

On the feast of the Annunciation, 1586 Margaret Clitherow, a butcher's wife of York, suffered the horrific *peine forte et dure* of being crushed to death for harbouring a Catholic priest. This barbaric punishment was the legal sanction imposed on those who refused to testify during trial. Margaret's silence was both a denial that she was guilty of any crime and an attempt to save her family and neighbours from having to testify. Though silent in death, Margaret's life story resounded throughout the recusant Catholic community and beyond, told by John Mush, a priest whom she had sheltered. Mush was her spiritual director and later that of Mary Ward, whose cousin Francis Ingleby, another priest sheltered by Margaret Clitherow, died a martyr's death on the Knavesmire in York in June of the same year. This web of connections was part of an extended network of recusant women and men whose enforced silence was broken by the irrepressible force of story and memory.

This study looks at the theme of silence in the life of Mary Ward and those who sought to keep her story alive. Positively, contemplative silence operated as the ground of Mary's remarkable vocation. Negatively, it was imposed on her and on her memory long after her death by a church that failed to understand the specific and universal value of that vocation. It stems from a more general silence imposed historically on women both in the church and in society as a whole. The vocation of her surviving companions was silenced by law in Catholic Europe as much as in Protestant England. It was a silence that the early generations subverted, but to which later generations assented for the sake of survival. Some colluded in this silence by repudiating her memory and attempting to destroy what evidence of her there was. Others colluded unwittingly by misinterpreting or losing sight of what she herself had suffered to maintain. In each generation the silence was broken by the devotion to Mary Ward of women and men who had never known her. The subversive force of story and memory succeeded in keeping something of her unique vision alive until its time had come.

The rehabilitation of Mary Ward is a story that belongs primarily to some remarkable characters of the nineteenth century who fell under the spell of the one whom Pope Pius XII called, 'that incomparable woman, given to the church by Catholic England in her darkest and bloodiest hour'.¹ I look at the breaking of women's silence by Mary Ward herself and then the breaking of the silence in which she was buried by a church unable to hear and accept the voice of God speaking through her. Mary Ward and her followers down the centuries struggled to survive against a background of violent political upheaval, whether instigated by Cromwell, Napoleon, Stalin or Hitler. All this contributed to the silencing of her founding vision, but even here, paradoxical new shoots arose amid the crushed reeds. Mary died during the siege of York, while the English Civil War raged around her, but attempts to found in Yorkshire ended up as the beginnings of the Bar Convent in York. The Napoleonic secularization of religious houses in Europe gave rise to the Bar Convent's dark period of enclosure and alienation from its Ignatian origins, but from this period there also arose the flourishing Irish branch of Mary Ward's family under Teresa Ball. The persecution of the Catholic church in countries overwhelmed by the regimes of Hitler and Stalin included the closing of novitiates, communities and apostolic works, but one result of this was the proliferation of missionary initiatives outside Europe which spread and strengthened Mary Ward's Institute in Latin America, India and Africa.² All of this illustrates the adage that you can't keep a good woman down.

Mary was born into a Catholic family in Yorkshire at a time of severe persecution of Catholics by the English state. Three of her uncles were killed in the Gunpowder Plot and many of her first companions were related by blood or marriage to other plotters and to one another. English Catholicism at this time was marked by the absence of structure, hierarchy and regular sacramental practice. Served sporadically by itinerant priests, it provided an unexpected opening for the collaborative work of women who could more easily move around undetected than men. No religious houses existed in England at this time. In the absence of other forms of spiritual sustenance and support, the stories that circulated in recusant circles served to break the silence of the 'bare, ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds sang' and they resonated heroically in the hearts of the young.³

Mary was painfully shy and attracted to the silent, cloistered life which she twice attempted, only to receive intimations from God that she was being called to 'some other thing'. Returning to London to work in secret in the Catholic underground, she heard God break through the mysterious silence in what is known as the 'Glory Vision', received not during formal prayer, but in the ordinary context of doing her hair.⁴ She returned overseas with a group of young companions who entered with her into a period of doubt and indecision during which they imposed severe penances on themselves in order to hear what their silent God had to say.

In 1611 God spoke in words that were as unexpected and contradictory as possible. 'Take the same of the Society. Father General will never permit it. Go to him'. By this Mary understood that she and her sisters were to live a religious life on the Jesuit model, itself only recently approved by the church. This meant a life of apostolic activity, without choir or enclosure, organized centrally by a female general superior. These were unthinkable innovations, in contravention of the Council of Trent, and of the will of St. Ignatius himself, who had written into his Constitutions an absolute veto against there ever being a female branch of his order.⁵ Convinced that she was obeying God's will, Mary founded schools and communities across Europe, which aroused bitter opposition culminating in the complete suppression of her order and Mary's own imprisonment on a charge of heresy. She died in York during the English Civil War when such was the hatred of Catholics that her few remaining companions had to bribe an Anglican cleric to bury her, and the story of her life is encrypted in an enigmatic epitaph on her tombstone.⁶

The remnant of her once extended order clung on as secular teachers, living precariously together for fifty years until in 1680 Mary's friend and first biographer, Mary Poyntz, considered the Institute's third General Superior, gained diocesan recognition for a modified form of religious life under Mary Ward's charism. It was Mary Poyntz's biography and her efforts to gain canonical status which first broke the silence around Mary Ward and constituted the first steps towards rehabilitation. Nonetheless the Bull of Suppression remained in force, Mary Ward remained suspect and subsequent biographies naming her as foundress were placed on the Index of Forbidden Books.⁷

We leave Mary Poyntz and her companions clinging to the wreckage for now as we return to the theme of silence and the beginning of Mary Ward's story. In a recusant community marked by the need for silence and secrecy she received her vocation to religious life at the age of fifteen, when she heard the subversive story of monastic life from the lips of a pious old servant.⁸ Two interesting themes emerge here. One is that of the silencing of women: in her autobiography Mary writes,

'I had no inclination to any Order in particular, only I was resolved within myself to take the most strict and secluded, thinking and often saying that as women did not know how to do good except to themselves (a penuriousness which I resented enough even then) I would do in earnest what I did.'⁹

The second is that of scandal. The history of very real disorders and violations of discipline among women religious goes back further than Mary Ward. While there was clearly an urgent need to deal with open scandal, the widespread accusations of scandal where there was none illustrates the social and ecclesial antipathy to women claiming a public space.¹⁰ The story told by the servant Margaret Garrett was of a nun doing severe penance for having broken enclosure and her vow of chastity and become pregnant. The fear of lost virginity, ruined chastity and secret pregnancies runs through the spies' reports and the attacks on Mary Ward with monotonous regularity. In the absence or suppression of many words from Mary Ward herself, generations of her followers have drawn inspiration from *The Painted Life*, a series of seventeenth-century devotional paintings, some of which were executed in her own lifetime, now displayed in the convent of the Congregation of Jesus in Augsburg.¹¹ I may be disturbing the silence myself, by reading more into these paintings than they actually contain, but I see in many of them encrypted themes and motifs from Mary's life and work. The first painting illustrates Mary's own story of how her first spoken word was a repetition of her mother calling on the name of Jesus. Mary Poyntz recounts an incident in which Mary as a child fell on her head and was taken up stunned and speechless,

'she had her understanding good, and thought with her selfe, could she but once say JESUS she would willingly dy; which sacred name she at last pronounced, and it

brought her so much sweetness and Love, as all her Life after she was most sensible of, and in that instant restored to her former health'.¹²

The significance of this name, and the Society which bore it, was not lost to the adult Mary and her companions. The seal which she used during the years in which she acted as superior general of the 'Mothers of the Society of Jesus' was copied from that of the Jesuit General Superior. One of the many causes of contention between Mary Ward and those Jesuits opposed to her was the setting up of the IHS monogram above their chapel door, marking them as members of a society that bore the name of Jesus.¹³ The agitation of the Jesuits in St. Omer when Mary Ward proposed taking the Jesuit rule and name for her new society is almost comical,

'My confessor resisted; all the Society opposed; various plans were drawn up by several persons [...] These were offered us and as it were pressed upon us: there was no remedy but to refuse them. This caused infinite troubles. Then they would needs that at least we should take the name of some Order confirmed, or some new one, or any we could think of, but not that of Jesus'. But Mary was adamant, not countenancing that a name should be silenced that had been given her by God, 'Concerning the name, I have twice in several years understood, in the same way as these other things I have recounted, that the denomination must be that of Jesus'.¹⁴ At the same time she nevertheless repudiated the notion of any dependency on the Society of Jesus, which is what the Jesuits most feared.¹⁵

Like St. Ignatius Loyola before her, Mary was extremely reluctant to reveal the way in which God had been at work in her own life and imposed silence on herself. Unlike Ignatius she at least avoided being ambushed in the garden and on the staircase by a dogged and devoted scribe, but bound under obedience to her spiritual director to break her silence so that her story might serve as instruction for those that followed, she reveals in her autobiography the remarkable dominance of the Ignatian *Spiritual Exercises* as a guiding dynamic in her life.¹⁶ In her book *Keeping God's Silence* Rachel Muers speaks of the 'dumb silencing' of women, in which they are ignored in public discourse dominated by men. The construction of the universal subject as male tends to lead to the exclusion of concerns specific to women as being trivial or irrelevant. Women become absent in

contexts where their experience is not thought to count.¹⁷ Mary Ward most notably broke the dumb silencing of women in this respect in an instruction given to her sisters in 1617.

'There was a father that lately came into England whom I heard say, that he would not for a 10,000 of worlds be a woman, because he thought a woman could not apprehend God: I answered nothing but only smiled, although I could have answered him by the experience I have of the contrary: I could have been sorry for his want of judgement, I mean not want of judgment, nor to condemn his judgement, for he is a man of a very good judgment; his want is in experience'.¹⁸

The marginalization of women's experience within the church, based on the conviction that their access to God was of an entirely different order from that of men, led to a high degree of invisibility and inaudibility in spiritual and ecclesial matters. In *A Room of One's Own* Virginia Woolf suggests that women are also silenced by being talked about.¹⁹ One of the most comprehensive ways of silencing Mary Ward came from the reports on her which flowed into the papal and Jesuit curias and into the English government of the time. What arouses particular anger and resentment is these women's claim to speak for themselves and to teach others to speak. Echoing the concerns of Boniface VIII about quasi-religious groups of women, they accuse Mary and her followers of scandalizing Catholics & rendering themselves ridiculous to heretics by aspiring to preach and teach, also teaching their pupils to act in plays so that later on they might preach from the pulpit.²⁰ Mary is reported as being a *Vergine d'animo virile*, disporting herself around England and Flanders in a coach and four, claiming to be a princess *incognita*, preaching from a chair placed in front of the altar and giving instructions on the Our Father'.²¹

It seemed, however, that Mary herself had the power to impose silence on her enemies. Mary Poyntz remarked, 'It is not of small consideration that of all her powerfull, great and violent ennemyes, never any one had the courage to professe it to her face, or make other semblance than of friendship'.²² This, of course, was to be the undoing of her in her dealings with a Pope whose word she believed, but who was a consummate dissembler. Women's participation in speech denotes not merely equal recognition for women as equivalent speaking subjects but also the articulation of the distinctive realm of

'womens' experience' of a 'different voice'.²³ Mary Ward's comment about the Jesuit's lack of the experience needed to understand the equality before God of both genders is reinforced in her response to a remark made by another Jesuit that while the 'Jesuitesses' fervour was impressive, 'when all is done they are but women'.

'I would know what you all think he meant by...'but women' and what fervour is. Fervour is a will to do well [...] which women may have as well as men. There is no such difference between men and women that women may not do great matters'.²⁴ How far Mary had travelled from the time, some seventeen years previously, when she thought that women could do good to none but themselves. 'I confess wives are to be subject to their husbands, men are head of the church, women are not to administer sacraments, nor to preach in public churches, but in all other things wherein are we so inferior to other creatures, that they should term us but women [...] as if we were in all things inferior to some other creature which I suppose to be man, which I dare be bold to say is a lie, and with respect to the good father may say it is an error.'²⁵

Trained by Mary Ward with such notions since their novitiate, her scattered companions in Munich, Rome and Yorkshire received some support after the suppression of the order, even from Pope Urban himself, but his Bull of 1630, *Pastoralis Romani Pontificis*, remained absolute. Nailed to the doors of the Lateran Basilica, St. Peter's, the Cancellaria and the place of execution at Campo dei Fiori, it spoke in the most violent terms of the offence done to the church and Christian civilization by Mary and her 'Jesuitesses':

'under the guise of promoting the salvation of souls [they] have been accustomed to attempt and to employ themselves at [...] works which are most unsuited to maidenly reserve - works which men of eminence [...] undertake with much difficulty and only with great caution. [...] these [...] have not only arrogantly and obstinately disobeyed our paternal and salutary warnings to the grave disadvantage of their own souls and the disgust of all good people, but they are not ashamed, even daily, to [...] utter many things contrary to sound teaching, we have decreed that [...] the poisonous growths in the Church of God must be torn up from the roots lest they spread themselves further [...] We totally and completely suppress and extinguish them, subject them to perpetual abolition and

remove them entirely from the Holy church of God; we destroy and annul them, and we wish and command all the Christian faithful to regard and repute them as suppressed, extinct, rooted out, destroyed and abolished'. The Bull forbids any future change, challenge or revocation of its proscriptions and declares itself 'valid in perpetuity, firm and efficacious now and in the future and [...] to be inviolably observed by all and everyone to whom it refers or will refer in any way in the future'.²⁶

What was unpalatable to both her enemies and many of her admirers, including Urban himself and the Jesuit General superior, was:

- the refusal to accept enclosure, even in the form of 'two crossed sticks'
- the nature of the apostolates to which she aspired
- the idea of apostolic mobility, with the structures of self-governance that this required.

Strict enclosure was imposed on all nuns in the Western church from the end of the thirteenth century. The Council of Trent recognized only three legitimate causes for violating enclosure: fire, leprosy and contagious illness.²⁷ The Painted Life recounts the incident of a fire in Mary's childhood home of Mulwith, in which she and her sisters had sheltered within the enclosure of the home, until drawn out of it to safety by their father. A further painting recounts how she received a false message from her father telling her to refrain from making her First Communion. The iconography of the picture, with the women enclosed in the house, or behind the fence, and the messenger holding out a piece of paper which determines whether or not Mary receives the Sacraments is reminiscent of her imprisonment by the Inquisition, during which she became dangerously ill and was only offered the last sacraments on condition that she signed a paper repenting of any possible errors.²⁸

A further silencing of Mary Ward came about during her imprisonment when she was forbidden to write to her sisters. From the silence of her enforced cloister in the Poor Clare Convent on the Anger in Munich, where she lay desperate to know what had befallen them all and anxious to salvage what she could, Mary made use of the English recusant method of writing invisible letters in lemon juice. When brought near candle flame the words emerged, full of encouragement, serenity and determination. The letters make

ample use of coded language, words themselves having become dangerous to those whose way of life had brought them persecution now not only from state authorities in England but from the church itself.²⁹ Full approbation was not given to women attempting to live an apostolic life under simple vows, and therefore without formal enclosure, for nearly three centuries. Limited forms of unenclosed consecrated life were already common in Northern Europe, whether among the Béguines or orders like the Ursulines whose rule was the first in the Western church written by a woman for women living outside monastic enclosure. But Pius V's constitution *Circa Pastoralis* of 1566 obliged tertiaries and others like them to take solemn vows and observe pontifical enclosure.

By opening a free school in Augsburg in 1662 Mary Poyntz showed her determination both to further Mary Ward's work and to maintain the spirit of the Ignatian Constitutions. The first canonical recognition of the English Ladies' status as religious accepted in large part the Ignatian absence of cloister and the power of the chief superior to transfer members from house to house. But the recognition was for the members, not for the order. Further petitions to obtain papal approval for the Institute and its Constitutions failed, despite support from episcopal and secular authorities. Pope Innocent XII said that if the rule chosen were that of St. Ignatius, it could not be confirmed, having been forbidden by Urban VIII's Bull and because it involved profession of the three vows and freedom of movement by order of the superior, while the church decreed that nuns must be more enclosed within the cloister.

If the first great silencing of Mary Ward came from Urban VIII, a second and more insidious one came when the chief superior drew up a short text of Rules to be presented to the Holy See by the Elector of Bavaria. These consisted of something very akin to the Jesuits Summary of the Constitutions, with their *Rules of Modesty* and sections of the rest of the Ignatian Constitutions, but without the vital Part VII with its apostolic thrust. Both in letter and in structure they lost much of the Ignatian dynamism originally planned by Mary Ward. Although these Rules were approved by Pope Clement XI in 1703 the community that lived by them were not considered religious but 'ecclesiastical persons'.³⁰ Silence had fallen on the sisters' status as religious, on Ignatian mobility, mission, apostolate and on the question of governance.

Frances Bedingfield, foundress of the Bar Convent in York, entered religious life at Munich in 1630 and was the only companion of Mary Ward's generation who lived to see the approbation of rules in 1703. Her less redoubtable successor, Cecily Cornwallis, doubted the legitimacy of the institute, and took a step which showed how understanding of the essential value of the Ignatian Constitutions had been eroded. She put her community in Hammersmith under the jurisdiction of the bishop, who immediately established himself as superior in place of the chief superior in Munich. Cecily discovered her error too late, resigning as superior and transferring to York, a sadder if not a wiser woman. The community became cut off from its roots, dwindled and died out. In other communities, while the letter of non-enclosure was kept, in fact virtual enclosure came gradually to be accepted with the newly-approved religious status. This led to severe limitations in terms of ministry without a trace of the apostolic ministry of Mary Ward's time, or her desire to take the Jesuit fourth vow of obedience to the Pope for the sake of universal mission.

Despite these unpromising elements, houses and schools famous for their educational excellence multiplied and grew and the silence about Mary Ward was broken by a number of lives written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by various admiring clerics. Things had come a long way from the days when the 'Jesuitesses' were 'Galloping girls' and 'Wandering Gossips' lured to their ruin by Mistress Ward, but a number of these books found their way onto the Index. Breaking the silence about Mary Ward was still in some measure a hazardous business. The silence that almost obliterated her memory as foundress came when, in a quarrel over jurisdiction, the Bishop of Augsburg accused the sisters of Mindelheim of being members of Mary Ward's Institute, condemned by Pope Urban VIII in 1631. The subsequent dispute resulted in Pope Benedict XIV's Bull *Quamvis Justo*, which recognized the Institute's right to exist as a foundation quite separate from that condemned in 1631 and recognized the office of General Superior. But to emphasize that he was upholding Urban VIII's Bull of Suppression Benedict XIV issued a ban on naming Mary Ward as the foundress of this second Institute, apparently in an attempt to forestall her more enthusiastic followers from venerating her as an uncanonized saint. This prohibition lasted until 1909.

Political events of the eighteenth century fragmented the institute into three different generalates, thus losing the notion of one central authority. In Germany the Painted Life was banned, rolled up and stored in an attic. Hymns and prayers in honour of Mary Ward were forbidden, but biographies, even those on the Index, were hidden away in large numbers. Portraits were saved and in 1773 the Painted Life found its way back up onto the walls. News of the ban did not reach York until the early nineteenth century, but it unleashed an orgy of zealous obedience in which members tracked down and destroyed pictures, letters, papers - anything relating to Mary Ward. In the library her very name was cut out from the pages of books. Visits to her grave were discontinued for fifty years. The Jesuit historian John Morris, searching for documents in 1889, found to his horror that a German novice had been ordered to burn a trunk full of Mary Ward's papers. She 'knew English enough to see what was being done and to feel sure that it would be deeply regretted afterwards'.³¹ The name 'Institute of Mary', which had become their name, was replaced by 'Institute of St. Mary', or later 'Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary' to ensure that no one could claim that 'Institute of Mary' referred to Mary Ward. The Napoleonic secularization of religious houses coincided with the death of the general superior in Munich. Between the disappearance of institute traditions and loss of contact with the continent, Mother Elizabeth Coyney, the nervous superior of York, petitioned for it to be placed under full episcopal jurisdiction, a step which led to York becoming effectively enclosed.

It was during this period that Frances, later Mother Teresa Ball, was sent to York by Archbishop Murray of Dublin to make her novitiate with a view to founding the Institute in Ireland. That foundation was from its inception juridically separate, and became the origin of the flourishing worldwide institute known as Loreto - now the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Mother Teresa took back with her to Rathfarnham the 1707 Constitutions, which retained much of the spirit of Ignatius, if not his structures. It was perhaps these that maintained in those early generations a missionary freedom of spirit that in Teresa herself, Teresa Dease, the foundress of Loretto Canada and Gonzaga Barry, foundress of Loreto Australia, produced women of astounding courage and energy in the

direct mould of Mary Ward. But no one else had ever been named as the Institute's foundress and even Teresa Ball herself remained in ignorance, writing in 1849,

'I never was informed of the merits of Mary Ward. M. Babthorp [sic], I was told, procured the confirmation of our holy rule'.³²

In 1861 she drafted new Constitutions, approved by the Archbishop of Dublin but bearing little resemblance to the Ignatian Constitutions and ending with the suggestion that 'Mother Mary Anne Barbara Bapthorp', under whom the Bull of Clement XI was issued, might be regarded as the foundress of the Institute. In 1877 another Loreto sister, M. Joseph Hogan, foundress of the mission in Darjeeling, wrote that when asked who founded their congregation they replied, 'In Germany, Mrs Babthorpe, in England Mrs Beddingfield [sic] but *my heart whispers poor, persecuted, maligned Mrs Ward*'.³³ The silence was being broken by the occasional dissident whisper, but it would fall to three Anglican converts and a fighting Irishwoman living in England to break it definitively.

Fr Henry Coleridge, a great-nephew of the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge, was the son of Sir John Taylor Coleridge, who was the sentencing judge at the infamous Achilli Trial of 1853 in which John Henry Newman was successfully tried for libel. Coleridge senior had delivered himself of a resounding 'jobation' to Newman for his own deterioration and that of converts in general upon becoming Catholics.³⁴ The Tractarian judge's antagonism was perhaps based on the fact that his son Henry's conversion was in large measure due to Newman, with whom he had been friends at Oxford. Fr Henry Coleridge had been one of the founders of the *Guardian* newspaper and its Oxford sub-editor and as a Jesuit took on the editorship of *The Month*.³⁵ He knew the Institute of Mary both in London and in York and this led him to collect documents on Mary Ward and write the twelve part series on her early life, (from 1585 to 1621, ending with her journey to Rome) published in *The Month* from February 1880 to June 1881. At this point he handed the work on to Catherine Chambers (1821-1886), possibly because when he looked into what followed when Mary Ward reached Rome he realised that it was all far too risky for a Jesuit to write under his own name, or for a Jesuit publication to bring out.

Catherine Elizabeth Chambers was a woman whose life reads almost as remarkably as Mary Ward's own. A friend of the Coleridge family, she became one of the founder

members of the Anglican Devonport Sisterhood or Sisters of Mercy, founded by Priscilla Lydia Sellon, whose sisters distinguished themselves nursing with Florence Nightingale in the Crimea. This did not prevent them from being the object of public calumnies as severe as those heaped upon Mary Ward by sectors of the Anglican Church and the public furious with anti-Catholic bigotry and fearful of the Puseyite enemy within. Mother Eldress Catherine, as she became, was part of a missionary expedition to Hawaii in 1864 and nursed cholera victims in the East End of London, as well as setting up a printing press for poor girls to give them an alternative source of income than prostitution. She became disenchanted with Dr. Pusey's influence on the order and by internal dissension within it, and in 1876 was received into the Catholic church.³⁶ She wrote to Newman to seek his advice on a place of refuge once she had left the sisterhood, and his reply mentions 'ladies in London, friends of Fr. Coleridge SJ'.³⁷ It was Henry Coleridge who introduced her to Mother Joseph Edwards, of the Institute of Mary in Hampstead, and here she entered in December 1878. She was professed at sixty years old in 1881, and in her short life in the Institute would become the single most effective voice that broke the silence about Mary Ward. Mother Joseph saw in Catherine Chambers the educated and meticulous woman of letters that she was not, and realised her potential as a researcher and biographer. Chambers revised Fr. Coleridge's twelve part series, greatly improved its style, and brought it out quite quickly as Volume I of her biography in 1882. She then went on to do her own researches, travelling with Mother Joseph in Belgium and Germany and copying the documents in the Munich archives. This became her Volume II which was published in 1885, the year before her death. Henry Coleridge edited both volumes and added his own introductions.³⁸

Fr John Morris, a Jesuit canon lawyer, advised Catherine Chambers on an early rule of Mary Ward's, the *Ratio Instituti*, and on the treatises of Lessius and Suarez on the legal position of her new Institute in Church law. His academic career in the University of Cambridge had come to an end when he converted to Catholicism. As a Jesuit he became the postulator for the cause of canonization of the English Catholic Martyrs. The lure of their story and memory led him into research at the Bar Convent, friendship with the nuns and interest in the history of their Institute. He advised the superior, Mother Juliana

Martin, to press ahead with a petition for final approbation of the Institute in view of changes in the discipline of the church since the French revolution and the proliferation of congregations of simple vows. He drafted the petition, insisting that all the houses of the Institute and their local bishops should sign it. The German houses, suffering under Bismarck's May Laws, stayed silent, as did Ireland, despite sending warm greetings. Only the bishops of Patna, in India, and of Beverley, in England, responded. Despite the thinness of episcopal support, the arguments won the day and Mary Ward's Institute was finally approved on 15th February 1877.³⁹ But was this in fact Mary Ward's Institute? Opinion was divided.

In 1851 Canon Laurence Toole of Manchester had requested a foundation from Rathfarnham for the poor immigrant Irish of the city, harassed by anti-Catholic agitation in the aftermath of the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in 1850. He became fascinated by the origins of the Institute and in 1869 wrote to the Bar Convent chaplain, 'I do not ask you to go against the Bull of Benedict and to say that [Mary Ward] was *Foundress* - no, that is ecclesiastically forbidden - but you must acknowledge what is historically true, that she is the *origin* of the whole Institute'.⁴⁰ For his part John Morris was ambivalent about Mary Ward and cautious about Rome in the 1870s. He thought of writing Mary's life, but by 1876 had thought better of it, fearing danger to the convent & the whole congregation in bringing up the spectre of the suppressed foundress again.

In 1872 a community and school under the jurisdiction of Germany had been founded in Haverstock Hill, London by Mary Joseph Edwards, a dynamic and pugnacious Irishwoman who had imbibed from Augsburg an ardently partisan and defensive love of Mary Ward. Her correspondence with Fr. Morris from the 1870s until their deaths centres on the rehabilitation of the foundress. It was a remarkable attraction of opposites. His letters are spare, precise and neat. Hers are sprawling, laden with underlinings and exclamation marks and full of her passionate enthusiasm. She wanted nothing less than total victory: the writing of a life of Mary Ward that would forever break the silence about her, show the world that she and her institute had been wronged and gain for her personal vindication and for her sisters the right to call her foundress. Morris was captivated by Mary Ward herself, but nervous about engaging in such open battle, writing in 1876,

'I entirely understand and largely sympathize with your feeling for Mary Ward. She is one of the most interesting persons in a very interesting time. But to write her life is beset with difficulties [...] I am convinced that if what is done about her is not done with the greatest possible caution, a great deal more harm than good would be done [...] we must neither write nor think nor feel as though the Bull of the Suppression of the Jesuitesses were recalled, or as if Benedict XIV's famous Constitution [...] had never been written.'⁴¹ Two years later he was even franker,

'I am sure that Rome will never let you identify yourselves with the Jesuitesses whom Mary Ward founded and Urban VIII suppressed [...] My own belief is, that if Mary Ward had given up the power of roaming over England, and had taken such an enclosure as the Institute has, her Jesuitesses would have not been suppressed, but approved though not under that name. [...] Mary Ward's idea of roaming about England was due to the state of England. If she lived now she would be quite satisfied with the modern idea of nuns stopping at home, and in all other points she seems to me to be the mother of the hundreds of modern Congregations who live under the Rule of St. Ignatius.'⁴² He was an admirer of Mary Ward, but in the absence of documentation proving her determination to live the Jesuit life, he had entirely failed to understand her. Her insistence on taking the Jesuit fourth vow of universal mission, her desire to roam not only all over England but as far as the Indies and the land of the Turks for the sake of the kingdom of God had escaped him. And this was not through a wanton desire on Mary Ward's part to be a gadabout, but instigated by the zeal for apostolic service that comes from someone who has internalized the Ignatian *Exercises* to a high degree.

Further on in the correspondence he is still more blunt. He is willing to accept her apostolic zeal, but not the charismatic source from which it came, 'I continue to think that Mary Ward threw away her chance, and that the Jesuitesses would not have been suppressed if she had not been obstinate. Her obstinacy, as I have said, proceeded from her thinking that she had a revelation on the subject, but that does not make it less a misfortune. But as she did so stick to her ideas that she brought Urban's Bull down on her [...] it does not make it desirable for the Institute of Mary to claim her for foundress. And [...] to call her sole foundress seems to me to be contrary to fact. On the other hand I do

not see how it is possible to help having a strong affection for her and a great admiration for her wonderful anticipation of our moderns wants. And with these words in her praise I leave her'.⁴³

Part of the trouble lay in discovering the exact story of the aftermath of the suppression, and since Morris could find no evidence of Mary Ward living in community after 1631, he bizarrely concluded from her death in Heworth that she was not a member of the post-Suppression Institute at all.⁴⁴ In these doubts and hesitations he was supported by the York nuns, trained for years to fear anything that could link them with the disgraced name of Mary Ward. Mrs Edwards, as she was called, had an acerbic temper, tongue and pen which allowed her to pass remarks about their narrow-mindedness that offended Fr. Morris, who delivered some home truths, 'You scare them and then wonder that they do not take a fancy to you!' Morris urged obedience to the Pope and to religious superiors, regretting what he saw as Mother Joseph's cavalier attitude to structures within the church. His fears were not unfounded, as time would show, but another champion was about to enter the lists from an unexpected quarter.

Like Mother Joseph Edwards, Morris also recognized the talents of Catherine Chambers, but feared that through lack of prudence her *Life* would end up on the Index as had previous ones. The campaign to rehabilitate Mary Ward gained momentum in various parts of her Institute and among an ever-widening network of supporters, but the gap between Mother Joseph's enthusiasm and Morris's caution resulted in a major quarrel in 1890 over his reluctance to appeal to the Papal Nuncio, as Mother Joseph urged him to. Morris argued that he was bound by obedience to the Jesuit General Superior, Fr. Antonius Maria Anderledy, who was no more enthusiastic about his men getting embroiled with Mary Ward than had been his predecessors,

'Fr. General's letter has just reached me and it is adverse to my going to Munich. [...] Now a Jesuit is nothing if he is not obedient and so I have at once answered him that I will conform to his mind and in accordance with his wishes not take any further part in the matter.'⁴⁵

He had hopes (which proved well-founded) that the Chambers *Life* would gain Mary Ward many friends and partisans but in March 1891 warned again that this was not

enough to gain Fr. General's approval, offering instead his act of obedience for the furtherance of her cause. Mother Joseph had written herself to Fr. Anderledy, claiming that it was Mary Ward's friendship for the Society of Jesus that drew upon her the enmity that resulted in the Bull of Suppression, thus slyly hinting that the Society owed her a favour in some respects. Fr. Anderledy was proof against such strategies and replied firmly that, 'We must avoid in the nineteenth what was a mistake in the seventeenth century'.⁴⁶

Obedience to superiors secured the silence of Fr. Morris as it had that of Mary Ward's Jesuit admirer Fr. John Gerard in 1629 who wrote, 'Though I have kept silence [...], as it was needful I should, and must still continue to do so, yet I have pleaded their cause where only I can avail them [...] Other help I cannot afford [...] my hands being tied'.⁴⁷ The campaign became not only one about breaking the silence but about uniting the fragmented provinces and branches of Mary Ward's institute into one congregation. Already Morris's work had aroused the interest and commitment of elements in the York community hitherto distanced from their unknown foundress, a letter from York of 1879 enthusing, 'People's minds here are changing very much on some points, and they will go on in the right direction if we are prudent. M. Ward is nearly fit for canonisation in the Community. Last year her memory would have been simply cut by the majority.'⁴⁸

Catherine Chambers's work to break the silence had exhausted her and she was dead within a year of finishing. Shortly after her death Morris himself wrote a brief *Life* of Mary Ward for the general reader, mainly taken from the Chambers biography. A decade later he foresaw her work as a major tool in promoting unity among Mary Ward's followers, 'What a change of feeling has come about in Mary Ward's favour! It shows that her life has been widely read. If the Loretto nuns take up Mary Ward, all feeling about their not belonging to the Institute will disappear, and a movement in favour of unity will begin amongst them'.⁴⁹

Nevertheless there was still considerable caution from most directions towards claiming the name of foundress for Mary Ward. Mother Joseph Edwards particularly resented the lack of Jesuit support, and was betrayed into expressing bitter regret that Mary Ward had ever entangled herself with them. Not only did this cause understandable

offence to the long-suffering Fr. Morris, but it also shows that even this ardent partisan did not fully understand her foundress's distinctive genius. The resulting letter shows an ironic lack of understanding of the bigger picture on the part of Mary Ward's daughter, and a correspondingly profound insight on the part of the Jesuit, despite his continuing to think the insistence on freedom from enclosure a fatal delusion that brought about her ruin.

'It is a big blunder on your part to be sorry that your Rules are taken from those of the Society. It is just the thing for which Mary Ward is most remarkable, that like St. Ignatius she should have foreseen what was best suited to our times. If she had taken any other Rule but that of the Society it would have shown no foresight at all, though of course it would have entailed no trouble. [...] Mary Ward was before her time, but if she had done as you wish [...] she would have been nothing particular. Your wishes therefore are not only ungracious when addressed to a Jesuit, but they undermine Mary Ward and take away her greatest honour [...] Your mistake lies in this, that you love Mary Ward, but you do not love what Mary Ward loved. You would be just as well content if you were Franciscanesses or Dominicanesses, if only Mary Ward had founded you [...] You say I will not allow you to defend your Institute. Defend it by all means, but not by wishing it were something else'. Later on, however, he concedes that 'Mary Ward's time has come, and if she is rehabilitated, she will owe it all to you'.⁵⁰

Despite these misunderstandings, Mother Joseph Edwards and Bishop Hedley of Newport & Menevia gathered the signatures of most of the major IBVM Superiors, twenty-one of the twenty-three bishops of England and Wales headed by Cardinal Manning, the Archbishops of Dublin and Munich, the Bishops of Mainz, Fulda and Passau, and several Canadian bishops in a petition presented to the Propaganda in Rome to have *Quamvis Iusto* and its ban on naming Mary Ward foundress revisited. But neither the Chambers biography nor all of Morris and Edwards's efforts around the petition to Rome succeeded. On March 15th 1893 the Holy Office responded '*Omnino negative*' to the request for a new examination of the cause of 'Maria Warth', a misspelling copied from *Quamvis Iusto* that suggests little had been done in Rome by way of new research, despite all the work of Coleridge, Chambers, Morris and others. In April Morris wrote to the superior of York, 'All

hope for Mary Ward is gone'.⁵¹ Catherine Chambers was already dead, John Morris died seven months after the 'heavy blow' from Rome fell. His fellow champion, the intrepid Mother Joseph Edwards, died in 1901, their ambition to break the silence surrounding Mary Ward only partially fulfilled.

Mother Francis Pope, Superior of the Bar Convent, York, with Mother Loyola Giles, the Novice Mistress, took up the task of the rehabilitation of Mary Ward once more with the help of Mother Magdalen Grémion of the English foundation in Rome. In this they had the assistance of a friend of Mother Joseph Edwards, Mgr. Merry Del Val, who became Cardinal Protector of the Institute, and Abbot, later Cardinal Aidan Gasquet of the English Benedictines. Given the negative role played by Cardinals and Benedictines in Mary Ward's condemnation and in the suppression of her work, there is something particularly satisfying in this. When Magdalen Grémion went to the Vatican hoping to speak to Pius X personally about Mary Ward, the Pope stepped backwards in dismay, saying, "What? *She* a foundress? She was a heretic!" Mother Magdalen fled the Vatican in distraught tears, only to bump into Cardinal Pompili who advised her to seek Abbot Gasquet's help. Armed with a letter from Gasquet, who was a great friend of the Pope's, she returned to the Vatican, and the letter duly wrought a complete change in the Pontiff, who agreed to their preparing a Memorandum which would enable Cardinal Merry del Val to re-open the process of rehabilitation.⁵² In the Memorandum Gasquet argued,

'There is no question of asking that any point of Canon Law established by Pope Benedict XIV in *Quamvis Iusto* be changed in any way [...] Neither does the granting of what is asked in any way even imply that the Institute as first established by Mary Ward was not absolutely and irrevocably suppressed by Pope Urban VIII in 1630. The matter at issue is as to one historical point - namely that Mary Ward was the foundress of the present Institute, which is not identical with the Jesuitesses so suppressed.'⁵³ He further contended that the original Institute with solemn vows was replaced by one with simple vows at Pope Urban VIII's suggestion, with Mary Ward as superioress with the Pontiff's full knowledge.⁵⁴ While not strictly accurate in this respect the Memorandum was presented to Cardinal Merry Del Val on March 4th, 1909 and on April 6th Abbot Gasquet came to the Roman house with the news that the papal decree permitting Mary Ward to be known as

foundress of the Institute had been signed that morning.⁵⁵ Even then, silence was imposed until the Decree was formally issued. Abbot Gasquet sent the Bar Convent a telegram from Rome that read, 'Foundress recognized by Pope. Silence except to community till Decree is issued'. On April 20th 1909, three hundred years after the founding of their first house in St Omer, Mary Ward's companions were allowed once more to call her foundress. Mother Michael Corcoran, General Superior of the Irish Loreto Branch, wrote to Mother Gonzaga Barry, the Australian Provincial, of singing the *Te Deum*, and saying the *Magnificat* after Mass for nine days in thanksgiving. Five 'actions' were also proposed in response to the rehabilitation of Mary Ward: her beatification, the unification of the whole Institute, its organization under common and suitable Constitutions, its renovation by a renewal of fervour and finally the canonization of Mary Ward.⁵⁶

These hopes are yet to be fulfilled, and in fact the rehabilitation was far from the last word on Mary Ward in Ireland and Australia.⁵⁷ The hope for union among the houses and branches of the Institute had come to a head in a Union Chapter held in Rome in 1900, passionately supported by Mother Gonzaga Barry of Australia, but this also foundered under the weight of cultural and political pressures internal and external to the order.⁵⁸ The Irish feared German dominance while there was pressure from Bavaria not to reunite under a foreign General Superior. The chapter was suddenly disbanded under huge secrecy, the Bavarian sisters ordered home. Suspicion and mutual distrust spread, and correspondence on the matter was monitored. Those who wrote to each other once again resorted to codes and secrecy when referring to authority figures. Gonzaga Barry found herself locked in conflict with Laura Teresa Ball, great-niece of the Irish pioneer. She attributed Mother Laura Teresa's objection to union to her 'thorough ignorance of the history of the Institute'. Hopes of union were further impeded by the interference of the Archbishop of Dublin and of Cardinal Moran in Australia.

In 1909 Mother Michael Corcoran, who had been deposed from office by the Archbishop of Dublin in 1906 only to be re-elected in 1907, had written to Gonzaga Barry, 'I bring you the joyful & consoling tidings of our dear Mother and Foundress' rehabilitation. Mary Ward has been canonically recognized as such by the Holy See & henceforth one may freely and gratefully and I may add fearlessly proclaim her without

hesitation'. But the name of Mary Ward was associated with hopes of union. Irish bishops united against foreign influence and a new general superior of the Loreto sisters elected in 1918 showed herself strongly against union. In an atmosphere of increasing Anglo-Irish political hostility, pro-Mary Ward sisters were removed from office and replaced by those who remembered the Bar Convent's lack of support for Teresa Ball's original Irish foundation and revered her instead as their foundress. A note in the Australian province archives reveals that, 'When MM Raphael Deasey [sic] became Mother-General in 1919 she immediately took steps to suppress devotion to our foundress Mary Ward.'

It was not only Mary Ward who became the object of a campaign of silencing but her great Australian champion. A letter of Mother Ursula Lyons at Kirribilli states, 'the plan of campaign was definite. Mother M. Gonzaga's spirit was to be eradicated - with all allegiances to Mary Ward. Any thought of union was to be treated as distinct disloyalty to the Superior General in Ireland [...] The life of Mary Ward, the annals of York, disappeared from libraries. The name was never mentioned'.⁵⁹ Once again, libraries were pillaged in the attempt to silence the name of Mary Ward. A letter asking for help was daringly sent to the Apostolic Delegate, but help was long in coming. The period from 1924 to the 1940s became known as 'the terrible years'. In 1930 twenty-seven sisters wrote to the General Superior 'this province will never be content until sympathy is shown with the Cause of our Foundress, Mary Ward'. This won them a severe reprimand, but they persevered, writing to Cardinal Merry del Val in Rome. He replied, 'Several years ago the Holy See recognized Mary Ward to be the Foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, nor does the Holy See recognize any other or approve the foolish efforts to invent a different foundress [...] this is public and nobody can question it'.⁶⁰ The signatories of the letter were separated and forbidden to communicate, their letters and conversations monitored & reported on. A former pupil of the schools who entered as a novice through love of Mary Ward clashed so strongly with the novice mistress over the silence regarding her that she was not accepted for vows. Further appeals to the Apostolic Delegate won some redress and in 1945 it was possible to celebrate openly the three hundred year anniversary of Mary Ward's death. The acknowledgment of Mary Ward as foundress of both branches of the Institute became symbolic of all the tensions within a struggle for

Australian independence from Ireland, and was not effectively and completely healed until after the Second Vatican Council.

Pope Benedict XVI is a former pupil of a Mary Ward school in Bavaria. As Cardinal Ratzinger he spoke of her at the Mass in St Mary Major's Basilica commemorating the fourth centenary of her birth in 1985:

'Even when she saw her work destroyed by the authority of the Church she remained obedient, remained, in a rebellious age, firmly anchored in the Catholic Church. Such is the hope and patience of the saints; they sow in the field of the Church not for a brief personal success but for the age to come. The Church caused Mary Ward great suffering, but at the same time, the Church was for her, her surest consolation and peace, the ground of all ages, the guarantee of the truth of the promise: one sows and another reaps.'⁶¹

Carolyn G. Heilbrun writes, 'We tell ourselves stories of our past, make fictions or stories of it, & these narrations *become* the past, the only part of our lives that is not submerged'.⁶² Attempts were made by state repression in England, by church repression in Rome and by her own followers to silence the name of Mary Ward, making a fiction of the story of her founding vision. In the breaking of that silence lies another story, in which she found herself supported by unlikely champions, many of whom, like her, died with their goal unfulfilled. But with a hope and cheerfulness reminiscent of 'that incomparable woman' they persisted. Less than a month before his death Fr. John Morris addressed a last letter to Mother Joseph Edwards in response to her suggestion that he must be getting tired of the struggle to break the silence about Mary Ward, 'Do not say that I must be quite tired of the whole story. I shall never be tired of Mary Ward and I hope she will not be tired of me'.⁶³

-
- ¹ 1951, first World Congress of the Lay Apostolate.
- ² See <http://www.interruptedlives.org> for details of the documentary film *Interrupted Lives: Catholic Sisters Under European Communism*, which features Sister Clara of the CJ Romanian province.
- ³ William Shakespeare, Sonnet 73.
- ⁴ See <http://www.loretonh.nsw.edu.au/faith/ourheritage/paintedlife3.html>, painting 21.
- ⁵ Gemma Simmonds, 'Women Jesuits?' in Thomas Worcester, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Jesuits*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 120-135.
- ⁶ See <http://www.cjengland.org/ourpages01.asp?pageid=83>.
- ⁷ Christina Kenworthy Browne, ed., *Mary Ward 1585-1645, A Briefe Relation: with Autobiographical Fragments and a Selection of Letters* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), p.xiv.
- ⁸ *Ibid*, p.114, see also <http://www.loretonh.nsw.edu.au/faith/ourheritage/paintedlife.html> painting No.9.
- ⁹ *Ibid*, p.122
- ¹⁰ Elizabeth M. Makowski, *Canon Law and Cloistered Women: Periculoso and its commentators 1298- 1545* (Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1997), pp. 40, 46
- ¹¹ See <http://www.loretonh.nsw.edu.au/faith/ourheritage/paintedlife.html>
- ¹² Kenworthy Browne, *A Briefe Relation*, p.5
- ¹³ Henriette Peters, *Mary Ward: a World in Contemplation* (Leominster, Gracewing, 1991), pp.252-3, 577.
- ¹⁴ Emmanuel Gillian Orchard ed., *Till God Will: Mary Ward through her Writings* (London Darton, Longman and Todd, 1985), p. 53.
- ¹⁵ See also Ursula Dirmeier, *Mary Ward und ihre Gründung: die Quellentexte bis 1645* (Münster, Aschendorf, 2007), 1, pp.402, 540.
- ¹⁶ Kenworthy Browne, *A Briefe Relation*, pp.103-5.
- ¹⁷ Rachel Muers, *Keeping God's Silence: Towards a Theological Ethics of Communication* (Oxford: Blackwells, 2004), pp. 32-3.
- ¹⁸ Dirmeier, 1, *Mary Ward*, p.359 [spelling modernized].
- ¹⁹ Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, (Penguin, London, 1945), pp.27-8.
- ²⁰ Dirmeier, 1, pp.664-6 and Makowski, *Canon Law and Cloistered Women*, p.132.
- ²¹ Dirmeier 2, p.325
- ²² Kenworthy Browne, *A Briefe Relation*, p.28.
- ²³ Muers, 36-7.
- ²⁴ Orchard, *Till God Will*, pp.56-57.
- ²⁵ Dirmeier, 1, *Mary Ward*, pp.364-5 [spelling modernized]
- ²⁶ Margaret Mary Littlehales, *Mary Ward: Pilgrim and Mystic*, (Burns & Oates, London, 1988), pp. 253-257.
- ²⁷ Cf. Makowski, *Canon Law and Cloistered Women*, pp. 2, 35, 90.
- ²⁸ See <http://www.loretonh.nsw.edu.au/faith/ourheritage/paintedlife.html> paintings 4 & 6.
- ²⁹ See Dirmeier, 3, *Mary Ward*, pp.213-217 and ff. Cf. also Clare Aquith, *Shadowplay, the Hidden Beliefs and Coded Politics of William Shakespeare*, (New York, Public Affairs, 2005) for similar theories about the plays of Shakespeare. Asquith was educated by the Congregation of Jesus.
- ³⁰ Mary Wright, *Mary Ward's Institute: the Struggle for Identity*, (Crossing, Sydney, 1997), pp.53-57.
- ³¹ *Ibid*, p. 134.
- ³² *Ibid*, p. 134.
- ³³ *Ibid*, p. 135.
- ³⁴ See <http://www.newmanreader.org/biography/ward/volume1/chapter10.html#note5>.
- ³⁵ See <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04097c.htm>.
- ³⁶ See Thomas Jay Williams, *Priscilla Lydia Sellon: the Restorer after Three Centuries of the Religious Life in the English Church*, (London SPCK, 1950)
- ³⁷ BCA, G12B/1c.
- ³⁸ I am indebted for the accuracy of the information regarding Frs. Coleridge and Morris and Sister Catherine Chambers to Sister Christina Kenworthy-Browne, archivist at the Bar Convent, York.
- ³⁹ See M. Gregory Kirkus, *Fr. John Morris SJ. His Relationship with and Work for the Mary Ward Institute*, (printed by the Bar Convent).
- ⁴⁰ Kirkus, *Fr. John Morris SJ.* (p.6 of an unnumbered pamphlet).
- ⁴¹ Bar Convent Archives [BCA], July 4th 1876.
- ⁴² Jesuit Archives, Farm Street, London [SJA], 1878.
- ⁴³ BCA, Oct. 15th 1878.
- ⁴⁴ BCA, Oct. 16th 1878.
- ⁴⁵ SJA, Letter to Mary Joseph Edwards, Sep, 19 1890.
- ⁴⁶ BCA, Sep. 10th 1891, MW 15 12/126.
- ⁴⁷ Kirkus, *Fr. John Morris*, p.12.
- ⁴⁸ BCA, October 13 1879.
- ⁴⁹ SJA, 1891.

⁵⁰ SJA, November 8, 1891.

⁵¹ CJ Archives, Rome, II/0533.

⁵² M. Philip Hardman, *Some Daughters of Mary Ward*, unpublished manuscript, BCA.

⁵³ CJ Archives, Rome, II/0644

⁵⁴ CJ Archives, Rome, II/0688

⁵⁵ CJ Archives, Rome, II/0708

⁵⁶ I am indebted for this & the story of the Memorandum to unpublished research by Sister Francis Orchard CJ.

⁵⁷ See Mary Ryllis Clark, *Loreto in Australia* (UNSW Press, 2009), pp. 162-180 for all that follows.

⁵⁸ Wright, *Mary Ward's Institute*, pp. 142-148.

⁵⁹ Ibid, pp. 165-167.

⁶⁰ Ibid, pp. 171-2.

⁶¹ Bar Convent Archives

⁶² Carolyn G. Heilbrun, *Writing a Woman's Life*, (New York and London, Norton, 1988), p.51.

⁶³ BCA Sept 26 1893 B28.