

Executed in Lyon on the twenty-second of January, eighteen hundred and twenty-eight. I have read and I approve the present receipt for seven thousand francs as complete payment.

Widow Dioque, nee Bedor

### 6

*Statistics of the 1st October 1832, about the house of Le Puy.* - From the original preserved in the National Archives of Paris, F<sup>19</sup>, 6307.

These statistics are the same as those of another dated 1st December 1831 preserved in the departmental archives of Le Puy. The first column probably indicates that the Congregation possessed four buildings in Le Puy, comprising the principal edifice. The number of pupils remained stationary because of the limited capacity of the house. Therefore a property was acquired in the district of St. Jean, covering about 17,000 sq. metres in area, with two buildings, where the community was transferred a little later. A large building and a big chapel in Gothic style were constructed there.

From the outset, the house of Le Puy gave solid vocations to the Congregation of Jesus and Mary, and it enjoyed a good reputation. This appears for example, from confidential information of the departmental prefect of Haute-Loire to the Minister of Worship in 1853, in which we read, regarding the Superioress, M. St. Cyprian, "She is a very refined lady and is very witty. The boarding school and day school, have many pupils; no political observations" (Departmental Arch. Le Puy, 8, V, 1).

M. St. Cyprian (Rose Eynac), was the daughter of Jean Pierre and Madeleine Bonnet. She was born in Coulon (Haute-Loire), on the 19th June 1815, and entered the Congregation on the 19th June 1832. She made her profession on the 18th June 1835. She was one of the first group of religious that went to found a house in Canada in 1855 where she died on the 19th December 1868.

Some years later, in 1880, when the project for suppressing the religious communities in France was about to be launched, the government requested confidential information from the departmental prefects on the situation of the religious houses and on the probable reaction of the public. In general, the prefects showed signs of hostility and little sympathy towards the religious. Regarding the community of Jesus and Mary, the Prefect of Le Puy wrote: "The Sisters of Jesus and Mary bring up young girls of middle class families of Le Puy, who number about 80. They will see their studies suddenly interrupted on the 29th June; the bourgeoisie of the town, even those who are liberal in outlook, confide their children to that Congregation. It follows from this consideration that the closure of the establishment without a transitional period will cause a certain disturbance and some discontent among the interested families, whose opinion is, moreover, in favour of established institutions. Otherwise the application of the decrees will not meet with the least resistance" (cf. National Arch., Paris, F<sup>19</sup>, 6256).

### Department of Haute-Loire

Place of Establishment	Name of the Communities	a. o. X	Teaching	Com. independent of a Superioress Gen.	Head House	Number		Number of Pupils
						Prof.	Conv.	
Le Puy	Sisters of Jesus and Mary		Yes	Dependent	Lyon	8	9	46

1st October 1832.

### DOC. XVI

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CONGREGATION from the election of the Servant of God in 1823 until the year 1836. — From the documents examined below.

We are assembling under this somewhat general and indeterminate title the principal events in which the Servant of God must have taken part as Superioress General of the Congregation during this period. In the first place we present the directions of her government as drawn from the official Registers which we shall study at some length, and elucidate with the aid of a handwriting expert. In the second place we shall explain the relations of the Foundress with the Vicar General and Ecclesiastical Superior of the Congregation, Simon Cattet. Finally we shall present some scattered and fragmentary information through which is seen the active and personal participation of the Servant of God in the life of the Congregation.

#### A)

ACTS OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OF THE CONGREGATION. — From the original "Registers" preserved in *A. G. Roma*.

The approbation of the Apostolic Administrator of the diocese of Lyon of 1825 (Doc. XIV, 2) which was almost simultaneous with the transfer of the community from Monistrol to Le Puy (Doc. XVI), opened a new period in the life of the Servant of God and in the development of her Congregation, which appears henceforth established and definitely organised. From this point the real Mother House, with the Generalate residence, is that of Fourviere. The Superioress General lived there herself habitually and, while she attended to the two works of Lyon, the *Providence* and the boarding school, with particular care, she governed the Congregation with prudence and visited the houses of Belleville and Le Puy when necessary.

Although the way of acting of the Vicar General Cattet, in his role of Ecclesiastical Superior of the community (cf. *infra*, 1 & 2), was at times difficult for the Servant of God, in general, at meetings, it was correct. From Register III of the Congregation we see that Fr. Cattet presided at a Chapter, and made two canonical visitations of the Fourviere community, in 1831 and 1833 respectively (cf. *infra*, 6). On her part the Servant of God showed every consideration due to his office. When, in the absence of the Superior Cattet, she took some important decision, it was immediately communicated to him, as we read, for example, in the report of the 4th September 1829: "the Rev. Chaplain undertook to communicate the decision of our Council of the 1st September to our Rev. Fr. Superior"; and on the 3rd December 1832: "Having informed our Rev. Fr. Superior of this opinion, he gave his approval."

For knowledge of the Servant of God in this period (1825-1836) we have documents which come from three principal sources:

1. The Registers of the Congregation;
2. A series of family letters;
3. The registers of the archbishopric of Lyon.

In this section we are using only the reports from Register III of the Congregation. The family letters will be presented in the following sections. In the registers of the Archbishopric of Lyon are found only references to the approbations and other small notes. In going through these last-mentioned registers we have noted the frequency of complaints and of measures taken against religious communities; but never against the Congregation of Jesus and Mary, an evident sign that the little community was functioning well.

Register III to which belong the documents transcribed here, is not the original but a copy in the handwriting of M. St. Andrew.

We believe that it is possible to establish with certainty the origin of this Register: when in 1823 the Congregation obtained canonical approbation in Monistrol, diocese of Le Puy (Doc. X, p. 245), Fr. Coindre began a register (I) in which were transcribed successively first the reports regarding the house of Monistrol and then of Le Puy. This register was closed on the 13th November 1827.

From 1824, new registers were gradually opened at Lyon, for reports regarding different events: appointments or elections, admission of postulants and novices, clothings, professions, etc. Of these first registers, which contain acts of government of the Servant of God, the following have come down to us:

Register II, *appointments*: opening with the transcription of four reports from Register I, beginning from the 6th January 1824. Then there were written the reports of successive appointments, and the register was closed on the 9th February 1837, with the minutes of the election of M. St. Andrew as Superioress General and a note written in the hand of Fr. Pousset.

Register IV, *admissions*: copy of minutes — disappeared — from the 2nd August 1834 until the 13th March 1837; from that date until the 10th February 1901 the entries are original.

Register V, *Clothings*: original in its totality, 2nd March 1824-2nd February 1838.

Register VI, *Professions*: Copies from Register I of deeds of profession from the 25th February 1823 until the 7th January 1824; it is original from the 2nd March 1824 to the 17th April 1895. In an early period (1822-1824) the reports were not written in bound books but on pages which at a later time were sewn together in a rather rudimentary way, as is seen in Registers I, II and III. In 1824 this system was abandoned for new registers, which would explain the disappearance of some reports afterwards, leaving gaps in the chronological series of events.

After the death of the Servant of God the new Superioress General, M. St. Andrew, worked actively for the interests of the Congregation, continuing the work of the Foundress, paying particular attention to obtaining the Pontifical Approbation of the Constitutions, and to everything connected with this. When, in 1841, the Mission to India was accepted and M. St. Teresa, the immediate collaborator of M. St. Andrew was on the point of departure at the head of the expedition, the Mothers wanted all the affairs of the Congregation to be left in order and so set to work on the registers. So at that time — 1841/1842, they prepared Registers III and IV; but Register III, which contains various deliberations from Register I and from others which have now disappeared, could, it would seem, have been copied by M. St. Andrew only in 1843.

The study of the documents has led to the establishment of the dates and other details from the Registers cited; all this was confirmed by technical analysis made by Rev. Fr. Pinzuti (cf. *infra*). Having referred them for final technical clarification by accurate handwriting tests made by Fr. Pinzuti, given the importance of these registers, and the mistaken interpretations of them which some have made, it seemed opportune to give beforehand the following information.

Referring to Register III, which is the register that concerns us in this document, it appears that the first two reports and those of the 26th February and the 16th March 1823, are copied from Register I, begun by Fr. Coindre in Monistrol (Doc. XI, *intr.*, 251). Into this Register III were then transcribed, from a register that has disappeared, the reports of the meetings of the Council which treat of admissions and dismissal of subjects, and all the decisions that did not refer to ceremonies of clothing and profession or appointments to important offices, which are written in the appropriate registers.

Judging from the copies of which the originals are preserved, the transcription of the registers that have disappeared is faithful, with the exception of some significant variations relative to the Servant of God in the

first report; in the other three, the variations result from copying in the third person phrases referring to Fr. Coindre which he wrote in the first person in the original. We give an example, copying some paragraphs from the first report. In the original the words that are suppressed or modified are in italics, and in the copy those which are added are in italics.

*Register I* (original)

Convinced by a serious examination of their regularity, their zeal and very special talents that they have received from God to form young girls in virtue and the knowledge necessary to become good Christians, edifying mothers of families and excellent class mistresses, we thought we would render a most important service first to the town of Monistrol and *thereafter* to other parishes of the diocese which *might* receive them, by favouring their arrival here. Having adopted the rule of St. Augustine and the Constitutions of St. Ignatius with the modifications necessary on account of the difference which must exist between the employments to which women devote themselves and those which clerics carry out, they inspire the Superiors of the diocese with the greatest confidence. We have written to Mile *Claudine* Thevenet, *foundress* of the establishment of Lyon and of Belleville, and *she* has *appointed* Mme Dioque, nee Marie Antoinette Bedor, called Sister St. Peter to be Superioress of the community; Mile Jubeau called Sister St. Bruno; Miles Daval and Anne Noel, *Mile* Marie Boisson, and they have laid the first foundations of the establishment *in* the house attached to the church of the former Capuchins of Monistrol.

*Register III* (copy)

Convinced by a serious examination of their regularity, their zeal and *of their* very special talents that they have received from God to form young girls in virtue and the knowledge necessary to become good Christians, edifying mothers of families and excellent class mistresses, we thought we would render a most important service first to the town of Monistrol and *in short* to other parishes of the diocese which *might wish* to receive them, by favouring their arrival here. Having adopted the rule of St. Augustine and the Constitutions of St. Ignatius with the modifications necessary on account of the difference which must exist between the employments to which women devote themselves and those which clerics carry out, they inspire the Superiors of the diocese with the greatest confidence. We have written to Mile Thevenet *of the* establishments of Lyon and Belleville, and *we have appointed* Mme Dioque, nee Marie Antoinette Bedor, called Sister St. Peter to be Superioress of the community; Mile Jubeau called Sister St. Bruno; Miles Daval and Anne Noel, Marie Boisson, and they have laid the first foundations of the establishment *of* the house attached to the church of the former Capuchins of Monistrol.

In Register III, which was copied after the death of the Servant of God, as we have said, it is logical that her signature, which figured in the original is lacking. If to this fact is added that in many reports it is not said explicitly that the Servant of God presided over the meetings, it is clear that superficial reading of them could make one think that the Foundress was absent from acts of government of the Congregation, an inadmissible supposition.

In fact, Register III contains in all 87 minutes. In 11 of these the beginning, where in the other minutes the person presiding is named, is missing. However, it is possible to deduce from the text that the Superioress General presided. We are dividing these reports into groups according to the person who presided over the General Council; moreover, in those not presided over by the Servant of God, we shall indicate whether her presence is mentioned, or if it may be deduced either from the text itself or from other documents:

52 Council Meetings are presided over by the Servant of God;

14 are presided over by Fr. Coindre; in 1 it is certain and in 12 one may deduce that the Servant of God was present;

8 are presided over by Fr. Cattet; in 1 the presence of the Servant of God is certain and in 5 it may be deduced;

13 have no indication; in 1 the presence of the Servant of God is certain and in 9 it may be deduced.

We now present a brief chronological synthesis of the contents of the Register, where we note 5 periods in which the meetings seem to be interrupted, and which correspond: to a grave and long illness of the Servant of God in 1828; to the revolutions of July 1830 and of November 1831; to cholera in 1832; and to a third revolution in 1834. The minutes indicated by a cross are those presided over by the Servant of God.

1. 10th October 1822 — Historical information about the foundation of Monistrol, copied from Register I.
2. 15th February 1823 — Historical information about the approbation of the Congregation, given by Mons. de Salamon, copied from Register I.
3. 15th February 1823 — The Servant of God decided who would make profession and organised the journey to Monistrol.
4. 25th February 1823 — Admission of 4 postulants for clothing.
5. 26th February 1823 — Election of the Superioress General and her Assistants; appointment of the superioresses of Monistrol and of Belleville, copied from Register I.
- +6. 10th March 1823 — Admission of three of the first companions of the Servant of God to profession.
7. 16th March 1823 — Election of the First Assistant General and appointment of Provincial Superioresses, copied from Register I.
8. 1st June 1823 — Admission of 4 postulants for clothing.
9. 27th June 1823 — Deliberation about the Providence and the admission of postulants to the novitiate.

- + 10. 10th August 1823 — Admission of 9 novices to perpetual profession and vow of stability, and 1 to temporary profession for 4 years.
- + 11. 10th September 1823 — Admission of one novice to profession.
- 12. 15th December 1823 — Admission of two novices to profession.
- + 13. 2nd January 1824 — Admission of one novice to profession.
- 14. 6th January 1824 — Appointment of 4 Electresses.
- 15. 28th February 1824 — Admission of 18 postulants to clothing and 2 novices to profession.
- 16. 10th August 1824 — Admission of 2 postulants to clothing and 1 novice to profession.
- 17. 25th October 1824 — Admission of 3 postulants to clothing and 3 novices to profession. Postponement of 1 clothing and 1 profession.
- + 18. 25th January 1825 — Admission of 2 postulants to clothing and 8 novices to profession. Postponement of 1 profession.
- 19. 30th March 1825 — Admission of 3 postulants to clothing.
- 20. 12th July 1825 — Admission of 2 postulants to clothing.
- 21. 18th July 1825 — Approbation of the Statutes by Mons. de Pins.
- 22. 27th October 1825 — Admission of one postulant to clothing, 9 novices to profession and 1 professed to the vow of stability.
- 23. 12th December 1825 — Admission of 2 novices to clothing. Deliberation on the frequency of Council meetings.
- 24. 24th January 1826 — 3 admissions to clothing.
- + 25. 1st April 1826 — 1 admission to clothing and 1 to profession.
- + 26. 20th April 1826 — A subject dismissed.
- + 27. 16th May 1826 — 2 admissions to profession.
- + 28. 15th August 1826 — Appointment of a Superioress.
- + 29. 18th August 1826 — Deliberation about M. St. Peter.
- + 30. 25th September 1826 — 4 admissions to profession. One deferred.
- + 31. 1st October 1826 — Dismissal of a subject.
- + 32. 2nd April 1827 — 2 admissions to profession. 4 deferred; one deferred for clothing.
- + 33. 1st September 1827 — 2 admissions to clothing; 3 to profession; 3 deferred; one dismissed.
- + 34. 22nd September 1827 — 2 admitted to profession.
- + 35. 23rd September 1827 — appointment of 3 Electresses.
- + 36. 10th October 1827 — Appointment of a superioress.
- + 37. 22nd January 1828 — 1 admission to profession; 1 deferred; 1 sent away.
- + 38. 25th April 1828 — 1 admission to profession.  
[During the long interval that follows, the Servant of God and 2 other religious were seriously ill. These last died.]
- + 39. 14th October 1828 — 1 admission to clothing; 3 to profession; 6 to vow of stability; 2 professions deferred; 1 dismissed.
- + 40. 16th October 1828 — 3 admissions to profession.
- 41. 7th November 1828 — Election of 2 Assistants General.

- + 42. 14th March 1829 — 3 postponed for clothing.
- + 43. 20th March 1829 — 3 admissions for profession.
- + 44. 23rd June 1829 — Proposal to dismiss a subject.
- 45. 26th June 1829 — Ibidem. Mons. Cattet confirmed the dismissal.
- + 46. 1st September 1829 — Arrangements were made for the said dismissal.
- 47. 4th September 1829 — The Superior Fr. Cattet confirmed the above.
- + 48. 7th September 1829 — 2 admissions to clothing; 2 to profession.
- + 49. 22nd September 1829 — 1 admission to profession; 1 to vow of stability; 2 professions deferred.
- + 50. 26th September 1829 — 3 admissions to perpetual vows; 1 to temporary vows for 6 months.
- 51. 27th September 1829 — Deliberation about the suppression of the house of Belleville.
- 52. 1st October 1829 — 2 Electresses named.
- + 53. 1st December 1829 — 1 admission to clothing.
- + 54. 9th January 1830 — 1 admission to perpetual vows.
- + 55. 27th April 1830 — 1 admission to clothing; 1 to perpetual vows; 1 to receive the cross.
- + 56. 18th May 1830 — 1 admission to temporary vows.  
[Interval caused by the revolution of July 1830]
- 57. 1st February 1831 — Deliberation about sending away 2 subjects.
- 58. 5th October 1831 — 2 admissions to clothing; 3 to perpetual vows.  
[Interval caused by the revolution of November 1831]
- + 59. 15th December 1831 — Deliberation about the correction of a subject.
- 60. 26th December 1831 — Report on the canonical visitation.
- 61. 18th January 1832 — Various deliberations.  
[Interval coinciding with the spread of Cholera in France.]
- + 62. 26th July 1832 — 3 admissions to the Novitiate; various deliberations.
- 63. 2nd December 1832 — Deliberations about the correction of a subject.
- + 64. 3rd December 1832 — 3 admissions to clothing.
- 65. 14th February 1833 — Deliberations on the modification of the timetable.
- 66. 8th March 1833 — Postulant dismissed for reasons of health.
- + 67. 14th March 1833 — The decision to be taken about the subject mentioned in no. 57 was postponed.
- 68. 18th April 1833 — The application of the above was settled.
- + 69. 23rd April 1833 — 1 admission to vow of stability; 1 admission to clothing.
- + 70. 6th June 1833 — 1 admission to the Novitiate.
- + 71. 18th July 1833 — A Postulant sent away for health reasons.
- + 72. 7th September 1833 — 1 admission to clothing.
- + 73. 5th October 1833 — 1 admission to clothing.
- + 74. 18th November 1833 — 1 admission to clothing.
- 75. 3rd December 1833 — 1 admission to the Novitiate.
- 76. 27th December 1833 — Report on the second canonical visitation.

- +77. 7th January 1834 — They took measures to promote order.
- +78. 20th January 1834 — Dismissal of a subject.
- +79. 25th February 1834 — 1 admitted to the Novitiate.  
[Interval which coincides with the Revolution of April 1834.]
- +80. 10th June 1834 — Deliberations about permission for postulants to receive Communion.
- +81. 1st July 1834 — 2 admissions to the Novitiate.
- +82. 12th August 1834 — 4 admissions to clothing; 1 deferred.
- +83. 22nd September 1834 — 1 admission to the Novitiate.
- +84. 25th September 1834 — 1 profession deferred.
- 85. 27th September 1834 — Dismissal of a subject.
- +86. 10th October 1834 — Election of 2 Assistants General and 2 Electresses.
- +87. 3rd November 1834 — 1 admission to clothing; 1 to take the Cross; 1 profession deferred.

The Minutes contained in this Register and which we have copied in this document are of great importance for knowledge of the Servant of God, of her way of governing and of the normal internal running of the Congregation. From these documents we present Nos. 30, 33, 34, 39, 44, 45, 56, 62, 69, 86, because in our opinion they are the most significant; their importance will be brought out in the respective introductions.

## 1

*Meetings of the 25th September 1826 and the 1st September 1827*

The Servant of God possessed the innate qualities of an educator: an intuition seldom at fault in judging people and an appropriate way of acting with each one in her care, according to their character and circumstances. This stands out in the reports that treat of admissions to the Novitiate, to clothing, etc., and which are not made *en masse*. In those which we present, we see some subjects who are admitted, others who are deferred, and still others who are sent away. To confirm what has been said, we present two reports, of 1826 and 1827 respectively; we note that the one indicated with the letter *a*) is the first in which the Servant of God is seen exercising her office after the death of Fr. Coindre and before the appointment of M. Cattet as Superior of the community. The report indicated by the letter *b*) concerns another meeting of the General Council, also before the appointment of M. Cattet. On these occasions the action of M. St. Ignatius was free from all pressure or influence.

## a)

The Council was presided over by our Reverend Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After invoking the light of the Holy Spirit, our three dear Sisters Sr. Ste. Ursule, Sr. Ste. Claire, Sr. St. Joseph were proposed for profession. They were admitted for 3 years. Sr. St. Leon, Sr. St. Regis were deferred until the next profession. M(ar)ie Aloysia was admitted for 3 years.

Then our three dear daughters: Mile Vachot, Agaritte Thomas, Toinette Dubost were proposed for admission to clothing. They were admitted.

M(ar)ie Andre

## b)

The Council was presided over by our Rev. Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After invoking the light of the Holy Spirit Mile Antoinette Cholle, Catherine Large were proposed to take the habit. They were admitted.

Then the very dear Srs. M(ar)ie Ste Marie, M(ar)ie St. Augustin, Sr. St. Clement, were proposed for profession. They were admitted. Sr. St. Leon, Sr. St. Laurent, Sr. St. Germain were deferred; Sr. St. Regis was dismissed from the Congregation.

At the annual retreat Sr. St. Louis and Sr. St. Jerome will renew their vows for 6 months only.

M(ar)ie Andre

## 2

*Meeting of the 22nd September 1827*

After the defection of M. St. Peter (Doc. XV, 4, p. 267) M. St. Gonzaga Chardon was appointed to replace her as Superioress of the Community of Le Puy. She was an exemplary religious and still young and she had been one of the first companions of the Servant of God (Doc. XI, *intr.*, p. 251).

M. St. Bruno was the Assistant of the community of Le Puy, and was also one of the first companions of M. St. Ignatius (Doc. XI, *intr.*, p. 251). She was among the first missionaries who sacrificed their lives in India, heroically refusing the offer of repatriation by the French Government during the Sepoy war. She died a holy death in the missions in the year 1877.

These two religious had inspired the greatest confidence in the Servant of God, as we see confirmed in the present report, and in various others of this same Register.

The Council was presided over by our Rev. Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After imploring the light of the Holy Spirit, the dear Sisters M(ar)ie Ste. Therese, and Sr. Ste Veronique, were proposed for profession. They were admitted in view of the testimony given of their edifying conduct during their novitiate made in our community of Le Puy.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

3

*Meeting of 14th October 1828*

The document that we present here is of the 14th October 1828. The preceding meeting had been held on the 25th April. Between these two meetings there was therefore an interval of more than five months, during which the Servant of God was seriously ill and another two religious died (Doc. XVIII, p. 336). We note that in the present document mention is made of Fr. Catlet for the first time in this Register (cf. *infra*, B, p. 296).

The Council was presided over by our Reverend Mother St. Ignatius Superioress General.

After invoking the light of the Holy Spirit, Mile Alexandrine Delion was proposed for admission to take the habit. She was admitted.

Then our dear Sisters, Sr. St. Philippe, Sr. St. Felix, Sr. St. Leon were proposed for profession. They were admitted.

M(ar)ie St. Francois, M(ar)ie Ste Therese, M(ar)ie St. Simon, Sr. Ste Marie, Sr. St. Antoine, Sr. Ste Scolastique, were admitted to make the vow of stability.

Sr. St. Louis will renew her vows only until the next renewal date.

Sr. Ste Cecile will not renew them. As far as Sr. St. Jerome is concerned, we are leaving the decision to our Rev. Fr. Superior, M. Cattet, Vicar General.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

4

*Meetings of the 23rd June 1829 and 26th June 1829*

The report which we present here under letter *a*), relative to the meeting of the Council on the 23rd June 1829, shows us a new aspect of the government of the Servant of God: her conduct when confronted with cases which might prejudice the good spirit of the Congregation. It can be deduced from the text that M. St. Ignatius did not act in a hurry, but when the means suggested by charity and prudence failed, she did not hesitate to put the general good before that of the individual.

In document *b*) we see the submission of the Servant of God to the authority of Fr. Cattet, and his reply confirming the decision of the Council of the 26th June 1829.

a)

The Council was presided over by our Reverend Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After invoking the light of the Holy Spirit, we proceeded to examine the faults imputed to Sisters St. Paulin and St. Louis. Having observed the conduct of these two Sisters for a long time, we have recognised that neither one nor the other has the spirit proper to our Institute. The first, Sr. St. Paulin, is accused 1. of insubordination towards the Sisters employed in directing the workrooms; 2. of acting in an irresponsible manner in front of the merchants who visit the workrooms; 3. of being extraordinary in all her actions.

Sr. St. Louis is accused of having tried to undermine the confidence that the Sisters should have in their Superiors; 2. of having aroused others to disobedience by her dangerous insinuations; 3. of having by her spirit of intrigue brought a Sister to join with her to make false accusations against the Sister to whom they both were subordinate. The Council observed that for the six years since this Sister was admitted to holy profession in our Congregation there has been nothing but reproaches to make regarding her conduct; she was sent to our Mother House by the local Superioresses of Le Puy and of Belleville because of insubordination. Since the expiration of her vows, which she made only for four years, the Council has been able to allow her to renew them only for 6 months at the time of retreats because of

her disedifying conduct. In view, therefore, of the facts that we have just stated and according to Article 12 of our Statutes, the dismissal of Sisters St. Paulin and St. Louis has been decided provisionally whilst awaiting the definitive pronouncement of our most Rev. Superior M. Cattet, Vicar General.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

b)

On the 26th June 1829 the most Rev. Vicar General, our Father Superior, confirmed the decision of our Council of the 23rd of this month regarding Sr. St. Louis. She will leave the community as soon as possible. Sr. St. Paulin is put off indefinitely; if there were some improvement in her conduct she might still be pardoned.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

5

*Meeting of the 18th May 1830*

The Register preserves only three minutes of 1830. We are reproducing the last, that of the 18th May, which treats of the admission to profession of M. St. Pothin who, in 1867, would become the fourth Superioress General of the Congregation (Doc. XXVI, *intr.*, and 3).

M. St. Pothin, Antoinette Cholle, daughter of Jean Pierre and Jeanette Marie Brossy, was born in Chateau-Neuf near Rive-de-Gier (Loire) on the 7th July 1806. She entered the Congregation on the 7th June 1827, made her profession on the 23rd May 1830, and died in Lyon on the 15th February 1885.

The revolution of the month of July which dethroned Charles X inaugurated a new period of religious persecution, during which various novitiates were closed and the novices sent to their respective families. The novitiate of Fourviere remained open, but from that date until the 5th October 1831, there were no admissions.

We note that during the life of Fr. Coindre vocations for the Congregation of Jesus and Mary were numerous, and that later they diminished notably, not only because of the political situation, but also because of the attempt of M. Cattet to fuse the Congregation with that of the Sacred Heart (cf. *infra*, B, p. 296, and C, 6, p. 318).

The Council was presided over by our Reverend Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After invoking the light of the Holy Spirit, we proceeded to the admission to profession of Sr. St. Pothin nee Cholle; she was admitted for three years.

M(ar)ie St Andre

6

*Canonical Visit of the 26th December 1831*

The political and social situation in France and especially in Lyon in 1831 continued to be critical, until in the month of November a bloody revolution broke out, preceded and followed by months of unrest. Naturally this state of things had its repercussions in religious houses. From the Register it is found that there was only one admission during the whole year in Fourviere, and that was on the 5th October. The Apostolic Administrator of Lyon, wanting to understand the consequences of the revolution in religious communities of women, put M. Cattet in charge of making the canonical visitation. Register III of the Congregation preserves, in the report that we present, the account of the canonical visitation made in the community of Fourviere from the 26th to the 30th December 1831.

From this report we see that the visit proceeded normally, and that the Servant of God was the first to present herself to the ecclesiastical Superior. The observations that he made at the end of the visit are of a general character, as is usual in such cases, and in reality they bear witness to the regular observance of the community, which does not exclude the presence of faults susceptible of correction, since timely correction of faults and expulsion of subjects who do not observe the Rule is the sign of the good spirit of a religious community.

*1st Canonical Visit*

This year the Lord in His goodness has wished to accord to our community the grace of a canonical visitation. The Vicar General, our most Rev. Father Superior, delegated by His Lordship the Archbishop, came, on Monday the 26th December 1831, into our chapel, and after celebrating Holy Mass, he gave us some information relative to the visitation which he was about to begin. After urging all

the Sisters to tell him frankly and in conscience what each one had remarked regarding defects, whether in conscience or in conduct, or in short whatever they might have observed in the community concerning the different observances of the Congregation. After giving these recommendations, our most Rev. Fr. Superior listened to all the Sisters individually, beginning with our Reverend Mother. After this he visited all the rooms: classrooms, dormitories, cells, etc. On Friday the 30th December he returned to our chapel and before celebrating Holy Mass, he addressed some edifying words to us giving some advice relative to the present occasion.

He said: "There is no Congregation, however holy it may be, that does not need to renew itself from time to time in the spirit of fervour. That is why I believe that it is useful to speak to you today on four points that are essential to your holy state. I mean the religious spirit, obedience, poverty and charity.

I say firstly, the Sisters must seek to increase their religious spirit. It must animate all their conduct. Therefore they should always act from interior motives and those worthy of God, fulfilling all their duties as perfectly as possible, with the sole intention of pleasing their Divine Spouse, never losing sight of His divine presence. They must very carefully avoid acting from low and natural motives, such as fear of blame, or of a penance. Their only fear should be to displease God; their sole ambition to be pleasing to Him. They should often recall the motives which brought them to enter religious life and often ask themselves as St. Bernard did, 'Why have I come here?' It is through lack of the religious spirit that persons live a life that is wholly sensual, carnal, earthly, that places them beneath the level of ordinary Christians who live in the world. The Sisters shall use two very powerful means to increase their religious spirit: spiritual reading and prayer. They will look upon these two exercises as the two eyes of the spiritual life, which will make them see the stumbling blocks that they must avoid in the way of perfection. They will listen to the voice of God in spiritual reading, and in meditation they will speak to Him heart to heart.

Negligence in fulfilling these two duties dissipates the religious spirit little by little and ends by making it be lost entirely. There must be great exactitude therefore, in spiritual reading, and great attention to pray well. Above all one must make an effort to take practical

resolutions which will serve to amend one's life. In short, to reflect and to overcome oneself, that is in what prayer consists.

As for obedience, it must be perfect, prompt and entire. It must be an obedience of action, of spirit and from the heart. Unhappy the religious whom the Superioress would be obliged to spare on this point, the religious spirit would be weak, in her; she would show she has forgotten that when she entered religion she made a sacrifice of her will, which she put from then onwards into the hands of her Superior, and that at her profession she sacrificed it to God without reserve. It is therefore at this perfection of obedience that the Sisters must aim in all their conduct, obeying the first sign that is given them, obeying so that it is never necessary to repeat an order, each one fulfilling the employment with which she is charged as best she can, not doing it carelessly but with exactitude, and in such a way that nobody will have cause either to suffer or complain. Thus for example, the Mistress of the workroom will take care that all in the workroom is done at the right time, and in the manner indicated, that the children fulfil their duties exactly and observe the rules of the house, that the prayers be said with piety, and that silence be observed as carefully as possible.

The portress will fulfil her employment punctually so as to give nobody cause for murmuring and complaint against the house. They shall take great care of order and cleanliness in all parts of the house.

On the subject of holy poverty, each one shall take care not to dispose of the least thing without permission, whether it be to lend or give; permission shall not be presumed; they shall take care to have permission before acting. Each one must take the greatest care of the things of which she has charge or of which she has the use, so that nothing will be spoilt or lost.

Finally, charity must reign among the Sisters. It is for this reason that they will help each other in their employments, that they will support each other patiently, that they will never argue, above all in front of the children. They will always act in harmony and seek to gain the heart of their pupils by their gentleness and by their interest in them."

Such was the advice that our very Rev. Fr. Superior gave us, and with the grace of God, we shall make every effort to put it more and more into practice.

*Meeting of the 26th July 1832*

In 1832 the cholera had invaded Paris and various other cities of France, killing numerous victims everywhere. Lyon, with its narrow streets where the air circulates only with difficulty, and its high density of population, seemed especially suitable to be a victim of the deadly scourge. The Apostolic Administrator of the diocese, Mgr de Pins, ordered processions and a novena to Our Lady of Fourviere, to begin on April 9th, when the cholera was raging in Paris. The protection of Our Lady was not slow in coming and Lyon was saved from the scourge.

In these circumstances the meeting of the Council to which the following report refers took place. We find in it, in the first place, an act of charity of the Servant of God, which established the offering of prayers for the repose of the souls of dead parents of the religious. Then we see how, in the presence of imminent danger, when all the people of Lyon were going to Fourviere to implore the protection of the Blessed Virgin Mary, on the proposal of Fr. Cattet the Vicar General, Mother St. Ignatius made a vow in the name of the community to adopt two poor children of five years of age, until they were twenty-one.

Later, on the 23rd November, 1832, when the Bishop opened with his own contribution a list of subscribers to raise a monument in thanksgiving to Our Lady of Fourviere, the Servant of God was among the first to support the initiative, on the 24th December, with a contribution of 360 francs. This was a considerable amount at that time, given her financial condition, and few contributions exceeded it (cf. A. A. Lyon, "*Souscription au monument de Fourviere*").

The Council was presided over by Rev. Mother St. Ignatius, Superioress General.

After imploring the light of the Holy Spirit, it was proposed to the Council to determine the prayers that should be offered by the religious for their deceased parents.

1. It was decided that when the news of the death of father or mother of one of the Sisters of the community came, a Mass would be said for the repose of the soul of the deceased, and all the religious would offer a communion for that intention.

2. Our Reverend Mother ordered us to give an account here of the vow that we made in the month of April.

Towards Easter time, when heaven seemed to threaten us with a terrible scourge, the plague known as deadly cholera, which was

making fearful ravages in the capital at that time, our very Rev. Fr. Superior, M. Cattet, Vicar General, proposed that we should make a vow, in order to avert the anger of God. This vow consisted in receiving two children into our *Providence* free of charge, and keeping one whom we already had, Alix Mazoyer, for life. Being infirm and without any resources she would find herself entirely abandoned in the world. We vowed to keep her for the rest of her life unless however, through lack of submission showing signs of insubordination, she rendered herself unworthy of the advantage we gave her. We have received Catherine Lafleur aged five years free of charge, and we shall keep her until she is twenty-one years old. Marie Hugonet, aged five years, has also been received with the intention of fulfilling our vow. The protectors of this last child had set aside a sum of one hundred and fifty francs to place their protegee in a *Providence*. This money was given to us, but we have promised God to give it to the child when she leaves the house at the age of twenty-one years.

It was proposed to admit the first exercises of the Novitiate Mile Amelie Faisandier, Mile Rosine Eynac, Mile Zulme Limosin. They were admitted.

It was decided that Sr. Madeleine who had been excluded from the refectory and the chapter for a long time, shall take part from now on. One week she will come on Wednesday and the following week on Friday. She will listen to the reading, and after making her accusations and passing the chapter, she will withdraw. At dinner she will not enter the refectory until after the accusations of the Sisters.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

*Meeting of the 23rd April 1833*

The year 1833 was a relatively normal one in Lyon. This is reflected even in the Register where the meetings recorded are more numerous than they were in the three preceding years, in which there were interruptions due to the revolution and the cholera. We reproduce here the report in which there is the account of the admission to the vow of stability of M. St. Paul and the clothing of Rosine Eynac.

The vow of stability, according to the documents preserved, both of Fr. Coindre and of the Servant of God, was not permitted to all the religious.

Those who had made it could participate in the General Chapter. By this vow they bound themselves to go to any house whatsoever of the Congregation where they might be sent, and to do whatever work might be assigned to them, to live always in dependence on the General house and never to ask or accept dispensation from vows.

M. St. Paul, Julie Ferrand, who according to this document was admitted to the vow of stability, was the daughter of Gabriel and Françoise Blanc. (Docs XI, *intr.*, p. 251, and XVI, *intr.* p. 264). She was born in Lyon on the 17th March 1808, entered the Congregation on the 1st October 1825, and made her profession on the 2nd Feb. 1828. She took part in the first expedition to India in 1842 where she was successively Superioress in various houses; she died in Murree after a long and fruitful apostolate, on the 20th June 1879 (Doc. III, I, b, *intr.*, p. 24).

Rosine Eynac, in religion M. St. Cyprian (Doc. XV, 6, *intr.*, p. 270).

The Council was presided over by Reverend Mother St. Ignatius.

After imploring the light of the Holy Spirit, our dear Sister M(ar)ie St. Paul was proposed for the vow of stability. She was admitted.

The ceremony of clothing of Mile Rosine Eynac, which was postponed, will take place on the same day.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

9

*Meeting of the 10th October 1834*

In Register III we find again, in 1834, indications of a revolution. After the report of the 25th February, there is an interval until the 1st July. At this meeting of the Council another two postulants were admitted. The break in the meetings corresponds with the revolution of the month of April 1834. This was the most terrible of all the revolutions of that period.

We reproduce the report of the 10th October, which treats of the election to some offices, and which refers to the corresponding registers, giving some details about the procedure under these circumstances.

The Council was presided over by our Reverend Mother Superioress.

After imploring the light of the Holy Spirit, our very dear Sisters, St. Hilaire, and St. Aloysia were proposed for the rank of electresses, and their names were put to the vote. The result showed that our very dear Sisters St. Hilaire and St. Aloysia were admitted to the rank of electresses. The act of admission was drawn up. It was written in the Book of Elections.

We then proceeded to the election of two Assistants General whose term of office had expired. Fr. Rey, our Reverend Chaplain, who had been delegated by the Bishop to count the votes announced that Mother St. Andrew and M. St. Teresa were named by an absolute majority of votes.

The deed of election was recorded and signed in the Book of Elections.

M(ar)ie St. Andre

APPENDIX

Given the importance of the Registers examined and in order to clarify and better evaluate the interpretation of these, we have considered it opportune to give the report of the test of handwriting carried out at the request of the Historical Section by the calligraphic expert, Fr. Mario Pinzuti of the Benedictine Monastery, Olivetano, Director of the Institute for the "Scientific Restoration of Books."

*Calligraphic Test for the Cause of beatification of the Servant of God, Sr. M. St. Ignatius (Claudine Thevenel), Foundress of the Congregation of Jesus and Mary.*

Institute for the Scientific Restoration of Books  
(Benedictine Monastery, Olivetano)

In the name of Our Lord. Amen.

I the undersigned, Dom Mario Pinzuti O.S.B. Oliv. Director of the Institute for the Scientific Restoration of Books, situated in the Palaces of the Sacred Congregations, Via Rusticucci, 13, Rome, in the capacity of Calligraphic Expert, present and subscribe to the results of the Calligraphic Technical Test, carried out by me, in connection with the process for the beatification of the Servant of God, Sr. M. St. Ignatius, secular name Claudine Thevenet, foundress of the Congregation of Jesus and Mary.

The aforementioned test was entrusted to me at the express charge of Rev. Monsignor Pietro Amato Frutaz, Relator General of the Historical Section of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, who put the following questions:

1) What can the Technical Expert say about the signatures of Sr. M. St. Andrew, secular name Louise Claudine Victoire Ramie, and that of Fr. Pousset, that have been affixed to these Registers:

- a) Reg. VI.-F Archives, Mother House  
N. 85 A. 2 R. 4 B. 43
- b) Reg. V.-E Archives, Mother House  
N. 84 A. 2 R. 4 B. 43

c) Reg. III-C Archives, Mother House  
N. 82 A. 2 R. 4 B. 43

2) Let the Technical Expert say at what time, presumably exact, it is possible to date the signatures.

3) Let the Technical Expert say to what date it is possible to attribute the corrections to the text and the substitution of the pages of the Rule — Archives, Mother House — N. 95 A. 2 R. 4 B. 37.

4) What else may be said in the course of such an examination? Having studied the documents referred to in the questions, after an attentive, accurate and detailed examination of each of these

/ reply

to questions n. 1 and n. 2 regarding the signatures of Sr. M. St. Andrew and of Fr. Pousset.

*In general*

Since the debate does not turn on the authenticity or not of the signatures in question, but on the date when they were affixed to the registers mentioned in question 1, I am of the opinion that it is useless to compare them with other documents presented, having found in these Registers all the elements, in my opinion, possible, probative and sufficient to make an expert judgement.

*In particular*

A) Register VI-F Archives, Mother House  
N. 85 A.2 R.4 B.43

Register for the ceremonies of Profession

Size: 80 pages, 36 cm by 22 cm.

Is copied from page 1 to page 6

Is original from page 7 to page 80

The volume presents the following alterations:

Page 24 has been cut with a razor on the inside edge and then glued afresh to the stump with a strip of material.

Page 30 has two pages stuck together.

The following pages have been removed from the volume as well:

1 page between pages 13-14	2 pages between pages 64-65
1 „ „ „ 17-18	1 page „ „ 66-67
1 „ „ „ 20-21	2 pages „ „ 78-79
1 „ „ „ 49-50	1 page „ „ 79-80
1 „ „ „ 58-59	

*Various examinations* of the signatures of Sr. M. St. Andrew and of Fr. Pousset affixed to different pages of the register examined.

As regards time we limited ourselves to the year 1843, because it seems to us that this date marks a decisive change in the validation of the different acts. After this date the acts were always signed by those present when they were being drawn up.

D) *Examinations under ultraviolet rays*

Although with Wood's Lamp the examinations of the colour of the dye (= ink) had negative results until page 36 (year 1855) because of the identical chemical components, nevertheless the fluorescence is slightly, but clearly different in intensity, through the different way the mixture (= ink) oxidises, according to the different quantity of the substances of which the formula is composed.

In other words, although the formula of the ink (= chemical mixture) is identical in the quality of the substances used:

Gall nut (for tannic acid)

Iron filings (for iron oxide)

Alcohol (Wine, vinegar, beer?)

Spring water

nevertheless, because it is applied empirically, it varies in the *quantity* of each substance, in the average *boiling and sediment at ion points* and the *purity* of the *substances* used.

For this reason we will have the result: that writings of identical colour will have different fluorescence through the different oxidisation of various products during the passage of time.

Therefore, two pieces of writing will be identical and written with the same ink within a more or less short period of time (about six months in a century) if they have identical colour and fluorescence under Wood's Lamp.

Applying this method we shall have the following results:

a) Signature of Sister M. St. Andrew affixed to the pages indicated below in the Register which is being examined.

page 7. Front and back	page 15. Front and back
8. Front and back	„ 16. Front and back
9. Front and back	17. Front and back
10. Front and back	18. Front and back
11. Back	19. Front and back
12. Front and back	20. Front and back
13. Front and back	21. Front and back
14. Front and back	22. Front and back
	23. Front and back

are all written with the ink used for the signature of the said Sister on page 23, back, in the act bearing the date 14th February 1843.

After that date something inexplicable took place.

In fact it appears that page 24 as we have already noted, has been tampered with and the ink used for the writing on the back of the act dated the 10th August 1843 is the same as that which M. St. Andrew used to add to the signatures affixed on pages

18 back

19 front and back

20 front and back

21 front

the title Sup. General.

In confirmation of this there is the singular fact that on the back of page 21 Mother St. Andrew signed the act of the 29th August 1840, and by mistake forgot to add the title Sup. General.

Therefore we must conclude that all the signatures of Mother St. Andrew affixed to this register (Reg. VI — F, Mother House Archives — N.85 A.2R.4 B.43) from page 7 to page 23 are to be dated between the 14th February and the 10th August 1843.

*b) Signature of Fr. Pousset.*

Since all the signatures written by Fr. Pousset in the register under examination, from pages 17 to 21 present identical characteristics of colouring and fluorescence to those of Mother M. St. Andrew examined above, we must conclude that these too were written between the 14th February and the 10th August 1843.

*II) Chromatographic Examination.*

The chromatography down through the ink of the signatures in question, both those of Mother M. St. Andrew and of Fr. Pousset, has confirmed the identity of stratification and sedimentation on absorbent paper separating in colour the chemical components with the signature of Mother M. St. Andrew affixed by her to the act of the 14th February 1843.

The addition — Sup. General — to the signatures of Mother M. St. Andrew on pages

18 back; 19 front and back; 20 front and back; 21 front presents the same chromatographic stratification as that of the signature of the same Sister, affixed to the act of the 10th August 1843 on the back of page 24.

Regarding the first part of the register from page 1 to page 6, it is a copy, written with the same identical ink as that used for the act dated the 14th February 1843 on page 23, since the examinations under ultraviolet rays and chromatographic comparisons have given a positive result.

*B) Reg. V-E Archives of the Mother House.*

N. 84 A.2 R.4 B.43

Register of Clothings

*Measurements:* 16 pages, 26 by 18.5 cm.

It is *original* in all its parts.

It has been tampered with by removal of pages:

1 page between pages 13-14

5 pages after page 16.

1) *Examination of signatures affixed by Mother M. St. Andrew* to the following pages of the register in question:

page 2 back; page 3 front and back; page 6 back; page 8 back; page 9 front.

*I) Examination under ultraviolet rays.*

Under ultraviolet rays the colouring and fluorescence of the said signatures are identical with those of the signature of the same Mother St. Andrew on the document dated the 14th February 1843 of Reg. VI-F, on the back of page 23.

*II) Chromatographic Examination.*

The chromatography up through the said signatures being examined, presents chromatic stratification and chemical sedimentation identical with that of the signature examined above in Reg. VI-F on page 23, back, bearing the date 14th February 1843.

Therefore it must be admitted that the said signatures were written around the aforementioned date.

The writing at the close of the register dated 2nd February 1838 and the signature of Mother M. St. Andrew has similar fluorescence and colouring under Wood's Lamp and the chromatic stratification is like the chromatography of the ink used for the signature of Mother M. St. Andrew affixed to the back of page 24, dated August 1843, ink never found before that date.

Therefore in my opinion this writing was not put on paper on the date given (2nd August 1838) but around August 1843.

2) *Examinations of the signatures of Rev. Fr. Pousset* from page 10 to page 16 of the Register in question.

*I) Examination under ultraviolet rays.*

The signatures of Fr. Pousset under examination, affixed to the register in question, have the same identical characteristics of fluorescence as the ink used at the close of the same register, dated (2nd February 1838) and signed (Mother St. Andrew).

*II) Chromatographic Examination.*

The chromatographic examination of the ink used for the said signatures of Fr. Pousset also shows complete identity of chromatic stratification and chemical sedimentation with the ink used for the signature at the close of the same register dated (2nd February 1838) and signed (Mother St. Andrew).

Through the same means of verification carried out above on the close of the register, the date and the signature of Mother M. St. Andrew in the register examined, we must conclude that the signatures of Fr. Pousset were written in August 1843.

*C) Reg. III — Archives of the Mother House*

N. 82 A.2 R.4 B.43

Register containing deliberations.

*Dimensions:* 22 pages, 35.5 by 24.5 cm.

It is *copied* from the beginning to the end.

The Register has been tampered with on the back. As it now appears, it seems composed of a collection of loose pages that have been sewn together badly.

It is entirely written in the hand of Mother M. St. Andrew and is signed only by her.

At the foot of the last page it has a conclusion with the date 3rd November 1834 and signed by Mother M. St. Andrew, which calls for a separate examination.

*Examinations under ultraviolet rays and chromatography.*

I) *Under ultraviolet rays* the identity of the fluorescence and colouring of the ink of the first six pages of Register VI-F, already examined, is established.

The same must be said for the chromatic stratification and chemical sedimentation resulting from the chromatography.

Therefore this register also, with the corresponding signatures, must be held as written between February and August 1843.

II) The conclusion of the register with the corresponding signature of Mother M. St. Andrew dated the 3rd November 1834, whether under examination by ultraviolet rays or chromatography shows that it was written with ink that is identical with that used for the conclusion, date and signature of Register V-E, namely around August 1843.

D) Rule of St Augustine ... Archives of the Mother House. N. 95 A.2 R.4 B.37.

*Description:* 2 blank pages, then 322 pages, then 2 blank pages.

It is a copy concordant with the original.

The following pages have been removed and pages which have been copied have been substituted:

Pages 35-36	Pages 159-160	Pages 285-286
103-104	„ 167-168	„ 291-292
117-118	„ 179-180	„ 313-314
151-152	„ 201-202	

Words have been erased on the following pages:

Page 27	Page 47	Page 58	Page 116	Page 144
29	„ 48	„ 101	124	„ 163
41	„ 50	„ 106	126	„ 166
42	„ 51	„ 108	129	
46	„ 53	„ 113	141	

Except for the erasure on page 124, which is modern, all the others are old.

As a result of this study there is need to examine:

- I) The writing of the text;
- II) The writing on the pages substituted;
- III) The erasures.

For this part of the test I have taken as a basis for comparison and as a point of certain proof:

- a) Reg. **VI-F** Archives of the Mother House  
N. 85 A.2 R.4 B.43

- b) Register of Deliberations of the General Chapter  
N. 102 A.2 R.4 B.41

according to the case.

I — *The writing of the text*

*Examination under ultraviolet rays.*

The colouring and fluorescence of the ink used for the text of the Rule are identical with the fluorescence and colouring of that on page 18 front and back, dated the 3rd April-27th October 1837 of the original Register VI-F.

Therefore it is possible to conclude that the said Rule was written between April and October 1837.

*Chromatographic Examination.*

The chromatographic examination fully confirms what has come from the examination under ultraviolet rays. In fact both the chromatic stratification and the sedimentation of the ink correspond perfectly with that of the ink on page 18 back and front (3rd April-27th October 1837) of Register VI-F.

II — *The writing on the pages substituted*

The ink when placed under ultraviolet rays gives the same fluorescence and colouring and under chromatographic examination has identical chromatic stratification and chemical sedimentation with that of the Register of deliberations of the General Chapter, on page 12, with the signatures of the act dated 10th March 1842, and the signatures of the act of 23rd December 1842, on page 13.

Therefore the said pages are very likely to have been substituted between these two dates: March-December 1842.

III — *Cancellations*

The ink used for the cancellations, except that used on page 124 which only dates back a few years, gives the same result from the analysis using ultraviolet rays as from chromatography. It is of the same chemical composition and of the same time as that of the signatures of Fr. Coindre and Fr. Pousset affixed to the act of the 14th February 1843 on the back of page 23 of Register VI-F.

Therefore it must be concluded that the said cancellations were made around that time.

CONCLUSIONS

Regarding questions 1 and 2, to sum up:

A) *Reg. VI-F*

All the signatures of Mother M. St. Andrew from page 7 to page 23 were affixed between February and August 1843.

Pages 1-6 were also copied either immediately before or immediately after the 14th February 1843.

All the signatures of Fr. Pousset from page 17 to page 21 were also written between February and August 1843.

B) *Register V-E*

The signatures of Mother M. St. Andrew on the back of page 2, back and front of page 3, back of page 6, back of page 8, front of page 9, were affixed immediately before or soon after the 14th February 1843.

The conclusion of the Register with the date (2nd February 1838) and the signature was written around August 1843.

The signatures of Fr. Pousset, from page 10 to page 16 are also from August 1843.

C) *Register III-C*

This register, with the corresponding signatures, except the conclusion, was written between February and August 1843. The conclusion of the register, dated 3rd November 1834, and the signature, should be attributed to August 1843.

For question N. 3 we sum up:

I) The writing of the text of the Rule must be fixed between April and October 1837.

II) The writing on the pages substituted, was done between March and December 1842.

III) The cancellations, except that on page 124, were made either immediately before or immediately after the 14th February 1843.

The answer to question 4 is fully covered in the individual analyses.

Rome, 6th March 1963.

In Fede

Dom Mario Pinzuti

B)

THE VICAR GENERAL SIMON CATTET AND THE SERVANT OF GOD

Fr. Coindre, although he was the Superior of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts — later known as Congregation of Jesus and Mary — left Mother St. Ignatius, in whom he had absolute trust, freedom to act, as we see also from letters (cf. *infra*, C, 1, p. 301). The Servant of God on her part, governed the Congregation as Superioress General, consulting him when necessary. The death of Fr. Coindre, then Vicar General of Blois, which took place on the 30th May 1826, was the beginning of a new series of difficulties for the Servant of God. Provisionally, it seems that she addressed herself for the necessary authorisations to the Vicar General Cholleton, in charge of the religious communities, but from the 27th December 1827, the name of M. Cattet appears in the register of the Congregation with the title "our very Rev. Fr. Superior".

Simon Cattet was born on the 4th October 1788 in Neuville-sur-Saone (Rhône). In 1809 Cardinal Fesch sent him to Paris to complete his studies in the Seminary of St. Sulpice. He was ordained priest in 1811 by Mgr Simon, Bishop of Grenoble, and was entrusted with the office of teaching dogmatic theology in the Seminary of Lyon. On the 28th December 1825 he was

appointed Vicar General by Mgr de Pins, who retained him in this office all during his administration, at the end of which Fr. Cattet also ceased to be the Vicar General. He was appointed Canon of the Primatial Church in 1840 by Mgr de Bonald. He died in Lyon on the 30th June 1858. There exist abundant documents of that time which present Fr. Cattet as a person who was impulsive and authoritarian. It is sufficient in this regard to quote some evidence.

1. The Vicars General, of whom M. Cattet was one ... "Believed that the diocese should be conducted along the same lines as those on which they conducted the seminaries, that is to say, always with an iron hand" (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Nunciature of Paris N. 57: *L'Administration du diocese de Lyon jugee d'apres ses actes*).

2. Canon Delandine wrote to Cardinal Fesch on the 28th August 1830 "I tell you in confidence that the Administrator of the diocese is weak, inexperienced and not well informed; it is a recognised fact both here and in Paris at the former Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs; the Vicars General are too young and do not inspire enough confidence in general and especially among the older members of the clergy who tolerate this youthful superiority unwillingly." (Secret Archives of the Vatican, *Napoleonic Epoch, France*, 5).

3. In an anonymous and undated *Note sur l'état du diocese* one reads "To improve on things, they had the idea of adding the young and hasty Cattet junior to this immature group who were already governing; this only served to create an even greater muddle." (National Archives, Paris. F<sup>19</sup>, 1904).

4. Pauline Jaricot in her *Memoire* of 1834 to Cardinal Lambruschini, in exposing in all its details the persecution against the "Living Rosary" on the part of the "Archbishop's Council" showed clearly the situation in which the works and even the Apostolic Administrator found themselves under the authoritarian pressure, of these "Gentlemen of Archbishop's House". In a note we read "But since I am opening my whole soul to you today, I will tell you, that this sad state of affairs often gave rise in me to the wicked thought that the devil of this century had perhaps placed in Lyon his most perfidious batteries against God's Church and that if we were destined to see a schism in France, the *Council* could well be the centre and focus of it." (S. Congregation of Rites. *Writings of Pauline Jaricot* Vol. 11, p. 56).

Besides this it may be added that Mr. Cattet was then a partisan for the fusion of religious congregations that pursued more or less the same ends. Two letters which we are publishing here are, in this regard, very significant. Without doubt the Vicar General, Fr. Cattet, entertained the same sentiments with regard to the Servant of God, and this is indicated in his intervention in the closing of the house of Belleville, to the prejudice of the institution of which he was the Superior (Docs. IX, 8 and 9, pp. 240-241). In the last years of his office as Vicar General we see him still adopting an unfriendly attitude towards Fr. Francois Vincent Coindre who was the successor of his dead brother as Superior of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart (cf. *infra*, 2).

The character and way of acting of Fr. Cattet as Superior of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts — later Congregation of Jesus and Mary — must have created difficulty for the Servant of God, whom we see as it were eclipsed. In fact, Mother St. Ignatius while keeping the title and rights of Superioress General, no longer had the liberty of action that she was given when Fr. Coindre lived. Fr. Mayet, Marist priest, nephew of the Servant of God, wrote in this regard as follows: "But as far as I could see, Mother St. Ignatius never did anything out of the ordinary without the express permission of the Vicar General, Fr. Cattet, who was appointed by the Bishop as Spiritual Father of the house. It seems that I can still hear the words 'With the permission of M. Cattet'." (Doc. XXV, 2. p. 487).

## 1

*Letter of Fr. Andre Coindre to Brother Borgia, Director General of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, 3rd May 1826.* — From the original kept in the Gen. Arch, of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart in Rome.

The document which we present is an extract from the last letter of those preserved, from Fr. Coindre, written three weeks before his death. In it is seen his preoccupation for the Congregation of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, whom he followed closely in the smallest details. The First part concerns the Vicar General Cattet, who at that time was attempting to fuse the Brothers of the Sacred Heart with those of St. Viateur, founded by Fr. Querbes, and with those of Blessed Marcellin Champagnat.

The arguments put forward by Fr. Coindre in the letter, in defence of the autonomy of his Congregation are doubtless the same as those the Servant of God used in the same circumstances (cf. *infra*, 6. pp. 318-320).

Blois, 3rd May 1826

My very dear Brother,

The restless mind of Fr. Cattet shows us the way we should proceed. He is one of those men who want to undo everything in order to remake it in their own way. Let us distrust such a system. Nothing nature has produced can be remade without total destruction; and we can never be sure that what has been reduced to dust will enter again into the constitution of a new product. It is the same with the works of grace. It shows little knowledge of men or of the works of God to think about such fusions. It is as if someone said that all families must be dissolved and made into one; all states fused to make only one.

Furthermore, if they are happy, what more is needed? No one will trouble [us] I think, because we are not bothering anyone.

It is quite unnecessary to go to Monistrol to take the habit, since it can be given in Lyon, without a ceremony, when necessary. Moreover, this permission has been granted in a general way, and no one has said that it is not to be used any more. Besides, it is well known that the Brothers wear it, no one forbids it, no law forbids it, the Government leaves each one to dress as he likes as long as he does not wear the dress of an authorized institute. We also know that if there were difficulty for a priest to give the habit, there would be none for you. We know too that the Brothers of the Christian Schools give the habit without a presiding priest and without even informing the Ordinary. I see no need to ask this permission every time. The first permission seems to me to be sufficient, until it is forbidden.

As for vows, that could cause difficulties. Although anyone can make a vow to God to do something good and better than if that person remained in the ordinary state; although this vow obliges equally in conscience; the person who would receive them publicly without authorisation could be repudiated if the one who makes them complained, if he changed his mind, if he were to apostatise. Therefore it is better if they are made in territory where authorisation is granted and all is well regulated. But taking the habit which only requires a ceremony without any other obligation than to be faithful as long as one wears it, does not involve the same difficulties.

Keep this to yourself and communicate it to the Chaplain. For the rest, as M. Cholleton is in charge of communities, and M. Cattet is only responsible for small works, it seems to me that your business is more in the competence of M. Cholleton. Moreover, I think that I shall have an explanation with M. Cattet when I go on holiday.

I do not doubt that Brother Chrysostome has made Brother Bernard suffer. But I also know very well that Brother Bernard has sometimes a dry way of speaking which will undoubtedly not have pleased the parish priest, if it is he who has complained to Mgr. As for Brother Stanislaus, I agree that he should be in Lyon, if you think it is a good thing. Brother Bernard has great need to read and re-read the rules of conduct that I sent to our Ladies in Fourviere, and which apply to all Directors. Meditate much on them and endeavour to put them

into practice. The more experience you have the more you will realise the truth they contain.

Our establishments . . .

Your Father, Coindre

## 2

*Letter of Fr. Françoise Vincent Coindre to Mgr de Pins, Apostolic Administrator of Lyon, 11th May 1838.* — From the original preserved in A. A. Lyon.

Fr. Vincent Coindre was the younger brother of Fr. Andre, and like him he was a priest (Doc. IV, 2, note 78, p. 170).

For many years he was chaplain of the *Providence* of Fourviere and was the successor of Fr. Andre Coindre as Superior General of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart. In the exercise of this office he encountered various difficulties with the Vicar General M. Cattet, difficulties that impelled him to write the letter which we publish here. In it he confides in Mgr de Pins, asking his protection against the attacks of M. Cattet, which lasted for more than ten years. This period of time coincides with that in which the Vicar General Cattet was Superior of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts (later Jesus and Mary). So it is logical to think that the Servant of God found herself in the same situation as that disclosed by Fr. Francois Vincent Coindre.

Les Chartreux, 11th May 1838

Monseigneur,

Counting above all on your kindness, and the interest which you have always shown in me, and seeing that by suppositions which have some semblance of truth, Fr. Cattet would in the end make me lose both one and the other, and after suffering for more than ten years from him, I would like, if possible, to submit the differences that exist between him and me to Your Lordship. These differences put him in the position to publish everywhere and to whoever wishes to listen, that I am nothing but an *unjust person* and an *interfering busybody*. These things coming from him would not bother me if they were only against me personally, and did not also affect a work that I hold dearer than myself; but alas, it is not so, it seems necessary to pull down. And gossip, which tends to do just that is published and repeated by persons who ought to be models of prudence and discretion. It had to reach this point for me to feel justified in complaining.

But knowing your kindness, I am having recourse to you like a docile child who comes to its father, confiding his sufferings to him and feeling in some way happy as soon as he has done so. If this last-mentioned grace is not accorded to me, at least please keep for me the last place in your heart, so that, if you forget me elsewhere, you will not forget me in your fervent prayers and Masses. In that way I hope to obtain that resignation in suffering that is so necessary to a minister of a God who has suffered.

Assuring Your Lordship of my most profound respect, I am your most humble and obedient servant,

[Vincent] Coindre, p. m.

P.S. If Your Lordship wishes to grant me an audience, please write to me by the local post to Les Chartreux.

## C)

### DIRECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONGREGATION

The documentation relative to the development and the life of the Congregation, except that of the foundations of Lyon, Belleville, Monistrol and Le Puy, is rather scarce and fragmentary. The information gathered here will serve to illustrate more fully the zeal of the Servant of God in defending her work and in promoting the spiritual good of the religious and pupils. In addition, it will in some way provide a view of the state of the Congregation towards the end of the life of the Foundress.

## 1

*Extracts from the letters of Fr. Coindre to Brother Borgia of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, 1821-1826.* From the originals preserved in the Gen. Arch. of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Rome.

The letters written by Fr. Coindre to the Servant of God and to other religious of the Congregation have disappeared. Only two are known, the text of which is preserved in the *Histoire* (Doc. XXVII, pp. 560-563, 571).

The Brothers of the Sacred Heart have preserved twenty-three letters of Fr. Coindre. Twenty are directed to Brother Borgia, Director General, two to Brother Bernard, Econome General, and one to Brother Louis, Director of the house of Pradelles.

The incessant apostolic activity of Fr. Coindre is clearly seen from these letters, and his constant preoccupation with the problems of the Brothers, even the smallest details. The good progress of the Congregation of the religious under the government of the Servant of God is also seen through

these same letters. She is in frequent communication with Fr. Coindre, with whom she is collaborating in the definitive drawing up of the Rules.

Among the letters directed to Brother Borgia, we see that there are eight in which he refers to Mother St. Ignatius. We are publishing extracts taken from six of these letters which contain some information which directly concerns the Servant of God.

a)

Anse, 10th January [1822]

Fr. Coindre instructs the Brother Director on the government of the Congregation and encourages him in difficulties. In one of the last paragraphs we can perceive his satisfaction with the good spirit of the community of the Servant of God, which he proposes for the example of the Brothers.

Let the Brothers be very united among themselves. Let them be saints, let them show the same zeal for their work as do the fathers of families. I am responsible for them and in token of this I would like to offer them the example of Fourviere.

b)

St.-Arcon-pres-Pradelles, Haute-Loire, 29th April [1823].

This is a long-letter in which Fr. Coindre descends to the smallest details in his advice, and consoles Brother Director in his sufferings. It is evident from the paragraph we have copied that the Servant of God corresponded frequently with Fr. Coindre, requesting advice and permissions.

Tell me about your little sufferings. I could write to you so as to dispel them and give you advice. Mother St. Ignatius is at my door much more often than you are. She always has something to ask me, and I always have some answers to give her. I will do the same for you when you open your heart and that of our Brothers to me.

c)

Tence, near Yssingeaux, 11th September 1823.

Advice to the Brothers on government and the direction of the pupils; information about the mission. From this letter we also learn of the appeal to the Servant of God to found a Providence at Ste-Sigolene, but this foundation was prevented by a fire which destroyed the building constructed for this work.

The Parish Priest of Ste-Sigolene was very upset to see the house that he had had prepared for the little Providence, and to which he wished to call some of our Sisters, consumed by flames and reduced to a heap of ashes. Please let the Sisters of Fourviere know about this calamity and urge them to take every possible precaution.

d)

Monistrol, 24th April 1824.

In this letter Fr. Coindre gives much information on the vocations of the Brothers. From the last few lines, which we have copied, we see how he was working in collaboration with the Servant of God at that time, drawing up the Rules which were to be definitive.

I am sending our Sisters in Fourviere several articles of their Rules which will be of use to you one day. See that they are forwarded immediately.

e)

Blois, 25th February 1826.

In this long letter, Fr. Coindre, besides concerning himself with every detail of the Brothers' personnel, gives the Master of Novices some special norms, many of which are found in the Rules of the Servant of God, which were later approved, in 1838 (Doc. XIX, p. 412). Fr. Coindre said that he was also sending a letter for a Brother who was vacillating in his vocation; this letter is referred to in the paragraph which we give here.

I am sending you a letter for Brother Louis. Copy it. Take out what is personal to him and put as the title:- "Letter of our Father to a Brother who might be tempted to lose his vocation." When you have written it in this way, send it to our different houses. Please give a copy to Fourviere. What I say for a Brother can be equally useful for the Sisters, and even to their pupils and yours, with suitable modifications, for it is the seed of the whole doctrine of salvation.

Yours ever, L.J.C.

## 0

Blois, 3rd May 1826.

The first part of this letter treats of the attempts made by the Vicar General, Cattet, to fuse the Brothers with another Congregation. In the paragraph which we give here we see Fr. Coindre still concerned with drawing up the Rules for the community of Fourviere.

Brother Bernard greatly needs to read and re-read the Rules of conduct that I sent to the Sisters of Fourviere and which are for all Directors. Meditate well on them and try also to put them into practice. The more experience you have the more you will find truth in them.

## 2

*Extracts from some letters of Father J. M. Mioland about the activity of the Servant of God, Lyon, 1824.* From the originals preserved in the Archives of the "Carthusian" Missionaries, Lyon.

The Rev. Fr. J. M. Mioland (Doc. IV, 2, note 34, p. 119), was a good friend of Fr. Coindre and of Mother St. Ignatius and her family, as is proved by many original letters preserved, from which we are publishing here some extracts which refer to the Servant of God.

## a)

*Extract from a letter of Rev. J. M. Mioland to Rev. J. M. Ballet, Lyon, 12th April 1824.*

In 1824 an important event for the diocese took place in Lyon: the arrival of an Apostolic Administrator to govern the diocese during the enforced absence of the Titular Bishop. The negotiations had been long and difficult. Monseigneur de Pins made his entry into Lyon on the 18th February and was received with the honour due to an envoy of the Pope, although one sector of the clergy and population questioned the authority of an administrator while the Titular Bishop was still alive. As Superior of the "Carthusian" Missionaries the Rev. Mioland was the first to give good example, and on the day following the solemn entry of Mgr de Pins, he hastened to present his own respectful obedience and that of his Missionaries. The Servant of God acted in the same spirit, and on the 2nd March, 12 days after the installation of the Apostolic Administrator, the first ceremony of clothing and profession took place in the Mother House of Fourviere "with the authorisation of Mgr de Pins", as is recorded in the Register of the Congregation.

The extract from the letter which we reproduce says that Mother St. Ignatius also invited the Prelate to give the First Communion to the children; after some unavoidable delays this celebration took place on the 21st June.

Joseph Marie Ballet who was still a sub-deacon, was one of the first members of the society of "Carthusian" Missionaries in 1816 (A. M. ODIN, *Les Chartreux de Lyon*, Lyon, 1937, pp. 63, 64); he preached with Fr. Coindre under his direction for many years. He had connections with the Servant of God and with her Congregation, and in the Registers we repeatedly find his signature. Although remaining a missionary he was a Canon and the Vicar General of Avignon.

Monseigneur was enchanted with Verrieres ... he is going to have two vast wings built at Argentiere. They will be for studies, recreation rooms, dormitory and refectory. He is going to build at Alix; to build everywhere. I fear that too many projects will come to nothing. There are always difficulties if things are not done as promised; yet all can be done and not without need. This morning Monseigneur is going to officiate at the First Communion at the establishment of Mile Thevenet in Fourviere.

## b)

*Extract from the letter of Rev. J. M. Mioland to Rev. J. M. Ballet, Lyon, 16th April 1824.*

Four days after the preceding letter, Rev. Mioland wrote again to the Rev. Ballet. From the extract given here it is clear that the First Communion of the pupils of Fourviere was postponed because of some obstacle on the part of Mgr de Pins.

You may be sure that the Prelate was unable to keep his promise and this was a source of great embarrassment for him. He is beginning to realise that his kindness makes him promise more than his strength allows. Last Monday, he should have gone to Fourviere for the First Communion. A heavy cold caused him to put it off until Tuesday, and on Tuesday word had to be sent that he could not go. You can imagine the predicament of Mile Thevenet. He had promised to bless the church of the Trappists on Saturday. At the very moment of departure he was unable to go, and he sent M. Cholleton, who found a great gathering, and everybody very dissatisfied to see only hi in.

## 3

*Care of the Foundress for the spiritual good of the religious.*

We present here three initiatives of the Servant of God which reveal some traits of her spirituality: a) Marian devotion, b) love of the religious life, c) devotion to the Holy Family.

## a)

*Letter of M. St. Andrew to Elisabeth Mayet, Lyon, 2nd September 1828.*

— From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.

In giving news of the convent to Elisabeth Mayet, M. St. Andrew wrote particularly about the way in which the community honoured Our Lady. She narrates the ceremony of the opening of the month of Mary. This long and affectionate letter reveals that M. St. Andrew was on familiar terms with the niece of the Foundress.

L.s.J.C.

Lyon, 2nd September 1828

My very dear Elisabeth,

You will be surprised, my dear, to receive my letter. I am ahead of you for sure, as you will not be expecting this letter on account of my laziness. If I were to confess to you from my heart ... if I were to tell you that you caused me a big distraction on Sunday evening during Benediction, what would you think? Yes indeed! The idea of writing to you came to my mind whilst I was in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. I thought of telling you about the ceremony we had celebrated that day.

Perhaps you have heard that we had the intention of keeping the month of September as a month devoted to Mary? We began this on Sunday evening. I must give you some details about it. I am going to let you into our little secret. It goes without saying that it is between the two of us. You have promised me and I have the greatest confidence in your discretion. I am rousing your curiosity. You cannot imagine, my dear child, what you are going to learn after such a long introduction. Calm your eagerness. Here is what we did. You know very well that the homage of our prayers is worth very little before God if we do not join the practice of virtue to it. And so we each took the resolution to apply

ourselves to the practice of a virtue, and after choosing the flowers to symbolise them, we made a bouquet which we placed at the feet of the Blessed Virgin. A number of Sisters chose a virtue to which we gave the bell flower as the emblem, so that it was easy for us to make a large garland with which the Blessed Virgin was completely surrounded. Each one liked to think about her flower and present it to Mary while offering her at the same time the desire that we all have of honouring her by the virtues which we do not yet possess, but that we hope to obtain. How heartily and sincerely we sang the pretty hymns that you know, and that you have so often sung with us. Well, to finish where I began, it was in the middle of that touching ceremony that the memory of all my dear little ones came to my mind. You understand that it would have been impossible to forget them on such a beautiful occasion, and could my dear Elisabeth have been forgotten? No, definitely not! She loves God too much for me not to love her with all my heart. Yes. She will always be God's dear child, and consequently my much-loved little daughter.

I left off writing, my dear Elisabeth, to go and say the prayers for the dying for poor Mother Xavier. They fetched me because she asked for me. I ran to her with my good St. Teresa; she had such difficulty in expressing herself that I could not understand what she said, but I knew that she had just asked Sr. St. Vincent to fetch me to pray near her bed. Without delay we began to pray to the good God — indeed we prayed with all our heart. I sent for about fifteen Sisters, and we all knelt at the foot of her bed. Our dear Sister, after three quarters of an hour in agony, fell asleep in the Heart of Jesus. Yes, we have every reason to believe that her death was precious in the sight of God. May we have the grace to die as peacefully, or rather, have as saintly a death.

You must be very worried about our Mother. Undoubtedly we have all had to make a very painful sacrifice, but God is our support, and divine Providence has allowed that neither our Mother nor Mother Stanislaus should be here. They had been out of the house since morning without suspecting what would happen in the evening. Our Mother had gone to your mother to have the pleasure of spending a short time with her before leaving for Belleville. The next day they were to take the coach, but this was cancelled and they returned in the evening.

Our Mother's health is always more or less the same. As for us, we are always in excellent health.

You are well aware that I would reproach myself severely if I did not send you a message for your dear sister, Mme Nicod. I love her with all my heart, but do not tell her that I used that expression. I console myself by confiding this to you. Give her a thousand best wishes from me. You cannot exaggerate my affectionate greetings to your dear sister, still less put into words all that I feel for her. I await a letter from you soon, my dear little friend. Our Mother will write to you one of these days. She sends you her love.

M. Andre

b)

*Rescript from the S.C. for Indulgences, 1829.* — From the original preserved in the Secret Archives of the Vatican. Rescripts of the S.C. for Indulgences and Holy Relics, 1829, 3 n. 294.

A document of 1829 shows the solicitude of the Servant of God to procure the greatest spiritual good for her religious and for the persons in her care.

On the 12th November 1829 she requested His Holiness Pope Pius VIII to grant a plenary indulgence in favour of the religious and persons who lived in the house, on the day of profession and renewal of vows, on condition that they receive Holy Communion in the chapel of the Mother House, Lyon.

We present: aa) the petition of the Servant of God together with the recommendation signed by the Vicar General, Cattet, and bb) the rescript dated 27th November 1829, with the concession valid for 20 years.

aa)

Our Most Holy Father Pope Pius VIII happily reigning in Rome.

Most Holy Father,

The Superioress of the religious known by the name of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, who live in the city and diocese of Lyon, with the authorisation of the Ordinary, humbly prostrate at the feet of Your Holiness, earnestly beseeches that in his clemency he will deign to

grant each and all of the religious and persons living in the Convent in Lyon who receive Holy Communion in the chapel of the aforesaid Convent, a plenary indulgence on the day of profession of the religious and of the renewal of vows of the same, which, etc.

We the undersigned Vicar General of the diocese of Lyon, testify that the petition written above is true, and likewise prostrate before Your Holiness, and kissing your feet, humbly beseech, that, to promote the praiseworthy love of prayer, the progress of the religious and the fervour of the faithful, the grace solicited be granted.

Lyon, 12th November 1829

Cattet Vicar General

L.S.

bb)

From the Audience of the Most Holy Father

Our Most Holy Father graciously grants to all the religious and those who live in the above mentioned convent, who, being truly sorry for their sins, and having confessed them and devoutly received Holy Communion visit the convent chapel mentioned in the petition and pray there, that they may gain a plenary indulgence on any of the days on which religious profession is celebrated in the same convent. He also grants to the aforementioned religious that they may likewise gain a plenary indulgence on the day of the anniversary of renewal of their vows, on the conditions mentioned above, provided that they are in the required dispositions and have visited the chapel and prayed there. Valid for twenty years, etc.

Dated 27th November 1829.

[Attested]

His Holiness Pope Pius VIII

Lyon. From the Audience on the 27th November 1829

Rescript graciously accorded

For twenty years.

For the undersigned petitioners of the Diocese of Lyon.

Cav<sup>e</sup> de Rossi

C)

*Erection of the Confraternity of the Holy Family, 1834.* - From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.

The Servant of God, always zealous for the spiritual good of souls, and especially for those confided to her care, through the chaplain, J. Rey (Doc. XX VII, pp. 593-602), requested Mgr de Pins, Apostolic Administrator of the diocese of Lyon, to set up the Confraternity of the Holy Family, in the chapel of the *Providence*. Mgr de Pins kindly agreed to this petition on the 24th March 1834, as the document we present shows. It is signed by the Vicar General Cattet.

We Jean-Paul Gaston de Pins, by the grace of God and the favour of the Holy See, Archbishop of Amasie, Apostolic Administrator of the Diocese of Lyon and Vienne.

In view of the request of the chaplain of the *Providence* of Fourviere to obtain the erection of the Confraternity of the Holy Family in the church of that community.

In virtue of the Brief His Holiness deigned to address to us on the 9th July 1824

We institute in perpetuity in the said church the Confraternity of the Holy Family, with all the indulgences that the Sovereign Pontiffs have attached to it.

Given at Lyon, 24th March 1834.

Cattet v.g.

L.S.  
Archbishop's House  
Lyon.

4

*Statistical data on the development of the Congregation*

a) MONISTROL

*Statistics of the community of Monistrol, 1824* — From the originals preserved in the departmental archives of Le Puy (Haute-Loire), V, 3.

As we have been unable to collect detailed information on the beginning and activity of the foundation of Monistrol which took place in 1822, we are presenting two sets of statistics which show the evolution of the work of the Servant of God until the end of 1824.

1) When the community was first established in Monistrol, the religious were only occupied with looking after the wardrobe and infirmary of the college of Missionaries (cf. *Prospectus* - Arch. Minor Seminary, Yssingeaux, Haute Loire, 1822); on the 10th January 1824, the date of these statistics, the community did not yet have a school.

2) According to the second statistics which were certainly compiled by the end of 1824, in the first scholastic term, a school was functioning with 30 free pupils and, between boarders and day-scholars, 100 fee-paying pupils, with an increase in the personnel of the community.<sup>1</sup>

1)

*List of religious communities of women who are dependent on a hem I house, and a Superioress General, presenting:*

1. Those who have asked for legal recognition.
2. Those who have not made any request.

Names of the Congregation	Place of its establishment	Name of the Community	Number of members who compose il		
			Professed	Novices	Postulants
Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary	Monistrol	Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary	8	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

<sup>1</sup> In the same archives there is another statistic without a date, probably going back to 1823. It is a little different from that above, in the way it is set out. but the dutll are Identical.

This house has just been established, it has not yet begun to receive pupils. It is supported by the Head house in Lyon.

Yssingaux, 10th January 1824.

2)

*Table of Religious Communities of women who are dependent on a head house and Superioress General presenting:*

1. Those who have asked for legal recognition.
2. Those who have made no request.

Names of the Congregation	Place of the establishment	Name of the Community	Number of members who live there				Number of Pupils	
			Prof.	Nov.	Post.	Lav Srs.	Paying Pupils	Free Pupils
Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary	Monistrol	Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary	9	3	6	2	100	30

Vice-Prefecture of Yssingaux

Yssingaux, 1824

*b) LYON AND BELLEVILLE*

a a)

*Statistics of the Houses of Lyon and Belleville, 1831. — From the original preserved in A. D. Lyon, V, 257.*

The statistics of the 14th January 1832 which are reproduced here refer to the situation on the 1st December 1831. In them may be noted how there was a diminution of novices and boarders after the revolution of November 1831 in Lyon, while the number of orphans was maintained almost at the maximum level.

Regarding the house of Belleville, the statistics confirm the closure of the boarding school and the uninterrupted functioning of the free day school (Doc. IX, 1, p. 217).

General state of communities of Religious women.

Situation on 1st December 1831

districts where the religious are established	• 5 2 5 £ 3 p 2 8 -	Name of the Institution	Occupation of the Religious			
			Nursing	Nursing and Teaching	Teaching	Contemplative
Lyon	1	Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary			Yes	
Belleville	1				Yes	

  

Names of the Congregation	Place of the establishment	Name of the Community	Communities dependent on a Superior General	Head house of the Congregation	Number of Religious				Number of pupils	
					P.	c.	P.	N.	Free	Paying
Lyon Belleville				Lyon	8 3	16 8	i	2	70 60	10 (a) (b)

(a) It is a Providence of orphan girls; all are domiciled at the place, where they are taught a trade such as the making of silk materials and winding.

(b) Sixty poor extern pupils, free tuition.

The present table certified by us is a true copy of the information given by the communities above named.

Lyon, 14th January 1832

The Mayor of the Town of Lyon member of the Chamber of deputies.

Signed Prunelle

bb)

*List of the community of the Mother House, written in the hand of the Servant of God, Lyon, 9th November, 1832. — From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.*

In the first cash book of the Congregation, begun, as said in the subtitle, on the 15th October 1819, and ended on the 2nd March 1831, the Servant of God, on the last page, on the 9th November 1832 gives the list of the members of the community of Lyon and of the personnel of the house: there were 126 persons there.



chapter meetings and to have active and passive voice in the elections, in witness whereof we have signed.

Lyon, 19th February 1836

M(ar)ie St. Andre

b)

In the year 1836 on the 2nd March, we the undersigned, assembled in chapter, after collecting the votes of Mother St. Ignatius, St. Andrew, St. Francis, St. Teresa, St. Bruno, St. Ambrose, and our Rev. Fr. Superior, M. Cattet, Vicar General, having counted the votes, declare that our dear Sister, Marie St. Regis, nee Viscomte, has been elected unanimously to the office of Assistant General, in witness whereof we have signed.

Cattet, Vicar General.

### 5

*Notes of accounts of M. St. Borgia, administered by the Servant of God, Lyon, 1830, 1831, 1832. — From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.*

In A. G. Roma the original of this memorandum, written almost entirely in the hand of the Servant of God in the years 1830, 1831, 1832, is preserved. Francoise Blanc nee Ferrand and her daughter Julie, named in the note, are respectively M. St. Borgia and M. St. Paul (Doc. XI, *intr.*, p. 251, and Doc XVI, A, 8, p. 288). During these years M. St. Borgia was in Le Puy as Superioress and the Servant of God undertook the responsibility of looking after her business affairs. In these notes is seen the precision with which M. St. Ignatius treated financial matters, noting the payments made and writing down those particulars which she judged useful for the exact fulfilment of her obligations. Her obedience is also evident, e.g. the charge which she gives to her heirs, whenever they might find it impossible to fulfil any of their obligations, to consult the Fr. Superior and abide by his decisions.

In A. G. Roma, in addition to these notes and other letters of Sr. Marie Josephine de la Rochette, some letters are preserved, as for instance that of the Rev. Fr. Bonnet, parish priest of Malavellette (Haute-Loire) regarding the inheritance of Sister St. Jerome (Henriette Claire Brouillat), and of Rev. F. J. Silvent, parish priest of Chatonnay (Isere), which treats of the inheritance of M. St. Maurice (Marie Pocatton), and all reflect these same qualities of the Servant of God.

Send to the Justice of the Peace of Vitri sur Marne, two thousand francs to be distributed among the heirs of the widow Benoit, nee Paquet, deceased on the 19th

- 2,000. September 1829 in the region of Vitri, the said two thousand francs to be distributed according to the share that the widow Paquet had given to her heirs in her will.
500. To Mme Pierrette Goselin nee Nete, five hundred francs, her husband is a watchmaker in Paris.
500. To Mme Lebon, nee Rose Nete, five hundred francs.
500. To the Nete children, whose father died in the district of Vitri, five hundred francs.
- 1,800. To the heirs of the late Benoit who lived in 1829 in Grande Cote, near rue Vieille Monaie, eighteen hundred francs.
370. To M. Berger, living in 1810 on Quai du Rhone, three hundred and seventy francs.
- 5,670. To M. Villard, living in 1810 in rue Merciere, forty francs.
40. To M. Petrequin, former farmer at the Tete d'Or, where he was living in 1810, forty-six francs.
46. 5,756.

I oblige my heirs in conscience, to pay the sum of five thousand seven hundred and fifty-six francs, in the year of my death; I declare that the said amount is not a debt that regards me personally. It is by Francoise Blanc, Madame Ferrand that I have been charged to pay it; it must be deducted from the sum of eighteen thousand two hundred that I have received from her for her dowry and that of Julie Ferrand, her daughter.

Fourviere, 21st October 1830.

Claudine Thevenet

In case it should be impossible for my heirs to reimburse the sum of 5,756 which has been mentioned above, the Father Superior of the house shall be consulted and his decision shall be accepted. Were it not for the unfortunate circumstances in which we find ourselves, my intention was to pay this sum this year, if I am able to effect this payment (*all or in part*) before my death. I shall have two copies which must remain in my papers, and I wish they should not be known except to my heirs alone.

Fourviere 21st October 1830.

Claudine Thevenet

I declare that I have paid the sum of eighteen hundred francs that I was obliged to pay to the heirs of the late Benoit, living in 1829 at Grande Cote des Capucins.

Fourviere, 30th October 1831.

Claudine Thevenet

I have handed over to M. Cotte, Notary, rue Neuve, the five thousand seven hundred and fifty-six francs indicated in the said note which he has undertaken to send to each of the heirs designated above by Françoise Blanc, Widow Ferrand, called Mother Borgia.

My heirs will be absolutely free of the said sum of five thousand seven hundred and fifty-six francs.

Fourviere. 14th October 1832.

Claudine Thevenet

6

*Unsuccessful attempts to unite the Congregation of Jesus and Mary with the Society of the Sacred Heart founded by Saint Madeleine Sophie Barat.*

When the disagreeable business of M. St. Peter and its repercussions, which must have caused much suffering to the Servant of God, seemed to have blown over, new preoccupations and sufferings came, just at the time when the dispute with the parish priest of Belleville was beginning (Doc. IX, 5, pp. 237-242).

M. St. Borgia discovered that an attempt was being made to unite our Congregation with that of the Sacred Heart, founded by Madeleine Sophie Barat, which pursued similar aims, and she communicated the danger to the Servant of God.

The *Histoire*, relating this fact, makes us realise the profound grief which this caused the Servant of God and all the community, and states that these attempts were repeated "several times" causing the Foundress continual suffering and requiring her to practise virtue (cf. Doc. XXVII, *Histoire*, pp. 615-616, 619).

The attacks against the Congregation did not end with the death of the Servant of God; there is evidence in a letter of Pauline Jaricot (cf. *infra*, b), which shows that they continued in 1841, and Mons. Borghi was sadly surprised when he had occasion to note this in 1844 (cf. *infra*, c).

Mother St. Ignatius struggled during her life (cf. *infra*, a), to defend the autonomy of her Congregation, with humility, prudence and firmness, and at the same time to provide for the good of the young silk-workers. "What suffering our Rev. Mother St. Ignatius had to bear!!! Her zeal had made her undertake this work for poor children and she was not at all discouraged, in

spite of difficulties. She placed her confidence in God. I le upheld hu and hi I great spirit did not weaken." Thus testified Mother St. Pothin (I)oc. XXVI, 3, a, p. 498).

We may believe without being rash, that her prayer on her death bed (Doc. XX, *intr.* 424) and her intercession in Heaven preserved the autonomy of the Congregation, all the more if we consider that the attacks in 1841 and 1844 were not known to the religious of that period, and so they were unable to defend the work from unknown dangers.

The "Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Ladies of the Sacred Heart — Rome), with which it was desired to fuse the newly-formed Congregation of the Servant of God, was founded in Amiens at the beginning of the XIX century, but the Generalate, which is now in Rome, was soon established in Paris. The foundress and first Superioress General was Saint Madeleine Sophie Barat. Approved by Leo XII on the 22nd December 1826 in the Bull *In supremo*, its Constitutions were a little modified on the 23rd May 1851. The aim of the institution is the education of young upper-class girls and the promotion of free elementary education for young working-class girls. The sisters also occupy themselves with the work of giving retreats to ladies of the world and with other works of charity both spiritual and material" (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, XI, p. 863).

The Society of the Sacred Heart had experienced splendid development, helped by the approbation and benevolence of the French Government and of the ecclesiastical authorities. When in 1818 the Servant of God began her work, in the humble house of Pierres Plantees, opening a *Providence* for poor silk weavers, the Congregation of the Sacred Heart was already solidly established in various cities of France, and it opened a boarding school not very far from Lyon, at Ferrandiere, in the diocese of Grenoble. Later on, in 1827, a second house was founded in Lyon at the foot of the hill of Fourviere. From its origin the Institute of the Sacred Heart dedicated itself especially to the education of upper class girls. The Servant of God on the other hand was filled with zeal to do good for souls of whatever social class, but she saw that in Lyon, in the years that followed the revolution, there was an urgent need to procure the good of the silk weavers, and she opened the *Providence* with the double aim of protecting them from the moral dangers of their domestic surroundings and of the factories, giving them a solid Christian formation, and at the same time, procuring for them material well-being from honest, lucrative and independent work. Therefore, while both Congregations were dedicated to the formation of the young, the foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart gave preference to the upper class, and the Servant of God to the poor workers, considering the boarding school as a means of helping the *Providence*. And so, when for want of space she had to sacrifice a part of her work at Fourviere, without hesitating for an instant she decided "Let us keep our poor" and she closed the boarding school (cf. Doc. XXVII, *Histoire*, p. 629).

Therefore the aims of the two Congregations were not the same. Somebody, animated with a good intention, but without understanding this essential difference in the aim of the respective congregations, believed it was a good thing to use all possible means to fuse the works. This fusion, pursued tenaciously by one person or another, provided continual suffering for the Servant of God in her life as foundress. Her conscience obliged her to defend the work which she saw to be the will of God, and by taking this position she had to oppose persons worthy of respect and esteem.

The *Histoire* says that this attempt to fuse the two congregations was repeated a number of times. We can determine that for the Servant of God, this painful situation began in the first place in Lyon with the intervention of the Vicar General Cattet, after the death of Fr. Coindre in 1826; and simultaneously at Le Puy, soon after its foundation in 1825, when Mons. de Bonald had the same idea, which took shape with the establishment of the Jesuits at Vals, only 2 km from Le Puy, on the 10th October 1828 (J. BURNICHON, *La Compagnie de Jesus en France. Histoire dun Siecle 1814-1914*, I Paris, 1914, pages 478-483). The *Histoire* refers to these when it says "How did it come about that some persons, with confidential missions in the house, conceived the idea of taking away our autonomy from us?" (Doc. XXVII, p. 615).

In Lyon the danger continued to be hidden and unknown to the Mothers; Pauline Jaricot speaks of it in 1841; Cardinal de Bonald abandoned the idea when he authorised the foundation in India in 1842. However, Mons. Borghi in 1844 reveals that some person was trying to bring about the fusion, which was prevented so many times. Finally these attempts ceased with the unexpected development of the Congregation and especially after the Pontifical approbation in 1847.

a)

*Extract from the "Deliberation of the Archiepiscopal Council of Lyon", 7th October 1835. — From the original preserved in A. A. Lyon.*

This short extract from the Register of Archbishop's House, Lyon proves that the Servant of God, in face of the danger that threatened the Congregation in Le Puy, seriously menaced with extinction, had recourse to the ecclesiastical authority of Lyon requesting advice.

The date of the document which we present shows that this last attack on the autonomy of the Congregation at LePuy, took place a few days before the death of M. St. Borgia, which occurred on the 21st September 1835 (Doc. XXVI, p. 613). The reply from Archbishop's House to the request presented by the Servant of God was received only at the meeting of the Council on the following 7th October.

The danger was averted even though it led to the loss of some vocations. Some years later Mons. de Bonald, as Archbishop of Lyon, confessed that he had supported the project of the fusion of the Congregation when he was at Le Puy.

7th October 1835

9. It was decided that the Superioress of the Sacred Heart in Fourviere is free to recall her Sisters from the house of Le Puy, since an attempt is being made to change the organisation there.

b)

*Extract from a letter of Pauline Jaricot to Mother Prevost, Lyon, 29th February 1841. — From the copy preserved in the archives of the S.C. of Rites. Writings of Pauline Jaricot, Vol. 26, p. 83.*

This letter of Pauline Jaricot to Mother Prevost, from which we present some paragraphs, although written in 1841, four years after the death of the Servant of God, is of direct concern to the Cause.

Mother Prevost, to whom the letter is directed, was the Superioress of the community of the Sacred Heart at La Ferrandiere, which she governed for more than twenty years, fulfilling at the same time, important duties in the General Council as principal collaborator of St. Madeleine Sophie Barat in the foundation or fusion of various communities in Annonay, Charleville, Tolosa, Algeri, Sarria (Barcelona), Montfleury (L. BAUNARD, *Histoire de la bienheureuse Mere Madeleine Sophie Barat*, II Paris 1910, p. 352). At La Ferrandiere, a place very near Lyon, but belonging to the diocese of Grenoble, the Congregation of the Sacred Heart had founded a boarding school in 1818, where later Pauline Perrin was a boarder. She was the niece and god-daughter of Pauline Jaricot. It was for this reason that Pauline was in contact with Mother Prevost and the Congregation of the Sacred Heart. This connection became even more close in the journeys of Pauline Jaricot to Rome, where she was accustomed to lodge at the house of the Sacred Heart at Trinita dei Monti.

This letter of Pauline has for its principal object to propose to Mother Prevost that a foundation should be made on the hill of Fourviere, with the principal aim of dedicating it to the work of retreats. From the text it may be deduced that this business had already been proposed earlier, but Mother Prevost had avoided it, giving as her reason that she lacked resources. In this letter Pauline insists on her intention and explains all the things she has initiated regarding it, on her own account: she went together with her sister, Mme Perrin, to pay a visit to Mons. de Bonald, who showed himself favourable to this work of retreats, as well as to the proposal that the religious of the Sacred Heart would take on the direction. Pauline Jaricot was also interested in the house and proposed to Mother Prevost diverse solutions in order to acquire or, better still, to lease, a property adjoining her own, offering her help to procure some easy terms. Among the advantages which

would result from this foundation in Fourvière, great prominence is given to the union or fusion of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart with that of the Servant of God, which would provide "this beautiful property of the Religious of Jesus and Mary", where the novitiate, *the Providence*, the work of retreats, etc. could be carried on, says the writer, thus achieving fusion without the drawback of exciting gossip, jealousy, and other distressing things which accompany brilliant undertakings ... Pauline then speaks about the vocation of her niece and of other details relating to her project, and ends by saying that she looks forward to a reply, "with a certain impatience".

Such a reply could never have arrived since no document is preserved that refers to it, and the occasion was not propitious. In fact Pauline Jaricot's letter reached Mother Prevost at the most critical moment for the Congregation of the Sacred Heart, when its unity and even its very existence in France were threatened (L. BAUNARD, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 175-225).

The document which is copied here puts four questions which concern the Cause: *a)* "The matter of the Ladies of the Hearts of Jesus and Mary who would like to unite with your Congregation;" *b)* "It would have been done if it were not for an important person . . . the changing of the important person in question;" *c)* The attitude of Pauline Jaricot, apparently unfavourable to the work of the Servant of God; *d)* The attitude of Mons. de Bonald, who was in favour of the fusion of the Congregation of the Servant of God.

*a)* Pauline Jaricot speaks in this letter of 1841 of some religious of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary who wanted to join the religious of the Sacred Heart. No evidence of this exists at that time, either in the archives of the two Congregations or in the archives of Archbishop's House in Lyon, or in any of the archives consulted. There is the fact, registered in Le Puy, of two religious who transferred to the community of the Sacred Heart in 1834 (Doc. XXVII, p. 616), when Mons. de Bonald himself was in favour of the fusion, as we read in this letter of Pauline, and there were other attempts at fusion on the part of persons outside the Congregation. It is probable that Pauline knew about this from the Servant of God herself, and had referred to it without mentioning the precise date, thinking that perhaps there were still some religious favouring the idea of fusion.

*b)* The letter says that the fusion would have taken place in 1834 if it had not been prevented by a *person* of note, and that now (1841) the same *person* continued to be an obstacle. An effort has been made to identify this influential person, taking into account that, because of the matter in question, it must have been an ecclesiastic who held a high position in the diocese of Lyon or of Le Puy. It does not seem to have been Le Puy, where Mons. de Bonald was Bishop, and as Fr. Coindre was already dead, it would have been difficult to find someone who would have opposed that Prelate. In 1834 the *person* in Lyon could have been identified with Mons. de Pins, who at that time had himself offered to receive the community of Le Puy, because: "they wanted to change the organisation" (cf. *supra*, 1), but it does seem impossible

that, in 1841, he could have opposed the wishes of Mons. de Bonald. In fact on leaving Lyon on the 6th May 1840, Mons. de Pins retired to the "Grande Chartreuse" of Grenoble, and at that time (1841) he had no influence whatever on the administration of the diocese of Lyon. If Mons. de Pins is excluded as *the person* in question, it must have been someone who possessed the above mentioned qualifications and who was favourable towards the Servant of God and her work. In all probability this was Mons. Mioland, whose interest in the Foundress is proved from some of his letters (Docs. IV, 2, note 34, p. 119 and XVI, c, 2, p. 304). Superior of the "Carthusian" Missionaries and an honorary canon, he was a member of the Archbishop's council in Lyon, from 1824 to 1838; he was appointed Bishop of Amiens, but often came to Lyon, where he stayed with the Missionaries or with the Perroud family, niece and nephew of the Servant of God. Mons. Mioland was the Superior, friend and admirer of Fr. Coindre, and of his works, and friend and spiritual director of the family of M. St. Ignatius, as is proved by many letters that still exist, both of this prelate and of the Mayet family.

*c)* Attitude of Pauline Jaricot regarding the Servant of God. — Pauline Jaricot had maintained an intimate relationship with Mother St. Ignatius, as can be seen from the register of the Association (Doc. IV, 2, pp. 107, 146), and this is confirmed by *the Histoire* (Doc. XXVII, p. 544), and by Fr. Mayet in his letter of the year 1878 (Doc. XXV, 2 and 3, pp. 486, 492), but without any details. The attitude which can be inferred from this letter, united with the absence of particular information, could make one think that at a certain moment a break in friendly relations between Pauline and the Servant of God had taken place. The documents preserved in *A. G. Roma*, although scanty in information give sufficient to prove the contrary. In the account books of the Congregation we find that Pauline Jaricot sent the Servant of God a sum of money from time to time, for the upkeep of some orphans. The Servant of God and the Superioresses who came after her were interested in the work of the Propagation of the Faith, and the Living Rosary, to which they sent their offerings. In some letters coming from India dated after 1841, news is given which proves the uninterrupted friendship of Pauline with the Congregation of the Servant of God (cf. *A. G. Roma*, letter of M. St. Teresa to M. St. Andrew, Agra, 17th April 1844).

*d)* The attitude of Mons. de Bonald — The idea of fusion of the two congregations in the mind of Mons. de Bonald, Bishop of Le Puy, does not suppose lack of friendship towards the Servant of God, nor towards her Congregation. The new Bishop of Le Puy had known the Congregation of the Sacred Heart in Paris, its rapid development and the favour it had enjoyed from the Government. On his arrival in Le Puy, he had found in the diocese, another Congregation with similar aims, but which, in its early stages, had not obtained authorisation from the State, and probably this was the reason that moved him to promote fusion, judging it to be for the benefit of all. When Mons. de Bonald arrived in Lyon he had not changed his opinion; but the

designs of God were different, and Cardinal de Bonald saw the new turn of events with satisfaction and ceased to think about fusion.

Considering the circumstances we have dealt with here, it is not possible to exclude the possibility that Pauline Jaricot herself was preoccupied with something that was not her business. However, we must be grateful to her for the information provided by the letter.

But another matter which could well come up again later if you come to live near us and if you place your first efforts of retreat under the auspices of Our Lady of Fourviere and St. Philomena, is that of the Ladies of the Heart of Jesus and Mary who wished to unite themselves with your Congregation and who would have done so except for the influential person you have made known to me formerly. Regarding the business of fusion, Mgr de Bonald told me that it was he who had had that idea whilst he was Bishop of Le Puy; and he is now Archbishop of Lyon: this idea is *still in his mind*. What would be needed to put it into action? . . . Let the person in question be changed, and then, little by little under different pretexts that the Providence will provide, get to know one another well. Thus the fusion could be brought about in the space of a few years, without the public even suspecting it. Once you come into this beautiful property of the Religious of Jesus and Mary, you will find all you need for the novitiate, *Providence* and retreats for ladies of independent means. We shall provide then, with the help of God, what is needed to continue to carry on in some way the work that you will have begun near us, if you do not wish to continue both at the same time — one for high class girls, and the other for the lower class; in any case these would always be two solid good works with which you would please the Lord.

In placing yourself beside us in the first place, you are preparing much good for later on and beginning to do a certain amount even now, without having the drawback of stirring up gossip, jealousy, and other distressing things which accompany brilliant undertakings.

c)

*Extract from a letter of Mons. J. A. Borghi, Bishop of Agra (India) to Mons. G. Brunelli, Secretary of Propaganda Fide, Lyon, 12th July 1844. — From the original preserved in the archives of the S.C. for the Propagation of the Faith. Indie Orientali. Vol. 9, f. 935.*

Mons. J. A. Borghi, Bishop of Agra (India), had in 1841 requested and obtained from M. St. Andrew a group of religious for his mission (Doc. XXVII, p. 648 and notes 1 and 2). In 1844 he had gone to France to obtain further help. He returned to Agra with some missionary priests and sixteen religious of Jesus and Mary, who embarked from Marseille on the 4th October of the same year. On January 27th 1845 they arrived safely at Agra.

During the days that Mgr Borghi spent in Lyon he learnt with great sadness that there was an attempt being made against the existence of the Congregation whose religious displayed such zeal and abnegation in the missions. Alarmed, he wrote this letter to the S.C. for the Propagation of the Faith, so that they might avert the danger. In the archives of the Sacred Congregation many letters of Mgr. Borghi are preserved which testify to the apostolic work of the Religious of Jesus and Mary and the interest and gratitude of the zealous Bishop for his collaborators.

From the letter which I have written this very day to His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect, he will know what, until now, have been the results of my tour in Europe.

You will observe that I am in a hurry to get a house in Lyon for the French priests, who wish to dedicate themselves to serve in my mission. I would like these priests to serve as a support to the Congregation of the Religious of Jesus and Mary of Fourviere, since I know for certain, that a body of Religious is trying in every way to induce these to unite themselves to certain other nuns directed by them, and in this way, to come into possession of the establishments the Congregation of Jesus and Mary possesses in France. His Eminence Cardinal de Bonald, together with me, has asked that their Constitutions be approved by the Holy See, but until now we have not had any favourable result. I am telling you in secret and confidentially that there is some intrigue involved in this affair, and I therefore warmly recommend you to make haste that the aforesaid Constitutions of the Religious of Jesus and Mary be approved as soon as possible, so that some inconveniences which otherwise would occur regarding the nuns of Agra may be prevented and also to preserve the

establishments which I have erected lately over there from foreign influence.

## 7

*The Servant of God asks for civil authorisation for her Congregation, 1836. — From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.*

We bring together in this document the testimony of the last acts of the government of the Servant of God. In 1834 she saw the year ending under the threat of expropriation of her house in Fourviere. On the 12th November, the Archbishop's Council had decided that if the Government insisted upon expropriation, the religious should accept it, if the conditions were advantageous, otherwise they should wait for the valuation of the courts {A. Lyon, Register "Deliberations of the Council: 2nd June 1830. - 28th December 1837"}.

The year 1835 began in an atmosphere of optimism. On the 29th January Elisabeth wrote that her sister, Mother St. Ignatius, was well and that there was no more talk about expropriation, from which all hoped that she could keep the house. Then on the 8th February M. St. Hilaire, a young religious, the sister of M. St. Pothin, died in Le Puy. She had recently been appointed to form part of the Chapter. This death seemed to mark the beginning of a series of anxieties coming from that house, where at the same period, one of the most dangerous attacks on the Congregation of the Servant of God was taking place (*supra*, 6, a). Between the 5th and 20th May the Assistant General, M. St. Andrew, on behalf of the Servant of God, went to make a visitation in Le Puy and on the 7th October the latter was authorised by the Archbishop's Council in Lyon to transfer the community of Le Puy to this diocese, "because an attempt was being made to change the organisation". The miraculous cure of Jeanne Portier in Lyon (Doc. XVII, 5, *intr.*, p. 357) brought a moment of relief to the Servant of God, but very soon came terrible news, again from Le Puy: the Superioress, M. St. Borgia, was dead — crushed under masonry by the collapse of a wall (Doc. XXVII, p. 613).

At about the same time, Mother St. Ignatius lost the moral support of Fr. Rey (Doc. XXVII, p. 601) and for her the year ended darkened by worry and uncertainty, not to mention the death of the 29 year old Sister St. Clement that took place in Lyon on the 20th December.

The beginning of 1836 was no less overshadowed. The health of Mother St. Ignatius could not help being affected by all this. The letters of that time speak of a weakening of her health. "She is better but not really well." On the 30th January Mother St. Gonzaga died (Doc. XI, *intr.*, p. 251). On the 13th February Fr. Pousset was appointed, as chaplain of the Mother House, to assist the Servant of God in putting the final touches to the Rules (Doc. XVII, p. 363).

Notwithstanding everything the Servant of God continued to direct her Congregation and the documents which we transcribe here, corresponding to this last period of her life, are a proof of this.

## a)

*Deed of the constitution of the Congregation of the Servant of God as a Civil Society, Lyon, 30th June 1836. — From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.*

The French Revolution, by the Law of the 18th August 1792, had suppressed all the religious congregations and associations, no matter what their denomination. On the 18th February 1809 a Decree of Napoleon I authorised the restoration of congregations of religious women, but, it followed from Article 1 that there was question only of the re-establishment of nursing congregations, and there was no question of creating new ones whose purpose was teaching, and still less contemplative life. On the 24th May 1825, Charles X subjected the institution of congregations of religious women to legal authorisation beforehand (Paris, Arch. National, F<sup>19</sup> 6247). These congregations had to submit their request together with a favourable recommendation from the Bishop and a copy of their statutes, which must show especially:

1. the nature and end of the institute,
2. submission to the Bishop and the civil authorities,
3. the disposition of goods,
4. the duration of vows.

The Servant of God, adhering to these stipulations, asked for authorisation, but like other congregations, which were becoming increasingly numerous in France at that time, she did not obtain it. The religious congregations that were not authorised by the law were tolerated, but not being juridical persons they could not receive legacies or enjoy other material benefits, as is seen in a letter of November 6th, 1833 from Mons. de Pins, Titular Bishop of Amasie, to the Prefect of the Rhone, M. de Gasparin. "As the Providence established in Fourviere is not authorised and belongs in no way to the House of the Providence of St. Michel, according to the dispositions of the Royal Ordinance of 14th January 1831, and the Ministerial Instruction of 29th of the same month, I did not think I ought to institute proceedings in the matter of the legacy to this establishment from M. Nicolas, which you mentioned in your letter of 14th October last" {A. A. Lyon, "Copie de Lettres" 1833}.

In the margin of an undated consultation on this subject is written: "Religious Associations that are unrecognised may form a civil association which our laws do not forbid" (cf. Paris, Arch. Nationale, F<sup>19</sup> 6246, *Documents divers*). We do not know if the Servant of God had asked for advice and received the above reply, but it is certain that she followed this

course of action, and desiring to give her Congregation the greatest stability possible, she signed the deed of constitution of a civil Society on the 30th June, 1836. We reproduce an extract from the deed in this document.

The deed consists of 18 articles preceded by an introduction in which there are the names of the 10 associates of Lyon, followed by signatures and by the final formulae.

The deed states that the associates, having already had the experience of finding in the spirit of peace and charity which animates them one towards another the help and consolations that the needs and infirmities of life render necessary, and wishing to regularise an association that is already in existence in fact, establish the following 18 articles:

The 1st and 2nd refer to the Society in itself, which is individual in what is contributed to it and universal in the benefits it bestows, and is for life for each member.

The 3 articles which follow concern the duties of the administrators who are two from among the associates, with full powers (Art. 3). They may dispose of the surplus profits of the Society, in favour of the orphans to whom the associates dedicate themselves. The 4th, regulates the meetings, the first of which will be held on the 25th September 1839 and the others every three years, in the house of Lyon; they will deal with administration and they will make decisions according to the majority of votes of the associates present. In case of the death or retirement of one or two administrators, their replacements will be elected by the majority of the votes of those present. The administrators must reside in Lyon and may delegate to another associate the administration of property in another Department (Art. 5).

Articles 6 and 7 refer to the quota of contributions which will constitute the society's fund. The particular goods of the associates, independent of their contribution, do not belong to the Society, but the Society will enjoy the usufruct of what the associates may come to possess through inheritance, donations, etc. (Art. 6); the 7th explains the conditions relative to the contributing associates, namely to be lodged, fed, etc., without the right of participation for their heirs, in the case of death.

There follow 3 articles which establish the cases of non dissolution of the Society, such as death (Art. 8) and resignation of one or more members (Art. 9). The associate who withdraws has the right only to an income representative of her contribution, and which shall not exceed 600 frs., and someone who has remained in the Society for less than three years, may be given the amount of her contribution instead of the revenue (Art. 10).

There follow the conditions for the admission of new associates (Art. 11); the steps to be taken in the case of the dissolution of the association through circumstances outside their control or through the unanimous vote of its members (Art. 12); and the rights of the associates who belong to the Society at the time of its dissolution (Art. 13).

Article 14 regards the designation and determination of individual contributions to the Society, and it shows that the Servant of God gave the

Society the greatest share; Article 15 describes the actual state of the Society's capital, both active and passive; Article 16 establishes that difference of contribution does not constitute a difference in the rights of individual associates. Article 17 prohibits the associates from carrying on activities that do not benefit the common good. Article 18 fixes the norms for resolving difficulties which could arise in carrying out what is foreseen in the articles above.

The deed was signed in LePuy on the 2nd July 1836, and duplicate copies were registered in Lyon on the 16th of the same month and year.

After the signatures follows the text of the power of attorney given by the associates of Le Puy to A. F. Matagrin, notary of Lyon, responsible for looking after the business affairs of the associates in that city.

The undersigned Miles Claudine Thevenet, Louise Claudine Victoire Ramie, Therese Besson de la Rochette, Marguerite Augustine Viscomte, Jeanne Planu, Agathe Daval, Julie Ferrand, Alexandrine Delion, Josephine Limousin and Elisabeth Levret, all ten being spinsters of mature age and independent means, living in Lyon in the district of Fourviere,

and Miles Marie Motte, Catherine Jubos, Clementine Levrat, Marguerite Clotilde Revel, Jeanne Marie Greppo, Agarithe Thomas, and Antoinette Cholle, all spinsters of mature age and independent means living in the town of Le Puy, department of Haute-Loire,

having already had the experience of finding in the spirit of peace and charity which animates them towards one another the help and consolation that the needs and infirmities of life render so necessary,

wishing on the other hand to increase their means by putting together their personal goods, in order to be able to profit from the advantages and economy which obviously result from a community which shares profits and expenditure,

and with the purpose of regularising an already existing association of the undersigned, which may come to receive at a later date other persons who are penetrated with the same sentiments, have made the following agreement between themselves:

Article 1. The undersigned propose to have everything in common. They bring individual contributions and all share the profits.

Article 2. The Society is for life, in the case of each associate.

Article 3. The administration of the business of the Society will be confided to two ladies from among the associates; the powers which are conferred on them include the faculty to acquire on behalf of the

Society, to alienate, to contract an obligation in its name, to mortgage its goods, to take a case to court, to discharge all assets, to free from all mortgages; nevertheless, all acts relative to these powers must be carried out in the name and with the simultaneous agreement of both administrators. Thus carried out these deeds will become binding on all the associates. Regarding business that concerns ordinary administration, these two ladies may deal with it individually. They may also use the surplus profits belonging to the Society for the education of the young orphans of whom they have promised to take care.

Miles Claudine Thevenet and Louise Claudine Victoire Ramie, two of the ladies undersigned, are from this moment named administrators of the business affairs of the Society, and they will exercise this office until the time of its renewal foreseen in the following article.

Article 4. On the twenty-fifth of September eighteen hundred and thirty-nine, all the associates will be invited to meet for the purpose of providing anew for the administration of the goods of the Society, and as long as it continues to exist this general meeting will take place for this same purpose every three years at the same time in the house of the Society situated in Lyon. The decisions will be taken by a majority of votes of the associates present at the meeting.

Article 5. On the death of the two administrators, or of one of them, or in the case of resignation, their replacements will be elected by the lady associates who will have met for that purpose, according to the majority of votes of those present at the meeting. The two lady administrators must of necessity live in the principal house situated in Lyon. They may delegate one of their co-associates for the administration of property that the associates possess in another Department, with the obligation to submit all acts other than those of internal administration, to the lady administrators.

*(There follow another 13 articles and the deed ends with the following formula:)*

Agreed and accepted reciprocally.

Drawn up and signed in as many copies as there are parties, in Lyon, on the thirtieth day of June, eighteen hundred and thirty-six, and on the 2nd July of the same year in Le Puy.

The signatures follow.

Certified genuine and true, signed and initialled in conformity with the act of deposit today. Lyon, the twenty-fifth of July eighteen hundred and thirty-six.

The signatures follow.

Registered in Lyon, on the sixteenth July eighteen hundred and thirty-six.

F<sup>o</sup> 17 r<sup>o</sup> and v<sup>o</sup>. Received five francs and fifty centimes tax.

Signed Meschini

b)

*Deed of Negation of inheritance of Claudine Thevenet, 5th November 1837.* — From the original preserved in *A. D. Lyon*, 45, Q, 13.

On the death of the Servant of God, the clauses in articles 7 and 13 of the contract of the Civil Society regarding the case of death or resignation from the Society of an associate were applied for the first time. It was established there that the heirs of an associate had no right to claim her inheritance.

Anticipating events we are giving here, as complementing the contract of the Society, summed up in a), the document corresponding to the negative inheritance of Claudine Thevenet, as it is preserved in the departmental archives in Lyon.

No. 594. — Negative inheritance of Claudine Thevenet, deceased on 3rd February 1837. Tf 181 See the deed of the Society.

On the 4th November 1837, Francois Matagrin, lawyer, rue du Boeuf No 36, appeared as authorised agent according to the privately contracted deed of Louise-Claudine-Victoire Ramie, Superioress of the Sacred Heart Community established in No. 1, Place Fourviere. He declared to us that Claudine Thevenet, former Superioress, died at the said place on the 3rd February 1837, and that there was neither fixed nor movable property to be claimed as inheritance, considering that by a Society established on the 2nd July 1836 and deposited at the office of Mr. Coste, Notary, according to a deed of 25th July of the same year, the deceased, the party here present, and the ladies Besson, Viscomte, Planu, Daval, Ferrand, Delyon, Limosin and Levrat, Motte, Jubeau, another Levrat, Revel, Greppo, Thomas and Cholle, placed everything in common (Article 7) on condition that they would be lodged, fed, and provided with what they needed from the common fund; that according to the same article the heirs would have no right to claim inheritance, and finally that by article 13 all the assets of the society would accrue to the survivors, etc., etc.

In case of a false declaration, the parties submit themselves to the penalties laid down by law, while observing that each associate brought a trousseau valued at 300 fr. per person, and that the real estate consisting of the property of Fourviere which is used as the dwelling house of the community, was provided by Miles Thevenet, Ramie, and Besson de la Rochette.

Matagrin

Decreed on the 4th November 1837, Guillot.

Decreed on the 5th November 1837 (Sunday) Guillot.

8

*Minutes of Register IV, 12th September, 1836.* — From the original preserved in A. G. Roma.

The infirmity and preoccupations that afflicted the Servant of God at that time did not prevent her from busying herself, as we have seen, not only with the duties of her office, but with everything which could contribute to the good of others.

On April 3rd Elisabeth wrote again to her daughter giving good news of her sister, Mother St. Ignatius, and she referred to some flowering plants that filled her house with perfume: "It is my sister who sent me these flowers from her garden." In family letters there are many references to the liking for flowers of the Servant of God.

Register IV gives us some information about the activity of the Servant of God, as Superioress General, in presiding at the meetings of the General Council for the admission of postulants and novices, to clothing and profession. From August 12th 1834 until the death of the Servant of God eight reports are found corresponding to five meetings of the General Council, on the following dates: 12th August 1834, 9th June and 11th September 1835, 15th March and 12th September 1836. We reproduce the report relative to this last date, which treats of admission to clothing of the novice Clarisse Bergonhoux. The ceremony of profession took place on the 6th October and one of the three minutes corresponding to this, in Register VI of the professions, is that reproduced in Doc. XVIII, 2, b, p. 369, and it reveals the anomalies which will be spoken of later.

Register IV mentioned above, written after the death of the Servant of God, includes the period from the 2nd August 1834 to the 10th January 1901. Until the 28th May 1841 it was written by M. St. Teresa and signed by the General Councillors (cf. Doc. XVI, *intr.*, p. 273).

In the year eighteen hundred and thirty-six, on the twelfth day of the month of September, our Reverend Mother Superioress General

proposed to the members of the General Chapter assembled according to Rule to admit to clothing Clarisse Bergonhoux whose time of postulancy had expired.

The subject was admitted, having obtained the number of votes required by the Constitutions.

M(ar)ie St. Andree Ass. Gen. M(ar)ie St. Paul  
Marie Ste Therese M(ar)ie St. Francois

**DOC. XVII**

THE LETTERS OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, 1828-1836. From the originals preserved in A. G. Roma.

The writings of the Servant of God which have come down to us are: *a*) 16 letters sent to her family; *b*) pp. 43-46 of the Register of the Association; *c*) the account books I and II for the greater part; *d*) various scattered notes or additions to bills; *e*) the Rules approved in 1838 (copy).

Various causes contributed to the disappearance of some of the documents which we know existed, and undoubtedly there are others of which we are unaware. We know for example, that the Servant of God wrote frequently to Fr. Coindre (cf. Doc. XVI, C, 1, b); (a) we do not know whether the priest kept or destroyed these letters; (b) however, the sad circumstances of his death at Blois caused the loss of part of his correspondence; (c) at the request of the Servant of God, Mons. Mioland wrote a biography of Fr. Coindre, the manuscript of which was preserved in Fourviere (cf. Letter of Fr. Ballet to Fr. F. V. Coindre, 2nd February, 1856, in the archives of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart in Rome), but after the revolution of 1848 it disappeared; (d) because of the expulsion of the religious orders from France in 1902, many other documents were lost. The letters of the Servant of God to the religious of the communities of Belleville, Monistrol and Le Puy are not preserved, nor those from M. St. Andrew nor of other religious of the first generation.

We have put together in this document the 16 letters which the relatives of the Servant of God kept as relics and which their descendants gave to the Congregation for the Diocesan Process. We have divided them into five groups according to the principal subject matter; each group and each letter is preceded by an introductory note.

1

*Letter to her niece Elisabeth Mayet on the death of two religious, 11th September 1828.*

Among the letters of the Servant of God that have been preserved, the one which we are publishing here is among the most interesting because it