

**DePaul University**

---

**From the Selected Works of John E Rybolt**

---

1993

**“As Good Friends.” Reflections on the  
Development of the Concept of Fraternal Life in  
the Congregation of the Mission**

John E Rybolt, *DePaul University*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/john\\_rybolt/40/](https://works.bepress.com/john_rybolt/40/)

**“As Good Friends.”**  
**Reflections on the Development of the Concept of Fraternal Life**  
**in the Congregation of the Mission**

BY

JOHN E. RYBOLT, C.M.

Introduction

This presentation intends to examine the concept of fraternal life in the Common Rules and Constitutions. To accomplish this, I have chosen (1) to examine the Common Rules and several additional documents to reveal, at least in part, the mind of Vincent de Paul, (2) to go beyond documents to actual experiences, and (3) to trace the development of the concept of fraternal life in our modern documents. I will conclude with some personal reflections, then with a reading and some questions for reflection and discussion.

**I. The experience of Fraternal Life in the time of Vincent de Paul**

As is well known, Vincent de Paul published the Common Rules of the Congregation of the Mission in 1658, only two years before his death. To trace the development of his thinking, it would be good to examine earlier rules and documents.<sup>1</sup> I begin with the foundation documents of the Congregation. These documents, the Act of Association, 4 September 1626, and the bull “Salvatoris Nostri,” 12 January 1632, (which he regularly called our “Institute,” that is, our charter or founding document) both specify priests living in common, but do not mention how this was to happen. The pope noted that: “[It is] an institute most acceptable to God, most useful to the Christian people, and truly necessary for the Church of God.” Such a commendation, whether made for all other religious institutes is unknown, underlines also the importance given to community life. One important view of community life, in addition, comes from the remarks that the founder made at the retreat of 1632. He called for “tender and cordial friendship” with all the confreres, and then spoke about times of recreation:

*We are to have a great respect for each other. At recreations, although we should act with gaiety, we should nevertheless do so with respect. For this reason, it is very advisable not to touch each other, not to use “tu” [tutoyer, that is, to use the familiar form in speaking], and not to speak bad Latin, which gives rise to silliness.<sup>2</sup>*

In ten years, at the assembly of 1642, the first official meeting of this type, the earliest confreres had more experience. Vincent had prepared drafts of the rules and explained to the other confreres present there the motives and means for working on these rules. The first of these motives, and for our topic the most important, was “to unite divers spirits and men from different nations.” In other words, confreres had joined the Congregation with different outlooks, and the founder hoped to generate unity among them. This would be accomplished, he continued, by “putting aside one’s affections, inclinations, and particular aversions.” (p. 291.) It should also be noted that Vincent de Paul was the oldest member of the Congregation, with the sole exception of the father of M. Alméras, René, born in 1575. He, however, was in the Congregation for only nine months until his death.

In various rules given to those going to work with the armies or to the missions, the founder urged observance of the rules, of course, but also counseled observance of humility,

mortification, and obedience. Without saying so, he expected, I believe, that the practice of these special virtues would lead to a smoothly functioning community for the mission. (pp. 280, 306, 363.)

The confreres at second assembly held in his lifetime, in 1651, faced issues coming from the lack of charity and consequent disunion among them. These issues were many, but a sample will give the sense of Monsieur Vincent's concerns: the desire for goods, honors, pleasure; rash judgment; self-love; speaking of the defects of others; lack of mutual respect; envy, pride, anger; lack of uniformity and compassion, etc. (p. 349.)

From my point of view, Vincent's thinking about the Tuesday Conferences parallels his thinking about his own confreres in community. His rules for the members of the Tuesday Conferences contain this remarkably modern paragraph:

*They will understand that Our Lord bound them together with a new bond of his love and that he binds them with great perfection. Thus they will love one another, visit and console one another in their problems and illness. They will attend the funerals of those who die, and each of the priests will say three masses, if he can, for the solace of the soul of the departed, and the others will receive communion once for their intention.*

Out of all this experience, both positive and negative, grew our Common Rules.

By chance we have a preliminary edition of the Common Rules, dating from 1655 at the latest. Father Angelo Coppo, C.M., discovered them in a document he called Codex Sarzana, in the library of the house of the confreres of the Turin province at Sarzana, Italy.<sup>3</sup> For our purposes here, the text of Codex Sarzana differs little from that which eventually became the Common Rules, published three years later, 1658.

To define how the confreres should live together, Vincent de Paul enshrined his thinking primarily in chapter eight. The following list shows the organization of this chapter:

Introduction: The example of Jesus (1)

Relationships: to one another (2), to superiors (3)

Silence and Speaking: when and where to keep silence (4), "separation" (5), avoiding noise (6), daily conversation (7-9), secrecy (10), and topics to avoid (11-16).

Interestingly, issues of speaking and silence occupied twelve paragraphs, while the specific issue of relationships with one another occupies only one. The founder may be seen to have had an obsession with noise, understandable in large institutions with long and noisy corridors. One sentence, omitted from the Common Rules, is worth quoting from Codex Sarzana: "On returning home or leaving the house, all shall abstain from ringing the bell too loudly or repeatedly."<sup>4</sup>

It is also worth reading the one paragraph on relationships:<sup>5</sup>

*Love, like that between brothers, should always be present among us, as well as the bond of holiness, and these should be safeguarded in every possible way. For this reason there should be great mutual respect, and we should get along as good friends, always living in community. We should particularly avoid exclusive friendships, as well as any sort of ostracism, as experience has shown that these give rise to factions and destroy Congregations.*

We can gather more information from elsewhere in the text: 10,12, on the topics for conferences, in this case “getting along well together like brothers”; 12,3-4, on praise for one another; 12,6, on the virtues to be exercised in dealing with students and ordinands, and presumably our own confreres, and 12,10, on our corporate humility.

Surprisingly, the constitutions contained in the Codex Sarzana, with the rules for the superior general, the visitor, and the local superior, are nearly devoid of further comments on our life together.<sup>6</sup>

How are we to interpret the Common Rules? Besides the conferences that Vincent gave on the rules, two official explanations were published, but only in this century.<sup>7</sup> These works had the advantage of pulling together in one place materials from decrees of the general assemblies, rules of office, etc., concerning each topic in the Common Rules. Unfortunately, this new information adds little to our understanding of the rules of Saint Vincent on fraternal life. About the only significant change involved an insistence on taking common recreation, found especially in the directories governing missions, major seminaries, and parishes.

A second source is the document with the rules of the internal seminary.<sup>8</sup> The earliest remaining text of the rules has marginal comments in the hand of Vincent de Paul, and for this reason can be taken as his personal version. These rules open with a section on the spirit of the internal seminary. Number 5 reads: “A great respect for each other, which shows both in words as well as in marks of respect and greetings, as much as simplicity allows.” This is, as far as I can tell, the only observation made on how the novices were to deal with each other.<sup>9</sup>

A third, and so far unknown, source contains instructions for those giving ordination retreats.<sup>10</sup> This document in the section on the time for recreation after meals parallels the rules for the internal seminary. In addition, it instructs the confrere in charge to have the ordinands avoid loud talking, songs, discussions of food, drink and lodging, profane or impolite speech, etc. It is difficult to imagine that the candidates for the Congregation of the Mission would have been much better mannered than these diocesan ordinands.

By the year 1888, when, under Father Antoine Fiat, C.M., the superior general, the rules for the internal seminary were redacted in a better form, the original statement from Saint Vincent on the spirit of the novitiate had been greatly expanded.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, terms such as the following indicate the concern of our ancestors of a century ago for how we are to get along “as good friends”: reverence, praise, joy, propriety, tender and cordial friendship, cheer, mutual respect. On the negative side, and similar to the directory for the ordination retreats, one was counseled to avoid the following faults: a worldly spirit, singularity, being disorderly, too grave, giddy, arrogant, contentious, satirical, critical, suspicious, tepid, violent, or duplicit. Also, throughout all Vincent's documents, the issue of avoiding particular friendships occupies a central place.

To summarize this section, our founder's original inspiration of living together in community for the mission continued to guide his thinking throughout his life. As with all initial ideas, the usual human problems and crises arose. The issues, frankly, sound very contemporary.

## **II. The Community's experiences of Fraternal Life**

*The time of Saint Vincent*

Examination of official documents will show us how community life is supposed to be lived in the ideal order. It is, however, also important to examine other authentic materials to uncover the actual experiences of community life. I would like to begin with Saint Vincent. As Father Thomas Davitt, C.M., pointed out,<sup>12</sup> close study of these texts reveals much about how the confreres lived. For example, the students (scholastics) enjoyed the large garden at Saint Lazare for walks and probably games. Yet they sometimes extended this permission to take their recreation at a larger estate of some 100 acres belonging to the community.<sup>13</sup> What Vincent objected to was the scandalous impression of luxury or a delicate life that could be given to the ordinands and the mentally handicapped. He said:

*Instead of taking recreation in the garden on days which are not free days they take it out in the estate; I'm talking of what I've seen; I recently went out into the estate, for the third time this year, and was surprised to see them [the students] there. Is this garden not enough for us? Is it not big enough, top and bottom? Very few gardens in Paris are as big as ours. (Coste, CED 11, 197.)*

Even more interesting is this next glimpse of the confreres left to themselves eating and drinking away from the austere motherhouse refectory:

*When someone returns from the country he is brought either to the infirmary or to another room. Dinner or supper is brought up to him, and there are some who have had this treatment for two or three days running. This is an abuse and the source of much evil, because there is talking and laughing, and people being encouraged to drink. One will say: "Drink to my health!", and the other does so. There is no limit to the wine brought along, and for that reason much evil can arise. There's cackling and gossip. It's lamentable. (Coste, CED 11, 327.)*

This contrasts sharply with the much-repeated expression found first in Abelly, about the confreres living "like Carthusians," i.e., hermits, at home.<sup>14</sup> Vincent, of course, could visit Carthusians and observe their lives, since there was a Carthusian monastery in Paris.

It was not at all uncommon for community houses to have gardens to provide "a bit of air when needed."<sup>15</sup> The houses were to be simple, but at the same time be suitable for the apostolate. Even newspapers were allowed at times--not for enjoyment, of course, but only to help in the mission. A special heated room was provided in most houses, since other rooms had no heat year round. Detailed descriptions are available in several sources concerning one's physical needs, and the cleanliness of the toilets was a matter of great concern.

Although the normal confrere was generally modest in his dress, several abuses crept in: long hair, the use of wigs and perfumes, pocket watches, elaborate snuff boxes, and even colored undergarments [culottes].<sup>16</sup>

As is well known, Monsieur Vincent watched carefully over the quantity and quality of food, and was generous in his regulations to maintain the health of the confreres. He urged the confreres to water their wine generously, as the etiquette of the day required. This was especially important at breakfast, when wine was taken, coffee, tea or chocolate not yet being drinks for breakfast. He commented negatively on eating salads in a conference devoted to temperance:

*Apropos of this, I will now tell our Brothers who serve at table that they should not serve plates piled up with salads, as they do. They give one person what would do for three or four. Salads! Alas! the old religious Orders do not eat them.*

*And if they do not, cannot we also be content without them? Look at the Oratory. It is true that they have salad there. But how much do you think is given to each person? Oh! very little. I would like you to see what they get there. You would quickly see the difference between them and ourselves. Should we be surprised at seeing many of the Company so frequently out of sorts? No; and why? Well, it is because their discomfort very frequently arises from eating and drinking too often. For instance, there are some who eat breakfast, dinner, a snack in the afternoon, and then supper. In the morning, they go to the refectory for breakfast. From breakfast to dinner is not a very long time and so the poor stomach has no time for digestion. A person goes to dinner before the first process of digestion is finished and then, shortly afterwards, an afternoon snack is added. All that gives rise to vapors which circulate and mount to the brain, and that is the cause of most of the headaches from which some of us suffer.<sup>17</sup>*

In this same connection, it should be noted that the rules in the Codex Sarzana (rules for the local superior, on domestic order) specified that “From the signal for dinner, at least eight hours shall pass before supper, according to the custom of the region, and seven hours from the time when confreres go to bed to the signal for rising.” (With this schedule, it was no wonder that a mid-afternoon snack was taken. In fact, the assembly of 1736 gave in on the matter, allowing goûter, but only with permission.)

For recreations, community regulations forbade the use of musical instruments. These violated poverty. The Codex Sarzana specified, in the rules for the local superior: “There shall be no musical instruments, except organs, especially the portable ones, and monochords and the like which help to learn intervals.”<sup>18</sup> The rule of 1786 for the seminary of Luçon proscribed musical instruments, as well as having dogs, birds, and vases of flowers on the windows. Seminarians, and probably the confreres, were to avoid all of these, but the rules would not have specified them if the students and priests had not already had them.

The issue of games is difficult to trace, but certainly card games, billiards, and nine-pins [quilles] enjoyed some popularity. Superiors regularly forbade them when the confreres gambled for money.

Vincent saw to the care of sick confreres, (see Common Rules 6:3-4) and later generations, too, provided good care for the sick and aging. Bathing was not countenanced, except when a physician ordered it, and then only in the infirmary. Consequently, swimming for sport or recreation was unheard of.

The question of the care of guests was carefully articulated. In the Codex Sarzana, the visitor was instructed to discover whether “due care is given to. . . guests.” In general, guests were either clerical guests or other confreres. Laity were not usually admitted to our houses, except for retreats, and then they were lodged elsewhere in the house, apart from the confreres. Since there was always reading at table, there was no mixing of confreres with guests. How well this was observed in small houses is unknown.

In keeping with the standard practice of European society, great authority was granted to one's superiors. In Vincent's mind, all superiors were oracles of God's will. “For this reason we should be completely obedient to every one of our superiors, seeing the Lord in them and them in the Lord.” (Common Rules, 5:1) The texts of the Codex Sarzana are more specific on these issues. For the superior general: “The Superior General represents the person of Jesus Christ for the whole Congregation.” For the visitor and the local superior, the accent is on the imitation of Jesus. For the local superior: “(He) must be a man who has to guide spiritual men striving for their own perfection and the sanctification of others. He shall

envision himself as the soul of his house and must, therefore, fashion his house with his prayers, holy desires and examples, and strive as much as he can that he first fulfills what he requires of others.”

The local superior was to address his confreres regularly on their spiritual duties, but was also to be in contact with them about their physical and emotional health. The role, in other words, was one of the local father. As a father, he was also to inquire about the confreres spiritual well-being in the practice known as the Internal Communication. The Common Rules (10:11) specify: “Each one of us, therefore, should with complete openness and due reverence give an account of his conscience to the superior, or someone assigned by him, in the manner customary in the Congregation.” This meant in practice that each confrere was to have an interview with the superior four times a year on five subjects: his principal virtues, his vices, graces received from God, his commitment to his vocation, and his emotional and physical health. It was a formalized practice, often neglected, but one which if rightly practiced could have excellent results in building community. The problem was that it could cross the boundaries between what we now know as internal forum--matters of conscience and therefore private, and external forum--matters of public knowledge.

#### *After the Founder's Death*

The common prayers customary in the Congregation have an obscure history. In Saint Vincent's time, confreres regularly prayed in their rooms on arising in the morning before going to the oratory for mental prayer. Once there, they prayed the Veni Sancte Spiritus, heard the topics for prayer and began. The exercise was closed, as Abelly tells us, with the Litany of the Holy Name, followed by the Angelus. If it was time for mass, the confreres either said mass, the priests, or attended, the brothers, both clerical and lay. If it was not time for mass, they returned to their rooms for study or other exercises. Vincent often used the time for praying his Breviary.

Just exactly how the rest of the prayers were inserted into the daily schedule is unclear. Examinations of conscience on some prevailing fault or virtue to be acquired were held twice daily before the main meals, in common, although the Common Rules do not specify this (10:9). A general examination of conscience was to be held in the evening, again probably in common. Joined to these prayer times was the celebration of the Divine Office, which the Common Rules do specify as being done in common (10:5). The time for this was left to local determination; in fact, it was much neglected, save for the major hours of the day (Lauds, Vespers) in major houses. Small houses, as today, found it difficult to find the time for everyone to be present.

The confreres nourished their common spirit, of course, in many other spiritual ways, such as with retreats, prayer days, repetition of prayer, etc., as will be noted below.

The assembly of 1668 decreed that a prayer be said to recall the Congregation to the zeal, called the Primitive Spirit, exercised by the founder. This prayer, modeled on the prayer for the octave of the feast of Saint Lawrence, is the first of those that have continued and developed in the history of the Congregation.

*O Lord, arouse in our Congregation the spirit  
that animated your servant Vincent,  
that, filled with the same spirit,  
we may enthusiastically love what he loved,  
and practice what he taught.*

This prayer is important in that it marks the break between the time of foundation and that of the rest of the Congregation's life without the founder. It emphasized also both affective charity (loving what he loved) and effective charity (practicing what he taught), a feature of nearly all subsequent prayers in his honor.

The members of the Congregation of the Mission were also to remain faithful to the simple manner of dress of the founder. The Congregation did not have a specific habit, since the members were secular clergy, although the simple dress of the founder's day developed into a Vincentian style. The black cassock was normally worn with a traditional white collar protecting the stiff black collar of the cassock. The saint is regularly pictured in this fashion, as are other confreres. The cassock was buttoned, a sash was worn--the founder had a rosary at his side, a practice not copied by many others. Under the cassock he wore a cloth belt from which hung two or more small bags, like the pockets sewn into today's trousers. He insisted on short hair, as Abelly recounts, but his followers apparently felt that fashion overwhelmed custom. What did continue, however, was the small Henry IV beard. In an attenuated form it was followed by several superiors general after his time, and it is clearly evident in the model engraving of the Priest of the Mission. This was, perhaps, the one sent around as a result of the assembly of 1673. It is instructive to read the entire discussion of Session Eleven on this subject:

*On the same day [12 January] it was proposed that to better preserve both modesty and uniformity in the matter of our hair, beard and clothing, a certain missionary ought to be depicted in a painting, to whom our confreres should conform in the above-mentioned matters. The assembly praised this proposition, and decreed that a picture like this would be very useful to preserve a similarity of hair and beards in the Congregation, inasmuch as local custom would allow. It decreed that a drawing of a missionary be painted that would be especially accurate as regards his hair and beard, and that a second one also be done, giving one for the missionaries [priests] and the other for the lay members [brothers]. Also, a written description of clothing, head covering and shoes should also be done for both groups, and a drawing of both should be made following the norm in use in this house of Saint Lazare. It should be sent to our houses especially in the Kingdom of France, that both our clerical and lay members should conform to it according to the state of each. In addition, it was decreed for the same purpose that no one should have his beard trimmed except by those designated for doing so by the superior. Visitors and local superiors should take care as best they can that this be put into practice and kept forever, and this assembly enthusiastically exhorts them to do so.<sup>19</sup>*

Note the emphasis on uniformity. In addition, following the ancient canons of the Church, clergy were to observe modestia, a word best understood as moderation in dress or decorum.

Father Watel, superior general, pointed to an unpleasant side of community life in a circular letter dated 12 September 1703: "Some guide their local communities in an imperious fashion that does not resemble at all the sweet and charitable guidance of the Son of God, so perfectly imitated by our venerable father." Clearly, some information had reached him, but it may be believed that he was glorifying the mythic time of Vincent de Paul.

One image of the Congregation, therefore, was that of the modest or moderate priest. Many comments in the biographies of deceased confreres speak of the modesty of the confreres, in public or with one another. This kept them from elaborate dress, jewelry, whatever was the latest fashion. The same assembly proscribed the use of pocket watches for



the same reasons: it was contrary to poverty and humility, i.e., to a modest behavior. Nevertheless, experience was cited as a reason for those going on missions to have a timepiece to help them observe established order.<sup>20</sup> Confreres were not to powder their hair (Assembly 11, 1747), and the use of wigs was likewise proscribed. One of the earliest depictions of confreres, besides the engravings mentioned above, is found in the shrine of Our Lady at Buglose near the Berceau.

At the time of the transfer of the generalate to Rome, the question of which form the habit would take was also raised. The reason was that in France, one form had become traditional, while Italy had kept the traditional “Vincentian” collar (borrowed by the Redemptorists and their offshoots, such as the Paulists in the United States.) It was resolved that the Italians would change, and they did with some sacrifice of their traditions.

Besides the image of the confrere known for his moderation, the Congregation also sought to develop other images of itself. At the time of the beatification and canonization of the founder, a series of large, and expensive, paintings was commissioned. They were eventually hung in Saint Lazare. Copies were made and engravings were also taken, thus preserving for us some which have been lost. These formed the basis for the standard iconography of the life of Saint Vincent, such as is seen in the windows of the chapels of the Maison Mere in Paris and the shrine chapel at the Berceau.

An image with a tangled history is that of the emblem and motto of the Congregation. The figure of Jesus standing on a globe, arms outstretched down, is well known from the seal of the superior general. It took its origin in all likelihood from the drawing of the Lord of Charity, first produced by Louise de Marillac, an amateur artist. Several of these paintings exist today. Vincent adopted the figure of Jesus as central to his thinking, but it should be noted that the figure was of the risen Christ, wounds visible in his hands and feet. The gesture of charity is an unusual one, not commonly depicted as such in the art of the period.

The motto, Evangelizare pauperibus misit me, although well known today, was early on associated with the emblem used as a seal for letters and documents. However, it did not form part of the oval frame around the emblem until the 19th century, perhaps in imitation of the Miraculous Medal, and/or of the emblem of the Daughters of Charity. Vincentian designs from an earlier period chose several biblical phrases to commemorate the founder. The great statue in Saint Peter's in the Vatican has the standard motto, while others do not. It does not appear, for example, either at the chapel of the Berceau nor in the Maison Mere. As the Congregation continued to reflect on its identity and mission in the Church, both the figure of the charitable Christ and the emphasis on the evangelization of the poor have taken on new and powerful meaning.

A quick review of certain other concerns of the 19th and 20th centuries will show the Congregation at work and the values it professed concerning the personal and community lives of its members. First, the issue of newspapers. Father Etienne was against reading them, even 200 years after they had first begun in France (during the time of Saint Vincent). The problem was that they were often more interested in politics than in news. The assembly of 1849 regretfully agreed that reading of newspapers could be allowed, and asked the superior general to determine the conditions. He responded by restricting reading to priests only, never brothers or students; by limiting the choice to one paper only, carefully selected; by urging superiors to be vigilant over the activities and conversations of their subjects on political topics, etc. The same issues were repeated in 1867.

Travel was also never allowed during vacations. The assembly of 1867 allowed pilgrimages, but they should be closely regulated. The first circular of Father Fiat, 22 May

1879, is valuable for reviewing the history of the struggle that most superiors general had in enforcing this rule.

Another issue much discussed was smoking. The assembly of 1861 forbade it, and this prohibition was repeated until to 1912. The reasons cited against it were poverty and modesty--typically Vincentian concepts. It could only be allowed with dispensation, and provided a doctor prescribed it! Huge fights broke out over the subject, and many confreres simply did not observe the prohibition at all. Note that the prohibition was against smoking, but not against taking snuff. The snuffbox belonging to Father Etienne is still in existence.

The issue of uniformity among the confreres was another matter much in the mind of various general assemblies. They were to live together according to the same style of life. This came to a high point in the centralizing administrations of the nineteenth century. One example is that of uniform clothing. Father Etienne in his letter of 1 March 1869, announced the formation of a depot for winter and summer clothes and cloth at the Maison Mere. Each house was to get its materials from Paris--whether in China or Latin America, Persia or elsewhere. Needless to say, this was never activated.

Uniformity was also urged for meals. Assemblies, or more often superiors general, legislated the food for meals. Father Fiat, in his New Year's circular of 1907, wanted the rest of the Congregation to forgo the use of cookies and other liquids along with feast-day coffee. He offered this as a sacrifice to Saint Vincent to help the Congregation. Etienne urged the confreres to use wine since it was good for their health.<sup>21</sup> This disregarded, evidently, those parts of the world where grapes do not grow and wine is expensive.

Another issue was silence, particularly at meals--the easiest time to manage this. Saint Vincent had legislated this (Common Rules 8:4) for the dining room, "particularly during meals." The confreres would be able to nourish themselves both spiritually as well as physically. In the Maison Mere in recent memory, the ordination day of one confrere was marked by having reading at table--he was the reader!--in the presence of his family. The pressure to conform to rules for the sake of religious uniformity was too great to relax the rules. In fact, the bishop, also at the breakfast, was astounded and gave permission to talk--the first such event in years.

Lastly, the daily schedule. Saint Vincent hesitated between prescribing rising at 4:00 or 5:00. He eventually went for 4:00, much like other congregations of his time did, as well as working people. As a result, in his day the mid-day meal was often held around 10:00 or 10:30, again, like working people. The upper classes rose and ate later. What started out as a common-sense regulation became a matter of religious uniformity in later years, mainly neglected outside large central houses. To leave the house, confreres were expected to go in company with other confreres, not for the sake of community but to keep one another on the right path. It is unknown, however, whether this early custom from the founder's day continued to be observed. For the evening, it was generally demanded that confreres return before nightfall. Exceptions, in large houses, were rarely given.

Shared suffering brought confreres together at times when other activities did not. With increased communications and access to information through better roads, newspapers, and especially in the modern world, the former spirit of uniformity within community relationships has vanished. The same became true, particularly in France, where confreres were taken to fulfill their national service, most often in the military. This brought them into daily contact with people of all sorts, good and bad, religious and not. Confreres elsewhere in the world were forced by the press of circumstances to adapt their lifestyles, whether the official Community permitted it or not.

Father André Dodin has pointed to two “ideal” types of confreres, “two psychological types, two different ways of living the same grace.” He describes them as the “Missionary Type” and the “Contemplative Type.” The first is characterized by initiative, adventure, risk and adaptability. The second is composed of teachers, researchers, hard but silent workers. Many houses had men of both type.

In summary then, the confreres throughout our history did develop a life together “as good friends.” Their ways of being together extended beyond simply prayer and the works of the apostolate. Yet, official sanction of ways of “building community,” as we would say today, did not exist. This was left to the present century.

### **III. The Community's experience of Fraternal Life as reflected in its modern constitutions**

On 25 January 1954, Father William M. Slattery, C.M., the superior general, promulgated the thoroughly revised constitutions of the Congregation of the Mission which the Code of Canon Law had mandated in 1917.<sup>22</sup> Two great wars and numerous other delays had prevented their publication until 1954. We begin the third part of this study with these constitutions because from them in some way modern Vincentian life has developed.

The 1954 constitutions are mostly silent about fraternal life. For example, the paragraphs specifying the rights and duties of the visitors say nothing about the lives of the confreres of their provinces. The text concentrates instead on the apostolate, rules, and so on. In speaking of local superiors, paragraph 231,2 points to the “great humility and charity” with which the superior is “to take care of his subjects, both in spiritual and temporal matters.” This is not much.<sup>23</sup>

On the positive side, however, paragraphs 222 and 223, (with 231,4-5) repeat the Common Rules concerning modesty and cheerfulness in conversation and recreation, and the union, reverence for one another, and manner of living “after the manner, however, of dear friends” (223,1) so familiar to us from Saint Vincent. Also, the common exercise of the Friday chapter of faults, mentioned in paragraph 245, would purify and in some way help fraternal life to grow. This section does not, however, mention repetition of prayer, another exercise with potential to strengthen fraternal life.

The same silence mentioned above is also evident in examining the revised collection of decrees of previous general assemblies published in 1964.<sup>24</sup> The assembly of 1963 had mandated this collection, but it had nothing special to say about fraternal life.

By 1968, however, matters had changed considerably. The Second Vatican Council had concluded, and had called for a thorough revision of religious life in the Church. As a result of many meetings on the subject, a special commission consisting of ten confreres from different provinces developed a text based on documents presented by various working groups. Their text, a draft of constitutions and statutes, became known as the “Black Book” from its black cover.<sup>25</sup> This volume became a cause célèbre at the assembly, since its work was largely discarded.

Nevertheless, the section “De vita communi in Congregatione Missionis,” paragraphs 58-69, marks the first time that the Community laid down specific details governing our common or fraternal life. Some of the details may amuse us now, such as norms for reading at table (parag. 65), but other paragraphs sound very contemporary, speaking of the use of radio and television, recorded music, cars, traveling, and home visits. Although little of this

work in the Black Book, as I mentioned, made its way into the constitutions of 1969, it had opened the door to a more systematic and official treatment of fraternal life.

The work of the extended 1968-1969 general assembly introduced the expression “fraternal communion” into our thinking about common life.<sup>26</sup> Paragraph 7, in Part II on the nature of the Congregation, reads:

*The members of the Congregation, both clerics and brothers, living and working in community, devote themselves to the pursuit of perfect charity through the practice of the evangelical counsels, and they strive to practice that same charity in genuine fraternal communion, in the service of God, and in their missionary activity for the salvation of men, especially of the poor.*

“Fraternal Communion” became the title for the entire section known previously in the draft, the Black Book, as “Common Life.” That expression is certainly richer and more theological. In this section, paragraphs 29-38, much more interest is shown than ever before to personal development, personal dignity, and privacy. At the same time, terms such as respect, understanding, trust, support, and forgiveness (parag. 33) appeared. Elsewhere, the proposed constitutions called for fraternal fellowship, shared decision making, friendly dialogue and the like, and ended with this paragraph:

*Because God has commanded everyone to watch over his neighbor, and because holiness in the Congregation can never be considered a merely personal gift, the common life of confreres carries with it the obligation of charity, whereby each of us must be prepared both to help his brothers and to be helped by them.*  
(parag. 65)

The next assembly, 1974, contented itself with proposing modest changes in the 1969 text, and in producing a series of declarations.<sup>27</sup> These declarations, a set of commentaries on the constitutions and statutes, made even more explicit that common life is “our ordinary way of life,”<sup>28</sup> even though some confreres lived alone, for whatever reason. The entire section obviously reflects some uncertainty in the provinces about just how confreres were to exercise their common life on the basis of fraternal union. The assembly urged, quite simply, that confreres spend time together in prayer (parag. 46), in work and in a community of goods (parag. 47). Subsequent documents, to be noted below, will develop this last expression.

In that period, my own province, the Midwest Province, attempted, with greater or less success, to become goal oriented. The provincial leadership mandated an extensive study of the province, and from this study, called the COTA [Committee on the Apostolate] Report, several goals emerged to guide the province's development. It is remarkable to me to see that the entire text opens not with the vows or the apostolate, but with community life. This section was followed by one on the growth of the individual. Some of the issues developed in the Black Book of 1968 appeared once again, since they were, obviously, of great interest to the confreres of my province. In the next two provincial assemblies (1982, 1985), the members reviewed these same goals and even altered them somewhat, but the centrality of community life remained.<sup>29</sup> Although I do not have access to the work of other provinces during this period, my hunch is that similar trends were at work elsewhere.

The next general assembly, 1980, thoroughly reworked the constitutions of 1969, as revised in 1974.<sup>30</sup> The result was that these were more theological, and continued to emphasize community life. The title “Fraternal Communion” disappeared, replaced by “Community Life,” a simpler but less theological expression. This formed the second section of the constitutions, immediately after “Vocation,” thereby demonstrating again the centrality

of the concept of common life for the Congregation of the Mission. Indeed, paragraph 33 sums up the concept best:

*Community life has been a proper characteristic of the Congregation from its very beginning. This was the clear will of St. Vincent. Therefore, this is our ordinary way of living. This fraternal life together, nourished continually by the mission, forms a community which promotes both personal and communitarian good and renders the work of evangelization more effective.*

Gone from this version were the overly detailed prescriptions concerning the development and centrality of the individual confrere, and the members of the assembly took care to distinguish between personal and communitarian matters. The “Five Virtues” specified by Saint Vincent also appear (parag. 36), together with love, as the animating characteristics of community life.

One of the decrees coming from the 1980 assembly was the directive for the superior general and his council to compose a directory (“Ratio Formationis”) for the Internal Seminary of the Congregation. This document, published in 1982, bears the title “The Basic Program for the Internal Seminary.”<sup>31</sup> This document is important as a witness to how the community would expect its future candidates to live out the constitutions, with their expanded and focused understanding of community life.

The objective for formation in community life sums up best the perspective of this document:

*The seminarists will learn to live in community “as dear friends” and will come to appreciate concretely that the Vincentian mission is realized in common. (page 239)*

To make this happen, several means are specified, such as mutual service, listening, sharing, active participation in prayer and work, recreation, etc. These are probably all terms familiar to us now, but they were new for the Congregation on the official level.

On 27 September 1984, Father Richard McCullen, C.M., superior general, promulgated the constitutions and statutes that the 1980 assembly had prepared.<sup>32</sup> In the area of our interest, little had been changed after study and review by the Holy See, apart from the addition of 24,2, and 26,2.<sup>33</sup>

Father Jaime Corera, C.M., prepared an important study of community life in the Common Rules.<sup>34</sup> He demonstrated, from a sociological viewpoint, that the institutional mechanisms used in the beginning to hold together the community were the superior/subject relationship, uniformity, and community of goods. In the preliminary drafts for the 1980 (1984) constitutions, much of that had changed. Active participation, coresponsibility and dialogue, and the role of the superior as servant all gave a new perspective to the old superior/subject relationship. Uniformity was called for, for example, primarily on the level of the basic nature and purpose of the Congregation, together with a commitment to the Five Virtues. Much else was left to local determination. The communitarian ramifications of prayer, liturgy, Eucharist, chastity, poverty, etc., missing from the Common Rules, were also stressed.

In brief, the developments that Corera noted have continued to receive attention in several documents from the assembly of 1986 to that of 1992. The “Lines of Action” coming from the 1986 assembly grew from responses from the provinces to certain questions

concerning the constitutions.<sup>35</sup> For example, “The responses of the Provinces manifest an ever sharper focus on the idea that community is for the mission.” (p. 39) Several examples were given of positive factors, but negatives were noted as well, such as individualism, lack of organization, a superficial manner of living together, formalistic uniformity without interior change, and functionalism. The address of Pope John Paul II to the members of the assembly contained one especially important observation in this regard. It could be the basis for much fruitful thought.

*I offer you lively encouragement to set aside a special time every week or every fortnight to search more deeply into the mystery of prayer, to immerse yourselves in the writings, so contemporary, of your Founder, to evaluate calmly your apostolic activities, to examine carefully your community life.*

The superior general and his council examined the danger of disunity in community life, and published their study as “‘One Body, One Spirit in Christ.’ Reflections on the Unity of the Congregation of the Mission.”<sup>36</sup> Here, too, several means, not previously sanctioned in the Congregation, are suggested: co-responsibility, cooperation in solidarity with one another, and in-depth sharing.

The next year, 1988, brought yet another document, this time the “Program for Vincentian Formation in the Major Seminary of the Congregation of the Mission.”<sup>37</sup> In this, the section on formation for community life repeats the affirmation: “our community is for the mission.” (parag. 47) Of major importance because of its clarity is paragraph 49,a:

*[Steps toward achieving the objective. . . reciprocal relationships:]  
The attempt to create fraternal communion among the members of the community, which should be manifested in mutual appreciation and esteem, openness to dialogue, cordiality, offering and receiving pardon, respect and confidence, and the quest for unity, along with the acceptance of diversity, among persons.*

Clearly, these means are not proper only to formation programs. They are important in every community house.

In 1991, the superior general published a directory, or “Ratio Formationis,” for the brothers of the Congregation, “Hermanos para la Misión.”<sup>38</sup> This document stressed the communitarian nature of the formation of the brothers.

In the same year, an evaluation of the “Lines of Action” appeared.<sup>39</sup> This preliminary document for the 1992 general assembly pointed, in 3.1, to notable improvements in fraternal communion, such as better communication, mutual sharing, and planning and evaluating our lives and works. Negatively, it became clear in the responses to the questionnaires sent to the provinces and houses that modern life styles pose increasingly serious problems for community life:

*The young confreres belong to a new generation which values a life style that is more affective and more personal. They will need to be supported along these lines.*

*Open and serious reflection is also needed on our lifestyle, in regard to community for the mission, which should include an openness to*

*creative forms of communication and commitment to social justice. (parag. 3.6)*

The 1992 assembly, in both the sections on new men and new communities, pointed to the renewal taking place in the Congregation of the Mission.<sup>40</sup> More details are listed to help local communities to grow in fraternal communion. Following the expression of Saint Vincent, the members of the assembly reminded us once again: “We should get along as good friends.”

In response to a directive of 1992 assembly, the superior general and his council published in 1996 “Instruction on Stability, Chastity, Poverty and Obedience in the Congregation of the Mission.” I point out only the principal sections where common life is treated in the context of these virtues and the vows that accompany them. Stability: V. Living stability, “fostering a spirit of dialogue and friendship as brothers.” Chastity: V. Living chastity, “Community Life.” Poverty: V. Living poverty, “Support for Community.” Obedience, V. Living obedience, “Simple Dialogue; Responsible Initiative.”<sup>41</sup>

The superior general and his council published “A Practical Guide for the Visitor” in 1998. Article 12 is especially instructive concerning the value of community life:

*12. Fraternal life in common for the sake of the mission is one of the major graces that a missionary enjoys. But to live in common has its risks, and as St. Vincent said, community life tests us as gold is tested in fire. [Coste 13, 144] The visitor should not only show his appreciation for this fraternal life, but should also be an example and encouragement to others in times when the temptation to scatter is strong. Fraternal life is, without doubt, a support for the visitor’s duties, it gives him the opportunity to share faith and prayer, to exchange ideas, and to take part in the joys and sorrows of his confreres in community. With frequency, he should meditate on articles 19-25 of the Constitutions.<sup>42</sup>*

Because of the special nature of the theme for the 1998 General Assembly (the Vincentian Family), the final document of the assembly did not give any direct attention to the question of common life.

This study has attempted to show the development of an idea from the time of Saint Vincent to our own day. The single main idea that can be taken away from this presentation is that the explicit emphasis on fraternal life and community building is new to the Congregation of the Mission. It is also new to the Church, which has been facing issues of the importance of the human subject and how he or she lives in community. In many local communities and provinces the question has arisen of the balance among personal needs, community life, and the apostolate. Some older confreres are more likely to emphasize the apostolate and downplay personal needs and even community life, while the younger men are more person oriented. What is needed is balance. We are in community, after all, for the mission. In our community, we are called to “get along as good friends.”

#### **IV. Personal Reflections**

One of the insights that has most touched me in recent years has been that when I look in the mirror in the morning I see a poor man. When I see my confreres, I see poor men. When I see the poor in the streets or in prisons or in hospitals, I realize that I, and my confreres, are just like them.

Of course, I am not poor in the material sense. I have the advantage of birth, education, support of others, connections, access to power, information, and many other advantages. My confreres are, for the most part, not poor in the material sense, and for the same reasons. They do not need to worry where their next meals are coming from, where they will sleep, how they will manage when they are sick and old, or how to confront the many changes that face them. Our Community is not poor. Many provinces, my own included, are not poor; far from it. Some provinces are poor, but can rely on the help of others for their mission. In my judgment, it is nonsense to choose to live as the poorest of the poor in our societies, mainly since we have, for the reasons mentioned above, left that behind.

All of this would mean, I believe, that we are rich, and out of our goodness we minister to the “others,” the poor. We would then place a great distance between people, between “us” and “them.”

For me, however, the essence of this argument is to realize that the evangelization of the poor and community life are part of the same reality. We, the poor, love and support our poor brothers and sisters, whether as members of the Congregation of the Mission or not even Christians. If we love our brothers, we love the poor. If we love and care for the poor (outside our houses), we love and care for the poor (inside our houses.) And we begin by saying: I am poor.

To say: I am rich, means that I control my life. I make my choices. I do what I want. I direct my future. For a Christian, this is heresy. Any Christian, particularly one committed to the service of the Gospel, must say: I am poor. That means that God alone controls my life. God the Holy Spirit guides my choices. God shows me the way and in his Providence, guides my future. This God-directed life brings us to see our own poverty, our dependence on God, and the poverty of our brothers.

It is no wonder, then, that Vincent spoke of the “poor little Congregation of the Mission.” I believe that he was speaking from conviction, not just from rhetoric. Therefore, let us love our brothers, our poor brothers, poor like us. Their faults come from their poverty. Their ignorance comes from their poverty. Their dissipation or lack of dedication to the mission also comes from their poverty. We love them as poor men and because they are poor men. For me, this is the real way to “get along as good friends.”



## **V. Readings and Questions for Reflection and Discussion**

The first text comes from Father McCullen's "A Reflection on the State of the Congregation," in 1986:<sup>43</sup>

**There is a desire in many provinces to improve the quality of community life, to live more deeply that *Communio* to which we are called by our vocation as members of the Congregation. In our Constitutions it is made abundantly clear that community is for mission. The quality of community life, then, should give tone or color to our mission. The adoption of the principle of consultation, as well as the formulation of community projects, has contributed to improving the quality of community life. Much, however, remains to be done. Individualism needs to be cut back and a greater willingness to transcend oneself and one's preferences needs to be cultivated, if the community mission is to become a deeper reality in the life of the Church and if the Congregation is to be seen more clearly as *Unum Corpus, Unus Spiritus in Christo*.**

The second selection has questions from the reflections on the unity of the Congregation.<sup>44</sup>

- \* Do we listen to and celebrate the Word of God together?
- \* Do we show one another signs of esteem and pardon?
- \* Do we accept what is given us and give what we have and challenge one another to be faithful to what our vocation and common mission demands?
- \* Do we accept one another as we are, with our gifts and limitations, with our distinctive ways of thinking, but without losing sight of our common end?
- \* Do we open our horizons beyond the local community to the whole Congregation?
- \* Do we help those who exercise the service of authority so that they might succeed in maintaining and promoting what is proper to the Vincentian community?

---

<sup>1</sup> These documents are taken from Coste, *Correspondence, Entretiens, Documents* 13, unless noted otherwise. Much more could be gathered, of course, from his letters and the accounts of the earliest conferences and repetitions of prayer. (For these, see Coste, 11.)

<sup>2</sup> Coste, *CED* 11:101. As far as can be determined, Vincent never used “tu” in his letters, even to those closest to him, like Portail and Louise de Marillac. He wrote “tu” when speaking of himself, or in prayer, or when quoting the scriptures.

<sup>3</sup> John E. Rybolt, C.M., ed., “Codex Sarzana,” *Vincentiana* 33 (1991):307-406.

<sup>4</sup> Codex Sarzana, on modesty.

<sup>5</sup> Translations are from the English edition: *Constitutions and Statutes of the Congregation of the Mission*, (Philadelphia, 1989.)

<sup>6</sup> These constitutions were not published until 1847, and then only in a revised form. They, too, show almost no concern for fraternal life. *Collectio Bullarum, Constitutionum ac Decretorum quae Congregationis Administrationem spectant*, ([Paris], 1847.) Emilio Molina Ríos, C.M., researched the role of the local superior in 1960, but failed to address the question of fraternal life, since it had not been an issue in previous documents. See his doctoral dissertation in canon law, *El Superior local de la Congregación de la Misión*, (Salamanca, 1960.)

<sup>7</sup> *Explications sommaires des Règles Communes de la Congrégation de la Mission*, (Paris, 1901); and a second edition, Paris, 1912.

<sup>8</sup> “Regles du seminaire, comme elles ont commencé d’être observées au premier mois de l’année 1652, conformément aux intentions de Monsieur Vincent et à l’état présent du Séminaire,” pp. 3-49 of the (untitled) manuscript with the heading “Directeur du Séminaire interne,” Archives of the Congregation of the Mission, Paris.

<sup>9</sup> These rules also contain “Avis pour l’office de la Conversation et lecture,” rules for the confrere deputed to oversee the novices’ daily conversation and reading at table. Topics were to be selected to guide their discussions or sharing.

<sup>10</sup> “Istruzioni per tutti quelli, que s’impiegano nelle Funzioni degli Esercizj spirituali de’ ss.ri Ordinandi, ed Esercitanti Secolari,” manuscript in the Archives of the Province of Turin. This document appears to be a translation from an early French version from Saint Lazare, reflecting pre-Revolutionary conditions. The section cited here is from section 10, pages 55-57.

<sup>11</sup> *Regulae Seminarii Interni Congregationis Missionis [et] Monita ad Curatores*, (Paris, 1888.)

<sup>12</sup> Thomas Davitt, “The ‘Repetitions of Prayer’ in Volumes XI and XII of Coste,” *Colloque* 27 (Spring 1993):186-93. The translations which follow are those of Father Davitt.

<sup>13</sup> See also Abelly, 3,18, on recreation at the farm at Orsigny, outside of Paris.

<sup>14</sup> “In this connection Monsieur Vincent said several times, ‘The life of a Missionary ought to be the life of a Carthusian in the house, and an apostle in the countryside. The more he cares

---

for his own interior development the more his labors for the spiritual good of others will prosper.” Louis Abelly, *La Vie du venerable serviteur de Dieu Vincent de Paul. . .*, (Paris: Florentin Lambert, 1664), bk. 2, sect. 1, part 3, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> Much of what follows is taken from Felix Contassot, “Notes d'histoire interne de la Congrégation de la Mission dès origines à la Révolution (1625-1792). II. La vie matérielle des missionnaires.” Typed manuscript, Archives of the Mission, Paris, 1959. In addition, see Luigi Mezzadri and José María Román, *Storia della Congregazione della Missione. I. Dalla fondazione alla fine del XVII secolo (1625-1697)*, (Rome: CLV, Edizioni Vincenziane, 1992,) ch. 14, “La vita per la missione.”

<sup>16</sup> On the subject of the Vincentian habit, see Abelly, 1,49 (p. 348 of the Pémartin edition in French.) English translation, p. 249, “The cassock of our Congregation.”

<sup>17</sup> Coste, *CED* 12:45-46. English version from Leonard, *Conferences* 449-50. (Translation slightly edited.)

<sup>18</sup> Monochords were one-stringed instruments played with a bow in the left hand, and a small keyboard for the left hand to carefully mark the intervals.

<sup>19</sup> Sessio Undecima, assembly of 1673; typed transcript, p. 29, in Archives of the Mission, Paris.

<sup>20</sup> Session 13.

<sup>21</sup> The opening discourse for the 1867 general assembly.

<sup>22</sup> *Constitutions and Rules of the Congregation of the Mission*, (Paris, 1954.) All citations are from the English translation.

<sup>23</sup> The draft form of these constitutions, printed and distributed in 1947, took nearly the same perspective, largely restating chapter eight and the relevant sections of chapter twelve of the Common Rules. “Schema Constitutionum Congregationis a Missione approbationi Conventus Generalis XXXI subjiciendum.” Paris, 1947.

<sup>24</sup> “Decreta conventuum generalium in Congregatione Missionis vigentia,” 4th ed. (Rome, 1964.)

<sup>25</sup> “Schemata constitutionum ac statutorum Congregationis Missionis,” Rome, 1968.

<sup>26</sup> *Vincentiana* 13 (1969):85-137; all texts are cited from the English translation published, anonymously, in the Western Province, USA

<sup>27</sup> *Vincentiana* 18 (1974):283-396. All translations are from the text prepared by the Western Province, “Thirty Fifth General Assembly of the Congregation of the Mission.”

<sup>28</sup> Parag. 42.

<sup>29</sup> “Vincentians. Goals, principles, directives, norms,” Saint Louis, Missouri, 1979; revised, 1982; revised, 1985 (under the title: Vincentian Goals, Principles, Directives, Norms.)”

- 
- <sup>30</sup> *Vincentiana* 24 (1980):193-304. All translations are taken from the English translation printed in the Midwest Province, “Constitutions and Statutes of the Congregation of the Mission. 36th General Assembly. Rome. 1980,” (Perryville, Mo., 1981.)
- <sup>31</sup> *Vincentiana* 27 (1983):227-80 (published simultaneously in English, French, and Spanish.)
- <sup>32</sup> *Constitutiones [et Statuta] Congregationis Missionis*, (Rome, 1984.) Note that this publication includes the Common Rules of 1658.
- <sup>33</sup> For a thorough history of the text, see Miguel Pérez Flores, C.M., “De las constituciones de 1980 a las de 1984,” *Vincentiana* 29 (1985):84-146; reprinted in *Anales* [Madrid] 93 (1985):102-58.
- <sup>34</sup> Jaime Corera, C.M., “La comunidad en las Reglas Comunes,” *Anales de la Congregación de la Misión y de las Hijas de la Caridad*, 84 (1976):319-40. This study was expanded to be one of the six studies prepared for the general assembly of 1980. The English title is: “Community life in the time of St. Vincent and in the present,” but the name of the author was not given.
- <sup>35</sup> *Vincentiana* 30 (1986):549-605, (published simultaneously in Spanish, English, and French.)
- <sup>36</sup> *Vincentiana* 31 (1987):223-85, (published simultaneously in English, Spanish, and French.)
- <sup>37</sup> *Vincentiana* 32 (1988):155-238, (published simultaneously in English, Spanish, and French.)
- <sup>38</sup> *Vincentiana* 35 (1991):77-85, (published in Spanish only.)
- <sup>39</sup> “Synthesis of the Responses from the Provinces for the XXXVIII General Assembly, 1992.” *Vincentiana* 35 (1991):525-64, (published simultaneously in French, Spanish, and English.)
- <sup>40</sup> “The Thirty-Eighth General Assembly of the Congregation of the Mission. Letter to the Confreres,” Rome, 25 July 1992. (Duplicated letter.)
- <sup>41</sup> *Vincentiana* 40:1 (January-February 1996), published simultaneously in English, Spanish and French.
- <sup>42</sup> “A Practical Guide for the Visitor.” Rome: Congregation of the Mission, General Curia, 1998. (Published simultaneously in English, Spanish and French.) Article 12, p. 16.
- <sup>43</sup> *Vincentiana* 30 (1986):435-75, (published simultaneously in English, Spanish, and French.) The selection is from pp. 443-44.
- <sup>44</sup> *Vincentiana* 31 (1987):240-41 (English version.)