

Brother Leonard Guittoger: Prophet or Fool?

Brother Leonard Guittoger was born Pierre-François to Pierre Guittoger and Marie-Scholastique Poussin at Terrehaut¹ (Sarthe) on July 13, 1802, the year of Napoleon's much needed and much welcomed Concordat. Thus he arrived when France was settling down into a relative peace following the terrible dozen years of the Revolution and its bloody aftermath, the Reign of Terror. Robespierre, Danton, and Marat would still, of course, be names on everyone's lips, even in remote provinces, but the country by and large began to enjoy the calm of Napoleonic dictatorship, a calm that would last until the next upheaval, the petit revolution of 1830. In the Guittoger family, Leonard would have spent his early years getting a rudimentary education at the local elementary school and thereafter being employed on the family farm or in the family business, but we know nothing precise about his youth until, at the age of 23, he went to Ruillé-sur-Loir in the autumn of 1825 to enter Dujarié's Brothers of St. Joseph. By the time of his arrival, the little band of brothers, begun only five years earlier, had swelled in number and were serving as teachers in a dozen towns around the diocese. Over 100 men had come to Ruillé before Leonard² and over 70 had remained with the Community (Klawitter, "Chronicle" 3).

At Ruillé in these early days, life was regulated by the talented Brother André Mottais who served as Dujarié's right-hand man and more or less ran the community on a day by day basis. André was not only novice master, but he was also supervisor for all the schools making him totally responsible for the academic development and expertise of all the brothers. Since he was also responsible for the spiritual direction of all the men

at Ruillé, one wonders what exactly Dujarié had to do with the little community, aside from his daily Mass, weekly confessions, and correspondence with priests regarding placement of his men in the parishes. Of course Dujarié, a saintly man himself, was never a vowed religious and remained throughout his life a guide to those within the Brothers of St. Joseph. Dujarié, with whimsical respect, would on occasion refer to André as “his Holiness” (Mérianne 552 in Catta, *Dujarié* 142). Having had a formal novitiate and scholastic training with the Christian Brothers in Paris, André shouldered quite properly the daily shaping of the amorphous group at Ruillé into the vigorous community it would eventually become. He and Dujarié made a superb team, although he has been overlooked more often than not, or simply dismissed by Holy Cross historians as Dujarié’s “secretary” (Smith 12). Like the other young men who came to Ruillé, Leonard would have followed a strict daily routine, rising at 5 AM, kneeling for meditation before Mass, then having breakfast, morning classes, prayers before the noon meal, followed by afternoon classes until 4:30, prayers and study before supper at 7 PM, recreation thereafter until prayers and retiring at 9 PM (Catta, *Dujarie* 115-116). There were, however, no games allowed for recreation. The young men recreated themselves with pious conversation. One wonders how young bodies survived without exercise or play.

Three months after arriving at Ruillé, Leonard began his novitiate, or rather became a novice since the term “novitiate” implies a limited time (a year or two) in a semi-cloistered atmosphere. In Dujarié’s community, however, the brothers could remain “novices” for ten years or more, until they felt impelled to take a simple promise of obedience, a step some of them never took. We know, however, that Leonard renewed

his vow of obedience on September 11, 1830. We have no record of when he first took the vow. One year later he signed the Pact of Fidelity, the touching document that, following the political turmoil of 1830, the remnants of Dujarié's band of brothers created and signed as an endorsement of their wish to remain faithful to Dujarié's vision. Noting that they lacked the "hope of expanding or even continuing to exist for any length of time" (Pact of Fidelity in *Catta, Dujarié 225*), thirteen brothers signed the document. They wished to preserve what they had joined so faithfully, but should they have to disband, they wanted "to remain united in heart and affection, supporting and assisting one another." In the document Leonard is named "Second Director," right after the First Director André Mottais, and before both the Third Director Henri-Michel Taupin, and the Fourth Director Vincent-Ferier Pieau.³ Thus at the age of 29, just six years after his arrival, Leonard has already risen to a position of prominence and authority, so evident were his talents and his promise as an administrator and leader. He had been, in fact, one of the four directors since 1826 and would remain so named until 1833 when he would be assigned to teach for one year at the school in Esclimont.

As an administrator, Leonard was entrusted with significant responsibility as can be deduced from his January, 1833, letter to a priest concerning the ability of the brothers to acquire property in their own names without legalizing the purchase under Dujarié's name alone. The problem on which Leonard was seeking the priest's advice was the matter of obligation that the community had or did not have to consult departed members on the matter of property disposal. Leonard argues, and we presume he is arguing as a voice of all four Brother Directors, that consultation with dispersed members would be difficult if not impossible in the matter of property the community enjoyed while those

members were still legally members of the community. Leonard is trying to argue for an institution's ability to buy and sell property in its own name, not in the name of a specific individual, a matter of intense debate in France at the time. Moreover, five of the brothers are dead, and consultation with their relatives would be pointless since the latter would have little or no knowledge of or interest in the affairs of the Ruillé brothers. The addressee of this letter is not known, but he obviously was a canon lawyer since Leonard requests that the priest's decision on the matter be communicated to a notary for legal approbation. Leonard writes an intelligent letter in impeccable French. He writes with authority, deferential but authoritative nonetheless.

By October of 1834, Leonard has returned from Esclimont to Ruillé to be on site as the little community devolved from Dujarié's hands to Basil Moreau's. In 1835 he goes with Moreau to La Chesnaie where for three days the two consult with the founders of the Brothers of Ploërmel. It is curious that Moreau, as he moved to take over direction of the brothers, did not take André Mottais with him. Instead he takes Leonard. One would think that as Moreau developed his ideas for rules and the direction of the Brothers of St. Joseph, he would keep at his right hand André, the man most responsible for moving the community away from Dujarié's direction to Moreau's care. It was André after all who wrote behind Dujarié's back to Bishop Bouvier about the aged founder's failing health and inability to oversee the group. It was André who for all intents and purposes ran the community, not Leonard. The selection of a companion for the visit to La Chesnaie does not, however, indicate Moreau's lack of trust in André. As of September 1, 1835, Leonard had been made Master of Novices in Le Mans, while André remained at Ruillé to direct the remnants of the community there and oversee the school.

From day one Moreau had intended to move the brothers from Ruillé to Le Mans, a metropolitan area much more conducive to the growth of a community than was rural Ruillé: the bishop resided in Le Mans as well as the government officials to whom Moreau needed access. Moreover, Moreau was an established and respected citizen in Le Mans. It made perfect sense for him to capitalize on his Le Mans contacts to further the growth of his new community of brothers to whom he intended to attach his little band of auxiliary priests. Moreau would thus leave André at Ruillé to oversee the winding-down of the community headquarters there and where André could be close to his mentor and friend Dujarié.

Moreau eventually did away with the concept of the Four Directors in favor of a government run by a General Council and a Particular Council. As both the brothers and the priests started to grow rapidly in Le Mans, Moreau saw the need for a more complex system of running operations. The system of four Brother Directors may have worked in little Ruillé, but a more representative system was needed at Le Mans. In 1836 Leonard was third in rank on the Particular Council and held the title "Master of the House" at the new school in Le Mans. Early that year he was elected secretary of the General Council and named Director of the Brothers' Society. One year later, however, he left both councils and was sent to teach in Saint-Berthevin. In this same year he received his teaching diploma. On August 19, 1838, he took religious vows in Moreau's Holy Cross Community, but within a year he supposedly began his attempts to separate the brothers from the auxiliary priests. It was a cause to which he would be linked, whether he liked it or not, for most of the rest of his life.

That Leonard enjoyed a good deal of respect from Moreau is obvious when one reads Leonard's letters to Moreau. In fact, Leonard had the same "frankness" (letter to Moreau October 15, 1847) that Moreau valued as a trait in himself. Writing confidentially to Moreau, Leonard could raise sensitive issues about his own removal from office as well as the assignments of various other brothers. Moreau had a tranquillizing effect on Leonard's insistence, possibly because he sensed in Leonard gifts valuable to Holy Cross. Thus Leonard honestly submits to Moreau's judgment: "In all these circumstances [just enumerated] and others I am grateful for, I have never acted against you for purely personal reasons, but only for reasons suitable for religion and the Congregation...I have the highest confidence in you" (letter October 15, 1847). This is not to say, however, that Leonard did not confide in other brothers his concerns about the direction the Community was taking under Moreau's leadership.

In a letter to Brother Hilarion⁴ dated June 17, 1849, Leonard reveals his concerns about keeping the novitiate where it is: he wants it distanced from Le Mans for reasons unspecified other than for "incessant disturbances." Presumably he wanted novices kept away from community intrigue, or he may have wanted the brothers' novitiate separated from the priests' novitiate. He asks Hilarion to communicate these views to Brother Louis Gonzaga but not to tell Louis that they originated with Leonard: "I don't want to be an instigator—I want everyone to have freedom of initiative for the community's needs—I frankly do not want to be behind the others as they write or speak, do not want either to harm nor constrict what may come." Although Leonard here again uses the word "frankly," he is being disingenuous for not being willing to show openly his behind-the-scenes efforts to move action on the relocation of the novitiate: we can learn much about

the man from what he may not think he is doing. Furthermore, Leonard is concerned that he is being watched because a long letter to Brother Pascal four months earlier has not elicited a reply from Pascal: "I suspect it has been intercepted," he tells Hilarion. Intercepted or not, a truly frank person would not let paranoia dissuade him from letting his own name be attached to his efforts and ideas. We do not know where Brother Pascal was stationed in the winter of 1849. If he were at Le Mans, the implication would be that Moreau was canvassing incoming mail, something totally out of character for Moreau. If Pascal were not in Le Mans, the implication is even more devastating—that Leonard's reputation for intrigue was such that others besides the Superior General were interested in preventing Leonard's correspondence from reaching its designated addressee. What we should not overlook, however, are two other eventualities: the letter may have been lost en route (a very slight possibility) or the letter may have been received by Pascal but not answered for whatever reason. The important point for Leonard, of course, is that he suspects it had been intercepted.

By the end of the summer in 1849, Leonard had become such a concern to Moreau that the founder wrote to Bishop Bouvier:

Since Brother Leonard has upset a dozen brothers by saying you approved of their society's being governed by a brother rather than by a priest, I beg you to please tell me if this is really your thinking, because it is important for the future of this institute, especially when I will no longer be around, that no one sow seeds of division which would overwhelm it one day.
(Letter August 19, 1849)

It is significant in this letter that Moreau does not know if Leonard has actually communicated with the bishop. Moreau was not one to impede his subjects from having correspondence with higher authorities. Nor does Moreau ask Bouvier if Leonard has approached the bishop for an opinion. It would be foolish for Moreau to ask anything about a bishop's correspondence or involvement with religious matters. It was none of Moreau's business whom the bishop corresponded with or what the bishop said to correspondents. Moreau is very careful simply to ask Bouvier if he is indeed in favor of a brother directing the brothers' society. Moreau's letter to Bouvier proves how firmly Moreau believed in his system of governance for Holy Cross: after all, by this time he had spent fourteen years creating and refining the rules of governance, and even though his Constitutions were yet six years from papal approbation, they were solidly in place in a Community thriving on two continents.

One month after Moreau's letter to Bouvier, Leonard himself writes from St. Berthevin to the bishop requesting advice on letters that Leonard has received from various brothers. He wants to know if he can simply summarize the contents of the letters for Moreau instead of turning over the letters themselves. He is most intent on preserving the anonymity of the brothers who have written to him presumably in confidence on sensitive matters, possibly the matter of the novitiate location. There is no indication that the letters may have concerned the matter of a brother director for the brothers' society, but since the matter was probably hot at the time, we might presume that the brother director matter was indeed touched upon in the letters in question. As harmless as a separate brother director may seem to us today, it was probably perceived

as the first step, a very important step, on the way to separation of the two societies. Moreau undoubtedly would have seen it in that light.

In May of 1853 Leonard writes again to Bouvier. It is getting close to Bouvier's death (1854) and the approbation of the Holy Cross Constitutions (1857), both events having significant impact on the firming up of governance within Holy Cross. Leonard, in fact, remarks in his first paragraph on the movement in Rome towards approbation. Eighteen brothers and Father Chappé have met at Bouère to discuss confidentially what they might say to Bouvier. Leonard says he could have summarized the meeting to the Apostolic Nuncio but has not for two reasons: the nuncio has recently been changed, and secondly Leonard has great confidence in Bouvier. The telling paragraph follows:

I told Father Moreau confidentially eighteen months ago when he thought about sending me to Rome that in this case, if I were admitted to an audience with the pope or with some Roman prelate, there would be some question about our society—I would speak in all frankness about our congregational weaknesses and thus the necessity to prolong the [Constitutional] experiments. Good grief! He was offended at my frankness and divulged my confidences—to my great surprise. (Letter May 13, 1853)

The significance of this paragraph cannot be underrated. First of all, we learn that Leonard was still held in such high regard that Moreau actually considered using him in Rome as advocate for the approbation of the Constitutions—at least according to Leonard, and we have no reason to doubt his veracity since he is, after all, telling such to the bishop who could easily confirm the information with Moreau. Secondly, we are

confronted with something we rarely see in Moreau—a show of pique, an abrupt loss of face, and most importantly a misreading of one of his closest and most talented brothers. Moreau would never have suggested sending Leonard to Rome if he were not sure that Leonard was of his mind on the importance of getting the Constitutions approved as soon as possible. After all, such approbation would lend not only dignity to the Community but also a kind of permanence that would attract vocations and reassure prelates and pastors that Holy Cross was viable and worthy of trust. But the most significant insight we can take away from this letter is a softening of our century old evaluation of Bouvier in regard to the Holy Cross Constitutions. We have always believed that Bouvier withheld his approval of the document (a politic if not necessary step before they could be passed by Rome) because of some nastiness that existed between the bishop and Moreau, his former assistant at St. Vincent's Seminary, some nastiness that could never be resolved: Bouvier gave excuses for not forwarding the document (e.g., he had misplaced it, he needed another copy). But in reality his motive may very well have been a valid concern that the document was flawed because a number of brothers were dissatisfied with the matter of the brother director. Bouvier would have seen no point in approving a code of governance that might one day explode in Rome's face as indeed it would a century later in 1945.

It is good to soften our appreciation of former nemeses, and just as Bouvier has alternately endeared himself to or distanced himself from various historians as a Gallican bishop, times change and attitudes toward Rome change. So too in Holy Cross our own appreciation of Bishop Bouvier should tilt to favorable where it might once have been negative. Bouvier may very well have had the welfare of the lay brothers very much in

mind as he failed to pass on the Holy Cross Constitutions (right up to his death). After all, he must have had immense respect for a man like André Mottais. Even though André was more in the confidence of Bouvier's predecessor Carron as André helped engineer the transition of the Josephites from Dujarié to Moreau, Bouvier would have known, as rector of the seminary, all of the good work that André was doing in the diocese, at least second hand from Moreau, in the years 1830-1833 when the Ruillé community was falling apart. Then when the novitiate was transferred to Le Mans under Leonard's direction, in the second year of Bouvier's tenure as bishop, Bouvier would have knowledge of Leonard as well as of Vincent Pieau and others. Bouvier was, after all, bishop of lay people as well as of priests. So when one of his prime laymen expressed doubt to him in letters about the need to reconsider the matter of a brother director, Bouvier would have listened, not to block the heady success of his previous assistant Moreau, but simply out of a valid concern that Holy Cross laymen be afforded justice as they saw it.

After Bouvier's death on December 29, 1854, it was not long before his successor Jean Jacques Nanquette became involved in the matter of Brother Leonard. By the summer following Bouvier's death, Victor Drouelle, the first Holy Cross Procurator General, wrote to the Sacred Congregation requesting that the original character of the Congregation uniting priests and brothers be preserved as a distinct characteristic of Moreau's vision. Drouelle grounds his argument in a little known fact: Father Dujarié had actually attracted three or four auxiliary priests to his little community at Ruillé, and one of them was still living at Holy Cross in Le Mans (Drouelle letter 1855). So intent was Moreau on saving the Josephites that he had "radically" reformed Dujarié's group with

the result that “within a very few years few of the first brothers were to be found” (Drouelle letter 1855). Drouelle does not refine “few,” but a solid core of the early brothers actually did remain after the transfer to Moreau including three of the four brother directors. Drouelle asserts to Rome that the brothers benefit most materially from the linkage to Holy Cross priests because if the two societies were separated, eight-tenths of the Community property would be held by the priests. Presumably the buildings in Le Mans were the bulk of this “eight-tenths” because the schools that the brothers ran in various little town were parish owned.

Father Drouelle’s sentiments in Rome were undoubtedly known to Leonard, even though Drouelle was living far from Le Mans. In any case, by December of that year Leonard was formally warned of his dangerous attitudes:

His Reverence [Moreau] expresses the strongest discontent with the conduct of Brother Leonard who, as proven in one of his own letters, persists in a bad spirit; and in particular by not stopping his correspondence with other brothers, in spite of his being forbidden by his Reverence, showing sentiments contrary to the union of the societies forming the Congregation, vowing to have sent to the bishop copies of letters unfavorable to the establishment; having notoriously encouraged his confreres (in a letter to Brother Zachary) to govern themselves...as a result of these grievances, which his Reverence declares authorized [by Leonard], he [Moreau] commands this brother to communicate in the future with anyone, either in writing or vocally, under pain of removal from the Congregation. (Document December 19, 1855)

Thus Leonard has been put on notice officially that he is treading on dangerous and seditious grounds. The warning, apparently, was not enough to keep Leonard from pursuing his conscience. The next month from Vendôme he writes to Bishop Nanquette, and two brothers sign the letter: one brother, Leonard explains, has been with the Josephites for thirty years, the other for twenty. Leonard, having been with the group since 1825, would be the former, and the latter is Narcissus, who entered Holy Cross in 1835.⁵ Noting that both men consider their Community under the bishop's authority, Leonard wants to bring several matters to Nanquette's attention. Leonard has already consulted several priests in the diocese. His discontent, apparently, was no secret. In sketching for Nanquette the early history of the Josephites, Leonard says that two brothers, one now in America (this would be Vincent Pieau) and the other dead (probably André Mottais⁶) wanted to move the headquarters from Ruillé to Le Mans because there was no real formation program in place and not even a set of rules to follow. Leonard makes no mention of Moreau's hand in the move (letter to Nanquette January 10, 1856). This is an odd omission since history has always understood the Josephites were transferred to Le Mans at Moreau's insistence. It was, in fact, one of his conditions for assuming direction of the group. This is not, apparently, Leonard's recollection: Moreau becomes a bystander to the saving of Dujarié's religious group. Leonard is anxious to share with Nanquette a summary of letters written seven years ago by six brothers but cannot show the bishop the originals because Moreau has destroyed them. The gist of their complaints is that the new rules are a hodge-podge of prescriptions, many of which go unfulfilled. Thus the community is at the edge of a "menacing abyss" from which only the bishop can save them. There is no mention in this letter of separating the two

societies. It may very well be that Leonard, under threat of dismissal for any discussion of that question, has chosen to try a different tactic with the bishop, hoping possibly that once the ordinary got involved with the question of rules, the matter of separation could surface naturally. Perhaps, but one would never know from this letter that Leonard is at the heart of the separatist movement. He never mentions it here as a desired goal.

Two weeks later Leonard again writes to Nanquette, this time without Narcissus as a co-signer. The letter is sensitive as it contains gossip that Leonard passes along purportedly from Father Chappé and another unnamed priest (whose name Leonard promises to give the bishop if the bishop thinks it necessary). The latter informant supposedly said to Cardinal Barnabo: "What good is founding a group of priests when there are already so many such groups? And why found a group of Sisters when they are springing up all over and the group Dujarié founded is prospering?" (letter January 28, 1856) Leonard clearly thinks he has the good will of the bishop. But such wishful thinking gets Leonard nowhere. It was not likely that Nanquette would keep such discontent secret from Moreau, a man close at the bishop's hand in Le Mans. Nanquette did not have the strong hand Bouvier had, nor did he have any reason to trust a religious complaining about a superior. Nanquette was a peacemaker (Catta, *Moreau* II 171) and would have let any community organized under his predecessor handle its own internal dissent. Moreau was, after all, well known around the diocese as a successful administrator, spiritual advisor, and founder of several religious communities. No matter how many years Leonard had in religious life before Moreau, the brother would never have the cachet of the priest-founder.

More telling than any correspondence with a bishop is Narcissus' letter to Leonard dated 1856 (tentatively so dated on the basis of its contents). Very rarely does correspondence between Holy Cross brothers survive the early years. Most of their correspondence to superiors was, of course, archived but letters between themselves were generally read and discarded. Narcissus's letter to Leonard bears citing in full:

It seems that the good priests do not like Brother Edward.⁷ They want a priest superior for the Brothers' novitiate, the goal of these good priests being to let disintegrate all the little establishments the brothers have, keeping only the strong establishments, and having priests as superiors. This would be for them a good way to annihilate the brothers' authority: most of the brothers would have consented without thinking they were destroying themselves. Father Dujarié's goal was to form teachers for the countryside. If we never forsake that goal, the brothers will flourish. I am only a poor, ignorant person, but I have always foreseen that things would happen as they are today. You are the only one who has shown courage and steadfastness. (Letter 1856)

Narcissus is not the most intelligent of letters writers (he pretty much ignores punctuation), but he does voice his passionate concern with some vivacity. It was probably to Narcissus's bad fortune that Leonard did not destroy this letter as it eventually found its way to the archives suggesting that Moreau did get it, probably as a result of Leonard's determination to prove that Leonard was not alone in his concern for the direction that authority was taking in the Community under Moreau.

The archived letters of 1855 and 1856 end one chapter in the life of Brother Leonard. Although he continued to write, letters in the following decade are business letters. We can presume, therefore, that somehow Moreau came to grips with Leonard and was able to convince him that the major superiorships would best remain in the hands of Holy Cross priests. At any rate, Leonard did not leave Holy Cross and was not dismissed. But all fire was not extinguished in the breast of Brother Leonard. By the summer of 1866 Father Moreau was replaced as superior general and Leonard would soon have a new nemesis to face.

Edward Sorin was elected Superior General of the Congregation on July 15, 1868, in a chapter which mercifully included the Father Founder, who had been refused attendance at the 1866 General Chapter where he was denounced, without benefit of formal hearing, for the financial woes of Holy Cross and where Pierre Dufal was elected Superior General. Dufal lasted less than two years before he realized he could not shoulder the crises of the Congregation, including the in-fighting among its members, but his resignation, he should have realized, only added another crisis to the pile. While the Congregation wrestled with its problems in the spring of 1868, Brother Leonard began again his efforts to save the brothers. Unwilling to let the Dufal dust settle, he may have seen the time as opportune to make a move calculated to revert the brothers to their structure as envisioned by Jacques Dujarié. By May of 1868 the General Council became aware of machinations Leonard had begun at Easter time. The minutes of the May 8, 1868, General Council meeting indicate that the matter of Brother Leonard needed serious and quick attention:

Reading is given of Brother Leonard's letter dated April 29 in which he pretends that he and those who signed a piece addressed to the Eminent Prefect of Propaganda [Cardinal Barnabo] did not ask formally for the separation of the two Societies because, he says, "we recognize that we can't nor ought to ask Rome to demolish what it built in 1857, otherwise it would be audaciously foolhardy on our part." But it is not less true that the goal of this step and the sole interpretation to which it is susceptible is to bring about this separation, as is evident from the tenor of the letter and notably its citing the Christian Brothers at Nancy, those at St. Gabriel, St. Lawrence in Vendée, and the Little Brothers of Mary who originally were associated with priests and had gotten a separation to their advantage. This letter, drafted by Brother Leonard, steward at the Flers foundation, dated Holy Saturday, April 10, peddled around Mayenne during Easter week, where it gathered eighteen signatures, was brought to Father Chappé's attention by April 16, but only then through a copy. The author hedged from addressing it to His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda. After reading this copy, Father Chappé made some remarks to Brother Leonard who declared himself enlightened and promised not to send the Cardinal the letter in question, adding that Bishop Fillion [of Le Mans], who had been privy to it, had also counseled him not to send it saying that this letter would be in direct contradiction to what he [Fillion] had himself written to Rome about the Congregation.

In spite of Brother Leonard's promise, he has not stopped following his plan as is plain from the following passage in his April 29 letter: "Would you let me add, Reverend Father, that our request has twenty-four signatures and would have sixty more if we were permitted to present it to Propaganda as we asked." Despite long years and many retreats, this brother followed up by sowing among his brothers the deadly idea to separate the brothers from the priests, and in 1855 had proposed the break between the two societies to such a point that the General Council after being made aware of it, found themselves obliged to threaten expulsion from the Congregation if he did not desist.

Today the General Council regrets bitterly seeing one of the oldest members of the Holy Cross family working so assiduously and secretly for the institution's destruction at a moment when the Congregation is passing through a crisis which asks urgently for the most heroic and most selfless devotion from its family members in order to save it. The Council senses so vividly the danger of steps similar to Brother Leonard's, and those of his followers, that the Council believes it has to make known to the said Brother the Council's decision dated December 19, 1855, at the same time that the decision reached by the Council, which neither the old age nor the remembrance of a long devoted life can swerve from a just punishment of he who makes a criminal attempt at the life of the Congregation, the saving of which has to be the goal of all its members during this crisis through which we are passing.

Father [Pierre] Chappé

Father Dillion

Brother Gregory [Henry Leroy]

Brother Bernard [Adolphe-Jean Legras]

Although the council does not indicate what exactly it would do to punish Leonard, they are unanimous in their will that he stop his campaign as they perceived it. Father Moreau's vision for Holy Cross remained for the majority of its members the desired structure of their religious institute, and since at the time there were over five hundred priests, brothers, and sisters serving in ninety-three houses in three different countries (*Catta Moreau* II 772), one can assume that the separatists were a minority: only eighteen signatures appear on Leonard's circulating document. Curiously, the minutes are not signed by Dufal, the Superior General.

It is too easy to fault Leonard at this juncture in Holy Cross if we were to condemn him for taking advantage of chaos in the Community in order to further his agenda. After all, he was witnessing Moreau's public disgrace at the hands of men far less talented or saintly than the Father Founder. We have no indication that Leonard sided with Moreau's opponents, and given the Founder's care for Leonard, we can presume that Leonard acted in 1868 not to further distress Moreau, but simply to act on what he saw as the imminent demise of Holy Cross due to internal factions. To salvage the originating vision of Jacques Dujarié and the fundamental work of Brother André Mottais, Leonard may have had to pursue "separation" in order to divide the brothers from rancorous priests who were chaffing under Moreau's reprimands for what Cleary has identified as "administrative irresponsibility" (18). As much is said in a letter dated

June, 1868, sent from the Josephite Capitulants to Dufal just as the General Chapter convened in Rome: "Brothers Leonard and John-Baptist here present, signers of the petition [sent to Barnabo], have declared they have no other goal than to insure the existence of the Brothers' Society in case the Congregation dissolves."⁸ The capitulants are concerned that brother directors of houses have written to Brother Gregory, a member of the General Council, expressing their wish to keep the Community united. But the brother capitulants acknowledge that the circular letter informing the Community of Dufal's resignation threw everyone into a panic as far as the future of the Congregation was concerned. Leonard and John-Baptist have both declared that their petition to Barnabo was not meant to separate the two societies. The brother capitulants, however, are concerned that the "germs" of division are fermenting not just among many of the brothers but also among the priests. After listening to the dissatisfied, the brother capitulants list the causes they have identified for the unrest. First of all, some of the priests consider themselves superior to the brothers. Secondly, some priests have little regard for the brothers. Thirdly, some priests have not shown good example to the brothers in matters of poverty and obedience. Fourthly, some priests have attracted gifted recruits away from the brothers. Fifthly, some priests have made excessive demands on brothers. Sixthly, there is a certain antipathy evident among some priests for the manual-labor brothers. In order to address the growing problems, the brother capitulants propose a novel solution: reunite the two novitiates into one novitiate under the direction of a Jesuit who would be assisted by a Holy Cross priest for the Salvatorist novices and by a Holy Cross brother for the Josephite novices. Finally, the brother capitulants suggest that the phrase "of two distinct societies" be erased in the Constitutions from the sentence

“The Congregation of Holy Cross is composed of two distinct societies.” The brothers do not suggest replacement wording for the sentence.

It is easy to read in this letter the hand of Brother Leonard or at least his spirit at work. Although the letter is not signed (at least not in the typescript that remains for us) and purports to be written in the name of the brother capitulants, near the end of the document the phrase “je puis ainsi parler” clearly indicates a single author. If that author were Brother Leonard, we have to conclude that his threats of separation, if there actually were any, were used to get the priests and brothers to recognize the serious problems that were arising, and are bound to arise, in an organization that defines itself on the basis of cleric and lay.

The amazing document generated by Brother Leonard and dated June 8, 1868, was addressed to Cardinal Barnabo in Rome prior to the opening of the General Chapter summoned to replace Bishop Dufal as Superior General of Holy Cross. The dating of the document is actually the dating of a copy made by Bishop Dufal, probably for use at the General Chapter. In order to accumulate the number of signatures it did accumulate, the letter would have to date back to at least May or even April, that is, soon after the resignation of Dufal sent the Community into a tail spin. Dufal himself attributes it to Easter week. The document originated at Flers where it was signed by three men: Brothers John-Baptist, Leonard, and Leontien. Thence it went to Oisseau where it was signed by Brothers Macaire, Ariste, Elisée, Eulade, Moses, Germain, and Raphael. At Bouère, Brother Francis Xavier signed it. At Gennes, Brother Zachary. At Ernée, Brother Valery. At Bourgneuf, Brothers Sixtus and Basilide. At Anjou, Brothers Adolphe, Frederick, Sosthènes, Julian, and Vincent de Paul. At Rosnes, Brothers

Octavius, Claude, Ives, and Matthew. After establishing the credentials of the signers, some of whom, they declare, have been with the brothers for thirty-five and forty-two years, the writers get to the heart of their grievance: the Holy Cross priests are “suffocating” the brothers, but a problem with separating from the priests, they aver, would be the matter of debt liquidation. Finally Leonard (and John-Baptist and Leontian) are mortally afraid that the demotion of two Superiors General (Moreau and Dufal) within six years is going to demoralize the Congregation into extinction. There is no overt request to Barnabo for separation of the two societies, but obviously the brothers are less concerned about the future welfare of the priests than they are about the future of the brothers. They cite, after all, several examples of brothers’ communities who have thrived without connection to priests. But that said, there is no rabid posturing over division of the two societies, only the wish, as the letter concludes, that the signers “can sincerely continue the association of the Brothers of St. Joseph if the Congregation of Holy Cross cannot subsist.”

Rather than think of Brother Leonard as a separatist, that is someone who wanted to fracture Holy Cross, one should think of him as someone who wanted to save the Josephites should the Congregation crumble. The documents of 1868 make this point clear. One cannot read, of course, Leonard’s heart, but the documents come as close to his heart as anything we can get. Once Edward Sorin was established as leader of Holy Cross, however, Leonard was up against a more formidable superior than any he had met to date. He knew Sorin well, of course, but since the priest had been in America for twenty-seven years, Leonard’s recollection of the young Edward Sorin would have had to have been radically altered after the priest’s heady success first in Indiana and then at the

Rome General Chapter of 1868. At the end of the year 1868 Leonard writes kindly to Sorin, but the issue of the brothers' grievances is not dead. We do not hear of those grievances, however, from Leonard. It is Brother Leon, writing from Dampierre, who tells Sorin on December 31, 1868, that he (Leon) is convinced the Community is so sick it will collapse sooner or later.⁹ Leon is convinced that Holy Cross, the sole French religious community formed of lay and cleric members, is inherently unviable. He rues the day that the Brothers of St. Joseph, without being consulted (his words), had their purpose changed. He claims, moreover, that such is the sentiment of the majority of brothers, offering, however, no proof.

Leonard himself, in fact, was quite reconciled to the state of the Congregation in the years following the 1868 Chapter as he asserts to Sorin in a letter dated August 20, 1870: "I can affirm in good conscience that I have said to no one since our chapter in Rome that I desire and ask for the separation of the brothers from the priests." He goes on to say that it was the desertion of Holy Cross priests in 1867 and 1868 as well as Dufal's resignation that prompted him to petition Cardinal Barnabo to save the brothers as a unit in case Holy Cross were to fold. We have no reason to doubt the sincerity of Leonard's remarks. That he would be working secretly behind the scenes while telling his Superior General the contrary would be unthinkable for a religious of Leonard's age and prestige. In a strongly worded letter to Sorin the following May, Leonard regrets Sorin's extended absence from France and the fact that they have not heard from him in eight months. Various matters, some scandalous, need immediate attention and Leonard does not spare on details, but the General Council, he avers, is nonfunctional: two of its members, in fact, cannot get out of Paris because of political unrest there. Moreover,

Leonard does not like the rumor that Sorin wants to pull all Holy Cross members out of France and bring them to America: France, Leonard maintains, is the birthplace of the Congregation and needs its presence now more than ever.

Leonard may have overplayed his hand, and unfortunately the ax was soon to fall. In the minutes of the August 15, 1871, General Council meeting, drastic action was taken on the grand old man of Holy Cross:

For many years Brother Leonard, scorning infractions of his vows, his oaths, his promises to repent, his repeated promises constantly broken, has worked to sow discord among his brothers and has become the instrument of the devil, regarding the Constitutions, in order to trap them in a kind of coalition having for its purpose the separation of what God has united by the authority of his Vicar on earth. Nothing would correct him, neither multiple public humiliations nor threats from superiors, nor his protests to Rome during the Chapter, especially to Cardinal Barnabo; his vows today and his new protests not assuring the administration nor sufficiently repairing the scandal given, the General Council, after reading the last deliberation of the Provincial Chapter, decides:

- 1) that Brother Leonard, so often relapsed from amending, no longer merits the Congregation's confidence
- 2) that he will be deprived of all honor and any voice in the chapter
- 3) that he will be publicly stripped of his professed insignia, that is the statue of St. Joseph and the blessed cord
- 4) that he will always be placed after the last professed person

- 5) that he can correspond with no member of the Congregation, except his superiors, until he has given sufficient proof of conversion
- 6) that he will accept the obedience to be given to him, or better yet, if he wishes, he will receive permission to leave the Congregation.

These are unbelievably harsh pronouncements on the head of one of the oldest members of Holy Cross. Leonard, after all, entered the Brothers of St. Joseph in 1825, just five years after their foundation, and he had risen to the highest positions possible for a brother in Moreau's Community. But this was no longer Moreau's Community. It was Sorin's, and the harsh hand of Sorin is evident in Leonard's public fall from grace.

What had happened to the cordial sentiments that had been proffered by Leonard to Sorin since 1868? Were they all a façade under which hid a snake ready to strike? The facts do not support such a conclusion. Leonard was no doubt as shocked by the Council's decrees as we are today. Moreau himself commiserated in January, 1872, that Leonard had not been afforded due process (*Catta Moreau* II 1013). What seems to emerge from the Council minutes is a picture of a hasty trial and judgment meted under the hand of Sorin, who was present at the meeting. Sorin, divided between his first love (Indiana) and his job as Superior General, had adopted a new homeland and had even, according to rumor, thought about closing down all Holy Cross operations in France. Leonard represented to him the strongest of the old, entrenched French guard. To get him out of the way would afford Sorin greater leverage for his autocratic methods, which worked handily in the Indiana frontier on his fiefdom but would not wash without draconian displays of power in France. Who would confront Sorin when so many considered him the only man capable of saving the Community during its crisis? There is

no paper trail of any machinations sown by Leonard to pull the brothers away from the priests. Sorin and his puppet council were probably acting on paranoia and rumors. Their actions were unjust and, quite probably, uncanonical (for lack of due process). In the words of Father Moreau: “Poor Leonard submitted when on retreat to treatment he did not merit, and which he ought to report to Bishop Simeoni: he [Leonard] is professed and has the right to a canonical trial before being so humiliated and degraded. Even the servants at the Précigné seminary spoke about it—that he was going to appeal to Bishop Fillion as a Superior and separation from the Salvatorists” (letter January 2, 1872). Moreau, of course, was a veteran pastor, and Sorin was an off-shore administrator divided between continents. It did not help Leonard, of course, that at this time his confidential communications to Bishop Fillion were being betrayed to Sorin. Bishops, for one reason or another, feel it their prerogative to toss religious and their confidential correspondence back to major superiors whether as a way of lessening their own episcopal burden or as a way of letting religious communities handle their own affairs. Sometimes the very correspondence from the religious is sent to major superiors. Fillion, either out of a wish to not get involved or out of respect for Sorin’s authority, tossed Leonard into the Frenchman-turned-American’s claws. The result was calamitous for Leonard who, at age seventy and with fifty years of service to the Community, deserved better treatment than he got from Sorin.

Sorin, of course, was not new to public humiliation of subjects. His cavalier treatment of old Brother Vincent Pieau is narrated in Costin (78): Sorin told Vincent to drink wine in front of a visitor knowing that wine made Vincent ill, then stopped the old man just short of sipping and told him to leave the room. Sorin wanted to prove the old

man's absolute sense of obedience. It was a cruel gesture. Sorin's ways were imperious and contrast totally with Moreau's concern for his subjects' dignity, but Costin has written more kindly of Sorin that "like God, Father Sorin seems to have made a point of testing his favorites occasionally" (132). At St. Mary's Sorin publicly humiliated Sister Heart of Jesus for traveling to Detroit to visit a doctor without permission—at a time when he himself was hobnobbing hither and yon at will.

When we were all assembled...Father Superior present...Mother Superior brought Sister Mary [of the Heart of Jesus] into the chapel dressed in secular dress. She knelt on the floor, made her accusation, and asked pardon of us all. Reverend Father Superior said she deserved to be sent away, but as she begged to be kept, they would excuse her. The novices present, who love her, cried aloud to see her dressed like a Lady. (Nowlan I, 28 in Costin 26)

Sorin the aristocrat tried to establish himself as an icon, whereas Moreau the farmer never tried to further himself at the expense of others. The one Nero, the other Claudius. How many places did Moreau name after himself or his patron saint? How many did Sorin?

There is no evidence that Leonard attempted to defend himself after the 1871 summer retreat where he was demoted and disgraced. Unlike Moreau, who fought vigorously after the 1864 and 1866 chapters to salvage his good name, Leonard did nothing but accept his punishments. Does this indicate he was guilty? Not necessarily. Having seen the slanders leveled at the Father Founder year after year not only by Sorin, Champeau, and Drouelle, but also by the rank and file men of Holy Cross who deserted Moreau, Leonard may have been traumatized enough by Sorin to simply give up and try

to live with whatever simple dignity he could muster for the remaining years of his life. He would still have sixteen years in Holy Cross before his death. Sorin, of course, was not content to leave Leonard anywhere near the center of the French community where the brother could refresh his stained reputation. Sorin not only took away Leonard's religious insignia, he also took away his career. After decades of teaching, Leonard was sent as a cook to the boondocks where he was to prepare meals for a single brother, a young one at that (Guittoger folder 1877 XII-12) under, let us remember, the injunction to correspond with no one besides his superiors. Was Sorin so threatened by a brother that he had to have the man isolated? Apparently so, and yet there is no evidence that Leonard ever intended to work to separate the brothers from the priests—his goal was to make sure only that the brothers would endure as a unit if the Congregation folded. His fault, if any, was a lack of concern for the fate of those priests who had joined Holy Cross in good faith and zeal.

Leonard's next extant letter is dated October 12, 1875. It is feast day greetings to Sorin sent from the brothers at Soligny and the "penitential group" at La Grande Trappe: "May your august patron St. Edward, who undoubtedly enjoys heavenly rewards in proportion to earthly merit, be your powerful protector to fortify you in the virtues you practice and obtain for you grace to succeed in important works and in the good governance of your numerous children in Jesus Christ." The letter is signed by Leonard and four others. Two of the signatures are illegible and one signature is followed by "J.S.C." (Josephite of Holy Cross). Leonard is living out his days in peace and without rancor. By 1876 the interdiction on correspondence has apparently been lifted as Leonard sends a short letter to Vincent Pieau thanking his American confrere for a recent

letter. Leonard is quite sick. He praises the day of his Baptism (July 14, 1802) and expresses happiness at recent events in the Congregation. He then turns to his own troubled past:

I sincerely desire that whatever had been attributed to me as oppositional to the submission which I expressed at the 1868 Rome chapter may be forgotten. I forget and pardon the wrongs done by those who brought me the precious crosses that ensued. I wholeheartedly pardon and ask the same pardon for whatever, promising and assuring that no one will get either a spoken word or a written word from me about the past, every trace of which is erased according to the wish of the Superior General.

These words of reconciliation and resignation come from a man on a sick bed, a man who has accepted his fate and does not nourish resentment. It takes an extraordinary character to step aside from positions of power and let others work as best they know how. And why was Leonard ordered to expunge any trace of his side of the story? Someone tried to fudge history. But Leonard evidently found peace in his solitude and isolation with the Trappists at the very monastery where Moreau, at the grotto across the lake, first conceived a plan for his new Congregation and where Moreau brought his little band of Salvatorists by foot for their first retreat.

A year and a half later Leonard writes to Brother Gregory (Henry) Leroy, in response to a request for remembrances of Jacques Dujarié. Leonard replies that he has but one handwritten letter by Dujarié, a circular from 1834, with lines intercalated by Brother André Mottais: Leonard cherishes it as a souvenir of the two deceased founders. Leonard's handwriting, for a man of seventy-five years is steady and quite beautiful.

Was Leonard forgotten by his Community? No. In an anonymous history of the brothers of St. Joseph, dated 1877 and filed with Leonard's papers in the Holy Cross General Archives, note is taken that Leonard was publicly humiliated for supposedly advocating in 1868 a separation of the brothers and priests, but when Salvatorists advocated such a separation at the 1872 General Chapter in America, no one considered their actions criminal. The anonymous author adds that Cardinal Barnabo himself had said to a brother capitulant in 1868: "This union is not wise—if the plan of the first founder had been followed, you would today have expanded all over the place." Priest-less communities of brothers, the author notes, have thrived: the La Mennais Brothers have grown from 1200 to 1500, the St. Lawrence Brothers from 900 to 1000, the Marist Brothers from 2000 to 3000, while the Brothers of St. Joseph have only 150 men in France. Although one would be tempted to attribute this document to Leonard, enough evidence points to another hand.¹⁰ What we must recognize is that a half dozen years after Leonard's demotion, received opinion was still that Leonard did work to separate the brothers from the priests. The paper trail, of course, does not support that conclusion, but he apparently remained a hero to separatist brothers.

The truth is we have precious little from Brother Leonard after his downfall: four letters in sixteen years. He lived a quiet life until his death on June 9, 1877, which was announced to Sorin in a letter dated four days later and written by the French provincial Father Hippolyte Lecointe, who writes from Angers but a short paragraph on the passing of the long-lived Leonard:

The last news you receive from France tells you of the death of the good Brother Leonard. Almost at the moment when God called him to account

for the 85 years given him, he warned me that soon I would have to answer for my own life and administration.

We are given no details of his death at Meslay, the single consolation being that the provincial afforded him the sobriquet “good brother,” which is often more formulaic than thoughtful when applied to a brother. We do not know what Sorin’s response was to the news. We can only hope he repented the shameful treatment he accorded one of the most important of the early Brothers of St. Joseph.

We are left with the question: was Leonard a prophet or a fool? Did his warnings about the growing inequalities of the two Holy Cross societies of men presage the grief of 1945? Or was he simply a disgruntled reactionary? The answer, I think, is that he was a prophetic fool—for the sake of Christ. St. Paul could ask for no more.

Notes

- 1 Terrehaut was originally "Terrehault" but assumed its present name at the time of the Revolution.
- 2 Brother Leonard Guittoger is listed as #106 in the General Matricule of the Congregation of Holy Cross. As with most of the early brothers, we have no photograph of Leonard. It is not surprising, given the naissance of the art and the attitude of Moreau, for whom we have but one photo because, as he said, the only photo he would allow would be the one taken "after my death" (Charles Moreau II, 53). It is time to set the story straight about the one Moreau photograph we do have. Years ago at the Le Mans Holy Cross Institute, members were told a story that the severity of that Moreau photo was due not to Moreau's actual visage, but rather was due to the circumstances under which the photo was taken. Community members tricked Moreau into posing for a group shot with two other religious who suddenly bolted out of the way as the photographer took the picture. Their act so startled Moreau that he grimaced. The story is, unfortunately, apocryphal and has been handed down simply to mitigate the harshness of Moreau's only photographic reproduction. Charles Moreau tells a quite different story:

In his second visit Father Moigne was accompanied by Jules Dubosc, physician and expert photographer from Paris, who obtained the privilege up to then impossible of leaving to the Institute Father Founder's portrait. Several times supplications and all manner of influence had been tried in vain. Basil was inflexible on that point, as inflexible as the Superior

General of the Sulpicians, of whom a portrait may not be taken before his death. When anyone spoke to Father Moreau of his portrait, he always gave the same permission, "after my death." In vain he was told that he need never see it, that it would be given only to the Missionaries of the Institute, leaving for foreign countries. Nevertheless, the presence of the photographer who had succeeded in taking several views of the Establishment and of several groups of pupils, furnished an occasion for a new attempt. Father Founder's friend, the Count de Ch— who had his two sons at Holy Cross College, knew of this ardent desire of the Community, which he himself shared. The day of the distribution of prizes, after the departure of the pupils, the Count happened to be with a group of ecclesiastics who took recreation with Basil, and who begged him to have his photograph taken in front of the group. Seeing that they were getting nowhere, the Count himself went to Basil, knelt at his feet, and arose only after having won. The artist awaited but the sign, succeeded to his satisfaction, and from the group picture later made a photograph of Father Moreau alone. (53)

And so is laid to rest another bit of Community folklore.

- 3 Brother Henri-Michel Taupin eventually became the black sheep of the four Brother Directors. Although he signed the Pact of Fidelity in September, 1831, by August of 1834 he had become such a scandal in the community that Brother André Mottais complains about him in a letter (August 18, 1834) to Bishop Bouvier. Henri-Michel left the brothers in October of that same year. We know

little about him and have no letters by him or to him. Brother Vincent Pieau, the Fourth Director, went on to become a kingpin in the Indiana colony. The oldest to emigrate there in 1841, he died, a much revered member of the American community, at Notre Dame, 93 years of age, in 1890.

- 4 Brother Hilaron (Louis) Ferton was the son of Louis Ferton and Agnes Baguette. He was born February 24, 1817, at Boulogne and entered Holy Cross on May 20, 1837. He became a novice August 30, 1837, and was professed August 22, 1841. He was sent to Oran, Algeria, in August, 1844, and died there October 15, 1849. The June 17, 1849, letter may not have been written to Hilarion. Its recipient is conjectural. All letters, unless otherwise noted, are found in the Holy Cross General Archives at Notre Dame, Indiana. They are quoted here by permission of the Notre Dame Archives.
- 5 Brother Narcissus (Jean-François) Hulot was born October 3, 1817, at Pezé le Robert. He entered Holy Cross in December, 1835, and became a novice in February, 1836. He received a teaching certificate in 1844. He did not profess vows until August 15, 1872. He died December 29, 1887, in Angers.
- 6 Leonard gets the year of André's death incorrect. André died in 1844, not 1838.
- 7 Brother Edward (Celestine) Raymond (#598 in the General Matricule), the son of Bertrand Raymond and Jeanne-Marie Dedieu, was born September 4, 1827, at Foix. He came to Holy Cross in August, 1845, was a novice the following summer (1846), and received his teaching certificate in 1850. He professed vows in 1854 and died January 8, 1871, at La Faye.

8 Three 1868 typescripts in the Holy Cross General Archives at Notre Dame are important to Brother Leonard but are problematic. The original letters no longer exist, a situation that could cause some alarm to researchers of the period. The first typescript is dated only June, 1868, and is addressed to "Monseigneur." Someone has written "Dufal" in parenthesis after "Monseigneur." The document is five pages long and has several typed-in corrections.

The second typescript is only three pages long and comes from the lost original that also generated the first typescript. Someone has written in this second document in the top right margin "Petition des Frères [au] Card. Barnabo." It seems to be an earlier typescript of the first document because the errors corrected in the first document are not corrected in the second. Possibly an early archivist (Vanier?) began a typescript (document #2) of the original document, set it aside, came back to the project at a later date, began a new typescript (document #1), completed the typescript, found the earlier one and decided to file both. For practical purposes, it is best to ignore document #2, the incomplete earlier transcript, and rely solely on document #1, the complete transcript of the lost original. A crucial point, of course, is the identification of "Monseigneur." Was the letter addressed to Bishop Dufal or to Cardinal Barnabo? The first paragraph of the document indicates that the document was indeed addressed to Dufal: "On the invitation of Your Excellency [Dufal] the Josephite capitulants [of the General Chapter] came together to know the true sense and purpose of the petition which was just addressed by your intervention to His Eminence Cardinal Barnabo."

The third typescript is dated June 8, 1868, and also has a handwritten note that the original no longer exists in the General Archives. This document is clearly directed to Cardinal Barnabo.

- 9 Brother Leon (Norbert-August) Cotin was born March 16, 1819, in Sérigny. He entered at Le Mans July 9, 1838, and received his teaching license May 11, 1843. He did not profess until August 12, 1888, and died January 21, 1894, at Angers.
- 10 At the end of this remarkable document is a note by the copyist that the document is a faithful copy of a report given to the bishop of Laval. The original is in the handwriting of Brother Basil (Michael) Gary, but the main ideas are those of Brother Vital, a capitulant at both the 1868 General Chapter and the 1872. Obviously Vital had considerable compassion for Leonard, although he does not name Leonard directly. Someone opines, probably Brother Basil, at one point that the old maligned brother in question was Leonard.

Works Cited

- Catta, Etienne and Tony Catta. *Basil Anthony Mary Moreau*. Trans. Edward Heston, C.S.C. 2 vols. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1955.
- Catta, Tony. *Father Dujarie*. Trans. Edward L. Heston, CSC. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960.
- Cleary, Hugh, C.S.C. "A Year of Rejoicing and Spiritual Renewal." Rome: Via Framura 85, 2006.
- Gervais, Bernard, C.S.C. *General Matricule*. Notre Dame: Midwest Province Archives, n.d.
- Costin, Sister M. Georgia, C.S.C. *Priceless Spirit: A History of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, 1841-1893*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Klawitter, George, C.S.C. "Chronicle of the Brothers of Saint Joseph." Notre Dame: Midwest Province Archives, 2002.
- Mérianne, Rémi, C.S.C. *Recueil Documentaire*. Notre Dame: Holy Cross Archives.
- Moreau, Charles. *The Very Reverend Father Basil Anthony Mary Moreau, Priest of Le Mans and His Works*. Trans: anon. 2 vols. Paris: Firmin didot et cie, 1900.
- Nowlan, Sister M. Emerentiana, C.S.C. Unpublished Chronicles. 2 vols. Notre Dame: St. Mary's Archives, n.d.
- Smith, Charles Edward, C.S.C. *Documentation for Preserving the Memory of Canon James François Dujarie*. Private printing: 2003.

Brother George Klawitter, CSC

St. Edward's University, 2007