

1169 (1): *To Pope Pius IX*
Rome

[After April 27, 1852]¹

J! M!

Most Holy Father!

In their distress, the respectfully undersigned recently ventured to turn to Your Holiness as Father of the Faithful because, by separating the mission in Rottenburg from our motherhouse, His Excellency, the archbishop of Munich,² did away with the beautiful structure that united all School Sisters up to now.

Great as our anguish was over this separation, we have now reached the depths of our sorrow because the archbishop no longer recognizes our common spiritual mother as the superior of the order, but only as the local superior of the motherhouse. From the beginning and until very recently, she was in charge of the motherhouse and all the missions. All archiepiscopal decrees now come to her as the motherhouse superior, and she may not exercise any of the rights inherent to the general superior as they were drawn up by the founders.

For 19 years, she exercised these rights with the knowledge and consent of the bishops, who never raised any objection, as is evident from the enclosed testimonials.³

With this new regulation, there is no longer any central government at the highest level. The sisters in the mission houses are no longer under her direction because one who is merely a local motherhouse superior does not have the right to look after the proper order and discipline in the other houses. The sisters in these

houses are thereby released from the obligation to turn to her, to stand by her, and to be governed by her.

With this regulation made by His Excellency, the unity of the entire order, which cannot be preserved without central government at the highest level, is fundamentally destroyed. Total disintegration and inner turmoil are the inevitable result.

This regulation already marks and paves the way, so to speak, for a separation that would affect the missions in all the other dioceses—as is already the case in Rottenburg.

After consulting many God-fearing and learned persons here and abroad, it seemed necessary for us to turn to Your Holiness the first time.⁴ Now, however, with new blows that are even worse, we must respectfully call upon Your Holiness again and present the necessity of both the unity of our entire religious institute and a general superior who governs all the members and houses of the order.

Throughout the history of the world, there have been societies, associations, fraternities, sororities, and organizations. As soon as something great or important needed to be done, organizations rose up on their own—at all times, in all places, and among all peoples—created by necessity and advantage. The Church in particular brought forth new organizations and religious associations. The Holy Spirit—a spirit of unity that always inspires unity and harmony among the people—guides, directs, and inspires the Church. Therefore, could it be any different?

The Church knows well that only associations can guarantee duration and steadfastness for the future. It is only through associations that those who are weak

and powerless as individuals will be given the strength to curb need, to remedy great difficulties, to create lasting benefit, and to carry out great things in general. From time immemorial, therefore, the Church zealously protected, promoted, and supported associations. As soon as unity suffers harm, however, this incalculable advantage of associations disappears because every violent separation weakens the potential and brings destruction to the entire living organism.

Therefore, the Church never gave up the principle of unity. The Church never caused, promoted, or encouraged a violent separation in a religious association because that would oppose precisely the Spirit breathing in her, a spirit of unity.

Convinced of the need for unity, the Church formed a large number of religious associations or reunited those associations that had been separated by the injustices of the times, as was the case in Bavaria not long ago.⁵

There can be no doubt that this unity cannot exist without central government at the highest level. Taking the head away from an association that has expanded and abolishing its unity are indisputably one and the same thing because lack of leadership at the highest level necessarily leads to isolation of the individual parts. In his document approving the rule for the Sisters of Charity of Verona,⁶ His Holiness, Pope Leo XII, stated that the unity of all the houses cannot be preserved without an integrated center in the office of a general superior.

If, according to the Holy See, unity and leadership on the highest level are necessary for the preservation of unity in every religious association that does not want

to fall into ruin, then the office of a general superior is a condition for the survival of the Religious Institute of the Poor School Sisters because:

1. The order of the Poor School Sisters is a missionary order, and as such, has the primary purpose of accepting teaching responsibilities in schools located in small towns and rural areas. From the very beginning, it would never have been possible to achieve this purpose without the office of a general superior who had to take the first steps in establishing all the new houses and their schools and organizing them in accordance with their purpose. Numerous difficulties are connected with the establishment and furnishing of new missions, and therefore this highest level of leadership was and is of even greater necessity. Individual local superiors do not always have the required time or necessary knowledge, and therefore it is impossible to expect them to surmount and settle these problems.

If there were no general superior at the head, the purpose of the order of the Poor School Sisters as a missionary order could no longer be fulfilled. Usually two or three teaching sisters are sufficient to conduct our rural schools. Inadequate financial means and poverty in the rural communities do not allow a larger number of sisters either.

Since the state and its inspectors supervise all the schools in our country, and since classes in these public institutes may not be interrupted, someone must be sent quickly to fill the position of a sister if she becomes ill, which often happens in the difficult teaching vocation. How could this happen if the urgently needed transfer and exchange of sisters could not take place

immediately, and if there were no superior of the entire institute who knew the personnel and the whole situation well enough?

2. It is absolutely necessary for the order of the Poor School Sisters to have uniform methods of education. The great effectiveness of its work, as religious and secular authorities testify, must be attributed chiefly to these uniform methods of education, which also contributed largely to the spread of the institute. When people saw for themselves the successful results, the demand for teaching sisters was enthusiastic and, because of these uniform methods of education, they were not disappointed in their expectations. The same success has been apparent everywhere up to now.

The lack of a general superior, however, would destroy this most beneficial source of effectiveness. The sisters in Germany are constantly subjected to many changes that are initiated by the government. Since our sisters teach in various parts of our country, the unique characteristics of our methods would disappear and be replaced by a great diversity in the teaching sisters and their methods. If a general superior does not keep close watch over the methods of education and see to their uniform implementation and preservation in all the institutes, the sisters would become more or less estranged from their original purpose. It was for this reason that our founders wisely admonished that we hold fast to unity. Otherwise, beating the air, we will exhaust ourselves.

3. All sisters do not have the same level of education and differ in disposition and character. Indeed, wanting all to be the same would mean

demanding the impossible. Nevertheless, if the lawful demands made on the schools by secular governments are to be satisfactorily met, it is absolutely necessary that a general superior, with precise knowledge of the individual members' characteristics in every respect and aware of the needs of the individual houses, will bring unity into this diversity through a well-balanced allocation of sisters. Only in this way can we hope for genuine, universal benefit.

If every bishop or every school inspector desires to keep only the most capable sisters and to have this or that sister and no other, or if there is no general superior to maintain unity in this diversity by assigning personnel and filling vacancies, how will the order continue to accommodate the demands of the school authorities? What will soon become of the order itself? The inevitable outcome will be the closing of individual houses. Therefore, the office of a general superior with internal jurisdiction over all the houses of the religious institute was and is a condition for the existence of the entire order.

4. Fathers and mothers know their children. They know their talents, knowledge, instincts, and weaknesses better than anyone else, and therefore they alone can best judge the conditions under which their children will or will not do well physically and spiritually. If the bond of unity is broken, then caprice or even sensuality will determine whether to have this or that sister here or there, to her own ruin or that of others.

5. A general superior is even more necessary in order to keep the Schools Sisters united because, as discussed in Paragraph 2 above, two or three sisters are

often isolated on a mission and have to struggle with difficulties coming from every side. It has often happened that demands with regard to the school, education, character formation, household affairs, and so forth, have been placed on them, demands which a School Sister neither can nor may deal with if she wants to act in the spirit of her religious institute. Often people ascribe this dutiful resistance, not to the conscientiousness of the sisters but to their self-will. To whom will the sisters turn in such a case? The local pastor will not support them because he himself is usually involved. Often the pastor's opinion has a greater influence on the school inspector and the bishop than the opinion of a mere sister. If a sister does not comply with their demands, however, what sort of things will she have to fear in the future? When she is with her class in school, she is often subject to the very one whom she opposed. If you put yourself into her position, you can decide for yourself if the principle of unity and the desire for a general superior—in this case the only person in whom she can confide—are essential demands.

6. In their isolated locations, the sisters are often left to themselves in spiritual matters, and as experience unfortunately shows, priests now and then try to lead them astray and separate them from us. Indeed, the most recent experience⁷ has shown that even priests in high positions constantly tempt faithful sisters by giving presentations that last for hours, by promising to obtain promotions or an episcopal dispensation from the vow of obedience, and by separating them from the religious institute that provided their education and formation and in which

they vowed obedience. Where should the sisters turn if there is no general superior to remove, recall or transfer them?

7. Ever since its origin 19 years ago, the order has been very successful with uniform methods of education and central leadership. On the other hand, experience has always shown what happens to sisters who were tempted to separate from this unity. Little good is accomplished in those houses where the pastor or the confessor tries to change the standard rules and observances to fit with his way of thinking. How easy it is to find a sister—for the Church also had traitors in its midst—who eagerly accepts the promise, “You will be independent and on your own!” If this sister is not removed immediately, she will bring ruin to the entire house. Should there not be a general superior who has internal jurisdiction over everything and who can therefore order her removal?

8. We are now compiling the order’s experiences in observing Blessed Peter Fourier’s rule for the last 20 years.⁸ It was according to this rule, together with the statutes of the School Sisters,⁹ that we made our profession. This rule and these statutes will be revised so that the norms the order observed for the two decades, during which it worked so happily and successfully, will finally become permanent.

Precisely now, when the revision of the rule and precepts is not yet canonically secured, what would become of the entire order if suddenly there was a separation and no general superior to maintain the former observance? Everyone whom we consulted because of their insight and prudence agreed that the lack of a general superior precisely now would

inevitably result in as many different kinds of School Sisters as there are male inspectors who assume the highest authority in the various dioceses, something that would not be tolerated by a standard rule.

9. Some say that a woman is too weak to maintain such a work, but His Holiness, Pope Leo XII himself, said that a woman is strong enough to exercise central, internal governance, and that the union of all the houses through the bond of Christian love cannot be maintained without a unifying center in the office of a general superior. Therefore, it is precisely a woman, a School Sister, who must be the head. It is impossible for a man to be in this position. The order of School Sisters has taken upon itself the education of girls and young women. Mothers raise and train their daughters. Often a man neither knows nor understands the needs of a woman, and often it would be dangerous if a man did know them. The superior does not scorn the advice of men. As prescribed by the rule, she will accept advice gratefully from all sides. Nevertheless, the superior must remain free to appoint and assign the sisters in the interest of the order.

10. If a woman is too weak to uphold such a work, which, up to now, was maintained only through unity, and which, God be praised, has spread throughout Germany and even as far as North America, how could she even have begun the work? How could she have maintained it so well that petitions for the introduction of this religious institute have come from almost all the dioceses of Germany? No less than 30 applications are here now.¹⁰

Moreover, if this large, extended society's preservation and furtherance were possible under a

general superior before the revision of the old holy rule was canonically secured, then the governance and furtherance of the society will be that much easier to preserve and carry out when the approved rule supports the general superior.

11. There are certain situations in life when one looks for a person who, in complete confidence, will provide help. If the sisters do not have a general superior to whom they can open their hearts as they would to a helpful, loving mother, then their situation is the saddest in the world. Precisely our century is one of respect for humanity and universal human happiness.¹¹ Should a School Sister who, by leaving her natural mother, made the greatest sacrifice for the Church and the well-being of the state, be denied what the poorest beggar is guaranteed?

12. Furthermore, this centralization does not by any means infringe on the rights of a third party. This united association gladly submits to a higher authority and even endeavors to fulfill its every wish. No bishop has ever had cause to complain about interference with episcopal rights or about actions that are of a purely priestly character. If this unity has not been a source of harm for anyone, but rather a source of the greatest benefit, as 19 years of experience have confirmed, should it be abolished?

13. The experience of all centuries demands this unity. Every religious house that separated itself from unity declined and disbanded. It was not without reason that His Eminence, Cardinal [Frederick] Schwarzenberg, said with respect to our current differences that he noticed in both Salzburg and Prague¹² that almost all religious houses that are not

vitaly connected with other houses gradually lose their religious spirit and perish. Our religious institute, which, according to the bishops, is developing so beautifully for the good of the Church and the state, will doubtlessly face the same fate if its energies are dissipated due to the fact that it no longer has a common leader in the person of a general superior.

In view of all this, the respectfully undersigned kneel at the feet of Your Holiness and submit our petition that the order will not be left without a common leader in the person of the general superior. Until the latest decrees by His Excellency, the archbishop of Munich,¹³ the order has never been without an actual general superior, nor could it be. The respectfully undersigned professed sisters of the order have no other desire in this regard than to have the same person who held this position until the latest sorrowful events remain their general superior.

She is the one whom the blessed founder, Bishop [George Michael] Wittmann of Regensburg, trained for this office for ten years.

She is the one who, because Bishop Wittmann died before the order came to life, founded the first mission at the cost of great sacrifice but with trust in God and the deceased bishop's intercession.

She is the one who helped establish all the missions, opened them, and attended to the appropriate furnishing of the houses.

She is the one whose leadership God used to form and expand the order under her charge and give to it the effectiveness that we see today.

When the preliminary waves of the 1848 Revolution posed a threat to all religious associations in

our land, she is the one who, purely out of motherly concern for all of us, left our country with a number of our sisters. She did not shrink from the long and arduous ocean voyage, and amid unspeakable suffering, hardship, effort, and sacrifice, founded new missions in North America so that now, not even four years later, five large missions are already established.¹⁴

She is the one who formed and trained all the sisters until now, and with joyful hearts, all of them professed their vows before her.

She is the one who led us until now with such love, dedication, self-sacrifice, care, and complete giving of self that it made us forget even our own mothers.

She is the one who won all our hearts through love and gentleness so that the first postulants and novices from Württemberg, who had been here only a few years, preferred to remain here as novices or even as candidates under their superior rather than return to their own country. This was despite the verbal threat made by the archbishop of Munich that, if they did not return to Rottenburg—which is now separated from us—he would never allow them to make their profession.¹⁵

Finally, she is the one whom our founders appointed as superior and about whom one of them wrote in a public document in 1833:¹⁶

1. “She is universally recognized as an experienced, capable teacher.
2. “With her ability, virtue, and zeal for the good cause in particular, it is as if she were chosen by God.
3. “My friend of blessed memory, Bishop [George Michael] Wittmann, prepared and trained her for this

office for ten years, and she quietly practiced all this under his direction.

4. “On his deathbed, this man, in whom the Spirit of God was clearly at work, expressly appointed her to this office.”

We certainly know that our humble petition for the canonical appointment and retention of our Mother Superior as general superior would be in vain if we did not enclose the exact precepts according to which she exercises her office. Therefore, in addition to the outline that we already submitted to Your Holiness,¹⁷ we are enclosing the version of the general superior’s duties that will be included when we submit the reform of the old holy rule for confirmation.

In view of the great expansion of our association and the testimonial of each bishop in whose diocese School Sisters are serving, we respectfully approach the throne of Your Holiness and repeat our petition. If our association does not have a general superior as we have had for the last 19 years, it will perish.

We ask Your Holiness to allow our order to continue as an ecclesial body, to declare the unity of all the houses, and to approve the governance at the highest level, which is essential to maintain this unity, through a general superior in the person of Mary Theresa of Jesus Gerhardinger, who has been our general superior up to now.

If the canonical appointment of the general superior is prolonged, however, we ask that Your Holiness, as our chief shepherd, would at least see to it that the order is not destroyed for want of a general superior. Therefore, we also ask that Your Holiness would prescribe that, until a formal canonical

appointment is possible, the former general superior would continue to act as such under the charge of a cardinal protector and in accordance with the outline and the rule of Blessed Peter Fourier which has already been approved.

Maria Foreria [Schiesser]
Vicar, in the Name of the Sisters

1169 (2): *To Pope Pius IX*
Rome

[After May 19, 1852]

J! M!

We had already finished the above when the archbishop of Munich announced a new decree by which he appropriated jurisdiction not only over the sisters who are in his archdiocese but also over those who are in all the other dioceses.

By virtue of another decree, His Excellency also recalled two of our sisters from the diocese of Rottenburg in Württemberg without having given any information to the superior before whom they professed their vows, thereby completely separating the mission in Rottenburg from us.¹⁸

We venture to enclose these documents, but we cannot refrain from respectfully declaring that, until now, we have not been governed arbitrarily but always according to the enclosed outline and, as far as possible, the *Notre Dame Rule* of Blessed Peter Fourier. We were governed with the kind of love that made us forget our love for our earthly parents, with indescribable care,

dedication, and sacrifice, and in a way that caused bishops and kings to speak about the great success of the order.

With the exception of the single recent case of Rottenburg, which would have never happened if it had not been separated from us by force, there has been no discord with the bishops. On the contrary, they have always wanted sisters in their dioceses, and they still do, as the bishops of Eichstätt, Regensburg, Passau, Breslau, and most recently, Leitmeritz in Bohemia, have expressed in the most benevolent manner.

From the enclosed testimonial by the cardinal, you can see what these bishops think about the effectiveness of the order. We have already requested the other bishops in whose dioceses our sisters are serving to write their testimonials and we will submit these to Your Holiness as soon as they arrive.¹⁹

Maria Foreria [Schiesser]

Vicar, in the Name of the Sisters²⁰

Letters of Mary Theresa of Jesus Gerhardinger, translation and notes by Mary Ann Kuttner, SSND, vol. 3, *Jolted and Joggled, 1849-1852* (Elm Grove, Wisconsin, 2009), 132-146.

1. The copy of Document 1169 in the beatification collection was divided into two parts.

2. Carl August von Reisach (1800-69), Archbishop of Munich and Freising (1846-56)

3. On April 21, 1852, Melchior Joseph von Diepenbrock (1798-1853), Cardinal and Prince Bishop of Breslau (1845-53), wrote the following testimonial: “At the request of the Venerable Mother Superior of the Poor School Sisters in Munich, Mary Theresa of Jesus, I hereby testify that I have known the devout society of the Poor School Sisters from its earliest origins. I recognize the hand of God and the intercession of the two venerable founders, [Francis Sebastian] Job and [George Michael] Wittmann, in its miraculously rapid and beneficent development and expansion. I also consider the

effectiveness of this institute to be very significant and useful precisely in our times when so much is ruined through education while so much can also be saved and built up through education. I am completely satisfied with the sisters whom I am happy to have in my diocese, and I owe the interior and exterior improvement of one of the Catholic orphanages under my special care to their faithful and devout work. I earnestly desire the further expansion of this devout society in my diocese, and I expect the very best results for the genuine Christian education of girls and young women.” See Mai, *Selige Theresia*, 246.

4. See Document 1143.

5. During the reign of King Louis I (1825-48), 132 convents and monasteries in Bavaria were restored after having been dissolved as a result of the Secularization. See Peter Pfister, *Leben aus dem Glauben: Das Bistum Freising*, Heft 4 (Strasbourg Cedex: Editions du Signe, 1991) 15.

6. The congregation of the Sisters of Charity of Verona, now known as the Canossian Daughters of Charity, Servants of the Poor, was founded by St. Magdalene of Canossa in 1808. On December 23, 1828, the rule of this congregation was approved by the Holy See.

7. In Rottenburg

8. *Notre Dame Rule*

9. *Spirit of the Constitutions for the Religious Congregation of the Poor School Sisters of Notre Dame* by Francis Sebastian Job

10. As a result of the decree by King Maximilian II on January 9, 1852, which recommended that the Poor School Sisters would be employed in the schools in Bavaria, there was a great increase in the number of applications for sisters.

11. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the ideals of the French Revolution, “*liberté, égalité, fraternité*” had spread through much of Europe.

12. Prince Frederick von Schwarzenberg (1809-85), Archbishop of Salzburg (1835-50), Cardinal Archbishop of Prague (1850-85).

13. In an episcopal decree enacted on April 21, 1852, and read to Mother Theresa and the sisters of the motherhouse the next day, Archbishop Reisach stated that the increasing expansion of the religious institute at home and abroad necessitated its ecclesial direction because the lack of a definite rule would lead to inevitable conflicts with the bishops. “In his overly great trust in the order’s leadership, as he now realizes to his great regret,” he had not insisted on the presentation of an outline of the rule. However, the latest occurrences [involving the mission in Rottenburg] convinced him that, “for the well-being of the entire institute, he was strictly obliged in conscience to take things into his own hands and hasten with all possible means the compilation of a well-ordered constitution.

“This was all the more urgent because, as bishop of the motherhouse,” it was the archbishop’s responsibility to the other

bishops to see to it that the institute is governed “in the spirit of the Church according to definite rules and not through the arbitrary use of power outside the jurisdiction of episcopal authority.”

Archbishop Reisach stated that he had the right to do this because the School Sisters’ institute was not an order approved by the Church and still did not have an approved rule. According to the archbishop, the *Notre Dame Rule* to which they referred “was not given to them by the Holy See as a rule,” and “it could not be used without drastic and essential changes.” The entire external and internal structure of the institute, the existence of the motherhouse and its missions, the recognition of the vows made by its members, and the power of the superior were “solely dependent on the recognition and approval of the diocesan bishop.”

The archbishop stated that, although he had allowed the superior freedom of movement until that time and had not insisted on the presentation of a rule, she could not draw the conclusion that the norms she followed were recognized by the Church. If the superior would be confronted with episcopal orders, she could not refer to a definite rule based on experience. As superior of the motherhouse, she was subject to the archbishop and must obey him in the exercise of her office—inside as well as outside his diocese—because her office was solely dependent on him. She may not take exception from his jurisdiction through any higher power.

By virtue of the obedience she owed him, the archbishop ordered that, from then on and until the order and its rule were approved by the Church, “she is not to decide or arrange anything new in regard to personnel, goods, and precepts without his express permission and approval. She is not to change anything that is already in existence, and she is not to accept any new mission houses in Bavaria or any other country without having presented all the initial negotiations and obtained his approval first.”

The decree continued: “Moreover, the archbishop demands and orders that, in the exercise of her office, she turn to him in all important matters, especially when these have to do with mission houses in other countries, and that she act only with his consent.” With no mercy, he would “severely punish every single infringement” with canonical censure. See Ziegler, *Kampf um die Regel*, 64-65.

14. Missions were established in Baltimore in 1847; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in 1848; Buffalo, New York, in 1849; and Milwaukee in 1850.

15. In a letter of March 29, 1852, to Joseph von Lipp, Bishop of Rottenburg (1848-69), Archbishop Reisach wrote that it would be most advisable to call back to Rottenburg the four novices and six candidates from Württemberg who were still in Munich so that they, together with Sister M. Rosa Franz, could continue the institute in Rottenburg until it was strong enough to become a motherhouse. The archbishop thought that after the rule and statutes were approved, this house could be loosely connected with Munich again.

Archbishop Reisach then wrote that he would do all in his power to convince the novices and candidates to return to Rottenburg. On April 27, 1852, he returned to the motherhouse in Munich, spoke with each of these candidates and novices, and asked that they return to Rottenburg. Only one novice, Sister M. Valeria Dreher, agreed to leave Munich. See Ziegler, *Kampf um die Regel*, 70-75.

The date of this occurrence also helped determine the date of the first part of this letter.

16. In an official document written on June 21, 1833, Fr. Francis Sebastian Job declared that “the way of life, which they [the three teachers in Neunburg vorm Wald] led for many years in accordance with the directives of the now deceased Bishop Wittmann, will continue under the watchful care and direction of the teacher, Caroline Gerhardinger. During this time, the rules and statutes of the future religious association will be clarified and then presented to the authorities responsible for these decisions for their inspection and approval.” (Transcript, Munich) 14812

17. See Document 1143.

18. On May 5, 1852, Archbishop Reisach issued the decree that Sisters M. Willibalda Deischer and M. Hilda Vestner leave Rottenburg immediately. On May 7, Dr. Joseph Mast notified the sisters of this decree, and they left the house within a half hour. See Ziegler, *Kampf um die Regel*, 75.

19. On May 12, 1852, Sister M. Foreria made this request of the other bishops in whose dioceses the Poor School Sisters were missioned. (Typescript, Generalate)

In addition to Cardinal Diepenbrock, George von Oetzl (1794-1866), Bishop of Eichstätt (1846-66), wrote a testimonial on May 18; Valentine von Riedel (1802-57), Bishop of Regensburg (1841-57) on May 19; and Henry von Hofstätter (1805-75), Bishop of Passau (1840-75), on May 19, 1852. Although no sisters were in his diocese, Augustine Hille (1786-1865), Bishop of Leitmeritz (1832-65) (now Litoměřic in the Czech Republic), also testified for the congregation.

The dates of these testimonials help to determine the date of this section of Document 1169.

20. Before sending this letter to Rome, Sister M. Foreria asked each professed sister in the congregation to sign it. It was forwarded immediately from one mission to the other for these signatures. Sister M. Raphaela Landthaler in Hirschau was the only professed sister who refused to sign the letter. See Ziegler, *Kampf um die Regel*, 85, and (Typescript, Munich) 16415.

Sister Foreria requested King Louis I to see to it that the letter would be delivered to the Holy Father in Rome and to petition that Mother Theresa would be confirmed by the Holy See as the general superior. King Louis asked Count Carl von Spaur (1774-1854), the Bavarian envoy in Rome, to deliver the communications to Pius IX. (Transcript, Munich) 1275 b and 1280 b