STUDIES

IN
THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

"Our American Champions"

The First American Generation of American Jesuit Leaders after the Restoration of the Society

ANTHONY J. KUZNIEWSKI, S.J.

46/1 • SPRING 2014

THE SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

The Seminar is composed of a number of Jesuits appointed from their provinces in the United States.

The Seminar studies topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and gathers current scholarly studies pertaining to the history and ministries of Jesuits throughout the world. It then disseminates the results through this journal.

The issues treated may be common also to Jesuits of other regions, other priests, religious, and laity. Hence, the studies, while meant especially for American Jesuits, are not exclusively for them. Others who may find them helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR

Shay Auerbach, S.J., is pastor of Sacred Heart Parish, Richmond, Va. (2011)

Richard A. Blake, S.J., is chair of the Seminar and editor of STUDIES; he teaches film studies at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (2002)

Kevin Cullen, S.J., is treasurer and assistant for higher education for the Missouri Province, St. Louis, Mo. (2013)

Barton T. Geger, S.J., is Director of Ignatian Programming and rector of the community at Regis University, Denver, Col. (2013)

Gregory A. Kalscheur, S.J., teaches law and is associate dean in the College of Arts and Sciences at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (2012)

Gasper F. LoBiondo, S.J., is Promoter of Ignatian Identity and superior of the community at Gonzaga High School, Washington, D.C. (2013)

William O'Neill, S.J., teaches social ethics at the Jesuit School of Theology, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, Cal. (2012)

Robert E. Scully, S.J., teaches history and law at LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N.Y. (2011)

Gilbert Sunghera, S.J., teaches architecture at the University of Detroit-Mercy, Detroit, Mich. (2011)

The opinions expressed in STUDIES are those of the individual authors. Parentheses designate year of entry as a Seminar member.

ISSN 1084-0813

"Our American Champions"

The First Generation of American Jesuit Leaders after the Restoration of the Society

ANTHONY J. KUZNIEWSKI, S.J.

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

46/1 • SPRING 2014

the first word . . .

The opening paragraphs in a review in the *New York Review of Books* (12/19) piqued my curiosity. Lucky for me. The subject matter was Julian Barnes's latest book, *Levels of Life.* The reviewer, novelist Cathleen Schine, began her leisurely essay with a description of the structure of this very brief work, only 127 pages. It would seem—at least on first reading—that Barnes had undertaken a most foolhardy venture in genre mixing. This first section provides a thumbnail history of ballooning in Europe, especially France and Britain, in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Some futurists predicted the eventual dominance of heavier-than-air flying machines, but at the time the matter was still hotly debated. From our perspective, the intrepid self-confidence of these hot-air enthusiasts cannot but provoke the odd moment of amusement. What ought a gentleman pack in his picnic basket as he glides above the English countryside? The middle portion of the book contains a fictionalized story of a romantic interlude between the distinguished French actress Sarah Bernhardt and a British adventurer and balloonist. Yes, at one point she soared with him on his flights over Paris. The last and longest essay is a prolonged personal meditation on the grief that the author experienced after losing his wife of thirty years. How could such a farrago of literary forms—history, short story, meditation—possibly come together in any meaningful way? I had to find out for myself.

Yes, the daring structure works brilliantly. Barnes acknowledges quite emphatically that even in his moments of wrenching loss, he could summon no faith in a God or an afterlife to ease the pain. But as an artist, he did have the power to turn his grief into words, his memories into metaphor. A less skillful writer might have relied on anecdote. What episodes capture this woman, now lost forever, and the life they shared? He never tells us. The pull toward eulogy might have proved irresistible. Another diarist might have lingered on those thirty-seven days between diagnosis and death by recounting clinical details and final conversations. Barnes chooses not to share her with his readers. He never mentions her name. She remains his alone.

Rather than reconstruct the splendor of their lives together, Barnes speaks about soaring above the earth in a balloon, the privacy, the exhilaration, the delight of heretofore unimagined sights. Such voyages into the clouds change a person's perspective on life. Earth yields wonders unimaginable

from our crabbed vantage point of rock and soil. The sky, once conceived as a playground of the gods, now welcomes mere human beings in their canvas and wicker contraptions. It's a life far richer than anyone dare hope for. And once a photographer has the wit to take his camera on this journey; the artist in him captures the experience for his public. Words for Barnes, images for his fictional cameraman: it makes little difference. But the soaring life is not without risks. A sudden shift of wind, a cigar held too close to a hydrogen canister, a miscalculation of ballast on descent, all bring the journey to an untimely ending. Bernhardt and her lover fly above the clouds together. They are both transformed by the experience, but even the most ecstatic relationships eventually end, without reason or explanation. Love, like life itself, offers only a temporary haven for us mortals. It happens, and then it is gone. Barnes has no need for autobiography to prepare us for his meditation on grief. The stories serve quite well.

Episodes of loss, of course, enter each person's life, and they assume many forms, from the shattering death of a loved one, as Julian Barnes experienced, to matters too trivial to be considered in the same context. Yet in they come. Some characteristics, however, run across the entire spectrum. An integral part of one's life suddenly vanishes. An empty place opens up deep within. Something else might fill the void eventually, but the process of dealing with the initial shock may take more time than one would want to admit. Rage, despair, self-pity, resignation: these rim the void at first. Healing, if it comes at all, will never quite substitute for the original. Loss drives some to withdraw from life for longer or shorter periods of time. Sadly in some instances the melancholy morphs into a bitterness that lasts a lifetime. In ideal circumstances, a person appreciates the past for what it is: the past. Then it is time to rebuild, not an imitation of what has been lost, but something new. Faith surely makes the transition pass more gently. Grief counselors, psychologists, mystics, and poets surely can expand on these reflections of a sensitive essayist as interpreted by one limited reader. This is the best I can do at present.

The Jesuit experience of grief most often reflects our commitment to "the work." The sense of loss can be corporate as well as individual, and for Jesuits these two can be readily conflated. Following on the personal memoir of Julian Barnes, our own reflections can best be begun with the individual experience before looking at the corporate. How often have we run into Jesuits who grieve for a lost "golden era" they believe really gave their lives meaning. A classic example comes to mind. For a brief time, professors faced compulsory retirement at sixty-five. Jesuits, expecting to work at the same ministry forever, were ill-prepared for a sudden shift of lifestyle. In good health and reasonably expecting many more years, a Jesuit losing the familiar "job" felt as though he were losing a part of his self. A lot of the resentment seemed tied into the "separate incorporation" traumas of the 1960s. One remark summarizes much of the resentment of the time: "Father Provincial sent me here, and a layman fired me." It doesn't take much imagination to reconstruct conversations in which a

Jesuit receives the news from someone that it's time to move on to another location or to some stage of retirement. Even if the conclusion comes from within, by way of prayer and an honest assessment of one's present-day capacities, the sense of diminishment through loss still carries the sting of regret.

No, this syndrome does not strike us older men exclusively. Not uncommonly first-year theologians find it difficult to leave regency. Several classmates of mine—and theologians were in their late twenties in those days—had no difficulty in arranging transportation back to their old high school for meetings or social events. Some even arranged part-time teaching. Their bodies may have been at Woodstock on the Patapsco, but their interests lay amid the memories of their high-school teaching and coaching. Trying to relive that debate championship of last year by advising this year's team—whether or not the current moderator welcomed the assistance—struck them as infinitely more attractive than the tasks of the present: learning about the Q-source and reserved sins. The transition grated on the sense of self-worth: one day the lone adult stands at the center as a leader among boys; the next day he is one of the many young Jesuits in standard-issue black cassocks being scrutinized by a faculty of elders. Some had a harder time making the adjustment than others.

Both groups, the young and not so young, have to work through a very similar sense of loss. In an earlier life, they were key players. At present, less so. In the future, who knows? The future always holds elements of the unknown. That's what makes it the future. One personal experience may help illustrate what I mean. Indulge me. After fourteen years at *America*, I was ready for a change. The obvious transition would probably lead to higher education, but that was a long stretch of years without research or scholarly publication. My classroom experience ended as a teaching assistant, some sixteen years earlier. The future was predictably scary, but during my retreat during that summer of transition, I confronted an inflated sense of my own importance to the operation. The truth emerged very slowly. I had actually come to believe—but would never admit even to myself—that the editorial office at *America* needed me. I was at the center of the staff and made the whole machine run. Actually, the opposite was true. *America* got along perfectly well without me, but it was I who needed the weekly grind. Without the office and the role, I was diminished: one more new, inept adjunct professor at Georgetown being scrutinized by peers, department chairs and deans, evaluated by undergraduates, and submitting my primitive scholarly essays to editors of professional journals. Talk about role reversal! It was like leaving regency, or stepping down from an administrative post. Without the grind, what am I?

So much for the individual. Corporate loss may be shared by colleagues, but it brings the same feeling of diminishment. For the Church, this has become a mark of our times, especially in the United States and Western Europe. Bishops face terrible decisions about closing or combining parishes because

of a lack of priests, or deteriorating structures, or simply shifting populations. Parishioners write to Rome, sign petitions, stage sit-ins, and write angry letters to the editor. Letting go and moving on proves more challenging than one might have anticipated. Somehow Catholics feel slighted if their parish church or school simply fades away, no longer needed or sustainable in the present day. Fitting into a new parish or sending their children to a new school can be a tough adjustment, as can attending communion services conducted by deacons or lay ministers. The trends show few signs of reversing direction. New corporate structures will evolve, but slowly, and acceptance of them cannot be guaranteed. It seems unfair to lose what we once had, and not know what will replace it.

Over the past few decades, this contraction has impacted us Jesuits deeply. Here's where the corporate and the individual loss intersect. A school closes, and Jesuits who have worked there for decades must simply await another assignment. The province loses a proud moment in its history, and the individual loses a bit of himself. An undeniable loss strikes us all. Some handle the transition creatively, others cannot accept the present reality. The school—or retreat house, or parish—has served its purpose, and now it is gone. This pattern even applies to provinces. For example, as a Jesuit applied to the New England Province, I can't help but notice the wistful references to Baghdad. The same is probably true in New York when someone mentions the Philippines, but since I spent the bulk of my Jesuit life there, I never noticed. Hasn't this experience touched all of our American provinces to some extent? We wrote a magnificent chapter in the history of the Society during the age of "the missions." Then it ended. In some places political upheaval or post-colonial nationalism made foreigners no longer welcome. In the best-possible outcome, these young provinces were able to take on the work of the Society in their own culture with their own resources. Americans were no longer needed. Even with a smooth transition from mission to local church, we still occasionally find a slight twinge of loss amid the gratitude and justifiable pride we have in recognizing what God accomplished through the efforts of our elder brothers.

In the interests of full disclosure, I write these reflections as a proud alumnus of Brooklyn Prep, whose closing I have defended as wise and courageous more often than I can remember. Why presume I should be angry about it? It was a wonderful institution, but its time had passed and it was time for the province to take on something new. Like what? Just out of curiosity, I Googled "Brooklyn Jesuit Prep," the Nativity-style middle school that opened not far from the old Prep buildings in Crown Heights. I found the Website moving, especially this section of the mission statement.

> The school's logo bears the phrase "Honoring the Promise," an homage to Brooklyn's former Jesuit institution, Brooklyn Prep. BJP honors

the promise of offering Jesuit education to the children of Brooklyn, as Brooklyn Prep did for seventy years.

Presently, no Jesuits appear among the staff listing, nor is the generosity of the Brooklyn Prep Alumni Association mentioned. The Jesuit work continues among God's people without us. The hard-edged realization of that transitional retreat of many years ago returns to haunt the corporate body: do the particular institutions need us or do we need the particular institutions?

The question can be posed with variations in many ministries and provinces, I'm sure. Even as our commitment to the staffing of our traditional institutions has been adjusted to face the newer realities, we've had the freedom to open Cristo Rey and Nativity schools to serve different needs of the Church. We've developed new models for our ministries. Yes, of course, we understandably miss the old schools and universities with their predominantly Jesuit faculties, but we can look forward to a continuing evolution of our presence in the American church.

History helps put this in perspective. Last summer Bob Scully gave us a wonderful summary of the Suppression as it spread from country to country across Europe (STUDIES 45/2). The Jesuits of the day surely knew what was happening. The glory days of the past were gone. They might have braced themselves for some serious "reallocation of resources," but as the years passed, they realized that adjustments would not be enough. For more than two hundred years, they had soared across Europe, the Americas, and the East. They brought new perspectives to the Church and spread the Gospel around the world. Who could have predicted what happened? At the height of their voyage, they suddenly felt the air slowly leak out of their balloon, as one kingdom after another expelled them. Finally came the papal suppression of the Society in the summer of 1773. It was all but over. It's difficult to imagine the sense of loss those early Jesuits must have experienced at the closing of their beloved Society. How did they cope with the loss? Surely in thousands of individual ways, from sadness, despair, and bitterness to hope that something new would emerge in God's own time.

As we know, something new did emerge in 1814, when Pius VII officially restored the Society. But no one waved a magic wand to recreate the Society as it was before. There would be decades of struggle. As we read Tony Kuzniewski's thought-provoking essay in this current issue, we might even want to challenge the term Restoration. Especially in the United States, the Jesuits of the restored Society could not return to a "golden era" of the British colonies in America. They had to create an altogether new Society for a new nation, dedicated to the principles of liberty and tolerance. The invention of this new entity would challenge their ingenuity and their faith. As Tony points out, they were dedicated but fallible men trying to balance tradition with innovation, independence with a fealty to the universal Society. They struggled,

did their best, failed at times, but moved on. Somehow it worked, and they set the stage for a "Golden American Era" of vitality to rival the achievements of the pre-suppression Society in Europe.

I find an odd timeliness in this monograph commemorating the bicentennial of the Restoration. Here and now, in the United States we're engaged in the same kind of enterprise. Like the "American Champions" Tony brings to life for us, we're trying to reinvent ourselves and build a new Society for a changing church in the United States. We're now in the process of combining provinces and redefining priorities in keeping with our resources. Consider it more a spiritual journey than a juridical procedure. As we go about the task, we can acknowledge our sense of loss honestly, but we can't become prisoners of our history. We have an enormous advantage over Julian Barnes in dealing with our loss. We can acknowledge the past gratefully, confident that God eventually uses us to accomplish his own mysterious purposes. Like the Champions in times past, we undertake the work of reinvention that has been set before us with patience and hope. Especially hope.

Richard A. Blake, S.J.

Editor

CONTENTS

Anthony J. Kuzniewski, S.J., is professor of history at the College of the Holy Cross. After studies at Harvard and the Jesuit School of theology in Chicago, he initially taught at Loyola University Chicago. Among his publications are Faith and Fatherland: The Polish Church War in Wisconsin, 1896-1918 *(winner of the Kocsiuszko Foundation Doctoral Dissertation Award and the 1978 competition for the series Notre Dame Studies in American Catholicism),* Thy Honored Name: A History of the College of the Holy Cross, 1843-1994, *and "Francis Dzierozynski and the Jesuit Restoration in the United States," in* The Catholic Historical Review *(1992). He has served as trustee at Loyola University Chicago, Cheverus High School in Portland, Maine, and Nativity School Worcester. He is currently Archivist of the New England Province.*

The author wishes to thank members of the Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality for content suggestions, and Thomas Repensek, a friend from Marquette days and now a freelance editor in New York, for editorial assistance.

"Our American Champions"

The First Generation of American Jesuit Leaders after the Restoration of the Society

After the Restoration, the Roman Catholic Clergymen of Maryland had to rebuild the Society in the United States with very little precedent. European traditions could not readily be adapted to the American spirit in this new country. As they set the foundations for the Maryland Province, native and European Jesuits did not always agree among themselves. Directives from Rome were not universally welcomed—or followed.

In the summer of 1820, six American scholastics, aged nineteen to twenty-six, set sail for Rome. When they reached the port of Naples, a Jesuit familiar with the Maryland Mission hailed the arrival of "our six American champions."[1] His enthusiasm reflected the high expectations surrounding this group. George Fenwick, William McSherry, Thomas Mulledy, Charles Constantine Pise, James Ryder, and John Smith were to be trained in leadership for the works of the Society of Jesus in the United States. Of the six, Pise soon left the Soci-

[1]Giovanni Grassi to John McElroy, August 27, 1820, Maryland Province Archives [hereafter MPA], 205G6b.

ety and Smith died in 1823, but the remaining four were supplemented by Aloysius Young, who had preceded them to Italy by two years.

When they returned to the United States at the end of the 1820s, this group of five influenced the Society's discernment for several decades. Their challenge was to address a set of difficult polarities that faced the restored Society on the East Coast. Some Jesuits favored the traditional approach of pastoral work through Jesuit manors that dated back to the colonial era; others envisioned the Society's future in educational and pastoral work in rapidly expanding cities. Disagreement over Jesuit slaveholding on the manors added a second neuralgic point as opposition mounted to the Society's involvement in the South's "peculiar institution." More tension emerged when the preference of some American Jesuits for republican liberties and New World adaptations raised strong objections from the significant element of European Jesuits assigned to America and some who were native born. This conflict reflected two schools of thought that divided American Catholics. As historian Jay Dolan put it, "One desired to fashion an indigenous church, an American Catholicism; the other wanted to transplant to the new nation a continental European version of Roman Catholicism."[2]

As the "champions" addressed their challenges, consistency between means and ends proved difficult to achieve, and fraternal charity sometimes fell victim in the process. In the end, their efforts met with mixed success. But this group promoted the transition from mission status to the Maryland Province. And they set a trajectory for Jesuit life and work that has endured from the nineteenth century to the twenty-first.

They undertook their roles with strong assistance from two Europeans who were sent by Rome to address the Society's problems in America and to supply leadership while the young men were being trained. Peter Kenney, an Irish Jesuit, twice journeyed to America as Visitor and laid the foundation for the new Maryland Province and work in the Missouri Valley. Francis Dzierozynski, a Polish Jesuit with roots in the old Society in Russia, supplied critical guidance for the

---

[2]Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience* (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1985), 124.

Americans as *formator*, mission superior, and acting provincial. Out of the interaction between the older generation and the younger, the Old World and the New, the first American province came to life.

I. Background

By the time the scholastics sailed to Rome, Jesuits had been in Maryland for almost two hundred years. This first period of the Society's life and work in the New World has been studied and described by competent historians—among them Gerald Fogarty,[3] Joseph Durkin,[4] and R. Emmett Curran.[5] After the suppression in 1773, John Carroll, now a former Jesuit who had been working at St. Omers, a school for recusant English (including Maryland) Catholics in Belgium, returned to his homeland, where he organized and rallied the former Jesuit priests around three ideas: an organization of former Jesuits to hold what were once Jesuit properties as a legal corporation, a college to train educated American laity and Catholic priests, and a church in the New World that would be distinctly American.[6] Georgetown College opened in 1792, using the *Ratio studiorum* as its pedagogical model. Meanwhile, in 1792 the Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen of Maryland was set up to hold the church properties

---

[3]Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., "The Origins of the Mission, 1634–1773," in *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833* (Baltimore: The Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, the Maryland Province Society of Jesus, 1976).

[4]Joseph T. Durkin, S.J., "The Mission and the New Nation, 1773–1800," in *The Maryland Jesuits.*

[5]Emmett Curran has written extensively and with deep insight about Jesuits in the United States before the Civil War. Noteworthy among his writings are "From Mission to Province, 1805–1833," in *The Maryland Jesuits.* Also *Shaping American Catholicism: Maryland and New York, 1805–1915* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012); an edition of spiritual writings by American Jesuits, *American Jesuit Spirituality: The Maryland Tradition, 1634–1900* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988); and the first volume of his bicentennial history of Georgetown University, *From Academy to University* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1993), revised and republished in 2010 as the first volume of a three-volume set.

[6]William Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus,* 2nd ed. (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986), 407; Anthony J. Kuzniewski, *Thy Honored Name: A History of the College of the Holy Cross, 1843–1994* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 12.

and manors formerly owned by the Jesuits. The holdings were extensive, gifts from Lord Baltimore to support their work—twelve thousand acres in Maryland on six estates and plantations, plus seventeen hundred acres in eastern Pennsylvania.[7] For the thirty thousand Roman Catholics living in the United States at the time of independence, twenty-five former Jesuits constituted the entire presbyterate of the Church.[8] From their number, the Holy See appointed John Carroll prefect apostolic in 1784 and then Bishop of Baltimore in 1789. In 1805, under a new dispensation from Rome, five of the ten former Jesuits still living reentered the Society; Robert Molyneux became the first superior of the restored Maryland Mission. Their number grew when Father General Thaddeus Brzozowski assigned Jesuits from Europe to supplement the older Americans and the men who entered the American novitiate, starting in 1806.[9]

In the decades that followed, European Jesuits reinforced the Society's work in the United States and supplied much of the leadership. Although they provided "intelligence, foresight, and goodness," these newcomers encountered resistance from the older native element, who found them resistant to the democratic spirit of the new nation and unappreciative of the Society's role as a large landowner.[10] One example was Anthony Kohlman, sent from Russia in 1805. In 1808 Bishop Carroll sent him to New York City as administrator of the new diocese and future founder of a school. Kohlman viewed the New York Literary Institute as a lever for moving the priorities of Jesuit work in the United States away from the Maryland manors to educational work in cities. The school in New York thrived, but Kohlman was ordered to close it in 1814, because the resources of the Mission were stretched too thin. As Curran puts it,

> The good will was there. There were serious differences, nonetheless, about their apostolic priorities and about the Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen that was funding their

---

[7]Curran, *Shaping*, 15–16, 31–32.

[8]Ibid., 5.

[9]Bangert, *History*, 407, 425–26.

[10]Early on, the manors had supported apostolic work; but by about 1820, they were becoming a financial liability (Curran, "Mission to Province," 49–50, 52).

> activities. In general the native Jesuits tended to be conservative, suspicious of anyone suggesting that they change or expand the nature of their operations in America."[11]

When Kohlman was named superior of the mission in 1817, he was religious superior of the Jesuits but lacked control over the Select Body of the Clergy, out of which the landholding corporation had grown. Even after the General ordered the corporation members in 1818 to give plenary powers to Kohlman in his role as superior, tensions remained.[12] In these circumstances, Father Brzozowski decided to send a Visitor to the United States to study the situation and offer a comprehensive report, along with recommendations, directly to Rome.[13]

Peter Kenney, Visitor

The General's choice of Visitor was Peter Kenney (1779–1841), a distinguished Irish Jesuit who had received most of his Jesuit formation in Italy. After ordination, he served as rector of Maynooth and of Clongowes Colleges and as superior of the Irish Mission.[14] In April of 1819, Father Brzozowski wrote to Kenney of his concerns with the state of the Society in the United States—"a wretched parish."

> Nationality has taken possession of the spirit of Ours, and so has discord. The native-born Jesuits cannot put up with either an Italian, or a German, or a Belgian superior. They insist on having either an American or an Englishman. Are these the voices of religious men? Are they Jesuits? Absolutely not. . . . To stamp out and eradicate this spirit I am sending you as Visitor.

Brzozowski instructed Kenney to dictate that the mission superior be designated head of the civil corporation. He was also to receive ac-

---

[11]Ibid., 51.

[12]Ibid., 52–54.

[13]According to the Norms of the Society, "The superior general can send visitors into the provinces on whatever occasion, for whatever length of time, and with whatever authority and jurisdiction seem good to him" (Norms, Part IX, section 2, in *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), 381.

[14]Thomas Morrissey, *As One Sent: Peter Kenney SJ, 1779–1841* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1996), 3–134.

counts of conscience, to determine whether an American was qualified to succeed Kohlman as head of the mission, to examine the formation program, and to consult with local superiors as to whether some novices "who had been well trained [by Kohlman when he was master of novices] could be sent to Italy to do their studies there, and thence return to America fortified in piety and knowledge."[15]

Kenney arrived at Georgetown in late September and set to work, "to get a grasp of essentials and . . . the great needs and possibilities of the mission."[16] At the time of his arrival, the Maryland Mission numbered twenty-two priests, twenty-one scholastics, and thirteen novices. His first impressions were mixed. In early October he observed, "Matters are not so bad as they were made to appear." But he had found "great disorders amongst some young priests, who wished to live in the college in a way that suited themselves"; and there were some old priests, members of the corporation, who "tended to undermine the authority of the superior."[17] Two months later, in his first report to the General, Kenney noted the fierce republicanism and individualism he had encountered: "The Society has this obstacle to overcome in these parts—namely, that Americans have such an ardent passion for liberty and for their country that it approaches madness, and they have of their nature an intense hatred of manifesting themselves or others to superiors." He found no suitable candidates to be superior of the mission; and he recommended sending scholastics—five or more—to Italy for more training, particularly given the inadequacy of theology offerings at Georgetown.[18]

As Kenney continued his visitation, Thaddeus Brzozowski died at Polotsk in February of 1820. Shortly afterwards, Czar Alexander banished the Jesuits from Russia and 350 members of the Society with-

---

[15]Brzozowski to Kenney, April 23, 1819, Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus [hereafter ARSI], MD, 2.III.1, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 134–35, 147.

[16]Ibid., 149.

[17]Kenney to Charles Aylmer, October 5, 1819, Kenney papers, Irish Jesuit Archives, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 150.

[18]Kenney to Brzozowski, December 2, 1819, ARSI, MD, 2.II, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 154–59.

drew to find assignments in other lands.[19] A new general congregation, meeting in Rome in October, elected Luigi Fortis to be general.[20] By then, Kenney had visited the Jesuit manors. He set down rules and policies regarding temporal administration of Jesuit-held properties and lamented the generally unhappy situation of Jesuit-owned slaves. He sailed back to Europe in the summer of 1820, too late to receive orders to remain in America pending the disposition of the new general.[21] Kenney's final report, sent to the general congregation in October, repeated that none of the priests were capable of governance nor of teaching theology or philosophy adequately; the slaves, he described as a source of scandal.[22]

In [sending your Jesuits to Europe for studies], Kenney had to face initial skepticism on the part of at least some Jesuits in the United States.

In the course of his visit, Kenney earned the respect of the Americans. His biographer asserted that Jesuits of all stripes were "disarmed by his unassuming manner, impressed by his oratory and powers of organization, and won over by his obvious desire to understand and be of assistance." Kenney had "imbibed the spirit of the Old Society in its European setting," but he understood differences in nationality, and came to appreciate the inherent opportunities for the Church in a democratic context.[23] Kenney's eloquence was a particular facet of the impression he left. When he preached in Baltimore at the conferral of the pallium on Archbishop Ambrose

[19]The primary reason for expulsion was the Jesuits' role as highly visible educators, mostly Polish and French, who represented Western ideas at a time of heightened Russian xenophobia and nationalism during and after the struggle with Napoleon. The czar had lost enthusiasm for the doctrines of the Enlightenment and wanted to mollify conservative opinion in Russia regarding education (James T. Flynn, "The Role of the Jesuits in the Politics of Russian Education, 1801–1820," *The Catholic Historical Review,* 56 [July 1970]: 249–65).

[20]Bangert, *History,* 434–35.

[21]Morrissey, *Kenney,* 149–78.

[22]"Relatio de Statu Missionis SJ in America," October 1820, ARSI, MD, 2.III.12, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 181–83.

[23]Morrissey, *Kenney,* 138, 142.

Maréchal, Anthony Kohlman spoke of "singular praise, that never such sermon was heard in Baltimore. He joins solidity to a most flowing and unaffected language." Later, Kohlman reported that Kenney was "generally declared to be the best Orator that ever was heard in this country." And he expressed strong hopes that Kenney would be assigned permanently to the United States.[24]

Before his return to Europe, Kenney arranged to send young Jesuits to Europe for education and formation. In taking this initiative, Kenney had to face initial skepticism on the part of at least some Jesuits in the United States. Giovanni Grassi, an Italian who preceded Anthony Kohlman as superior of the Maryland Mission, had aired the idea in 1817. But Kohlman called the plan "impracticable" because sending all the eligible scholastics would be too expensive; while selecting only some for training in Italy would demoralize those left behind.[25] Nevertheless, Grassi took a scholastic, James Neil, with him when he left America in 1817. Soon, Neil was studying dogmatic theology and canon law at Ferrara. A year later, at Grassi's insistence, Aloysius Young followed.[26]

"Improve daily in literature and science, but much more in the science of the Saints: remember always that you belong to an Apostolical Society, and that the Catholic Religion looks to you as the blessed instruments, by whom it is to be solidly established in America."

In time, Peter Kenney overcame the objections to Italian training for younger Jesuits. Kohlman reported in April of 1820 that five or six would be dispatched: "I wish our Scholastics may be indulged to become perfectly acquainted with the various affairs of the Society at Rome . . . and especially with such for which they may seem to have a more particular turn particularly with the charges of Masters

[24]Kohlman to Anthony Grassi, December 13, 1819, and April 1, 1820, ARSI, MD, 2.III.3 and 2.I.17.

[25]Kohlman to F. Supr. of Whitemarsh, July 12, 1817, ARSI, MD, 1.VI.2.

[26]Neil to [?], November 18, 1818, ARSI, MD, 2.VI.2; Curran, *Academy,* 89.

of Novices, Ministers, etc."[27] Eventually, six were chosen to be formed for such positions of leadership: George Fenwick (1801–57), William McSherry (1799–1839), Thomas Mulledy (1794–1860), Charles Pise (1801–66), James Ryder (1800–1860), and John Smith (1800–1823). All had entered the novitiate in 1815.

The scholastics sailed from Alexandria on June 6, 1820, bringing with them a letter from Anthony Kohlman to Giovanni Grassi, who was acquainted with the young men from his time of service in the Maryland Mission. They were, Kohlman stated, the "first fruits of the American Mission . . . yr. spiritual children, nurtured under your paternal solicitude, the objects of our great hopes." The goal was to prepare them "to become the very pillars of the Society in the New World before long, by a solid association of piety and knowledge." Kohlman offered a characterization of each member of the party. Mulledy was "subject to very strong passions of pride and anger" but was "open, candid, nobleminded and possessing excellent talents." Smith and McSherry were "fine young men" with leadership potential. Ryder and Pise were the most intellectually gifted, but "mighty young, light and naturally dissipated." Fenwick had "middling talents" and a tendency to laziness. All, Kohlman stated, would benefit from disciplined community life and the edifying example of European Jesuits.[28]

Their voyage was an adventure. A few days after their departure, Thomas Mulledy reported, "It was really laughable to see us this morning walking the deck, the vessel rearing up upon her hind legs, then pitching upon her head[,] sent us hither and thither." They avoided the cabin in preference for the deck. While they sailed, Mulledy turned to poetry, his cherished hobby:

> The anchor is hoisted, the streamer is flying,
> The canvass is swollen & spreads to the wind.
> The son of Columbia sits lonely & sighing
> To catch a last view of the land left behind.[29]

---

[27]Kohlman to Grassi, April 1, 1820, ARSI, MD, 2.I.17.

[28]Kohlman to Grassi, June 2, 1820, ARSI, MD, 2.VII.5.

[29]Mulledy Papers, Georgetown University Archives [hereafter GUA], 1:11; Mulledy to John McElroy, June 12, 1820, MPA, 127–10.

The scholastics arrived at Gibraltar on July 13 and, after quarantine, booked passage to Naples with the assistance of the American consul. They followed instructions to sleep on board and expend "as little money as possible." As they waited for passage, they enjoyed a tour of the British fort. "This rock," James Ryder asserted, "could not be taken by the united exertions of the world."[30]

By late August, Father Grassi reported their safe arrival in Rome, in good health and spirits, relieved to be off the water and out of quarantine.[31] During the first year, Anthony Kohlman encouraged them via letter to learn Italian and to keep the *magis* in mind as they pursued their studies: "Improve daily in literature and science, but much more in the science of the Saints: remember always that you belong to an Apostolical Society, and that the Catholic Religion looks to you as the blessed instruments, by whom it is to be solidly established in America."[32]

Francis Dzierozynski

As the young Americans took up their studies in Italy, Luigi Fortis responded to Kenney's judgment that the mission lacked competent leadership by sending a seasoned Jesuit, Francis Dzierozynski, to lead and guide the Marylanders. Forty-two years old at the time of his arrival at Georgetown in 1821, this Polish Jesuit had entered the Bielorussian Province of the Society in 1794, had taught as a regent in the Jesuits' *Kolegium Nobilum* in St. Petersburg, and after ordination served at the college at Mogilev. From 1814 to 1820 he taught dogmatic theology, apologetics, and homiletics at Polotsk. After the expulsion from Russia in 1820, Dzierozynski taught at Bologna, awaiting his next assignment. There he met Peter Kenney, who was favorably impressed and may have recommended him for America to the General. This newcomer was delegated by the General to hold the offices of socius, mission consultor, and admonitor to Charles Neale, who had succeeded Kohlman as mission superior. He was to learn English, see to improvements in the curriculum and religious life at Georgetown, and,

---

[30]Ryder to John McElroy, July 19, 1820, MPA, 127–10.

[31]Grassi to John McElroy, August 27, 1820, MPA, 205G6b.

[32]Kohlman to Magistres, September 3, 1821, ARSI, MD, 2.VII.7.

in general, animate and correct the life of American Jesuits.[33] Writing to Neale, Fortis explained that he was sending Dzierozynski to assist him, to prop him up with gifts of mind and will.[34]

Until his death at Frederick in 1850, Dzierozynski was a mainstay of Jesuit life on the East Coast. After Charles Neale's death in 1823, he served as superior of the Maryland Mission until 1830, when Peter Kenney returned for a second visit; and as acting provincial of the Maryland Province from 1839 to 1843. He was novice master for a total of fourteen years at three different times, also tertian director, and a member of the Georgetown faculty for theology and philosophy. Among his achievements as leader of the Maryland Jesuits was the resolution of the long-standing conflict with the archbishop of Baltimore, Ambrose Maréchal, who claimed a share of income from the Jesuit properties; he also succeeded in bringing the civil corporation of Jesuits entirely within the governance structures of the Society.

Francis Dzierozynski was a living link between the Society in Maryland and the remnant of the Society that had survived the suppression in eastern Europe—a noble gift from Father General Fortis to the Jesuits of the United States.

At first, American Jesuits resisted his leadership. Writing to the General from Georgetown, Benedict Fenwick opposed Dzierozynski's potential appointment as mission superior, saying that he was "too little acquainted with the country as yet and too ignorant of its language to act as Superior, to say nothing of the evil consequences that may result from nominating one who is perfectly a stranger and a foreigner."[35] Watching developments from afar, Peter Kenney also had

[33]Fortis to Dzierozynski, June 9, 1821, ARSI, Russia 1521, 291–93, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 214; Anthony Kuzniewski, "Francis Dzierozynski and the Jesuit Restoration in the United States," *The Catholic Historical Review,* 78 (January 1992): 52–54. This article contains a fuller account of Dzierozynski's work in America.

[34]Fortis to Neale, ARSI, Registrarum epistolarum Aloysii Fortis [1822], 1:55.

[35]Fenwick to Fortis, June 22, 1823, ARSI, MD, 2.I.64.

reservations about the Polish newcomer. He found Dzierozynski to be "extremely imprudent" for expressing the hope that young Americans would not "retain their republican spirit." A different approach was called for: "Surely it is of more consequence to gain their affections, increase their piety and docility, than to lessen their attachment to their republican government! If they are to have any opinion in politics, should it not be in favour of their native government?"[36] Experience with Americans had softened Kenney's view of American Jesuits. In time, Dzierozynski would follow the same pattern.

For almost three decades, Francis Dzierozynski served as a vital link between the Jesuits of Maryland and the old Society that had survived in Russia. He served as spiritual director and retreat director for Jesuits and for religious sisters. In direction and retreat work, he utilized notes he had taken in Russia on a wide variety of theological and spiritual topics. He also translated a number of spiritual works from Latin and Polish into English. To an isolated pastor in Maine, he urged confident prayer: "Endeavor to animate yourself in the Spirit." The others remained in Europe for the better part of a decade; after ordination they were employed there in a variety of duties "as an equitable payment of the expense of their studies." yourself with the Spirit, the zeal and piety of our ancient Fathers, especially of those who were your predecessors in that Mission, and the Almighty will bless your labors." He also recommended regular recourse to the Spiritual Exercises.[37] With a young priest dealing with discouragement, he took an avuncular tone: "I congratulate you on these little crosses and advise you to hope against

The [American scholastics] remained in Europe for the better part of a decade; after ordination they were employed there in a variety of duties "as an equitable payment of the expense of their studies."

[36]Kenney to McElroy, June 28, 1822, MPA, 206W9a, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 142.

[37]Dzierozynski to Vergil Barber, n.d. [1829] and September 8, 1830, MPA, 209Z11 and 209M10.

the hope.—Beginning is always hard."[38] Counseling another pastor, he recommended devotion to Mary and pointed out the wisdom of having a cemetery in the churchyard so that the deceased could offer, in silence, the "most profitable preaching" about the end of human striving![39] For the noted Jesuit preacher, John McElroy, he copied a meditation on the Four Last Things, translated from a retreat given to scholastics at Polotsk. He was also reputed to have directed John C. Calhoun through readings in Catholic philosophers.[40]

Like Peter Kenney before him, Francis Dzierozynski grew to appreciate distinctively American approaches to Jesuit life and work. During his time as acting provincial, he incurred criticism for being lax in implementing religious discipline. One European newcomer complained to Rome: "He is a saintly man but that is not enough."[41] By 1840 he had become a spirited defender of American customs. He allowed visitors at Georgetown and permitted the celebration of patriotic holidays, including banquets at which students sometimes overimbibed. Emmett Curran suggests that Dzierozynski "had come to appreciate the Ignatian principle of adaptation according to circumstances." But his defense of a distinctively American manner of Jesuit life earned the displeasure of a younger set of leaders in Rome who found it increasingly difficult to place confidence in his judgment.[42]

Dzierozynski succeeded in facilitating the establishment of a Jesuit college in New England, thus gratifying the persistent desire of Benedict Fenwick, who was now bishop of Boston and wished to have a Jesuit college in his diocese. In this case, the acting provincial had to compromise the General's preference for day schools in large cities with the bishop's desire for a boarding school exclusively for Catholic boys, beyond the reach of nativists in Boston and in an atmosphere that

---

[38]Dzierozynski to Charles Lancaster, September 11, 1842, MPA, 213G0.

[39]Dzierozynski to Theodore Jenkins, September 6, 1844, MPA, Dzierozynski Papers, 3:2.

[40]Kuzniewski, "Dzierozynski," 69; John Ryan, "Our Scholasticate," *Woodstock Letters* [hereafter *WL*], 33:18.

[41]Fidele de Grivel to Assistant, September 8, 1841, ARSI, MD, 7.I.38, in Emmett Curran, "Troubled Nation, Troubled Province, 1833–1880," unpublished MS, 13.

[42]Curran, "Troubled Nation," 12–15; Kuzniewski, "Dzierozynski," 71.

would be conducive for vocations to the priesthood. When it became clear that the bishop would refuse the Jesuits' wish for a day school in Boston unless they first accepted a boarding school in Worcester, the deal was closed; The College of the Holy Cross opened in 1843.[43]

In September of 1843, James Ryder succeeded Dzierozynski as head of the Maryland Province. Dzierozynski spent the next three years in Frederick as novice master until his declining health and new disagreements with Jan Roothaan forced him to relinquish the position. The General's objections to Dzierozynski's role as a *formator* included laxity regarding smoking, the rules of silence, and novices' contact with other Jesuits. The new provincial, Peter Verhaegen, was less severe in his judgment, instructing Dzierozynski to remain in residence near the novitiate and to train his successor: "As much as possible, introduce him into the office, and on all occasions *act together with a perfect understanding."*[44] Verhaegan defended the old veteran to the general, observing that the novices venerated him as a saint and that he stimulated them to become worthy Jesuits.[45] Early in 1850, John Fitzpatrick, Fenwick's successor as bishop of Boston, requested that the old man be assigned to Holy Cross. He had long desired to make a retreat under Dzierozynski's direction; he and his clergy would consider it "a favor conferred upon them" if the old man could be reassigned.[46] By then, however, he had become too frail; he was no longer able to celebrate Mass and had received the last rites.

Dzierozynski died on September 22, 1850. Before the funeral, Frederick's Visitation Sisters, who had long benefited from his ministry, received locks of his hair and sent rosaries and crucifixes to be touched to his hands and face. Sensitive to the fact that the sisters were restricted to cloister, Dzierozynski had directed that his remains be carried past their convent on the way to his funeral. As the sisters watched through the windows, the coffin was opened and the sisters gave themselves to tears of grief. On the day of his death, the house

---

[43]Kuzniewski, *Thy Honored Name,* 22–27.

[44]Verhaegen to Dzierozynski, September 23 and 29, November 7, 1846, MPA, 215N7, 215N9, 215M3.

[45]Verhaegen to Roothaan, September 24, 1846, ARSI, MD, 8.I.20.

[46]John Early to Ignatius Brocard, January 8, 1850, MPA, 218Z3.

diarist at Frederick wrote, "Today . . . died Father Francis Dzierozynski of the Society of Jesus. He was a lover of the brethren and a father in Israel, loved by all, without an enemy, and if such a one were found and were to say aught against him, he would hurt his own fair name rather than the memory of Father."[47]

Francis Dzierozynski was a living link between the Society in Maryland and the remnant of the Society that had survived the suppression in eastern Europe—a noble gift from Father General Fortis to the Jesuits of the United States.

II. Americans in Italy

While Francis Dzierozynski took up his assignments in the United States, the scholastics in Italy were also at work. Of their number, Charles Pise left the Society in 1821 and joined the secular priesthood in the United States.[48] Then John Smith died in Italy in 1823 after an illness. The others remained in Europe for the better part of a decade; after ordination they were employed there in a variety of duties "as an equitable payment of the expense of their studies."[49] Father Fortis reported in 1824 that they were observing the rules and spirit of the Society, and after tertianship would bear fruit in America.[50] The remaining four and Aloysius Young were ordained in 1824 and 1825, thereafter making their tertianship. Afterwards, they worked at a variety of Jesuit schools in Italy: George Fenwick taught mathematics and physics at Reggio di Modena; McSherry worked at the Roman College and then in Turin; Mulledy taught logic at Turin and later metaphysics and ethics; James Ryder taught theology at the Roman College and later at Spoleto; Aloysius Young taught theology at the Tiburtine College. McSherry, Mulledy, and

---

[47]Cited in Edward I. Devitt, "History of the Maryland–New York Province," *WL*, 62:315–16; see also Kuzniewski, "Dzierozynski," 72–73.

[48]John Smith to McElroy, December 12, 1821, MPA, 127.1.

[49]"Some Old Letters," *WL*, 44:325.

[50]Fortis to Dzierozynski, 1824 [no other date], ARSI, Epistolae, Russia, 1521, 306.

Young returned to Georgetown late in 1828. Fenwick and Ryder returned the following year.[51]

During their stay in Italy, the young Americans took advantage of the opportunity to see the sights and study Jesuit schools. One unidentified letter written in early 1821, speaks of visits to the Vatican library and museum, where they were moved at seeing torture instruments used on the early Christians. Michelangelo's statue of Moses was another delight; they repeated the story that, after finishing the sculpture, Michelangelo struck the statue with his hammer and said, "Speak!"[52] In 1824, William McSherry reported on a visit to Galloro near Castel Gandolfo which featured "one of the most pleasant meals I have ever had." He exclaimed over the wonderful soft beds at the Grecian College and reported on regular daily prayer—the Marian Litany and the De Profundis, with silent periods for meditation and the examen.[53] In 1828 Mulledy reported a five-month journey "on a kind of roving commission to colleges in Italy and Savoy."[54] They longed for news from home and berated Georgetown Jesuits for the infrequency of the letters. "My companions salute you but they are not very much pleased that you have ceased to write us," complained George Fenwick to John McElroy in 1824. The same letter offered a facetious update on Aloysius Young, who was in Turin: "I hear that he is preaching with wonderful success to the dumb & the deaf in Italian."[55]

Languishing far from home on the Riviera, Mulledy felt isolated, writing to George Fenwick: "You all seem to have forgotten me, but I must not complain of that—no doubt I deserve it."

[51]Dzierozynski to Fortis, December 28, ARSI, MD, 3.VII.7. For a summary account of these scholastics in Italy, see Edward Devitt's history of the Maryland-New York Province, *WL,* 62:309–13.

[52]Unidentified letter from Rome, February 24, 1821, MPA, 127.1.

[53]McSherry to George Fenwick, September 28, 1824, MPA, 127.2.

[54]Mulledy to Dzierozynski, July 8, 1828, GUA, Dzierozynski Papers, 3:2.

[55]Fenwick to McElroy, May 10, 1824, MPA, 127.2.

Many of the anecdotes relating to the Americans' adventures in Italy were eventually lost. However, J. Fairfax McLaughlin, who graduated from Georgetown in 1860 and later became a lawyer and Catholic newspaper editor, penned a biographical portrait of George Fenwick in 1887. He included stories about Fenwick's beautiful tenor voice. On his way to Italy, several vessels were becalmed near Gibraltar. An English midshipman sang "God Save the King and elicited great applause. The Yankees were reproached for being unable to respond in kind, "and then . . . Mr. Fenwick sang the Star-Spangled Banner, leaving the Englishman far behind him." On another occasion, Fenwick was singing the Marseillaise in one of the Roman houses, at a time when France "was indulging . . . in one of its chronic eruptions against the Church." A visiting cardinal overheard the song and exclaimed, "What! The Marseillaise in a Jesuit house?" The rector replied, "Only an American, your Eminence, blessed with a fine voice." "That rendered it innocent," wrote McLaughlin. After Fenwick's ordination, a worshipper who heard him sing High Mass in Rome suggested a career in opera.[56]

Among the young Americans, Thomas Mulledy carried a high profile by virtue of his temperament and his stridently American identity. Early in his stay, he lampooned Baltimore's Archbishop Ambrose Maréchal for his affected style while in the Eternal City:

> His *Lordship* (God forgive me) is rigged off in Italian style. . . . he wears also the cock hat, the purple stockings, etc. etc. . . . His lodgings consist of four or five rooms furnished in grand style. Chambers and ante-chambers all upon the high rope—I felt my republican simplicity a little ruffled when we visited his Lordship (O dear! Relapsed again) to find that, according to the European style we had to take an airing of 10 or 15 minutes in the ante-chamber before we were admitted to an audience.[57]

---

[56]J. Fairfax McLaughlin, "Father George Fenwick, S.J." (September 1887), GUA, George Fenwick File; Curran, *Georgetown,* 212.

[57]Fragment of letter from Mulledy to [?], [February or March 1822], GUA, Thomas F. Mulledy Papers.

The same letter lamented the "ancient austerity of Roman lents . . . nothing but fish & oil & herbs & herbs & oil & fish—hard times." In Italy, Mulledy remained attached to the United States, composing patriotic poems and maintaining his interest in American politics—particularly the presidential election of 1824. At about the same time, he was seeking books that included a biography of Patrick Henry and the Federalist Papers.[58] Evidently his heart was more attached to these American documents than to materials in a course he inherited at Turin in the spring of 1825, when a teacher grew ill. "It is a compilation of civil & canon law—Theology, Ideology, Cosmology, anthology and big-wow-wow-ology &c &c &c &c. You need not be so squeamish about the studies of Jesuits."[59] It was an American's impatient critique of a needlessly complex European approach.

In making a point of their "republican" appropriation of Catholicism, Mulledy and others reflected the distinct character of the American church that had been set in motion by Bishop Carroll.

III. Foundation of the Maryland Province

After the "champions" returned to America, they set to work. Luigi Fortis died in January of 1829, to be succeeded as general by Jan Roothaan in July. Soon, his desk held letters praising the young Americans. Francis Dzierozynski reported that the returned Marylanders had energized and enhanced the enterprise at Georgetown: Mulledy became rector in September of 1829; McSherry was minister, procurator, and student prefect; Young was a professor of philosophy. Soon, George Fenwick joined them as a professor of grammar and syntax, while James Ryder was teaching theology.[60] They took up these tasks in a spirit of willing service in an American manner. As Ryder put it in a letter to McSherry,

---

[58]Mulledy to McSherry, February 28, 1825, MPA, 127.3. A thick folder of poetry may be found in the Mulledy Papers, GUA.

[59]Mulledy to McSherry, May 6, 1825, MPA, 127.3.

[60]Dzierozynski to Roothaan, October 26, 1829, ARSI, MD, 3.I.63; Stephen Dubuisson to Roothaan, May 21, 1830, ARSI, MD, 3.I.67.

> You know better than I . . . that far more good is to be done in America by reason and good example than by authority and force. Accordingly, all the true spirit of the Society you have imbibed in Italy infuse into Ours without letting it appear that it is imported from Italy, and be "to their virtues ever kind, and to their faults a little blind."[61]

As the young Americans established themselves at Georgetown, transition was underway in Rome. Peter Kenney was present at the general congregation that elected Jan Roothaan in the summer of 1829. There Kenney learned that he would again be named Visitor to the Maryland Mission. In mid-November of 1830, he arrived at Georgetown, where he found detailed instructions in a letter from Father Roothaan. He was directed to cultivate cordial relations with the hierarchy, and to examine carefully the "temporal affairs" of the mission, including the wisdom of continued slaveholding and continuing presence in the manors. Fathers Mulledy, Dzierozynski, and two immigrant Jesuits were appointed to be his consultors. The fact that Mulledy was the only native American vested with this responsibility suggests the probationary status held by the European-educated Americans at that time. And the general was still uneasy regarding the Americans' "republican" values; he instructed Kenney to keep a careful eye on Mulledy's work as rector of Georgetown.[62]

Very soon, Kenney responded that Mulledy was doing well as "an active rector—he gives satisfaction to the members of the house and strongly upholds discipline both among the boarders and the religious, and is highly regarded by outsiders, especially the native Americans." He had eliminated most of the college's debt, and had built up enrollment. Those qualities, in Kenney's judgment, overrode Mulledy's defects; his "extremely impetuous enthusiasm and excessive patriotism" were gradually becoming more moderate as he sought to live and work in the authentic spirit of the Society. As Mulledy's consultors, Kenney appointed Ryder, McSherry, Young, and Fenwick. He had appointed Ryder minister and admonitor to Mulledy, leaving

---

[61]Ryder to McSherry, September 16, 1828, *WL,* 44:323.

[62]Morrissey, *Kenney,* 221–22, 224–25, 230–238.

McSherry to teach full time.[63] After a remarkably short interval, then, responsibility for Georgetown College had been shifted to those sent to Italy.

Midway through his visitation, Kenney received an unexpected letter from the General, announcing that he had decided against selling the properties in Maryland. The decision was a setback for the younger men, who favored selling the farms and altering priorities in the mission. Fearing that this cadre would influence Kenney, several Jesuits of the old guard, including Dzierozynski, had written preemptively to Roothaan to argue for the retention of the properties, partly to afford shelter and protection to the slaves who resided and worked there. Ryder lamented: "We were persuaded that Revd Fr Visitor would sell, as reason dictates, some of the immense waste of landed property belonging to the Society, but owing to *increased representation* made by some here to our Very Revd Fr General, poor Fr Visitor has been ordered not to think of so doing."[64] Needless to say, the decision in Rome did not end the discussion. In due course Mulledy sent his own letter to Roothaan (who had been his rector in Turin), scolding him for being unduly influenced by the "continental" Jesuits in the United States. It would take most of the decade to resolve the issue.[65]

From October 1831 to June 1832, accompanied by William McSherry, Kenney visited the Jesuits who were at work in St. Louis and in the Missouri Valley. Back at Georgetown in July, he applied successfully to Bishop Francis Kenrick for the return of St. Joseph's church in Philadelphia to the Society. In August, William McSherry was elected delegate to a procurators' congregation in Rome. Before his departure, the consultors drafted a number of petitions to the General. The most important sought the establishment of Maryland as a full province in the Society, with Missouri as a mission. (Kenney, however, favored separating Missouri from Maryland, a view that the General

---

[63]Kenney to Roothaan, January 10, 1831, ARSI, MD, 4.I.3, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 244. In late 1832 Kenney delivered a severe lecture to Ryder on the duties of the minister's office. Six Belgian Jesuits had arrived at Georgetown and were there five days without being offered a change of clothing (ibid., 329–30).

[64]Ryder to Kohlman, September 30, 1831, F.G. vii, Epist. Collectio, no. 718, 16/ Kohlman, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 265.

[65]Ibid., 266.

decided to adopt.) Other items included support for the idea of gradually eliminating slavery in favor of free laborers and an appeal to charge tuition at schools. Kenney provided McSherry with detailed instructions on how to present these points to the General. In early January of 1833, Roothaan confided to Kenney that McSherry was his choice to be the first provincial in Maryland, information the Visitor was to publicize after McSherry's return. While he awaited the provincial designate, Kenney moved to Philadelphia to initiate the restoration of Jesuit work.[66]

In early June, William McSherry returned to Georgetown, where rumors spread quickly about the changing status of Maryland and its new provincial. Peter Kenney read the formal announcement on July 8. He began with an exhortation that charged his audience to face the future and all its difficulties with confidence, and "to press onward with good heart." One of the fathers then read Roothaan's decree erecting the Maryland Province and naming McSherry as provincial. Kenney delivered the documents to the new provincial and, with a bow, gestured to him to leave the room first. His work as Visitor was concluded.[67] The new province had ninety members: thirty-eight priests, twenty scholastics, thirty-two brothers. The population they would be serving included 19,000 Catholics in Baltimore; 35,000 in New York; 25,000 in Philadelphia; and 11,000 in Boston.[68] Thomas Mulledy and

Cutting to the chase with teenage boys, he denounced idle youths ". . . proud and haughty to their very parents, irreverent and disrespectful in the church, strangers to the sacraments, dissolute in their conduct, foul and filthy in their language; whence a catastrophe so mournful; whence? From idleness, my beloved friends, from idleness."

[66]Ibid., 314, 318–19, 331–34.

[67]*WL*, 12:208–9, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 337–38. Documents erecting the Maryland Province are in ARSI, MD, 5.I.1. Roothaan's decree was dated February 2, 1833. ARSI, Litt. ad MD 1833-53 [hereafter Litt.], I.70.

[68]Morrissey, *Kenney,* 338.

Francis Dzierozynski were among the first province consultors; Aloysius Young was the first socius.[69]

Directed by the General to return to Ireland in the fall, Peter Kenney took a long farewell from the people and places he had grown to love in America. At Georgetown the house diarist resorted to superlatives: "Never has a man lived among us whom all without exception so loved and reverenced."[70] Seventy-five years later, an early historian of the province used similar language: "Vision, courage, confidence in God, utter abandonment to the lead of obedience, these made Peter Kenney a man almost without compare in this country . . . , a giant of God."[71] He sailed from New York in mid-August, sad that his wish to remain in pastoral work in Philadelphia had to be subordinated to the needs of the Society elsewhere. In a final report to the General, he confessed: "Nothing pertaining to that province and region can be unwelcome to me, nor was ever given me by holy obedience a mandate less welcome than that which ordered me to leave America and our Americans."[72] He had served the Marylanders well on two lengthy occasions. The mutual regard between Kenney and the Americans indicated how successfully he had modeled the union of minds and hearts.

William McSherry

When William McSherry assumed leadership over the new province, he was just short of his thirty-fourth birthday. Over six feet tall, he is described by Emmett Curran as "amiable," with "modest intellectual gifts and an undistinguished academic record." After ordination, he had served two years in the Jesuit college at Turin under the rectorship of Jan Roothaan.[73] At first, matters went smoothly. Francis Dzierozynski observed that McSherry "pleases everyone" with his

---

[69]McSherry to Roothaan, July 30, 1833, ARSI, MD, 5.I.5.

[70]*WL*, 12:207, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 338.

[71]Edward J. Devitt, "History," *WL,* 62:344–45.

[72]Kenney to Roothaan, October 20, 1833, ARSI, Hib., 2.II.25, in Morrissey, *Kenney,* 345.

[73]Curran, *Georgetown,* 109. Since he lacked advanced academic achievement, McSherry was designated a spiritual coadjutor at the time of his final vows (Roothaan to Kenney, December 8, 1831, ARSI Litt., 44–45).

governance and expressed approval that he was acting in strength.[74] The General was confident enough in Maryland leadership to extend McSherry's term for another three years in 1836. On that occasion, Roothaan praised his service and recommended holding the line against American exceptionalism in Jesuit discipline. To the line "We are in America," McSherry was instructed to reply "We are in the Society of Jesus," and not to yield the authentic spirit of the Society.[75]

A major event during these years was the province congregation of 1835, when McSherry and Mulledy teamed up to force the issue on divesting the province of its slaves. They were convinced that the Maryland manors were a drain on the province's financial and personnel resources, holding the province back from its true mission in cities and schools. Because few of the older Maryland Jesuits had the fourth vow, the Roman-trained Americans dominated the assembly of ten and narrowly succeeded, by a vote of six to four, in approving a *postulatum* requesting Roothaan's permission to sell the slaves and keep only some of the estates, operating under free labor.[76] Roothaan's reply came in October 1836. He set six conditions based on the traditional Catholic teaching that the interests of slaves took priority over the desires of their masters. These conditions were intended to protect the Catholic identity and practice of the slaves, including the sanctity of their marital and family bonds, and to ensure that the revenue devised would be used exclusively as an endowment for the formation program.[77]

---

[74]Dzierozynski to Roothaan, February 20, 1834 and February 20, 1836, ARSI, MD, 5.I.12 and 5.I.28.

[75]Roothaan to McSherry, January 15, 1836, ARSI, Litt., 114–17.

[76]The most recent publication on this matter is Curran, *Shaping,* 114–15. Fuller accounts of Jesuit slaveholding include Edward F. Beckett, S.J., "Listening to Our History: Inculturation and Jesuit Slaveholding," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits,* 28/5 (November 1996); and Robert Emmett Curran, "Rome, The American Church, and Slavery," in *Building the Church in America,* ed. Joseph Linck and Raymond Kupke (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 30–39. The most complete account is Thomas Murphy, *Jesuit Slaveholding in Maryland* (New York: Routledge, 2001), especially pages 164–223. Murphy describes the debate on the postulatum, 196–99.

[77]Roothaan to McSherry, December 27, 1836, ARSI, Litt., 231; Murphy, *Jesuit Slaveholding,* 199; Curran, *Shaping,* 46–47. An English translation of the General's let-

By the time the letter arrived, McSherry was suffering with what proved to be stomach cancer, unable at times to fulfill the duties of his office. In August of 1837, he wrote the General: "I feel myself incapable of the office I hold and would consider myself wanting in my duty did I not supplicate your paternity to appoint someone who will have strength and energy to give new life to the Society in this country." Having submitted his resignation, he declined, in a cryptic afterthought, to recommend a successor: "From my previous letters yr. Py. Will have understood that I do not think that any in the Province would suit for the place. I know of no one whom I could recommend, though any one is better than myself."[78] In October the General chose Thomas Mulledy as provincial, imposing on him "the heaviest cross in the province." Two months later, Roothaan sent a pep talk to the new provincial: "I have great confidence in your energy and good spirit. The College has been changed for the better through your work. And I hope for the Province, that the spirit, the Spirit of the Society, will be awakened, and all will succeed well A.M.D.G."[79] Meanwhile, McSherry, his prognosis still uncertain, was appointed rector of Georgetown.

Addressing critics who argued that Jesuits in the United States had monarchist tendencies, Ryder stated that the government of the Society is republican, using general congregations as a case in point.

Under Mulledy's leadership 1838 became an *annus horribilis* in the province. Emmett Curran characterizes him as "imperious [with] fondness for the manorial lifestyle of Chesapeake society, especially its drinking habits." Many of the Europeans in the Maryland Province found him lax, failing to enforce sacred silence, tolerating overindulgence in alcohol, evening visits without companions, and the reception of guests of both sexes in Jesuit rooms. By March the General directed

ter is in *WL*, 41:281–82.

[78]McSherry to Roothaan, August 6, 1837, ARSI, MD, 5.I.42.

[79]Roothaan to Mulledy, October 10 and December 16, 1837, ARSI, Litt., 140–142.

Mulledy to prohibit the use of alcohol; later, he ordered correction of the other issues.[80] Meanwhile, in June of 1838 Mulledy sold 272 slaves from the four estates in southern Maryland for $115,000. In some cases, to forestall local Jesuits from hiding the slaves, Mulledy arrived unannounced with the sheriff and the buyer. From the proceeds he gave $8,000 to Archbishop Samuel Eccleston of Baltimore as a final settlement of the dispute initiated by Archbishop Maréchal over income from Jesuit properties; $17,000 went to Georgetown to reduce institutional indebtedness; the remaining $90,000 went into a formation endowment. Immediately, Maryland Province members began sending angry letters to Roothaan, with heartbreaking stories about the roundup and denunciations of Mulledy for his inability to safeguard the marital bonds of the slaves. Archbishop Eccleston also wrote, stressing the separation of families. Curran concludes, "The available evidence suggests that, despite the elaborate instructions of . . . Roothaan, families were separated."[81]

In March of 1839, the General rebuked Mulledy for disregarding his instructions about restricted use of proceeds from the sale; he also noted the letters of protest coming in from Maryland.[82] By August, with the uproar continuing, Roothaan ordered McSherry to tell Mulledy to resign as provincial or face dismissal. By then, Archbishop Eccleston and McSherry had persuaded Mulledy to resign and take his case in person to Rome. Eccleston wrote Roothaan "to engage your paternal indulgence on behalf of Revd. F. Mulledy, whose many excellent & distinguished qualities are known to me, as well as the weaknesses which have pained both you and myself." The archbishop advised that dismissal would produce more harm than retaining Mulledy in the Society; he also expressed his personal regard: "If I may venture to speak of my own feelings, you will . . . spare me many a sorrowful moment by leaning to the side of clemency and confiding in the sincerity & generosity of his resolutions."[83] The General assigned Mulledy

---

[80]Curran, *Shaping,* 116–17.

[81]Contracts of sale from 1838 are in MPA, 40.10. See also Curran, *Shaping,* 47–50, and Murphy, *Jesuit Slaveholding,* 203–9. The economic recession following the Panic of 1837 reduced the amount of the sale.

[82]Roothaan to Mulledy, March 1, 1839, ARSI, Litt., 161–62; Curran, *Shaping,* 117.

[83]Eccleston to Roothaan, June 27, 1839, ARSI, MD, 7.I.5.

to teach English in Nice. The whole episode had become, in Curran's words, "a morality play worthy of Harriet Beecher Stowe. [84]

The eight professed fathers elected McSherry to resume the office of provincial; Roothaan quickly confirmed the appointment. At this point, Roothaan seems to have been in the dark about the severity of McSherry's illness. The previous year he had been impatient with McSherry's failure to send regular reports from Georgetown to Rome: "The Province of Maryland should rather cease to exist, than to exist in the Society in such universal disgrace. . . . God have mercy, and Mary be propitious! That we don't come to this extreme." By November, the General's tone was more sympathetic, though apparently he retained hope that McSherry would recover.[85] By the fall of 1839, however, McSherry was in constant pain with a tumor the size of an orange. He died on December 21, designating Francis Dzierozynski to succeed him *ad interim*.[86]

Thomas Mulledy

As the Marylanders mourned the loss of their provincial, Thomas Mulledy was in Nice, "a Preacher in English to the Englishmen numerously resorting there." The General explained the reason for his *ritiro* from Maryland as "a necessary measure so as not to worsen the offense given to many." [87] Languishing far from home on the Riviera, Mulledy felt isolated, writing to George Fenwick: "You all seem to have forgotten me, but I must not complain of that—no doubt I deserve it."[88] By his second year as acting provincial, Dzierozynski, repeating a request of the 1841 province congregation, asked the General if it were possible to bring Mulledy home. He requested "our good

---

[84]Curran, *Shaping*, 51.

[85]Roothaan to McSherry, September 11 and November 3, 1838, ARSI, Litt., 154–55, 159; Curran, *Shaping*, 117–19.

[86]Francis Vespré to Roothaan, November 29 and December 21, 1839, ARSI, MD, 7.I.21, 22; Curran, *Shaping*, 117.

[87]Dzierozynski to John McElroy, March 9, 1840, MPA, 213Z7a; Roothaan to Vespré, December 31, 1839, ARSI, Litt., 169.

[88]Mulledy to Fenwick, March 15, 1841, MPA, 213R6.

Father Mulledy" again early in 1842.[89] Dzierozynski told Archbishop Eccleston about his reasons for ending the exile: "We stand in need of such a subject here"; the length of exile was a "sufficient atonement for anything he might have been guilty of." Only the archbishop's approbation was needed to conclude the matter. To this Eccleston responded that he would be "very glad" for Mulledy's return, a man he had always esteemed for his "great talents and good heart."[90]

Eccleston's eagerness notwithstanding, the thinking in Rome was that Mulledy would best be placed away from Maryland and the scene of the scandal. So it was that the Diocese of Boston became an option as Benedict Fenwick's plans for a college neared completion.[91] At year's end, Mulledy sailed to America and arrived at Georgetown in January of 1843. Dzierozynski reported his reception at the school where he was received by all "with open hearts and arms—and the Boys at their entrance gate with a Flagg, welcomed [him] with cheerful and hasty *hurra! hurra! hurra!*"[92] Immediately, Bishop Fenwick requested his services as rector of the new college in Worcester: "Mulledy . . . will answer exceedingly well in every respect." After receiving approval from the province consultors, Mulledy traveled to Boston in early March and set to work. The College of the Holy Cross, named by Bishop Fenwick after his cathedral in Boston, opened on November 1. At Fenwick's insistence, the school was restricted to Catholic boys only, a scheme designed both to isolate Holy Cross from Yankee nativists and to foster religious vocations. Mulledy put it thus: "We are on the cheap plan—not a heretic shall poke his nose, as a stu-

James Healy, the brightest student in the class and one of Fenwick's protégés, was praised for his excellence in Classics: but rebuked for the "little red rag" of his very critical tongue.

[89]Dzierozynski to Roothaan, August 28, 1841, and February 14, 1842, ARSI, MD, 7.I.37 and 7.I.45; Curran, *Shaping*, 121.

[90]Dzierozynski to McElroy, February 26, 1842, MPA, 213K6.

[91]Roothaan to Dzierozynski, October 29, 1842, ARSI, Litt., I:204.

[92]Dzierozynski to McElroy, January 11, 1843, MPA, 214Z2.

dent, in the College."[93] The speaker at the formal cornerstone-laying ceremony in June was Mulledy's shipmate from 1820, Charles Constantine Pise.

Mulledy was more successful at opening the college than at getting it off the ground. A tug of war developed between Bishop Fenwick and the Maryland Province about the Society's assuming sponsorship of the school instead of merely staffing it. The issue was money: Mulledy challenged the bishop for leaving the school poorly supplied, while the bishop alleged wasteful administration. The situation brought out the stormy side of Mulledy's personality, and after two years he was brought back to Georgetown to serve a second term as rector.[94] In 1847 Mulledy was elected procurator for the Marylanders after another province congregation—a contentious affair during which Mulledy clashed angrily with a number of others, including James Ryder. The Belgian Jesuit, Peter Verhaegen, who was provincial at the time, was appalled at breaches of fraternal conduct during this meeting, describing to Roothaan Mulledy's "imperious and despotic" temperament, his impatience with opponents, bitingly stated points, without any suggestion of a mortified spirit. Verhaegen suggested that the election had been engineered.[95]

***All accounts of him at the three schools where [Fenwick] taught stress the great affection in which students held him. More than most Jesuits of his generation, he succeeded in representing Ignatian pedagogical ideals described by George Ganss in his classic study,* St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University.**

Mulledy's reputation preceded him to Rome for the procurators' meeting, but Jan Roothaan did not condemn him: "I believe that his rusticity or external rudeness harmed him more than any lack of true charity." He advised leaving Mulledy at Georgetown for another

[93]Mulledy to George Fenwick, June 30, 1843, MPA, 214W8; for an account of the origins of Holy Cross, see Kuzniewski, *Thy Honored Name,* 19–33.

[94]Kuzniewski, *Thy Honored Name,* 42–47.

[95]Verhaegen to Roothaan, August 14, 1847, ARSI, MD, 8.I.27.

three-year term, especially if the bishop desired it, but he left the ultimate decision to a new provincial from Switzerland, Ignatius Brocard, who sailed from Europe with Mulledy to take up his new responsibility.[96] Ultimately, Brocard sent Mulledy to Philadelphia to work as procurator; and in 1850 sent him to be rector of the school in Frederick. From 1854 to 1857, Mulledy was back at Holy Cross serving as spiritual prefect and prefect of studies. In 1857 he returned to Georgetown to work at Holy Trinity parish; thereafter he spent a year in Philadelphia, and a year as superior at St. Joseph's in Philadelphia before his death at Georgetown in the summer of 1860 at the age of sixty-six.

An energetic administrator and insightful educator, Thomas Mulledy was an earthen vessel with a knack for putting other Jesuits on edge. From Worcester, James Ryder declared that the decision not to send Mulledy back to Holy Cross in 1848 was "something which will be appreciated by not a few." [97] Two years later Ryder's successor told the provincial that Mulledy's return to Worcester would "never suit—he is known and disliked by the whole community."[98] And yet, when he was reassigned to Worcester in 1854, a different rector reported his eagerness to have Mulledy: "His presence will be a great help—for he is popular with the clergy."[99] But Mulledy was not good in subordinate roles. Within two years he was blaming the rector for undercutting his position at the school; he requested a new assignment.[100] His impatience with imperfection in others and snap judgments were the stuff of legend. Two letters from 1844 illustrate the point. On one occasion, he described Father Henry Balfe as "a mere ninkempoop, . . . about one of the last to be sent to a new College."[101] Later in the year he noted that Brother Finegan, in reporting to his new assignment at Holy Cross, had missed his rail connection: "From this *small fact* & some other passing observations, I clearly perceive, that said Br. Fine-

---

[96]Roothaan to Brocard, November 27, 1847, ARSI, MD, I.258; *WL*, 8:111.

[97]Ryder to Brocard, August 11, 1848, MPA, 216K2.

[98]John Early to Brocard, September 15, 1850, MPA, 218N3.

[99]Anthony Ciampi to Charles Stonestreet, August 14 and August 28, 1854, MPA, 222T6 and 222T9.

[100]Mulledy to Stonestreet, September 11, 1856, MPA, 224S18.

[101]Mulledy to George Fenwick, February 18, 1844, MPA, 214P9.

gan *is not* the inventor of gun-powder."[102] Mulledy struggled with his drinking at times in his life; in 1837 he confided to a veteran Jesuit that he had resolved to abstain from wine and liquor. "I hope that this will enable me to correct my other defects—which, I believe, took their origin from this."[103]

As an educator, Mulledy understood the need for adaptation. While rector at Frederick, he defended English-only classes as consistent with the *Ratio studiorum*, citing a conversation he had had with Jan Roothaan in 1847 about the revised version of the *Ratio.* "I am strongly inclined to think, that it is necessary for us, particularly in mixed populations, to have a regular course in their respective vernacular tongues, in order to prevent Catholic boys from becoming driven, by necessity, into protestant schools."[104]

Mulledy was a sincere and devout Jesuit. He kept a record of intentions for every Mass he celebrated. During rectorship in Worcester, he listed about sixty Masses "For New College," "For My Boys," and "For the Community." In his pastoral ministry, he worked particularly hard at preaching; and his reputation was sufficient that John Hughes invited him to preach at his consecration ceremony as coadjutor bishop in New York in 1838.[105] He preached from a written text, saving his sermons in pamphlets that resemble modern examination blue books. Inside, he noted the location and date of each delivery. The index to his sermons lists eighty-one items on a wide variety of topics: "Love of Neighbor," "Vainglory," "The Truth That Reprehends," "Effeminate Life," "Divine Providence," "The Mercy of God," "Death," "The Blessed Virgin Mary," "Love of Enemies," "Prayer," and others. He threw himself into the work of preaching with careful rehearsal and Websterian vigor. After his arrival in Boston in 1843, Bishop Fenwick wrote: "Fr. Mulledy preached in our Cathedral on Last Sunday one of his awful sermons, & scared all the old Irish women almost to death—

[102]Mulledy to Ryder, October 15, 1844, MPA, 214H1.

[103]Mulledy to John McElroy, February 20, 1837, MPA, 212H4.

[104]Mulledy to Stonestreet, September 6, 1852, MPA, 220M2.

[105]John Hughes to Mulledy, November 17, 1837, GUA, Mulledy Papers.

It will take them some [time] to recover from it. Okone! Okone! Okone! Was their constant exclamation the whole time."[106]

The sermons were long by modern standards, but in most respects they stand the test of time. "Devotion to the Passion of Christ," written for Palm Sunday in Nice in 1840, is geared toward increasing "a more tender devotion towards our Suffering Lord." "The Dying Sinner," given seventeen times between 1832 and 1860, is a lengthy reflection on John 8:21: "You shall seek me, and you shall die in your sin." Against a horrible end to life, described in lurid detail, Mulledy recommended throwing oneself on the mercy of the crucified Jesus. "Duty of Promoting the Glory of God," written at Holy Trinity in Georgetown in 1857 for the feast of St. Ignatius, praised the founder for "never seeking any thing but the glory of God."[107] "Idleness," written at Frederick in 1852, was designed for boys and young men enrolled at the schools where Mulledy worked. It was not delivered in parishes. The sermon insists that the devil's greatest opportunity comes "when he perceives us spending in lazy tranquility our idle hours!" Cutting to the chase with teenage boys, he denounced idle youths

At the start of his rectorship at Georgetown, Roothaan voiced his suspicion that Ryder was "more American than Jesuit. If true, God prevent it."

> . . . proud and haughty to their very parents, irreverent and disrespectful in the church, strangers to the sacraments, dissolute in their conduct, foul and filthy in their language; whence a catastrophe so mournful; whence? From idleness, my beloved friends, from idleness.

Idleness, he warned, reduces one to the level of desires, like David—"in war a saint, in idleness an adulterer and a murderer." The sermon

---

[106]Benedict to George Fenwick, March 13, 1843, MPA, 214Z7; James Healy to [George Fenwick], December 24, 1856, MPA, 224S11."Ochone" *[okone]* is an Irish and Scotch expression: Alas!

[107]Mulledy's sermons are in the Mulledy Papers at Georgetown. Curran reprints the two cited above in *American Jesuit Spirituality,* 253–71.

concluded with a prayer for forgiveness: "I beseech thee, my Jesus, through the merits of thy cross and passion, to give me grace, so that treating myself as the sinner that I really am, I may never seek any other repose, but that, which thou has prepared for every penitent heart in thy kingdom."

After his death in 1860, Mulledy left vivid memories and stories that must have been echoed in Jesuit common rooms for decades. Writing in 1904, Jesuit John Ryan described him as "a genial, rough-and-ready, independent American—faithful in his devotion to duty."[108] Thus was he remembered, and thus have historians depicted him: a man of strong appetites and strong opinions. Genuinely pious and generous, his capacity for bombast and his energy in carrying out his assignments made him always a productive bundle of contradictions. Perhaps more than any of his contemporaries, he led the way in reorienting the work of the Society on the East Coast toward the apostolate of education and pastoral ministry in cities.

James Ryder

James Ryder was appointed provincial in 1843, succeeding Francis Dzierozynski, who strongly approved the appointment.[109] Ryder held the office for only about a year, serving simultaneously as rector of Georgetown. Curran speculates that Roothaan had at last decided "that the province could not cure itself [and] replaced him with an outsider," Belgian-born Peter Verhaegen, who had held several offices in Missouri. The brightest of the group who traveled to Italy in 1820, Ryder taught after ordination at Spoleto, where he befriended Archbishop Giovanni Ferretti, the future Pius IX.[110] After his return from Europe, he taught at Georgetown and served twice as president from 1840 to 1845 and from 1848 to 1851; during the intervening years, he traveled to Rome and then served a three-year term as rector of Holy Cross. He helped to open and then guide St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia, 1851–55, moving the following year to become rector of

---

[108]*WL*, 33:17.

[109]Roothaan to Ryder, July 15, 1843, ARSI, Litt., 210–11; Dzierozynski to Roothaan September 28, 1843, ARSI, MD, 7.I.61.

[110]Curran, *Academy,* 109; *Shaping,* 121.

St. John's in Frederick. A year later, he was assigned to pastoral ministry in Alexandria, Virginia. He returned to St. Joseph's as spiritual prefect in 1859 and died there in January of 1860 at age fifty-nine.

Like Thomas Mulledy, James Ryder was thoroughly American in attitude. At the start of his rectorship at Georgetown, Roothaan voiced his suspicion that Ryder was "more American than Jesuit. If true, God prevent it."[111] But Ryder had more serious problems with his standing in the Society: suspicions about his epistolary relationship with a woman. Ryder sailed to Rome in 1845 to clear his name. Evidently, he satisfied the General that his letters involved spiritual counseling only, but shortly after Ryder returned to America, the General was warning him again that accusations from other Jesuits were still in the air. Roothaan corresponded with Ryder about "that certain matter." He warned, "If there is no submission, there is no union; and with union taken away, what remains of the Society?"[112] And in 1847 he told Ignatius Brocard, now Maryland provincial, that he wanted the evil "rooted out" by telling Ryder to stop the correspondence: "Go into the matter, then prohibit it in Holy Obedience in my name."[113] Evidently, that ended the matter; allusions to it cease afterwards.

Throughout his life, James Ryder achieved particular distinction through his preaching. Unlike many contemporaries, he preached without notes—an extemporaneous style that amazed and gratified his listeners. Curran has called him "perhaps the most renowned preacher in antebellum Catholic America."[114] Archbishop Eccleston was among his strongest admirers. When Ryder preached at the cathedral in Baltimore during Lent of 1842, the prelate marveled at his pastoral success

> I earnestly requested him to prolong his stay. . . . The Revd Mr Ryder has proved himself to be a worthy and honored Son of St. Ignatius. His impressive, pious and eloquent instructions have mainly, after the grace of God, contributed to render the Cathe-

---

[111]Roothaan to Dzierozynski, September 18, 1840, ARSI, Litt., I:185.

[112]Roothaan to Ryder, November 3, 1846 and March 11, 1847, ARSI, Litt., I:242 and 250.

[113]Roothaan to Brocard, November 27, 1847, ARSI, Litt., I:258.

[114]Curran, *Academy*, 121.

> dral Retreat one of the most edifying and consoling that was ever given in this Country.[115]

Jan Roothaan was aware of Ryder's success and attributed many conversions to the Catholic faith to Ryder's pastoral effectiveness.[116] Throughout his life he was active in preaching retreats and missions, events Curran describes as "something between the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola and the missions that Jesuits . . . and others made such an institution of American Catholicism later in the century."[117] Both Ryder's pastoral effectiveness and his wide renown must have been factors in the General's urgency to suppress the alleged scandal.

During his time as Georgetown rector, Ryder cultivated good relations with the federal government and promoted the college in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. He had a warm relationship with President John Tyler, who participated in commencement ceremonies and sent his son to Georgetown. Curran speculates that Ryder used speaker's fees to improve the financial strength of the college. And in 1852 he raised $5,000 on a fund-raising trip to California for St. Joseph's College. Ryder also built Holy Trinity church in Georgetown, completed in 1852.[118]

Ryder's work as a Jesuit educator had a strong impact on provincial policy. In 1843 he was one of those ardently supporting the reordering of priorities. With John McElroy and Giovanni Grassi, he served on a commission whose conclusions supported the sale of the old estates. Anticipating opposition, they advocated moving slowly and without fanfare. The emerging scene of the mid-nineteenth century, they concluded, made the old parishes more suitable for diocesan priests. "We concur . . . in the opinion that being freed from parochial duties, and establishing our schools in the large Cities, forming one or more bands of missionaries to be ready at the request of the Bishops to give retreats, that much more good could be effected, and that we

---

[115]Eccleston wrote to Dzierozynski, who quoted him to Roothaan, March 29, 1842, ARSI, MD, 7.I.46.

[116]Report of Roothaan to Propaganda Fidei, April 12, 1845, ARSI, Missiones, 1840–50, 284.

[117]Curran, *Shaping,* 123.

[118]Curran, *Academy,* 121–24.

would gain more respect for the Society, both from Clergy & Laity."[119] It was a goal for Jesuit work in America, grounded to a certain extent in his experience of educational work being done by Jesuits of the restored Society in Italy.

Committed to defending the Society as antebellum nativism flared up, Ryder lectured on the Society in New York in 1850. Addressing critics who argued that Jesuits in the United States had monarchist tendencies, Ryder stated that the government of the Society is republican, using general congregations as a case in point. During his visit to Italy in 1845, he recruited eight Jesuit priests and scholastics for work in the United States.[120] Both before and after his short-lived provincialate, James Ryder proved himself to be a tireless worker, dividing his time between administrative duties in Worcester, Washington, and Philadelphia, and traveling widely to preach retreats and missions. Archbishop Eccleston's observation that Ryder "has done a great deal of good in Baltimore"[121] echoed from Washington, D.C., to California, at colleges, convents, parishes, and public meetings where people were touched by grace through his remarkable preaching, clear insights, and his gift for making Catholicism respectable and attractive.

George Fenwick

George Fenwick was nineteen years younger than his brother, Bishop Benedict Fenwick. After his return from Italy, he was at Georgetown until 1844 in a variety of assignments that included teaching and serving as spiritual prefect, prefect of studies, and minister. Then he worked at Holy Cross as prefect of studies and spiritual prefect until 1852, when declining health prompted his return to Frederick for two years. Afterwards he returned to Georgetown, where he maintained his pattern of pastoral effectiveness among students until his death in 1857.[122] Altogether, he spent twenty-seven years as a teacher, achieving great success because, as historian Albert Foley put it, "he was a hu-

---

[119]Report to Giovanni Grassi, June 17 and 27, 1843, ARSI, MD, 7.II.4; Curran, *Shaping*, 120–121.

[120]Brocard to Roothaan, November 25, 1850, ARSI, MD, 8.II.32; Curran, *Academy,* 132.

[121]Quoted by Dzierozynski to Roothaan, March 29, 1842, ARSI, MD, 7.I.46.

[122]Curran, *Academy,* 173.

manist in the best sense of the word, who taught students as well as subjects."[123] Trained for leadership in Italy, he was more fit for pedagogy; it was in that field that he expressed and lived the *magis.*

One strong piece of evidence regarding Fenwick's pedagogy is a set of prefect's reports from his years at Holy Cross. The reports were read publicly on Ash Wednesday each year and singled out individual students for praise or censure. In Fenwick's handwriting, they ran from twenty-two to thirty-two pages and certainly caused tension for students in those days before laws forbade the publicizing of grades. The report for 1846 had a classic opening, citing the observation of Samuel Johnson that a person of ordinary talent could become a learned man by devoting four hours per day to study. "Now not reckoning the time you spend in school almost every day, you have more than four hours regularly dedicated to study and consequently have every opportunity to realize the object for which you were placed by your parents or guardians within the walls of this institution." Fenwick contrasted the diligent student—"one of the most engaging of objects"—from the lazy one—"a disgusting, loathsome, tedious sight." He challenged students who were weak spellers, and reminded his audience of exclusively Catholic boys that "their religion is not a matter of opinion; we may be asked to give an account of it; we may be asked why we are so fully persuaded of its truth. . . . The one who pays little or no attention to the elements of Christian doctrine will never be able to do justice to his religion."[124]

After many years, these accounts of energy, imagination, and confidence in God offer perspective and hope as we come to terms with scandals involving betrayal of trust and pastoral responsibility and re-form our provinces.

Moving to specifics, he administered strong censure to a lazy student: "He was entirely deficient in everything. Yet he bore himself

[123]Albert S. Foley, *Dream of an Outcaste: Patrick F. Healy* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: Portals Press, 1989), 60.

[124]Prefect of Studies Report, February 25, 1846, GUA, Fenwick Papers. Some punctuation supplied.

so insolently as to change our pity to disgust." James Healy, the brightest student in the class and one of Fenwick's protégés, was praised for his excellence in Classics: but rebuked for the "little red rag" of his very critical tongue: "This very man . . . could be . . . the pattern and model of our students; for his piety is solid, . . . his manners are genteel, his application to study serious and constant, but for his blessed tongue!" Having written those words, upon reflection, Fenwick substituted a milder, less explicit critique. He may well have administered stronger correction privately. What comes through in these reports is Fenwick's thorough knowledge of students; he interested himself in them, created an interpersonal mentoring space in which many of them thrived.

Nicknamed "Dad" Fenwick, he took a personal interest in his students as mentor and, later, friend and religious advisor. At Holy Cross he turned the minds of the Healy boys toward the priesthood—James as a diocesan priest who became the first African-American bishop in Portland, Maine (1875–1900); Patrick, a Jesuit, whose presidency at Georgetown (1873–82) transformed a college into a university; and Sherwood, who became rector of the cathedral in Boston.[125] The Healy brothers were sons of an Irish immigrant who lived in a common-law marriage with a mulatto slave. Under the laws of Georgia, the Healy children were slaves. From the time of their enrollment at Holy Cross in 1844 until Fenwick's death, he served as mentor and spiritual advisor to them. They discussed their vocations with him; and Patrick sought his advice when he was sent to Worcester for regency in 1853. Historian James O'Toole describes Fenwick as their "surrogate parent . . . , a special protector and patron. . . . They confided in him as they did in no one else, sharing among themselves concerns over his health, just as children do with aging parents."[126] Fenwick recommended perseverance to Patrick when he started regency at Holy Cross: "However restive or lazy your boys may be, you are sure—yes infallibly sure

[125]On the Healy family, see James M. O'Toole, *Passing for White: Race, Religion, and the Healy Family, 1820–1920* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 2002).

[126]O'Toole, *Passing for White,* 38–39.

that with prudence & patience you will gain your end." Study hard, he advised, "to keep crickets out of your head."[127]

Mixed in with his pedagogical and pastoral strengths, including his singing at liturgical celebrations, George Fenwick shared a weakness with Thomas Mulledy: fondness for the bottle that his brother Jesuits regretted and sincerely tried to correct. That may have been the issue in 1834, when Jan Roothaan asked him to spend some time considering and correcting his faults before final vows.[128] Roothaan raised the matter directly with John Ryder in 1846 and asked him, as Fenwick's rector, to address the matter. A year later, he wrote again, telling Ryder to administer a rebuke in his [the General's] name and to threaten dismissal from the Society if necessary.[129] By 1851 Fenwick was suffering debility in his eyes and legs. In Worcester, he was forced to give up his work as prefect of studies to save his strength for his work as spiritual prefect. That summer, Rector John Early wrote from Worcester that Fenwick was unable to read ordinary or large print: "We should pray hard for his recovery—He's a most valuable member of the Society—one whose lose [*sic*] will be greatly felt."[130] He improved somewhat in the fall; his new rector reported that his health depended on resisting his appeals for a drink![131]

Fenwick was assigned to Frederick in 1852 and after two years moved to Georgetown to spend his declining days. There, he sat on the porch, surrounded by younger students—one wearing his biretta, one on his knee, one with his arm around his neck. Fenwick was in a public

---

[127]Fenwick to Healy, [n.d.] and September 28, 1853, GUA, Patrick F. Healy S.J. Papers.

[128]Kenney to Fenwick, June 23, 1833, MPA, 210G13, in Morrissey, *Kenney*, 337. On his singing, Bishop Fenwick reported in 1841 on his younger brother's visit to Boston: "He sings high mass for us in his usual high flowing style & while doing it thinks himself the wonder of his age" (to Mother Mary Agatha, September 28, 1841, MPA, 213).

[129]Roothaan to Ryder, April 10, 1846, and March 11, 1847, ARSI, Litt., I.237 and 250.,

[130]Early to Brocard, August 4 and 10, 1851, MPA, 219R4.

[131]Anthony Ciampi to Brocard, September 16 and October 10, 1851, MPA, 219P9 and 219N5.

place, and his conduct generally won approbation, not censure.[132] All accounts of him at the three schools where he taught stress the great affection in which students held him. More than most Jesuits of his generation, he succeeded in representing Ignatian pedagogical ideals described by George Ganss in his classic study, *St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University:*

> Ignatius . . . desired the teachers in his schools to take a personal interest in the students. Speaking of the intellectual training, he asserted that "the masters . . . should take a personal interest in the progress of each one of their students." His remark when he is treating their spiritual welfare is similar: "The teachers will take care of this, each one with his own students." Furthermore, he desired the professors to have fixed times to make it easy for the students to consult them privately.[133]

Drawing on his training in Italy and his appropriation of Jesuit ideals in an American way, he modeled Jesuit mentoring and promoted *eloquentia perfecta* in ways that drew vocations to the Society and elicited warm and appreciative memories.

Aloysius Young

Although Aloysius Young preceded the six "American champions" in Europe by two years, he was associated with them in Italy and afterwards in the Maryland Province. Ordained in 1825, he returned to the United States at the end of 1828 and began to teach at Georgetown. There, at first, he displayed an "autocratic" temperament.[134] When the Maryland Province was established in 1833, Young became its first socius. At the time of the stormy province congregation in 1835, Young opposed Mulledy's pressure to deemphasize the old manors, accusing him of bias against the fruitful rural tradition of the Maryland Jesuits. In this, Young spoke for many of the other native Marylanders and local superiors, but he was the only Roman-trained American at the

---

[132]Before 1870, Georgetown accepted students as young as six (Curran, *Academy,* 69, 168–69).

[133]Published in Milwaukee (The Marquette University Press, 1956), 79.

[134]Curran, *Academy,* 117.

congregation to vote against the sale.[135] The following year, Roothaan named a replacement as province socius and Young returned to teaching, this time at Frederick, except for a brief interlude in New York City. He acquitted himself well in the classroom. John McElroy, his rector in Frederick and New York, reported to Roothaan that Young, who apparently mellowed with age, was "very attentive to his Classes, much loved by his scholars, and highly esteemed as a teacher by the Public—he is also regular in the domestic discipline & on all occasions obedient and respectful."[136] McElroy appreciated Young's pedagogical success and they worked well together. Young also served as prefect of studies and as minister in Frederick. His health weakening, Young was sent to pastoral work at St. Mary's parish in Alexandria, Virginia, where he died in 1844 at the age of 46.[137]

Charles Constantine Pise

One of the scholastics who departed for Rome in 1820, Pise left the Society shortly after arriving in Italy. But his profile completes the story of the American travelers of 1820. Pise went on to a distinguished pastoral and literary career in the United States. Ordained in 1825, he was pastor of St. Patrick's parish in Washington when he was chosen (1832) as the first Catholic chaplain of the U.S. Senate. Later, he served in Brooklyn as pastor of St. Charles Borromeo parish from 1849 until his death in 1866.[138] He wrote several novels to illustrate and defend Catholic positions in polemical wars with anti-Catholic writers. He also published poetry, a five-volume history of the Church, and a notable book defending Jesuits from their opponents, *St. Ignatius and His First Companions* (1846), which went through multiple printings. Containing sketches of the lives of Ignatius, Xavier, Peter Faber, and

---

[135]Curran, *Shaping,* 43–44.

[136]McElroy to Roothaan, August 3, 1835, ARSI, MD, 5.IV.4.

[137]*WL,* 15:32–33. On the Alexandria parish, see *WL,* 13:44–56 and 14:97–112.

[138]Comparatively little scholarship has been done on Pise. The most recent that I could find is an analysis of Pise's novels by Willard Thorp that appeared in T*he Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* April 1, 1968, under the title "Catholic Novelists in Defense of Their Faith, 1829–1865," 28–38. See also a master's thesis written at The Catholic University of America about 1930 by Sister M. Eulalia Teresa Moffa entitled "Charles Constantine Pise (1801–1866)," in *Historical Records and Studies* (New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1931), 64–98.

others, the book began with Pise's statement of purpose: "I earnestly hope that the facts which I have collected relating to the lives of the first companions of St. Ignatius may tend to show forth the real spirit of his order, and disperse some of the prejudices that prevail against it."[139] Like his early companions, Pise worked at reconciling his Americanism with Catholicism. Addressing the Maryland House of Delegates on July 4, 1833, he denied a temporal connection with the pope. "I am, as all American Catholics glory to be, Independent to all foreign temporal authority, devoted to freedom, to unqualified toleration, to republican institutions."[140] Ten years later, with Bishop Fenwick and Thomas Mulledy present, he spoke at the cornerstone laying at Holy Cross. Keeping in mind the anti-Catholicism of some New England Yankees, he defended the purposes and methods of Jesuit education, a system that produced "true Christians and sincere republicans" who owed spiritual, not temporal, allegiance to the pope. "He who is not faithful to his country," Pise insisted, "will not be true to his God."[141] Unencumbered by directives from Rome against American adaptations, Pise became a forthright articulator of Catholic republican sentiment.

IV. Conclusion

After their return to the United States, the "American champions," now numbering five, shaped the Society's discernment and directed its choices for several decades. Their primary achievement was to reorient the work of the Jesuits from the traditional rural manors of Maryland and Pennsylvania to education and pastoral work in cities and to help adapt the Jesuit lifestyle to an American context. The process was neither easy nor flawless. As a means to this end and in response to their moral sensibilities, they sponsored the sale of Jesuit-owned slaves in a process rife with scandal and remorse because the humanity and the religious faith of the African-Americans

---

[139]Pise, *St. Ignatius and His First Companions,* reprint ed. (New York: Thomas McCurtain, 1866), 22.

[140]Cited in Moffatt, "Pise," 80–81.

[141]James Fitton, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Church in New England* (Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1872), 292–307.

were so egregiously violated. Americans always, they set a tone for Jesuit life that struck Roman authorities as lax and undisciplined; from their point of view, their choices reflected appropriate Ignatian adaptation to persons, places, and times. Their mixed success in providing leadership betrayed an unintended consequence of their Roman training: in the context of European conservatism that followed the Congress of Vienna and in the spirit of the restored Society in Europe, their sense of distinctiveness as Americans and republicans was enhanced. The result was persistent tension with Generals Fortis and Roothaan, and with European continentalists who came to America as Jesuit superiors and co-workers. Both Fortis and Roothaan knew these men personally, so the tension was mitigated by personal regard.

Among this cadre of Roman-trained Jesuits, three in particular—McSherry, Mulledy, and Ryder—assumed prominent roles in the new Maryland Province. All knew Jan Roothaan and carried their responsibilities in the context of a durable personal relationship. Only William McSherry was successful as provincial; his early death deprived the Marylanders of wise direction. Apart from his disastrous decision regarding the sale and disposition of Jesuit-owned slaves, Thomas Mulledy provided energetic leadership at Georgetown and Holy Cross, the well-being of both schools being heavily dependent on his energy and vision. James Ryder, also an excellent institutional leader at Georgetown, Worcester, Frederick, and Philadelphia, spread the Society's reputation broadly through his sermons and lectures. Less temperamentally suited for leadership, George Fenwick and Aloysius Young set high standards for Jesuit education by their pedagogical dedication and successful mentorship. Charles Pise, publicist and pastor, never abandoned his affection toward the Society.

In their work in America, these European-educated Jesuits did not stand alone. The stage for their achievements was set by two outstanding Jesuits—Peter Kenney and Francis Dzierozynski. More than anyone else, Kenney, by his brilliant leadership and clear-sighted vision, fostered the transition to the Maryland Province. His recommendations during his first visitation resulted, not only in sending the scholastics to Italy, but also in the wise decision of Fortis to send Dzierozynski to the United States. At first resisted and resented, the latter, "Father Zero," as Georgetown students and others were wont to call

him,[142] earned great respect as province leader, novice director, and tertian master—a gift from the Old World to the New. The willingness of both to allow adaptation of American customs to Jesuit norms signaled that native birth was not the only engine for republican values. Their willingness to adapt, in fact, helped to legitimize the persistent republicanism of the American Jesuits.

This narrowly focused account of antebellum Jesuits and one former Jesuit neglects the outward surges of Jesuit work from Europe and Maryland into the Middle States and the West Coast. There, too, priorities and personalities produced both concord and conflict, validating the response Jan Roothaan advanced when James Ryder complained of the state of the province: "Most Dear Father! No new Province is ever in a happy state."[143] Happiness in the early decades of the Maryland Province could be elusive. Challenges, and trial-and-error adjustments and responses, were constant. Like all Jesuits, the "champions" were sinners called to companionship with Jesus. The story of their lives sustains both elements of Jesuit self-understanding: imperfect men, they labored to uphold the *magis,* advancing the Society's service to the people of God in their own difficult times. After many years, these accounts of energy, imagination, and confidence in God offer perspective and hope as we come to terms with scandals involving betrayal of trust and pastoral responsibility and re-form our provinces.

---

[142]Kuzniewski, "Dzierozynski," 56.

[143]Roothaan to Ryder, April 10, 1846, ARSI, Litt., !:237.

Past Issues of Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits
Available for Sale

(For prices, see inside back cover.)

14/5 Ivern, *The Future of Faith and Justice: Review of Decree Four* (Nov. 1982)
15/1 O'Malley, *The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context* (Jan. 1983)
15/2 Sullivan and Faricy, *On Making the Spiritual Exercises for Renewal of Jesuit Charisms* (Mar. 1983)
15/3–4 Padberg, *The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus* (May–Sept. 1983)
16/2 O'Malley, *To Travel to Any Part of the World: Jerónimo Nadal and the Jesuit Vocation* (Mar. 1984)
16/3 O'Hanlon, *Integration of Christian Practices: A Western Christian Looks East* (May 1984)
16/4 Carlson, *"A Faith Lived Out of Doors": Ongoing Formation* (Sept. 1984)
17/1 Spohn, *St. Paul on Apostolic Celibacy and the Body of Christ* (Jan. 1985)
17/2 Daley, *"In Ten Thousand Places": Christian Universality and the Jesuit Mission* (Mar. 1985)
17/3 Tetlow, *Dialogue on the Sexual Maturing of Celibates* (May 1985)
17/4 Spohn, Coleman, Clarke, Henriot, *Jesuits and Peacemaking* (Sept. 1985)
17/5 Kinerk, *When Jesuits Pray: A Perspective on the Prayer of Apostolic Persons* (Nov. 1985)
18/1 Gelpi, *The Converting Jesuit* (Jan. 1986).
18/2 Beirne, *Compass and Catalyst: The Ministry of Administration* (Mar. 1986)
18/3 McCormick, *Bishops as Teachers and Jesuits as Listeners* (May 1986)
18/5 Tetlow, *The Transformation of Jesuit Poverty* (Nov. 1986).
19/1 Staudenmaier, *United States Technology and Adult Commitment* (Jan. 1987)
19/2 Appleyard, *Languages We Use: Talking about Religious Experience* (Mar. 1987)
19/5 Endean, *Who Do You Say Ignatius Is? Jesuit Fundamentalism and Beyond* (Nov. 1987)
20/2 Padberg, *How We Live Where We Live* (Mar. 1988)
20/3 Hayes, Padberg, Staudenmaier, *Symbols, Devotions, and Jesuits (May 1988)*
20/4 McGovern, *Jesuit Education and Jesuit Spirituality* (Sept. 1988)
20/5 Barry, *Jesuit Formation Today: An Invitation to Dialogue and Involvement* (Nov. 1988)
21/1 Wilson, *Where Do We Belong? United States Jesuits and Their Memberships* (Jan. 1989)
21/2 Demoustier, Calvez, et al., *The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor* (Mar. 1989)
21/3 Soukup, *Jesuit Response to the Communication Revolution* (May 1989)
22/2 Bracken, *Jesuit Spirituality from a Process Prospective* (March 1990)
22/3 Shepherd, *Fire for a Weekend: An Experience of the Exercises* (May 1990)
22/5 Coleman, *A Company of Critics: Jesuits and the Intellectual Life* (Nov. 1990)
23/1 Houdek, *The Road Too Often Traveled* (Jan. 1991)

23/3 Begheyn and Bogart, *A Bibliography on St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises* (May 1991)
23/4 Shelton, *Reflections on the Mental Health of Jesuits* (Sept. 1991)
23/5 Toolan, *"Nature Is a Heraclitean Fire"* (Nov. 1991)
24/1 Houdek, *Jesuit Prayer and Jesuit Ministry: Context and Possibilities* (Jan. 1992)
24/2 Smolich, *Testing the Water: Jesuits Accompanying the Poor* (March 1992)
24/3 Hassel, *Jesus Christ Changing Yesterday, Today, and Forever* (May 1992)
24/4 Shelton, *Toward Healthy Jesuit Community Living* (Sept. 1992)
24/5 Cook, *Jesus' Parables and the Faith That Does Justice* (Nov. 1992)
25/3 Padberg, *Ignatius, the Popes, and Realistic Reverence* (May 1993)
25/4 Stahel, *Toward General Congregation 34* (Sept. 1993)
25/5 Baldovin, *Christian Liturgy: An Annotated Bibliography* (Nov. 1993)
26/2 Murphy, *The Many Ways of Justice* (March 1994)
26/3 Staudenmaier, *To Fall in Love with the World* (May 1994)
26/5 Landy, *Myths That Shape Us* (Nov. 1994)
27/1 Daley, *"To Be More like Christ"* (Jan. 1995)
27/2 Schmidt, *Portraits and Landscapes* (March 1995)
27/3 Stockhausen, *I'd Love to, but I Don't Have the Time* (May 1995)
27/4 Anderson, *Jesuits in Jail, Ignatius to the Present* (Sept. 1995)
27/5 Shelton, *Friendship in Jesuit Life* (Nov. 1995)
28/1 Begheyn, *Bibliography on the History of the Jesuits* (Jan. 1996)
28/3 Clooney, *In Ten Thousand Places, in Every Blade of Grass* (May 1996)
28/4 Starkloff, *"As Different As Night and Day"* (Sept. 1996)
28/5 Beckett, *Listening to Our History* (Nov. 1996)
29/1 Hamm, *Preaching Biblical Justice* (Jan. 1997)
29/2 Padberg, *The Three Forgotten Founders* (March 1997)
29/4 Keenan, *Are* Informationes *Ethical?* (Sept. 1997)
29/5 Ferlita, *The Road to Bethlehem—Is It Level or Winding?* (Nov. 1997)
30/1 Shore, *The "Vita Christi" of Ludolph of Saxony and Its Influence on the "Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola"* (Jan. 1998)
30/2 Starkloff, *"I'm No Theologian, but . . . (or So . . .)?"* (March 1998)
30/3 Torrens, *The Word That Clamors* (May 1998)
30/4 Petrik, *"Being Sent"* (Sept. 1998)
30/5 Jackson, *"One and the Same Vocation"* (Nov. 1998)
31/1 Clifford, *Scripture and the Exercises* (Jan. 1999)
31/2 Toohig, *Physics Research, a Search for God* (March 1999)
31/3 Fagin, *Fidelity in the Church—Then and Now* (May 1999)
31/4 Schineller, *Pilgrim Journey of Ignatius* (Sept. 1999)
31/5 Fullam, *Juana, S.J.: Status of Women in the Society* (Nov. 1999)
32/1 Langan, *The Good of Obedience in a Culture of Autonomy* (Jan. 2000)
32/2 Blake, *Listen with Your Eyes* (March 2000)
32/3 Shelton, *When a Jesuit Counsels Others* (May 2000)
32/4 Barry, *Past, Present, and Future* (Sept. 2000)
32/5 Starkloff, *Pilgrimage Re-envisioned* (Nov. 2000)
33/1 Kolvenbach et al., *Faith, Justice, and American Jesuit Higher Education* (Jan. 2001)
33/2 Keenan, *Unexpected Consequences: Persons's Christian Directory* (March 2001)

33/4 Veale, *Saint Ignatius Asks, "Are You Sure You Know Who I Am?"* (Sept. 2001)
33/5 Barry and Keenan, *How Multicultural Are We?* (Nov. 2001)
34/1 Blake, *"City of the Living God"* (Jan. 2002)
34/5 Bireley, *The Jesuits and Politics in Time of War* (Nov. 2002)
35/2 Madden/Janssens, *The Training of Ours in the Sacred Liturgy* (March 2003)
35/4 Modras, *A Jesuit in the Crucible* (Sept. 2003)
35/5 Lucas, *Virtual Vessels, Mystical Signs* (Nov. 2003)
36/1 Rausch, *Christian Life Communities for Jesuit University Students?* (Spring 2004)
36/2 Bernauer, *The Holocaust and the Search for Forgiveness* (Summer 2004)
36/3 Nantais, *"Whatever!" Is Not Ignatian Indifference* (Fall 2004)
37/1 Smolarski, *Jesuits on the Moon* (Spring 2005)
37/2 McDonough, *Clenched Fist or Open Hands?* (Summer 2005)
37/3 Torrens, *Tuskegee Years* (Fall 2005)
37/4 O'Brien, *Consolation in Action* (Winter 2005)
38/1 Schineller, *In Their Own Words* (Spring 2006)
38/2 Jackson, *"Something that happened to me at Manresa"* (Summer 2006)
38/3 Reiser, *Locating the Grace of the Fourth Week* (Fall 2006)
38/4 O'Malley, *Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism* (Winter 2006)
39/1 McKevitt, *Italian Jesuits in Maryland* (Spring 2007)
39/3 Kennedy, *Music and the Jesuit Mission* (Autumn 2007)
40/1 Giard, *The Jesuit College* (Spring 2008)
40/2 Au, *Ignatian Service* (Summer 2008)
40/3 Kaslyn, *Jesuit Ministry of Publishing* (Autumn 2008)
40/4 Rehg, *Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation* (Winter 2008)
41/1 Friedrich, *Governance in the Society of Jesus, 1540–1773* (Spring 2009)
41/3 Clarke, *Our Lady of China* (Autumn 2009)
41/4 Hezel, *Life at the Edge of the World* (Winter 2009)
42/1 McCarthy, Massaro, Worcester, Zampelli, *Four Stories of the Kolvenbach Generation* (Spring 2010)
42/2 Haight, *Expanding the Spiritual Exercises* (Summer 2010)
42/3 Cohen, *Jesuits and New Christians* (Autumn 2010)
42/4 Anderson, *Numa J. Rousseve Jr.* (Winter 2010)
43/1 Walsh, "To always be thinking somehow about Jesus" (Spring 2011)
43/2 McCarthy, "Let me love more passionately" (Summer 2011)
43/4 Gavin, *"True charity begins where justice ends"* (Winter 2011)
44/1 Barber, *Desolation and the Struggle for Justice* (Spring 2012)
44/2 Geger, *The* First *First Companions* (Summer 2012)
44/3 Colombo, *"Even among Turks"* (Autumn 2012)
44/4 Stegman, "Run That You May Obtain the Prize" (Winter 2012)
45/1 Pabel, *Fear and Consolation* (Spring 2013)
45/2 Scully, *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus* (Summer 2013)
45/3 Endean, *Writings on Jesuit Spirituality I by Jorge Bergoglio, S.J.* (Autumn 2013)
45/4 Endean, *Writings on Jesuit Spirituality II* by *Jorge Bergoglio, S.J.* (Winter 2013)
46/1 Kuzniewski, "Our American Champions" (Spring 2014)

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 2013

U.S. JESUITS:

An annual subscription is provided by provinces of the U.S. Assistancy for U.S. Jesuits living in the United States and U.S Jesuits who are still members of a U.S. province but living outside the United States.

ALL OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Subscriptions to STUDIES:

U.S.: one-year, $20; two years, $38.

Canada and Mexico: one year, $28; two years, $52

All other destinations: one year, $32; two years, $58

Gift Certificates available

All payments must be in U.S. funds.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS INFORMATION:

Jesuit Subscribers: Your province office should send us your change of address; you need not do so.

Non-Jesuit subscribers: Subscriptions and change of address information should be sent to the business office address given below.

Please include former address label if possible.

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
Faber House
102 College Road
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3841
Tel: 617-552-0860
Fax: 617-552-0925
E-mail: fleminpb@bc.edu

BUSINESS OFFICE

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits
Institute of Jesuit Sources
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108
Tel: 314-633-4622
Fax: 314-633-4623
E-mail: ijs@jesuitsources.com

BACK ISSUES:

An archive of recent issues is available through the Website of the Jesuit Conference, http://www.jesuit.org.

A complete archive can be accessed through the Boston College Library at http://ejournals.bc.edu/jesuits.

The Institute of Jesuit Sources
The Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108-3393