the novitiate with that of the residence, although there is a slight difference in the diet. The Master of Novices with his council will be in charge of the expenses for clothing and other needs. Brother Xavier will only be the steward. He will give the Master of Novices about 50 francs for the daily needs; he will receive an account of any expense.

5. No money or articles will be given to the novices by Brother Xavier without a note from the Master of Novices.

6. Anything of value or money received by the Master of Novices will be turned over to Brother Xavier with an explanatory note; likewise, anything of value or money which Brother Xavier receives for the novitiate will be reported in a note to the Master of Novices.

7. Any time an active or passive transaction amounts to 1,000 francs, Brother Xavier will make the proper entry in his books and send a note informing the Master of Novices.

8. Therefore, to avoid confusion, Brother Xavier will have three types of accounts: one for the boarding establishment, from which he will draw what is necessary to feed both groups; one for the novitiate, from which he will draw the funds needed for everything except food; and his own account, from which Brother Xavier will take what he needs to complement the other two. He will enter these sums in his book under the heading “advanced to the novitiate account or to the residence account.”

9. Saint-Hippolyte will have a steward who will be dependent on the director of Ebersmunster, but he will exercise his functions as if he were independent. They will agree on the budget.

10. Brother Xavier will be refunded for sums advanced to Saint-Hippolyte (a) from the tuition paid by the students; (b) from the *boni* left at the end of the year; and (c) by the payment of Ebersmunster’s debts to Saint-Hippolyte.

As soon as Saint-Hippolyte is self-sufficient, relationships with the Head of Work at Ebersmunster will be modified.

1. Brother Geng will become head gardener in charge of all the gardening. He will not have a key to the house.
2. He will be the baker for the house and will be in charge of the bakery.
3. He will saw the wood and prepare a winter supply for the furnaces and stoves. He will do this when garden work is impossible.
4. He will work under the direction of the Head of Work or of his substitute, and as a religious he will be under the direction of the Head of Zeal or his substitute in the community.

* * *

S. 775-2. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Bordeaux

May 31, 1835, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

See whether the move could be made soon and conveniently, although there is bound to be some discomfort. . .

* * *

S. 776. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

Ebersmunster, June 5, 1835, Ebersmunster

My dear Son,

Brother Mémain informs me from Bordeaux that you have sent M. Auguste 1,000 francs in two separate checks. Brother would have liked to use some of that money to pay that worrisome debt by the end of May. Father Caillet was expecting to receive 60-0 francs from Brother Coustou, who had saved them for him. Brother says he would willingly be the recipient, in your name, of sums from any of your debtors. On the other hand, it is up to you to exert pressure on them for he cannot; his status gives him no authority over the debtors.

The priority boarding school, my dear Son, is now. . .

*

P.S. Send Brother Roussel to Besançon as soon as possible to finish his course while the master weaver is still at the hospice. Brother Saras may have arrived before this letter. I asked him to try the weaver's trade before leaving the hospice.

* * *

S. 777. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

Ebersmunster, June 5, 1835, Ebersmunster

. . . the knack of keeping young people in tow.

In his present condition, it would be unwise to send Brother Duval to Orgelet to replace M. Couteret; he would draw too much attention. It would be different if M. Couteret left and after some time Brother Duval was sent there. He would be bored to death cooking for three brothers, himself included, with the replacement of Brother Olive for the lower class, knowing that for him this would be the *nec plus ultra*. It would be wiser if he went to his parents while he recovered his health; then if Orgelet needed someone he could be informed, and his decision would depend on his condition.

M. Couteret must be helped until the end of the year and the vacations in Saint-Remy. He could then go to the novitiate. Brother Duval should not be told that we do not expect him to recover completely. If he goes home without hope, it could do him considerable harm. I told Brother Clouzet to send Brother Roussel once he is here; he would do well to give me a short account of his spiritual condition.

The idea of reducing the tuition to 400 francs. . .

* * *

S. 778. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

Saint-Hippolyte, June 13, 1835, Saint-Hippolyte

. . . a fit of temper to which no attention should be paid.

The arrangements you have made with your brother and your family seem very wise to me. Get a promissory note for the 600 francs he owes you and give him up to three years to pay, even without interest. Brother Clouzet could use it in case of need, even with the discount. See to it that the note is made out to you so you can endorse it and transfer it to Brother Clouzet. . . .

Write to the superior of Arbois, tell her of the wishes of the professor, give her the information volunteered by the pastor of Buffignécourt, and include your own remarks.

Brother Mauchamp writes to me in his own way about the Chapter. . .

* * *

S. 780. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain

July 6, 1835, Ebersmunster

We would have to depart with a sort of dignity.

This assignment he leaves up to you.

It is possible that you might find some friends. . .

*

*Always work well together.
Discuss Bordeaux with Brother Clouzet.
Even if the pupils should find themselves somewhat hampered. . .*

* * *

S. 782. To Fr. Jean Chevaux
June 24, 1835, Saint-Hippolyte

I received your letter of June 16 through Brother Boillon at Saint-Hippolyte, three days sooner than the one you sent on June 15 from Ebersmunster. I will not speak of the main topic of these letters, Brother Brunet. You can see from the enclosed which I am sending to him what my reaction is and what you are to do. . . .

The incident with Brother Mauchamp was very well handled, as was the question of the tree-lined roads. I am sending a word to Brother Roussel; please seal the letter and see that he receives it in Besançon, where Brother Clouzet tells me that he is sending him to receive some lessons from a master weaver. I will write to Brother Clouzet about this.

It has rightly been observed that the reduction in tuition. . .

* * *

S. 783. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet
June 26, 1835, Ebersmunster

P.S. Give Brother Roussel the money he needs for the round trip.

* * *

S. 784. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet
Ebersmunster, July 7, 1835, Ebersmunster

I decided to send you the letter Bro. C. Boillon wrote to his brother. He says he needs tools, but there is no craftsman in the region who can make what he wants. Once they are ready, put them in a case and send them to Brother Coustou in Colmar, who will see that Brother X. Rothéa gets them. Brother Boillon is a hard worker and is well behaved, so far. I allowed him to buy in Strasbourg all the tools he needed to get started. He would need a helper, as I have already told you. He would prefer Auguste from Besançon, to whom he gave extensive training in carpentry. The most pressing work right now is in carpentry because of the furniture and the chapel for the novitiate. There are three hired carpenters here doing the rough work.

The novitiate at Ebersmunster will be beautiful. . .

* * *

S. 785. To Fr. Jean Chevaux
Ebersmunster, July 14, 1835, Ebersmunster

. . . in a grave and urgent matter, could he not let me know about it?

Let us be satisfied, my dear Son, with the promissory note your brother made out to you. Send it to Brother Clouzet. I will immediately answer Mother Superior in Arbois; what, I do not know yet. I presume that it will be in the negative.

Enclosed is a response—or rather a reply. . .

*

. . . not something they should give their principal efforts to.

When I suggested to Brother Galliot that he could have Brother Michaud as an extra teacher and not a replacement for Brother Perchet, he refused him, saying he needed a teacher of writing. I immediately found him not only a teacher of writing but an art teacher, and sent the man to him. The only fear I had was that the young man, who is pious and regular, might not become accustomed to a community which is criticized for its dissipation and lack of regularity. I recommended him to the care of Father Meyer. Let us not worry about Brother Courtet; at the end of the year we will have a better idea of what is to be done.

May the Lord be blessed, my dear Son, in all the mishaps. . .

* * *

S. 789. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

Ebersmunster, July 22, 1835, Ebersmunster

He left yesterday morning, the twenty-first, apparently for Agen.

I gave him 100 francs. I asked Brother X. Rothéa for the money, so as not to charge it to your account. Everything is going well here, but our young man becomes muddled easily. I also paid for most of the tools needed by Brother Boillon at Strasbourg. He asked his brother to get for him those that were not manufactured in Strasbourg, but that was not so simple. The cost of transportation from Saint-Remy to here would have been minimal. Neither he nor his brother expected to receive the tools already assembled. . . .

Recently I wrote to Father Chevaux or to Father Fontaine about young Dormoy and Brother Fridblatt. Brother Roussel arrived on the morning of July 15. He is doing well; I will have more to say about him in a few days.

Remain in peace, my dear Son, in the midst of all your worries.

* * *

S. 795. To Fr. Jean Chevaux

Ebersmunster, August 22, 1835, Ebersmunster

My dear Son,

I am writing to Father Fontaine about the dismissal of Brother Chavanne. In his letter of August 14, Brother Pelleteret says that he will go to Courtefontaine on Brother Clouzet's advice. He admits his misdeeds and does not seek to vindicate himself. I will write to him. Brother Boillon left on August 12 according to Brother Clouzet, but he says nothing about Brother Constant. The latter seemed to have come around, and that may be why Brother makes no mention of him in his letter of August 13. I had already written to him regarding Brother Mérigot.

Always remain in peace, my dear Son.

* * *

S. 795-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

Ebersmunster, September 7, 1835, Ebersmunster
(Copy, Agmar)

We discussed my personnel at some length. I had asked him to send me some teachers. He answered that the head of the establishment had begged him to allow his men to stay and not to remove any of his teachers. You had better not hire any professors from outside.

* * *

S. 797. To Fr. Jean Chevaux
September 14, 1835, Ebersmunster

. . . and furthermore, I am feeling fairly well.

I was expecting a letter from Brother Chopard before sending him an obedience for Bordeaux. This letter is not forthcoming; I will send him to you. I have already advised Bordeaux and have asked that Brother Oppermann go to Saint-Remy. There is no use discussing Brothers Duval, Froissard, and Couteret. I have just had a rather fine letter from Brother Mérito. I will answer; read my answer, then seal it and give it to him.

The Bishop of Saint-Claude had someone write. . .

* * *

S. 803-2. To Bro. Louis Rothéa
October 23, 1835, Courtefontaine
(Copy, Agmar)

Concessions Granted to the Houses in Alsace

1. The houses of Alsace may season their vegetables with salt pork, according to the custom of the country, and each one at table may eat a small portion of the pork with the vegetables; this, for dinner only.

2. Those houses that receive quantities of fruit as gifts and those that have gardens must proportionately reduce their purchase of comestibles??? So that a certain equality will reign overall.

3. Coffee and chocolate have always been considered as luxury items inappropriate for religious vowed to poverty. Such items received as gifts may be given to the seriously ill or to certain visitors. To avoid an overabundance of such items in small communities, these articles should be sent to the large establishments of Saint-Hippolyte and Ebersmunster which have a greater number of sick and infirm and more visitors of note.

4. The food will not be seasoned with delicate spices such as cloves, cinnamon, etc. Pepper may be added to certain foods which would otherwise be too insipid. Any practice to the contrary, as you say prevails in some of our establishments, is an abuse that must be suppressed.

5. Religious may not consume liquor, liqueurs, or foreign wines, even when these are gifts. Such gifts must be sent to the large establishments. The directors of these establishments who would serve these to visitors must abstain themselves. Should politeness oblige them to seem to indulge, they do so for appearances only.

6. Top boots and horn buttons on waistcoats and frockcoats are absolutely forbidden. Buttons must be made of the same cloth as the suit; however, anyone possessing coats with horn buttons who could not easily have them replaced with cloth buttons may wear these coats until they are worn out.

Although the community of Soultz does not qualify for the promises I made, I believe it would be good to have the *boni* from this house go to support the novitiate. This could have a beneficial effect and encourage others to contribute.

I have good reasons for wanting to sell Saint-Remy. I would like to sell it to a group of four members of the Society who, presumably, would have the money to buy it. I believe Brother X. Rothéa could take one-fourth, you and Father C. Rothéa another fourth, possibly Brother Xavier a third, you and Father Rothéa another third. Then Brother Clouzet would be in it for only one-third. I will submit this to Saint-Remy when I go there in a few days. It would be sufficient to have one of your three be present there with the procuration from the others—for instance, Brother Xavier. See if the idea is practical. I indent to sell only the open fields, not the woods. Each of your procurations could be worded like this. “Having heard that the château and property of Saint-Remy were up for sale, he empowered Brother X. Rothéa to act in his name and to buy a portion of the property corresponding to his means and resources, etc.” Discuss this immediately and let me have your answer. I will tell you when we can meet at Saint-Remy.

* * *

S. 806-2. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Layrac
Courtefontaine, November 9, 1835, Courtefontaine

I do not believe I told Father Lalanne of my disapproval of the repairs that were being made at Layrac.

* * *

S. 808-2. To the Community of Courtefontaine
Courtefontaine, November 17, 1835, Courtefontaine
(Copy, Agmar)

I, Superior General of the Society of Mary, considering the importance of combining under a unified direction the principal offices of the communities of the Society, considering that the authority of each of the directors must be confined to ordinary cases foreseen by the regulations, have constituted the Council of Courtefontaine as follows.

Article 1. The Council is composed essentially of five members: Father Meyer, Head of Zeal and pastor of the parish, now Master of Novices and Superior of the whole establishment; Brother Fridblatt, Head of Instruction and director of the residence; Brother Prost, Head of Work and assistant to the Master of Novices; Brother Noir, special assistant to the Head of Instruction; and Brother Verrier, assistant to the Head of Work. He is also assistant to the Head of Zeal for all the service personnel.

Article 2. The Council will meet regularly once a week, at a convenient day and hour, and extraordinarily when the superior deems it necessary.

Article 3. Father Meyer will preside. Attendance by the councilors at the ordinary or extraordinary meetings is compulsory (an obligation of conscience) when possible. Because of certain impediments and with the president’s agreement, the day and hour of the meetings may be changed.

Article 4. One of the five members will be a secretary. A non-member may be used for this office and to write up the minutes (which will contain the motivated opinions of the members) if need be. However, he will have no consultative vote. He will write the minutes into the register; the Superior General will check and initial the same. Insertion into the register is obligatory after the Council has approved the minutes. The Council appoints its secretary.

Article 5. The Head of Zeal is also the Master of Novices.

Article 6. Several assistants may be appointed to help the Head of Zeal in the discharge of his duties; his solicitude extends to everyone living in the house.

Article 7. The Head of Instruction has as many assistants as there are professors or people involved with the instruction and education of the students. Whoever they are, they must be in perfect accord; all opinions and feelings must concur and have the same focus.

Article 8. With only five members in the Council, a majority of four votes out of the five is required for motions that are within the competence of the Council.

Article 9. If the majority were three of the five votes, without that of the superior, and if one of the councilors demands a decision on an important matter, a copy of the minutes will be sent to the General Administration.

Article 10. All matters dealing with morals, religious life, and temporalities not covered by the general regulations or that constitute exceptions to what they forbid must be discussed in Council.

Article 11. Neither the Council nor the Heads who compose it can make a decision that would suppress or change a regulation or a method which has been approved, or authorize extraordinary expenses unless recourse to the General Administration is impossible. In such a case, the Council uses its discretionary power and immediately notifies the General Administration.

Article 12. Any permission, change, or modification to a rule or decision which the Council might make will never be considered as anything else but a momentary exception having no effect on the regulations in the future.

Article 13. The Council will zealously suppress all abuses. In case of doubt as to whether some custom is an abuse, the General Administration is consulted.

Article 14. Any permission, suggested change, or extraordinary expense for the establishment which the directors ask of the Superior General will normally first be submitted to the Council, and the minutes then sent to the Generalate.

Article 15. No Head in the house may dismiss a member from the community or exchange him for a member of another community without previous advice from the Council and the authorization of the General Administration.

Article 16. No Head may authorize, not even during the holidays, members of the community to take pleasure trips or excursions that would oblige them to spend the night outside the community or to take their meals elsewhere. The Council must see to it that such permissions are never granted except for grave reasons.

Article 17. Extraordinary items of business of the novitiate and of the residence will be matter for the Council.

Article 18. All the members of the Council must always put aside their personal opinions and preferences and seek only the interests of God and of holy religion in the wise direction of the works of the Society of Mary.

Article 19. The present directives will be written into the register of the minutes by the secretary. Five copies will be made by the Secretary General. The director of the establishment will see to their implementation.

Done at Courtefontaine during our regular visitation, November 17, 1835, under our signature and countersigned by the Secretary General.

* * *

S. 803-3. To Bro. Jean-Nicolas Troffer, Salins
Saint-Remy, December 2, 1835, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

Obedience

To our dear Son, Brother Troffer, principal of the primary school at Salins. With full confidence in you, my dear Son, after all the assignments you have been given in the various

houses to which you were sent, I have appointed you, as I do by these presents, to carry out the functions of principal in our new school at Soultz (Haut-Rhin). You will replace Brother Bourgeois, who will be given an obedience to go to another house. Your zeal in the formation of the children and adolescents of that town will be seconded by the respectable mayor and also by the worthy pastor, who is most interested in the education of youth. Leave as soon as you have settled your affairs at Salins, as we decided when I was passing through that town.

Done at Saint-Remy where I am on visitation, December 2, 1835.

* * *

S. 810-2. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Layrac

December 13, 1835, Saint-Remy

He [Father Chaminade] reproaches the same Brother Mémain with not having kept him informed. "Father Lalanne," he adds, "goes into no details, either about Layrac (this is not his concern) or about Bordeaux. He may have believed that, since you were acting for the Society as well as for him, you did what was required with respect to the Society."

* * *

S. 810-3. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Layrac

December 20, 1835, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

You might add . . . at the sign of the inextricable labyrinth into which he is heading in temporal matters, after buying the house in Layrac; this house now belongs to the Society because of your signature and it belongs to him because of his . . .

* * *

S. 813-3. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet, Saint-Remy

December 30, 1835, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, honorary canon of the metropolitan church of Bordeaux, a resident of the said town but actually living in Saint-Remy, canton of Amance, have sold under the most complete guarantee to M. Clouzet (Dominique), residing in Saint-Remy, canton of Amance, department of Haute-Saône, all the wood standing in the park of the château of Saint-Remy, the grounds of which he has reserved to himself in the bill of sale, a private agreement, on the third of the present month. As the price for the present sale, the buyer has paid the seller 9,000 francs in cash and 11,000 in promissory notes, a total of 20,000 francs, the total for the sale mentioned above. Done in duplicate in Saint-Remy, December 30, 1835

* * *

S. 814. To Fr. Léon Meyer

January 10, 1836, Saint-Remy

. . . even though he has taught some special classes. He had charge of the choir at the parish of his brother, the pastor. He seems to have much goodwill and a good dose of courage. He

will give you 200 francs for his first year of novitiate. I am not too sure what his trunk contains, but I do know that it is heavy. He has 25 francs left from his trip; that will be more than sufficient to pay for the transport of his trunk. Brother Bobby has just written that the entire town of Salins is up in arms over the loss of Brother Troffer and threatens to withdraw the students. I will answer Brother Bobby. . .

* * *

S. 816. To Father Trincaud

January 12, 1836, Saint-Remy

P.S. the Mother Superior will have the honor of showing you the letter which I am writing to Father Lalanne.

* * *

S. 818-2. To Father Trincaud

January 21, 1836, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

I took the liberty of writing to Father Lalanne urging him to pay the interest to the creditors holding mortgages on the real estate of the Society of Mary, and especially on the Razac mansion. Everything should incite him to pay—his conscience, his honor, justice, courtesy—but these motives have no weight with him. My arguments based on religion should be the strongest, of course. But since he ignores them and since they have no weight before the law, I must confine myself to those based on the strict justice found in civil societies. I am doing my utmost to avoid an outburst, which would lead to a scandal with unfortunate results.

The desire to prepare for himself a glorious future causes Father Lalanne to make many false moves under the pretext, however, of doing good. I hope you are convinced that I am far from approving his actions. I will not elaborate on this topic today. With this mailing I am answering one of his letters. I am sending a copy to the Mother Superior, who will have the goodness to show it to you if you believe these matters are sufficiently interesting to claim your attention. In order to spare Father, I have said nothing to the bishop. I am. . .

* * *

S. 820-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

February 9, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

Memorandum for Purposes of Consultation

Questions.

Must Father Lalanne, one of the first members of the Society of Mary, the appointed head and superior of the boarding establishment of Sainte-Marie in Bordeaux, render an account to the Society of the revenues and expenses of the school which is now at Layrac, having been transferred from Bordeaux to this ancient abbey?

Must Father Lalanne pay the debts incurred by the boarding school called Sainte-Marie, in Bordeaux?

Facts.

The Society of Mary, represented by its Founder and Superior, used a certain number of houses on the Rue des Menuts for a boarding establishment. A member of the Society was given charge of the work, and several others were employed as teachers and proctors; Father Lalanne was numbered among the professors. The superior of the residence paid the rent on the houses and provided for other needs.

Some years later, the Society of Mary decided to buy the Razac mansion. It did so on credit. The school was transferred to the new facility, and the teachers followed. All financial obligations were taken care of without difficulty, just as had been the rent on the houses of Rue des Menuts. Last year on April 18, M. Dardy, the proprietor of the ancient Abbey of Layrac, now adapted for boarders, offered to sell it to the Superior of the Society of Mary, giving the price and the conditions. In his answer of April 27 to M. Dardy, the Superior accepted all the conditions and sent a letter of acceptance to his council in Bordeaux, subject to the judgment of the council. Father Lalanne, a member of the council, gave the letter to M. Dardy through another member, without previous deliberation by the council and without the consent of the Superior's representative on the council. M. Dardy came to Bordeaux, acknowledged the receipt on May 13 of the Superior's letter of April 27, and accepted the Superior's terms. The sale of the ancient Abbey of Layrac was done by private contract.

Following M. Dardy's letter, the Superior asked his council in Bordeaux this. "What modifications should we ask M. Dardy to make? How will we proceed with the sales contract? The answer to these questions will be treated in another letter as soon as I have M. Dardy's answer. Give me your answer (this letter was addressed to Brother Mémain, a member of the council) after consulting with Father Lalanne and Caillet; also give me your own opinion; send me these as soon as possible."

Without further ado, Father Lalanne wrote to the Superior (then in Alsace) on July 31. "We have just returned from Agen, where we closed the deal! The contract has been signed in due form, in my name and in that of Brother Mémain." After receiving a copy of the agreement, the Superior of the Society did not believe it necessary to write to M. Dardy, for this matter had been carried out in such haste.

At many council meetings, the transfer of the boarding school from Bordeaux to Layrac was discussed. Father Lalanne argued that repairs for at least 30,000 francs would be needed before the house could be used. He thought he had found that sum, but this did not materialize.

The council finally decided on the transfer, but in a postscript to the minutes it asked that the final decision be left to the Superior, in view of the seriousness of the move. Father Lalanne refused to sign this postscript. He believed he was authorized to announce the transfer without waiting for the Superior's opinion. Later, and not to discourage Father Lalanne, the Superior did not manifest his displeasure at Father's refusal to sign the postscript, thereby assuming a great responsibility. The minutes are dated July 20, 1835. To console the Superior, Father Lalanne wrote on July 31 after a trip to Agen and Layrac: "We have agreed on the necessary repairs, which will not be as costly as first estimated. M. Ducos and other friends will help us in the work."

Father Lalanne knew that all the debts would follow him, those of the new boarding school and those of the Razac mansion which had been bought for the school and of which the Superior is the legal owner, unless the costs of the transaction and the interest on the mortgages were paid, and if the mansion was not leased or sold to pay these debts. All this was foreseen and discussed at the council meeting of July 20, 1835. Animated discussions followed between him and Father Caillet, the Superior's representative in Bordeaux. The latter was incensed when Father Lalanne, who had begun the transfer, told him that he would not pay the interest. The Superior has written ever since, most particularly on October 12, insisting that conscience, justice, honor, and courtesy made it a duty for him to pay that interest.

Father Lalanne's letter shows that even before the move, he was interested in finding some use for the deserted mansion. In the transfer from Bordeaux to Layrac, Father took with not

only all the furniture which could be useful, but also a library that was rich and precious because of the number and choice of books with which the Superior had endowed it. This library was completely detached from the ones set up in the school and for the teachers. It was the first item to be removed, without notice and without permission.

The purchase of the Abbey of Layrac was a pure and simple action by the Superior of the Society of Mary. M. Dardy already was boarding 40 students there. The Superior realized the great difficulty of transferring the school from Bordeaux and suggested that the institution in Bordeaux not be touched, and that some other director be sent to Layrac. This was rejected under the pretext that the entire Layrac region expected to have Father Lalanne at the head of the school, and that this already had been announced.

The Superior of the Society still does not possess a statement of the revenues and expenses of the school of Layrac. He heard from a third person that Father Lalanne refused to pay M. Loze of Bordeaux the interest on the mortgages he holds. For this reason, he has asked the two questions above, before taking further action.

* * *

S. 820-3. To Father Trincaud, Agen

February 9, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

Dear Father,

Only on February 9 did I receive your reply which was dated January 27, and I hasten to answer you. Your astonishment on receiving my letter would have been tempered by the realization that I had nothing to do with bringing the Layrac case before the See of Agen. During the many long years I have worked in the diocese under the auspices of His Excellency, I have never done or engaged in anything important or serious without informing him. In any case, it was to prevent the unfortunate consequences which a lawsuit involving Father Lalanne would have that I dared to ask your mediation to prevent it. If Father Lalanne has no ulterior motives, if he is acting in all honesty, why does he not stop it himself? He could have done so easily. Is it not evident that he must render an account to the Society of Mary for all income and expenditure connected with the institution? Is it not equally true that he must pay his debts in Bordeaux, at least those of the boarding school, or for the Razac mansion when he transferred the school to Layrac? You had no knowledge of the facts preceding the move, so you easily accepted the futile reasons given by Father in his answer to me. I will not answer him today, but I will send you a copy of a little memorandum on the matter and also a copy of a letter which I sent recently to Father in answer to one of his, telling me about his correspondence with you.

Memorandum To Be Consulted

Question.

Must Father Lalanne, director of the boarding school in the ancient Abbey of Layrac, pay the interest on the mortgages against the mansion of Razac in Bordeaux?

Facts.

The boarding school bearing the name of Sainte-Marie in Bordeaux, situated on the Rue des Menuts and occupying a certain number of rented houses adjacent to it, was later transferred to the old Razac mansion, Rue du Mirail.

The Superior General of the Society of Mary had just bought this mansion.

For many years, the cost was covered by mortgages. The two men who have been successively directors of the institution have always paid the rental on the houses on the Rue des Menuts and later on the Rue du Mirail, and the interest on the mortgages on the Razac mansion, and so faithfully that there was never any difficulty in negotiating these mortgages.

The owner of the ancient Abbey of Layrac offered to sell the building to the Superior General of the Society of Mary. He had made many repairs to the edifice. Father Lalanne, Brother Mémain the elder, and several other members of the Society of Mary debated whether to purchase the abbey on the terms proposed and to transfer the school from the Razac mansion. The greater possibility for development would furnish the means to pay off all the debts still plaguing the Sainte-Marie institution.

Brother Mémain and Father Lalanne hurriedly obtained legal approval for their private deal between the former owner and the Superior of the Society. Under the direction of Father Lalanne, the Sainte-Marie institution was transferred to Layrac with all the furniture. Father has refused to pay the interest due on several mortgages on the Razac mansion and sent the creditors to the Superior General of the Society or to his representative in Bordeaux. The Superior has been absent for some time, visiting other houses of the Society and founding others.

The consultant asks if, given the above facts, Father Lalanne, director of the boarding school of Layrac, is not obliged in justice to pay the interest on the debts of the Razac mansion by renting the house, or by selling it to pay off the debts. While the consultant demands that justice be done to the creditors, he reserves to himself the right to make other demands on Father Lalanne.

* * *

S. 822-2. To Father Trincaud, Vicar General, Agen

February 16, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

Father,

I felt it was my duty to send you on February 12 such lengthy dispatches that I was almost ashamed of them. And yet, how abridged they were and lacking in useful information.

Just as I was about to answer the note from Father Lalanne which you so graciously forwarded to me, I received another from the lawyer. I think you know its contents. I read it with pleasure and interest and sent an immediate answer, a copy of which I am enclosing. Father Lalanne seems to want to dialogue and there is nothing else that I desire more, provided he does so with frankness and in harmony of mind, heart, and action. Without this understanding, it will be impossible to remedy the evils that threaten and plague us already in Bordeaux. With this unity of purpose that I see, I hope to bring everything to a halt, to take care of the past without hard feelings, and to look to the future in peace. I would be grateful to you, Father, if you gave him my answer and urged him to contribute to this unity which I ask and which is so necessary. In the declaration he will make to you let there be no ambiguity, nothing that might lead someone to suspect an ulterior motive. I will cease all legal action against him. From his answer we will be able to judge his sincerity; then, I hope, you will rejoice over the institution of Layrac.

Finally, if you believe His Excellency should take part in this matter, then I would like you to ask Monsignor for a letter authorizing you to correspond with Father Lalanne in his name and in your. You know what I want.

The sales contract for the ancient Abbey of Layrac in the names of Father Lalanne and Brother Mémain does not need to be changed, provided the usual precautions are taken, such as those I would have taken had things not been so precipitate. I do not want to suppose any evil intention. I should then annul my compromise with M. Dardy, and everything will end there. I will go to Layrac if Father so desires, and if you believe it is helpful or necessary, but it will be only to terminate this business, to free the house from certain shackles which could hamper the development of this interesting institution.

Father Lalanne is guided by certain principles which become those of his partisans, but which I find unacceptable. They are the cause for the lack of unity among us. For instance, the

principle which allowed him to purchase the Abbey of Layrac in his name and against the wish of his Superior, as you saw in the excerpt from one of his letters. What principle guided him when he proposed that Brother Mémain sell him his half of the acquisition of Layrac? I can admit of no other principles except those that conform to justice to uprightness, to good faith, and to the virtues we must practice. However good our intentions, when we follow these principles we must do whatever good is possible without failing against a virtue. I must stop; I am, your most respectful. . .

* * *

S. 822-3. To Bro. Guillaume Silvain, Courtefontaine

February 16, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

The Superior General of the Society of Mary to his dear Son, Brother Silvain (Guillaume). My dear Son, you will go immediately to Saint-Remy to teach in the primary section according to the decision of Brother Clouzet, the director of the school. Before doing so, you will present your former pupil, M. Gazillot, to the mayor of Courtefontaine; he was brought up in the same commune and will be your replacement. I am sure that the mayor and the entire commune will see with pleasure that he has been legally hired as a teacher. Before your departure, my dear Son, see the subprefect of Dôle and whomever it may concern to inform the competent authority of your change. May the Lord and his august Mother ever keep you. Done at Saint-Remy, signed, and countersigned by our secretary.

* * *

S. 825. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

February 26, 1836, Saint-Remy

P.S. My dear Son, I did not grasp the meaning of the abbreviation you used in that sentence, "It is the immediate consequence . . . s.g. . . . in this state of affairs."

* * *

S. 825-2. To Father Trincaud, Agen

February 26, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

Dear Father,

I have just received a letter from Father Lalanne at Layrac dated February 15. He claims he did not receive the letter you were so kind as to announce to him. He also sends me the prospectus from a corporation for the establishment of a full-fledged *collège* at Layrac. I believe you know all about such prospectuses. I thought it right to send you a copy of my answer. I believe you have received my comments on his suggestion about a lawyer. I maintain the firm hope that through your intervention I will be able to bring some sense into this headstrong and stubborn person, who could otherwise do so much good.

I am with the most profound respect. . .

* * *

S. 825-3. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémmain, Layrac
February 26, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

You have made your position at Layrac most unsupportable and most dangerous, both for yourself and for the Society. Exhort your suppliers to patience.

* * *

S. 825-4. To M. Ducos, Lawyer, Agen
March 4, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

I hear that Father Lalanne continues to borrow money and to contract more debts. If at the moment you receive this letter you are aware that Father refuses to cooperate unconditionally with his associates, represented by their Superior, in the support and the maintenance of the Layrac institution, I beg and authorize you in my name to declare publicly that I cannot be responsible for the debts contracted by Father Lalanne, although he is one of the principal associates of the Society of Mary. I pray you to include nothing that might be injurious to him personally, and even to mention his talents, especially for the education of youth. Before giving this declaration to the publications of the department, I wish you would show it to Father Trincaud and change in the text whatever does not deal directly with the proposed announcement, that is, that I am no longer responsible for his debts.

The moment I hear of his submission, I will provisionally reestablish the financial process and will go as soon as possible to settle once and for all the affairs of this establishment. You may have noticed, Sir, from the note written by Father at your suggestion, that he was not completely frank and that my remarks justified your recommendation. I do not believe I have stated anything that cannot be proved. Please accept. . .

* * *

S. 825-5. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémmain, Layrac
March 4, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

You borrowed 5,000 francs from M. Maydieu in your own name. See to it that you use this money to pay those pressings debts for which the Society is liable.

* * *

S. 825-6. To Father Bardenet, Acey
March 5, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Collaborator,

Under the pretense of a simple consultation, Brother Clouzet presented his sales contract to the registration bureau of Amance, where the payment of 1,200 francs annually was severely criticized. Because the time for registration was running out, Brother came to see me. I told him

what I have always recommended, that M. Perrot, of admitted competence, be consulted. I explained in my own way the principles that guided M. Perrot in his preliminary work. Brother left the same day for Besançon without advising me. M. Perrot was not pleased with the contract we had written and asked for two days to study it and to consult. In fact, two or three days later, Brother Clouzet received at Saint-Remy the projected contract you have before you.

I believe it fitting to write to M. Perrot the letter of which you now have a copy. I will give you his answer as soon as it arrives. To the third question I put to him, I did not add the few means we have used thus far. Although they were successful, I have no great faith in them. He may find some that may be more productive. Our affairs in the Midi seem to have improved. I think I will have to go to Agen and Layrac to settle everything. I am your most respectful and devoted servant.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

*

Copy of M. Perrot's Project

The undersigned, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, honorary canon of the metropolitan church of Bordeaux, where he is now residing,

Has sold under the widest guarantees to M. Dominique Clouzet, residing at Saint-Remy; Charles Rothéa, priest; and Louis Rothéa, his brother, residing at Saint-Hippolyte, department of Haut-Rhin, the undersigned, and to their heirs,

The landed property belonging to him in the territory of Saint-Remy, canton of Amance, department of Haute-Saône, comprising:

1. A château, buildings, yards, gardens, orchards, park, fields, vineyards, and woods, the whole surrounded by a wall and a band of land allowing for vehicular passage,
2. A farm with buildings, houses, fields, vineyards, and appurtenances.

All this real estate as it stands and is the property of the seller, and furthermore is described in the bill of sale made out on May 17, 1823, by Father Bardenet before M. Belamy and his colleague, both notaries in Besançon, and was turned over to the purchaser. The seller does not intend to sell the woods on the property; he reserves the right to harvest the timber within the next three years.

It will be the joint responsibility of the purchasers or of their heirs to pay the price of the present sale to the seller, at his residence and unconditionally, 4,000 francs prepaid annually, for life. The first payment has been made to M. Chaminade and has been acknowledged. They also gave him promissory notes for 12,000 francs for the next three payments, to be honored by the buyers even should the seller die before they become due. This clause is essential; only on this condition is the sale to take place.

If the buyers wish to have this contract notarized, M. Chaminade appoints M. ---as his proxy who will be a witness to the signing, and he has all powers to do whatever may be stipulated.

Done in quadruplicate at Saint-Remy, - - -, 1836

* * *

S. 825-7. To M. Perrot, Besançon

March 5, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

I am glad I insisted with Brother Clouzet that he seek your advice before signing the sales contract. The project you were kind enough to send me pleases me very much. I believe it to be

unassailable; however, may I ask a few questions, not on the contract but on some extraneous aspects, for your kindness has inspired me with the greatest confidence.

1. Should Father Bardenet not give me in writing a release from the 10,000 francs I must pay to his heirs according to the terms of the sale of the château and estate of Saint-Remy?

2. Should the names of the purchasers replace mine in the simple contract allowing him 1,200 francs annually? I have just been told that you are not familiar with either contract; I hereby enclose copies of both.

3. Is there any way of preventing accidents to these contracts and agreements caused by events and human inconstancy? I have no fears about the present deal or from the present buyers, but in similar situations serious breaches of confidence could take place in time, and I believe we should find the means to forestall these. For instance, a group of members of the Society buys, in their names, allegedly for the Society, some rather valuable real estate. What type of document could protect me against their heirs or any other eventuality? It seems to me that the form of these documents should be different if this idea is taken into consideration, in the case where I myself am the seller. You can see how great my trust in you is; it is entire, as is the respectful gratitude with which. . .

* * *

S. 827-2. To M. Ducos, Lawyer, Agen

March 8, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

Monsieur,

I believe the time has come to formulate in my name the declaration of which I wrote in my last letter. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I have just received from Father Lalanne and my answer to the same. He seeks to forge ahead and tries to gain time by endless discussions. A good accounting system must be set up at Layrac. I had appointed Brother Mémain to the task, but he is completely under the sway of Father Lalanne. Father's opinions have prevailed in Bordeaux, and now in Layrac. By dint of demanding an accounting, I did receive something recently, and the list of the debts he has contracted now shows 19,000 francs.

In each of Brother Mémain's letters, I read only vague statements: the impossibility of keeping accounts, an impossible situation, Layrac where the Society was to find new life will be its grave, the institution, however, is prospering. It is imperative for Father Lalanne to submit to an effective bookkeeping system, one which gives an account of the past and of the present. By "past" I mean the debts he contracted in Bordeaux and now in Layrac; by "present," everything concerning the maintenance and the development of the institution. If Father does not immediately submit purely and simply, if he does not give Brother Mémain the freedom to balance his accounts, if he will not agree to all the restraints and economies that are called for, I hereby urge you to write the declaration I am requesting, and to agree with Father Trincaud as to the form it should take.

If in spite of Father Lalanne's written promises and the seeming liberty granted to Brother Mémain the latter is hampered in his duties, if all the money from the boarders does not find its way into the proper coffers (the tuition is being paid at this time), then and without another order you must, Sir, publish the suggested declaration. I will write to Brother Mémain and explain his responsibility at this point, for he and not Father Lalanne will then be responsible. If the latter behaves wisely, Brother Mémain may have to seek your advice. I would be greatly obliged if you gave it to him generously.

You realize the importance of setting up a strict accounting system at Layrac. I imagine Father Lalanne will later enjoy the peace and quiet which are bound to result.

If you are forced to issue that declaration, Monsieur, later we will see what must be done; things cannot remain as they are. On the other hand, if Father agrees to the bookkeeping but realizes that he has overextended himself, either in the past or in the present, I would willingly go there to try to arrange things. This supposes the goodwill of Father Lalanne, for I will not necessarily agree with all his opinions; even if I agree with some, I may gradually revoke the consequences.

Receive. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 827-3. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Layrac

March 9, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I do not know if you are familiar with the contents of the letter Father Lalanne sent me last February 26. If this does not find you at Agen, you can obtain a copy from M. Ducos or Father Trincaud. I answered Father and sent a copy of that answer to both of these gentlemen. We must put a stop to this, and the only way to do that is to introduce a systematized bookkeeping method. If Father does not agree in good faith and in all frankness, then M. Ducos will give him the declaration we agreed upon in previous letters and especially in today's, a copy of which I am enclosing for your guidance. Father must allow you to act responsibly toward the Society. You may notice that I never included you in my reprimands to Father Lalanne, for I realized that he was merely using you, or that he restricted your freedom by imposing his ideas on the accounting.

The problem is not to know what is advantageous for Layrac, but whether that advantage prevents the payment of long-standing debts. A responsible accounting requires strict attention to the past and to the present. If you find this impossible in the present situation, let me know and if necessary, I will go to Layrac to find the means of balancing the books. I said as much to Father Lalanne when I sent him a copy of my letter to M. Ducos.

Accounts, my dear Son, must be kept very strictly. Always be open with Father Lalanne, obliging even, but very strict and uncompromising when it comes to accounting. However, your inflexibility must be couched in friendly and courteous language and never lapse into dispute. When in doubt, consult me. Do not make a decision under the pretext that I would approve or disapprove if I were there. If Father truly agrees to the bookkeeping I am advocating and which is required by law, if he allows you to work in complete freedom, see to it that all revenues find their way into your cash box. This is the Easter season, when most of the money comes in; this is the time when you must be at your post, not absent, as happened at the opening on All Saints.

Brother Olivier's baker at Noailles wrote to tell me that Father Lalanne refused to accept a bill from Brother amounting to 326 francs, I believe, and that the bill had been returned to him with the surcharges. On the other hand, Brother Olivier, who is now in Bordeaux, states that he had arranged with you for the payment and that he had seen to the transport of all the furniture from Noailles. It was unwise of Father Lalanne to refuse to pay the bill, even if he had no money; the bill came one month before the money was due. He could have accepted it and paid it at leisure. What can be done with this mess? I will write to Brother Olivier and tell him that because you had agreed among yourselves to pay the bill, and now that the furniture is at Layrac, he should send a check to the baker and charge it to you or to Father Lalanne, along with the surcharge.

* * *

S. 828-2. To Father Trincaud, Agen

March 15, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

I gratefully received your letter of March 5 with Father Lalanne's reply to the remarks I had made about the consultation with the lawyer. I also received a letter from Father Lalanne from Layrac, dated March 3. We seem to be coming to a final understanding, and that is all I want. I make no reference to the past in my answer to Father, not even to his attempt to justify his actions. Enclosed is a copy of my last answer, which I am mailing directly to him. With your peaceful meditation all difficulties will vanish, even if Father Lalanne creates new ones.

I am. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 829-2. To Bro. Bernard Gaussens, Agen

March 22, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Superior General of the Society of Mary, do authorize by these presents Brother Gaussens, a member of the Society of Mary and director of the primary schools of Agen, to accept in my name and for the primary free schools of Agen a legacy left by M. Jacques François Ignace Dalès Latour, consisting of 100 francs per year, out of a listed (no. 133) 208 francs, dated March 15, 1820, Agen.

I also authorize the said Brother Gaussens to withdraw these funds and to spend them on the construction of the school at Agen. The heirs would see this as another proof of the intention of the Society to make the free schools a permanent institution in Agen.

Done at Saint-Remy, March 22, 1836, in the form of a private agreement.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 829-3. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémain, Layrac

March 24, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

It is up to you, my dear Son, to go ahead with wisdom, constancy, and firmness. You may never have in your lifetime another such opportunity to prove the trust I have in you. Do not worry or be surprised. I will pray for you.

* * *

S. 830-2. To Father Trincaud, Vicar General, Agen

March 25, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

Reverend Father,

The storm seems to have passed. Father Lalanne has just written asking me to send his declaration to you and to M. Ducos. He seems to have been touched by my last letter; he seems to have read in it insulting suspicions, which proves that he is acting in good faith and that we can

count on his promise. Enclosed is a copy of my answer. Your honorable and charitable suggestions helped greatly to settle this matter, which could have become very serious indeed.

Please accept this first expression of my gratitude. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 831-2. To Father Bardenet, Acey

April 6, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

My Respected Collaborator,

Brother Clouzet has just read to me the letter which you intended for my eyes; he has probably answered you in everything that concerned him. I always find your advice very wise indeed. I attribute your rather sharp comments on our affairs in the Midi to your zeal for the Society of Mary and an insufficient knowledge of their circumstances.

I find unassailable the project presented by M. Perrot for the sale of the Saint-Remy property. If I had signed the document I might have had cause to regret it, given some unforeseen events. So I consulted M. Perrot and in all frankness and simplicity sent you a copy of my letter to him. I was greatly surprised at his silence and was about to send a special delivery to Besançon when, from your letter to Brother Clouzet, I learned that he was dissuaded by your visit. You thought I wanted to retract the 10,000 francs the contract states will be due to your heirs after your death, and I thought you had told your heirs not to claim that sum. I thought a word about that revocation would not change your plans, but would calm the seller and the new buyers.

In your letter to Brother Clouzet you claim that you have no intention of giving the 10,000 francs mentioned in the contract. I do not know what has caused you to forget so soon what you had said. In any case, we will not discuss this. Without changing the form of the contract, it will not be difficult to add the 10,000 francs to it, and we will accept this senseless increase in registration fees for the remission of our sins. I will wait for an answer before signing the contract, keeping the earlier one in case of death. I know from the letters I received yesterday from the Midi that I can delay my visitation of that part of the country.

You say I have asked you five times for the remittance of those 10,000 francs. I did mention them five times, but always in conformity with the intentions that were yours. However lacking in discretion you may believe me to be, I could not push indiscretion so far as to ask you five times for the same thing; I would not be humble enough to accept your formal refusals. You say about this new incident, which led me to speak to you of the 10,000 francs, that you have given 300,000 francs to the Institute of Mary. I will not comment on that affirmation, or on the consequences you draw from it, that you cannot now give the 10,000 francs in question. This is what I believe I read in your letter to Brother Clouzet.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 831-3. To Bro. David Monier, Bordeaux

April 8, 1836, Saint-Remy

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am sorry to hear that you and M. Auguste are still at loggerheads about those much-discussed promissory notes. Because these notes are now null and have been cancelled, why do you refuse to hand them over? If you have destroyed them, why not admit it? Such a refusal can

only create anxieties in M. Auguste and in his lawyer. You can have both the peace and quiet you long for; why leave the seeds of new troubles and problems? You have been freed of all responsibility for those notes. I can find no solid reason for your resistance. I say “solid,” for I know that the imagination can create them. But it is not difficult to make a statement which would effectively kill all suppositions.

My dear Son, help us to put an end to our affairs in Bordeaux. This letter may not find you there; you may have traveled with M. Bousquet the elder to Saint-Remy, if his son convinced him to go. Should that be the case, I will have the satisfaction of embracing you. I will be here for a few more days and will not go to Bordeaux. More urgent business forces me to visit other houses. Please accept. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 831-4. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Layrac

April 11, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Had I any doubt of your good faith, I could very easily label the sheet you slipped into Brother Chopard’s letter on March 28. You always start from a false premise. Brother Mémain is in your employ and will be as long as he discharges his duties at Layrac. It is his duty to provide whatever is necessary for the management of the school, for the food and clothing of the religious. It is your duty and right to see that he is faithful to this assignment. However, it may be that he cannot satisfy everyone because of the deterioration of the linen and the wardrobe, that he cannot carry out every order you give because of the pitiable state of the bookkeeping which may, at a given time, jeopardize both you and the Society.

You say you cannot complain of Brother Mémain. You seem to hint that you do complain of his administration, that you could correct some deficiencies he might have. I had this in mind when, knowing his good character and his probity, I sent him to you as Head of Work. Now the administrative methods of the Society are basically sound; they are founded on true principles of prudence and justice. I can say without exaggeration that they exemplify the four cardinal virtues, and I could prove this. It can never be maintained that the head of an institution can arbitrarily dispose of its resources and encumber it with debt. It would be unavailing to claim that he had no evil intention, or that he is working for the good of the Society which had entrusted the direction of the institution to him.

If the Head of Work is responsible to his superior in the exercise of his duties as steward of the house, and if the superior clashes with him, the latter must refer to the General Administration. The Head of Work even has that right, because he may not obey orders that are contrary to the interest of the Society to which he is responsible. This may have led you to believe that he was your administrator, rather than your dependent. You are greatly mistaken in this respect, and your misconception is of long standing and is the cause of endless discussions and their unfortunate effects.

After these considerations I refer, my dear Son, to my last letter of April 4. If Brother Mémain does not suitably acquit himself of his duties before I arrive in Layrac, we will see whether he should be changed because of incapacity or some defect which he refuses to correct, or because he is oblivious to the fact that he must be responsible both to you and to the Society. In spite of my occupations and yours which oblige us to curtail our correspondence, I will add a few more words about your complaints.

A baker is never paid for the loss of weight of his product due to baking. If that is done at Layrac, this is due to faulty supervision. Customers who buy bread by the pound buy well-cooked

bread, and not a blob of dough. I am surprised that you are not aware of this; moreover, Brother Mémain should be an expert in this field. Partially cooked bread should be returned if it is not the first time and if it can be bought elsewhere. It should be refused if you can find another baker. It is even customary to weigh the bread when it is cold.

Clothing should not come back from the laundry reddish, smudged, and not fully repaired. Brother Mémain is to blame if he allowed this although he had the authority to correct it, and especially if you reproved him, as it was your duty to do.

Brother's anger and indignation toward the brothers who complain to him must probably be attributed not to the brothers, but to his situation and his inability to remedy things. Did you not all have good reason to complain of the calico shirts—you returned two bolts of cloth because it had been bought to make curtains—and he countermanded the order to the Daughters of Mary and compromised you? Besides, Brother Mémain recalled the remarks I had made to him at Agen about those calico shirts. The brother who stole a shirt from a boarder was in dire need of one. But it always comes back to the same question: did Brother Mémain have the freedom to use the resources of the institution? Let him put aside the defective clothing he is wearing, have someone mend it or do it himself in the present shabby state of the clothing of the institution. What can I say? If the clothing was all worn in common, it would soon all be threadbare. Not that I approve of Brother's fear of lacking clothing. Charity should have compelled him to deny himself to clothe his brothers in their need. With all the more reason, as a religious with a vow of poverty, he should have found satisfaction in the occasion to practice that virtue. If the brothers did not admire his little virtue, they also should not have ranted against him.

The conclusions you arrive at on your sheet are faulty because your principles are poorly expressed. True, your absence is not responsible for the loss of the boarding school at Saint-Remy, but neither is it the subjection of the director of the institution to the business manager. We would be better off if Father Fontaine had not adopted your bias against the temporal management. In any case, the loss is due to neither cause. I will not describe the true causes; that is not the purpose of this letter.

I believe the Layrac institution would have been jeopardized without a change in the quality of the bread before the Easter vacations. You did well to exert your authority. But your action will be ineffective if, to obtain that is fully baked and digestible, you still pay the baker for the loss of weight during the baking process.

I am surprised that none of your three last letters, to which I made a single reply, mentioned the unrest you speak of, although their dates were close to that of the sheet. I hope you will have straightened everything out before your departure, that Brother Rey will have agreed to replace you or rather, to represent you in the direction and supervision of the boarding school. Should he notice that Brother Mémain is neglectful of the diet or of some other aspect of his responsibility he should inform me immediately, unless it is an accident or a simple mistake on his part. I assure you, my dear Son, that if I am not more attached than you to the prosperity of the school at Layrac, I am just as much so. I must stop; I embrace you most tenderly and will pray for the absent and the traveler.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

P.S. The prefect of Haut-Rhin would like to know the whereabouts of M. Rohmer, a recruit of 1833. Father Rothéa assured the mayor of Saint-Hippolyte that M. Rohmer was on the list of the Archbishop of Bordeaux, that he was pursuing his clerical studies and preparing for Holy Orders, etc. Some are worried at Saint-Hippolyte because M. Rohmer's father showed the mayor a letter from his son stating that he was at Layrac with Father Lalanne, etc. Correct any conflicting statement you may find in Bordeaux, at Saint-Hippolyte, or at the bishopric of Agen.

S. 832-2. To Bro. Constant Gouverd, Saint-Claude

April 12, 1836, Saint-Remy
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

With full confidence in your ability, I have appointed you by these presents, director of the new establishment of primary instruction at Saint-Claude, as a replacement for Brother Galliot who has been given another assignment.

I am greatly interested in the prosperity of the house in Saint-Claude because of the interest shown in the work by the bishop, the pastor of the cathedral, and by M. de Montgaillard, and also because of the protection of the mayor and the interest shown by the townspeople. I hope, my dear Son, that the wisdom of your conduct will correspond to my hopes and feelings.

Done at Saint-Remy, under my signature and countersigned by my secretary.
G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 835-3. To Fr. Charles Rothéa and Bro. Dominique Clouzet

April 20, 1836, Besançon
(Copy, Agmar)

The undersigned, Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest, Honorary Canon of the metropolitan church of Bordeaux where he resides, being covered by the most solid guarantees, has sold to M. Dominique Clouzet, residing in Saint-Remy, to Charles Rothéa, priest, and Louis Rothéa, his brother, residing at Saint-Hippolyte (Haut-Rhin), and to their heirs, M. Clouzet having also signed and done so for M. Rothéa, whom he represents; their signatures to this document will be ratifications enough:

The lands belonging to him in Saint-Remy, canton of Amance, department of Haute-Saône, and consisting of

1. a château, buildings, yards, gardens, orchards, park, fields, vineyards, and woods, the whole surrounded by a wall and a strip of land allowing for vehicular traffic;
2. a farm with buildings, houses, fields, vineyard, and appurtenances.

All this real estate as it stands and is the property of the seller is described in the bill of sale made out on May 17, 1823, for M. François Xavier Faivre by M. Belamy and his colleague, notaries in Besançon, and was turned over to the purchaser.

The seller does not include in the sale the woods on the property; he reserves the right to harvest the timber within the next three years. It will be the joint responsibility of the purchasers or of their heirs to pay the price of the present sale to the seller, at his residence and unconditionally, 4,000 francs, prepaid annually, and for life.

Brother Clouzet, using his funds and those of his associates, has made the first payment to Father Chaminade, who has acknowledged it. He also gave him promissory notes for 12,000 francs for the next three payments, to be honored by the buyers even should the seller die before they become due. This clause is essential; only on this condition is the sale to take place.

If the buyers wish to have this contract notarized, M. Chaminade appoints M. Perrot, honorary notary of Besançon, to be his proxy who will be a witness to the signing and who has all the powers to do whatever may be stipulated.

Done and signed in duplicate at Besançon, April 20, 1836.

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 835-3. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet and Fr. Charles Rothéa

April 20, 1836, Besançon
(Copy, Agmar)

In the year 1836, on April 20, M. Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade, priest and honorary canon of Bordeaux, and Dominique Clouzet, residing at Saint-Remy, have agreed to the following:

Article 1. M. Chaminade sells to M. Clouzet the woods and the timber he had reserved to himself in the sale by private transaction of the château of Saint-Remy and of its appurtenances, and he declares to have been satisfactorily compensated by the said M. Clouzet.

Article 2. M. Chaminade also sells to M. Clouzet and to the Rothéa brothers, his associates, his furniture and all his movables presently in the château of the said Saint-Remy, on the farm, in the buildings and appurtenances. To pay for this acquisition, the purchasers will furnish

(1) an annual payment of 1,200 francs which M. Chaminade owes Father Bardenet according to a claim which he can prove and at the time stipulated, and

(2) 10,000 francs which M. Chaminade will owe after the decease of Father Bardenet, in virtue of the bill of sale of May 17, 1823, of which the buyers are clearly aware.

Done in duplicate in Besançon. . .

G.-Joseph Chaminade

* * *

S. 836. To Bro. Jean-Marie Mémoin

April 25, 1836, Courtefontaine

. . . *your letter of April addressed to Saint-Remy.*

I was at Saint-Remy when I received your note dated April 8, and in the meantime I received one from Father Lalanne at Courtefontaine, from Layrac and dated April 10. It appears that neither he nor you, but especially you, have understood my letter of April 4. Father Lalanne seems to have a better grasp of his contents, but he was only too willing to let you misinterpret it according to what was present in your mind. Your bias may disappear after you read my answer to the sheet he inserted into the letter Brother Chopard was writing to me. I answered on April 15 and insisted more briefly on bookkeeping and the bookkeeper.

I hope I will never be found to contradict myself. . .

* * *

S. 837. To Fr. Jean Lalanne

April 26, 1836, Caourtefontaine

. . . *I have so often and in so many ways explained to you,*

. . . and recently again in my reply of April 15 to the sheet you inserted into Brother Chopard's letter (a letter which, may I add, did not betoken one who had just been faithful to his Easter duties and still less one who is a frequent communicant).

The reading of my letter would not have discouraged. . .

*

. . . *as far as Agen, and going by way of Toulouse.*

I have nothing to add to answer on the Olivier matter. I knew, and he admitted that he received 500 francs which he did not report.

I am taking a great part, my dear Son, in the consolation. . .

* * *

S. 837-2. To M. Chauzu the Younger Brives

April 27, 1836, Courtefontaine

(Copy, Agmar)

I finally received your letter of March 22. I had just received one from M. Olivier dated March 14 and telling me that everything was in order in Brives, that he had gone to Bordeaux and was living at no. 2, Rue Tanesse. I advise you to apply directly to him, and should he refuse to pay you 345.82 francs, with your bills as evidence, threaten him with the courts.

M. Olivier can very easily pay you because, aside from what he took with him to Bordeaux, you yourself gave him 300 francs which he must still have, for he had no reason to spend them. He is not a member of the Society, as you may have noticed; that is why he took private lodgings in Bordeaux. I share with you, Sir, the discomfiture caused by M. Olivier; fortunately, such unpleasant things do not happen too often in life. I am traveling, and toward the end of may I will be in the Midi. Please accept this mark of my esteem and consideration.

* * *

S. 842-2. To the Daughters of Mary, Auch

July 1836, Auch

(Copy, Agmar 3.5.4, p. 1)

I, Missionary Apostolic, Founder of the Daughters of Mary and Superior General of the Society of Mary, have come to Auch at the invitation (which I consider an order) of His Excellency, Mgr. Joachim Jean Xavier d'Isoard, cardinal, priest of the Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Auch, etc., etc., in order to incorporate into the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, under the title of Companion Sisters, the actual directors of the relief center of the department and other young women who wish to devote themselves, under the protection of Mary and while leading a very religious life, to the care of the sick and the instruction of young girls.

With God's help, this is what we have inaugurated after a serious examination of the numerous candidates, and we have opened a novitiate which will in a short time turn out persons capable of founding small establishments in various corners of the diocese. We have bought a furnished house for this purpose. This house faces the relief center and will in perpetuity be under the management of the Daughters of Mary and under the jurisdiction and protection of His Excellency and of his successors the Archbishops of Auch. This was the wish expressed by His Excellency, who graciously signed with me the present act of foundation which will be in force forever.

* * *

S. 842-3. To the Archbishop of Auch

July 1836, Auch

(Copy, Agmar 3.4.5, pp. 1-2)

Excellency,

Divine Providence has been good enough to bless my actions, carried out under your orders. Your Excellency now has in his capital, through an extension of the exterior works of the Daughters of Mary, an Order which has been approved for the direction of the relief center of the department, and a novitiate which will furnish trained personnel for the various region of your diocese that ask for them. I am striving to overcome the many difficulties facing such an establishment in Baran.

I thank you, Monsignor, for giving me Father Chevalier as my helper. I have always looked upon him as a visible angel in all that I have been able to do. Your prayers, Excellency, and his cooperation are responsible for almost everything. I feel an increasing inadequacy when faced with delicate negotiations. This is why I came to Auch, through obedience and also to beg your protection for the convent of Condom because of the kindness which you have always manifested toward me. I will ask you to extend this protection and to grant it to me at the court of Rome. This short document witnessing to our foundation, which I take the liberty to submit for your approval and, if you believe it satisfactory, for your signature, could be sent to the Superior General for her signature. Three copies could be made, one for the archdiocese, a second for the administration of the Daughters of Mary, and a third which would remain in the novitiate.

I would be gratified, Excellency, to see de Belloc as both head of the relief center and also mistress of the novitiate, and Father Chevalier as superior of both establishments; this gesture would guarantee the steady development of these two institutions according to the designs of God who inspired them.

Furthermore, I make bold, Excellency, to recommend to you the ancient Sodality of the Immaculate Conception which was established here during a vacancy of your See. It has lost much of its vigor. I have given Father Dupin some suggestions on how to revive it. He is well equipped for this work, but a recommendation by you would spur him to even greater efforts. I have no doubt that it was the Holy Spirit who inspired you to appoint him pastor at Sainte Marie.

I am, with the deepest respect, Your Excellency's. . .

* * *

S. 843. To the Third Order

July 1, 1836, Auch

In witness whereof we have signed at Auch, on July 1, 1836.

Formula

We, the undersigned, being of age, after a long postulancy and believing ourselves called to lead a religious life in the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, to make the following commitment:

1. We promise to observe strictly the general regulations of the Daughters of Mary and in particular that of the Companion Sisters of the Institute.
2. We promise to keep silent about the services we may have rendered in our various assignments, should we withdraw from the Institute at some time.
3. We promise furthermore not to mention the value of the dowry we bring, as indicated on our admission forms, should we withdraw after our definitive reception or even after two years from this day. In witness whereof we have signed.

* * *

S. 844-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Layrac

July 12, 1836, Agen

(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I am afraid that if you do not practice a wise economy, your position will be most dangerous. You may find creditors, but you will not mollify their desire to be repaid, and they could proceed to seizure. I believe it would be prudent, for the Society of Mary and for Layrac, to have a written document stating that the furniture in your institution has been loaned to you to help your enterprise, so that I could defend you in case of a lawsuit.

* * *

S. 845-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Layrac

July 16, 1836, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

What I said to M. Dardy was that Brother Mémain allowed you to use his name; Brother himself confirmed this and said it happened frequently, and especially in this last incident. How we say something is not so important, provided the meaning is clear.

I see no problem in Brother Mémain's resignation if he transfers to you both the duties and his rights before the law. It is more difficult to formulate the statement. A simple declaration, a private agreement, would suffice it seems to me, without a public proclamation. See Brother Mémain.

The question of the furniture has nothing to do with the above problem. I am pleased with your subtle handling of the matter, and I certainly do not want to encourage you to engage in a fraudulent action. It is urgent now to resolve the problem with Brother Mémain. Please accept. . .

* * *

S. 847. To Bro. Dominique Clouzet

July 18, 1836, Agen

. . . have not received any other letter from you since the 28th.

I knew that Brother Silvain would be at Saint-Remy until the holidays. I have just had a letter from M. Laugeay; he will come to see me as soon as he can leave his brother, whom he is helping.

Father Bardenet, according to what Brother Galliot wrote. . .

*

P.S. My dear Son, I believe you are already overburdened and should not take charge of novices with the attention they require. This is what I say to Brother Bousquet in the enclosed letter.

* * *

S. 847-2. To Fr. Jean Lalanne, Layrac

July 22, 1836, Agen
(Original, Agmar)

My dear Son,

Your letter of July 14 deals with two distinct topics. On July 16 I answered the first, about Brother Mémain. A few words today about the problem with the furniture. On this second topic you say, "The furniture belongs neither to me nor to Brother Mémain; it belongs to the Society, to the Sainte-Marie Institution, and now it belongs to the Layrac school, the successor in all things to the Sainte-Marie boarding school."

Your reasoning, my dear Son, is not very convincing. You say that it belongs to the Society, and you are correct. However, it does not belong to the Society in the same way that it belongs to the Sainte-Marie Institution. The furniture belongs to the Society, which allowed Sainte-Marie to use it. How can you conclude that it now belongs to the Layrac foundation, the successor of Sainte-Marie? You may only conclude that the Society allows Layrac to use it.

To me the furniture means various things. For instance, the library was no part of the furniture of the Sainte-Marie school. The house and the community already had their libraries. This library was never bought for the school and should never have been transferred to Layrac. If you can have someone call for me next Monday afternoon we can speak of these things, and I know we can reach an agreement. Meanwhile, please accept this token of my sincere and tender friendship.

* * *

S. 857-2. To Bro. Alphée Clerc, Ebersmunster

August 9, 1836, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

My dear Son,

I have read and reread at various times your last letter dated July 29. In view of what is happening at Ebersmunster, I thought that the vacations which start at the end of the month were quite far away, and that you and M. Caillon and M. Peg would like to enjoy your freedom and see your families before taking another important step. I have given the necessary orders. My dear Son, I cannot dispense you, etc. . . . May the Lord grant you his light and his grace.

*

Draft of a Circular to the Parents

I am flattered that you have the confidence to place your son in our establishment of Ebersmunster, and I could not wait until the end of the year to send him on holidays. Brother Clerc and the other professors of the school are behaving in such an unseemly manner that your son may have been unfavorably impressed. The year is too far advanced to make any changes. It is better to advance the holidays, and later to make up for lost time. An adjustment will be made in the tuition for this quarter. I am . . .

*

Draft of the Notice Given to the Three Young Men

By order of the Superior General of the Society of Mary, I am obliged, Monsieur, to ask you to withdraw within 24 hours from the date of this notice. I am to allow you 25 francs for your journey. It is with a heavy heart that I carry out this assignment. I (or M. - - -) will read you the full text of the order if you should so desire.

(signature and date)

* * *

S. 857-3. To the Community, Ebersmunster

August 9, 1836, Agen
(Copy, Agmar)

I, the undersigned, Superior General of the Society of Mary,
Whereas, the students of the establishment of Ebersmunster, both day and boarding, are unfavorably impressed by the sustained revolt of Brother Clerc, the director of the boarding establishment, and of the professors his adherents, by their actions and their public declarations admitted by Brother Clerc,

Whereas no word of advice, of counsel, could lead to an understanding, as Brother Clerc admitted in his letter of July 29 last,

We decree

(1) that the boarding school of Ebersmunster will cease operation on reception of this notice, and that the students will be sent home with a letter explaining the reason for their departure;

(2) that Brother Clerc, M. Caillon, and M. Peg will leave the building within 24 hours from the moment of reception of this notice, and that each will be given 25 francs for his journey home;

(3) that the parents will not be charged for the days left to complete the classical year;

(4) that those students who deserved prizes and who would have received them at the end of the year will receive compensation at a later date.

Father Rothéa, Superior of the establishment of Ebersmunster, will see to the implementation of this ordinance.

Done at Agen, August 9, 1836, in the course of our visitation, under our signature and countersigned by the Secretary General of the Society of Mary.

* * *

S. 864. To the Administrators

End of August, 1836, Auch

P.S. While the sisters in required number will be working in your center, they will not be using the names they have been given in the Order so as not to hamper the action of the Superior General. The superior of the house will accept their salaries and will make all personal expenses for their wardrobe. Such is the procedure in the Institute of the Daughters of Mary.

* * *

S. 866-2. To the Prefecture of Gers

September 5, 1836, Auch

With M. Gabriel, Prefect of Gers, on the one hand, and Father Chaminade, Founder of the Institute of the Daughters of Mary, on the other, it has been agreed and decreed as follows:

Article 1. The Prefect of Gers, acting for and in the name of the department, entrusts the internal operation of the department relief center at Auch to the Institute of the Daughters of Mary.

Article 2. The number of sisters has been set at eight, counting the superior; the number may be increase should the needs of the center require it.

Article 3. Beginning in 1836, each sister, and also the superior, will receive an annual indemnity of 200 francs for wardrobe expenses. This is a variant to article 15 of the regulations, which sets this indemnity at 150 francs.

Article 4. In addition to this indemnity, the sisters and the superior will receive room and board, in health and in illness, at the expense of the department.

Article 5. The sisters will observe in their entirety the regulations of September 10, 1834, mentioned above.

Article 6. Those sisters who become incapacitated while in the center will remain there are convalescent inmates, with nursing care at the expense of the administration. They will no longer receive the 200 francs indemnity annually.

Article 7. For his part, Father Chaminade pledges in his name and in that of his successors to provide, at the request of the Prefect, the personnel which the administrative commission deems necessary for the service.

Article 8. Travel expenses for those sisters who have been changed not at the request of the administration will be the responsibility of the Institute. On the other hand, those resulting from a request of the center will be the responsibility of the center.

Article 9. Both parties agree that a six-month advance notice must be given of the community intends to abandon the service, or if the administrative commission wishes to confide it to some other religious body.

Article 10. This present agreement will be submitted to the approbation of the Minister of the Interior.

Done in duplicate at Auch, September 5, 1836.