

49. POOR

Summary:

1. Introduction. – 2. How can the dictionaries of the 17th C. help us? – 3. Who were the children of the artisans and the poor? – 4. The Testimony of Social Historians: 4.1. The situation in the 16th and 17th centuries. 4.2. Comparative Meanings. 4.3. Further Distinctions in Meaning. – 5. The Testimony of Blain. – 6. Blain, Bernard, Maillefer and the Language of the 17th C. – 7. The Distinction between "Pauvres" and "Misérables". – 8. The Option of the *Hôpital Général*. – 9. The Most Abandoned. – 10. Identification of the Poor – A Progressive Problem. – 11. The Word Poor in the Meditations For Sundays and Feasts. – 12. The Chapter of Renewal 1966-67 and the Word Poor. – 13. Some Remarks Towards a Conclusion: 13.1. The Contemporary Emphasis of the Church on the Service of the Poor as Fundamental Option. 13.2. La Salle's Inclusive Option. 13.3. Use of Scientific and Historical Methods. – 14. Conclusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

"The Definition of the poor, such as it was understood under the *Ancien Régime*, is very wide. The poor person is he who suffers, who is humble, afflicted, who has fallen into misfortune. In a more restricted view, he is a person who finds himself in 'need', who has only his work to provide him with a livelihood, who for want of savings, has pre-occupation with his daily needs. The poor man is not entirely without resources; he may have his work tools, even a little put aside" (*Lexique Historique de la France de l'Ancien Régime*, p. 248).

Within the school, the principal ministry of this Institute from its very beginning, there has always been a special concern for the poorest among its pupils. However, the earliest formulas of consecration and the primitive Rules spoke not of vowed "service of the poor" but of "conducting schools gratuitously" (RC 1705). Similarly, the first chapter of the Rules of 1705 which all the biographers attribute to John Baptist de La Salle describes the end of the Institute as being to give "a Christian education to children" (RC chp. I art 4). In this initial use in the Rules the word children is

not modified in any way. The same can be said of the Bull of 1725 whose wording was presumably very much influenced by Brother Timothy, the Second Superior General, and the other principal Brothers of the period who had been close to La Salle. It is only by way of modification that the Bull employs the word "poor".

In 1727 Canon J.B. Blain was commissioned by Brother Timothy to write the life of the Founder and to sketch the providential history of the Institute as it emerged under his guidance. It is clear that the major theme that the author is attempting to emphasize in chronicling these events is that La Salle, under God's inspiration, was seeking through gratuitous schools to break the vicious cycle of poverty, abandon and ignorance that vitiated the society of his day. A consequence of this situation was that children, particularly those of artisans and the poor "were unable to live well and hence were far from salvation" (Bull. *In Apostolicae Dignitatis Solio*). In establishing the Christian Schools "he did not wish to exclude the families of any of the categories of the poor that others might devise nor indeed the children of

those who might be defined as rich or in easy circumstances" (CL 8 34ff). As Blain further says, "For De La Salle the danger was too great of taking on the role of a judge, something he believed he had no right to do and which he could not indeed do fairly" (CL 8 36). Hence the importance for La Salle and his Brothers of the principle of gratuity for it enabled them to maintain schools open to all children and so to convert into a reality the expressed objective of their Institute: "The end of this Institute is to give a Christian education to children and it is for this purpose that they keep schools so that children being under the care of the masters from morning till evening, these masters may teach them to live well by instructing them in the mysteries of our religion while inspiring them with Christian maxims and so giving them an education which is suited to them" (RC 1705 chp. 1 art. 4). Brother Yves Poutet would seem to be strongly supporting this interpretation of La Salle's intention when he writes in *Lasalliana*: "La Salle absolutely refused to follow the demands of custom which would have made his schools into ghettos reserved for the poor. This was a radical innovation because it made the least cultivated pupils come into frequent contact with the more favoured orders of pupils who had come to profit by the exemplary value of his schools" (*Lasalliana* 09-A-44. 1.6.86).

2. WHO WERE THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR?

Brother Maurice Hermans in a brief study (1971) entitled *THE POOR TO WHOM SAINT JOHN BAPTIST DE LA SALLE AND THE FIRST BROTHERS DEDICATED THEMSELVES* has this to say: "It goes without saying that one must remember certain associations or contents. Thus it is, for example, that art. 3 of the 1st Chapter of the Rules where it is a question of the CHILDREN, is not to be put in opposition to arts. 4, 5 and 6 of the same chapter which speak explicitly of ARTISANS AND THE POOR, and even CHILDREN OF ARTISANS AND THE POOR (Hermans p. 6). It will appear all the same significant that the first word to which the author of Rules has recourse is a term of general impor-

tance or bearing: "The end of this Institute is to give a Christian education to children..." It is also very instructive to observe, as Hermans notes: "that the Rules which use the expression CHILDREN OF ARTISANS AND THE POOR so little, use about ten other times the word CHILDREN and sixty one times the word "écolier" (schoolboy, pupil, student). (Hermans op. cit. p. 6).

Brother Hermans also remarks that it is probably not without significance that the Meditations for the Times of Retreat give their preference to the terms, child, children, (more than eighty times) and DISCIPLES (between twenty five and thirty times), the related term PUPIL being used four times. The word POOR (singular or plural), whether used substantively or qualitatively, occurs rather rarely (Hermans op. cit. p. 6).

The simplest explanation for this varying terminology is that La Salle and the early Brothers used these terms interchangeably because all the children who came to them, with few exceptions, could be classed as poor. Thus whether they were thinking of the children of labourers, of workers in the simplest mechanical arts (artisans) or of shopkeepers; they saw them all as belonging to the world of the poor. In fact as will be evidenced from testimony from the late 17th and early 18th centuries, the majority of the French population could be appropriately described as poor and its lower echelons as indigent (*misérable*). As is also noted elsewhere, for the common people, this poverty was more or less intermittent and for many the economic situation was one of insecurity rather than of permanent poverty or destitution. (POUTET-PUNGIER, *Un éducateur aux prises avec la société de son temps*, p. 29). This distinction is also made clear by Blain when he analyses the categories of poor in the Brothers' Schools in Paris in the first decade of the 18th C. (CL 8, 9).

3. HOW CAN THE DICTIONARIES OF THE 17th CENTURY HELP US?

What reality, indeed, did these words express in the last years of the 17th C. when La Salle was reluctantly becoming involved in the business of the schools?

Furetière's *Dictionnaire Universel* (2nd. ed.) published in 1701 begins its definition of the word poor, as the person "Who has no resources; who is in distress; who does not have the necessities to sustain life or maintain his status". He goes on to say that there is a Poor Board in Paris; a tax is levied on the bourgeois for the poor; collections are made in parishes for the poor; that there are Commissioners for the Poor; that *Hôpitaux Généraux* have been established to incarcerate the poor who were previously a threat to life as they begged alms. He also refers to the PAUVRES HONTEUX, a category mentioned by Blain as identifying the parents of some poor, people of respectable family who suffer greatly without daring to make their situation known" (CL 8, 9).

Furetière's dictionary makes no distinction between the French words AISÉ and RICHE defined as: "He who has plenty of resources, who has an abundance of all things; who is rich in money, in rents, in lands, and honours".

Poutet and Pungier, referring to Richelet's dictionary of 1680 indicate that there was effectively little difference in economic status between artisans and the poor (Poutet-Pungier op. cit. 9.29). We may therefore, for our purposes here, virtually consider the terms to be synonymous. At least it may be said that many artisans lived in a near permanent state of insecurity and were in regular need of assistance. They were among La Salle's poor (See Theme: Artisans; Bedel ED 275/8; Hermans DC 401/ 17 D3).

4. THE TESTIMONY OF SOCIAL HISTORIANS

4.1. The situation in the 16th and 17th centuries

Who then belonged to the world of the poor in La Salle's time. Paul Christophe in his study *LES PAUVRES ET LA PAUVRETÉ* quoting Jean-Pierre Gutton offers an answer: "For the 16th and 17th centuries, those who were prone to become poor could be considered as poor, that is to say, labourers who had nothing but their strength of limb to support themselves and who had no reserves, a situation which pretty well characterised the common people in general (P. Christophe p. 7).

Further, he comments, that in the towns many craftsmen in a small way lived on the verge of destitution. These included: shoemakers, door-men, innkeepers, launderers, water-carriers, etc. What is really difficult to do, he adds is to separate difficulty from poverty, and poverty from indigence, beggary and vagabondage. He again quotes Jean-Pierre Gutton's view: "From poverty to beggary is a difference only of degree and not of nature" (J.P. GUTTON, *La Société et les Pauvres*. Quoted Christophe op. cit. p. 9).

4.2. Comparative Meanings

Poutet-Pungier help us to make a comparison with our own day: "According to present day criteria, people would be authentically poor who could not afford the minimum requirements of workers who have to be satisfied with SMIG (Subsistence wage). But in the 17th C. lack of basics was general. The great majority of the French population would have to be classed as poor; from beggars to craftsmen, to small shopkeepers and even to some degree rural nobility. However, the standard usage of the period does not see the matter in these terms. It distinguishes the poor from those in distress. It is not lack of basics which characterises the poor but the insecurity of tomorrow (Poutet-Pungier op. cit. p. 29).

Was the question of insecurity uppermost in the mind of the concerned Bourgeois, La Salle, when in his *Meditations of the Times of Retreat* he comments: "Consider that it is only too common for the artisans and the poor to allow their children to live on their own, roaming all over as if they had no home, until they are able to be put to some work. Their parents have no concern to send their children to school because they are too poor to pay teachers, or else they have to go out to look for work and leave their children to fend for themselves" (MR 194.1). Here La Salle speaking for himself identifies two categories of poor. Those whose money is so limited that they have none to pay teachers, and those who have the money but do not have the time or energy to see to their children's schooling because they have to give their attention to finding jobs that will keep the money coming into the home. La Salle outlines

further his perception of the poor whose children he was called to serve in a similar passage in another of these meditations: "One of the main duties of fathers and mothers is to bring up their children in a christian manner and to teach them their religion. But most parents are not sufficiently enlightened in these matters (poverty of knowledge); some are taken up with their material needs and the support of their family; others, under constant concern of earning the necessities of life for themselves and their children, cannot take the time to teach their children their duties as christians" (MR 193.2).

We need to take this question of constant concern and insecurity further in order to clarify our understanding of the word poor in the world today in comparison with its meaning for La Salle. It must not be assumed that the two are identical.

4.3. Further Distinctions in Meaning

In order to attempt this identification, a further initial clarification must be made. Even from an objective point of view the word POOR does not have the same referent throughout the world today. Starting from the widest perspective a distinction must be made between what the word means in a developed or First World country, and what it means in developing or Third World society. In the typical First World society the population generally falls into three categories: A relatively very small affluent group, a relatively large middle income group, and a relatively small deprived group. Within each of these three categories there is a corresponding economic range.

So, for instance, for the typical North American, French, Australian, Dutch, Spanish or English Brother or his colleague, the poor are a relatively small portion of the population. In economic terms one speaks of the poverty line and of those who live below the poverty line. In addition, in the typical developed country, there are those people who for a variety of reasons such as chronic illness, alcoholism or drug addiction are at the very bottom of the economic scale and may be classed as indigent. To these today must be added the street-kids (Cf. Poutet-Pungier op. cit., p. 29).

The indigent (*misérables*) of today may be entirely dependent on social welfare or charity. They are sometimes, in more emotive terms, referred to as THE POOREST OF THE POOR. This group of people is still to be found in societies where there is a comprehensive system of social welfare. For various reasons they are not able to avail themselves effectively of even the readily available welfare and charity resources.

On the other hand in the typical developing or Third World country the situation is quite different. There may be a relatively small affluent class, a similarly small though more numerous comfortable middle group and finally a very large group living at subsistence level. Such societies normally lack an official social welfare system. Maternity allowances, sickness and disability benefits and age pensions are non-existent. Lack of basic education and hygiene, recurrent famine and inter-ethnic conflict assure that a large proportion of the population lives in abject poverty. Such are the poor for many Brothers in parts of Africa, Asia and South America. It would seem that the majority of those who would be classed as POOR in those societies would have to be considered as INDIGENT in the terminology of developed countries. Considering what has already been said of the conditions of France in the 17th C. it would appear that we are closer here to a helpful contrast of relative economic conditions. We are also less likely to arrive at the naive conclusion that our use of the word POOR and theirs was identical.

Would La Salle have recognized the categories of Paul Christophe, of Jean-Pierre Gutton, of Jean Pungier and Yves Poutet? Since we cannot arrive at the answer from La Salle himself, we need to look elsewhere. His first biographers, among them men who were close to him and knew his mind, do have something specific to say on this matter. One of these is Canon Jean Baptiste Blain, his close friend and ecclesiastic superior of the Brothers at St. Yon, who outlived him by thirty years and wrote while many of the Founder's contemporaries were still living. These Brothers were quite ready to challenge perceived distortions in Blain's work which they certainly did on several issues (CL 8. Appendix Letter to Superior General).

5. THE TESTIMONY OF BLAIN

To seek some answers to this question let us plunge into a situation of conflict for the embryonic Institute in the Paris of the years 1704-1706 and join Blain as he writes: "So that in future the Writing Masters might not cause any more troubles in the schools, De La Chetardye sent Abbe Gergy, his Vicar at this time and today his successor as Parish Priest of Saint Sulpice, to investigate the financial standing of pupils' families. The pious priest spent several weeks doing so and drew up a list of the student's ages, names and addresses. The Brothers were told to admit only those who presented a note signed by a priest from the Community of Saint Sulpice designated by the Pastor to verify the financial status of the children's parents" (CL 8, 7).

It is important for us to remember that La Salle was adamantly opposed, according to Blain, to this prying into the private affairs of the families of the pupils flocking to the schools. Blain's claim is confirmed by the continuing troubles La Salle had with the Writing Masters. However, at this time, the alternative was the closure of the schools and so he reluctantly agreed to the issuing of certificates of poverty: "Fathers and mothers were thus obliged to come from all over the parish to secure a ticket, which was like a key which opened the doors of the gratuitous schools for their children. The procedure disarmed the Writing Masters completely and deprived them of any pretext for further harassment. It protected the Brothers and their schools and brought peace and quiet back to them. Yet they did not lose a single student. The classes were filled as usual, and no child who asked for admission was turned away. The great number of pupils was a fresh source of displeasure for the Parisian schoolmasters, but it would no longer excuse them for causing further trouble. The issuing of tickets which protected the schools from any invidious visitations was, when all was said and done, nothing but a pure formality; for the same students whose supposedly easy circumstances had provided a pretext for the lawsuits filed by the Writing Masters came back to the Brothers with their tickets duly signed, since the Priest in charge felt that in conscience he could not refuse them. Better informed than the Writing

Masters' imagination, he did not feel justified in classifying as RICH those who had a little money but also had large families, who owned well-stocked stores but owed more than they owned" (CL 8, 43).

A surface reading of these passages would lead to the conclusion that there was a considerable portion of students of families IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES in the gratuitous schools of the parish of Saint Sulpice. This conclusion, however, would not accord with the remark Blain makes in an earlier chapter regarding similar problems in the Faubourg Saint Antoine: That in a hundred poor children who frequented the Christian Schools three or four might belong to families in easy circumstances (CL 8, 7). The key to this problem is, perhaps, to be found in determining the distinction Blain is making between families in POOR and families in EASY circumstances.

6. BLAIN AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE 17th CENTURY

There are numerous passages that could be cited to indicate that there is considerable difficulty in interpreting just what is meant in Blain, in Bernard, and indeed in the texts of La Salle, when the terms POOR, IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES and THE RICH, are used. Light, however, is thrown on the problem when we look at the evidence as to the meaning of the words at the turn of the 17th C. as indicated above from Furetière's *Dictionnaire Universel* of 1690. It would seem that in Blain also the two later expressions are used interchangeably and, further, that he employs no intermediate terms between RICH and POOR. In other words RICH as used by Blain and also possibly by La Salle embraces those described as IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES: "They shall show equal affection for all their pupils but more so for those who are poor than for those who are rich because they are more entrusted by their Institute with the care of the former than of the latter" (RC 1705 3.13). Yet these would come from families little removed from those described as POOR. This word in turn, as has been indicated above, covers a wide spectrum from MISERABLE to those embraced by the word INSECURE. In fact,

it seems not unreasonable to conclude that those pupils described by Blain and La Salle as RICHE or AISÉ were only so, by contrast, and were, economically, from families, as is said above not far from those described as POOR.

In their study *Les Français et L'Ancien Régime*, Goubert and Roche identify an intermediate group LES MÉDIOCRES (the in-betweens). "Aux confins de l'indépendance économique se trouvaient les médiocres. Médiocres au sens classique, c'est-à-dire moyens, ainsi appelait-on avant 1750 les gens qui n'étaient ni "AISÉS" ni "PAUVRES" (Roche op. cit. p. 167). The term *médiocre* does not appear to be used by Blain. This perhaps is understandable when we consider the order of society from which both Blain and La Salle came. The interchangeable use of the terms RICH and THOSE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES thus becomes clearer when the terminology is clearly situated in the period and the context to which it belongs. The period was one in which society was divided virtually into three categories: a very small category of very wealthy people: some noble, some bourgeois; a second and still proportionally small group of moderately well-to-do-people: some noble, some bourgeois; and finally the vast majority of the people, POOR in a sense that is somewhat different from the poor in our day (see Pungier-Poutet comment above) but again composed of all ORDERS of society.

Blain himself offers us some help in situating the social and economic status of the families to whom he is referring.

He is commenting on the conflict between La Salle and the Writing Masters in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine in 1704 and suggests several factors La Salle could have pointed out to defend himself against the accusations of the Writings Masters that he was receiving into the gratuitous schools children of parents who were RICH or Well-OFF:

"How often do the walls of a house disguise seriously straightened circumstances which remain unknown to the public? How many indigent people suffer in secret the hardships of poverty while having a reputation of being well-off?

That the fact that some people are called surgeons, masons, butchers, locksmiths, wine merchants and so on does not imply that all of them are in fact in easy circumstances (d'être à leur

aise); many poor people exercise these roles.

That some of those (listed as wealthy) might have large families to provide for, something that soon exhausts the resources of those who live by a trade or have only limited income.

That everyday illness, business reverses and other misfortunes bring to the poorhouse (l'Hôpital) people who belong to all these professions, and who moreover are both skilled and diligent workers" (CD 9, 9).

Blain then poses a very practical question and in doing so he claims that he is faithfully recording the Founder's own dilemma: "Who has the right to inventory the possessions of a child's parents to prove whether they are in poverty or in easy circumstances... Was it his business to decide on the poverty or wealth of their parents? ... must the child who seems wealthy and who often enough is not at all so... choose an ignorant teacher (or have none at all) because his parents are not on the list of paupers duly recognised by the State?" (CD 8, 4)

As a closer examination is made of the meaning of these words we can better appreciate the dilemma of the Brothers in Paris of 1704-1706 and the frustration of parents at the behaviour of the Writing Masters who could not or would not understand the insecurity of their lot. Their great desire was to have their children's future bettered by an education that had been denied them by the social circumstances of the past and by the absence of schools such as La Salle was pioneering. These schools established an indispensable link between instruction in the faith and the teaching of basics. In due course the "Conduct of Schools" was to suggest that parents torn between the desire for their children's betterment and the urge to have them contribute to the family income should be put under pressure to leave them in school. The means proposed was that they should be deprived of parish assistance if they contributed to the absence of their children from school.

Blain, and perhaps it is not rash to accept that he was reflecting the mind of his friend, La Salle as he claims, expresses very sensitively an understanding of the world of the poor in the above quoted passages. Blain is certainly speaking out of a rather wide interpretation of the meaning of the word POOR and it would seem reasonable to conclude both from his actual comments and the theoretical

definitions of the word that La Salle in using it is thinking of a quite wide range of people as had been remarked above. Caboudin and Viard would seem to corroborate this interpretation in their comment on the word POVERTY in the *Lexique Historique de la France de L'Ancien Régime*: "The definition of the poor, such as it was understood under the *Ancien Régime*, is very wide. The poor person is he who suffers, who is humble, who has fallen into misfortune. In a restricted view, he is a person who finds himself in "need", who has only his work to provide him with a livelihood, who for want of savings, has preoccupation with his daily needs. The poor man is not entirely without put aside" (Op. cit. p. 248).

7. A DISTINCTION BETWEEN PAUVRES AND MISÉRABLES

In seeking to identify the POOR as La Salle knew them a closer look needs to be taken at the group known as the MISÉRABLES (the indigent).

The truly MISÉRABLES among the population of Paris, Reims, Rouen were to be found in the *Hôpitaux Généraux*. These people could no longer cope with life at all and they were forceably incarcerated in these centres. Adrien Nyel had devoted his life to teaching these people in the children's section of the *Hôpital* at Rouen. Why did not La Salle devote his life to founding a group of dedicated school masters to work in these centres? Consider the temporary residence of one group of Brothers in the *Hôpital* at Rouen (CL 8, p. 21). If his call had been to work with the most indigent among the poor then it would seem, perhaps, logical that the *Hôpital* would have been the place to direct his zeal. Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that his work was not to be concentrated on alleviating the situation of those who had failed totally to cope with the situation of the day. His aim was perhaps rather to establish an association of men whose task it would be to break the vicious cycle of poverty, vice and ignorance which resulted in the peopling of the *Hôpitaux généraux* of Paris and the other cities of France. His work was to be, in the first place, remedial not palliative. It was also to be universal.

In this regard it is perhaps significant to note the Memoir that the Brothers of Rouen wrote to La Salle when exhausted by attempting to combine the work of the four city POOR SCHOOLS with the demanding tasks of the *Hôpital*. They remarked in the Memoir that the good of the POOR required that they withdraw from the *Hôpital*. The quote is again from Blain: "In this document the Brothers brought out clearly how necessary it was to get them out of the *Hôpital*, where the spirit of their Institute ran as much risk as did their health. The advantage of the poor as well as their own required it" (CL 8, 24).

Blain concludes his discussion of this crisis with the remark that the conditions imposed on the Brothers working in the four city Charity Schools were such that the Board seemed to consider that "the Brothers should have been happy to pay for the privilege of serving the poor" (CL 8, 29). Is Blain perhaps making a distinction between the MISÉRABLES in the *Hôpital* and the POOR in the four city schools? Even though we may not presume so, the comparison cannot be without significance.

Brother Maurice Hermans has a number of reflections on the options that appeared open to La Salle in his efforts to establish the Christian Schools. In regard to the episode in the *Hôpital Général* of Rouen he concludes rather tentatively: "A second option: the Charity schools and not the *Hôpitaux*. In Rouen, the Brothers' responsibility, from 1705-1707 was for the poor children in the *Hôpital Général*. Then they withdrew to conduct the Charity schools of the four parishes of the city. If the *Hôpital Général* was abandoned, it was above all, it seems, because of the very multiplicity and difficulty of the services that were demanded from the Brothers outside of the school and education properly speaking" (Hermans op. cit., p. 12).

8. THE OPTION OF THE HÔPITAL GÉNÉRAL

As has been commented elsewhere La Salle gave no indication of perceiving his ministry as being one directed towards the schools of the *Hôpitaux Généraux*, the schools of the misérables (the indigent, the marginalised). Rather, in Rouen as

has been noted, he directed his hopes towards the schools that had been under Nyel's care within the town. Interestingly, Blain reflecting perhaps La Salle's language as he does elsewhere, refers to the children of the four town schools as the POOR. In fact the whole incident of the arrival of La Salle and the Brothers in Rouen in May 1705 as recorded in Blain is very enlightening in this regard (CL —, 24ff). The willingness of La Salle to accept responsibilities for the Brothers at the *Hôpital* seems to have been motivated by the desire to have the Brothers in charge of the Charity schools of the city which had been under Nyel's direction: "He had always wanted to have the schools which had been Nyel's and had thought that heaven intended him to have them" (CL 8, 24).

9. THE MOST ABANDONED

In attempting to arrive at the meaning of the word POOR as La Salle used it one must question references in some Institute literature to his ministry as having been addressed to the "most abandoned". Such a contention is exposed in the light of the historical facts as provided by the first Biographers. Further, it must be noted that the expression "most abandoned" in La Salle's very limited use of that term always means abandoned in so far as knowledge and practice of the faith is concerned:

"You should look upon the children whom you are called upon to instruct as poor, abandoned orphans, for although most of them have a father alive, they are as if they had not, being abandoned to themselves as far as the salvation of their souls is concerned" (MD 37.3). Such a passage taken in conjunction with many other instances pointed out in this analysis must suggest, at least caution, in any tendency to interpret narrowly "the scope of La Salle's Charity" and to confine it to a particular group (CD 8, 36).

10. IDENTIFICATION OF THE POOR – A PROGRESSIVE PROBLEM

Between 1680 and 1685 the infant Society was confined to Reims and its immediate environs.

When La Salle, born into affluence, and still enjoying the security of a rich inheritance dialogues with the masters and identifies the beneficiaries of their ministry as the POOR there is no ambiguity for us as to whom he is referring. We know without doubt that he as a man of status, wealth and influence was speaking of the majority of the citizens of his native town.

Between 1685 and 1688, the Society of Brothers was still limited to its place of origin, and the families using the schools were still drawn from the same clearly identifiable parochial groups. During that period La Salle had distributed the bulk of his patrimony to the starving population of Reims. At this stage of his life, although he was now speaking, in a certain sense in solidarity with the majority of his fellow citizens, we could not claim as Blain does, that he was now completely divested of human resources (CD 7, 214ff). He was still assured of a roof over his head. He has, as Brother Bernard records retained sufficient patrimony to produce the annual equivalent of a master's stipend. His situation was not then and was never to be that of the insecurity of the masses. This may be confidently stated regardless of what enthusiastic hagiographers assert. All through his life he controlled funds and property as the multiplicity of documentation unearthed by Brother Aroz attests and one of the concerns of his brother, Canon Louis de La Salle was that he should not die without assuring that these funds be properly distributed and these properties retained by the Brothers. L. 133A)

After 1688, when the Society expanded to Paris and then to Rouen and beyond, the economic status of those flocking to the schools became more diverse as Blain attests. This question has been addressed at length above. Yet it is safe to conclude, if only on the limited evidence that has been gathered, that from the viewpoint of solid bourgeois such as Blain and La Salle himself, it was perfectly logical and accurate to refer to the clientele of the schools as children of ARTISANS AND THE POOR even though the economic status of many was quite removed from those at the bottom of the continuum of poverty, the misérables. Thus Brother Maurice Hermans, although in accord with the general term POOR to describe the clientele of the schools, can legitimately con-

clude "A lire la Conduite, il semble qu'on puisse dire, qu'à côté des pauvres dont la présence est certaine, il y a place à l'école des Frères de 1705 pour des enfants de familles qui n'étaient pas dans l'indigence. L'écolier dont il est si souvent question semble appartenir, le plus ordinairement, à une famille en état d'acheter les livres classiques et quelques autres fournitures; à une famille qui n'a pas à mendier son pain, et peut l'assurer quotidiennement; à une famille qui serait peut-être même tentée de mettre quelque argent à la disposition des siens" (Hermans op. cit. p. 10). Once again, however, it needs to be stressed that the vast majority of the population of the towns of France, as also of the rural areas which concerned La Salle less, could rightly be described as POOR according to usage and the dictionary definitions of the time.

It follows that when Saint John Baptist de La Salle is quoted in contemporary contexts today, the greatest care must be taken not to presume, or not by default of explanation, to give the impression that the word the POOR, among other key Lasallian words, embraces today the same group of people as it did in La Salle's time and context. Even more importantly it must be made clear that a text addressed to groups of people scattered throughout the world and living in diverse cultures and various economic conditions, must be understood in its historic context.

11. THE WORD POOR IN THE MEDITATIONS FOR SUNDAYS AND FEASTS

It does not need to be stressed that the word POOR is frequently used in the meditations for Sundays and Feasts. Most often the references concern the love which Jesus Christ and the Saints had for the poor. In the meditation for the feast of St. Nicholas, La Salle reminds the Brothers: "Vous êtes dans l'obligation d'instruire les enfants des pauvres;... les regardant comme les membres de Jesus Christ et comme ses bien-aimés. La foi dont vous devez être animés, vous doit faire honorer Jésus-Christ en leurs personnes, et vous doit les faire préférer aux plus riches de la terre" (MF 80.3).

This and multiple similar references are inten-

ded to motivate and confirm the Brothers in their mission. In so far as the meaning of the word POOR is concerned there is no reason why it should be interpreted otherwise than has been the case in this analysis. However, it needs to be remembered that words have their own weighting from one literary genre to another. Here, La Salle's intention is spiritual and exhortative. Hence the usage can be expected to be less precise and more emotive. Consider for example the often quoted passage from the meditation for Christmas. "Nous sommes de pauvres frères, oubliés et peu considérés des gens du monde; il n'y a que les pauvres qui nous viennent chercher" (MF 86.2). What is La Salle saying? Apart from the fact that the position of the adjective *pauvre* in French leaves the passage open to several interpretations, a simple examination of the context would caution against a too literal interpretation.

La Salle, who always made the opening of a school conditional on an assured though modest stipend; who according to the testimony of Brother Bernard had made provision for his own support through retaining sufficient personal property to produce the annual equivalent of a master's stipend, as mentioned above; and who, on his death bed, at the request of his brother signed legal documents to hand over properties which he had gradually acquired to give some security to the Institute; would surely not, in the context of this meditation have been claiming identity with the most needy. La Salle had good reason to be aware that in the eyes of "worldlings" the Brothers who had embraced the cause of the masses (the artisans and the poor), were *pauvres frères*, that is "Brothers of no account", just as those they served in the schools were "*pauvres enfants*", that is, children of no account. La Salle is perhaps simply telling the community at St. Yon, in the emotive context of the celebration of the birth of Christ, that as they are in the eyes of worldlings "Brothers of no account" who have devoted their lives to "children of no account" then they can have no better model than the infant lying in the manger who in the eyes of the census crowd at Bethlehem is a "child of no account" the first-born of a "simple artisan's wife" also a "person of no account".

12. THE CHAPTER OF RENEWAL 1966-67 AND THE WORD POOR

The Chapter of Renewal 1966-67 considered it appropriate to modify the text of the vow formula which until then had been in essence identical with the formulae of 1694 and 1726. Prior to presenting the modified text to the capitulants and moving to definitive adoption, its formulators presented a long and closely argued paper aimed at assuring the capitulants that the phrase "the service of the poor through education" was a faithful representation of the intention of the Founder and the first Brothers as expressed in the former wording "to keep schools gratuitously"; noting, of course, that due allowance had to be made for changed circumstances and due consideration given to the action of successive Popes in granting indulgences to the Institute in this regard.

In the light of our present study the key point to underline would seem to be that this consonance hinges on the interpretation of the word POOR. As has been stated and hopefully illustrated La Salle's aim was to open the world of education to the POOR rather than exclude any group from his schools. Hence the emphasis on gratuity. Once again what must be avoided is giving too restricted an interpretation to the word POOR. As has been stated in so many different contexts, La Salle and the first Brothers understood it to refer to the vast majority of the common people and to include, but not to be limited to, those at the bottom of the economic scale. We must note too that its exact referent will vary in different countries depending on the economic structures of national populations. It would seem to some Brothers that the present formulation requires so much explanation that it does not represent a satisfactory final solution to the problem.

13. SOME REMARKS TOWARDS A CONCLUSION

13.1. The Contemporary Emphasis of the Church on the Service of the Poor as "Fundamental Option"

It seems clear that especially since 1966 the In-

stitute has been placing a great deal of emphasis on the "Service of the Poor" and stating that this "preferential option" is "in fidelity to the express intention of the Founder" (Declaration chp. 6. art. 1). There is a danger that this "preferential option" may move de facto towards an "exclusive option". Clearly this emphasis has been a genuine response to the Church's own "fundamental option for the poor" as articulated in so many contemporary papal statements.

In his study *Les Pauvres et la Pauvreté* Paul Christophe refers to the "priority option of the Church for the Poor" taken by the Bishops of Latin America at the conferences of Medellin and Puebla. This clear option was a response to the allocutions of Pope John Paul II during his South American visit:

"The choice for the poor is preferential not exclusive. The Gospel is proclaimed from a stance of solidarity with the poor. This point of departure allows the Gospel to be announced to all. In solidarity with the poor, the Church can evangelise the rich whose hearts are attached to riches by converting them and liberating them from this slavery and from self-centeredness" (Paul Christophe op. cit. p. 178).

13.2. La Salle's Inclusive Vision

As has been stated La Salle's vision was an inclusive one. His plan was to open, especially to the children of the poor, access to the knowledge of God and to a dignified life through instruction and education. The means he chose to attain this objective was the Christian School. An "essential" element of this school was its "gratuity" which was to assure that access to it was possible for all, but in particular for the children of the poor (RC 1.1). The Founder aimed at opening the school to this order of children rather than closing it off to the children of the "aisés" or the "riches". As Yves Poutet states, it would be a complete misinterpretation of his intention to say that La Salle established schools reserved for the POOR (*Lasalliana* 09-A-44 1.6.86). He is speaking here of the word POOR in both its historical meaning and its contemporary meanings.

13.3. Use of Scientific and historical methods

The above comments are not intended in any way to deny that La Salle brought together the teachers and subsequently founded the Christian Schools with the specific intention of making instruction and education available, especially to the poor as the Bull states.

But to understand what the word POOR meant to La Salle and the first Brothers we must use historical methods; it is totally misleading to simply presume that when today (three hundred years removed from La Salle and in an economically diverse world) we use the word POOR, that the word designates the same groups of people as it did for him and the first Brothers in the limited confines of Reims, Paris, Rouen and eventually twenty-two cities of France. This is particularly true when there is a tendency in the Institute to omit all reference to ARTISANS. It seems necessary to ask whether it is not a distortion to imply by omission or otherwise, that La Salle's vision was limited to the service of one particular group. Priority certainly he and the first Brothers gave to the service of the POOR but his option, to use a contemporary insight, was "fundamental but not exclusive". Fidelity to the initial intention of the Founder as, step by step, he co-operated in the establishment of God's work (*Opus Tuum*) as he conceived it, demands a serious effort to relate an historical context to our more complex and diverse social and economic situation. Words are a key to understanding. They must not be used loosely.

14. CONCLUSION

Let us conclude by allowing Blain to speak once more on behalf of La Salle:

"People thought that in founding the Christian Schools de La Salle had in view the instruction of the children of the poor exclusively, since the children of the affluent could afford to pay for their education. But that notion, apparently so equitable, was at bottom pernicious, because it provided those with selfish motives a specious pretext to interfere constantly and to cause trouble in the gratuitous schools...., de La Salle discerned the trap that they were setting for him in advancing a principle apparently so reasonable. He had never agreed to it and rightly so, for it would have set limits to his charity... Are not all children within their rights when they request gratuitous instruction in schools open to the public... must the child who seems wealthy... and often enough is not so at all... choose an ignorant teacher just because his parents are not on the list of paupers duly recognised by the state?" (CL 8, 36)

Finally, let us remind ourselves, as we come to the end of our attempt to answer our initial question, of the caution Brother Hermans makes at the end of his analysis. "If the poor were not the only ones to benefit from the Christian School it was they who in the first place justified, and therefore continue to justify, its existence" (Hermans op. cit. p. 14). As an ultimate caution it must be stated again that it would be rash, in the light of this analysis, not to give the term POOR, as La Salle understood it, a wider rather than a narrower span of reference as he himself so clearly appears to have done.

Complementary themes:

Artisans; Child; Christian; Church; Conduct; Education; Faith; Gratuity; Instruction; Ministry; Mission; Parents; Rule; Salvation; Vows; Zeal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cahiers Lasalliens Vol. 4; 6; 7; 8.

Common Rules ms 1705; 1718.

Rule 1987 Eng. Rome.

Méditations SJB. Region France 1982.

Bull *In Apostolicae Dignitatis Solio* (Eng. ed. 1947).

Letters SJD. Ed. Molloy. St. Mary's Press, Winona 1988.

Déclaration.

Circular 412. General Council. *The Service of the Poor and Education for Justice*. 1979.

Vocabulaire Lasallien

CAMPOS-SAUVAGE, *Announcing the Gospel to the Poor*. trans. O'Connell 1981.

POUTET-PUNGIER, *An Educator and a Saint in Relation to the Society of His Time: Jean-Baptiste de La Salle (1651-1719)*. Translated by Edwin McCarthy. Rome: CIL, 1981.

AROZ et al., *Beginnings*. trans. Salm St. Mary's Press, Winona 1980.

BEDEL H., *Les Artisans et les Pauvres aux temps des Origines de l'Institut*. ED 275/8. Archives Rome.

HERMANS M., *Les pauvres auxquels se vouaient SJB et les premiers Frères*. DC 401/17, D 3. Archives. Rome.

GUTTON J.P., *La Société et les Pauvres*. Paris 1971.

CHRISTOPHE P., *Les pauvres et la pauvreté*. Desclée. Paris 1987.

GOUBERT-ROCHE, *Les Français et l'Ancien Régime*.

CABOURDIN et VIARD, *Lexique historique de la France et de l'Ancien Régime*.

CAYROU, *Le Français Classique*. 1948.

FURÉTIÈRE, *Dictionnaire Universel*. 1690.

Bro. Raphael BASSETT, F.S.C.