

# THE FIEDORCZYK LECTURE

---



---

POLISH STUDIES  
CENTER

Central Connecticut State University

**THE FIEDORCZYK LECTURE  
IN  
POLISH AMERICAN STUDIES  
1988**

**THE POLISH STUDIES PROGRAM  
Central Connecticut State University  
New Britain, Connecticut**

## The Fiedorczyk Lecture in Polish American Studies

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alphonse J. V. Fiedorczyk endowed the Polish Studies Program at Central Connecticut State University with a \$10,000 gift for the establishment of the annual Fiedorczyk Lecture in Polish American Studies. The Lecture was established in the memory of the Vincent Fiedorczyk Family.

Msgr. Fiedorczyk, the son of Polish immigrants, was born in New Britain, Connecticut on September 10, 1910. He attended Sacred Heart School in New Britain, and later graduated from St. Mary's College at Orchard Lake, Michigan. He went on to attend St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, New York, and then Grand Seminaire de St. Brieuc in France, which he completed in 1935, the year of his ordination to the priesthood. He returned to his home parish to serve as a curate for eight years. In 1943 he joined the U.S. Army as a first lieutenant in the Chaplain Corps, and after 26 years of Army service retired with the rank of Brigadier General.

During World War II Msgr. Fiedorczyk served as chaplain with this 79th Infantry Division in Europe, and was decorated with the following honors: The Legion of Merit, The Bronze Star, the French Croix de Guerre with Fouragere, and the World War II Victory Medal. He also served in Korea and two post-war tours in Germany.

Upon completion of his military service, Msgr. Fiedorczyk returned to Connecticut to the Bridgeport Diocese, where he was subsequently assigned to Holy Name Parish in Stamford. He served fourteen years in Stamford, and was a critical figure in the revival of the parish's Polish profile.

First and foremost a priest, Msgr. Fiedorczyk always kept in the forefront during his 52 years of service the injunction "to preach and to offer sacrifice." He also viewed service to the Polish community as an integral part of his priestly duties, and was deeply concerned with the preservation and promotion of the history of the Polish community in America. He encouraged the Association of Polish Priests in Connecticut to commission Immigrant Pastor by Prof. Daniel Buczek, the important biography of the pioneering Msgr. Lucyan Bojnowski of New Britain. Msgr. Fiedorczyk was also a long-time member of the Polish American Historical Association. He was active in Polish affairs at Sacred Heart University in Bridgeport, and at Central Connecticut State University. He donated his papers and memoirs (over two thousand pages) to the Connecticut Polish American Archives and Manuscript Collection at CCSU.

Msgr. Fiedorczyk, after a long illness, passed away on November 16, 1987.

While Msgr. Fiedorczyk's death prevented him from attending the Fiedorczyk Lecture in Polish American Studies, he was informed prior to his passing that the first lecturer would be Rev. Dr. Anthony J. Kuzniewski, S.J., Professor of History at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts. Prof. Kuzniewski received his Ph.D. at Harvard, where he studied with the eminent immigration historian, Oscar Handlin. Dr. Kuzniewski has authored *Faith*

*and Fatherland: The Polish Church War in Wisconsin, 1896-1918*; and numerous articles in the area of immigration history. He is former president of the Polish American Historical Association, and is currently writing a history of the College of the Holy Cross.

On behalf of the Polish Studies Program, it is my pleasure to present to our friends and supporters the first Fiedorczyk Lecture in Polish American Studies, "Rev. Francis Dzierozynski, S.J. Polish American Educational Pioneer", which was delivered by Prof. Kuzniewski on April 5, 1988. In disseminating this lecture, we hope, as Msgr. Fiedorczyk wished, to promote the further study and preservation of the history of the Polish community in America.

Stanislaus A. Blejwas, PhD  
Professor of History  
Coordinator of Polish Studies  
Central Connecticut State University

**FRANCIS DZIEROZYNSKI AND THE  
JESUIT RESTORATION IN THE UNITED STATES**

**Fiedorczyk Lecture in Polish American Studies**

**Central Connecticut State University**

**April 5, 1988**

Anthony J. Kuzniewski, S.J.  
Department of History  
College of the Holy Cross

When the seventy-one year old Francis Dzierozynski died at Frederick, Maryland in 1850, he was eulogized as "one of the few remaining links" between the European Jesuit tradition of theology, education and missionary work, and the sons of Loyola in the United States.<sup>1</sup> Many years later, another writer extolled him as "a whole Jesuit . . . one of the great men of his own Province," who came to assist and re-orient the Jesuits of the United States. "The Jesuits . . . owe much to Father Dzierozynski," he concluded, "and his name should never die out amongst us."<sup>2</sup> And, in a long article written at the time of the Polish Millenium, Franciszek Domanski called him the "patriarch of American Jesuits."<sup>3</sup>

It was the fate of this extraordinarily gifted Polish immigrant to occupy a series of crucial positions within the Society of Jesus and the Catholic Church during the quarter century after his arrival in the United States in 1821. As superior and acting provincial of America's Jesuits at two important times, he helped orient the companions towards the apostolate of education, strengthening Georgetown College, accepting responsibility for St. Louis University, and supervising the founding of the College of the Holy Cross. He engaged in a bitter and lengthy dispute with the Archbishops of Baltimore to preserve the privileges and property of American Jesuits in the uncertain times after the Jesuit restoration in 1814. And he supervised missionaries and pastors working from the hinterland west of St. Louis to the forests of northern New England and areas of the South. A theologian and philosopher, he participated in the education of a whole generation of American Jesuits and enriched the intellectual lives of a wide variety of associates. As Master of Novices and Tertian Director, he bore the primary responsibility for teaching young men how to think and live as Jesuits. As a son of Poland, he befriended exiles and immigrants who were down on their luck or who sought his advice. And as a spiritual director, he drew from the wellsprings of his Polish background to give guidance and encouragement to bishops and priests, to women religious and students.

Yet he is hardly remembered today. He has escaped notice in the standard accounts of American Catholic history by John Tracy Ellis, James Hennesey, and Jay Dolan. Immigration historians have also tended to neglect him. John Bukowczyk omits Dzierozynski completely in his new (and praiseworthy) account of Polish-American History,<sup>4</sup> and the best, though flawed, accounts were done by Mieczyslaus Haiman,<sup>5</sup> and Sr. Neomisia Rutkowska,<sup>6</sup> and, in Polish,

<sup>1</sup>*Catholic Almanac* (1851), cited in *Woodstock Letters* (hereafter WL), 5:182.

<sup>2</sup>Edward I. Devitt, "History of the Maryland-New York Province," in WL, 62:314, 315.

<sup>3</sup>"Patriarcha amerykanskich Jezuitow, O. Franciszek Dzierozynski, T.J., in *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium*, 7, (Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1960), p. 459.

<sup>4</sup>*And My Children Did Not Know Me* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).

<sup>5</sup>*Polish Past in America* (reprint ed.; Chicago: Polish Museum of America, 1974), pp. 66-68.

<sup>6</sup>"A Polish Pioneer Jesuit in America," in *Polish American Studies*, 3 (3-4), pp. 98-103.

by Franciszek Domanski.<sup>7</sup> Only his historians of the Society of Jesus, have paid him much attention. For the rest, he has fallen between the cracks — “too Polish,” perhaps, to claim the attention of church historians, and too active outside the ethnic enclave to merit the consideration of immigration historians. Yet, his importance in American Catholic history cannot be denied; and the written records relating to his life — running to many hundreds of pages — still give vivid witness to his accomplishments.<sup>8</sup>

Dzierzozynski was born on January 3, 1779 at Orsza, a town on the Dnieper River near the eastern boundary of old Polish Commonwealth. Six and a half years before his birth, Orsza had been incorporated into the Russian Empire at the time of the first partition of Poland. These historical circumstances placed the Dzierzozynski family at a disadvantage. They were impoverished nobility who had been engaged in legal work as minor officials. Now, with the change in government, they were gradually losing status, particularly after the turn of the nineteenth century, when new policies of russification gave preference to Russians in appointments to official positions. The young Dzierzozynski grew up, therefore, in a milieu of cultural struggle between russification and Russian Orthodoxy, on one hand, and Polish Roman Catholic resistance on the other.<sup>9</sup>

Paradoxically, the very circumstances which were pressuring Poles within the Russian Empire, were favorable for the Jesuits and helped save that religious order from extinction. In 1773, bowing to pressure from a number of European monarchs, Pope Clement XIV had issued an edict suppressing the Society of Jesus in those countries whose rulers were willing to implement his decree. In rapid succession, the crowned heads of Europe promulgated the edict — all that is, but Frederick II of Prussia, who afforded partial protection to ex-Jesuits during his lifetime, and Catherine I of Russia, who actively opposed the suppression. Catherine was resolved to incorporate formerly Polish territories into her realm with a minimum of initial change in the lifestyle of the inhabitants; she also valued the educational work of the Jesuits in her realm,

<sup>7</sup>Above, n.3. Joseph Osuch's English summary of the Domanski article, "Patriarch of the American Jesuits," appeared in *Polish American Studies*, 17 (3-4), pp. 92-100.

<sup>8</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, found 604 letters and papers concerning Dzierzozynski, including 91 letters in Polish and Russian — some from participants in the November Insurrection of 1830. P. 460. His papers constitute a separate collection of the Catholic Historical MSS, Georgetown University Archives; but much of his correspondence is preserved in the Maryland Province Archives (hereafter, MPA) at Georgetown's Lauinger Library, including copies of documents from the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus (hereafter ARSJ).

<sup>9</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 461-65.

<sup>10</sup>I am indebted to my Holy Cross colleague, James T. Flynn, for this interpretation of Catherine the Great. On the Suppression and its background, see William V. Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus* (2d ed.; St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986), pp. 393-415; and Martin P. Harney, *The Jesuits in History*, (New York: The America Press, 1941), pp. 321-64.

<sup>11</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 465, 472-73. See also an English summary of Domanski's article by Joseph C. Osuch. *Ibid.*, p. 526.

and, as a Russian Orthodox ruler, was understandably willing to signal that papal decree had little value in her realm.<sup>10</sup>

Although they had been willingly incorporated into Russia shortly before the suppression, therefore, the 201 Polish and Lithuanian Jesuits were spared the fate which befell their brothers everywhere else. This remnant of the old Society of Jesus, called the Bielorussian (or White Russian) Province because of its location within the Russian Empire, included all or parts of the pre-partition Polish Jesuit provinces of Mazovia and Lesser Poland, and the Province of Lithuania. Its official language was Polish and the membership was predominately Polish — 80%, by one estimate.<sup>11</sup>

These men became the principal custodians of Jesuit traditions and life during the four decades of official suppression. Little by little, they were able to expand the scope of their activities. In 1780, they were allowed to open a novitiate. Then, as animosity towards the Jesuits began to subside, a papal brief of 1801 recognized the “Russian” Province, permitted its leader to be designated “general,” and allowed it to accept members from outside its borders. Young men now came from France, Holland, Belgium, Germany, and Italy to enter the novitiate, but about 80% of the candidates remained Polish. More significant was the determination of former Jesuits around the world to affiliate themselves with the Jesuits in Russian Poland. In 1805, five of the ex-Jesuits still in Maryland renewed their Jesuit vows; and, in 1806, these American Jesuits accepted their first novices as candidates for membership in a Jesuit order whose headquarters remained on formerly Polish soil. And when, in 1814, Pope Pius VII permitted the universal restoration of the Jesuits, Thaddeus Brzozowski became the first Father General of the restored Society of Jesus.<sup>12</sup>

These were the circumstances under which Francis Dzierozynski received his Jesuit training. In his home town of Orsza there was a royal academy which had been entrusted to the Jesuits by Sigismund III early in the seventeenth century. Dzierozynski attended the school until the age of fifteen, when he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Polock. From 1794 until 1809, he advanced through the normal course of studies, though he was ordained in 1806 after only one year of theology, because of the shortage of priests. The diary he kept from 1801 to 1818 shows him to have been as cosmopolitan and well-educated as the times and circumstances would allow. When he had finished his philosophy studies, he taught French, physics, music, and grammar as a scholastic in the Jesuits’ *Kolegium Nobilium* in St. Petersburg, next to the splendid St. Catherine’s Church, where sermons were preached in five languages. Students in the Russian capitol studied French, physics, music, and

<sup>12</sup>R. Emmett Curran, “From Mission to Province: 1805-1833,” in *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634-1833*, edited by R. Emmett Curran, Joseph T. Durkin, and Gerald P. Fogarty (Baltimore: The Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus, 1976), p. 47; Bangert, *History*, pp. 415-29.



grammer from this Polish scholastic. After ordination, he served on the faculty of the Jesuit *kolegium* at Mogilewo, where he taught philosophy and mathematics and carried pastoral responsibilities. During the Napoleonic invasion in 1812, he was at the college in Plock. Given 3600 rubles by his superiors, he bought wagons and horses to engineer a dramatic nocturnal escape from the invaders. Afterwards, he returned to Polock for six more years as a professor of dogmatic theology, apologetics, and homiletics to Jesuit seminarians and lay students.<sup>13</sup>

Dzierzozynski might have remained in Russia for the rest of his life but for another unexpected turn of fate. In 1820, Czar Alexander I, who had earlier refused Father Brzozowski permission to move the headquarters of the Jesuit order to Rome, now altered his policy and expelled the Jesuits from his realm.<sup>14</sup> Forty-three years old and in the full possession of his intellectual and physical powers, Dzierzozynski journeyed to Rome to await his next assignment. He spent about a year in Italy, teaching for a time in Bologna.<sup>15</sup>

The death of Father General Brzozowski just before the edict of banishment opened the way for the election of a new general, the seventy-two year old Veronese, Aloysius Fortis. The electoral delegates also approved an agenda of restoration for the new general: he was to maintain the spiritual and juridical character of the Society, strengthen the training of young Jesuits, and see to the efficient operation of Jesuit schools.<sup>16</sup> With these priorities in mind, Father Fortis summoned Dzierzozynski to receive his new assignment: the introduction and implementation of the new Jesuit agenda in the United States.

To assist him in the work, Fortis prepared a detailed set of instructions, delineating the policies Dzierzozynski was to introduce among the Americans. One commentator has called it “. . . not so much an instruction [as] a veritable constitution of a religious order which was not exactly a new order, but which was beginning a new existence, and that in circumstances which threatened it with extinction before it fairly got started on its new life in America.”<sup>17</sup> Essentially, the general gave his Polish associate three tasks: to strengthen the spirit of the American Jesuits; to wrestle with chronic administrative difficulties; and to extend the Jesuit apostolate to new areas. To enable him to carry out these responsibilities, Fortis gave Dzierzozynski sufficient authority in the Maryland Mission (as the American Jesuits were then organized) to ensure that he would be consulted on all major decisions.

In the company of Fr. Philip Sacchi (Sacki), a fellow exile from the Bielor-

<sup>13</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 466, 469-71.

<sup>14</sup>Bangert, *History*, pp. 433-35.

<sup>15</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, p. 475.

<sup>16</sup>Bangert, *History*, p. 435.

<sup>17</sup>Osuch, English summary, in *Millenium*, p. 527. The document, dated June 2, 1821, is reprinted in Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 475-80.

ussian Province, Dzierzynski set sail for America on June 6, 1821. The five-month voyage included numerous stops in the Mediterranean for trading purposes. At Elba, the two Jesuits visited the former home of Napoleon and collected mineral specimens for Georgetown College. In early August, they left Gibraltar for a turbulent three-month crossing of the Atlantic. Dzierzynski later described the voyage in language which disclosed both his vividness of expression and the religious faith which grounded his life:

We had more than fifteen big storms, some of them lasting several days . . . . When we looked upon the mighty, swelling waves . . . we seemed to behold the very Alps before us. Most formidable waves, higher than Count Potocki's castle attacked unceasingly our vessel. Everything outside and inside the ship was flying here and there, and we had to catch hold of one another to keep ourselves from falling and save our heads from being crushed . . . . What added to our terror were the torn sails, and the heavy rain accompanied by fearful lightning and thunder, and fiery balls falling on the mast. The more one heeded these things and thought on them the more fearful he became. But trusting in God and repeating with our lips or in our hearts the *Ave Maris Stella* we silently comforted ourselves and encouraged the captain, who was in desolation, not knowing what to do, and the sailors who were working day and night.<sup>18</sup>

They were carried off course several times and lost their provisions of meat, bread, and water. When their situation became desperate, they were able to buy food from a passing ship. Later, they rescued four survivors from another storm-battered vessel. Dzierzynski recalled the end of the voyage with prayerful gratitude: "And the Lord did save us and did bring us out of all the distress and misery, and joyfully and happily and in good health, without losing a hair, we reached our goal, that goal to which holy obedience called us."

When Dzierzynski and Sacchi arrived at Georgetown College on November 12 and presented themselves to their new collaborators, their work was cut out for them. The Jesuits of the Maryland Mission were seriously divided between a group who favored retention of rural holdings dating to colonial times, where Jesuits had assumed a planter lifestyle while pursuing their pastoral work, and another group who favored a more innovative outreach to the nation's expanding Catholic population.<sup>19</sup> A second source of discord was connected with nativism on the part of American Jesuits who were wary of the increasing numbers of Europeans who joined them after 1814. The Americans tended to believe that foreigners misunderstood the traditions and patterns of Jesuit life in the New World; they were conservative in approach, and suspicious of the immigrants' impatient suggestions that American operations be changed or expanded.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup>Dzierzynski to Aloysius Landis, Georgetown, June 21, 1822, in WL, 36:40-45.

<sup>19</sup>R. Emmett Curran, "Troubled Nation, Troubled Province, 1833-1880," unpublished MS, p. 1.

<sup>20</sup>Between 1815 and 1821, ten members of the old Bielorussian Province came to America, together with a substantial number of Belgians. Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, pp. 49-54; Domanski, *Millenium*, p. 474.

The unexpected authority with which Dzierozynski was vested, only exacerbated the suspicions. As late as June, 1823, Maryland Jesuit Benedict Fenwick, who was soon to be named Bishop of Boston, urged Roman authorities not to give Dzierozynski full authority:

... a rumor has prevailed here that your Paternity has it in contemplation to appoint F. Dzierozynski who is certainly too little acquainted with the country as yet and too ignorant of its language to act as Superior, to say nothing of the evil consequences that may result from nominating one who is perfectly a stranger and a foreigner.<sup>21</sup>

In an effort to surmount and overcome these reactions, Dzierozynski set out immediately to win the trust of his new colleagues. Language was the first obstacle, so he and Sacchi immediately began to take English lessons at Georgetown. Dzierozynski learned rapidly. Within three months, one of his correspondents answered a letter partly in English because, as he put it, "you say in your last (letter), that you are learning English fast."<sup>22</sup> The newcomer was also anxious to collaborate with the others in the American apostolate. On the third day after his arrival at Georgetown, he put his travel weariness aside and began to teach philosophy to the Jesuit scholastics and others (presumably in Latin). These efforts were a judicious display of good will and probably helped soften the blow of being an outsider designated in advance to be a prime influence among his associates. The students had fewer problems accepting him. Because his surname was difficult for tongues unaccustomed to Slavic consonant clusters, students quickly dubbed him "Father Zero" — a nickname which gained favor even among the Jesuits, who later used it with affectionate esteem.<sup>23</sup>

Although few of the documents allude directly to Dzierozynski's opinion of the United States, circumstantial evidence makes it clear that he adopted his new country with enthusiasm. He regarded his teaching, for instance, as a civic responsibility, and expressed the hope that Georgetown students would be "profitable members of the Republic."<sup>24</sup> He also pressed the process of naturalization and became a citizen in 1828.<sup>25</sup> Legends abound of his friendship with Henry Clay and, especially, John C. Calhoun. Near the end of the last century, a Georgetown alumnus described the connection as his teachers remembered it:

<sup>21</sup>Benedict J. Fenwick to Aloysius Fortis, Georgetown, June 22, 1823, ARSI, Maryland, 2 I 64. But not long afterwards, a Belgian-born Jesuit expressed the opposite view: "I did not wish to see a Society constituted only by Americans, for I observe they have curious principles; they wish for revolutions, adopt the condemned proposition: *that the sovereignty rests essentially in the people.*" J.W. Beschter to Dzierozynski, Baltimore, December 17, 1823, MPA, 206 R. 22.

<sup>22</sup>Beschter to Dzierozynski, Baltimore, February 16, 1822, MPA, 203 Z 3. See also Dzierozynski to Fortis, Georgetown, December 6, 1821, ARSI, Maryland 2 IV 7.

<sup>23</sup>Domanski, *Millentum*, 482; J. W. J., "Recollections of Georgetown College in the 1820's", WL, 14:267.

<sup>24</sup>Dzierozynski to John Hunter, Georgetown, August 21, 1829, MPA, 209 S 18.

<sup>25</sup>William McSherry to Dzierozynski, Georgetown, April 8, 1838, MPA, 212 P 1.

Mr. Calhoun, who lived in Georgetown . . . , seemed to take much pleasure in his visits to the College. He would go there . . . to talk science (with Fr. Levins) . . . and to discuss philosophy with Father Dzierozynski . . . . Father Curley once related anecdotes . . . to myself of these visits of Mr. Calhoun, and of his fondness for talking metaphysics with the learned Russian (sic) Father . . . .<sup>26</sup>

But Dzierozynski was careful to stay in contact with ordinary people. As his English improved, he became a familiar figure travelling about the District of Columbia on his horse, Tomek.<sup>27</sup>

Problems began to mount for the American Jesuits soon after Dzierozynski's arrival. The most serious involved the claims of the third Archbishop of Baltimore, Ambrose Marechal, upon Whitemarsh, an old Jesuit manor between Washington and Baltimore. The roots of the problem lay in the actions of American Jesuits during the period of the suppression. Banding together as the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, they had held the former Jesuit properties in trust until the restoration. As former Jesuits, the first two archbishops of Baltimore, John Carroll and Leonard Neale, had received from the Corporation regular allowances which were increased after their respective appointments to the (arch)bishopric of Baltimore. After the restoration, Archbishop Neale had signed an agreement recognizing Jesuit parishes in Maryland as property of the Society of Jesus.

But Ambrose Marechal, who succeeded Neale in 1817, was a Sulpician — not a Jesuit. He claimed the same pension that his predecessors had received, arguing that the original donors had given land to the Jesuits in trust for the entire Church, and not as gifts to the Society itself.<sup>28</sup> He also discovered an alleged agreement of 1806 between Bishop Carroll and the corporation of ex-Jesuits, which seemed to substantiate his claims.<sup>29</sup> A protracted controversy over the validity of the supposed agreement of 1806 was under way when word arrived, in October 1821, that Father General Fortis was rejecting the claims of the archbishop.<sup>30</sup>

Marechal then sailed to Rome to press his case in person. On July 23, 1822, he received a significant concession from the pope in the form of a brief,

<sup>26</sup> J. Fairfax McLaughlin, *College Days at Georgetown* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1899), pp. 72-73. See other reports from the *Catholic Almanac* in WL, 5:183; and John J. Ryan, "Our Scholastic . . ." in WL, 33:1-27.

<sup>27</sup> Domanski, *Millenium*, p. 519.

<sup>28</sup> Gerald Fogarty has demonstrated that the colonial grants were given to individual Jesuits and their legatees because English and Maryland law forbade the Church or religious orders to own property. "Property and Religious Liberty in Colonial Maryland Catholic Thought," in *Catholic Historical Review* 72 (October, 1986), pp. 577-80. See also Donald C. Shearer, *Pontificia Americana: A Documentary History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1933), p. 114.

<sup>29</sup> The original document, which was finally found in 1889, is reprinted in Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal: Documents* (2 parts; Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co., 1908 and 1910), pp. 929-30.

<sup>30</sup> Good sources on the controversy with Marechal are Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, pp. 55-56, and

*Quum nobis*, which directed the Jesuits to give Whitemarsh and all of its slaves and equipment, or another estate of equal value, to him and his successors in return for conceding the Society's right of possession to all other properties.<sup>32</sup> By November, the archbishop had returned to Baltimore and was demanding the property. Jesuits received the papal decision as a serious blow. True enough, poorly managed Whitemarsh was run down and barely supplied food to the novices who lived there, but it had productive potential and also symbolic value because it had been the center of activity for ex-Jesuits during the suppression. A stunned Dzierozynski said that he couldn't remember "when the Jesuits have found themselves in such difficulties."<sup>32</sup> For him, the difficulties soon became more personal. In April, 1823, Charles Neale, the elderly head of the American mission, died; and in August, Dzierozynski was appointed successor. According to one astute interpreter, Fortis trusted Dzierozynski's tact and fairness and had become convinced "that a non-American superior was his only hope for reaching some settlement with the archbishop."<sup>33</sup>

Nor was the dispute with Marechal the only problem which he faced. Dzierozynski became the leader of 95 Jesuits, of whom only 51 were fully formed for apostolic work. They were spread from the Chesapeake region to New England and the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys of the West. The debt on the mission exceeded \$32,000. The Maryland farms were poorly managed and absorbed a great deal of effort on the part of the Jesuits, but they barely supported the slaves who worked them. The novitiate, which had been moved from Whitemarsh to Missouri in the spring of 1823 partly because of Marechal's claim, was closed the following October due to a lack of vocations. And Georgetown College, proud flagship of the Mission, had dropped to thirty students by 1825. A victim of anti-Catholicism, competition, and a poor reputation, its officers were forbidden by Jesuit rules to charge tuition in the quest for solvency and improvement.<sup>34</sup>

Undaunted by the challenges, Dzierozynski set to work. At Georgetown, he continued to teach; he worked successfully to instill discipline; and he appointed the energetic Thomas Mully to the rector. By 1829, enrollment had risen to 140. The new superior also worked valiantly to represent the college on the public forum. In 1824, he gave a warm speech welcoming General LaFayette to the college despite his private misgivings about the old hero's

Laurence J. Kelly, "Father Charles Neale, S.J. and the Jesuit Restoration in America," *WL*, 72: 117-44.

<sup>31</sup>The Latin text of the document and a summary may be found in Shearer, *Pontificia Americana*, pp. 115-18.

<sup>32</sup>Dzierozynski to Fortis, December 28, 1822, cited in Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, p. 56.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>34</sup>Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, pp. 52-54, 63-64; Gilbert J. Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle States* (3 vols.; New York: America Press, 1938), 1:28-34, 79-91, 125; Hughes, *Documents*, pp. 963-64; Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 489-90, 497, 499-500.

lack of sympathy for Catholicism.<sup>35</sup> And finally, he pleaded with Rome that the American schools needed an exemption from the rule that education be tuition-free. Dzierozynski argued that American schools lacked sufficient endowment to be self-supporting and that free schools had undesirable reputation in the United States. But Fortis remained adamant and no exemption was granted until 1833, after Dzierozynski had completed his term as superior. Although these circumstances made Dzierozynski reluctant to favor additional schools in the East, he did eventually support John McElroy's successful effort to open a school at Frederick, Maryland, in 1828.<sup>36</sup>

In the West, a hardy band of Jesuits led by the Belgian, Charles Van Quickenborne, were engaging Dzierozynski's attention. The latter had moved the novitiate of the Maryland Mission from troubled Whitmarsh to a plot of over 200 acres at Florissant, Missouri given to the Jesuits under the terms of a concordat concluded by Charles Neale and Bishop Louis DuBourg of New Orleans. The agreement assigned to the Jesuits "practically the whole watershed of the Missouri River" from St. Louis to the Rockies to work at mission stations and be missionaries to the Indians.<sup>37</sup>

One of the bishop's chief concerns was to get the Jesuits to take over the Catholic school which had been founded at St. Louis in 1818. By the mid-1820's, it was struggling along with fewer than twelve boarding students. In 1827, Dzierozynski journeyed to St. Louis and Florissant to examine the situation first-hand. Although he had some misgivings about staffing, Dzierozynski was generally supportive of the idea and pleaded the case with the Roman authorities. Late in 1829, the approval came, and, although there were only eight Jesuits in Missouri, they assumed sponsorship of St. Louis University. At its Jesuit opening, the school had 30 boarding and 120 day students. Because the no-tuition rule was still in effect, day students paid a nominal charge "for fuel and servants."<sup>38</sup>

By far the most difficult challenge which Dzierozynski faced was the continuing controversy with Archbishop Marechal over Whitmarsh. After the prelate had returned from Rome with the papal brief in 1822, Charles Neale had written a 44-page response to the General, reviewing the validity of the documents in question, and advancing the argument that Jesuit properties belonged to the corporation formed during the suppression and could not, under civil law, be transferred to the archbishop. Papal interference, therefore,

<sup>35</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 499-502.

<sup>36</sup>Garraghan, *Jesuits*, 1:303-07; Dzierozynski (?) to Fortis, Georgetown, June 21, 1823, ARSI, Maryland, 2 I 60. Dzierozynski initially refused to permit McElroy to open the Frederick school because financial support for the Jesuit faculty was lacking. Dzierozynski to McElroy, Georgetown, January 21, 1828, MPA, 208 P 7. Financial assistance from the state helped assure the stability of the school. Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, p. 65.

<sup>37</sup>Garraghan, *Jesuits*, 1:61-64.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 1:135, 270-90, 305-06.

had connotations of "foreign interference in the civil rights in the rights of American citizens."<sup>39</sup> At Georgetown, apprehensiveness increased,<sup>40</sup> and from Rome, the General's secretary warned Dzierozynski that the Jesuits were about to lose Whitemarsh because they had defended themselves too weakly:

The fault is yours. Why did you not send documents on your side. The General without them, did not know how to defend himself. Nevertheless in the (papal) decree the condition is laid down that if the Jesuits have anything *in contra* they may, as soon as possible offer their cause before the Sacred Congregatio.<sup>41</sup>

General Fortis agreed. He pleaded for relevant documents and information.<sup>42</sup>

From 1823, to 1826, the case was debated before the Roman authorities and, at times, broke into the public forum.<sup>43</sup> Both sides sought allies within the American political community. Marechal spoke with Roger B. Taney, later appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by Andrew Jackson. And the Jesuits invoked the assistance of Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, who continued his support after his election to the presidency in 1824. Privately, Dzierozynski told Fortis that he had solicited help from Clay; and he disclosed that John Quincy Adams had warned Marechal earlier to leave the Jesuits alone.<sup>44</sup>

Ultimately it was the American government that helped the Jesuits to keep Whitemarsh. In December, 1825, Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs George Ironside prepared a formal endorsement for the Jesuit case for Father Fortis. Although he was a Catholic, Ironside was careful to balance his support for the Jesuits with proper republican rhetoric. His convoluted characterization of Dzierozynski as, "a holy and pious man (who) merits and possesses my reverence and respect, but as a Superior, in this Country, I heartily deprecate," made the point. Speaking for the Adams administration, he advanced the opinion that the estates were gifts to the Jesuits and denied the right of the pope or the Jesuit general to "interfere with temporalities" in the United States.<sup>45</sup>

Having laid the groundwork, Ironside came to the crux of the matter:

This Government is very jealous of the rights of the Citizens of the United States, and I have the *promise* of the President of the United States that he will remonstrate with the Government of the Holy See, should any step be taken from that quarter

<sup>39</sup>Neale to Fortis, St. Thomas Manor, November 22, 1822, ARSI, Maryland, 6 II; Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, p. 56.

<sup>40</sup>To his brother, Benedict Fenwick wrote: "The *Arp*. since his return does not at all appear to wish well to us. I shall not be surpris'd if he give us much trouble later. . . ." Benedict to George Fenwick, Georgetown, January 14, 1823, MPA, 206 S 2a.

<sup>41</sup>Jozef Korycki to Dzierozynski, Rome, February 8, 1823, MPA, 240 Extra.

<sup>42</sup>Fortis to Dzierozynski, Rome, August 27, 1825, MPA, 500 44g.

<sup>43</sup>Marechal to Dzierozynski, Baltimore, November 13, 1824, MPA, 206 H 4.

<sup>44</sup>Marechal to Daniel Brent, Baltimore, October 25, 1824, in Hughes, *Documents*, pp. 1073-74; Dzierozynski to Fortis, Washington, December 21, 1825, ARSI, Maryland, 6 III 11; the Jesuit petition against Marechal, *ibid.*, 6 III 9; and Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, p. 56.

<sup>45</sup>Ironside to Fortis, Washington, December 16, 1825, ARSI, Maryland, 6 III 10.

to wrest from any of our Citizens their property. If the Archbishop of Baltimore has a just claim to any part of the property of the Jesuits, let him bring forward his claim in our Tribunals, wherein he will have ample justice done him.

By taking the position that Marechal was opposing the administration of justice within the United States by invoking the authority of a foreign head of state, the government helped protect the Jesuits from the necessity of capitulating on Whitemarsh. Included with the Ironside letter were official documents supportive of Jesuit claims, carrying the personal attestation of Secretary of State Clay.<sup>46</sup>

If anything is clear in the controversy, it is that under Dzierozynski's leadership, the Jesuits were able to mount a strong enough case on both sides of the Atlantic to effect a stalemate. American Jesuits rallied loyally to support a Polish-born superior who had only recently been a stranger. From Baltimore, the intrepid Jesuit pastor, J. W. Beschter, wrote of a recent encounter in which Marechal had insisted: "' . . . a Society as yours is now, is not only dangerous but obnoxious . . . I will not give up.' I write you this in a hurry," said Beschter, "that you may be on your guard."<sup>47</sup> From Boston, Bishop Fenwick wrote: "I always knew that he was not a friend; but I never thought he would go to the lengths he has gone."<sup>48</sup>

In 1826, the Roman cardinals reached a compromise solution. For relinquishing his claim to Whitemarsh, Marechal was to receive \$200, trimonthly, for the rest of his life. In announcing the decision, Fortis confided that he wasn't pleased, but reasoned that this was the best solution which could be reached without risking public scandal. Since the American Jesuits could not afford payment, Italian Jesuits covered the obligation.<sup>49</sup>

The aftermath of the disagreement found Marechal still untrusting of Dzierozynski. In 1827, he complained to Fr. Thomas Mullydy at Georegetown about his superior's "frivolous and incoherent" reasoning during an episode three years earlier when they had clashed over the title to the Jesuit parish at Marlborough:

Nor will I accuse him in all these transactions for having acted in an uncandid manner. I like better to say that he is like some of his Brethren, who received their religious education in Poland, whom my Vener. Predecessor Dr. Carroll frequently declared destitute of the knowledge of their rules and of the true Spirit of the Society of Jesus.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46</sup>The Clay attestation is in ARSI, Maryland, 2 II 1.

<sup>47</sup>Beschter to Dzierozynski, Baltimore, January 8, 1824, MPA, 206 P 2.

<sup>48</sup>Fenwick to Dzierozynski, Boston, December 26, 1826, MPA, 207 F 11.

<sup>49</sup>Fortis to Dzierozynski, Rome, January 25, 1827, in Hughes, *Documents*, pp. 1094-95.

<sup>50</sup>Marechal to Mullydy, Baltimore, February 28, 1827, MPA, 208 Z 12. It is true that Archbishop Carroll had some disagreements with Jesuit superiors sent over from the Bielorussian Province during the time of partial restoration. He tended to blame "our foreign and precipitate Brethren." Carroll to Enoch Fenwick, Washington, June 8, 1814, in *The John Carroll Papers*, edited by Thomas O'Brien Hanley (3 vols.; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), 3:225. See also Annabelle M. Melville, *John Carroll of Baltimore* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), pp. 250-62.



Marechal asked Mully to "try to introduce into his mind some sound ideas, instead of those which he has received from some wrong headed persons," Towards the end of 1827 Marechal did soften his attitude sufficiently to thank his long-time adversary for hospitality at Georgetown.<sup>51</sup> The letter had the tone of a peace overture. A month later, Marechal was dead.

Entangled with the question of Jesuit properties was a second source of misunderstanding between Dzierozynski and the archbishops of Baltimore: Jesuit privileges. The question involved independent governance and the right of Jesuit superiors to transfer their men among the parishes entrusted to the Society by local bishops. The confusion was occasioned by the fact that the traditional Jesuit privileges which had been exercised uninterruptedly within the Bielorussian Province were not extended to the resorted Society of Jesus until 1826. In America, Archbishop Marechal maintained that he had an effective veto over new appointments to Jesuit parishes, while Dzierozynski insisted that he had merely to inform and consult about personnel changes. Marechal held that Fortis had personally told him that the Jesuits had no privileges — a statement which Dzierozynski attempted to explain away when he attended the First Provincial Synod of bishops at Baltimore in 1829, the year after Marechal's death.<sup>52</sup>

Dzierozynski's explanation drew a strong rebuke from Jan Roothaan, who had succeeded Fortis as Father General in 1829. Roothaan took the Maryland superior to task for misrepresenting Fortis, and for being imprudent in asserting Jesuit privileges so strongly.<sup>53</sup> The record shows that Dzierozynski did misconstrue the mind of Fortis, but there was a further dynamic at stake in the General's admonition. Battered by the long confrontation over Whitmarsh, the American Jesuits — Dzierozynski among them — were eager to assert their legitimate autonomy within Church structures. In Rome, however, Roothaan could see the danger of needlessly antagonizing the hierarchy. He desired Dzierozynski to be moderate and accurate in his assertions and to merit the confidence of the bishops.

To his credit, Dzierozynski was able to rise above immediate differences in working for the common good. One clear case was his management of the process by which Georgetown Jesuit, Benedict Fenwick, was appointed second bishop of Boston. It was Dzierozynski that Fenwick confided his misgivings about the new job and the long conversion in which Ambrose Marechal

<sup>51</sup>Marechal to Dzierozynski, Baltimore, December 17, 1827, MPA, 208 G 8.

<sup>52</sup>Three documents included in Hughes, *Documents*, help to explain the misunderstanding: "synodal article," November 15, 1810, pp. 976-77; the Neale-Grassi Concordat, April 3, 1816, pp. 952-53; and a letter of Fortis to Marechal, Rome, February 4, 1822, pp. 416 and 513-14, n. 3. See also Dzierozynski's "Notanda" for Jan Roothaan on the conciliar debate, October 14, 1829, MPA, 209 R 16; Martin R. Harney, *The Jesuits in History* (New York: The America Press, 1941), p. 369; and Robert G. North, *The General Who Rebuilt the Jesuits* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1944), pp. 222-23.

<sup>53</sup>Hughes, *Documents*, pp. 513-14, n. 3.

— benevolent in this matter — persuaded him of the duty to accept.<sup>54</sup> And it was to Dzierzozynski that Fenwick wrote on his first Christmas Eve in Boston, sharing thoughts about northern winters, codfish, and rioting mobs. Fenwick also shared with Dzierzozynski his thoughts on the importance of Catholic higher education — an enterprise which would eventually unite the two in the founding of Holy Cross.<sup>55</sup>

Dzierzozynski's term as superior of the Maryland Mission came to an end in November, 1830, when the Irish Jesuit, Peter Kenney, arrived to administer the mission and to report on its readiness for full provincial status in the Jesuit Order. Dzierzozynski seemed relieved to be able to surrender authority at a time of relative calm. To one friend he wrote:

The affairs of our dear Society here, are thank God going on quietly and succesfully tho' not without some patience — the greatest difficulty is want of a sufficient number of laborers and some old Baltimorean prejudices yet remaining on account of Whitemarsh.<sup>56</sup>

Dzierzozynski surrendered his authority humbly. To John McElroy he wrote: "I hope that all my Brethren who I love sincerely in Xt will forget and forgive all my defects and faults which I am persuaded were many — I return to them my best thanks for their numerous acts of kindness and charity which I received — and I assure them that I will never forget them."<sup>57</sup>

In expressing himself thus, Dzierzozynski spoke with becoming modesty. In the space of seven years, and using slender resources imaginatively, he had resuscitated one college and supervised the openings of two more, successfully resisted Archbishop Marechal's claim to Whitemarsh, extended the Jesuit apostolate in the Mississippi Valley, clarified (somewhat awkwardly) the nature of Jesuit governance, and given a new unity and vigorous orientation to the Jesuits in America. He had even succeeded in re-opening a novitiate at Georgetown in 1827, assuming the responsibility of Master of Novices himself. James Ryder, who later served as provincial, credited Dzierzozynski with saving the mission during these years through his spiritual and material labors.<sup>58</sup> There had been many misgivings about this Polish newcomer when he assumed leadership over Maryland; by now the doubts had turned to grateful and affectionate respect.

During the next two decades, Dzierzozynski continued to be a central figure in the Maryland Province. He continued as Master of Novices until 1831 and served in the same capacity again at Georgetown and Frederick from 1834

<sup>54</sup>Fenwick to Dzierzozynski, Portobacco, August 5, 1825, and Dzierzozynski to Fortis (Georgetown, August 1825), MPA, 207 P 11; Fenwick to Dzierzozynski, Baltimore, September 4, 1825, MPA, 207 P 19.

<sup>55</sup>Fenwick to Dzierzozynski, Boston, December 24, 1825 and January 5, 1829, MPA, 207 N 12 and 207 Z 3.

<sup>56</sup>Dzierzozynski to George Fenwick, Georgetown, May 24, 1829, MPA 209 T 5.

<sup>57</sup>Letter of November 14, 1830, Georgetown, MPA, 209 H 7.

<sup>58</sup>Rutkowska, "Polish Pioneer," p. 101.

to 1841 and 1844 to 1846 — a total of fourteen years in that office. Until 1838, he also taught philosophy and theology to Jesuit scholastics and lay students in Georgetown. In the 1840's he was also Tertian Master, overseeing the final stages of ascetical training for Jesuits. So extensive was his influence on the renovated Society of Jesus, that one historian estimated that half of all the American Jesuit teachers who were active between 1870 and 1900 had been molded in some significant way by Dzierozynski.<sup>59</sup> In addition, he continued to advise provincial superiors as a formally designated province consultor.

Apart from his formal duties, Dzierozynski gave extensive service as spiritual director and retreat director for Jesuits and for religious sisters and women students at the Visitation convents at Georgetown and Frederick. The latter assignments were particularly sensitive in the mid-century context of obscene and malicious rumors about priests and nuns from anti-Catholic nativists.<sup>60</sup> To further his work, he translated a number of spiritual works from Latin and Polish into English, including three lenten sermons of Peter Skarga, a work by the Polish Jesuit Daniel Pawlowski, and English translations of meditations originally given to Jesuit scholastics at Polock.<sup>61</sup> In all these things, he remained a living link between the uninterrupted Jesuit heritage in eastern Europe and the increasingly bright prospects for Jesuit life and work in the United States.

Dzierozynski's correspondence gives indications of his qualities as a spiritual director. To a young priest facing discouragement, he wrote in an avuncular tone: "I congratulate you on these little crosses and advise you to hope against the hope. — Beginning is always hard."<sup>62</sup> With his friend, Mgr. Joseph Mezzofanti in Rome, he exchanged poems which combined humor with blessing.<sup>63</sup> Mezzofanti's verse set the tone:

I'm now at Rome and like it well;  
For here my God will have me dwell.  
We from each other far are driven:  
God grant we meet again in heaven.

And Dzierozynski replied in kind:

I'm now in Georgetown, and follow my call:  
For I'm cuffed about like a football.  
If I must, I shall wait till I see you in heaven!  
But for fear we might slip, as the road is uneven,  
I'd like to give you old friend a shake of the hand  
And crack an old joke in this Nether-land.

<sup>59</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 514-16.

<sup>60</sup>Peter Kenney to Dzierozynski, Frederick, February 8, 1831, MPA, 209 Z 6.

<sup>61</sup>Domanski, *Millenium*, pp. 509, 514-16; Dzierozynski to John McElroy, Georgetown, January 21, 1828, MPA, 208 P 7; Peter Kenney to Dzierozynski, February 8, 1831, MPA, 209 Z 6.

<sup>62</sup>Dzierozynski to Charles Lancaster, Georgetown, September 11, 1842, MPA 213 G 0.

<sup>63</sup>The poems are dated February 13 and June 21, 1833. Dzierozynski Papers, 3:2. Another set of poems, more pious in tone, were printed at Georgetown for distribution in 1834.

His superiors rarely failed to call upon Dzierozynski's wisdom and humor; and, in at least one case, a Jesuit who had violated his clerical state was sent to Dzierozynski to make a retreat.<sup>64</sup>

Bishop Fenwick invited Dzierozynski to attend the second Provincial Council of American bishops at Baltimore in 1833. In requesting his services, Fenwick made it clear that he valued Dzierozynski both for his company and for his sagaciousness at a time when the American republic was being threatened by nullification:

You cannot be aware how proud I shall be to have the advice of one so learned on such an occasion; but you must be aware how much I shall stand in need of such a Consultor. . . . I shall consult you *publicly* (sic) — I will have an opportunity of consulting you *privately*; so, there will be *two* to take care *that the Republic suffer no detriment*: which is the more necessary as we live in *squally* times.<sup>65</sup>

Although Fenwick expressed his confidence that Archbishop Whitefield “will not fail to give his consent to your being there,” he did not attend.<sup>66</sup> The reasons are not altogether clear, but they may have been connected with the criticism he had received from Roothaan about his statement at the council in 1829.

Through all his American activities, Dzierozynski never seemed to lose an affectionate regard for his countrymen across the sea. In 1823, for instance, he was sufficiently moved by the death of Polish Primate Ignacy Raczyński to copy out the obituary by hand, noting particularly the primate's deathbed wish to see Jesuits flourishing all over the world.<sup>67</sup> Another time, the old veteran made efforts to lure some German-speaking Polish Jesuits to work in Pennsylvania, “if they wish to know and experience the sweetness of english language, and at the same time by the recollection of their old german jargon to gain many thousands of souls to our Lord.”<sup>68</sup> Dzierozynski tried to keep informed about the activities of his Jesuit associates from the Old Country and as late as 1846 he forwarded a letter to Father Sacchi with news of Jesuit activities in Galicia.<sup>69</sup> But his personal contacts gradually died away. In 1844, he told a correspondent that his brothers and nearest relatives were all dead and that he had no desire to make further inquiries about other former acquaintances.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>64</sup>Peter Verhaegen to John McElroy, Philadelphia, April 15, 1845, MPA, 215 Z 1.

<sup>65</sup>Fenwick to Dzierozynski, Boston, October 1, 1833, MPA, 210 D 8.

<sup>66</sup>*Concilia Provincialia Baltimori* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1842), p. 93, notes that Fenwick's designated theologian was Rev. John Chanche (Vice-president of St. Mary's College, Baltimore).

<sup>67</sup>Untitled document, MPA 1 T 3. On Raczyński, see Wincenty Urban, *Ostatni Etap Dziejow Kościoła w Polsce przed Nowym Tysiącleciem (1815-1965)* (Rome: Edizioni Hosianum, 1966), pp. 276-77.

<sup>68</sup>Dzierozynski to George Fenwick, Georgetown, May 24, 1829, MPA, 209 T 5.

<sup>69</sup>Xavier Stachowski to Dzierozynski, Clongerwood College, March 11, 1822, MPA, 206 Z 6; Dzierozynski to Sacchi, Frederick, June 20, 1846, MPA 215 R 10.

<sup>70</sup>Dzierozynski to George Fenwick, Frederick, July 19, 1844, MPA, 214 D.

Exiles of the November Insurrection also appealed to the well known Polish-American Jesuit for help. The files bulge with letters requesting aid, some fraudulent and some undoubtedly genuine. Today it is impossible to tell how Dzierozynski responded to all the requests for money, jobs, and advice. But there is evidence that, in one case involving an immigrant who claimed to be a cousin of Kosciuszko needing assistance to contest his will, Dzierozynski judiciously declined to become involved.<sup>71</sup>

1839 proved to be another difficult year for the Maryland Province. In that summer, Father Thomas Mulledy, the provincial, was recalled to Rome to defend himself against charges of lax discipline and the selling of slaves. His successor, William McSherry, died six months later. By December, Dzierozynski had been designated by the professed Jesuits of the province to govern the province again as vice-provincial in a caretaker capacity, until a permanent provincial with "the prudence and the firmness to make us respect his authority" could be appointed.<sup>72</sup> Dzierozynski had been ill for nine days when he received word of his new appointment. And as reflected on his predecessor's untimely death and the serious problems of discipline and indebtedness which the province faced, he remarked: "I fear our Dear Soc: may suffer by this loss and particularly on account of my weakness and misery —"<sup>73</sup>

And indeed, Dzierozynski's second stint as head of the Maryland Jesuits was less ambitious and successful than the first. He was over sixty and thought that his appointment would be temporary, though it lasted for three and a half years. His unwillingness to leave Frederick until forced to by Roothaan almost two years later, drew criticism that he was inaccessible and was not active enough in establishing authority and religious discipline. He also found himself in disagreement with the general about the province debt and about the limits of acceptable behavior for American Jesuits and their students. His spirited defense of American customs — his tolerance of visitors at Georgetown, and his support for the celebration of patriotic holidays, including banquets at which student sometimes drank too much — placed him at odds with some of the other immigrant Jesuits of the province, who complained bitterly to Rome. As Emmett Curran suggests, Dzierozynski "had come to appreciate the Ignatian principle of adaptation according to circumstances." European codes of behavior could not be rigidly applied in the circumstances of

<sup>71</sup>See letters, MPA, 210 Extra. The claimant to Kosciuszko's will was Ignacy Chutkowski, who wrote to Dzierozynski six times in 1841 and 1842. More on Chutkowski may be found in Maria J. E. Copson-Niecko, "The Poles in America from the 1830's to the 1870's," in *Poles in America. Bicentennial Essays*, edited by Frank Mocha (Stevens Point: Worzalla Publishing Co., 1978), p. 118. On Kosciuszko's disputed will, see James S. Pula, "The American Will of Thaddeus Kosciuszko," in *Polish American Studies*, 31 (Spring, 1977), pp. 16-25. An account of Dzierozynski's dealings with the Polish exiles is in Domanski, *Millentum*, pp. 519-23.

<sup>72</sup>Curran, "Troubled Nation," pp. 8-14; Francis Vespre to Roothaan, Georgetown, December 21 1839, ARSI, Maryland, 7 I 22, *ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>73</sup>Dzierozynski to Francis Vespre, Frederick, December 19, 1839, MPA, 212 D 6.

the New World.<sup>74</sup> After nearly two decades in America, Dzierozynski had taken on the ways of the New World; and younger leaders in Rome, shaped by different experiences, found it more difficult to place confidence in his judgments.

Dzierozynski's most lasting accomplishment in those years was his role in facilitating the agreement committing the Jesuits to staff a new college in Worcester. Negotiations reached their peak in 1842 and 1843. Dzierozynski was wary of accepting Bishop Fenwick's plan for a boarding school because of the lack of Jesuit manpower. But Fenwick was adamant, and helped to persuade his old friend by threatening to prevent the Jesuits from establishing a school in Boston if they would not first agree to staff the college in Worcester.<sup>75</sup> He also promoted the plan for Worcester with the argument that it would be an exclusively Catholic college — a situation, he insisted, that would produce more vocations to the priesthood than mixed schools.<sup>76</sup>

In the following months, Thomas Mulledy, who had been released from his assignment in Nice to head the new college, was reporting from Worcester that the building and location were ideal. And finally, in the summer of 1843, only a few months before the college opened, Roothaan gave his tentative approval for a boarding college.<sup>77</sup> Dzierozynski eventually derived a great deal of satisfaction from the progress of Holy Cross. Late in his life, he expressed his sentiments to a Jesuit stationed in Worcester:

I congratulate the Holy Cross College which has begun to produce the predicted fruits intended by . . . Bishop Ben, when he said that this college would supply not only the long house of St. Ignatius but also the whole United States with good Jesuits. This year particularly begins to verify the prediction. Be not proud, but say "Non nobis Dne, non nobis etc."<sup>78</sup>

When Dzierozynski surrendered leadership of the province for the second time in September, 1843, he was almost sixty-four and had six years of life remaining. He labored for three more years as Master of Novices until his infirmities and new disagreements with Roothaan over discipline, forced him to relinquish a position in which he had given such satisfaction.<sup>79</sup> In discussing the possibility of resignation, Maryland provincial Peter Verhaegen made it clear to Dzierozynski that he would appoint a successor only on condition that the venerable Pole was unable to continue. He instructed Dzierozynski

<sup>74</sup>Curran, "Troubled Nation," pp. 12-15.

<sup>75</sup>Dzierozynski to Fenwick, Georgetown, January 25, 1843, in Fenwick Correspondence, Boston Archdiocesan Archives; Mulledy to Roothaan, (November 17, 1843), copy in Dzierozynski Papers.

<sup>76</sup>Fenwick to Dzierozynski, Boston, February 4, 1843, MPA 214 Z 5.

<sup>77</sup>Mulledy to Dzierozynski, Philadelphia, March 18, 1843, Dzierozynski Papers; Roothaan to Dzierozynski, Rome, June 17, 1843, ARSI, Maryland, I 209.

<sup>78</sup>Dzierozynski to George Fenwick, Georgetown, August 16, 1850, MPA, 218 P 11.

<sup>79</sup>Among other things, the General objected to violations of silence and the toleration of smoking at the novitiate, to fraternization between novices and older Jesuits, and to the behavior of the novice manufacturer. Peter Verhaegen to Dzierozynski, Georgetown, July 21, 1846. MPA, 215 P 4.

to remain in the residence across from the novitiate and to train his successor: "As much as possible, introduce him into the office, and on all occasions *act together with a perfect understanding*".<sup>80</sup> To the General, Verhaegen observed that the novices venerated him as a saint and that they had stimulated them well to become worthy Jesuits.<sup>81</sup>

In his final years, Dzierozynski busied himself at Frederick, talking to young Jesuits, directing retreats, reading *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, and corresponding with friends — using a secretary towards the end, when he could no longer write for himself. In all his associations, he continued to communicate enthusiasm and encouragement with grace and dignity. To one young pastor, he wrote:

Your last letter will be placed on file with your preceding ones, so that I may repeatedly enjoy (,) in reading them over (,) the pleasure which I experienced at their receipt.<sup>82</sup>

In these final years of elder statesmanship, men and women in a variety of circumstances turned to Dzierozynski for counsel and support.

The widespread desire for contact with the elderly Jesuit indicates how far his reputation had spread. In Boston, John Fitzpatrick, who succeeded Benedict Fenwick as bishop in 1846, had long wished to make a retreat under Dzierozynski's direction. By the end of 1849, Fitzpatrick was begging that Dzierozynski be allowed to come to Holy Cross. The request was advanced in a letter from the college rector:

I hope your Reverance (sic) will send him to the H. Cross. When last I saw the Bishop, he enquired if there was any chance of his Coming; but I could give him no direct answer until I heard from you. He and his clergy anxiously desire it; and would Consider it a favour Conferred upon them, if you would let us have the old gentleman here.<sup>83</sup>

By then Dzierozynski had become too frail, and a move was impossible. Sensing his approaching death in August 1850, he bade farewell to a friend in Worcester: "I expect not to be so happy as to hear from you again, as I think my exit is not far off. . . . May you live many years for the greater glory of God. . . . Good bye, good father George, pray for me and for my happy death."<sup>84</sup> By then, he was no longer able to celebrate Mass and had received the last rites. He rallied during the first two weeks of September as the Visita-

<sup>80</sup>Verhaegen to Dzierozynski, Georgetown, September 23, 29, and November 7, 1846, MPA, 215 N 9, 215 N 7, 215 M 3.

<sup>81</sup>Verhaegen to Roothaan, Georgetown, September 24, 1846, ARSI, Maryland, 8 I 20.

<sup>82</sup>Dzierozynski to Theodore Jenkins, Frederick, September 6, 1844, Dzierozynski Papers, 3:2. See also Dzierozynski to John Early, Frederick, April 12, 1850, John Early Papers, Catholic Historical MSS, Georgetown University Archives.

<sup>83</sup>John Early to Ignatius Brocard, Worcester, January 8, 1850, MPA, 218 Z 3. See also letters of Thomas Mulledy to James Ryder, Worcester, December 16, 1843, MPA, 214 S 6; and Peter Blenkinsop to Brocard, Worcester, December 24, 1849, MPA, 217 C 7.

<sup>84</sup>Dzierozynski to George Fenwick, Frederick, August 16, 1850, MPA, 218 P 11.

tion Sisters in Frederick and Jesuits made novenas for his recovery. Then, suddenly, he took a turn for the worse. He lingered for about a week, edifying his visitors with cheerful conversation which showed little fear of death. As the end approached, he asked that his hands and feet be washed and that he be dressed in his habit. On the night of his death, a brother kept vigil, with a priest sleeping in the next room, on call for the final moments. Soon after midnight on September 22, Dzierozynski told the brother that he was dying. Supported in the brother's arms, he made his final confession and passed away at half past midnight.<sup>85</sup>

Before his remains were taken to the church, the sisters of the Visitation Convent received locks of his hair and sent rosaries and crucifixes to be touched to his hands and face. "I need not say that now (these objects) are doubly esteemed," one of them wrote, "and it seems to me, that I would not part with ours for the whole world."<sup>86</sup> Considerate to the end of the women religious whom he had counselled, Dzierozynski had directed that, as his remains were being conveyed from the residence to the church, they be carried past the convent, where the sisters were restricted to cloister. As they stood at the windows, the coffin was opened. Gazing at him for the last time, the women gave themselves over to tears of grief.

The funeral Mass was held on the morning of September 23. Afterwards, one of the sisters described the procession as it moved towards the cemetery. A scholastic, bearing a cross, led the group. He was followed by the 150 students of the Jesuit school at Frederick. Next came brothers, novices, scholastics and over thirty priests, dressed in surplices, carrying lighted candles. Dzierozynski's casket was borne by four men of the local parish. Once again, emotions ran high. "Never will we forget the deep and solemn tone of the Miserere, and the toll of the bell," wrote Sister Clare. "Again was every heart and every overflowing — and scarcely even now, do we speak of him without feeling the same as when we saw him carried to his last resting place."<sup>87</sup>

In this fashion, one of the most influential Polish-Americans passed to his reward. Cast out of his homeland by an unkind twist of fate, he had been sent to America by the General of the Society of Jesus to restore and realign a fragmented and confused segment of Jesuits, who did not completely welcome his arrival. By the end of his life, he had committed his companions more closely to the apostolate of education, had helped to define a cordial but distinctive relationship with America's Catholic bishops, and had trained a generation of Jesuits to carry on the work until the end of the century. He drew the best out of most people, and they responded to him on that account. For all

<sup>85</sup>Sr. Clare to George Fenwick, Frederick, September 29, 1850, MPA, 218 N 13.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., Charles Stonestreet to (?), Frederick, September 25, 1850, MPA, 218 P 21.



these tasks he was uniquely qualified, as Aloysius Fortis had surmised, because of his personal qualities and his contacts with the old Jesuit life which survived among the Poles and their associates in the Russian Empire.

On the day of Dzierozynski's death, one of the Jesuits at Frederick penned the following memorial in the house diary:

Today . . . died Father Francis Dzierozynski of the Society of Jesus. He was a lover of the brethren and a father in Israel, loved by all, without an enemy, and if such a one were found and were to say aught against him, he would hurt his own fair name rather than the memory of Father.<sup>88</sup>

The writer of those lines would doubtless be astonished that the man he was describing, is so little known today.

<sup>88</sup>Cited in Devitt, "History," WL 62:315-16.

## POLISH STUDIES

The Polish Studies Program at Central Connecticut State University is a unique endeavor. It contributes to the diversity and strength of Central as a University, and is the only active program of its kind in New England with roots both on the campus and in the community.

The Program, inaugurated in January, 1974, seeks to preserve and to stimulate an awareness of Poland's history and of her contribution to European and world civilization. The Program's core are courses in history, politics, culture, literature, language, and on the Polish American ethnic community. The Polish Heritage Collection in the University Library, numbering over 6,000 catalogued books and periodicals, and the Connecticut Polish American Archives and Manuscript Collection, a depository of research materials and memorabilia, supplement the course offerings.

The Program's activities also include evening and weekend lecture series and cultural events, including exhibits, the screening of motion pictures, concerts, and poetry readings. Educational materials for teachers are available from the Curriculum Laboratory in the University Library, and there is scholarship aid for students pursuing Polish Studies and for students of Polish American origin.

The Copernican Polish Heritage Endowment, which is located in the CCSU Foundation, Inc., supports all aspects of the Program, including the Connecticut Polish American Archives and Manuscript Collection. Donors are commemorated on the plaque hanging in the University Library. Individuals, families, businesses, and organizations are listed in the following categories:

Founders . . . . .	\$1,000 or more
Benefactors . . . . .	500 or more
Friends . . . . .	250 or more
Patrons . . . . .	100 or more

Individuals and families may also endow (\$10,000 or more) a special lecture series, a named scholarship, a book and publishing fund, a fund to bring an exchange professor from Poland to CCSU, a student exchange, or some other activity. These donations are commemorated with individual bronze plaques which also hang in the University Library.

Our ultimate objective is to endow a chair of Polish and Polish American Studies at CCSU.

For further information about the Program contact the Coordinator of Polish Studies, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT 06050. (203) 827-7469.

**Polish Studies Program**  
**Central Connecticut State University**  
**New Britain, Connecticut 06050**



NONPROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
NEW BRITAIN, CT  
06050  
PERMIT NO. 939

A publication of the CCSU Foundation, Inc.