

## **The Latin Question: A Conflict in Catholic Higher Education Between Jesuits and Christian Brothers in Late Nineteenth-Century America\***

Ronald Eugene Isetti, FSC, Ph.D.\*\*

At least since the Middle Ages, friendly rivalries and, occasionally, even bitter conflicts between religious orders of the Catholic Church have been fairly common. Often they have arisen from disputes over theology; for example, during the Molinist controversy of the sixteenth century, Jesuits and Dominicans clashed over divergent doctrines of grace and predestination. Arguments over territorial rights and evangelistic strategies in mission lands have also led to much ill-feeling between religious congregations. Perhaps the most interesting instances of such conflicts are the disputes between the Jesuits and the Franciscans and Dominicans in Japan and China during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, respectively.

In this essay, we will examine a controversy-commonly called the Latin Question<sup>1</sup>-which erupted in late nineteenth-century America between the Jesuits and the Christian Brothers, the two largest teaching congregations of the Catholic Church. In this case, neither fine points of doctrine nor different ideas of missiology were at issue. Rather these two orders tangled over the respective roles which each should play in the vast Catholic educational system that the bishops were erecting in the United States after the Civil War. Challenging the Jesuits at their strong point, the Christian Brothers attempted to broaden their educational apostolate by entering the field of classical education on the secondary and collegiate levels; the Jesuits, for their part, attempted to block this expansion and to confine the Christian Brothers to their traditional work in elementary, commercial, and technical schools.

The Christian Brothers began teaching Latin in 1854 at their academy in St. Louis, later known as Christian Brothers College.<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick asked Brother Patrick Murphy, the principal, to prepare some parochial school graduates for admission to the major seminary. The archbishop had been sending his candidates to the local Jesuit college for their secondary studies, but he was disappointed with the results. He reportedly said that many of these young men had either entered the Society's novitiate rather than the archdiocesan seminary or else had given up their vocations altogether.<sup>3</sup> Evidently, Kenrick had no fear that the Christian Brothers, who had forsworn the priesthood, would waylay the minor seminarians confided to their care.

**\*This article was originally published *The Catholic Historical Review*, Jul., 1990, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Jul., 1990), pp. 526-548, reprinted with permission.**

When asked by Archbishop Kenrick to teach the classics, Brother Patrick explained that it would be necessary to obtain the permission of the superior general of the Institute.<sup>5</sup> Saint John Baptist de La Salle, the founder of the Christian Brothers, had banned all classical studies in order to close off to his followers any path to the priesthood and to make certain that they remained faithful to their special mission in the Church of teaching basic subjects and religion to poor boys in their native tongue.<sup>6</sup> Despite the strict prescriptions of the Rule, the general chapter of 1854 granted permission to the American Brothers to teach Latin because of the pressing need of local bishops to prepare young men for the priesthood in a country still classified as mission territory.<sup>7</sup>

In 1858, the Society of Jesus complained to the Holy See that the Christian Brothers in the United States were violating their charter within the Church and moving into an educational field in which they did not properly belong. The *Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide*, which exercised jurisdiction over the Catholic Church in the United States until 1908, sent the titular leader of the American hierarchy, Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick of Baltimore (brother of Peter Richard), to St. Louis to investigate the charges brought by the Jesuits. Brushing aside the Jesuit protest, he reportedly told Rome: "Let the Brothers alone; they are doing a good work."<sup>8</sup>

The action taken by the Jesuits alarmed leading American Brothers, who decided subsequently to ask the archbishops of St. Louis, New York, and Baltimore to write on their behalf to Rome.<sup>9</sup> However, Brother Facile Rabut, the assistant superior general for the United States, harbored serious reservations about expanding the educational work of the Institute into classical academies and colleges. In October of 1859, he wrote to Brother Patrick: "I would not be sorry if the Jesuits carried the day; it would be a means of delivering us."<sup>10</sup> Brother Facile feared that if the teaching of Latin and Greek continued to spread in the United States the Brothers would begin to stray from the path marked out for them by their founder.

In Europe, classical studies had been long identified by the Christian Brothers with the upper classes. The situation in the United States, however, was quite different. Here young men from immigrant families could climb up the social ladder on the rungs of a higher education. And in the nineteenth century, a higher education normally entailed the study of Latin and Greek for those pursuing a bachelor of arts degree. Initially, the American Brothers began teaching Latin to prepare young men for the priesthood; however, as the years passed, offering classical courses to help poor immigrant boys rise in society became an even more compelling reason. In 1897, a Brother from the New York district (province) defended the teaching of the classics in the name of equal educational opportunity, writing to the superior general:

Our boys are chiefly the sons of poor immigrants whom cruel and oppressive laws have kept in subjection and in many cases in ignorance. The bishops and priests of this country

are laboring devotedly and zealously to educate and uplift the Catholic masses in order that they may reflect honor and glory on the Church and be a leaven of influence and convert those outside the Church. Shall we be rendered powerless [he asked to do our share in this great work?<sup>11</sup>

Within thirteen years of the introduction of Latin at Christian Brothers College in St. Louis, the American Brothers had added classical studies to several of their educational establishments in different parts of the country. The Jesuits watched this development with growing concern. In 1866, they complained to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore that the Christian Brothers were being "irregular" in teaching the classics and should be stopped.<sup>12</sup>

The Archbishop of Baltimore, Martin John Spalding, the papal delegate and president of the council, sent for Brother Justin McMahon, president of nearby Calvert Hall College in Baltimore, and asked him to explain why the Brothers were departing from their Rule. Brother Justin recounted the history of the question and told Spalding that he would summon Brother Patrick, by now installed as the visitor (provincial) of the New York district, to give him a more detailed account. On the fourth day of the council, the Reverend Doctor Henry B. Coskery, the vicar general of the Archdiocese of Baltimore and also the priest who had first brought the Christian Brothers to the United States in 1845, informed Brother Justin, on behalf of Archbishop Spalding, that the bishops had talked over the Latin Question informally and that the only "fault" they could find was the lack of more Brothers competent to teach the classics. "The Jesuits have counted noses," Coskery confided to Brother Justin, "and they find the bishops opposed to them-they therefore have withdrawn their complaint, and it will not come formally before the Council."<sup>13</sup>

Although relieved by the action taken by the bishops, Brother Patrick was shaken by the whole experience. "You have done perfectly well in going to Baltimore to inform the archbishops," Brother Facile reassured him in October of 1866; "however, I must confess that I am not at all frightened by the threat of the Council nor of the Jesuits."<sup>14</sup> Increasingly opposed to the teaching of the classics, Brother Facile thought that it was swelling the heads of some of the Brothers and even undermining their vocations. In April of 1868, he instructed Brother Patrick to leave the Jesuits "in peace" and "never make any commitment to teach Latin."<sup>15</sup>

Although the general chapter of 1873 approved the continued teaching of the classics, albeit with new conditions and limitations,<sup>16</sup> high officials of the Institute in Europe remained uneasy about what seemed to be happening to the congregation in the United States as the Brothers in this country moved more and more into the field of liberal arts education. In 1876, Brother Armin Victor Vigneulles, the visitor general to the United States, sent a report to Paris in which he said that opening more classical academies and colleges was putting the Christian Brothers on a collision course with the "illustrious Company of Jesus," which, unlike the Institute, was "admirably fitted for higher education." "Occasionally they suffer from and complain of our

prosperity," he said of the Jesuits. "It is not good to have them against us. At times they wait patiently, but their day will come. "<sup>17</sup>

With the convocation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884, leading American Christian Brothers feared that the Society of Jesus would lodge another complaint against their teaching of Latin and Greek. As a consequence, they apparently visited or wrote to several prelates to enlist their support. Brother Patrick even devised a plan to block any possible Jesuit moves he would ask the bishops to appoint an episcopal protector for the Christian Brothers in the United States or else name a brother as one of the "fathers" of the council. This second scheme did not prove feasible because the Holy See had already drawn up the official membership list of the council. However, the Most Reverend Michael Corrigan, the coadjutor to the archbishop of New York, agreed to look after the interests of the American Brothers in their controversy with the Jesuits.<sup>18</sup>

During the late nineteenth century, as the Christian Brothers were opening more classical schools, the American Jesuits were also drifting from their own educational moorings. Instead of adhering tightly to the famous *Ratio Studiorum*, which stressed classical studies, they were enlarging the commercial departments of their institutions and also loosening Latin and Greek requirements, especially for those students pursuing degrees in science.<sup>19</sup> The emerging situation seemed ripe for some kind of trade-off between the two teaching orders. In 1885, Brother Aurelian Sheel, president of Christian Brothers' College in Memphis, told Brother Patrick that an official of the Institute from France had informed him during a visit to this country that "the Jesuits had assured him of their determination to exclude their commercial course of studies from their colleges, as soon as the Brothers would decide upon ceasing to teach Latin and Greek classics in their schools."<sup>20</sup> Such a deal was never struck, and the two orders continued to poach, as it were, on the preserves of each other.

In 1894, another general chapter of the Institute convened in France to elect a new superior general of the Christian Brothers. The Latin Question was also on the agenda, in large measure because opposition to teaching the classics was beginning to mount among the Brothers in the Old World who, not fully appreciative of conditions in the United States, feared that their American confreres were subverting the fundamental meaning and mission of the Institute. After decades of accommodations and compromises, the general chapter of 1894 voted to maintain the articles of the Rule banning the study and teaching of Latin "in their full force and vigor in all our establishments."<sup>21</sup>

This decision sent shock waves throughout the hierarchy in the United States. Fearful that the extensive school system operated by the Christian Brothers might be seriously damaged or even destroyed, four American metropolitan archbishops sent an appeal to *Propaganda Fide* in 1894, pleading that the Christian Brothers in this country be permitted to continue teaching Latin and Greek.<sup>22</sup>

At this moment, Brother Joseph Josserand was the superior general of the Institute. When *Propaganda Fide* asked him for his views on the Latin Question, he sent it a memorandum in 1895 imploring that the decree of the recent chapter banning the classics be upheld. An article in the *Chicago Sunday Times Herald* claimed four years later that the Jesuits had exerted strong pressure on Brother Joseph to revoke the earlier permission given to the American Brothers to teach Latin and Greek.<sup>23</sup>

In the memorandum which Brother Joseph sent to *Propaganda Fide* in May, 1895, he did argue that "our Brothers, in limiting themselves to technical teaching, will avoid arousing on the part of congregations whose end is the teaching of the classics rivalries which are always regrettable and which can only be prejudicial to the charity and union so necessary between religious institutes."<sup>24</sup> This passage clearly shows that the superior general feared incurring the ire of the Jesuits, but it does not prove that the latter were using their influence in Europe to shut down the classical departments of the Institute's American schools. Brother Joseph, moreover, was not the kind of man who easily caved in to pressure from outside forces, and all along he had granted permissions for Brothers to study Latin with "much reserve and reluctance."<sup>25</sup>

Nonetheless, after *Propaganda Fide* upheld the ban on the classics in 1895, it proved nearly impossible to convince American Christian Brothers that the Jesuits were not directly involved, especially since an influential member of the special congregation which heard the case was the famous Jesuit cardinal, Camillo Mazzella. Actually, Mazzella was the *ponente* or presiding officer; as such, it was his special task to summarize and present the arguments of each side and to propose a final disposition of the case.<sup>26</sup> One of the founders of Woodstock College, Mazzella had spent some years teaching in the United States and had become an inveterate foe in Rome of the liberal wing of the American hierarchy,<sup>27</sup> many of whom were strongly supporting the Christian Brothers in this country in their efforts to continue teaching the classics.

The 1895 ruling of *Propaganda Fide*, mandating the eventual suppression of the classics in the Institute's American schools, upset many American bishops, especially John J. Keane, the founding rector of the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. Established in 1889, this pontifical institution had not been able to attract a large number of students in its early years, much less achieve a distinguished academic reputation in Catholic circles. Of those students who did enroll in the school in the 1890's, a significant number were graduates of the academies and colleges conducted by the Christian Brothers. A ban on the classics in the Institute's schools would almost certainly dry up a major pool of students for the university in Washington, an institution which Keane and other liberal American bishops had hoped to make the crowning jewel of the Catholic educational system in this country.

Late in 1896, Pope Leo XIII removed Keane from the rectorship after conservative bishops complained that he had been infected by those liberal ideas that would be condemned a few years later as the so-called heresy of Americanism. Although deeply hurt, Keane was

determined to do all in his power to protect the institution he had headed from further harm. After being called to Rome to accept a position in the Curia, he took it upon himself to visit the Institute's procurator general, who was stationed at St. Joseph's College in Rome, to plead early in 1897 that the Brothers in the United States be permitted to continue teaching Latin and Greek in their schools and colleges. According to the procurator general's secretary, who received Keane in his superior's absence, the bishop stated that the "Brothers have followed the ideas of the pope in all that pertains to the University at Washington. The Jesuits, on the contrary, have opposed them."<sup>28</sup> By this remark, Keane doubtless meant to say that the Jesuits had tried to undermine the university because of the threat it posed to their own college in nearby Georgetown.<sup>29</sup>

In 1897, another general chapter of the Christian Brothers was scheduled to meet in Paris. Several American bishops took advantage of the opportunity to send letters to the delegates pleading that the Brothers in the United States be allowed to continue teaching Latin and Greek. In his own letter to the chapter, Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria assured the capitulants, who may have been worried that the Jesuits and Christian Brothers were becoming rivals or even enemies, that "there is more than enough work for all teaching orders of men, especially here in the United States, and the Brothers' colleges do not interfere here with those of the Jesuits."<sup>30</sup> Spalding may have been stretching the truth with these soothing words; in several large cities in the United States, especially in Buffalo and Philadelphia, the Christian Brothers and the Jesuits competed sharply for the limited number of Catholic young men who could afford to attend college in late nineteenth-century America.<sup>31</sup>

The letters from American prelates did not have the desired effect on the European Brothers who dominated the general chapter, and they voted to reaffirm the ban on the classics in even stronger terms than before.<sup>32</sup> To ensure that the American Brothers obeyed the capitular decision and to prevent a schism in the Institute, Brother Gabriel Marie Brunhes, the newly-elected superior general, decided to send two visitors general to the United States early in 1898 invested with plenipotentiary powers to deal with the deteriorating situation. One of these envoys, Brother Aimarus Gaussiun, a French assistant superior general, spoke about the Jesuit factor in the Latin Question in his letters back home to France and also in his detailed travel journal, called in French *les ephemerides de ses visites canoniques*. Three things are particularly evident in these documents—the desire of American bishops to continue using the Brothers rather than the Jesuits to prepare candidates for the diocesan major seminary, the determination of the American Christian Brothers to prove to the public that they were as competent as the Jesuits in offering young men a classical education, and the contrary effort of Brother Aimarus to show that the American Christian Brothers were doing a miserable job in teaching Latin and Greek.<sup>33</sup>

Taking even more drastic action, Brother Gabriel Marie also removed leading "Latinists" from office, summoned them to Paris, tried them before a special commission, and found them guilty

of insubordination. Altogether thirteen provincial superiors, college presidents, and university professors were sent into "exile," as far away as Egypt and Ceylon, for advocating the teaching of Latin and Greek. Their banishments were covered in detail by secular newspapers. Echoing a widely held belief, a New York journal asserted that one of these exiles, Brother Paulian Fanning, visitor of the St. Louis district, was nothing less than an innocent victim of "Jesuit intrigue."<sup>34</sup> Actually, he was more the butt of his superiors' ire.

Enraged by the capitular decree of 1897, the visit of the two visitors general, and the exiling of leading American Christian Brothers, bishops throughout the country redoubled their efforts to overturn the various rulings prohibiting the teaching of classics in the Institute's schools. In the spring of 1898, Bishop Thomas S. Byrne of Nashville, fearing for the future of Christian Brothers College in Memphis, sent a long letter to Archbishop Sebastiano Martinelli, the apostolic delegate in Washington, pleading the cause of the American Christian Brothers. Byrne said, among other things, that the Brothers' "feeling and sense" of being wronged was "intensified" by the "settled conviction," whether justified or not, that "a rival body in the educational field" was fostering the "agitation" over the Latin Question.<sup>35</sup>

Bishop Byrne was not alone in his concern about the disastrous effects a ban on the classics would have on Catholic secondary and collegiate education in the United States. At the annual meeting of the American archbishops in the fall of 1898, the Latin Question was a major item on the agenda. After discussing the matter at length, the archbishops instructed John J. Kain, Archbishop of St. Louis, to draft but another memorial to *Propaganda Fide*, imploring that the decree of 1895 not be enforced in this country. In addition, they delegated Bishop Byrne, who spoke excellent Italian, personally to plead their case in Rome.<sup>36</sup>

Like Byrne, Archbishop Kain had a vital personal interest in the outcome of the Latin Question. A few months before the meeting of the American bishops, he had written a letter to Francesco Cardinal Satolli, former apostolic delegate in the United States who was now a prominent member of *Propaganda Fide*, explaining that the latter's suggestion of sending young men seeking a classical education to Jesuit institutions was not at all practical, at least in his archdiocese. The nearly 400 students at Christian Brothers College in St. Louis, he explained, could not be accommodated at the Jesuit college, which lacked a boarding department.<sup>37</sup>

Throughout 1899, as *Propaganda Fide* was being deluged with documents on the controversy from all sides, sensational stories began appearing in American newspapers about the Latin Question. The *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *St. Louis Republic*, *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, *Chicago Sunday Times Herald*, and *Baltimore Sun* all published lengthy reports on the tussle between the Jesuits and the Christian Brothers.<sup>38</sup> Nearly all of them portrayed the former as the villains of the piece. For example, an article in the *Washington Post* early in 1899 stated that "some of the parochial clergy, as well as some Brothers, attach much blame [for the controversy] to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. A distinguished Archbishop said to the writer that the aim of the Jesuits in our country was to sweep the educational deck."<sup>39</sup>

Although most of the newspaper articles on the Latin Question expressed sympathy for the Christian Brothers, they did not always sit well with some members of the Institute in the United States. For example, Brother Potamian O'Reilly, a distinguished professor of engineering at Manhattan College, wrote to the superior general in October, 1898, complaining that published reports on the controversy were reflecting badly on the Christian Brothers by making them look foolish in being forbidden to study and teach the language of educated men and women and even of the Church itself. "These articles dictated doubtless by the Jesuits who control the *Propaganda [Fide]*-do us much harm," he maintained.<sup>40</sup>

From 1895 to 1900, just at the time when the Latin Question came to a head, the so-called Americanist controversy was rife among certain bishops in this country. Conservative prelates accused their liberal colleagues of falsely teaching that the Catholic Church should adapt itself to the American mentality and republican form of government. Not a few of the newspapers that covered the Latin Question regarded the clash between the Jesuits and the Christian Brothers as just another facet of this larger conflict. It was easy to draw parallels. Like the liberal bishops in this country, the American Christian Brothers were also calling for adaptation to the American social system and, as a result, suffering from similar persecution at the hands of European church officials. "The removal of Brother Fabrician [Pelerin, president of St. John's College in Washington, D.C.]," the *Baltimore Sun* reported, "is regarded here as a parallel to that of Bishop Keane from the rectorship of Catholic University. The attack on American methods of teaching in American schools by French superiors is considered due to the same causes which instigated the effort to Europeanize the Catholic University"<sup>41</sup>

To observers of the Catholic scene in the late 1890's, it doubtless did not seem the least bit coincidental that John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul and a leading Americanist, had come to the defense not only of Keane, the Catholic University, and the Americanist position but of the Christian Brothers and their efforts to teach Latin as well. For credible reasons, then, a newspaper late in 1899 could report that "the troubles which the Christian Brothers are now experiencing in their schools is [sic] also considered part of this controversy [over Americanism]."<sup>42</sup>

If a single thread tied together all of the different strands of the Americanist controversy, including the Latin Question, it was the often-repeated charge that the Jesuits were the culprits in all cases. One journal claimed in 1899 that the Society of Jesus was behind not only the ban on Latin in the Brothers' schools but also the removal of Keane, the failure of the Catholic University of America to grow and prosper, and the scuttling of Ireland's plan to link public and parochial schools. Darkly, it asserted, "Archbishop Ireland has never hesitated to blame most of this conspiracy on the Jesuits."<sup>43</sup> In the context of the article it is difficult to discern whether this sentence applies to the Latin Question or to the whole Americanist controversy, which only serves to show how intertwined these two disputes became.



It is understandable that most of the newspapers which covered the Latin Question would side with the Christian Brothers rather than with the Jesuits. Americans are prone to root for the underdog, to favor educational opportunity, and to be suspicious of powerful religious bodies like the Society of Jesus. Jesuit baiting has often been fashionable in American history, not the least during the late nineteenth century. In England, hatred toward and suspicion of the Jesuits goes back to the reign of Elizabeth I and to the infamous Gunpowder Plot.

It is also important to note that the motives of liberal American bishops in supporting the Christian Brothers against the Jesuits were probably not altogether disinterested. Archbishop Ireland, for example, was opposed in principle to religious orders, especially the Society of Jesus, insofar as they were exempt by papal privilege from the direct control of the local ordinary, and as a result he did all in his power to develop and enhance the status of secular priests who were trained in diocesan seminaries and bound in obedience to their local bishop.<sup>44</sup> Many of these secular priests, incidentally, were graduates of the academies and colleges conducted by the Christian Brothers. Especially bitter toward the Jesuits, Ireland publicly blamed them for "the loss of Catholicism" of both England and Japan.<sup>45</sup> In Japan, the Jesuits made the big mistake, Ireland believed, of not petitioning the pope to establish bishoprics as a means of quickly developing a secular clergy, and in England they erred in opposing the appointment of bishops during the period of the penal laws.<sup>46</sup>

As non-clerical religious who did not operate parishes and were anxious to co-operate with local bishops, the Christian Brothers not only posed less of a threat to the authority of the local ordinary but also served, in the educational arena, as a counterweight to and even as a replacement for the more independent and powerful Jesuits, and not only in the United States but in other countries as well.<sup>47</sup> In certain respects, the Christian Brothers became the pawn in a much larger game of ecclesiastical chess.

Although much of the press and most of the American bishops supported the Christian Brothers in the Latin Question, the Society of Jesus was not without its defenders. In the spring of 1899, at the height of the controversy, a writer for the *Washington Post* criticized those journals which had reported that *Propaganda Fide* had ruled against the Christian Brothers "in favor of the Jesuits." He rightly pointed out that no decision had yet been made, and then went on to say that the widespread belief that the Jesuits were actively interested in the controversy was nothing more than an "assumption." "Again and again," he insisted, "have individual Jesuits declared that their Society has remained entirely neutral during the agitation of the Latin question in Rome."<sup>48</sup>

Interesting and important circumstantial evidence, which has recently been discovered, tends to undermine this claim of Jesuit neutrality, at least in terms of the activity of a high Jesuit official in Rome. Throughout 1899, Brother Gabriel Marie and his assistants and aides prepared lengthy documents on the Latin Question for submission to *Propaganda Fide*. Bishop Byrne, of course, did the same thing. One of the main points which the French superiors of the Christian

Brothers made in their memoranda was that young Catholic men in the United States could easily obtain a classical education in the schools operated by the Society of Jesus.<sup>49</sup> In the archives of the procurator general of the Christian Brothers in Rome is a handwritten list in pencil of all Jesuit colleges in this country, including those with boarding departments, to which the students of the Christian Brothers could transfer if Latin and Greek were banned in their schools. At the top of the list, the following note can be found: "*Liste des Collèges des RR PP Jésuites aux E. U. (donné par le R. P. Mayer, S.J.)*."<sup>50</sup> This "Father Mayer" (which is the French rendering of Meyer) was Father Rudolph J. Meyer, who was then serving as the assistant superior general for the Jesuits in the United States.<sup>51</sup> Perhaps to avoid any accusations of collusion with Jesuit officials in Rome, the superior general of the Christian Brothers used a list of Jesuit colleges taken from *Hoffman's Catholic Directory* rather than the one supplied by Father Meyer in the printed folio of documents which he finally sent to *Propaganda Fide*.<sup>52</sup>

In addition to supplying the superior general with a list of American Jesuit colleges, Father Meyer did some important translation work for him as well. During the winter of 1898 and the spring of 1899, American Christian Brothers began circulating petitions and issuing manifestoes which demanded the right to continue teaching the classics. These acts of formal disobedience greatly upset the superior general, Brother Gabriel Marie, and his regime in Paris. In July, 1899, he decided to draft a severe letter to the Christian Brothers in the United States, threatening them with dire penalties, including expulsion, if they continued to undermine the authority of their higher superiors. The superior general apparently wrote this letter while he was visiting Rome in the summer of 1899 to apprise himself of the final stages of the canonization process of then Blessed La Salle. He did not know any English, and so he needed help in translating this letter. The person who did him this favor was Father Meyer.<sup>53</sup>

There is even more circumstantial evidence which links Father Meyer to the Latin Question. As a provincial superior in the Middle West, he had achieved the reputation of being a staunch defender of classical studies in Jesuit academies and colleges in this country. In 1889, Jesuit officials in Rome sent him to Santa Clara College in California to make certain that officials there were faithfully following the prescriptions of the *Ratio Studiorum*. Italian Jesuits in California had complained to their father general in Rome that American confreres were placing too much emphasis on commercial education and dispensing certain students from required examinations in Latin and Greek.<sup>54</sup> In cooperating closely with the superior general of the Christian Brothers, Father Meyer was evidently working both sides of the fence in his efforts to reestablish the European division of labor between the two orders, whereby the Jesuits would conduct classical colleges and the Christian Brothers would run technical and commercial schools.

Bishop Byrne spent the first part of 1899 in Rome, lobbying for the American bishops and Brothers; however, *Propaganda Fide* moved slowly on the Latin Question. As summer arrived and the Vatican bureaucracy closed down, Byrne decided that nothing more could be done and

therefore returned to the United States without a decision. In the fall, the American archbishops convened for their annual meeting, and the unresolved Latin Question was high on their agenda once again. Largely through the determined efforts of Archbishop Ireland, they voted to deputize Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan of San Francisco to set their case before *Propaganda Fide* now for the third time.<sup>55</sup>

In Rome, Monsignor Denis O'Connell, the former rector of the North American College, was the resident spokesman and lobbyist for some of the liberal American bishops. Early in 1900, before *Propaganda Fide*'s decree had been released, Father John R. Slattery, a Josephite who later left the Church during the Modernist crisis, sent O'Connell a note thanking him for the copy of Riordan's memorial which he had recently received. Slattery told O'Connell that he thought it was "strange that our Archbishops would expose themselves to a refusal in such a matter as the Colleges of the Christian Brothers." Alluding to the popular belief of a Jesuit connection in the Latin Question, he added: "Probably the *Patres Conscripti* S. J. fancy that their colleges would be better by throwing out the classics from the institutions of the Brothers. But Catholics will sooner send their children to general seats of learning like Harvard, Yale, etc. *Quare non?*"

The long-awaited decision of *Propaganda Fide* was finally released in January, 1900. The American bishops and Brothers were devastated when they read it. The congregation not only reaffirmed the 1895 ban but, brooking no delay, also ordered the closing of the classical departments of the Brothers' American schools by the end of the current school year.<sup>57</sup> The language of the decree clearly indicated that the cardinals had accepted all of the arguments which the superior general of the Christian Brothers had made in the various documents he had sent to *Propaganda Fide*. Brother Gabriel Marie had insisted that young men who wanted to study Latin and Greek could always avail themselves of the "resource" of the colleges operated by the Jesuits and that restricting the Christian Brothers to work in primary and technical schools would ensure that both the "Fathers" and the "Brothers" remained within their "appointed places" in the Catholic Church.<sup>58</sup>

As expected, the Christian Brothers in the United States were convinced that the Jesuits had played a big hand in this latest decree. Whether or not this is true is difficult to judge on the basis of the available evidence. Inasmuch as the vote of *Propaganda Fide* in 1899 was unanimous,<sup>59</sup> it is certain that Mazzella and the other Jesuit member of the congregation, Andreas Cardinal Steinhuber, voted against the American Christian Brothers. However, the key figure behind the 1900 decision was Francesco Cardinal Satolli, who served instead of Mazzella as the *ponente* this time around.

Satolli's role in the Latin Question was nothing less than byzantine. When the four American metropolitan archbishops sent Rome the first memorial on the Latin Question in 1894, he was serving as apostolic delegate in the United States. Indeed, it was Satolli who had suggested that the memorial be drawn up and who had eventually forwarded it to Rome with his own

endorsement.<sup>60</sup> After he became a cardinal in 1895 and then returned to the Vatican shortly thereafter, Satolli politely pleaded the American cause before Institute officials in Rome,<sup>61</sup> then discreetly abandoned it,<sup>62</sup> and finally became one of its most effective opponents.<sup>63</sup> Eventually Satolli concluded that it would be best for the American Brothers to give up their efforts to teach Latin and to confine their educational work to preparing young men for careers in industry and commerce. He even thought that the Jesuits themselves were beginning to see the need to serve such students.<sup>64</sup>

American bishops and Brothers were astonished, understandably, when Satolli switched sides. And yet his behavior is not hard to explain in retrospect. Satolli probably abandoned his former position because of his past friendships with Institute superiors in Rome,<sup>65</sup> his assessment (on returning to Rome) of the hopelessness of the American position,<sup>66</sup> and his falling out with those liberal American bishops such as Ireland and Keane who were the most ardent champions of the teaching of Latin in the Institute's schools in this country.<sup>67</sup> It is also possible that he simply changed his mind on the Latin Question once he returned to Europe and heard the views of the French superiors firsthand.<sup>68</sup>

In March of 1900, the *American Ecclesiastical Review* published an article on the recent decision of *Propaganda Fide*. The anonymous authorship of the piece (other articles in the issue were signed), its high praise for Ignatian spirituality, and the character of its remarks on the educational work of the Institute in the United States must have led many American Christian Brothers to conclude that its author was a Jesuit. Among other things, he urged the Brothers to abandon their quest for educational prestige through classical studies and to return to the "appointed field" in primary schools and technical institutes. The most important duty of a religious, he reminded his readers, was to follow "every precept and act" of their founder. It was precisely such fidelity to rules and constitutions that accounted for the "wondrous strength of the Society of Jesus," he added. Enrollments in Christian Brothers schools in the United States would doubtless decline as a result of the ban on Latin, the writer conceded, but the sons of St. La Salle could find encouragement in contemplating the new educational frontiers opened up to them by "the undeveloped possibilities which the use of electricity and kindred forces have shown to exist, ... quite distinct from the universal demand for teachers for our parochial schools."<sup>69</sup>

The ban on the classics had a devastating impact on the Institute in the United States, college enrollments shrank, vocations sagged, and morale sank. At least at Saint Mary's College in Oakland, California, the Brothers contrived to provide their students with classes in the classical languages by surreptitiously teaching Latin and Greek in a room on the ground floor of a flat across the street from the college, where the school's baseball coach lived with his family.<sup>70</sup> When the Jesuits heard of this arrangement, they protested to church officials, and the little storefront Latin school had to be shut down.<sup>71</sup> It is not certain which Jesuit turned in the Christian Brothers at Saint Mary's College. However, we do know that on May 19, 1906, an

Italian Jesuit teaching at St. Ignatius College (now the University of San Francisco) confided to his diary that "it appears that the Christian Brothers have a house across the road from the college in which Latin is taught. They seem to evade the decision of the Holy See, a decision which is surely clear enough."<sup>72</sup>

After 1900, American prelates and priests continued to plead that the ban on the classics be lifted, but Institute officials put pressure on Rome to hold the line. Students seeking a classical education, they continued to insist, could always obtain one in Jesuit schools and colleges.<sup>73</sup> The superior general, Brother Imier Lafabregue, who had taken office in 1913, did not even want the Latin Question discussed in public. He was grateful, therefore, when Father Enrico Rosa, S.J., excised part of a 1919 article published in *Civiltà Cattolica*, in which a Manhattan College lay professor, with close ties to the Jesuits, claimed that the Brothers' hope of teaching the classics again was seriously undercutting efforts to maintain the quality of the school's engineering school.<sup>74</sup> Although Brother Imier thought the deleted section was truthful, he feared that it would not have produced a good effect in "Roman Circles," where support for Institute officials was beginning to erode. All would be well, Brother Imier concluded, if the American Brothers would only get over their foolish obsession to "smash" the Jesuits. It was time they realized that the Institute's schools were giving neither a technical nor a classical education but a modern one.<sup>75</sup>

In 1923, another general chapter of the Institute was scheduled to convene in Belgium. Despite strong opposition from their European superiors, the American Brothers were determined to raise the Latin Question on the floor of the chapter, although with little hope of success. However, shortly before the chapter opened, Pope Pius XI decided to intervene personally in the dispute. A classical scholar who favored the expansion of Catholic higher education in the United States, he was disposed to listen to the pleas of American bishops, who by now had gotten out from under the cloud of Americanism.<sup>76</sup> In a stunning letter to the general chapter, the pope virtually ordered the Christian Brothers to teach the classics to young men from all social classes, including even the well-to-do. Among other things, his Secretary of State, Pietro Cardinal Gasparri, cited changes in modern society and the spread of democracy and educational opportunity as compelling reasons for modifying the traditional observances of the order and reversing earlier papal edicts.<sup>77</sup>

After this chronological account of the Latin Question, it is now possible and indeed appropriate to make some critical comments about the controversy, especially about the role played by the Jesuits. It seems clear from the evidence that the American Christian Brothers exaggerated the influence of the Society of Jesus in securing the papal ban on the classics. The French superiors of the Institute, who opposed the teaching of Latin even more vehemently than the Jesuits did, needed little if any prompting to uphold the letter of the Rule. It should also be noted that charges of Jesuit interference were often based on circumstantial evidence. The fact that the Jesuits might benefit from the prohibition of the classics in the Brothers'

schools was doubtless at the basis of the widespread belief that they were somehow behind the ban. One newspaper improbably claimed in 1899 that the Society of Jesus in America would gain "thousands" of students if the Christian Brothers were forbidden to teach the classics.<sup>78</sup> However, such claims do not constitute proof of Jesuit involvement.

Nonetheless, there are several sources which clearly show that the Jesuits protested against the teaching of the classics by the Christian Brothers in 1858 and 1866. Even those Christian Brothers who opposed the teaching of Latin and were therefore disposed to downplay the Jesuit threat never denied that the Society of Jesus had lodged formal complaints against the Institute in the United States.<sup>79</sup> Moreover, there are a few documents, which might be loosely characterized as Jesuit sources, which indicate that leading Jesuits, including the assistant superior general in charge of the United States, either assisted Institute officials in suppressing the teaching of Latin and Greek or criticized the American Christian Brothers for circumventing the papal ban of 1900. It is also noteworthy that several prominent prelates and priests in the United States believed that the Jesuits were involved in the Latin Question and said so to the press and in their private correspondence. Numerous articles in leading secular newspapers repeated this charge in the late 1890's, but without offering hard evidence.

Although the extent and nature of Jesuit influence in the Latin Question remains debatable, it seems safe to conclude that in late nineteenth-century America the two largest teaching orders of the Catholic Church, attempting to adjust to new conditions in a missionary land, began to move into educational fields which they had not entered in the Old World and as a result began to compete in ways which had been previously unknown in Europe. Evidently, the expansion of the Christian Brothers into classical education proved more disruptive than the opening of commercial departments by the Jesuits. It is pleasant to note that today the Jesuit and Christian Brother high schools and colleges compete with each other without apparent acrimony or bitterness, except perhaps on the basketball court.

---

\*\* At the time of the original publication of this article, Brother Isetti was a professor of history at St. Mary's College, Moraga, California. He is indebted to the Faculty Development Fund and the Alumni-Faculty Development Fund of St. Mary's for helping to defray travel costs to archival sources in Rome and to the members of the History Department of St. Mary's College of California, Father Wilfred P. Schoenberg, S.J., and the referees for making corrections and suggesting changes in earlier drafts of this article. The pages printed here that exceed this journal's (Catholic Historical Review) normal limit on the length of articles have been paid for by a grant made by the same Faculty Development Fund.

<sup>1</sup> Before 1967, there were only three published accounts of the Latin Question. In *The Christian Brothers in the United States, 1848-1948: A Century of Catholic Education* (New York, 1948), Brother Angelus Gabriel Cashin, F.S.C., devotes only seven pages to the

controversy; see pp. 478-484. An even shorter treatment may be found in John Tracy Ellis, *Life of James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, 1834-1921* (Milwaukee, 1952); see Vol. II, pp. 373-375. In his *Historie Générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles Chrésiennes, La fin du XIX' Siècle*, Vol. IX (Paris, 1953), Georges Rigault, the official historian of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, spends some twenty-four pages on the Latin Question ; see pp. 202-226. His account, although cursory, is balanced and judicious. After the Second Vatican Council, Brother W. J. Battersby, FSC wrote a complete and critical account of the Latin Question in his history of *The Christian Brothers in the United States, 1900-1925* (Winona, 1967). I would like here to acknowledge my debt to Battersby. He was the first scholar to discuss the controversy in depth and to bring many key documents to light. For reasons that are not clear, Battersby did not use important materials from the archives of the procurator general of the Christian Brothers in Rome. It is in this depository that many of the crucial documents on the involvement of the Jesuits in the Latin Question are kept. The most recent published treatment of the Latin Question, although only three pages long, may be found in James P. Gaffey, *Citizen of No Mean City: Archbishop Patrick Riordan of San Francisco, 1841-1914* (Wilmington, North Carolina, 1976); see pp. 380-383.

<sup>2</sup> For a complete account of the impact of the Latin Question on Christian Brothers College in St. Louis, see Michael. Witt, FSC, "*The Devolution of Christian Brothers College*" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1980), pp. 43-85. Witt relies heavily on the earlier work of Battersby.

<sup>3</sup> Archives of the Procurator General of the Christian Brothers, Rome (hereafter APGR), Brother Justin McMahon, "Récit sommaire de l'introduction du Latin aux États-Unis," ca. 1894 (copy), p. 1; Box EL 612-1, Dos. 14, Doc. No. 14. See also in Archives of the Christian Brothers, Rome (hereafter ACBR), Copy of a Memorial submitted to the Chapter of 1897 and read in Public Assembly by Brother Justin [McMahon], April 2, 1897, p. 1; Box NS 503, Dos. 6; and, in APGR, Doc. XI, Attestation of Mgr. Kenrick, n.d., in "Documents présentés par Mgr. Byrne à la S. C. de la Propagande," 2<sup>c</sup> groupe, 1899; Folio XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 33. What motivated Brother Patrick to act on Archbishop Kenrick's request is not clear. Perhaps he thought that a formal request from a leading prelate deserved serious consideration. If Brother Patrick's future actions provide any clue, they would suggest that he was personally convinced of the practical necessity of teaching the classics in the Institute's schools in this country.

<sup>4</sup> The Christian Brothers proved remarkably successful in fostering clerical vocations by teaching Latin. In *Our Pastors in Calvary*, Mary Constance Smith states that half of the priests of the Archdiocese of St. Louis who died between 1854 and 1924 and were buried in Calvary Cemetery were graduates of Christian Brothers College. Cited in Battersby, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> APGR, "Récit sommaire," p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> For a brief discussion of De La Salle's reasons for opposing the teaching of Latin, see Battersby, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-12; and also De La Salle's "Mémoire sur l'Habit" in Battersby (ed.), *De La Salle: Letters and Documents* (London, 1952), pp. 242-243.

<sup>7</sup> APGR, "Récit sommaire," p. 1. See also, in ACBR, Brother Patrick Murphy to Brother Maurice Freeze, March 17, 1888 (copy); Box ED 232, Dos. 4.

<sup>8</sup> ACBR, Notes of the late Brother Justin (McMahon), Statement, "A Few Facts on the Latin Question," n.d. (copy), p. 1; Box NS 503, Dos. 35. This information was related to Brother Patrick by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. Archbishop Patrick J. Ryan of Philadelphia, according to the Notes, knew of the Jesuit complaint "in a general way but could not give a positive statement of details." See also "Récit sommaire," p. 1.

<sup>9</sup> ACBR, Brother Aphraates Dubois to Brother Provincial, June 13, 1884, as quoted in full in Brother Reticus Gonnet, "La Question du Latin aux Etats-Unis," *Projet de Circulaire*, 1900, p. 74; Box EL 612-14, Doc. No. 1.

<sup>10</sup> ACBR, Rabut to Murphy, October 5, 1859, as quoted in *Projet de Circulaire*, p. 26 (backside).

<sup>11</sup> Manhattan College Archives (hereafter MCA), Brother Donatian Joseph Kenny to the Superior General, August 5, 1897 (copy), Latin Question Correspondence.

<sup>12</sup> ACBR, Notes of the late Brother Justin, p. 1. See also "Récit sommaire," p. 2; Memorial presented to the Chapter of 1897, p. 1; and, in the Archives of the Baltimore District, Ammendale Maryland (hereafter ABO), Brother Maurelian Sheel to Brother Gerardus Dwyer, May 9, 1911 (copy), Letters and Notes from the Scrapbooks of Brother Maurelian, II.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1-3.

<sup>14</sup> ACBR, Rabut to Murphy, October 3, 1866, as quoted in *Projet de Circulaire*, p. 60; also quoted in Brother Reticus Gonnet, "La Question du Latin aux Etats-Unis," *Mémoire du F. Assistant*, 1907, pp. 36, 55-55; Box EL 612-6, Dos. 6. My translation of this letter in French is based on the most plausible reconstruction of the various citations of it in these two sources. According to the *Mémoire* (p. 55), the letters of Brother Facile to Brother Patrick in 1866 and 1867 were turned over by the latter to Brother Hermenegilde, who was then serving as the compiler of the *Annals of the Institute*. The originals were apparently kept in the New York District novitiate; however, they have since been destroyed. We must now rely on the variant long quotations from them which are preserved in the *Projet* and the *Mémoire*.

<sup>15</sup> ACBR, Rabut to Murphy, April 7, 1868, *Projet de Circulaire*, pp. 27 (backside), p. 74 (backside).



- <sup>16</sup> ACBR, Chapitre Général de 1873, 27<sup>e</sup> Séance, 28 juin (8 heures du matin), Registre Capitulaire B, No. 5, 1873; Box ED 228, No. 1.
- <sup>17</sup> ACBR, "Rapport général sur l'Amérique," 1876, as quoted in *Mémoire*, pp. 54, 65, 83, 153; also quoted in *Projet de Circulaire*, p. 65.
- <sup>18</sup> ACBR, *Projet de Circulaire*, p. 55 (second side), 56; *Mémoire*, p. 55. Brother Reticus, who assembled both documents, mistakenly noted that the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore took place in 1882 rather than 1884.
- <sup>19</sup> For an excellent account of how one Jesuit college adapted its educational philosophy to the American scene, see Gerald McKeivitt, S.J., *The University of Santa Clara: A History, 1851-1977* (Stanford, 1979), especially pp. 55-58, 107-129.
- <sup>20</sup> ACBR, Sheel to Murphy, August 28, 1885 (copy); Box EL 612-1, Dos. 14, Doc. No. 1.
- <sup>21</sup> ACBR, Chapitre Général de 1894, 24<sup>e</sup> Séance, octobre 28, 1894 (matin); Registre Capitulaire C, No. 7, 1882-1894; Box ED 228, No. 2
- <sup>22</sup> A copy of the memorial may be found in Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, pp. 53-57.
- <sup>23</sup> HMCA, "Jesuits Win a First Bout," *Chicago Sunday Times Herald*, January 22, 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.
- <sup>24</sup> APGR, à N. C. Fr. Procureur Général près le Saint Siège-note pour la Sacrée Congrégation de la Propagande, May 23, 1895, p. 3; Fol. XXIII, Dos. 414, Doc. No. 2.
- <sup>25</sup> Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, p. 50.
- <sup>26</sup> Archives of the Congregation for the Evangelization of the Peoples (formerly called *de Propaganda Fide*) Rome (hereafter APF), Acta, Vol. 265 (1895), No. 34, Pro. No. 13464, handwritten decision in Latin, p. 451 (both sides).
- <sup>27</sup> For a short account of Mazzella's career in the United States, see "Two of Woodstock's Founders: I. Cardinal Camillus Mazzella," *Woodstock Letters*, 2 (September, 1900), pp. 296-307. See also Thomas T. McAvoy, *The Americanist Controversy in Roman Catholicism, 1895-1900* (Notre Dame, 1963), pp. 35, 293; and Gerald P. Fogarty, SJ., *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* ("Päpste und Papsttum; Band 21 [Stuttgart, 1982]), pp. 55, 117, 150.
- <sup>28</sup> ACBR, Brother Thomas Alexandre Perrin to Brother Louis de Poissy Bruny, January 27, 1897, *Mémoire*, pp. 118-119.
- <sup>29</sup> McAvoy, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>30</sup> ACBR, Spalding to Members of the General Chapter of the Brothers of the Christian Schools of 1897, February 28, 1897; Box EL 612-1, Dos. No. 6., Doc. No. 14.

<sup>31</sup> For a brief discussion of this competition between Jesuit and Christian Brothers colleges, see Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, pp. 46-50.

<sup>32</sup> ACBR, Chapitre Général de 1897, 19 Seance, avril 1, 1897; Registre Capitulaire C, No. 52 (1897); Box ED 228, No. 2.

<sup>33</sup> ACBR, "Ephémérides de ses visites caoniques du 6 janvier 1856 au juin 1905," pp. 198, 199, 213, 222; Box EG 12 1, Dos. 15; and letters quoted in Mémoire, pp. 179, 189.

<sup>34</sup> MCA, untitled clipping, *New York City Cburchman*, March 25, 1899, Latin Question Box.

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, pp. 112-113.

<sup>36</sup> Ellis, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 373-375.

<sup>37</sup> APGR, Kain to Satolli, August 23, 1898 (copy); Folio XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 12.

<sup>38</sup> Clippings from these newspapers may be found in MCA.

<sup>39</sup> MCA, "Leo's Edict Awaited," *Washington Post*, February 12, 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.

<sup>40</sup> ACBR, O'Reilly to the Superior General, October 7, 1898, as quoted in Mémoire, p. 244.

<sup>41</sup> MCA, "Summoned to Paris," *Baltimore Sun*, August 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.

<sup>42</sup> MCA, "Ireland's Step a Challenge," *The [?] Press*, March 10, 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> McAvoy, *op cit.*, pp. 86-87.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> James H. Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop John Ireland* (New York, 1953), p. 113.

<sup>47</sup> In England, for example, Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, who disliked the Jesuits as much as Archbishop Ireland did, tried in 1880 to persuade the French De La Salle Brothers (as the Christian Brothers are known in Europe) to undertake a grammar school for the poor rather than "tolerate" the Jesuits schools which catered to the rich. Manning feared that a Jesuit school in London would siphon off for the Society the best boys who wanted to become priests. In contrast to American bishops, Manning disliked the Jesuit emphasis on classical education and

instead favored technical training as being better suited to his country 's needs. See Robert Gray, *Cardinal Manning: A Biography* (New York, 1985), pp. 252-253.

<sup>48</sup> MCA, "Latin in the Schools," *Washington Post*, March 1, 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.

<sup>49</sup> APGR, see, for example, "Deuxième Réponse du Supérieur Général des Frères à la Réplique de Mgr. de Nashville," 1899, p. 25; Fol. XIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 34.

<sup>50</sup> APGR, handwritten list; Fol. XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 60.

<sup>51</sup> For a short biography of Meyer, see "Father Rudolph J. Meyer," *Woodstock Papers*, 1 (February, 1913), 92-96.

<sup>52</sup> APGR, "Deuxième Réponse," p. 25.

<sup>53</sup> APGR, rough French version, clean French version, and rough English translation all appended; Fol. XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 51. On the rough English translation, the following note may be found in ink: "Cette traduction a été faite par le R. P. Mayer [Meyer], Assistant des Jésuites pour l'Amérique." The handwriting of the rough English translation matches perfectly the handwriting of letters and reports written by Father Meyer. These letters and reports may be found in the Archives of the Society of Jesus, Rome; see, for example, the letter which Meyer wrote to then Father Camillo Mazzella on June 12, 1886, In *Vita* 1024; *Viri Illustres, Card. Mazzella II; Lettere e documenti*, 1879-1900, Dos. "auguri per la promozione," 1886.

<sup>54</sup> McKcivitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125.

<sup>55</sup> Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, pp. 160-164; Gaffey, *op. cit.*, pp. 380-383.

<sup>56</sup> Archives of the Diocese of Richmond, Slattery to O'Connell, January 2, 1900. I am grateful to the Reverend William L. Pitt, chancellor, for sending me a photocopy of this letter.

<sup>57</sup> APF, Acta, Vol. 270 (1899), Prot. No. 36549, handwritten decision in Latin, p. 461 [441?].

<sup>58</sup> APGR, "Quelques notes au sujet de la lettre de Mgr. l'Archevêque de Saint Louis," ca. September, 1898, p. 5; Fol. XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 16. These notes, which were probably composed by one of the assistant superiors general, were sent for certain to Cardinal Satolli on September 7, 1898.

<sup>59</sup> ACBR, Mémoire, p. 32 5.

<sup>60</sup> ACBR, Copy of Notes, written by Our Late Dear Brother Justin, Visitor of San Francisco, New York, England, and Ireland, and the President of Christian Brothers College, St. Louis, May 8, 1910, pp. 1-3; Box NS 503, Dos. 28; APGR, Cardinal Miecislav Ledochowski to Brother Joseph Jossierand, ca. 1895 (copy); Fol. XXIU, Dos. 14; ACBR, Copy of a Memorial submitted to the Chapter of 1897, pp. 3-4.

<sup>61</sup> ACBR, Brother Robustinien Rabatel to Brother Joseph Josserand, November 9, 1896 (copy); Box EL 612-2, Dos. 1, Doc. No. 2. See also Brother Thomas Alexandre Perrin to Brother Louis de Poissy Bruny, November 18, 1896; Box EL 612-2, Dos. 1, Doc. No. 6; and *Mémoire*, p. 115.

<sup>62</sup> ACBR, Brother Thomas Alexandre Perrin to Brother Louis de Poissy Bruny, November 18, 1896; Box EL 612 -2, Dos. 1, Doc. No. 6.

<sup>63</sup> MAPGR, Archbishop Kain to Cardinal Satolli, August 23, 1898 (copy); Fol. XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 12.

<sup>64</sup> ACBR, Brother Casimiro Antoniotti to Brother Louis de Poissy Bruny, ca. July 25, 1897, as quoted in *Mémoire*, p. 144. Brother Casimiro was quoting Cardinal Satolli verbatim.

<sup>65</sup> ACBR, Copy of Notes, written by Our Late Dear Brother Justin, p. 3.

<sup>66</sup> APGR, Brother Casimiro Antoniotti to Brother Justian [Justin] McMahon, ca. July, 1897 (copy); Fol. XXIII, Dos. 415, Doc. No. 6.

<sup>67</sup> MCA, "A Blow to Americanism," *Washington Times*, January 3, 1900, clipping, Latin Question Box. See also Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, p. 52.

<sup>68</sup> ACBR, Brother Thomas Alexandre Perrin to Brother Louis de Poissy Bruny, November 18, 1896; Box EL 612-2, Dos. 1, Doc. No. 6. See also *Mémoire*, p. 115. In a letter to Brother Gerardus on May 18, 1911, Brother Aurelian Sheel, president of Christian Brothers College in Memphis, charged that Satolli had abandoned the Brothers in the United States after the Jesuits gave him a gift of \$1,000 to look after their interests at the Vatican. (See in ABD, Letters and Notes from the Scrapbooks of Brother Aurelian of the St. Louis District, II.) The author has not found any evidence to substantiate this charge of bribery.

<sup>69</sup> "The Recent Decree Regarding the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools," pp. 314-317.

<sup>70</sup> An advertisement for the classical courses, indicating that the baseball coach was the teacher, appeared in the *Saint Mary's Collegian*, 1 (October, 1903); see back page of cover. Copies of the *Collegian* may be found in the Archives of St. Mary 's College, Moraga, California (hereafter ASMC).

<sup>71</sup> ASMC, interview of Brother Cormac Murphy, archivist of the San Francisco district, with George Poultney, October 30, 1968.

<sup>72</sup> Oregon Province Jesuit Archives, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington, Gregory Leggio, S.J., "Diary, 1906;" Leggio Papers. I am grateful to Father Gerald McKeivitt, S.J., for supplying me with this source.

<sup>73</sup> APGR, Brother Alexis François Walteer to Brother Imier Lafabregue, November 7, 1913 (copy); Fol. XXIV, Dos. 421, Doc. No. 78.

<sup>74</sup> APGR, memorandum on "Latin" July 11, 1919; Fol. LXI, Dos. 886, Doc. No. 6. See also "Cronaca Contemporanea: Stati Uniti," *Civiltà Cattolica*, 70, III (July 5, 1919), p. 84 . In 1921, this lay professor, Charles Prelini, told Rosa that not only the Brothers and their alumni but also archbishops and priests were totally convinced that the Jesuits had secured the ban on Latin out of jealousy and spite. See Prelini to Rosa, October 10, 1921; APGR, Fol. LXI. Dos. 886, Doc. No. 41.

<sup>75</sup> APGR, Brother Imier Lafabregue to Brother Alexis Francois Walteer, July 17, 1919; Fol. LXI, Dos. 886, Doc. No. 8.

<sup>76</sup> Battersby, *The Christian Brothers*, p. 343.

<sup>77</sup> ACBR, Gasparri to Brother Imier Lafabregue, April 17, 1923; Box EL-612, Dos. 27, Doc. No. 1.

<sup>78</sup> MCA, "Jesuits Win a First Bout" *Chicago Sunday Times Herald*, January 22, 1899, clipping, Latin Question Box.

<sup>79</sup> Brother Reticus was a fanatical foe of classical courses in Institute schools. In both his *Mémoire* and *Projet de Circulaire*, he blamed the American Brothers for instigating the teaching of Latin and Greek and did all in his power to play down the Jesuit threat. (See *Mémoire*, pp. 36, 55, 136.) However, he never once denied that the Jesuits protested against the teaching of Latin by the Brothers in the United States throughout the late nineteenth century. Brother Reticus was very concerned about alienating the Jesuits because they usually served as the directors of the major retreats of the Christian Brothers. (See *Projet de Circulaire*, p. 60.)